

**THE CHURCH OF ANTIOCH
AND THE EUCHARISTIC TRADITIONS
(*ca.* 35–130 CE)**

Amiel D. Drimbe
Oxford Centre for Mission Studies

May 2018

THE CHURCH OF ANTIOCH
AND THE EUCHARISTIC TRADITIONS

(ca. 35–130 CE)

Amiel D. Drimbe
Oxford Centre for Mission Studies

ABSTRACT

It is a widespread view in modern scholarship that, in the earliest church of Syrian Antioch (*ca.* 35–130 CE), there came together ‘divergent theological traditions’. Yet here these traditions were ‘balanced’ and ‘synthesized’. So, from Antioch, there emerged a ‘middle [traditional or theological] position’, the *via media* that facilitated the ‘Christian unity’ of the ‘universal church’. This *via media theologica* offered a way of keeping together the divergent Jewish and Hellenistic groups of Antioch.

This study challenges this view and proposes a nuanced understanding of the dynamics of the theological traditions in the earliest church of Antioch. It is beyond reasonable dispute that ‘divergent traditions’ did emerge at Antioch. However, the case for the formulation of a ‘synthesized... middle position’ needs to be re-examined. To this end, the present study 1) analyses the eucharistic traditions of earliest Christianity, focusing on the following key texts: 1 Cor. 11.23–25 (Lk. 22.17–20), Matt. 26.26–29, *Did.* 9.1–10.6, and Ignatius, *Phld.* 4.1; and 2) traces their use within the earliest church of Antioch, arguing that all these traditions were composed (or adapted) and used here, between *ca.* 35–70 CE.

Having located the eucharistic traditions in the church of Antioch, their internal dynamics are subsequently investigated. While these internal dynamics cannot be conclusively unravelled, due to the lack of adequate data, it is highly improbable that, in Antioch, the eucharistic traditions were ‘balanced’ or ‘synthesized’. Rather, there seems to be a pattern of recurrent additions: a recent tradition was added to those already existing, while the older traditions were also kept and revalued. It is by this pattern of the ‘addition’ of new traditions and ‘reevaluation’ of older traditions that the church of Antioch sought to keep and consolidate the unity of its factions.

Finally, since existing scholarship concerns both 1) ‘the divergent groups/traditions’ and 2) ‘the Christian unity... of the universal church’, this study seeks to find an appropriate model of ‘unity and diversity’ in Antioch, by locating the internal dynamics of the Antiochene eucharistic traditions into the larger context of the ‘unity and diversity in earliest Christianity’. The patterns and dynamics uncovered in this study appear to corroborate Hurtado’s more recent ‘interactive diversity model’.

**THE CHURCH OF ANTIOCH
AND THE EUCHARISTIC TRADITIONS**

(ca. 35–130 CE)

by

Amiel D. Drimbe

B.Th. (University of Bucharest)

M.Th. (University of Alba Iulia)

Biblical Studies

Main Supervisor: Prof Andrew D. Clarke (University of Aberdeen)

Second Supervisor: Prof Mark J. Edwards (University of Oxford)

House Tutor: Dr Timothy Keene (Oxford Centre for Mission Studies)

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in Middlesex University

May 2018

Oxford Centre for Mission Studies

DECLARATION

This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree.

Signed



(Candidate)

Date

01/05/2018

STATEMENT ONE

This thesis is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. All sources are acknowledged by inline notes and footnotes, giving explicit references. A bibliography is appended.

Signed



(Candidate)

Date

01/05/2018

STATEMENT TWO

I hereby give consent for my thesis, if approved, to be available for photocopying by the British Library and for Inter-Library Loan, for open access to the Electronic Theses Online Service (EthoS) linked to the British Library, and for the title and summary to be made available to outside organizations.

Signed



(Candidate)

Date

01/05/2018

DEDICATION

With utmost reverence, to God – to You alone be all glory.

With love unspoken, to Adina and Eliana – I have just finished writing a (forthcoming) book; still I cannot find proper words to describe my love for you.

With highest gratitude, to Professor Andrew D. Clarke (University of Aberdeen) and Professor Mark J. Edwards (University of Oxford) – you truly reinvented the word ‘super’ in the ‘supervision’.

With deepest appreciation, to my OCMS family – the word ‘family’ says it all.

With sincere thanksgiving, to my biological family, to my colleagues, and to the many friends that supported this long and costly journey – if I were to mention all of you by name and give just a few details on how much your support means, this section alone would have exceeded the 80,000 word limit.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	vii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Antioch, the cradle of earliest Christianity	1
1.2 Aims and objectives	3
1.3 A history of scholarship	4
1.3.1 The church of Antioch in modern research	4
1.3.2 Unity and diversity in earliest Christianity: from W. Bauer to L.W. Hurtado	13
1.4 Outline of the study	20
2. ‘IT IS NOT THE LORD’S SUPPER THAT YOU EAT...’: PAUL, CORINTH, AND THE LORD’S SUPPER TRADITION	24
2.1 ‘Then he left [Corinth] and sailed for Syria’: On the (long) road to Antioch, via Corinth.....	24
2.2 ‘When you come together [to eat]’: The tradition of the Lord’s Supper in Corinth	26
2.2.1 From the solution to the problem: The difficulty of stating the problem	27
2.2.2 From the solution to the solution: The redundancy of the tradition?	46
2.3 Conclusion	55
3. ‘FOR I RECEIVED FROM [ANTIOCH] WHAT I ALSO PASSED ON TO YOU’: PAUL, ANTIOCH, AND THE LORD’S SUPPER TRADITION.....	56
3.1 From Corinth to Antioch: ‘The ways that I teach in every church’	56
3.1.1 Paul in Corinth: Foundational and universal teachings	56
3.1.2 Paul in Antioch: Chronology.....	60
3.1.3 The Lord’s Supper in Antioch: Conflict.....	66
3.1.4. Preliminary conclusions	69
3.2 From Antioch to Corinth: ‘For I received... what I passed on to you’	70
3.2.1 Paul, Damascus, and the foundational traditions	73
3.2.2 Paul, Mark, and Jerusalem	74
3.2.3 Paul, Luke, and Antioch.....	80
3.3 Conclusion	88
4. ‘THE NEWS ABOUT [JESUS] SPREAD ALL OVER SYRIA’: ANTIOCH AND THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW	90
4.1 ‘As is recorded in the Memoirs of the apostles...’	91

4.2 Locating the Gospel of Matthew: A history of scholarship	96
4.2.1 From Alexandria to Antioch.....	97
4.2.2 Concluding remarks	115
4.3 Locating the Gospel of Matthew: The case for Antioch	116
4.3.1 Antioch after B.H. Streeter.....	120
4.3.2 Matthew and the Didache: Two documents from the same Jewish-Christian milieu.....	126
4.4 Conclusion	128
5. ‘FOR THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS’: MATTHEW, ANTIOCH, AND THE LAST SUPPER TRADITION	130
5.1 Beyond Matthew and Mark: The literary connection, the ritual separation.....	131
5.2 Beyond Matthew, Paul, and Luke: The Antiochene connection, the ritual separation.....	136
5.2.1 Several churches, several traditions	137
5.2.2 Singular church, several traditions	138
5.2.3 Singular church, singular tradition	140
5.3 Conclusion	151
6. ‘THE BROKEN BREAD SCATTERED UPON THE MOUNTAINS’: ANTIOCH AND THE DIDACHE.....	153
6.1 Locating the <i>Didache</i> : The case for Syrian Antioch.....	155
6.1.1 Was the <i>Didache</i> composed in Antioch?.....	158
6.1.2 From Syria to Antioch. Further narrowing arguments.....	169
6.1.3 Preliminary conclusions	172
6.2 Locating the eucharistic traditions of <i>Didache</i> 9–10: The case for Syrian Antioch.....	173
6.2.1 Was <i>Didache</i> 9–10 composed in Antioch?.....	173
6.2.2 Preliminary conclusions	203
6.3 Conclusion	204
7. ‘YOU SHALL KEEP THE EUCHARIST AS FOLLOWS’: ANTIOCH AND THE EUCHARISTIC TRADITIONS OF THE <i>DIDACHE</i>	205
7.1 Two traditions, one function: Before the ‘before’ and ‘after’	206
7.1.1 ‘After you have eaten enough... Come!’.....	208
7.1.2 ‘With regard to the Eucharist, you shall keep [it] as follows...’	211
7.1.3 Making sense of the incompatibilities: A history of scholarship	215
7.1.4 Making sense of the incompatibilities: A proposal.....	224

7.2 The eucharistic traditions of the <i>Didache</i> and the church of Antioch.....	229
7.3 Conclusion	232
8. ‘PARTICIPATE IN ONLY ONE EUCHARIST’: IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH AND THE EUCHARISTIC TRADITIONS	233
8.1 ‘One church, one bishop’: Ignatius and the church of Antioch	233
8.1.1 Ignatius of Antioch: One bishop?.....	235
8.1.2 Ignatius’ Antioch: One church?	246
8.2 ‘One Eucharist, one flesh, one cup’: Ignatius and the eucharistic traditions.....	251
8.2.1 Apostolic traditions	251
8.2.2 Eucharistic traditions.....	254
8.3 Conclusion	270
9. CONCLUSIONS: THE CHURCH OF ANTIOCH AND THE EUCHARISTIC TRADITIONS (ca. 35–130 CE)	271
9.1 Antioch and the eucharistic traditions: Internal dynamics	272
9.2 Antioch and the eucharistic traditions: Internal diversity	280
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	284

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

General abbreviations

BCE	Before Common Era
<i>ca.</i>	circa, approximately
CE	Common Era
cf.	confer, compare
chap(s).	chapter(s)
<i>contra</i>	against
e.g.	exemplum gratia, for example
ed(s).	editor(s), edited by; edition
esp.	especially
ET	English translation
<i>passim</i>	in the following, in several passages
Ger.	German
Gk.	Greek
i.e.	id est, that is
inter alia	among others, among other things
Lat.	Latin
<i>pace</i>	with deference to
pl.	plural
rev.	revised
sg.	singular
trans.	translator, translated by
vol(s).	volume(s)

Translations of the Bible

ESV	English Standard Version
LXX	Septuagint
NASB	New American Standard Bible
NET	New English Translation
NIV	New International Version

NKJV	New King James Version
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version

Books of the Bible

1 Cor.	First Letter to the Corinthians
1 Pet.	First Peter
Acts	Acts of the Apostles
Col.	Letter to the Colossians
Eph.	Letter to the Ephesians
Ezek.	Book of Ezekiel
Gal.	Letter to the Galatians
Is.	Book of Isaiah
Jam.	Letter of James
Jn.	Gospel of John
Lk.	Gospel of Luke
Mal.	Malachi
Matt.	Gospel of Matthew
Mk.	Gospel of Mark
Nah.	Book of Nahum
NT	New Testament
OT	Old Testament
Philem.	Letter to Philemon
Ps.	Book of Psalms
Rev.	Revelation of John

Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

3 Macc.	3 Maccabees
4 Macc.	4 Maccabees
GPet.	Gospel of Peter
GThom.	Gospel of Thomas
Ps. Sol.	Psalms of Solomon
Sir.	Book of Sirach

Apostolic Fathers

<i>Barn.</i>	<i>Epistle of Barnabas</i>
Clement, <i>Cor.</i>	Clement of Rome, (<i>First</i>) <i>Letter to the Corinthians</i>
<i>Did.</i>	<i>Didache (The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles)</i>
Hermas, <i>Man.</i>	Hermas, <i>Shepherd: Mandates</i>
Hermas, <i>Sim.</i>	Hermas, <i>Shepherd: Similitudes</i>
Hermas, <i>Vis.</i>	Hermas, <i>Shepherd: Visions</i>
Ignatius, <i>Eph.</i>	Ignatius, <i>To the Ephesians</i>
Ignatius, <i>Magn.</i>	Ignatius, <i>To the Magnesians</i>
Ignatius, <i>Phld.</i>	Ignatius, <i>To the Philadelphians</i>
Ignatius, <i>Pol.</i>	Ignatius, <i>To Polycarp</i>
Ignatius, <i>Rom.</i>	Ignatius, <i>To the Romans</i>
Ignatius, <i>Smyrn.</i>	Ignatius, <i>To the Smyrnaeans</i>
Ignatius, <i>Trall.</i>	Ignatius, <i>To the Trallians</i>
<i>Mart. Pol.</i>	<i>Martyrdom of Polycarp</i>
Papias, <i>Frag.</i>	Papias, <i>Fragmenta (Fragments)</i>
Polycarp, <i>Phil.</i>	Polycarp, <i>To the Philippians</i>

Tractates in the Mishnah, Tosefta and Talmud

<i>b.</i>	Babylonian Talmud
Ber.	Berakot
‘Ed.	‘Eduyyot
Ketub.	Ketubbot
<i>m.</i>	Mishnah
Pesaḥ.	Pesaḥim
Šabb.	Šabbat
<i>t.</i>	Tosefta
Yad.	Yadayim

Greek and Latin Works

<i>Ap. Const.</i>	<i>Apostolic Constitutions</i>
Athanasius, <i>Ep. fest.</i>	Athanasius, <i>Epistulae festales (Festal Letters)</i>
Cicero, <i>Archia</i>	Cicero, <i>Pro Archia Poeta</i>

Chrysostom, <i>Adv. Jud.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Adversus Judaeos</i>
Clement, <i>Strom.</i>	Clement of Alexandria, <i>Stromata (Miscellanies)</i>
Clement, <i>Protr.</i>	Clement of Alexandria, <i>Protreptikos</i>
Diodorus, <i>Bibl. hist.</i>	Diodorus Siculus, <i>Bibliotheca historica</i>
Diogenes, <i>Oen.</i>	Diogenes, <i>Oenoandensis</i> (fragmenta)
Euripides, <i>Phoen.</i>	Euripides, <i>Phoenissae</i>
Eusebius, <i>Chron.</i>	Eusebius, <i>Chronicon</i>
Eusebius, <i>Hist. eccl.</i>	Eusebius, <i>Historia ecclesiastica (Ecclesiastical History)</i>
Irenaeus, <i>Adv. haer.</i>	Irenaeus, <i>Adversus haereses (Against Heresies)</i>
Jerome, <i>De vir. ill.</i>	Jerome, <i>De viris illustribus (On Illustrious Men)</i>
Josephus, <i>Ag. Ap.</i>	Josephus, <i>Against Apion (Contra Apionem)</i>
Josephus, <i>Ant.</i>	Josephus, <i>Jewish Antiquities (Antiquitates judaicae)</i>
Josephus, <i>J.W.</i>	Josephus, <i>Jewish War (Bellum judaicum)</i>
Justin, <i>1 Apol.</i>	Justin, <i>Apologia I (First Apology)</i>
Justin, <i>Dial.</i>	Justin, <i>Dialogus cum Tryphone (Dialogue with Trypo)</i>
Juvenal, <i>Sat.</i>	Juvenal, <i>Satires</i>
Martial, <i>Epig.</i>	Martial, <i>Epigrammata (Epigrams)</i>
Origen, <i>Cels.</i>	Origen, <i>Contra Celsum (Against Celsus)</i>
Philo, <i>Gen.</i>	Philo, <i>Quaestiones et solutions in Genesim (Questions and Answers on Genesis)</i>
Philo, <i>Leg. alleg.</i>	Philo, <i>Legum allegoriae (Allegorical Interpretation)</i>
Philo, <i>Sacr.</i>	Philo, <i>De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini (On the Sacrifices of Abel and Cain)</i>
Philo, <i>Spec.</i>	Philo, <i>De Specialibus legibus (On the Special Laws)</i>
Plato, <i>Phileb.</i>	Plato, <i>Philebus</i>
Plato, <i>Ep.</i>	Plato, <i>Epigrams</i>
Pliny, <i>Nat. hist.</i>	Pliny (the Elder), <i>Naturalis historia (Natural History)</i>
Pliny, <i>Ep.</i>	Pliny (the Younger), <i>Epistulae (Letters)</i>
Plutarch, <i>Is. et Os.</i>	Plutarch, <i>De Iside et Osiride (On Isis and Osiris)</i>
Ps.-Athanasius, <i>De virg.</i>	Pseudo-Athanasius, <i>De virginitate (On virginity)</i>
Seneca, <i>De prov.</i>	Seneca (the Younger), <i>De providentia (On providence)</i>
Serapion, <i>Euch.</i>	Serapion of Thmuis, <i>Euchologion</i>
Strabo, <i>Geogr.</i>	Strabo, <i>Geographica (Geography)</i>
Tacitus, <i>Ann.</i>	Tacitus, <i>Annales (Annals)</i>
Tertullian, <i>Adv. Marc.</i>	Tertullian, <i>Adversus Marcionem (Against Marcion)</i>
Theodoret, <i>Dial. Immutab.</i>	Theodoret, <i>Dialogue I: The Immutable</i>
Xenophon, <i>Mem.</i>	Xenophon, <i>Memorabilia</i>

Periodicals, Reference Works and Serials

AB	Anchor Bible
ABG	Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
AC	<i>Antike und Christentum</i>
ACC	Alcuin Club Collections
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
<i>AnBib</i>	<i>Analecta Biblica</i>
<i>ANRW</i>	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i>
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
AthANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
<i>ATR</i>	<i>Anglican Theological Review</i>
AV	Die Apostolischen Väter
AYBC	Anchor Yale Bible Commentaries
AZK	Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte
BA	<i>Biblical Archaeology</i>
BDAG	W. Bauer, F.W. Danker, W.F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich, eds. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologiarum Lovaniensium
BHGNT	Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament
<i>BJRL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library</i>
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BR	Biblical Research
BSC	Bible Student's Commentary
BT	Bibliothèque Théologique
BTS	Biblical Tools and Studies
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBNTS	Coniectanea Biblica: New Testament Series
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CHANE	Culture and History of the Ancient Near East
CHS	Church Historical Society
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CThM	Calwer theologische Monographien

<i>Drev</i>	<i>Downside Review</i>
EBC	Expositor's Bible Commentary
ECL	Early Christianity and its Literature
EDNT	Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider, eds. <i>Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . 3 vols. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1994.
EF	Erträge der Forschung
EKK	Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar
<i>EvQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
<i>ExpT</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
FBC	Focus on the Bible Commentary
<i>FF</i>	<i>Foundations and Facets</i>
FKD	Forschungen zur Kirchen-und Dogmengeschichte
FThSt	Freiburger Theologische Studien
GNS	Good News Studies
GP	Gospel Perspectives
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HTS</i>	<i>Hervormde Teologiese Studies</i>
IBT	Interpreting Biblical Texts
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
<i>JAC</i>	<i>Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JCP	Jewish and Christian Perspectives
<i>JECS</i>	<i>Journal of Early Christian Studies</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JPEC</i>	<i>Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics, Economics and Culture</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JR</i>	<i>Journal of Religion</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KAV	Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vatern
LCC	Library of Christian Classics
LCL	Loeb Classical Library

LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
NA	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
NAC	New American Commentary
NCBC	New Cambridge Bible Commentary
<i>Neot</i>	<i>Neotestamentica</i>
NGS	New Gospel Studies
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NIVAC	NIV Application Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NTD	Neue Testament Deutsch
NTL	New Testament Library
NTR	New Testament Readings
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTT	New Testament Theology
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
PAST	Pauline Studies
PBM	Paternoster Biblical Monographs
PNTC	Pillar New Testament Commentary
<i>PRS</i>	<i>Perspectives in Religious Studies</i>
PSB	Părinți și Scriitori Bisericești
QD	Quaestiones disputatae
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>RestQ</i>	<i>Restoration Quarterly</i>
<i>RHR</i>	<i>Revue de l'histoire des religions</i>
<i>RivAC</i>	<i>Rivista di archeologica Cristiana</i>
RNTS	Reading the New Testament Series
<i>RSR</i>	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i>
<i>RTR</i>	<i>Reformed Theological Review</i>
SAC	Studien zur außereuropäischen Christentumsgeschichte
SacPag	Sacra Pagina
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology

SC	Sources chrétiennes
<i>SecCent</i>	<i>Second Century (Journal of Early Christian Studies)</i>
SFC	Selections from the Fathers of the Church
SHBC	Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary
SHVL	Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
<i>SL</i>	<i>Studia Liturgica</i>
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SNTU	Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt
<i>SR</i>	<i>Studies in Religion</i>
SSEJC	Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity
STAC	Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum
<i>StPatr</i>	<i>Studia Patristica</i>
Str-B	H.L. Strack and P. Billerbeck. <i>Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch</i> . 6 vols. München: Beck, 1922–1961.
<i>StTheol</i>	<i>Studia Theologica</i>
<i>SUNT</i>	<i>Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments</i>
<i>TAPA</i>	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
<i>TBT</i>	<i>The Bible Today</i>
TCH	The Transformation of the Classical Heritage
TDNT	G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds. <i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . 10 vols. Trans., G.W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1964–1976.
<i>Them</i>	<i>Themelios</i>
<i>TheoLib</i>	<i>Theological Librarianship</i>
<i>ThStK</i>	<i>Theologische Studien und Kritiken</i>
<i>TMSJ</i>	<i>The Master's Seminary Journal</i>
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
<i>TrinJ</i>	<i>Trinity Journal</i>
<i>TS</i>	<i>Theological Studies</i>
TSAJ	Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
TVG	Theologische Verlagsgemeinschaft
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
<i>TZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>

ULB	Université libre de Bruxelles
UTB	Uni-Taschenbücher
VC	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
VCSup	Supplements to <i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WGRWS	Writings from the Greco-Roman World Supplements
WS	<i>Wiener Studien</i>
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAC	<i>Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum</i>
ZECNT	Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
ZKG	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZSNT	Zacchaeus Studies: New Testament Series

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Antioch, the cradle of earliest Christianity¹

Antioch on the Orontes (Ἀντιόχεια ἢ ἐπὶ Ὀρόντου) was the capital of Roman Syria and one of the chief cities of the East. According to Josephus (*J.W.* 3.2.4.29),² it was the third metropolis of the Empire,³ '[a city] intended to embody and represent in the Eastern world the grandeur and magnificence of Greek civilisation.'⁴ During its Greek and Roman administrations, Antioch became renowned for both 'its scholarship'⁵ and 'architectural splendour'.⁶ Moreover, as Michelle Slee asserts, 'the geographical position of Antioch (in particular its accessibility to Asia Minor) was a significant factor in its growing prestige'.⁷ It is of no surprise, then, that the city attracted numerous inhabitants, from various regions of the Empire (Strabo, *Geogr.* 16.2.4–10).⁸ Therefore, by the first century CE,

It was both an important area for commerce and trade, and a critical military base. Furthermore, a wide variety of people constantly passed through the city, often with news of developments (both political and religious) in other parts of the Empire.⁹

¹ Throughout this study, 'earliest Christianity' covers the first hundred years of the Christian era (*ca.* 30–130 CE), not just the so-called 'Apostolic age' (*ca.* 30–90 CE).

² Josephus ranks Antioch as 'unquestionably third among the cities of the Roman world', after Rome and Alexandria. See W.J. Woodhouse, "Antioch," in T.K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Biblica: A Dictionary of the Bible* (vol. 1; Toronto: George N. Morang & Co, 1899), 184–86. Cf. the more general estimation of Wayne A. Meeks and R.L. Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era* (SBL; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), 1: 'Antioch on the Orontes was a key city [...] one of the three or four most important cities in the Roman Empire.'

³ John P. Meier, "Antioch," in Raymond E. Brown and John P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (New York: Paulist Press, 2004), 85–86.

⁴ Michelle Slee, *The Church in Antioch in the First Century C.E.: Communion and Conflict* (JSNTSup 244; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2003), 1.

⁵ Antioch was an important learning centre, famous for its library (Cicero, *Archia* 3 §4). See G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria: From Seleucus to the Arab Conquest* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), 94, 132.

⁶ Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 1.

⁷ Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 1.

⁸ Thomas A. Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch and the Parting of the Ways: Early Jewish-Christian Relations* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009), 14–16.

⁹ Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 1.

In nuce, Slee describes a city that was, in various ways, both influenced and influential. Of course, this could be said of all major cities of the ancient world, in general. In particular, this could be said of Antioch and its influence on Christianity.¹⁰ As J.P. Meier notices, ‘Antioch was the first important urban center of the Christian movement outside Jerusalem’ (cf. Acts 11.19–21).¹¹ According to Acts 11.26, it was at Antioch that the followers of Jesus were first called Χριστιανοί (‘Christians’).¹² Also, the earliest extant instance of the term Χριστιανισμός (‘Christianity’) is found in the epistolary corpus of Ignatius of Antioch (see *Magn.* 10.1, 3; *Rom.* 3.3; *Phld.* 6.1).¹³ For these reasons, certain scholars designated the city of Antioch ‘the cradle of Christianity’.¹⁴ So, given its prominence in the earliest Christian movement, it is of no surprise that the city also attracted numerous adherents to Christianity from various regions of the East (Acts 13.1).

Therefore, as the earliest Christian writings show, the so-called ‘cradle of Christianity’ was both influenced (e.g., Gal. 2.11–14; Acts 11.19–27; 13.1; 15.1–35) and influential (e.g., Acts 13.2–3; 14.26–28; 15.36–41; 18.22–23; Ignatius, *Pol.* 8.1–2).¹⁵ As Meier concludes his research about the first century of Christianity at Antioch (*ca.* 40–140 CE),¹⁶ it was here that the ‘divergent theological traditions’ of the various Christian groups that inhabited the city were ‘drawn together and synthesized’, ‘for the sake of Christian unity’:¹⁷ ‘Peter, Matthew,

¹⁰ The influence of the Antiochene church during the first century CE is noted in the impressive list of Meier, “Antioch,” 85–86.

¹¹ Meier, “Antioch,” 12.

¹² A possible explanation for this term comes from Justin Taylor, “Why Were the Disciples First Called ‘Christians’ at Antioch? (Ac 11, 26),” *RB* 101/1 (1994): 75–94.

¹³ In Ignatius, the term appears as an identity marker, set in opposition to ‘Judaism’. See (for instance) Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 88.

¹⁴ Meier, “Antioch,” 12. For Woodhouse (“Antioch,” 1:186), it is ‘the cradle of the church’.

¹⁵ For the historical reliability of Acts, with special reference to the texts concerning Antioch (11.19–27; 13.1–2; 14.26–28; 15.1–41; 18.22–23), see the later discussions (§ 3.1.2). For the general use of Acts for the historical reconstruction of early Christianity, see (inter alia): Ben Witherington III (ed.), *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996); Loveday Alexander, “Mapping Early Christianity: Acts and the Shape of Early Church History,” *Int* 57 (2003): 163–73; Clare K. Rothschild, *Luke–Acts and the Rhetoric of History* (WUNT II/175; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).

¹⁶ Meier, “Antioch,” 28–84.

¹⁷ Meier, “Antioch,” 86.

and Ignatius all had to undertake a delicate balancing act between left and right as they struggled for a middle position in what was to become this universal church.’¹⁸

To summarize Meier’s argument, there were ‘divergent theological traditions’, of various Jewish and Gentile groups, that came together in the church of Antioch. Yet there, these traditions were ‘balanced’ and ‘synthesized’. So, from Antioch, there emerged a ‘middle position’ (*via media*) that facilitated the ‘Christian unity’ of the ‘universal church’, as it offered a way of keeping together the divergent groups.¹⁹ This view has largely been accepted by subsequent scholarship, becoming a widespread consensus.²⁰

1.2 Aims and objectives

This study aims to challenge the consensus expressed by Meier and propose a nuanced understanding of the dynamics of the (theological) traditions in the church of Antioch, during the first century of its existence (*ca.* 35–130 CE).²¹ It is beyond reasonable dispute that ‘divergent traditions’ were gathered at Antioch. However, the case for the formulation of a ‘synthesized... middle position’ needs to be re-examined. For the re-examination of this view, I have chosen 1) to analyse the eucharistic traditions of earliest Christianity; and 2) to trace their use within the church of Antioch, focusing on the following key texts: 1 Cor. 11.23–25, Matt. 26.26–29, *Did.* 9.1–10.6, and Ignatius, *Phld.* 4.1.

¹⁸ Meier, “Antioch,” 85.

¹⁹ Meier, “Antioch,” 85–86.

²⁰ Inter alia: W.D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (vol. I; ICC; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 146 (n. 126); David A. deSilva, *An Introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, Methods and Ministry Formation* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2004), 238 (n. 11). See also the reviews of Stephen C. Barton (*ExpT* 95.4/1984), I.H. Marshall (*JSNT* 8.25/1985), Alastair Logan (*SJT* 38.2/1985), and David L. Balch (*JBL* 104.4/1985). Meier himself builds upon the conclusions of B.H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: Macmillan, 1930), 511–16.

²¹ This study follows the dating suggested by D.C. Sim, “How Many Jews Became Christians in the First Century? The Failure of the Christian Mission to the Jews,” *HTS* 61 (2005): 429: ‘The church in Antioch on the Orontes was established in the early to mid 30s, by certain Hellenists.’ For the dating of the Ignatian corpus (*ca.* 120–130), see § 8.1.1 (1).

Therefore, connecting the four eucharistic texts to the early church of Antioch constitutes the main objective of this study. Once connected to Antioch, a subsequent objective is to unravel their internal dynamics. And finally, since the Meier consensus mentions both the ‘divergent groups/traditions’ and ‘the Christian unity... of the universal church’, a third objective is to locate these internal dynamics into the larger context of the ‘unity and diversity in earliest Christianity’.

1.3 A history of scholarship

The focus on the eucharistic traditions and the selection of the key texts is dictated by the history of scholarship to which I now turn. Moreover, since this task brings together 1) the history of the early church of Antioch and its traditions and 2) the issue of unity and diversity in earliest Christianity, the following history of scholarship will address both matters.

1.3.1 The church of Antioch in modern research

Since the church of Antioch was highly influential in early Christianity, it is expected that numerous studies would have focused on its rise and evolution.²² Many of these studies address the state of the early church of Antioch indirectly, especially scholarship on Galatians, the Gospel of Matthew, the Acts of the Apostles, the *Didache*, and Ignatius of Antioch.²³

²² Inter alia: C.H. Kraeling, “The Jewish Community at Antioch,” *JBL* 51 (1932): 130–60; B.M. Metzger, “Antioch-on-the-Orontes,” *BA* 11 (1948): 69–88; Meeks-Wilken, *Jews and Christians*, 13–25; W. Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 61–76; D.S. Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch: A Study of Early Christian Thought in the East* (Cambridge: CUP, 1982), 1–26; Meier, “Antioch,” 12–86; N.H. Taylor, *Paul, Antioch and Jerusalem: A Study in Relationships and Authority in Earliest Christianity* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992); Eckhard Rau, *Von Jesus zu Paulus: Entwicklung und Rezeption der antiochenischen Theologie im Urchristentum* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1994); Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer, *Paul between Damascus and Antioch: The Unknown Years* (trans., John Bowden; London: SCM Press, 1997), 178–310; J. Crowe, *From Jerusalem to Antioch: The Gospel Across Cultures* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1997); Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 12–164; Magnus Zetterholm, *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch: A Social-Scientific Approach to the Separation Between Judaism and Christianity* (London/New York: Routledge, 2003).

²³ Inter alia: S.A. Cummins, *Paul and the Crucified Christ in Antioch: Maccabean Martyrdom and Galatians 1 and 2* (SNTSMS 114; Cambridge: CUP, 2001); Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:143–46; David C. Sim, *The Gospel*

However, my history of scholarship will be limited to several monographs that examine the Antiochene church directly, particularly, and diachronically. But before I begin to assess some of these monographs, a general appraisal is required.

If Josephus' account is accurate,²⁴ the Jews were among the original settlers of Syrian Antioch (*Ag. Ap.* 2.39; *Ant.* 12.119; *J.W.* 7.44–45). Although he doesn't give specific figures, the historian considers the Jewish population living there to be 'numerous' (*J.W.* 7.44–45). In the estimation of W.A. Meeks and R.L. Wilken, during the first century CE the Jewish population of Antioch was about 22,000,²⁵ while C.H. Kraeling suggests 45,000²⁶ out of a total of 300,000–400,000 inhabitants.²⁷ In Antioch, therefore, Christianity evolved alongside Judaism—in its various forms.²⁸ Moreover, as David Sim estimates, not many Jews of Antioch adhered to the emerging Christianity.²⁹ Rather, there was a growing 'partition' since the beginnings of Antiochene Christianity,³⁰ as the movement there was predominantly Gentile (e.g., Acts 11.19–26; 15.1–35; *Did.* 1.1–6.3; 8.1–2; Ignatius, *Magn.* 10.1–3; *Phld.* 6.1): 'Antioch was the starting point for self-conscious mission to gentiles who had not previously become Jewish proselytes'.³¹ Moreover, the separation caused, at times, tensions and

of Matthew and Christian Judaism: The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Community (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998); W.D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: CUP, 1964), 91–125; Taylor, "Disciples First Called 'Christians' at Antioch," 75–94; Martin Hengel, *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity* (trans., John Bowden; Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2003), 99–110; Huub van de Sandt (ed.), *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005); Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen K. Zangenberg (eds.), *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings* (Atlanta: SBL, 2008); W.R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 10–11; Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 1–88.

²⁴ For a discussion on the accuracy of Josephus' figures, see Zetterholm, *Christianity in Antioch*, 32–37.

²⁵ Meeks-Wilken, *Jews and Christians*, 8.

²⁶ Kraeling, "Jewish Community at Antioch," 143.

²⁷ Zetterholm, *Christianity in Antioch*, 28. See also G. Downey, "The Size of the Population of Antioch," *TAPA* 89 (1958): 84–91; Rodney Stark, *The Rise of Christianity: How the Obscure, Marginal Jesus Movement Became the Dominant Religious Force in the Western World in a Few Centuries* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1997), 147–62 (150).

²⁸ For a thorough description of the various Jewish groups in Antioch, see Zetterholm, *Christianity in Antioch*, 55–58, 61–100.

²⁹ Sim, "How Many Jews Became Christians," 417–39.

³⁰ Meeks-Wilken, *Jews and Christians*, 18; Meier, "Antioch," 36–44, 57–72; Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 12–52; Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 69–88; James D.G. Dunn, *The Partings of the Ways Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity* (2nd ed.; London: SCM Press), 154–214.

³¹ Meeks-Wilken, *Jews and Christians*, 15.

‘conflicts’³² between the groups. So, given this broad context, it is understandable why most studies on the early church of Antioch would focus almost entirely on the complex relations between Christianity and Judaism, on the one hand, and Gentile and Jewish Christianity, on the other. This tendency will be apparent in the following overview:

(1) W.A. Meeks and R.L. Wilken (1978) examine briefly ‘the story of Christianity’s beginnings in Antioch’.³³ Their historical analysis is limited to ‘the first interactions between Jews and Christians there’,³⁴ or to ‘Christian-Jewish relations’.³⁵ It is also restricted to a few passages from Acts (11.19–26; 13.1; 15.1–35) and Galatians (2.11–21), and some fragments from the Ignatian corpus (*Magn.* 8.1–2; 10.3; *Phld.* 6.1; 8.2).³⁶ In their view, ‘Antioch at [its] earliest point in the church’s history looks [...] like a place of compromise, a bridge between Jewish and gentile Christianity.’³⁷ However, ‘at the instigation of certain people from Jerusalem’ (see Gal. 2.12), the ‘bridge’ is damaged and the ‘division’ or ‘partition’ soon begins, i.e., in the early 40s CE:³⁸

The form of the compromise after the crisis and Paul’s withdrawal is not altogether clear, although it looks from Gal 2:12f. as if former Jews and former gentiles formed henceforth separate fellowships, presumably meeting in different houses. There is also no mention of hostility from synagogue authorities in Antioch, although an argument from this silence would be precarious.³⁹

³² Actually, ‘conflict’ is a keyword in many of these studies. See (for instance) the sub-title of Slee’s work, ‘Communion and Conflict’; Magnus Zetterholm and Samuel Byrskog (eds.), *The Making of Christianity: Conflicts, Contacts, and Constructions* (CBNTS 47; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2012); Cornelis Bennema, “The Ethnic Conflict in Early Christianity: An Appraisal of Bauckham’s Proposal on the Antioch Crisis and the Jerusalem Council,” *JETS* 56/4 (2013): 753–63.

³³ Meeks-Wilken, *Jews and Christians*, 13.

³⁴ Meeks-Wilken, *Jews and Christians*, 13.

³⁵ Meeks-Wilken, *Jews and Christians*, 19.

³⁶ Meeks-Wilken, *Jews and Christians*, 13–21.

³⁷ Meeks-Wilken, *Jews and Christians*, 18.

³⁸ Meeks-Wilken, *Jews and Christians*, 18.

³⁹ Meeks-Wilken, *Jews and Christians*, 18.

The ‘partition’ becomes even more conspicuous after the events of 66–70 CE, as the letters of Ignatius reveal (see *Magn.* 8.1–2; 10.3; *Phld.* 6.1; 8.2).⁴⁰ However, this exacerbated separation should not be interpreted as a ‘decisive break’:⁴¹

if such a separation did take place around 70, it certainly did not mean the once-for-all isolation of the Judaeo-Christians from gentile Christians nor of Jews from Christians. The active influence of Judaism upon Christianity in Antioch was perennial until Christian leaders succeeded at last in driving the Jews from the city in the seventh century.⁴²

Throughout their study, Meeks-Wilken mention only one ‘liturgical’⁴³ text that is connected to first-century Antioch; yet its mention is entirely subjected to the main focus, i.e., the ‘Christian-Jewish relations’. They consider that, in *Smyrn.* 1.1–2, Ignatius quotes a ‘baptismal reunification formula [...] which probably echoes the liturgy of baptism at Antioch’:⁴⁴ ‘... his holy and faithful ones, whether among Jews or Gentiles, in the one body of his church’ (see Gal. 3.27–28).⁴⁵ Although this could be fundamental for the church of Antioch in the early second century (*ca.* 100–130 CE),⁴⁶ the baptismal fragment is only mentioned by Meeks-Wilken to contrast Ignatius’ radical attitude against the Jewish Christians (*Magn.* 8.1–2; 10.3; *Phld.* 6.1; 8.2).⁴⁷

⁴⁰ As Meier (“Antioch,” 13) notices, Meeks-Wilken do not offer primary sources for the period 40–70 CE.

⁴¹ Meeks-Wilken (*Jews and Christians*, 18) challenge the view of William Farmer, “The Post-Sectarian Character of Matthew and Its Post-war Setting in Antioch of Syria,” *PRS* 3 (1976): 235–47. Farmer has argued that, at Antioch, there was a ‘decisive break’ between Jews and Christians in the aftermath of the Jewish war (66–70 CE).

⁴² Meeks-Wilken, *Jews and Christians*, 18.

⁴³ Meeks-Wilken, *Jews and Christians*, 19. Throughout this study, I make a plain distinction between ‘liturgical’ and ‘ritual’. In my view, the term ‘ritual’ is the preferable one, when referring to the use of the earliest Christian traditions and creeds (*ca.* 30–70 CE). The term ‘liturgical’, I suggest, involves both steady formulation and deeper theological reflection, not just the ritual use. See the later discussions: § 3.2.2.1; § 5.1; § 7.1.4 (3).

⁴⁴ Meeks-Wilken, *Jews and Christians*, 19.

⁴⁵ For the view that, in Gal. 3.27–28, Paul is quoting an earlier ritual (baptismal) formula, see Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul’s Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1979), 181–85; R.N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (WBC 41; Dallas: Word, 1990), 151; J.L. Martyn, *Galatians: A New Translation and Introduction with Commentary* (AB 33A; New York: Doubleday, 1997), 378–83.

⁴⁶ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 220–24.

⁴⁷ Meeks-Wilken, *Jews and Christians*, 19–20.

(2) J.P. Meier (1983) notices the time gap between Galatians and Acts (*ca.* 50–70s CE), on the one hand, and the writings of Ignatius (*ca.* 108–117 CE), on the other.⁴⁸ Consequently, for a more elaborate reconstruction of the early church of Antioch, he adds the Gospel of Matthew (*ca.* 80–90 CE),⁴⁹ for it offers ‘reliable information about the period in-between’.⁵⁰ As a result, Meier proposes the examination of the literature of the first three ‘generations’ of Christians at Antioch: 1) the literature of the first generation (*ca.* 40–70 CE), Galatians and Acts; 2) the second generation (*ca.* 70–100 CE), the Gospel of Matthew; 3) the third generation (*ca.* 100–140 CE), the writings of Ignatius.⁵¹

As was mentioned above, Meier is particularly interested in the formation of a theological ‘middle position’ that facilitated ‘the Christian unity’ of the ‘universal church’.⁵² Therefore, he sees the church of Antioch as the place in which ‘divergent theological traditions’ came together and were ‘balanced’ and harmonized (‘synthesized’).⁵³ It was also the place in which divergent Christian groups learned to cohabit, despite their differences.⁵⁴ To prove these points, he focuses on Peter (representing the first generation), Matthew (second generation), and Ignatius (third generation). Following B.H. Streeter⁵⁵ and B. Holmberg,⁵⁶ Meier sees Peter as representing the *via media* between the ‘liberalism’ of Paul and the ‘conservatism’ of James: ‘In the face of these divisions and tensions within the Christian community, Peter may have played a moderating role, helping to keep the compromise solution from degenerating into complete schism.’⁵⁷

⁴⁸ Meier, “Antioch,” 13.

⁴⁹ Meier’s arguments for the Antiochene provenance of Matthew are listed in “Antioch,” 15–27.

⁵⁰ Meier, “Antioch,” 13.

⁵¹ Meier, “Antioch,” 13.

⁵² Meier, “Antioch,” 85.

⁵³ Meier, “Antioch,” 57, 86.

⁵⁴ Meier, “Antioch,” 41–43, 53–57, 78–79.

⁵⁵ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 504, 511–16.

⁵⁶ Bengt Holmberg, *Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 22.

⁵⁷ Meier, “Antioch,” 41.

According to Meier, ‘Peter’s pivotal role at Antioch, holding the two groups of Antiochene Christians together’,⁵⁸ was later assumed by Matthew, in whose Gospel Peter is a major character. For him, the Gospel of Matthew is ‘a theological and pastoral response to a crisis of self-identity and function in the Antiochene church’.⁵⁹ This crisis of identity was caused by the fall of Jerusalem and its temple, followed by the extinction of the Jerusalemite mother-church, the separation from the local synagogue,⁶⁰ and the death of Peter and James, the influential figures of the past generation.⁶¹ Moreover, this crisis led to the rigidification of three competing factions: 1) ‘the extreme Judaizers’ (refusing to accept the Gentiles into the community); 2) ‘the James group’ (accepting the Gentiles in the church, but requiring ‘stringent observance of the Mosaic Law’); 3) ‘the Hellenists’ (insisting on the acceptance of the Gentiles, without the requirements of the Law).⁶² Thus, Matthew attempts to ‘embrace, reinterpret, and synthesize the competing traditions’ of the three groups, in order to realize an ‘inclusive synthesis’ that would hold them together.⁶³

The church of Ignatius was so different from the church of Matthew that ‘we may be inclined to ask ourselves whether the latter could possibly be the descendant of the former.’⁶⁴ And yet, ‘Ignatius had inherited, in a more developed form, the tensions present in the Antiochene church from the days of Peter and Matthew.’⁶⁵ Accordingly, similar to Matthew, Ignatius ‘seeks a middle path between two extremes’:⁶⁶ the docetists (‘the left wing’) and the Judaizers (‘the right wing’).⁶⁷ In the words of V. Corwin, whom Meier cites, Ignatius was ‘the leader of the centrist party, which was maintaining a balance between the two extremes... [so,

⁵⁸ Meier, “Antioch,” 41.

⁵⁹ Meier, “Antioch,” 57.

⁶⁰ Meier, “Antioch,” 61.

⁶¹ Meier, “Antioch,” 57–58.

⁶² Meier, “Antioch,” 53–55.

⁶³ Meier, “Antioch,” 57.

⁶⁴ Meier, “Antioch,” 74.

⁶⁵ Meier, “Antioch,” 81.

⁶⁶ Meier, “Antioch,” 79 (n. 176).

⁶⁷ Meier, “Antioch,” 79.

Ignatius' theology] relies... on a strategy of inclusiveness.⁶⁸ In regard to the 'inclusiveness' of the 'divergent traditions', Meier concludes:

Ignatius was moved by [the analogous] theological crisis to take a direction similar to that of Matthew: to draw together venerable Christian traditions from different, even divergent streams, all in the service of the unity of the church...⁶⁹

Meier refers repeatedly to the 'divergent traditions' that were 'synthesised' within the church of Antioch. And yet he fails to address in depth the issue of the eucharistic traditions, all the more as these could invalidate or, at least, nuance his conclusions, as I will attempt to show later.⁷⁰ He does argue, however, that the eucharistic tradition of Matt. 26.26–29 was composed in Antioch, although it differs from the traditions of Paul (1 Cor. 11.23–26) and Luke (22.17–20), that were 'used in Antioch in the 40s'.⁷¹ Moreover, although there was only one Antiochene church,⁷² he admits that, even since the time of Paul and Peter, the divergent groups of Antioch held the Eucharists separately.⁷³ The situation remains unchanged by the time of Ignatius, when at least one faction of the church (i.e., the docetists) rejected the bishop's Eucharist.⁷⁴ Nevertheless, Meier does not draw much from these very brief references.

(3) M. Slee (2003) criticizes Meier for his failing 'to take into account the evidence of the *Didache*... as primary [resource] for the situation in the Antioch church in the first century CE'.⁷⁵ Moreover, she considers her addition of the *Didache* a 'relatively unprecedented step'.⁷⁶ In her own words, Slee aims to 'examine the problem of Gentile entry into the church in

⁶⁸ Virginia Corwin, *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), 64; Meier, "Antioch," 79 (n. 176).

⁶⁹ Meier, "Antioch," 78.

⁷⁰ I admit that the examination of the eucharistic traditions goes beyond the declared purpose of Meier's study (see Meier, "Antioch," 12–14). However, I am raising this point for (as I mentioned above) it could invalidate or, at least, nuance Meier's conclusions.

⁷¹ Meier, "Antioch," 25–26.

⁷² Meier, "Antioch," 40, 80.

⁷³ Meier, "Antioch," 40, 80.

⁷⁴ Meier, "Antioch," 80.

⁷⁵ Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 3. Cf. Meier, "Antioch," 81–84.

⁷⁶ Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 3.

Antioch during the period 50–100 CE and the related issue of Jewish–Gentile tablefellowship’.⁷⁷ So, adding the *Didache* to the existing list of ‘primary resources’, the ‘key texts’ Slee examines are ‘Acts 15, Gal. 2.1–14, the *Didache*, and the Gospel of Matthew’.⁷⁸ Since her study concerns ‘the period 50–100 CE’, the omission of Ignatius is justified.

As anticipated in her ‘Aims and Objectives’ section, Slee examines 1) the ‘conflictual’ relations between Jews and Gentiles and 2) their effect on the participation at the Eucharist. Actually, this double task is also emphasised in the sub-title of her monograph, i.e., ‘Communion and Conflict’. With regard to these two matters, Slee develops an argument similar to Meier’s:

That these issues nearly destroyed the Antioch church will be demonstrated, as will the fact that it was the Antioch church itself that managed to produce an effective solution to these issues, a solution that restored unity to the church and ensured its survival.⁷⁹

In my opinion, Slee’s treatment of the two ‘issues’ (the ‘communion’ and ‘conflict’) is fairly unbalanced. Although its sub-title places first the ‘communion’, the main focus of the study is on the ‘conflict’. In this regard, Slee follows previous scholars. For instance, throughout the three chapters dedicated to the Gospel of Matthew there are no references to the ‘communion’ of the Matthean church, nor to the eucharistic form of Matthew (Matt. 26.26–29).⁸⁰ Also, the placing of Matthew’s Gospel after the *Didache* has not gained wide acceptance among NT scholars.⁸¹ Then, Slee considers that ‘the Antioch incident’, the dispute between Paul and Peter (Gal. 2.11–14), involves the eucharistic meals, which is also a minority view in modern scholarship.⁸² At the same time, she does not connect Paul’s eucharistic form (1 Cor. 11.23–

⁷⁷ Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 1.

⁷⁸ Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 1.

⁷⁹ Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 1.

⁸⁰ Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 118–55.

⁸¹ G. Stanton, “The Early Church of Antioch: Review,” *ExpT* 116/9 (2005): 294.

⁸² Stanton, “The Early Church of Antioch,” 294. Slee follows Philip Esler, *Galatians* (NTR; London/New York: Routledge, 2003), 135–40.

26) to the church of Antioch, a view with a much larger acceptance.⁸³ The only section in which a eucharistic text receives adequate attention is the section on the *Didache*.⁸⁴ In conclusion, given her unbalanced focus on the ‘conflictual’ issue, Slee should have reversed the sub-title of her study, i.e., ‘Conflict and Communion’.

1.3.1.1 Placing this study in the history of research: The Church of Antioch and eucharistic traditions

The history of research was limited to the three studies above,⁸⁵ since I will attempt to construct the current study in the line of their progression. First of all, it should be noted that these studies successively build upon each other.⁸⁶ Moreover, with every new study, there is a new primary source that is added, i.e., Matthew (1983) and the *Didache* (2003). Then, there is a growing interest in the issue of the Eucharist, and how it relates to the complex relations between Jews and Gentiles in Antioch.

So, following this line of progression, the focus of the current study will be on the dynamics of the eucharistic traditions of the Antiochene church in its first century (*ca.* 35–130 CE), for this approach was neglected by previous scholarship. And since the issue of Jewish-Gentile relations dominated earlier studies, it is not my intention to focus on its analysis. I will only refer to the issue when it is requisite for the better understanding of the context in which

⁸³ Inter alia: Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (trans., Norman Perrin; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), 188; G.D. Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy: The Moorhouse Lectures 1975* (Cambridge: CUP, 2008), 23; Leonhard Goppelt, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (UTB; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976), 356; Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1988), 548 (n. 18); Burton L. Mack, *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1991), 102–120 (116); Friedrich Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther* (NTD 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 150, 153, 157–60; Ben Witherington III, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1995), 250; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AYBC 32; New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2008), 429; J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Keys to First Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues* (Oxford: OUP, 2009), 207. See the later discussions (§ 3.2.3).

⁸⁴ Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 94–100.

⁸⁵ I have omitted some major works (e.g., Downey, *History of Antioch*; Hadrill, *Christian Antioch*; Zetterholm, *Christianity in Antioch*) for reasons given in this section.

⁸⁶ Meier, “Antioch,” 22 (n. 51); Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 3.

the eucharistic traditions developed in Antioch. However, I hope that this new approach will offer some fresh nuances on this issue of Jewish-Gentile relations.

Furthermore, given the emphasis on the eucharistic traditions of the church of Antioch, I will also add a new primary source to this study, namely the tradition of 1 Cor. 11.23–25 (cf. Lk. 22.17–20). So, as was anticipated in the section ‘Aims and Objectives’, the key texts of this study are: 1 Cor. 11.23–25, Matt. 26.26–29, *Did.* 9.1–10.6, and Ignatius, *Phld.* 4.1. Moreover, in the same section I have expressed the hope that this study will offer a fresh understanding of the dynamics of the traditions within the church of Antioch. Finally, there is another contribution to scholarship I anticipate. Although there is an emphasis on the eucharistic traditions, this study only partially fits the area of Liturgical Studies. Still, this area may also benefit from the current approach; to my knowledge, there are not many liturgical studies focused on the evolution of the liturgy within the same location.⁸⁷

1.3.2 Unity and diversity in earliest Christianity: from W. Bauer to L.W. Hurtado

(1) In 1934, Walter Bauer published ‘perhaps his most significant scholarly contribution’,⁸⁸ *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*.⁸⁹ Following the examination of several Christian urban centres at the end of the first century and beginning of the second (Antioch included),⁹⁰ Bauer challenged a long-standing view on the development

⁸⁷ See (for instance) Hans Lietzmann, *Mass and the Lord's Supper: A Study in the History of the Liturgy* (trans., Dorothea H.G. Reeve; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979 [1926]); Dom Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London/New York: Continuum, 2007 [1945]); Willy Rordorf et al., *The Eucharist of the Early Christians* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990); Eugene LaVerdiere, *The Eucharist in the New Testament and the Early Church* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996); Paul F. Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins* (ACC 80; London: SPCK, 2004); Paul F. Bradshaw and Maxwell E. Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies: Their Evolution and Interpretation* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2012).

⁸⁸ So, Andreas J. Köstenberger and Michael J. Kruger, *The Heresy of Orthodoxy: How Contemporary Culture's Fascination with Diversity Has Reshaped Our Understanding of Early Christianity* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2010), 24.

⁸⁹ Walter Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1934). For ET, see n. 22 (§ 1.3.1).

⁹⁰ Bauer examines four major geographical centres of earliest Christianity: Asia Minor, Egypt, Syria (Edessa and Antioch), and Rome.

of earliest Christianity, i.e., the existence of a doctrinal mainstream that was in continuity with the teachings of Jesus and his apostles (see Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 3.3.4; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.32.8), a view in which ‘unity preceded diversity’ or ‘orthodoxy preceded heresy’.⁹¹ Instead, earliest Christianity was characterized by a generalized diversity from its very beginnings, so that there was no ‘orthodoxy’ nor ‘heresy’, Bauer argued.⁹² There were no theological, confessional, or traditional streams that could be traced back to Jesus and the apostles.⁹³ In other words, it was a view in which ‘heresy preceded orthodoxy’ or ‘diversity preceded unity’.⁹⁴

(2) Bauer’s seminal work has gained remarkable acceptance among scholars.⁹⁵ J.M. Robinson and H. Koester (1971),⁹⁶ for instance, building upon Bauer’s concept of initial and prevailing diversity, proposed a ‘trajectory’ model in which ‘there were multiple versions of the Christian movement from the outset, which [...] could be traced diachronically, each of them generating a distinguishable “trajectory” through early Christianity’.⁹⁷ Therefore, categories such as ‘canonical’ and ‘non-canonical’ or ‘orthodox’ and ‘heretical’ are inadequate for the study of earliest Christianity, as these were not yet existent during its formative years.⁹⁸

⁹¹ John Kaufman, “Diverging Trajectories or Emerging Mainstream? Unity and Diversity in Second Century Christianity,” in Reidar Hvalvik and John Kaufman (eds.), *Among Jews, Gentiles and Christians in Antiquity and the Middle Ages: Studies in Honour of Professor Oskar Skarsaune on his 65th Birthday* (Trondheim: Tapir Academic Press, 2011), 115–16; L.W. Hurtado, “Interactive Diversity: A Proposed Model of Christian Origins,” *JTS* 64 (2013): 445; Michael J. Kruger, *Christianity at the Crossroads: How the Second Century Shaped the Future of the Church* (London: SPCK, 2017), esp. 135–66.

⁹² Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, xi; Bart D. Ehrman, *Lost Christianities: The Battles for Scriptures and the Faiths We Never Knew* (Oxford: OUP, 2003), 2–3, 172–76.

⁹³ Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, xxv.

⁹⁴ Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, xxii–xxiii.

⁹⁵ Georg Strecker, “Appendix 2: The Reception of the Book,” in Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 286–316; Daniel J. Harrington, “The Reception of Walter Bauer’s Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity during the Last Decade,” *HTR* 73 (1980): 289–98; Ehrman, *Lost Christianities*, 176.

⁹⁶ James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester, *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), esp. 8–19.

⁹⁷ Hurtado, “Interactive Diversity,” 446.

⁹⁸ Robinson-Koester, *Trajectories*, 270; Helmut Koester, “ΤΝΩΜΑΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΟΙ: The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity,” *HTR* 58/3 (1965): 279–84.

(3) The works of Bauer and Robinson-Koester have the merit of emphasising the ‘diversity’ of earliest Christianity.⁹⁹ Virtually all subsequent critics of the ‘Bauer thesis’ admit that ‘there was variety of belief in the first century’,¹⁰⁰ or that Bauer’s study provided ‘an adequate basis for [the] conclusion [...] that early Christianity was diverse’.¹⁰¹ Nevertheless, Arland J. Hultgren (1994) argued that ‘there was a stream of Christianity—which indeed was a broad stream—that claimed that there were “limits to diversity”, and that persisted from the beginning on into the second century, providing the foundations for orthodoxy’.¹⁰² Hultgren agrees that there was diversity in earliest Christianity, but also suggested six major unifying elements: Christology, soteriology, the church as community, etc.¹⁰³ For him, these unifying elements point to the existence of a ‘normative tradition’, that can be attested since the earliest stages of Christianity.¹⁰⁴ A similar view was proposed four decades earlier by Henry E.W. Turner (1954), according to which there were several ‘fixed elements’ within earliest Christianity.¹⁰⁵ One of the fixed elements was the ‘realistic experience of the Eucharist’.¹⁰⁶ In sum, there was a ‘limited diversity’ in earliest Christianity; still, the Eucharist was among its ‘fixed elements’, it belonged to the ‘broad stream’.

(4) In spite of its title, Bauer’s work focused primarily on the literature of the second century CE. His interactions with the NT texts are minimal, as scholars have noticed.¹⁰⁷ Consequently,

⁹⁹ Hurtado, “Interactive Diversity,” 452: ‘Bauer’s 1934 book has been credited with making some scholars more aware of early Christian diversity.’

¹⁰⁰ I.H. Marshall, “Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earlier Christianity,” *Them* 2 (1976): 13; Köstenberger-Kruger, *Heresy of Orthodoxy*, 35.

¹⁰¹ Thomas A. Robinson, *The Bauer Thesis Examined: The Geography of Heresy in the Early Christian Church* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1988), 28.

¹⁰² Arland J. Hultgren, *The Rise of Normative Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 22; Köstenberger-Kruger, *Heresy of Orthodoxy*, 37.

¹⁰³ Hultgren, *Normative Christianity*, 87–103.

¹⁰⁴ Hultgren, *Normative Christianity*, 104.

¹⁰⁵ Henry E.W. Turner, *The Pattern of Christian Truth: A Study in the Relations between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church* (London: A.R. Mowbray, 1954), 26–35.

¹⁰⁶ Turner, *Pattern of Christian Truth*, 28–31.

¹⁰⁷ Kaufman, “Diverging Trajectories,” 118; Köstenberger-Kruger, *Heresy of Orthodoxy*, 30.

Robinson-Koester attempted to remedy this shortcoming, and trace the diverse traditions of the second century back to their first-century ‘trajectorial’ streams.¹⁰⁸ However, it was James D.G. Dunn (1977) who applied Bauer’s thesis particularly to the NT, i.e., to ‘*earliest Christianity*’.¹⁰⁹ Following Bauer’s line, Dunn argued that, in the NT, it is the diversity that prevails.¹¹⁰ As for the unity in the NT, there is an ‘integrating centre’, a ‘unifying element’, and a grand unifying theme: that of Jesus as the exalted Lord.¹¹¹ As part of his investigation, Dunn approaches the issue of the Eucharist (‘the Lord’s supper’) in the NT.¹¹² In his view, the NT shows both the ‘continuity’ and the ‘developments’ of the earliest eucharistic traditions.¹¹³ He identifies ‘at least two different textual traditions’ or ‘divergent forms’, namely Mk. 14.22–25/Matt. 26.26–29 and 1 Cor. 11.23–25/Lk. 22.17–20.¹¹⁴ For Dunn, these ‘divergent forms’ indicate that, in different regions, Christians had various degrees of separation between the Eucharist proper and the full meal, various degrees of transforming the meal ‘into a ritual act’, and various degrees of understanding the significance of the distinctive elements.¹¹⁵ So, it was the eucharistic diversity that preceded the unity, for ‘What we now call the Lord’s Supper, the Eucharist, Holy Communion, the mass, may be *the end result of a conflating or standardizing of a number of divergent traditions.*’¹¹⁶ However, in Dunn’s reconstruction, the diversity that

¹⁰⁸ Robinson-Koester, *Trajectories*, 8–19 (16), 114; Koester, “ΤΝΩΜΑΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΟΙ,” 284.

¹⁰⁹ James D.G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity* (3rd ed.; London: SCM Press, 2006), xi, 3–8 (emphasis original). Note the evaluation of Kaufman (“Diverging Trajectories,” 124): ‘With his model of diversity and unity in earliest Christianity, Dunn is primarily concerned with the diversity found within the emerging “orthodox” movement, not with diverging trajectories, but his model could easily be harmonized with that of Robinson and Koester, simply by allowing a number of alternative trajectories to remain outside the bounds of orthodoxy.’

¹¹⁰ Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, 406–408 (407): ‘We must conclude therefore that *there was no single normative form of Christianity in the first century.*’ (Emphasis original).

¹¹¹ Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, 369, 403–406, 437.

¹¹² Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, 176–83.

¹¹³ Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, 178–80.

¹¹⁴ Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, 181. Cf. Jens Schroeter, “Die Funktion der Herrenmahlsüberlieferungen im 1. Korintherbrief: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Rolle der ‘Einsetzungsworte’ in frühchristlichen Mahltexten,” *ZNW* 100/1 (2009): 99.

¹¹⁵ Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, 182–83.

¹¹⁶ Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, 180 (emphasis original).

is examined is ‘canonical diversity’¹¹⁷ and the ‘divergent traditions’ are ‘apostolic traditions’, belonging solely to the NT.¹¹⁸

(5) Since the discovery of the *Didache* (1873), scholars have struggled to place this writing in the larger context of the early Christian diversity.¹¹⁹ And when the issue of diversity is considered, probably the first passage that comes to the surface is *Did.* 9–10. For this section, ‘concerning the Eucharist’ (*Did.* 9.1), completely omits the words of institution and lacks any reference to Jesus’ passion.¹²⁰ Moreover, the eucharistic elements, which appear in the reversed order cup–bread, are nowhere related to Jesus’ blood or body.¹²¹ In the words of A.B. McGowan, these are ‘texts which present evidence that simply falls outside the paradigm’.¹²² To solve the peculiarities, earlier scholars tended to date this tradition later (second/third century CE) or to reject its eucharistic function.¹²³ Nowadays, however, most scholars admit both the primitive dating of *Did.* 9–10 (*ca.* 50–70 CE) and its eucharistic character.¹²⁴ As a result, this acknowledgment reignited the debate on the earliest Eucharist and diversity, for *Did.* 9–10 represents a ‘divergent [eucharistic] tradition’ that is not apostolic, nor belongs to the NT corpus (see Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.25.4–6; Athanasius, *Ep. fest.* 39.7).

¹¹⁷ Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, 415; Kaufman, “Diverging Trajectories,” 122–24.

¹¹⁸ Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, 413–15, 434–59.

¹¹⁹ D. Jeffrey Bingham, “The *Didache* as a Source for the Reconstruction of Early Christianity: A Response,” in Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford (eds.), *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity* (ECL 14; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 515–28; Jonathan A. Draper, “Conclusion: Missing Pieces in the Puzzle or Wild Goose Chase? A Retrospect and Prospect,” in Draper-Jefford, *Didache*, 529–43.

¹²⁰ A.B. McGowan, “‘Is There a Liturgical Text in This Gospel?’: The Institution Narratives and their Early Interpretive Communities,” *JBL* 118/1 (1999): 73–87; M.D. Larsen, “Addressing the Elephant That’s Not in the Room: Comparing the Eucharistic Prayers in *Didache* 9-10 and the Last Supper Tradition,” *Neot* 45/2 (2011): 252–74.

¹²¹ A.B. McGowan, “‘First Regarding the Cup...’: Papias and the Diversity of Early Eucharistic Practice,” *JTS* 46/2 (1995): 551–55.

¹²² A.B. McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists: Food and Drink in Early Christian Meals* (Oxford: OUP), 23–24.

¹²³ Theodor Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur* (3 vols.; Erlangen: Deichert, 1881–1884), 3:293–98; Frederick E. Vokes, *The Riddle of the Didache: Fact or Fiction, Heresy or Catholicism?* (London: SPCK, 1938), 197–207; Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 118 (n. 5). See the lengthier discussions in Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 141–42; Alan J.P. Garrow, *The Gospel of Matthew’s Dependence on the Didache* (JSNTSS 254; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 13–25. Cf. McGowan, “‘First Regarding the Cup,’” 551.

¹²⁴ E.g., Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 11; Draper, “Missing Pieces,” 541; Thomas O’Loughlin, *The Didache: A Window on the Earliest Christians* (London: SPCK, 2010), 86–104.

In 2008, Jonathan Schwiebert included *Did.* 9–10 in his study on the ‘exploration of early Christian diversity’, whose main focus is the ‘ritual divergence’.¹²⁵ Schwiebert builds his thesis upon Robinson-Koester’s ‘trajectory’ model, positing various Christian groups that evolved in relative isolation from one another, and variations of early traditions used independently from one another.¹²⁶ Consequently, the interaction between *Did.* 9–10 and the eucharistic traditions of the NT (Mk. 14.22–25; Matt. 26.26–29; Lk. 22.17–20; 1 Cor. 11.23–25) is minimal.¹²⁷ For Schwiebert, these are

two meal rituals taking two distinct paths but sharing significant common ground: two ‘eucharistic’ or meal traditions growing, without mutual influence, in a common environment and performing comparable functions for their participants. Both look to Jesus but for different reasons and, one might say, with different purposes.¹²⁸

As for the tradition of *Did.* 9.1–10.6, it belongs to the ‘Q trajectory’, being the outcome of a Christian group that saw Jesus solely as a wisdom teacher or revealer.¹²⁹

(6) For L.W. Hurtado (2013), the diversity of early Christianity is ‘undeniable’.¹³⁰ And yet, Robinson-Koester’s model is to be rejected, for ‘the image of a trajectory may oversimplify matters and may in some cases impose an artificial connection of texts and phenomena’.¹³¹ Despite its flaws, the ‘trajectory’ model was fairly influential, ‘part of the reason for the salience of the Robinson/Koester trajectories model is that there have been few rival theories of comparable breadth of scope.’¹³² Accordingly, Hurtado proposes an ‘interactive diversity

¹²⁵ Jonathan Schwiebert, *Knowledge and the Coming Kingdom: The Didache’s Meal Ritual and its Place in Early Christianity* (London: T&T Clark, 2008), 3.

¹²⁶ Schwiebert, *Knowledge*, 2–3. Cf. Hurtado, “Interactive Diversity,” 446.

¹²⁷ Schwiebert, *Knowledge*, 19–58, 107–110.

¹²⁸ Schwiebert, *Knowledge*, 110.

¹²⁹ Schwiebert, *Knowledge*, 113–47 (145): ‘The *Didache*’s meal ritual exhibits sympathies with a range of instructional materials, but its closest affinities lie with the kinds of sayings material preserved in Q especially, as well as the *Gospel of Thomas*, and at points John.’ But note the critique of Larry W. Hurtado: “Interactive Diversity,” 449–51; *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2003), 452–79.

¹³⁰ Hurtado, “Interactive Diversity,” 445.

¹³¹ Hurtado, “Interactive Diversity,” 445, 447–52.

¹³² Hurtado, “Interactive Diversity,” 446.

model’, that ‘more adequately reflects the complex nature of early Christianity’.¹³³ In his view, the ‘diversity of early Christianity also involved a rich and varied interaction and a complexity that is not adequately captured in a “trajectory” approach.’¹³⁴ What makes Hurtado’s view particularly interesting for this study is that he distinguishes between the ‘trans-local diversity’ (Acts 8.1–28.31)¹³⁵ and ‘intra-church diversity’, as shown in 1 Cor. 11.17–34.¹³⁶ However, the latter model is applied solely to Corinth and the participants at the ‘Lord’s Supper’.¹³⁷ Could this ‘intra-church diversity’ model be also applied to Antioch and the eucharistic traditions?

1.3.2.1 Placing this study in the history of research: Diversity in earliest Christianity and the eucharistic traditions

As a reaction to Bauer’s view (i.e., the initial and prevailing diversity), Hultgren suggested a ‘limited diversity’ model.¹³⁸ As a reaction to Robinson-Koester’s view (i.e., isolated ‘trajectories’), Hurtado suggested an ‘interactive diversity’ model. Furthermore, Dunn applied the ‘Bauer thesis’ to the NT, part of his examination dealing with the NT eucharistic traditions (Mk. 14.22–25/Matt. 26.26–29; 1 Cor. 11.23–25/Lk. 22.17–20). Since Dunn’s interest was in ‘*earliest* Christianity’,¹³⁹ he paid less attention to the post-NT literature. Schwiebert, on the other hand, applied Koester-Robinson’s ‘trajectory’ model to the *Did.* 9–10, yet paid less attention to the NT texts and their interaction, as the two streams of traditions are seen ‘without mutual influence’: ‘Comparing the Last Supper tradition and the meal ritual

¹³³ Hurtado, “Interactive Diversity,” 445, 452–54.

¹³⁴ Hurtado, “Interactive Diversity,” 445.

¹³⁵ Hurtado, “Interactive Diversity,” 454: ‘along with the evident diversity, a well-attested “networking” was another feature of early Christianity. This involved various activities, among them the sending and exchange of texts, believers travelling for trans-local promotion of their views (as e.g. the “men from James” in Gal. 2:11, or Apollos’ travels to Corinth in 1 Cor. 1:12; 3:5–9; 16:12), representatives sent for conferral with believers elsewhere (as depicted, e.g. Acts 15:1–35), or sent to express solidarity with other circles of believers (as e.g. those accompanying the Jerusalem offering in 1 Cor. 16:3–4).’

¹³⁶ Hurtado, “Interactive Diversity,” 453.

¹³⁷ Hurtado, “Interactive Diversity,” 453.

¹³⁸ As Hurtado (“Interactive Diversity,” 446 [n. 4]) notices, ‘Hultgren did not really offer a rival model.’

¹³⁹ Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, xi (emphasis original).

of *Didache* 9-10 is something like comparing apples and oranges.’¹⁴⁰ Moreover, in order to integrate *Did.* 9–10 into the ‘Q trajectory’, Schwiebert had to reject its Antiochene provenance.¹⁴¹

The current study examines also the diversity of the eucharistic traditions in earliest Christianity. So, in a sense, it owes much to Bauer’s seminal work. However, unlike Bauer, I don’t think that the diversity of earliest Christianity was ‘prevailing’.¹⁴² On the other hand, Hultgren’s ‘limited diversity’ model is not satisfactory either, especially when the eucharistic traditions of the *Did.* 9–10 are also considered.¹⁴³ So, another objective of this study is to find an appropriate model of diversity.

Furthermore, unlike Dunn, I am interested in the eucharistic traditions found both in the NT (Matt. 26.26–29; Mk. 14.22–25; Lk. 22.17–20; 1 Cor. 11.23–25) and the post-NT literature (*Did.* 9.1–10.6, and Ignatius, *Phld.* 4.1). Unlike Schwiebert, I will attempt to show that *Did.* 9–10 could be placed in Antioch, as could most of the NT eucharistic traditions (Matt. 26.26–29; Lk. 22.17–20; 1 Cor. 11.23–25). If my attempt to locate all these traditions in Antioch is successful, then the probability that there was an ‘interaction’ between them is high. So, would the ‘internal dynamics’ of these eucharistic traditions fit Hurtado’s ‘interactive diversity’ model? To answer this question will be the focus of the concluding chapter.

1.4 Outline of the study

To locate the eucharistic traditions of Matt. 26.26–29, Lk. 22.17–20, 1 Cor. 11.23–25, and *Did.* 9.1–10.6 in Antioch is the major challenge of the study. For if these traditions are not located

¹⁴⁰ Schwiebert, *Knowledge*, 98.

¹⁴¹ Schwiebert, *Knowledge*, 13 (n. 32).

¹⁴² See Kaufman, “Diverging Trajectories,” 124–28; R.L. Wilken, “Diversity and Unity in Early Christianity,” *SecCent* 1 (1981): 101–110.

¹⁴³ Schwiebert, *Knowledge*, 98–110.

there in reasonably convincing manners, the whole reconstruction is questionable. In a sense, this is the Achilles' heel of the whole study. Consequently, the Antiochene location will receive greater attention throughout this study, in the search to establish a plausible case.

In chapter two (“‘It is not the Lord’s Supper you eat’”: Paul, Corinth, and the Lord’s Supper tradition’), I will examine the way in which Paul uses the tradition of 1 Cor. 11.23–25 in the Corinthian setting (1 Cor. 11.17–34), analysing whether its use there is typical for the way the apostle uses the same tradition in other settings. In chapter three (“‘For I received from [Antioch] what I also passed on to you’”: Paul, Antioch, and the Lord’s Supper tradition’), the tradition of 1 Cor. 11.23–25/Lk. 22.17–20 will be connected to the church of Antioch, exploring a double hypothesis: a) Paul taught this tradition while he was in Antioch (Acts 11.25–26; 13.1; cf. 1 Cor. 4.17); b) Paul was taught this tradition while he was in Antioch (Acts 11.25–26; 1 Cor. 11.23a). In sum, the two chapters attempt to locate the tradition of 1 Cor. 11.23–25 in Antioch, in the 30s–40s CE.

Chapter four (“‘The news about [Jesus] spread all over Syria’”: The Gospel of Matthew and Antioch’) will seek to locate the composition of Matthew’s Gospel in Antioch, following a widespread consensus. Moreover, the competing theories concerning its provenance will be tested as well (i.e., Alexandria, Edessa, Caesarea Maritima, Transjordan, Phoenicia, Jerusalem, Syria), in order to assess the relative pre-eminence of the Antiochene hypothesis. Once the Gospel of Matthew is connected to Antioch, in chapter five (“‘For the forgiveness of sins’”: Matthew, Antioch and the Last Supper Tradition’) I will examine the use of the Last Supper tradition (Matt. 26.26–29) in the Antioch of the 70s–80s CE, and its connection to the prior tradition of 1 Cor. 11.23–25/Lk. 22.17–20.

In my view, the eucharistic traditions of *Did.* 9–10 (*ca.* 50–70 CE) predate Matthew’s Gospel (*ca.* 66–70 CE). Still, the Last Supper tradition recorded in Matt. 26.26–29 could be pre-Matthean, originating as early as the 40s. This is why I have decided to include the chapters

on Matthew before those on the *Didache*.¹⁴⁴ So, in chapter six (““The broken bread scattered upon the mountains”: The *Didache* and Antioch’) I will seek to defend and even strengthen the growing consensus regarding the Antiochene provenance of the *Didache*. Then, in chapter seven (““You shall keep the Eucharist as follows”: Antioch and the eucharistic traditions of the *Didache*’), I will examine the internal dynamics of the two traditions of *Did.* 9.1–5 and 10.1–6, as these could offer a glance into the internal dynamics of other traditions (Matt. 26.26–29, Lk. 22.17–20, and 1 Cor. 11.23–25).

In chapter eight (““Participate in only one Eucharist”: Ignatius of Antioch and the eucharistic traditions’), I will examine the use of eucharistic traditions in Antioch, during the period of Ignatius, with special reference to 1 Cor. 11.23–25 and Matt. 26.26–29. The internal dynamics of these two traditions will also be investigated. The final chapter of this study (‘Conclusions: The church of Antioch and the eucharistic traditions’) includes an examination of the internal dynamics of the eucharistic traditions of the first-century Christian Antioch (*ca.* 35–130 CE) and seeks to relate these internal dynamics to the larger academic context of ‘unity and diversity in earliest Christianity’.

Some thoughts on the hypothetical character of this study

As with many NT studies that are breaking relatively new ground, this study cannot offer on occasion more than reasonable hypotheses. For, given the fragmented and varied state of Antioch research, the extant data does not always allow for a conclusive approach.

Nonetheless, there is widespread academic precedent for an approach like this. For much scholarship today is, inevitably, based on a ‘best case’ argument. This is also how NT scholarship often works: for much NT scholarship concerns the development and testing of hypotheses, which lead to more or less of a consensus. Yet, each consensus starts as a single

¹⁴⁴ Pace Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 54–155.

voice and, though many details cannot be regarded as ‘fact’, they are often treated as such for the sake of argument and testing.

As for the present study, when the limited working data will only allow the formulation of a particular ‘best case’ scenario, I will seek to follow two methodological steps: 1) I will build a particular hypothesis upon the existing scholarly consensus. I will only challenge the consensus if there are solid grounds for doing so. 2) When it is possible, I will offer more than one scenario, trying to cover as many viewpoints as possible.

In the future, new evidence may challenge or develop some of the views expressed in this study. If this happens, this work has met its goal in seeking to shine a spotlight on current conclusions. For now, however, the project should not be dismissed just because not all of its findings may be considered incontrovertible at this stage. Again, so much historical research on the NT is yet unprovable, but nonetheless used as a working assumption.¹⁴⁵ Thus, the intention of this study is to further research on the church of Antioch and its eucharistic traditions, by offering several working assumptions.

¹⁴⁵ For instance, both John P. Meier and Raymond E. Brown (*Antioch and Rome*, 211–16) admit the hypothetical character of their reconstructions. However, they ‘ask that critics should provide more convincing [reconstructions] rather than simply find fault with theirs.’ See I. Howard Marshall, “Antioch and Rome: Book Review,” *JSNT* 8/25 (1985): 125–26.

CHAPTER 2

‘IT IS NOT THE LORD’S SUPPER THAT YOU EAT...’:

PAUL, CORINTH, AND THE LORD’S SUPPER TRADITION

2.1 ‘Then he left [Corinth] and sailed for Syria’: On the (long) road to Antioch, *via* Corinth

In 1 Cor. 11.23–25, Paul quotes the tradition of the ‘Lord’s Supper’ (cf. 1 Cor. 11.20),¹ tradition that he has previously ‘passed on’ to the Corinthians, most probably when he founded this church (Acts 18.1–18).² This is indicated by the use of the technical verbs of 11.23a, παρέλαβον... ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα (‘I received... what I passed on’), which in both Jewish (e.g., Josephus, *Ant.* 13.297; 408; cf. *m. Pe’ah* 2.6; ‘Ed. 8.7; *Yad.* 4.3) and Hellenistic circles (e.g., Plato, *Phileb.* 16c; *Ep.* 12.359d; Diodorus, *Bibl. hist.* 12.13.2; Plutarch, *Is. et Os.* 352c) mark the use of prior, consecrated traditions, ‘received’ from previous generations and ‘passed on’ to the next.³ Since there is no proof that Paul revisited Corinth between the foundation of the church (Acts 18.1–18) and the writing of 1 Corinthians (1 Cor. 5.9; 16.3–7),⁴ it is reasonable to conclude that he ‘passed on’ this tradition while he was there, i.e., during 50–52 CE (Acts

¹ Throughout this chapter, the eucharistic tradition of 1 Cor. 11.23–25 is called ‘the Lord’s Supper tradition’, following Paul’s phrasing (1 Cor. 11.20). For the technical use of the phrase κυριακὸν δεῖπνον in 1 Cor. 11.20, see Andreas Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief* (HNT 9/1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 251. According to Lindemann, κυριακὸν δεῖπνον could be technical, for it has no article.

² For a chronology of Paul, see § 3.1.2.

³ See Craig S. Keener, *1–2 Corinthians* (NCBC; Cambridge: CUP, 2005), 98. Keener calls this phrasing ‘conventional ancient language for carefully transmitted tradition’. Also, Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 195; Christine Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus? Analogien zwischen den echten Paulusbriefen und den synoptischen Evangelien* (BZNW 213; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015), 274–290 (275).

⁴ Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer, *Paul between Damascus and Antioch: The Unknown Years* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), xiii–xiv; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AYBC 32; New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2008), 37–45. Cf. J.M. Gilchrist, “Paul and the Corinthians: The Sequence of Letters and Visits,” *JSNT* 34 (1988): 47–69; J.R. Richards, “Romans and I Corinthians: Their Chronological Relationship and Comparative Dates,” *NTS* 13 (1966–67): 14–30. See the chronological table in the next chapter, § 3.1.2 (2).

18.12–18).⁵ Moreover, most scholars date the writing of 1 Corinthians between 54–56 CE.⁶ So, in 1 Cor. 11.23–25, Paul passes on the Lord’s Supper tradition to the Corinthians for a second time, within half a decade. This immediate repetition could offer a clue to the importance of this tradition for the apostle.⁷ But how important was this tradition for Paul? Was it so important that Paul would make it a fundamental teaching for all his churches, including the church of Antioch (see 1 Cor. 4.17)?

The aim of this chapter and the next is to answer the questions above, by exploring whether there is a connection between this particular tradition (1 Cor. 11.23–25) and the church of Antioch. The attempt to establish such a connection will test two working scenarios: 1) Paul taught this tradition while he was one of the teachers in the church of Antioch (Acts 13.1); 2) despite the use of the Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου (‘I received from the Lord’) formula, Paul was taught this tradition while he was in Antioch. But before I proceed to establish this connection, I will closely examine the background of its use in Corinth (1 Cor. 11.17–34). There are a couple of reasons for this ‘detour’: 1) by examining the historical and literary context of 1 Cor. 11.23–25, I seek to evaluate the importance of this tradition for Paul; 2) in the attempt to identify similarities between the background in which Paul uses the tradition in Corinth and the background of the church of Antioch (cf. Gal. 2.11–14; Matt. 26.26–29;

⁵ There is a widespread consensus on the historical reliability of Acts 18.12–18. Actually, Gallio’s governorship of Achaia (May 51 to April 52) is usually considered ‘the only firm date in the Pauline calendar’ and the point of departure for any chronological reconstruction. So, E.P. Sanders, *Paul: The Apostle’s Life, Letters, and Thought* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015), 227; Rainer Riesner, *Paul’s Early Period: Chronology, Mission Strategy, Theology* (trans., Doug Stott; Grand Rapids/Cambridge: W.B. Eerdmans, 1998), 211. See also: F.F. Bruce, *Paul: Apostle of the Free Spirit* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 1977), 248–55; Robert Jewett, *A Chronology of Paul’s Life* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 59–62, 104 and *passim*; John B. Polhill, *Paul and His Letters* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999), 78–80; Anthony C. Thiselton: *The Living Paul: An Introduction to the Apostle and His Thought* (London: SPCK, 2009), 26–28; *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2000), 29–32; J. Murphy-O’Connor, “When Was Paul in Corinth,” in *St. Paul’s Corinth: Texts and Archaeology* (GNS 6; Wilmington: Glazier, 1983), 129–52.

⁶ E.g., Jewett, *A Chronology of Paul’s Life*, 104; Riesner, *Paul’s Early Period*, 322; Polhill, *Paul and His Letters*, 79–80, 230; Thiselton: *The Living Paul*, 31–35; *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 31–32; Wolfgang Schrage, *Der Erste Brief an die Korinther* (EKK VII/1–3; Zürich: Benziger, 1991–1999), 1:36.

⁷ For Jacobi (*Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus*, 272), Paul recapitulates the tradition of 1 Cor. 11.23–25 because, unlike the previous traditions (cf. 11.2), the Corinthians were not ‘holding to this tradition’. The focus of my study, however, is not so much about how this tradition should have been kept by the Corinthians, but on what it meant for Paul. See § 2.2.2.2.

Ignatius, *Phld.* 4.1), I will challenge some long-established scholarly consensuses. However, in order that these challenges might be effective, a thorough examination of 1 Cor. 11.17–34 is required. So, let us turn to this pericope.

2.2 ‘When you come together [to eat]’: The tradition of the Lord’s Supper in Corinth

Paul quotes the Lord’s Supper tradition (1 Cor. 11.23–25) as part of a larger argument, developed in 1 Cor. 11.17–34. When this pericope is broadly considered, its occasional nature comes to the surface at once (see 11.34b). Of course, this observation applies to the whole letter (cf. 1.10–11; 7.1).⁸ As Thomas Schreiner notes,

One of the remarkable features of the Lord’s Supper in Paul’s writings is that, were it not for 1 Corinthians, we would not even know that it was practiced in Pauline communities. This serves as a reminder that the Pauline letters are occasional letters addressed to specific situations.⁹

Indeed, 1 Cor. 11.17–34 was likewise intended as a solution to a particular ‘problem’;¹⁰ or a reaction to ‘a specific situation’ (cf. vv. 17–22, 33–34). Unfortunately, as will be shown below, many ‘specifics’ of this situation still remain unknown. Nevertheless, while the exact nature of the problem is far from clear (see vv. 17–22), the solution that Paul renders twice (cf. vv. 22a, 33–34a) appears to be clear enough. This observation will be furthered in the following section, as I will examine the use of the Lord’s Supper tradition (vv. 23–25) as part of Paul’s solution to the Corinthian situation (vv. 17–22, 26–34).

⁸ For the relevance of 1 Cor. 1.10–11 and 7.1 to the occasion and themes of the letter, see (inter alia): Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1987), 46, 266–67; Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians* (SacPag 7; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999), 67–76.

⁹ Thomas R. Schreiner, *New Testament Theology: Magnifying God in Christ* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 730.

¹⁰ James D.G. Dunn, *1 Corinthians* (London/New York: T&T Clark, 1999), 76. Cf. A.B. McGowan, “‘Is There a Liturgical Text in This Gospel?’: The Institution Narratives and their Early Interpretive Communities,” *JBL* 118/1 (1999): 78: ‘[Paul] invokes the narrative for an explicit and particular purpose regarding the life of the community at Corinth, that is, the proper ordering of the eucharistic assembly.’

2.2.1 From the solution to the problem: The difficulty of stating the problem

The church of Corinth was a church divided (cf. 1.10–16; 3.1–5; 6.1–8).¹¹ And these ‘divisions’ (σχίσματα) manifested themselves even when the church ‘gathered together’ (συνέρχομαι; vv. 17, 19, 20, 33, 34) for the Lord’s Supper. This, at least, emerges quite clearly from the passage itself (vv. 17–22). Other than this, it is difficult to establish with greater precision the particularities of the problem that 1 Cor. 11.17–34 addresses. See, for instance, Schreiner’s appropriate evaluation: ‘Identifying the precise problem in the church is difficult, but the general nature of the situation is clear enough. Paul is dismayed because divisions among the members surfaced when they gathered for the Lord’s Supper.’¹²

For James Dunn, ‘One of the most serious problems in the view of Paul and his informants (11:18), but not, it would appear, of the Corinthians who wrote the letter to Paul, was the behaviour of the Corinthians at the common meal.’¹³ In 1 Cor. 7.1, Paul introduces a major division, responding to several topics addressed by the Corinthians in a previous letter (περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατε; cf. 8.1; 11.16; 12.1; 16.1).¹⁴ However, there is no indication that they addressed the ‘serious problem’ of the Lord’s Supper in their letter, since Paul emphasises that he heard about their ‘schismatic’ behaviour from oral reports (11.18): πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ συνερχομένων ὑμῶν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀκούω σχίσματα ἐν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχειν (‘in the first place, I hear that, when you come together as a church, there are divisions among you’).¹⁵ Accordingly, it may be assumed that the Corinthians (or at least some ‘factions’) considered their behaviour at the meal to be ‘fair and proper’.¹⁶

¹¹ See especially Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993).

¹² Schreiner, *New Testament Theology*, 731.

¹³ Dunn, *1 Corinthians*, 76.

¹⁴ Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 266–67.

¹⁵ Note the distinction between ‘you wrote’ (7.1; cf. 8.1; 11.16; 12.1; 16.1) and ‘I hear’ (11.18).

¹⁶ So, Gerd Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity* (trans., J.H. Schütz; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982), 154.

This striking lack of awareness has led numerous scholars, following the influential works of Günther Bornkamm¹⁷ and especially Gerd Theissen,¹⁸ to hypothesize that this ‘behaviour’ has to do with the discriminatory social stratification that the Corinthians kept during their common meal.¹⁹ By doing so, they mirrored the ‘formalized meals’ of the Greco-Roman society, meals that were marked by boundaries: stratification *versus* equality, exclusion *versus* inclusion, etc.²⁰ According to this ‘social’ reading of the pericope, the rich members of the church (the ‘haves’) treated the poor (the ‘have-nots’) in a shameful and despising manner (1 Cor. 11.22): τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ θεοῦ καταφρονεῖτε, καὶ καταισχύνετε τοὺς μὴ ἔχοντας.²¹ Again, it is difficult to pinpoint how exactly the discrimination happened, hence scholars take two major interpretative paths, emphasising either the temporal or the spatial aspect of the historical reconstruction.

2.2.1.1 A temporal reading of 1 Cor. 11.17–34

One possibility is to read 1 Cor. 11.21 (ἕκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον προλαμβάνει ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν) and 11.33 (ὥστε, ἀδελφοί μου, συνερχόμενοι εἰς τὸ φαγεῖν ἀλλήλους ἐκδέχεσθε) in a temporal manner.²² Such a reading requires a temporal sense for the verb προλαμβάνω (v. 21), giving temporal force to the preposition προ (‘before’, ‘prior to’, ‘in advance’).²³ It also

¹⁷ Günther Bornkamm, “Herrenmahl und Kirche bei Paulus,” in *Studien zu Antike und Christentum: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (vol. II; München: Kaiser, 1959), 138–76.

¹⁸ Theissen, *Social Setting*, 145–68.

¹⁹ On the influence of Bornkamm and Theissen, see Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 252.

²⁰ See (for instance) Theissen, *Social Setting*, 145–68; J. Murphy-O’Connor, “House-Churches and the Eucharist,” in *St. Paul’s Corinth*, 153–61; Dennis E. Smith, *From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early Christian World* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 9–12, 173–217.

²¹ E.g., Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 532–33.

²² This reading is followed (inter alia) by: Theissen, *Social Setting*, 151–55; Murphy-O’Connor, *St. Paul’s Corinth*, 160–61; Schrage, *Der Erste Brief*, 3:24–26; P. Lampe, “The Eucharist: Identifying with Christ on the Cross,” *Int* 48 (1994): 36–49 (37).

²³ BDAG, 872; Theissen, *Social Setting*, 151.

requires that the phrase ἀλλήλους ἐκδέχεσθε (11.33) be translated ‘wait for one another’, with a similar temporal sense as in 1 Cor. 16.11 (cf. Acts 17.16).²⁴

According to this reading, ‘the haves’ came to the gathering place (συνέρχουμαι) where the common meal was held earlier than the poor, bringing ‘their own food’ (the *eranos* or the ‘basket dinner’)²⁵ and consuming it in advance (11.21). By the later time the poor arrived at the gathering, due to their stricter work timetable,²⁶ most of the food was already consumed. Consequently, they had to settle for the leftovers, or endure hunger (11.21b): καὶ ὃς μὲν πεινᾷ.²⁷

2.2.1.2 A spatial reading of 1 Cor. 11.17–34

The other hypothetical reconstruction considers that the ‘humiliation’ of the poor occurred in their presence.²⁸ Five times in vv. 17–22, 33–34 Paul refers to the Corinthian church as ‘gathering together’, the verb συνέρχουμαι being ‘one of the key words that holds the argument together’:²⁹ ὅτι οὐκ εἰς τὸ κρεῖττον ἀλλὰ εἰς τὸ ἥσσον συνέρχεσθε (v. 17); πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ συνερχομένων ὑμῶν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ (v. 18); Συνερχομένων οὖν ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ οὐκ ἔστιν κυριακὸν δεῖπνον φαγεῖν (v. 20); συνερχόμενοι εἰς τὸ φαγεῖν ἀλλήλους ἐκδέχεσθε (v. 33); ἵνα μὴ εἰς κρίμα συνέρχησθε (v. 34). Moreover, the phrase ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ in v. 18 may well

²⁴ See the lengthier discussion in David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 540, 554.

²⁵ P. Lampe, “Das korinthische Herrenmahl im Schnittpunkt hellenistisch-römischer Mahlpraxis und paulinischer Theologia Crucis (1 Kor 11,17–34),” *ZNW* 82 (1991): 183–213; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 541. According to the *eranos* (‘basket dinner’) hypothesis, the Corinthians prepared their own food, packed it in a basket and took it to the gathering place, where the common meal was held. See the discussion in § 2.2.1.2.

²⁶ See Craig L. Blomberg, *1 Corinthians* (NIVAC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 228. According to Lindemann (*Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 252), there was no fixed time for the beginning of the meal. See also, Jens Schroeter, “Die Funktion der Herrenmahlsüberlieferungen im 1. Korintherbrief: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Rolle der ‘Einsetzungsworte’ in frühchristlichen Mahltexten,” *ZNW* 100/1 (2009): 92.

²⁷ *Contra* Justin J. Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 191. Meggitt argues that 1 Cor. 11.21 (including the phrase καὶ ὃς μὲν πεινᾷ) is a Pauline exaggeration, a ‘caricature’.

²⁸ Such a reading is followed (inter alia) by: Bruce W. Winter, “The Lord’s Supper at Corinth: An Alternative Reconstruction,” *RTR* 37 (1978): 73–82; Bradley B. Blue, “The House Church at Corinth and the Lord’s Supper: Famine, Food Supply, and the Present Distress,” *CTR* 5/2 (1991): 221–39; O. Hofius, “The Lord’s Supper and the Lord’s Supper Tradition: Reflections on 1 Corinthians 11:23b–25,” in B.F. Meyer (ed.), *One Loaf, One Cup: Ecumenical Studies of 1 Cor. 11 and Other Eucharistic Texts* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1993), 75–115; Richard B. Hays, *First Corinthians* (Interpretation; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 197, 202–203; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 540–41; Schreiner, *New Testament Theology*, 731–32.

²⁹ Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 536.

be a synonym for ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό (v. 20),³⁰ both phrases describing a gathering that shares common space or location.³¹

Furthermore, according to Peter Lampe, the Corinthian ‘communal meal of the Eucharist’ is to be compared to a Greco-Roman *eranos*,³² in which ‘each participant ate his or her own food, brought along in a basket, or all of the provisions were put on a common table, as is done at a potluck dinner’ (11.21).³³ Using Xenophon’s *Memorabilia*,³⁴ which he considers to closely parallel the Corinthian situation, Lampe shows how both Socrates and Paul ‘tried to protect the *eranos* custom from abuse: It was not to lead some to gorge themselves while others remained hungry.’³⁵ In the light of this Greco-Roman custom, he suggests the following reconstruction:

Each Corinthian celebrating the eucharistic dinner party according to the *eranos* custom brought his or her own food, but some came early and began eating before the others arrived. Some of the latecomers either had no time or no money to prepare sufficient food baskets for themselves. Because of this, they remained hungry, for when *they* arrived, those who had brought enough for themselves had already eaten most of their own food and thus could no longer share it. For Paul, the Corinthian *eranos* had become a social problem for three reasons. First, the self-prepared food portions apparently were of different sizes and qualities, as at Socrates’s dinner party. Second, there was no common starting point. Some began *before* everybody had gathered and the eucharistic ritual could take place. And third, as J. Murphy O’Connor points out, for the latecomers there was probably no room anymore in the *triclinium*, which was the dining room where usually no more than twelve could recline. The latecomers had to sit in the atrium or in the peristyle, which was another disadvantage.³⁶

Therefore, the Corinthians have imitated not only the Greco-Roman customs (the *eranos*), but also its abuses. However, they did not perceive their behaviour at the meal as abusive. In their

³⁰ Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 539.

³¹ Everett Ferguson, “‘When You Come Together’: *Epi to Auto* in Early Christian Literature,” *RestQ* 16 (1973): 202–208; Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 539 (n. 41). For both Ferguson and Fee, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό means “‘together” not in the sense of Christian unity, but in the sense of being “in the assembly””, i.e., being in the same place or in the same location.

³² Lampe, “Eucharist,” 37.

³³ Lampe, “Eucharist,” 38.

³⁴ Xenophon, *Mem.* 3.14.1: ‘Whenever some of those who came together for dinner brought more meat and fish than others, Socrates would tell the waiter either to put the small contributions into the common stock or to portion them out equally among the diners. So, the ones who brought a lot felt obliged not only to take their share of the pool, but to pool their own supplies in return; and so they put their own food also into the common stock. Thus, they got no more than those who brought little with them.’

³⁵ Lampe, “Eucharist,” 39.

³⁶ Lampe, “Eucharist,” 39 (emphasis original).

view, it was the simple compliance of the social *status quo*.³⁷ If Lampe's *eranos* proposal is adopted (v. 21: ἕκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον προλαμβάνει ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν), then the temporal rendering of προλαμβάνω becomes redundant. If one does not share his/her food (τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον), it makes no difference if the food is eaten prior to or simultaneous with others. Note again Lampe's observation:

If everyone was to wait before unpacking his or her own food basket, it stands to reason that the contents of these would have been shared on common platters. Otherwise the waiting, which is supposed to prevent some from remaining hungry, would be senseless.³⁸

Furthermore, it is argued by certain scholars, προλαμβάνω should be translated 'to eat', 'to partake' or 'to devour'.³⁹ Thus, it was an issue of sharing, not of synchronizing.⁴⁰ Following a similar argument, David Garland suggests a stylistic contrast between προλαμβάνω (v. 21) and λαμβάνω (v. 23), as the Corinthians 'take' the food for themselves, while Christ 'takes' the bread and 'shares' it with the participants at the (first) eucharistic meal.⁴¹

Thirdly, as Bruce Winter has proposed, when used in the context of a dinner, the verb ἐκδέχομαι (v. 33) should not be translated 'to wait [for one another]', but rather 'to receive or entertain [one another]'—as in 3 Macc. 5.26; Josephus, *J.W.* 2.14.7.297; *Ant.* 7.14.5.351–352; etc.⁴² According to Winter's reconstruction, 'the rich' and 'the poor' gathered together simultaneously and, while 'the rich' enjoyed larger portions of better quality food (which they brought from their homes), 'the poor' had to settle for less food of inferior quality or no food at all (see Martial, *Epig.* 1.20, 3.60; Pliny, *Ep.* 2.6; Juvenal, *Sat.* 5).⁴³ Furthermore, as J. Murphy-O'Connor has shown, since there were space limitations when all the church 'gathered

³⁷ See Dunn, *1 Corinthians*, 76.

³⁸ Lampe, "Eucharist," 42; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 541, 554.

³⁹ E.g., Winter, "The Lord's Supper at Corinth," 75–77; Blue, "The House Church at Corinth," 230–31; Hofius, "The Lord's Supper," 89–91; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 540.

⁴⁰ E.g., Lampe, "Eucharist," 42; Hays, *First Corinthians*, 203; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 541.

⁴¹ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 542.

⁴² Bruce W. Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2001), 151–52; Hays, *First Corinthians*, 202.

⁴³ See (for instance) Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 540 (n. 55); Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 543–44.

together' (1 Cor. 11.18, 20), one would also expect a spatial differentiation. Accordingly, the rich ate while reclining in the *triclinium* and the poor ate while standing in the *atrium*.⁴⁴

To the above reconstructions Bradley Blue adds some dramatic nuances, suggesting that the city of Corinth faced a severe famine at the time Paul was writing the letter (see 7.26: διὰ τὴν ἐνεστῶσαν ἀνάγκην).⁴⁵ And this makes the attitude and the insensitivity of 'the rich', who were gorging themselves in the presence of the needy and famished poor, even more outrageous.

2.2.1.3 Challenging the consensus: A. Lindemann and D.G. Horrell

Regardless of how scholars reconstruct the details of the Corinthian 'problem', either in terms of time or space, there is a widespread scholarly agreement with regard to the social differentiation or discrimination between 'the rich' and 'the poor'. In other words, it was an upper-lower class separation, that the Corinthians kept even at the Lord's Supper. Therefore, following Theissen and Murphy-O'Connor, numerous scholars assumed that the problem Paul addresses in 1 Cor. 11.17–34 was essentially social, not theological.⁴⁶ It was the behaviour of this 'socially stratified community',⁴⁷ who mirrored the social stratification of Greco-Roman formalized meals.⁴⁸ Note again the generalisation of Schreiner, certainly representative of this consensus:

Identifying the precise problem in the church is difficult, but the general nature of the situation is clear enough. Paul is dismayed because divisions among the members surfaced when they gathered for the Lord's Supper. The divisions in this instance are not theological but social.⁴⁹

⁴⁴ Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth*, 168–69.

⁴⁵ Blue, "The House Church at Corinth," 236. Cf. Bruce W. Winter, "Secular and Christian Responses to Corinthian Famines," *TynBul* 40 (1989): 88–106.

⁴⁶ E.g., Dunn, *1 Corinthians*, 77; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 533: 'The Lord's Supper should accent and intensify group solidarity; the Corinthians' supper accented and intensified social differences.'

⁴⁷ Dunn, *1 Corinthians*, 77.

⁴⁸ Smith, *From Symposium to Eucharist*, 9–12, 173–217.

⁴⁹ Schreiner, *New Testament Theology*, 731.

(1) However, this widespread agreement has been challenged by Andreas Lindemann.⁵⁰ Lindemann questions Theissen’s social reconstruction,⁵¹ as the distinction between ‘the rich’ and ‘the poor’ is hardly evident in the text itself (see 11.18–19).⁵² In his opinion, the οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες (11.22) should not be taken to describe those who ‘have nothing at all’, but only ‘those who have nothing to eat at the table’, for the food has already been consumed, prior to their arrival.⁵³ Furthermore, if social discrimination truly existed, Paul would have addressed the issue explicitly.⁵⁴ His silence on the matter would be inexplicable (cf. 1.26–29), thinks Lindemann.⁵⁵ Consequently, he argues, the Corinthians’ problem was ‘individualism’ (11.21),⁵⁶ since 1 Cor. 11.17–34 concerns the whole community (cf. 11.21, 28),⁵⁷ not only those who were ‘wealthier’.⁵⁸

(2) Another scholarly *quasi-consensus*⁵⁹ that has received a fairly recent critique regards the spatial reconstruction of Murphy-O’Connor, based on the archaeological findings of the Roman villa at Anaploga.⁶⁰ The architectural partition of the villa was used by Murphy-O’Connor as an additional explanation for the divisions at the Lord’s Supper: due to the limitations of the domestic space, the few belonging to the upper class ate while reclining in

⁵⁰ Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 248–61.

⁵¹ Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 260–61.

⁵² Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 252. Another recent critique (from a social and cultural perspective) comes from John S. Kloppenborg, “Precedence at the Communal Meal in Corinth,” *NovT* 58/2 (2016): 167–203.

⁵³ If I understand Lindemann correctly, there seems to be inconsistencies in his interpretation of προλαμβάνω. Cf. Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 251 and 260.

⁵⁴ Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 253, 260–61.

⁵⁵ Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, esp. 253.

⁵⁶ Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 253.

⁵⁷ Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 249, 253. Lindemann refutes H. Probst, *Paulus und der Brief: Die Rhetorik des Antiken Briefes als Form des Paulinischen Korintherkorrespondenz (1 Kor 8–10)* (WUNT II/45; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991), 325. According to Probst, in 1 Cor. 11.2–16 Paul addresses the whole community, while in 1 Cor. 11.17–34 only the wealthier (‘the haves’) are addressed.

⁵⁸ I prefer the generic ‘the wealthier’, rather than the social ‘the rich’ (as numerous scholars have it). As I will argue later, the difference in 1 Cor. 11.17–34 seems to be one of degree, rather than a defined social category of ‘the rich’. See § 2.2.1.4 (1).

⁵⁹ I call this a *quasi-consensus* since the bulk of German scholarship makes little reference to Murphy-O’Connor’s spatial reconstruction, as David Horrell correctly notices. See David G. Horrell, “Domestic Space and Christian Meetings at Corinth: Imagining New Contexts and the Buildings East of the Theatre,” *NTS* 50 (2004): 353 (n. 15).

⁶⁰ Murphy-O’Connor, *St. Paul’s Corinth*, 154–61; S.G. Miller, “A Mosaic Floor from a Roman Villa at Anaploga,” *Hesperia* 41 (1972): 332–54.

the *triclinium*, while the large majority, i.e., ‘the poor’, ate while standing in the *atrium*.⁶¹ His reconstruction was immediately assumed by numerous scholars, becoming a largely accepted view.⁶² In 2004, however, David Horrell rightly brought into question this assumption, affirming the ‘considerable uncertainty concerning the scenario that Murphy-O’Connor depicts’.⁶³ Horrell helpfully summarizes his critique thus:

First, the archaeological evidence is much less clear than [Murphy-O’Connor] implies, and does not allow us to be confident about the character and use of dining rooms in the villa at Anaploga or elsewhere in Corinth at the time of Paul. Second, we can hardly be confident that such a villa is a plausible context in which to imagine the Corinthian Christians meeting. Furthermore, given that even proponents of the new consensus consider the lower classes to have comprised the majority in the congregations, we would do well to try and describe some of the domestic contexts in which it is realistic to imagine such groups meeting.⁶⁴

Instead, Horrell puts forward another ‘imaginative context’⁶⁵ and suggests different (hypothetical) places for the meetings of the Corinthian church, namely the upper-storey rooms on the East Theater Street.⁶⁶ While admitting that this is an ‘entirely imaginative’ reconstruction, ‘though no more so (and probably a good deal less so) than imagining them meeting in the villa at Anaploga’,⁶⁷ Horrell underlines certain strengths of his hypothesis:

The East Theater Street scenario is also imaginative, but for a number of reasons constitutes a more plausible, if less detailed, reconstructed setting: it represents one form of urban accommodation that existed during the time of Paul’s visits to Corinth, a type likely to have been occupied by non-elite, though not the most impoverished, urban residents, and it fits well with the setting Luke depicts in Acts 20.9. Of course, this is only one plausible type of setting among a range of possibilities, but on a number of counts it is worth considering seriously, even though it means confessing that we are – and are likely to remain – unable to ascertain any architectural explanation for the Corinthian *σχίσματα*.⁶⁸

Although Horrell makes no use of the internal data (1 Cor. 11.17–34), since the scope of his study is limited to archaeology, the negative conclusion he reaches (‘we are – and are likely to

⁶¹ Murphy-O’Connor, *St. Paul’s Corinth*, 158–59.

⁶² See the discussion in Horrell, “Domestic Space,” 352–53. Horrell mentions Peter Lampe, Carolyn Osiek and David Balch, Gordon Fee, Richard Hays, Raymond Collins, and Anthony Thiselton.

⁶³ Horrell, “Domestic Space,” 360.

⁶⁴ Horrell, “Domestic Space,” 360. See Murphy-O’Connor’s response in J. Murphy-O’Connor, *Keys to First Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues* (Oxford: OUP, 2009), 190–93.

⁶⁵ Horrell, “Domestic Space,” 360.

⁶⁶ Horrell, “Domestic Space,” 360–68.

⁶⁷ Horrell, “Domestic Space,” 368.

⁶⁸ Horrell, “Domestic Space,” 369.

remain – unable to ascertain any architectural explanation for the Corinthian σχίσματα’) entails a return to the text itself, in search of more reliable data. And this latter remark brings us to the following methodological proposal.

2.2.1.4 From the solution to the problem: A methodological proposal

(1) As Lindemann observes, 1 Cor. 11.17–34 does not refer to ‘the wealthier’ explicitly (11.22a; cf. 1.26).⁶⁹ Moreover, there is an ongoing debate among scholars regarding the social status of the ‘wealthier’ members of the church. It is unclear whether ‘the wealthier’ should include the aristocracy (εὐγενεῖς; 1.26),⁷⁰ or should be limited to the prosperous ‘middle class’ of merchants, craftsmen, etc.⁷¹ Since there is no strong evidence for the former case (1.26),⁷² I concur with Horrell’s archaeological reconstruction. It seems more likely that the Corinthians met inside the residence of a prosperous tradesman, than in the premises of an aristocratic villa (cf. Rom. 16.23).⁷³ Furthermore, the dualistic distinction ‘the rich’ *versus* ‘the poor’, that many scholars assume, is too rigid or simplistic, as Dirk Jongkind and others have convincingly shown.⁷⁴ So, I gather that the Corinthian church was a heterogeneous community of various social strata (cf. 1.26; 12.13; 16.1–2). In the words of Wayne Meeks, there were ‘mixed strata

⁶⁹ Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 253.

⁷⁰ See the discussion in Andrew D. Clarke, *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1–6* (PBM; Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006), 41–45. Cf. W.A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1983), 72–73.

⁷¹ Meeks, *First Urban Christians*, 51, 73; Dirk Jongkind, “Corinth in the First Century AD: The Search for Another Class,” *TynBul* 52/1 (2001): 139–48. NB: I am not referring to a ‘middle class’ as defined by the Marxist class theory. See Dale B. Martin, “Review Essay: Justin J. Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*,” *JSNT* 84 (2001): 51–64 (53).

⁷² Theissen, *Social Setting*, 69–110; Meeks, *First Urban Christians*, 72–73. Cf. Clarke, *Secular and Christian Leadership*, 45.

⁷³ Horrell, “Domestic Space,” 360–68.

⁷⁴ Jongkind, “Search for Another Class,” 139–48; Meeks, *First Urban Christians*, 51–73. See also A.J. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity* (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983).

of ambiguous status'.⁷⁵ In sum, I think Lindemann is correct to reject this too simplistic, rigid, and difficult to prove upper-lower class distinction.⁷⁶

However, I differ from Lindemann's interpretation of οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες (11.22). If the phrase only describes 'those who have nothing to eat at the [common] table', it is difficult to see why their deprivation of food, during this common meal, would be 'despising' or 'humiliating' (11.22). In this respect, I am in agreement with Meeks, for whom the phrase οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες (11.22b) is a syntactic continuation of the οἰκίας οὐκ ἔχετε (11.22a).⁷⁷ Apparently, the 'have-nots' had no homes (cf. 11.22, 34).⁷⁸ Moreover, the participants were expected to bring τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον ('their own supper'), as 11.21 indicates.⁷⁹ Yet the 'have-nots' brought no food to the table, so they 'hungered' (11.21b).⁸⁰ In conclusion, I think Lindemann does have a case against the textual detection of the 'wealthier'; but not so much against the 'poor'. The absence of the former should not have determined his disregard of the latter. As for this latter category, it remains to be defined below.

(2) Still, Lindemann's work does have a strength that I wish to emphasise: the coining of the term 'individualism' as the better depiction of the Corinthian 'problem'.⁸¹ a) First of all, the term fits better the general context of the letter, addressed to a schismatic and conflictual church (e.g., 1.10–16; 3.3–4; 6.1–8; 8.1–13; 10.23–33).⁸² It is hard to envisage Paul's 'faction' sharing

⁷⁵ Meeks, *First Urban Christians*, 72. Meeks (*First Urban Christians*, 68), however, chooses to 'relativize' the rich and the poor, speaking of those 'relatively poor' and 'relatively rich'. As I will argue later, the poor of 1 Cor. 11.22 (οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες) should not be relativized. See § 2.2.1.4.1.

⁷⁶ Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 252, 260.

⁷⁷ Meeks, *First Urban Christians*, 68.

⁷⁸ Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 543: 'the wealthy [...] "have houses to eat and drink in." This implies ownership, not simply a place where meals may be eaten, as in v. 34. As such it stands in stark contrast to "those who have *nothing*.'" (Emphasis original).

⁷⁹ Lampe, "Eucharist," 38.

⁸⁰ Cf. Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, 191.

⁸¹ Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 253. Cf. Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 862.

⁸² Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 65–183.

the food with Peter's (σχίσματα ἐν ὑμῖν ... αἰρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν; cf. 1.10–16; Gal. 2.11–14),⁸³ although some of their adherents could have shared similar social positions.⁸⁴ b) Second, 'individualism' makes better sense of the apostle's depiction of the problem (v. 21): ἕκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον προλαμβάνει ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν ('in eating, each one goes ahead with his own supper'). c) Third, it makes better sense of Paul's generic call to self-examination, prior to participating in the meal (11.28): δοκιμαζέτω δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτὸν ('let everyone examine himself').⁸⁵ Nevertheless, I suggest there is another term that could be added to Lindemann's 'individualistic' diagnosis. And it comes from Paul's explicit diagnosis: σχίσματα ἐν ὑμῖν... αἰρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν ('divisions among you... factions among you'). Therefore, I consider that the problematic behaviour of the Corinthians is both 'individualistic' and 'schismatic' (cf. 1.10). The separation was not among 'the rich' and 'the poor'. It was a multifaceted separation. If this view is accepted, then a replacement of terms is also required for the depiction of Paul's solution. Although numerous scholars consider that Paul offers a social solution to a mainly social problem, I suggest the apostle's solution should be considered 'practical', rather than social (11.22, 33–34a).⁸⁶

(3) Another strength of Lindemann's non-social and 'individualistic' reading is the prominence he gives to Paul's solution, anticipated in 11.22a and reiterated in 11.34a: εἴ τις πεινᾷ, ἐν οἴκῳ

⁸³ I am in agreement with the commentators that relate the factions of 11.18–19 to the factions of 1.10. E.g., Hans Lietzmann, *An die Korinther* (vol. I/II; HNT 9; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1949), 55; Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 250; Panayotis Coutsoumpos, "Paul, the Corinthians' Meal and the Social Context," in Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Land (eds.), *Paul and His Social Relations* (PAST 7; Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2013), 291, 293: 'It is possible to believe, according to Barrett, that some Jewish Christians may have insisted on kosher food and thus separated themselves from their Gentile brothers and sisters.' Cf. C.K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (BNTC; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1968), 261.

⁸⁴ According to Meeks (*First Urban Christians*, 73), most Corinthians belonged to 'the levels in between', i.e., the middle class.

⁸⁵ Cf. Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 251.

⁸⁶ The idea of a 'practical' solution appears also in Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, 190; Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians* (PNTC; Grand Rapids/Cambridge: W.B. Eerdmans, 2010), 558: 'It seems that v. 21 refers to the precise practical offense while v. 33 provides the precise practical correction to that offense.' However, there is no emphasis on this, as Ciampa-Rosner maintain a social reading.

ἔσθιέτω (‘if anyone is hungry, he should eat at home’).⁸⁷ If there was a social chasm between ‘the rich’ and ‘the poor’, and the poor had no food (as Blue suggests), would this solution (‘eating at home’) be conceivable to Paul? Lindemann argues that such a solution would be cynical, if indeed the passage (11.17–34) referred to the poor, and if indeed they had neither food nor homes.⁸⁸ This proposal is consistent with his general view, that 1 Cor. 11.17–34 (v. 34 included) addresses the whole community,⁸⁹ not only the wealthier. Moreover, if the wealthier were gorging themselves in the presence of the poor (as Winter suggests), would Paul have advanced the same adequate regulation (‘eating at home’)? As the laconic ending of the pericope indicates (τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ὡς ἂν ἔλθω διατάξομαι; 11.34b), Paul considers that the solution he just offered is sufficient (11.34a).⁹⁰

If I understand Lindemann correctly, he distinguishes between the solution of 11.34a (‘eating at home’) and the previous solution of 11.33, as the latter concerns the factions (‘accept one another’), not the food. So, according to Lindemann, the idea of sharing the food is entirely absent from 1 Cor. 11.17–34, as the ‘hunger’ referred to in 11.21 (ὃς μὲν πεινᾷ) is not an aftermath of poverty.⁹¹ Thus, ‘eating at home’ (11.22a, 34a) becomes the singular solution with regard to the consumption of food. I will challenge certain details of this reconstruction in the paragraphs below. For now, it is worth noting that Lindemann, wittingly or not, makes Paul’s solution (v. 34a) one of the controlling elements of his thesis, i.e., that 1 Cor. 11.17–34 does not address the social discrimination, nor alludes to the social strata of ‘the rich’ and ‘the poor’. And this general remark deserves further exploration.

⁸⁷ Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 260.

⁸⁸ Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 260. Could Paul have expected they come to the gathering satiated, if there was no food in their homes? In my view, the answer should be negative.

⁸⁹ Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 253.

⁹⁰ For Lindemann (*Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 260), Paul’s solution refers not so much to the sharing of food (11.33), but to the eating the food in one’s private home (11.34). Of course, this latter statement requires a more nuanced interpretation of 11.33: συναρχόμενοι εἰς τὸ φαγεῖν ἀλλήλους ἐκδέχεσθε (‘when you gather to eat, you should wait for one another’). Consequently, ἐκδέχομαι should be translated ‘wait for one another’, with a temporal sense, suggests Lindemann.

⁹¹ Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 260.

(4) To further Lindemann's line of reasoning, I propose that the practical solution Paul anticipates in 11.22a and reiterates in 11.34a should become the controlling element of the historical reconstruction of the Corinthians' problem. Moreover, it should become the internal (fixed) starting point for this reconstruction. As was already shown, previous attempts to recover the *Sitz im Leben* of 1 Cor. 11.17–34 have relied too heavily on the external data provided by the archaeology and ancient literature, data that was subsequently considered to be unreliable, due to its paucity or incertitude.⁹²

To strengthen this latter point, I am now returning to Horrell's critique. As was already noted, Horrell criticizes Murphy-O'Connor for his use of the archaeological data, while using a similar, though different, set of external data, only to reach a negative conclusion: 'we are – and are likely to remain – unable to ascertain any architectural explanation for the Corinthian σχίσματα.' Horrell hardly makes any use of the internal data (1 Cor. 11.17–34),⁹³ except for the corresponding Acts 20.8–9 (ἐν τῷ ὑπερώῳ... ἀπὸ τοῦ τριστέγου), considered to depict a 'typical' meeting place for a whole church.⁹⁴ In conclusion, as these two archaeological approaches reveal, even adequate access to the external data⁹⁵ does not ensure the accuracy of the internal reconstruction.⁹⁶ Hence the methodological approach I propose: the internal data should become the starting point, and also the controlling element, for a given reconstruction.⁹⁷

Therefore, I suggest that the historical reconstruction of 1 Cor. 11.17–34 should develop from the solution, which is clear enough, to the problem, which lacks both clarity and consensus. Unlike Lindemann, I consider that the solution should include vv. 21–22 (anticipation) and vv. 33–34 (formulation). Still, I agree that the very starting point of the

⁹² Horrell, "Domestic Space," 349–59.

⁹³ Again, Horrell's obvious purpose is archaeology, not exegesis.

⁹⁴ Horrell, "Domestic Space," 368 (n. 87).

⁹⁵ By this I mean having access to the archaeological data offered by both Murphy-O'Connor and Horrell.

⁹⁶ See (for instance) Paul Foster, *Colossians* (BNTC; London/New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016). Foster criticizes the previous scholarship for reading too much external data into the topic of 'Colossian heresy', data coming from the Jewish religious background, simply because there is larger access to it.

⁹⁷ Unlike Horrell, Murphy-O'Connor does apply his archaeological findings to the text of 1 Cor. 11.17–34. However, his exegesis is heavily influenced by the archaeological approach, even secondary to it.

reconstruction should be the regulation of 11.34a: ἐν οἴκῳ ἐσθιέτω (‘one should eat at home’).⁹⁸ Not only is this solution unambiguously rendered, but also it is rendered twice (11.22a, 34a). On the other hand, as various scholars have acknowledged, there is a degree of uncertainty in regard to the meaning of the verbs προλαμβάνω (11.21) and ἐκδέχομαι (11.33). So, how does a historical reconstruction that starts from the ἐν οἴκῳ ἐσθιέτω regulation look like?

2.2.1.4.1 *Not many of you were... poor, according to human standards*

Why would Paul exhort the bulk of the community to ‘eat at home’ (v. 34a)? As Lindemann convincingly shows, this regulation is general, having addressed the church as a whole.⁹⁹ In my view, the question above allows only two possible answers. The first answer, highly improbable in my view, expands on Justin Meggitt’s reading of 1 Cor. 11.17–34.¹⁰⁰ For Meggitt, the Corinthians should come to the place of gathering satiated, so that the ‘limited quantities’ of ‘bread and wine’ will suffice for all, including those ‘who were less fast on the uptake’.¹⁰¹ It should be noted that Meggitt’s reading dismisses the possibility of a ‘real meal’ (*agape*), limiting the ‘eating’ (vv. 21, 33) to ‘the consumption of the [eucharistic] elements alone’.¹⁰² In order to defend this highly sacramental reading, Meggitt rejects any occurrence of the ‘love feast’ in the NT, referring (only) to obscure texts, such as Jude 12, while ignoring much clearer texts, namely Gal. 2.11–14.¹⁰³ He also rejects the view that *Did.* 10.1 (‘after you have had enough to eat, you should give thanks as follows’) depicts a regular meal, that took

⁹⁸ Note here the reading of Suzanne Watts Henderson, “‘If Anyone Hungers ...’: An Integrated Reading of 1 Cor 11.17–34,” *NTS* 48/2 (2002): 195–208 (196): ‘instead of referring to the private homes of the wealthy, the occurrences of οἰκία/οἶκος (11.22, 34) denote the gathering places of the Corinthian church, so that Paul in the one instance utters a reminder, “For do you not have houses [expressly] for eating and drinking [together]?” (11.22) and in the other closes the discussion by urging, “if anyone hungers [when you gather], let that one eat in the house [church], lest you gather in judgment” (11.34). Taken together, these verses underscore rather than undermine the significance of the Corinthians’ shared meal (δεῖπνον), a meal which Paul would have conform to Jesus’ model of self-sacrifice to become a meal that is ‘of the Lord (κυριακὸν δεῖπνον).’

⁹⁹ Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 260.

¹⁰⁰ Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, 190–93.

¹⁰¹ Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, 190.

¹⁰² Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, 190.

¹⁰³ Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, 192–93.

place at the same time as the ‘Eucharist’ (cf. *Did.* 9.1–10.7).¹⁰⁴ Still, the view that Meggitt dismisses so easily, with no proof of thorough research,¹⁰⁵ is a solid scholarly consensus, supported by strong textual evidence, as I will show in the following chapters. So, his problem is not the challenge of the consensus per se,¹⁰⁶ but its challenge without the proof of serious interaction with *Didache* scholarship. Furthermore, Meggitt ignores the common laws of Greco-Roman hospitality, which centres around eating and drinking.¹⁰⁷ In sum, I find his reading to be anachronistically sacramental. Therefore, I suggest that Paul’s ἐν οἴκῳ ἐσθιέτω regulation (11.34a) has little to do with the absence of ‘real food’ at the Lord’s Supper.

This leaves us with the alternative of sharing the food.¹⁰⁸ In my view, Paul states that ‘some’ of the Corinthians should eat at home (11.22a, 34a), so that ‘other’ Corinthians, having no food and no home (11.22b), could eat at the gathering (11.33). This latter claim will be detailed below, in search of specificity. Until then, it should be noted that, if the sharing of the food is in view, then the moment and the place of the gathering become at most secondary, having little influence over the interpretative process.¹⁰⁹ Nevertheless, the verbs προλαμβάνω (11.21) and ἐκδέχομαι (11.33) still allow for various meanings. A more confident reading of the verbs is not possible at this point.

Now, we shall return to the detailing anticipated above. If the ἐν οἴκῳ ἐσθιέτω regulation (11.34a) becomes the hermeneutical lens of the text, its generic and conclusive language (ὥστε, ἀδελφοί μου...; 11.33) allows one to be more specific about the ‘some’ and the ‘other’ that were rendered above. In my view, Paul’s generic regulation (11.34a) regards the whole church, *grosso modo*. In other words, it concerns the ‘schismatic’ and ‘fractured’

¹⁰⁴ Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, 193 (n. 14).

¹⁰⁵ Meggitt only quotes one (obscure) article related to this topic.

¹⁰⁶ After all, both this study (in general) and this chapter (in particular) challenge certain academic consensuses.

¹⁰⁷ Smith, *From Symposium to Eucharist*, 13–46.

¹⁰⁸ Lampe, “Eucharist,” 42; Hays, *First Corinthians*, 203; Garland, *I Corinthians*, 541.

¹⁰⁹ Lampe, “Eucharist,” 42.

majority (σχίσματα ἐν ὑμῖν... αἰρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν), rather than the assumed wealthy minority.¹¹⁰ Consequently, 11.21 (ἕκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον προλαμβάνει), must depict the behaviour of certain ‘divisions’ and ‘factions’ that are more complex than the ‘social discrimination’ view allows. As was suggested above, the generic σχίσματα ἐν ὑμῖν (11.18) and αἰρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν (11.19) should be interpreted in the context of the whole letter (e.g., 1.10–16; 3.3–4; 6.1–8). It is less probable that a conflictual and schismatic church, such as the church of Corinth, would assemble at the meal in accordance with some rigid criteria of social stratification.

Then, a reading that considers the ‘schisms’ and ‘factions’ (11.18–19) to be more complex than is assumed by the simplistic distinction ‘the rich’ *versus* ‘the poor’, creates an even stronger contrast between the numerous ‘individual meals’ of 11.21 (ἕκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον προλαμβάνει) and the ‘one cup’ and ‘one loaf’ fundamentals of 10.16–17:

The cup (τὸ ποτήριον) of blessing that we bless, is it not a participation (οὐχὶ κοινωνία ἐστὶν) in the blood of Christ? The bread that we break (τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλωμεν), is it not a participation in the body of Christ (οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστὶν)? Because there is one bread (ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος), we who are many are one body (ἐν σῶμα), for we all partake of the one bread (ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν).

During their common meal, the Corinthians used ‘one cup’ (that was shared) and ‘one bread’ (that was broken), as implied by 1 Cor. 10.16–17.¹¹¹ Furthermore, as numerous scholars consider, this ritual of ‘oneness’, or at least part of it, followed the regular meal depicted in 1 Cor. 11.17–22 (cf. 11.25a).¹¹² Therefore, for Paul, it was the ‘schismatic’ character of the regular meal (τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον) that annulled the substance of the Lord’s Supper: οὐκ ἔστιν κυριακὸν δεῖπνον (11.20). Again, I suggest that a more complex reading of the ‘schisms’ and ‘factions’ fits better both the context of the whole letter (1.10–16; 3.3–4; 6.1–8) and the immediate context (1 Cor. 10.16–17). It also strengthens the probability that some of the

¹¹⁰ *Contra* Murphy-O’Connor, *St. Paul’s Corinth*, 155–61.

¹¹¹ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 477–78.

¹¹² E.g., Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (trans., Norman Perrin; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), 121. For the order bread–regular meal–cup, see (inter alia): Hofius, “The Lord’s Supper,” 80–88; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 546.

‘factions’ that ‘came together’ at the Lord’s Supper were divided over Paul and Peter (1 Cor. 1.12). The relevance of this finding will become evident in the following chapters.

There is, however, a distinguishable social minority that stands apart from the generic ὑμῖν (‘you’): ‘you... you... you... those’ (11.17–22). In v. 22, τοὺς (‘those’) depict the few poor (οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες) that attended the church. And it is precisely this generic language that suggests the poor (‘those who have nothing’) constituted a small minority in the church. So, note the frequency of the pl. ‘you’ (ὑμῖν), in vv. 17–22. Note also the phrase ‘coming together [as a church]’ (συνέρχομαι):

¹⁷But in the following instructions I do not commend you, because when you come together (συνέρχεσθε) it is not for the better but for the worse. ¹⁸For, in the first place, when you come together as a church (συνερχομένων ὑμῶν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ), I hear that there are divisions among you (ἐν ὑμῖν). And I believe it in part, ¹⁹for there must be factions among you (ἐν ὑμῖν) in order that those who are genuine among you (ἐν ὑμῖν) may be recognized. ²⁰When you come together in the same place (συνερχομένων οὖν ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ), it is not the Lord’s Supper that you eat. ²¹For in eating, each one goes ahead with his own meal. One goes hungry, another gets drunk. ²²What! Do you not have houses to eat and drink in? Or do you despise the church of God and humiliate those who have nothing? What shall I say to you? Shall I commend you in this? No, I will not.

The term ‘poor’ (11.22) needs, at this point, to be more accurately defined.¹¹³ According to Peter Garnsey and Greg Woolf, ‘the poor’ are those ‘whose prime concern it is to obtain the minimum food, shelter, and clothing necessary to sustain life, whose lives are dominated by the struggle for physical survival.’¹¹⁴ In my view, Garnsey-Woolf’s definition of poverty seems to match Paul’s (implicit) definition; for the apostle, the ‘have-nots’ are those deprived of home and food (11.22). As the ESV, NASB, NET, NIV, NKJV, NRSV, and other English translations render it, they ‘have nothing’.¹¹⁵ This definition, that narrows significantly the boundaries of

¹¹³ See (for instance) the three alternatives for establishing the identity of the ‘have-nots’ in Winter, “The Lord’s Supper at Corinth,” 81; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 542.

¹¹⁴ Peter Garnsey and Greg Woolf, “Patronage of the Rural Poor in the Roman World,” in Andrew Wallace-Hadrill (ed.), *Patronage in Ancient Society* (London: Routledge, 1990), 153; Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, 5; Martin, “Review Essay,” 52.

¹¹⁵ Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 848.

poverty,¹¹⁶ entails the conclusion of David Fiensy: ‘The overwhelming majority of Christians were not poor, if by poor we mean destitute, starving, and anxious about finances.’¹¹⁷ Moreover, Fiensy’s general appraisal¹¹⁸ fits the Corinthian context particularly well, as it was the wealthiest city of the Ancient Greek world (Strabo, *Geogr.* 8.6.20).¹¹⁹ Even the average tradesmen, craftsmen, unskilled labourers and peasants enjoyed ‘relatively high wealth’, as Donald Engels and others have shown.¹²⁰ Consequently, I consider that ‘the poor’ (οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες) were a small minority in the church, the large majority could afford to ignore or neglect (cf. 1 Cor. 16.1–2).¹²¹ Therefore, when the church ‘came together’ to ‘eat the Lord’s Supper’, the various ‘divisions’ and ‘factions’ simply ignored each other; and all ‘factions’ ignored ‘the poor’: not only because they ‘had nothing’, but also because they were few. In sum, 1 Cor. 11.17–22 depicts not the few (‘the rich’) disregarding the many (‘the poor’), but the many (the ‘fractured’ and ‘divided’ church) disregarding the few (‘the poor’).

In my view, this reading of 1 Cor. 11.17–22 allows for a dual meaning of the verbs προλαμβάνω (11.21) and ἐκδέχομαι (11.33).¹²² If ‘the poor’ were but a few, it was much easier for the many to ignore them and ‘consume the meal before (προ-)’ they were able to attend (προλαμβάνω).¹²³ But even the ‘humiliation’ of the lowest few makes the Lord’s Supper

¹¹⁶ *Contra* Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, 13, 99–100. According to Meggitt, 99% of the population living within the borders of the Roman Empire was ‘poor’. The same percentage was true for the Christians in the Pauline churches. Cf. Martin, “Review Essay,” 57.

¹¹⁷ David A. Fiensy, “What Would You Do for a Living?,” in Anthony J. Blasi, Jean Duhaime, Paul-André Turcotte (eds.), *Handbook of Early Christianity: Social Science Approaches* (Walnut Creek: Altamira Press, 2002), 572. See also pp. 573–74: ‘there would have been a few [...] poor.’

¹¹⁸ Fiensy, “What Would You Do for a Living,” 572–74. Fiensy’s general approach concerns the Christian church in the first three centuries.

¹¹⁹ Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 1.

¹²⁰ Donald Engels, *Roman Corinth: An Alternative Model for the Classical City* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 29–30; Fiensy, “What Would You Do for a Living,” 572–74; Jongkind, “Search for Another Class,” 140; Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 3–4.

¹²¹ See Chrys C. Caragounis, “A House Church in Corinth? An Inquiry into the Structure of Early Corinthian Christianity,” in Constantine J. Belezos (ed.), *Saint Paul and Corinth: 1950 Years Since the Writings of the Epistles to the Corinthians* (vol. 1; Athena: Psychogios, 2009), 365–418.

¹²² Both verbs support multiple meanings. See (again) the discussion in Winter, “The Lord’s Supper at Corinth,” 74–78; Garland, *I Corinthians*, 540–41, 554.

¹²³ Cf. Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 251, 260.

impossible (11.20–22). Accordingly, the many are to ‘wait in order to share’ (ἐκδέχομαι)¹²⁴ the food with the few (11.22, 33–34). Otherwise, what would be the point of ‘waiting’? As Garland remarks, ‘simply waiting for the “have-nots” [...] would not overcome the problem of their hunger’.¹²⁵ In conclusion, Paul’s practical solution could be summarized as follows: most of the Corinthians should ‘eat at home’ (11.34a), so that the few Corinthians, having no food and no home (11.22), could eat at ‘the gathering’ (11.33). Only the sharing of the previous ‘individual suppers’ (11.33–34) validates the subsequent sharing of the ‘Lord’s Supper’ (cf. 10.16–17).

2.2.1.5 Preliminary conclusions

The endeavour undertaken in this section proves once again how difficult it is to identify the particularities of the ‘problem’ that Paul addresses in 1 Cor. 11.17–34. Schreiner’s inference from above is entirely correct.¹²⁶ Scholars can make firm decisions only in regard to the big picture. The more they get into details, the more difficult it becomes to reach a definitive conclusion. However, I believe that there is a valid point in the suggestion that a given reconstruction is more likely to gain approval if it avails starting points and controlling elements that are fixed, internal and unambiguous. In my view, the ἐν οἴκῳ ἐσθιέτω regulation, anticipated in 11.22 and reiterated in 11.34, meets the criteria. In other words, I am suggesting that the historical reconstruction of 1 Cor. 11.17–34 should begin not with the Corinthian problem, but with the Pauline solution.

Nevertheless, up to this point, Paul’s ἐν οἴκῳ ἐσθιέτω regulation (11.22, 34) has been applied only in connection to the surrounding context (11.17–22, 33–34), and not with the Lord’s Supper tradition per se (11.23–25). Consequently, I will now further the argument and

¹²⁴ Lampe, “Eucharist,” 42.

¹²⁵ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 541.

¹²⁶ Schreiner, *New Testament Theology*, 731.

re-evaluate the necessity of the tradition (11.23–25), in the light of this practical solution (11.22, 33–34).

2.2.2 *From the solution to the solution: The redundancy of the tradition?*

How does the ἐν οἴκῳ ἐσθιέτω regulation (11.22, 34) function within the internal logic of the argument (11.17–34)? And how does it relate to the Lord’s Supper tradition (11.23–25)? Virtually, all scholars admit there are lexical and logical correspondences between vv. 20–22 (in which Paul depicts the problem and anticipates the solution) and vv. 33–34 (in which the solution is reiterated).¹²⁷ Wolfgang Schrage, for instance, rightly notes that v. 33 forms an *inclusio* with v. 21:¹²⁸ while 11.21 identifies the practical offence, 11.33 provides the practical correction to the offence.¹²⁹ Yet similar correspondences are also evident in vv. 22 and 34, as the following set of parallel columns reveals:

Συνερχομένων οὖν ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ οὐκ ἔστιν κυριακὸν δεῖπνον φαγεῖν. ἕκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον προλαμβάνει ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν, καὶ ὃς μὲν πεινᾷ... μὴ γὰρ οἰκίας οὐκ ἔχετε εἰς τὸ ἐσθίειν... (11.20–22)	ὥστε... συνερχόμενοι εἰς τὸ φαγεῖν ἀλλήλους ἐκδέχεσθε. εἴ τις πεινᾷ, ἐν οἴκῳ ἐσθιέτω, ἵνα μὴ εἰς κρίμα συνέρχησθε. (11.33–34)
---	---

Furthermore, I suggest that the bulk of lexical similarities indicates a structural or circular logic, one that is peculiar to Paul’s reasoning throughout the letter. J.P. Heil, for instance, argues that almost half of Paul’s quotations from the OT are ‘part of a carefully constructed chiasmic structure’: 1 Cor. 1.19; 1.31; 6.16; 9.9–10; 10.7; 10.26; 15.25, 27.¹³⁰ Thus, it is peculiar to Paul to quote older and authoritative traditions at the centre of his problem–tradition–solution argument.¹³¹ Moreover, similar yet larger chiasmic partitions are suggested by Gordon Fee and

¹²⁷ E.g., Hays, *First Corinthians*, 197, 202; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 426.

¹²⁸ Schrage, *Der Erste Brief*, 3:56.

¹²⁹ Ciampa-Rosner, *First Letter to the Corinthians*, 558.

¹³⁰ J.P. Heil, *The Rhetorical Role of Scripture in 1 Corinthians* (Atlanta: SBL, 2005), 10–15.

¹³¹ Heil, *Rhetorical Role of Scripture*, 261; Kenneth E. Bailey, *Paul through Mediterranean Eyes: Cultural Studies in 1 Corinthians* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2011), 314–16.

John Collins, both scholars identifying the use of an A–B–A` pattern throughout the letter: 1) A: 8.1–13; B: 9.1–27; A`: 10.1–22; 2) A: 1.10–2.5; B: 2.6–16; A`: 3.1–23; 3) A: 12.1–31; B: 13.1–13; A`: 14.1–40.¹³² As for Kenneth Bailey, he most likely overstates when he considers the entire letter to be a chiasmus composed of five essays (1.5–4.16; 4.17–7.40; 8.1–11.1; 11.2–14.40; 15.1–58), each essay a chiasmus in itself.¹³³ These are but a few instances of attempts to identify chiastic structures, of different lengths in the text: pericopae, major sections, entire letter.¹³⁴ However, we should receive with great reservation proposals such as these, since Paul indicates he dictated this letter (16.21).¹³⁵ Still, the numerous lexical, logical, and circular correspondences found in 1 Corinthians disclose perceptible patterns of thought (cf. 12.1–14.40),¹³⁶ the outcome of a disciplined, rigorous mind.¹³⁷

So, given this acknowledgment, when scholars try to pinpoint the internal structure of 1 Cor. 11.17–34, they usually appeal to the lexical parallelisms of vv. 20–22, 33–34, as these offer a reliable starting point. The framing of the structure may differ from scholar to scholar, yet these correspondences are regularly adduced to defend their structuring decisions. For instance, Fee suggests the following chiastic structure:

- A. Vv. 17–22: The statement of the problem: the rich are abusing the poor (“going ahead with their own [private] meal”) at the Lord’s Table.
- B. Vv. 23–26: The repetition of the “tradition,” the words of institution, with their emphasis on “remembrance of me” and “proclaiming his death until he comes.”
- B’. Vv. 27–32: “So then”—in response to vv. 23–26, one must “discern the body” as one eats; otherwise one is in grave danger of judgment.

¹³² Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 15–16; John J. Collins, “Chiasmus, the ‘ABA’ Pattern, and the Text of Paul,” in *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus* (1961): *AnBib* 17–18 (Rome: BIP, 1963), 2:575–584.

¹³³ Kenneth E. Bailey: “The Structure of 1 Corinthians and Paul’s Theological Method with Special Reference to 4:17,” *NovT* 25/2 (1983): 152–181 (156); “Recovering the Poetic Structure of I Cor. 1.17–2.2: A Study in Text and Commentary,” *NovT* 17 (1975): 265–96.

¹³⁴ See also N.W. Lund, *Chiasmus in the New Testament: A Study in the Form and Function of Chiastic Structures* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1992); Ian H. Thomson, *Chiasmus in the Pauline Letters* (JSNTSup 111; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

¹³⁵ Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 1347; J. Murphy-O’Connor, *Paul the Letter-Writer: His World, His Options, His Skills* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1995), 7–9, 104–106, 110–113 (7): ‘Most letter writers in antiquity used a professional secretary and the Apostle was no exception.... The fact is beyond question.’

¹³⁶ Such as the ‘A-B-A’ patterns identified by Fee and Collins. See also Bailey, *Paul through Mediterranean Eyes*, 314–15.

¹³⁷ Cf. Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 67: ‘There can be little question, it would seem, that much of Paul’s argumentation takes on the patterns of Semitic parallelism; but this is a reflection of how his mind works.’

A`. Vv. 33–34: “So then”—in response to vv. 17–22, they are to “welcome/receive one another” at the meal, so as not to incur the judgment of vv. 30–32.¹³⁸

Fee connects the A–A` units (vv. 17–22, 33–34), considering vv. 33–34 as a direct ‘response’ to vv. 17–22. Unlike Fee, Garland identifies a tripartite structure, similar to the structures suggested by PHEME PERKINS¹³⁹ and CIAMPA-ROSNER.¹⁴⁰

- A. Criticism of the abuses at the Lord’s Supper (11:17–22)
- B. Recitation of the Last Supper tradition,
which should inform the Corinthian observance (11:23–26)
- A`. Instructions to correct the abuses at the Lord’s Supper (11:27–34)¹⁴¹

Garland isolates the Lord’s Supper’s tradition (11.23–26) and broadly connects 11.17–22 and 11.27–34.¹⁴² He then sub-structures the text, considering that διὰ τοῦτο (11.30) marks a shift of the argument: Paul goes from the general truth (11.27–29) to the specific application (11.30–32).¹⁴³ Moreover, he admits the connection between vv. 21 and vv. 33–34 and, accordingly, uses the latter keyword (ἐκδέχομαι) to interpret the former (προλαμβάνω) and vice-versa.¹⁴⁴

Therefore, if the lexical correspondences and the internal logic of the argument are considered, I suggest that Paul’s ἐν οἴκῳ ἐσθιέτω regulation could have been on his mind from the beginning of the argument. At least, this is suggested by its anticipation in 11.22: μὴ γὰρ οἰκίας οὐκ ἔχετε εἰς τὸ ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν. As soon as the ‘practical offence’ is depicted (11.21), the ‘practical solution’ is hinted (11.22a). Moreover, as has been noted already, Paul considered the practical solution rendered in 11.34a to be sufficient for this particular situation (11.34b). So, as these lexical similarities indicate, I consider that v. 34a is a mere reiteration of the

¹³⁸ Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 532. Similarly, William F. Orr and James Arthur Walther, *I Corinthians: A New Translation, Introduction, With a Study of the Life of Paul, Notes, and Commentary* (AB 32; New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2008 [1976]), 265.

¹³⁹ PHEME PERKINS, *First Corinthians* (Paideia; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 141.

¹⁴⁰ CIAMPA-ROSNER, *First Letter to the Corinthians*, 541.

¹⁴¹ Garland, *I Corinthians*, 535.

¹⁴² Garland, *I Corinthians*, 533.

¹⁴³ Garland, *I Corinthians*, 553.

¹⁴⁴ Garland, *I Corinthians*, 540–41, 554–55.

solution hinted in v. 22. In my view, there is no significant development from v. 22 to v. 34a, as far as Paul's solution is concerned. So, I am structuring this line of reasoning as follows:

A: The problem is depicted (vv. 17–22): the ἐν οἴκῳ ἐσθιέτω regulation is hinted (v. 22)

B: The Lord's Supper: tradition (vv. 23–25) and reflection (vv. 26–32)

A: The solution is depicted (vv. 33–34): the ἐν οἴκῳ ἐσθιέτω regulation is reiterated (v. 34)

If the structure proposed above is followed, then Lindemann is entitled to consider the Lord's Supper tradition (vv. 23–25) to be, in a sense, superfluous.¹⁴⁵ For him, the words of institution cited in 11.23–25 bring no additional contribution to the solution that Paul has offered before the citation (11.22) and reiterated after the citation (11.34a). So, following Lindemann, I concur that Paul could have offered a viable solution to the particular problem of the Corinthians, without even alluding to the Lord's Supper tradition. Why, then, is Paul (re)using this tradition? And how does its citation relate to the internal argument of 11.17–34?

2.2.2.1 Why cite a tradition, why cite this tradition? Some limitations of the socio-theological approach

Scholars have offered various explanations as to why Paul cites the Lord's Supper tradition, with regard to the Corinthian situation. For instance, Orr-Walther consider that the social abuses are the result of the Corinthians' failing to continue the practice of Jesus. Therefore, the insertion of the tradition aims to bring them back to the origins of the practice.¹⁴⁶ According to Fee, 'The words of institution are repeated to remind them of why they celebrate such a meal in the first place, a reason that goes back to Jesus himself.'¹⁴⁷ For Hays, Paul restates the tradition 'to spotlight the death of Jesus as the central meaning of the Supper'.¹⁴⁸ Fitzmyer takes it to be 'an important step in [Paul's] argument, because that practice has in

¹⁴⁵ Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 252–54.

¹⁴⁶ Orr-Walther, *I Corinthians*, 270.

¹⁴⁷ Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 547.

¹⁴⁸ Hays, *First Corinthians*, 199.

effect been neglecting the real meaning of the eucharistic celebration and its concern “for others”¹⁴⁹ Lindemann argues that vv. 23–25 defend Paul’s strong disapproval of the Corinthians’ practice, though there is no direct connection between the tradition and the solution Paul offers to their disapproved practice.¹⁵⁰ For Horrell, ‘The purpose of this citation is probably to remind the Corinthians that this is not merely a meal together [...] it is a remembrance of the Lord Jesus [...] instituted at his command’.¹⁵¹ Schroeter argues that Paul cites the tradition with a double purpose: 1) to correct the Corinthian malpractice, as their communal meals were imitating certain pagan rituals; 2) to unite the schismatic factions of the church.¹⁵² Finally, for Jacobi, Paul reiterates the Lord’s Supper tradition because, unlike other traditions (cf. 11.2), the Corinthians were not ‘holding to’ this one.¹⁵³ These are but a few instances, however sufficient to help one notice that various scholars offer different explanations regarding the logical connection between the citation of the tradition (11.23–25) and the underlying historical context in Corinth (11.17–34).

Furthermore, when the connection between the Lord’s Supper tradition and the Corinthian context is examined, scholars that favour a social reading tend to operate with a dichotomy that is artificial, referring to a ‘theological solution’ (11.23–32) offered in response to a ‘social problem’ (11.17–22, 33–34).¹⁵⁴ I call this approach ‘socio-theological’. Schreiner, for instance, after concluding that ‘the divisions [...] are not theological but social’, rightly adds in regard to Paul’s theological resolution: ‘this text reminds us that Paul does not separate the theological and the social’.¹⁵⁵ Indeed, a ‘social-theological’ partition is artificial and foreign

¹⁴⁹ Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 435.

¹⁵⁰ Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 253, 258.

¹⁵¹ David G. Horrell, *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 152.

¹⁵² Schroeter, “Die Funktion der Herrenmahlsüberlieferungen,” 99. Similar to Lindemann, Schroeter (“Die Funktion der Herrenmahlsüberlieferungen,” 99–100) considers that the Lord’s Supper tradition is not essential to Paul’s argument.

¹⁵³ Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus*, 272.

¹⁵⁴ E.g., Theissen, *Social Setting*, 163–65, 166–68; I. Howard Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord’s Supper* (Vancouver: Regent, 2006), 111.

¹⁵⁵ Schreiner, *New Testament Theology*, 733.

to the mindset of most ancient people.¹⁵⁶ Paul's worldview is integrative, holistic, and profoundly theological, as Ben Witherington III and others have shown.¹⁵⁷ In various sections of the letter, the apostle brings theological insights no matter how mundane the matters are (e.g., 7.1–11; 10.31).¹⁵⁸ So, given the previous patterns listed above (e.g., 1.19; 1.31; 6.16; 9.9–10; 10.7; 10.26), it is expected that Paul would bring a theological insight in this particular context and even cite an authoritative church tradition.¹⁵⁹

A point similar to that of Schreiner, yet stronger, is made by I.H. Marshall. Marshall considers that Paul was not concerned about the social consequences of the divisions, but of their theological significance (11.22). So, the Lord's Supper tradition is meant to reinforce the theological significance of both the meal and the church.¹⁶⁰ Similarly, the 'individualistic' reading I propose admits that the behaviour manifested at the Lord's Supper was a serious matter for Paul,¹⁶¹ as it exacerbated the already existing disunity of the church (11.17–19). In the comprehensive words of Dunn, 'the unity of the Corinthian church was most at risk precisely because the expression of unity and of mutual sharing (10:16–17) had become an expression of greed and inconsiderateness (11:21).'¹⁶² However, in my view, Paul's depiction of the problem transcends the social and the individual sphere, as the interweaving of the categories indicate (11.17–22). Paul considers the 'individualistic' behaviour of the Corinthians (11.20–21) to mean, in essence, 'the despisement of the church of God' (v. 22): τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ θεοῦ καταφρονεῖτε. Also, as Lindemann suggests, the identification of the

¹⁵⁶ E.g., Michael B. Hundley, *Gods in Dwellings: Temples and Divine Presence in the Ancient Near East* (Atlanta: SBL, 2013), 131–36 and *passim*.

¹⁵⁷ Ben Witherington III, *Paul's Narrative Thought World: The Tapestry of Tragedy and Triumph* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994).

¹⁵⁸ Hays, *First Corinthians*, 179.

¹⁵⁹ According to Bailey (*Paul through Mediterranean Eyes*, 316), on seven occasions Paul places OT quotations/citations at the centre of a homily (6.13–20; 9.1–12a; 10.1–13; 14.13–25; 15.24–28; 15.42–50); on six occasions he places early church traditions in the middle of his argument (1.17–2.2; 2.7–10; 11.17–34; 14.37–40; 15.1–11; 15.12–20).

¹⁶⁰ Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*, 111.

¹⁶¹ Cf. Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 252.

¹⁶² Dunn, *1 Corinthians*, 76.

‘individualistic’ problem should become secondary, since Paul’s emphasis lies on the definite verdict of 11.20: οὐκ ἔστιν κυριακὸν δεῖπνον φαγεῖν (‘it is not the Lord’s Supper you eat’). In a wordplay, Paul counterposes the κυριακὸν δεῖπνον (11. 20, ‘Lord’s Supper’) they ‘do not eat’ and the ἴδιον δεῖπνον (11. 21, ‘your own supper’) they actually eat.¹⁶³ For Paul, the church ‘belongs to God’ (11. 22); it is ‘the body of the Lord’ (11. 29). Likewise, the meal is ‘not yours’ (11.21) but it is ‘the Lord’s’ (11.20).¹⁶⁴ Such phrasing transcends both the ‘social’ and the ‘individual’.¹⁶⁵ Consequently, the Lord’s Supper tradition may follow as the anticipated answer to potential questions ensuing these verdicts (11.20, 22): ‘If ours is not the Lord’s Supper, then what is the Lord’s Supper?’ (cf. 11.23–26); ‘If this behaviour means “the despisement of the church of God”, then how shall we behave in regard to the church?’ (11.27–30).¹⁶⁶ These latter remarks shall be expanded below.

In conclusion, I suggest that an integrative reading is truer to Paul’s mindset.¹⁶⁷ It also has fewer limitations than the ‘socio-theological’ reading. As was already noted, the instances listed above show that virtually all scholars offer different answers to the question ‘how does Paul’s citation relate to the internal argument or the Corinthian context?’ In my opinion, this generalized lack of consensus may indicate a methodological flaw.¹⁶⁸ Moreover, the ‘socio-theological’ approaches fail to elucidate Paul’s specific preference for this tradition.

2.2.2.2 *An integrative reading: Paul’s supper*

On the one hand, the difficulty of this endeavour is undeniable. On the other hand, I suggest that a larger integrative reconstruction, that starts from the ἐν οἴκῳ ἐσθιέτω regulation

¹⁶³ Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 862.

¹⁶⁴ Theissen, *Social Setting*, 148; Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 539; Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 862.

¹⁶⁵ Cf. Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 862.

¹⁶⁶ See Collins, *First Corinthians*, 416, 425.

¹⁶⁷ Bailey, *Paul through Mediterranean Eyes*, 314–16.

¹⁶⁸ Or the lack of adequate data.

(11.34a), could offer additional insights. As I have shown above (with regard to the internal structure of the pericope), the lexical and logical similarities between vv. 20–22 and vv. 33–34 indicate a certain redundancy of the citation. Therefore, I consider that the tradition Paul cited in vv. 23–25 is secondary in relation to the Corinthian problem (vv. 20–22, 33–34).¹⁶⁹ It has primarily to do with Paul’s integrative understanding of what the Lord’s Supper is (11.23–29).¹⁷⁰ Paul’s evaluation and critique have an overarching conclusion (11.20): what the Corinthians were eating was not the Lord’s Supper (οὐκ ἔστιν κυριακὸν δεῖπνον). Therefore, first and foremost, the insertion of the tradition must be related to what the Lord’s Supper is for Paul (11.23a: ‘I have received’).¹⁷¹ As James Dunn puts it, ‘Paul cites old tradition as the basis for his understanding of the Supper’.¹⁷² Apparently, as was noted above, Paul’s preference is to cite authoritative traditions (cf. 7.10, 12, 25), even when a given situation is not related directly to a particular tradition (see 1.19, 31; 2.9, 16; 3.19–20; 5.13; 6.16; 7.10, 12, 25; 9.9–10; 10.7, 26; 11.23–25; 14.21; 15.25, 27, 32, 45, 54–55).¹⁷³ How much more, then, is he expected to cite a tradition when such a direct relation exists: οὐκ ἔστιν κυριακὸν δεῖπνον... Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου (11.20, 23).¹⁷⁴

Robertson-Plummer connect the subordinating conjunction of 11.23 (γάρ) with the previous ἐν τούτῳ οὐκ ἐπαινῶ (11.22).¹⁷⁵ However, this connection is weak and ignores the

¹⁶⁹ I am not denying the fact that this tradition (11.23–25) could have been applied to the specific situation of the Corinthians (11.17–22). My point is that Paul does not connect the two (i.e., the problem and the tradition) directly and unambiguously, hence its secondary character.

¹⁷⁰ Cf. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 416, 425; Tom (N.T.) Wright, *Paul for Everyone: 1 Corinthians* (London: SPCK, 2004), 147.

¹⁷¹ L. Morris call this ‘the emphatic “I” (*egō*)’. See Leon Morris, *1 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC 7; Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1985), 157; Collins, *First Corinthians*, 425. Note also Bruce’s expanded paraphrase of 1 Cor. 11.23: ‘Let me remind you what the Lord’s Supper is. The tradition which I delivered to you was earlier delivered to me, and it stems from the Lord Himself. It is this...’. F.F. Bruce, ‘The First Epistle to the Corinthians: An Expanded Paraphrase,’ *EvQ* 32/2 (1960): 115.

¹⁷² James D.G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity* (London: SCM Press, 2006), 178.

¹⁷³ Heil, *Rhetorical Role of Scripture*, 14–15.

¹⁷⁴ See Anders Eriksson, *Traditions as Rhetorical Proof: Pauline Argumentation in 1 Corinthians* (CBNT 29; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1998), esp. 100–34.

¹⁷⁵ Archibald Robertson and Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (ICC; New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1911), 242.

larger flow of the argument (11.20–23). As one may notice below, the use of the conjunctions in vv. 20–23 creates a syntactical and logical connection between the phrases οὐκ ἔστιν κυριακὸν δεῖπνον (11.20) and Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου (11.23). The concluding οὖν of v. 20 suggests that οὐκ ἔστιν κυριακὸν δεῖπνον is central to Paul’s thought, at this point of argument (11.17–22), while the consecutive subordinating γάρ (vv. 21, 22, 23) creates a syntactical link between v. 20 and v. 23:

²⁰ Accordingly (οὖν), when you come together, it is not the Lord’s Supper you eat, ²¹ for (γάρ) when you are eating, each one of you goes ahead with your own private supper. As a result (δὲ), one person remains hungry and another gets drunk. ²² Therefore (γάρ), don’t you have homes to eat and drink in? Or do you despise the church of God by humiliating those who have nothing? What shall I say to you? Shall I praise you? Certainly not in this matter! ²³ For (γάρ) I received from the Lord what I also passed on to you...

Furthermore, I now return to the issue of the redundancy of the tradition. Such a conclusion becomes possible only when the tradition is related to a simplistic ‘problem-solution’ pattern. Then, it is this assumed redundancy that leads Lindemann to conclude that the tradition was not constitutive for the celebration of the Lord’s Supper, at least not in Corinth.¹⁷⁶ Indeed, I concur with Lindemann that, in some sense, the insertion of the tradition was unnecessary. Therefore, the citation of the Lord’s Supper tradition should not be connected primarily to Paul’s ‘problem-solution’ reasoning. However, unlike Lindemann I consider that Paul’s insertion, even repetition of the tradition he had already taught in Corinth (11.23a) creates even stronger connections between the tradition of the Lord’s Supper (11.23–25) and the essence of the Lord’s Supper (11.26). Although it is impossible to prove this, it appears that, for Paul, there could be no ‘commemoration’ without the tradition (11.24–25): τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.¹⁷⁷ In other words, Paul uses the Lord’s Supper tradition, even if not directly related to the Corinthians’ situation, because it was particularly important to him. This acknowledgment shall be furthered in the following chapter.

¹⁷⁶ Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 258.

¹⁷⁷ In my view, the repetition of the phrase τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν (11.24–25) creates a stronger connection between this tradition and the commemoration of the Lord’s Supper.

2.3 Conclusion

Paul taught (11.23a) and repeated (11.23b–25) the Lord’s Supper tradition in Corinth because it had to do with what the Lord’s Supper was for him (Ἐγὼ παρέλαβον [...] ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν) and should be for all Corinthians (cf. 11.20, 26): ἔστιν κυριακὸν δεῖπνον φαγεῖν... ὅσακις γὰρ ἐὰν ἐσθίητε [...] τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε, ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ. Therefore, the citation of the tradition should not be connected primarily to the particular problem of the Corinthians, but to Paul’s general appreciation of what the Lord’s Supper is and should be. In a nutshell, for Paul the tradition was the *sine qua non* of the ‘commemoration’.¹⁷⁸ This latter observation shall be expanded in the next chapter, as it introduces the first probable connection to Antioch. So, let us now turn to the search for the anticipated connection between this tradition and the Antiochene church.

¹⁷⁸ See Tom (N.T.) Wright, *The Meal Jesus Gave Us: Understanding Holy Communion* (London: SPCK, 2014), 49–51, 55–56.

CHAPTER 3

‘FOR I RECEIVED FROM [ANTIOCH] WHAT I ALSO PASSED ON TO YOU’:

PAUL, ANTIOCH, AND THE LORD’S SUPPER TRADITION

In the previous chapter, the Lord’s Supper tradition Paul quotes in 1 Cor. 11.23–25 has been related to the Corinthian church and its ‘individualistic’ and ‘schismatic’ context (11.17–34). On the whole, it has been shown that the citation of the Lord’s Supper has less to do with the particular situation of the Corinthian church (1 Cor. 11.17–22, 33–34), and more with the significance of the Lord’s Supper for Paul (1 Cor. 11.20, 23–26), a significance that should be grasped by all Corinthians (1 Cor. 11.27–34). In this chapter, I will further the argument and search for a connection between this particular tradition and the church of Antioch. As was anticipated in the introduction of the previous chapter, the endeavour to connect this tradition to the Antiochenes will follow a double scenario. Firstly, I will examine the hypothesis that Paul taught this tradition while he was one of the teachers in the church of Antioch (see Acts 13.1). Secondly, the view that Paul was taught this tradition while he was in Antioch will be examined. If one of the two assumptions is proven valid, the connection between this tradition and the church of Antioch should be established.

3.1 From Corinth to Antioch: ‘The ways that I teach in every church’

3.1.1 Paul in Corinth: Foundational and universal teachings

I have previously shown how diverse the scholarly opinions are, when exegetes seek to relate the citation of 1 Cor. 11.23–25 to the particular situation in Corinth. Given this perplexity, it is perhaps more profitable to return to the simplicity of the approach I have

suggested in the previous chapter,¹ i.e., to connect the Lord's Supper tradition primarily to Paul, not to the Corinthian 'problem'. I consider that there is one simple and obvious explanation for this insertion/repetition; and it has to do with the importance of the tradition for Paul. *In nuce*, the apostle quotes this tradition primarily because it was important to him, not because it fitted the situation of the Corinthians. So, unlike Andreas Lindemann and Jens Schroeter, I consider that the redundancy of the use indicates the importance for the user.²

I have also begun to examine how important this tradition was for Paul, suggesting that the apostle considered it to be the *sine qua non* of the commemoration.³ I will now further this thesis, considering Paul's foundational and universal teachings. According to William Campbell, there are 'elements that indicate that Paul himself did have certain general patterns of communication and teaching that applied in all the churches of the Gentiles, as is found in e.g. 1 Cor 4.17 where he speaks of "my ways in Christ which I teach in every church" (cf. also Phil. 4.9)'.⁴ There are common 'teachings' (1 Cor. 11.16), fundamental 'doctrines' (1 Cor. 15.1–11), and basic 'practices' (1 Cor. 7.17; 14.33) that Paul offered consistently in 'all the churches' where he taught.⁵ Actually, in 1 Corinthians, Paul uses this 'general-ecclesiastical' argument (the ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις πάσαις formula: 7.17; 11.16; 14.33) as a 'rhetorical device', requiring a unifying response from 'all the churches' (1 Cor. 1.12), precisely because he assumes some consistency to his teachings.⁶ However, was the Lord's Supper tradition part of Paul's universal teachings?

¹ See § 2.2.2.1 and § 2.2.2.2.

² Cf. Andreas Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief* (HNT 9/1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 258; Jens Schroeter, "Die Funktion der Herrenmahlsüberlieferungen im 1. Korintherbrief: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Rolle der 'Einsetzungsworte' in frühchristlichen Mahltexten," *ZNW* 100/1 (2009): 99–100.

³ See above (§ 2.2.2.2).

⁴ William S. Campbell, "Universality and Particularity in Paul's Understanding and Strategy of Mission," in Trevor J. Burke and Brian S. Rosner (eds.), *Paul as Missionary: Identity, Activity, Theology, and Practice* (LNTS 420; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2011), 195.

⁵ Campbell, "Universality and Particularity in Paul," 196–98.

⁶ Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians* (SacPag 7; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999), 201.

(1) According to 1 Cor. 11.23a (ὁ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν), Paul had initially ‘passed on’ this tradition while he was in Corinth, i.e., when the local church was founded (cf. Acts 18.1–18).⁷ To my knowledge, there is no evidence that Paul revisited the city prior to the writing of 1 Corinthians, in *ca.* 55 CE (see 1 Cor. 16.3–7).⁸ If this is the case, then the Lord’s Supper tradition must have been part of the ‘foundational’ teachings upon which the church was ‘built’ (see 1 Cor. 3.10; 15.1–11). Therefore, I am in agreement with Thomas Schreiner⁹ and others who consider that this tradition was ‘foundational’ for Paul.¹⁰ In Schreiner’s words, ‘It is likely that Paul communicated the tradition about the Lord’s Supper when he established the various churches.’¹¹ As may be noticed, Schreiner deduces the universal (‘various churches’) from the foundational (‘established’). In my opinion, Paul’s repetition of the tradition—in such a short amount of time (1 Cor. 11.23a)¹² and unrelated to the problem he deals with (11.20–22, 33–34)—confirms his deduction. The repeated and unrelated use indicates generalisation; it could also indicate universality.¹³ However, there are other arguments to be adduced in order to strengthen this point.

⁷ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AYBC 32; New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2008), 430. For the historical reliability of Acts 18.1–18, see § 2.1 (n. 7). Also, Richard I. Pervo, *Acts: A Commentary on the Book of Acts* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009), 445–47.

⁸ See above (§ 2.1). Also, Jürgen Becker, *Paulus: Der Apostel der Völker* (UTB; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1998), 32; David G. Horrell, *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 87.

⁹ Thomas R. Schreiner, *New Testament Theology: Magnifying God in Christ* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 730.

¹⁰ Judith M. Lieu, *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World* (Oxford: OUP, 2004), 89. Lieu suggests this is ‘a possible exception’ for Paul: ‘with the possible exception of 1 Cor. 11. 23–6, Paul does not use Jesus traditions as foundational’. Also, Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2000), 866: ‘Paul appeals to the givenness and universality of a pre-Pauline tradition which originated with the Lord himself as a dominical institution and is transmitted as Christian *paradosis* in terms which soon became a formulaic liturgical narrative in the life of the churches.’

¹¹ Schreiner, *New Testament Theology*, 730.

¹² In less than half a decade. See above (§ 2.1).

¹³ Cf. Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 866.

(2) Another argument that Paul used the Lord's Supper tradition both foundationally and universally concerns its language. I will consider this argument by challenging C.K. Barrett's dissimilar view. According to Barrett,

It should not be simply assumed (though this is often done) that the words that follow (in verses 23 ff.) were already in liturgical use at the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Paul gives no indication that he is using words that the Corinthians would recognize in this sense, nor does he make the point that the Corinthians' behaviour was inconsistent with words that they themselves used in the course of their meal.¹⁴

I am only in partial agreement with Barrett.¹⁵ He may indeed be correct to argue that the Corinthians did not use the Lord's Supper tradition 'liturgically'. Still, I consider that Paul expected that they would use it 'in this sense', which in my view should be labelled 'ritually', rather than 'liturgically'.¹⁶ First of all, the words of institution he quotes are 'tradition' (cf. 1 Cor. 11.2, 17).¹⁷ As we have seen, they belong to the foundational teachings that the Corinthians received when the church was established (11.23a). Secondly, this tradition has initially been 'passed on' to them in a very specific context, i.e., when Paul established the rite of the Lord's Supper in their community (1 Cor. 11.23–25).¹⁸ Thirdly, Paul expects the Corinthians to 'maintain the traditions even as he delivered them' (11.2); this, I suggest, includes 'maintaining' their initial purpose.¹⁹ So, thus far it is reasonable to conclude that Paul should have expected that the Corinthians used the Lord's Supper tradition during their communal meals (cf. 11.2, καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν). But how often should Paul have expected

¹⁴ C.K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (BNTC; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1968), 264.

¹⁵ Cf. Wayne E. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 239 (n. 27). Meeks finds Barrett's scepticism to be 'excessive'. See also, Horrell, *Social Ethos*, 87 (n. 147).

¹⁶ Note again: Throughout this study, where scholars use the term 'liturgical', with reference to the use of the NT eucharistic traditions by the earliest communities (1 Cor. 11.23–25, Matt. 26.26–29; Lk. 22.17–20), I prefer the term 'ritual'. Cf. § 1.3.1 (n. 43); § 3.2.2.1; § 5.1; § 7.1.4 (3).

¹⁷ Note the use of παραδόσις and παραγγέλλω in 11.2, 17: 'I commend you because you remember me in everything and maintain the traditions even as I delivered them to you (καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε) ... But in the following instructions (τοῦτο δὲ παραγγέλλων) I do not commend you'. See Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 866.

¹⁸ Anders Eriksson, *Traditions as Rhetorical Proof: Pauline Argumentation in 1 Corinthians* (CBNT 29; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1998), 100; Collins, *First Corinthians*, 425–29.

¹⁹ Collins, *First Corinthians*, 425–29.

them to use the tradition—at every communal meal, at some meals? In order to answer this question, we shall consider the language of this tradition. Fourthly, then, it should be noted that the language of this tradition is highly ritualistic (cf. Lk. 22.17–20).²⁰ And by ‘ritualistic’ language I am referring to the ‘redactional parallelism’ (11.24–25, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν) that indicates a ‘ritualistic repetition’ (11.25–26, ὁσάκις).²¹ In my view, Paul would have not ‘passed on’ this ritualistic form if he did not expect a ritualistic use. If my reading is correct, this observation also answers the question above: it is likely that Paul expected the Corinthians to use this tradition repeatedly, rather more than less often. Moreover, as I will show in the following sections, the language of this form is not only ‘ritualistic’, but it is also ‘universal’: this form was conceived to fit the context of various Hellenistic churches.²² In conclusion, the ritualistic and universal language of the tradition is another argument for its universality. It shows that it was meant to be used in more churches.

So, if this tradition was both ‘foundational’ and ‘universal’ (11.23a), one that Paul may have ‘taught in every church’ (cf. 4.17), there is the high probability that the apostle taught this while he was in Antioch (early 40s). This shall be the focus of the following section.

3.1.2 Paul in Antioch: Chronology

To frame a Pauline chronology is a difficult task, for sure, especially when the period that includes Paul’s stay in Antioch (the so-called ‘hidden years’) is under scrutiny.²³ In part, this is so because there is uncertainty about the reliability of Luke’s writings.²⁴ Since this

²⁰ Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 429.

²¹ E.g., Joachim Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (trans., Norman Perrin; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), 137, 168. See the later discussions (§ 3.2.2.1).

²² Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 866.

²³ See Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer, *Paul between Damascus and Antioch: The Unknown Years* (trans., John Bowden; London: SCM Press, 1997).

²⁴ See the discussions in I.H. Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press 1970); Gerd Lüdemann, *Early Christianity According to the Traditions in Acts: A Commentary* (trans., John Bowden; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989); Clare K. Rothschild, *Luke–Acts and the Rhetoric of History* (WUNT II/175; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004); and others.

section makes substantial use of the book of Acts,²⁵ I will begin this endeavour by affirming my agreement with J.P. Meier's balanced approach to the issue of reliability: 'we would do well to pursue a middle course in which Acts is neither dismissed lightly as pure theologizing nor accepted naively as pure history. Each text must be judged on its own merits and on available information from other sources.'²⁶ This, then, shall also be my approach to Acts.

When the specific passages recording Paul's stay in Antioch are considered (Acts 11.19–26; 13.1; 14.26–28; 15.1–35; 18.22–23), there are solid reasons to accept their reliability. I will briefly mention two reasons: 1) the internal data; 2) the corroboration of external sources.

(1) As R. Glover notes, Acts is 'not the history of the early Church, but merely that portion of the Church's history with which Luke happened to be acquainted.'²⁷ Indeed, the specific pieces of information are distributed quite disparately in Acts, as there are sections abounding with details (e.g., 27.1–28.29) and sections with scarce information (e.g., 12.20–23).²⁸ Fortunately, the passages dealing with Antioch are in the former category. As has been identified by Rainer Riesner, the bulk of chronological information in Acts comes from the 'we-passages' and from the passages related to Antioch.²⁹ In both cases, the significant number of minor details that are included in the narrative (e.g., 13.1; 15.22–35), some of which add no significant value to the overall description, indicates the author's first-hand knowledge of the situation.³⁰ So, in all

²⁵ Contra Douglas A. Campbell, *Framing Paul: An Epistolary Biography* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2014). In my view, there is no gain in deliberately leaving aside the book of Acts, as Campbell (*Framing Paul*, 20–21) does. Still, there is the anticipation of a second volume that will consider Luke's writing.

²⁶ John P. Meier, "Antioch," in Raymond E. Brown and John P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (New York: Paulist Press, 2004), 29.

²⁷ Richard Glover, "'Luke the Antiochene' and Acts," *NTS* 11 (1964–65): 98.

²⁸ Glover, "Luke the Antiochene," 97–106; Rainer Riesner, *Paul's Early Period: Chronology, Mission Strategy, Theology* (trans., Doug Stott; Grand Rapids/Cambridge: W.B. Eerdmans, 1998), 323–24.

²⁹ Riesner, *Paul's Early Period*, 318–33. See the later discussions (§ 3.2.3).

³⁰ See also Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AB 28A; New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2008), esp. 35–51.

probability, the internal data concerning the city of Antioch in the 40s, the period that includes Paul's stay there, comes for the most part from an eyewitness.³¹

(2) Secondly, the information provided by external sources, such as Galatians, Josephus, Suetonius, Cassius Dio, and other ancient historians, sets a favourable historical context that makes the data included in Acts 11.19–26; 13.1; 14.26–28; 15.1–35; 18.22–23 highly probable.³² Hence, the purpose of the time chart rendered below: 1) to emphasise the coherence of certain historical events that are related to the city Antioch in the 30–40s; 2) to imply the reliability of Luke's historical accounts. Moreover, some additional, corroborative data will be listed in the footnotes, for the same purpose, i.e., to reinforce the historical coherence and, consequently, the reliability of the Antioch-passages in Acts.

So, connected to the period Paul spent in Antioch are the following historical events: the great famine 'in the days of Claudius' (Acts 11.27–30);³³ the death of Herod Agrippa I (Acts 12.20–25);³⁴ the 'Antioch incident' between Paul and Peter (Gal. 2.11–14);³⁵ the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15.1–35);³⁶ the edict of Claudius, by which the Jews were expelled from Rome (Acts 18.2);³⁷ and Paul's mission to Corinth (Acts 18.18–22), 'while Gallio was

³¹ Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 46.

³² Cf. Riesner, *Paul's Early Period*, 322.

³³ The reign of Claudius (41–54 CE) was marked by numerous droughts and crop failures (Suetonius, *Claudius* 18.2). According to Josephus (*Ant.* 3.320; 20.51–53, 101), the famine was especially severe in Judaea. In the procuratorship of Cuspius Fadus (44–46 CE) and Tiberius Julius Alexander (46–48 CE), Helena, the Queen-mother of Adiabene, a proselyte to Judaism, bought grain from the land of Egypt and figs from Cyprus for the relief of the Judeans. King Izates, Helena's son, also sent money to the Jewish authorities in Jerusalem for distribution among the poor. See (for instance) F.F. Bruce, *Paul: Apostle of the Free Spirit* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 1977), 150.

³⁴ Herod Agrippa I died in 44 CE (Josephus, *Ant.* 19.343–50). Therefore, the events of Acts 11 should be dated in 42 or 43 CE. See Darrell L. Bock, *Acts* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 424; Riesner, *Paul's Early Period*, 322.

³⁵ While the authorship and reliability of Galatians are hardly disputed among scholars, the placing of Galatians in relationship to the Jerusalem Council is highly debated. I am dating the 'incident' in Antioch just prior to the Jerusalem Council, in 48–49 CE. The fact that Paul never mentions the decision of the Council (the 'Apostolic decree') in Galatians remains (for me) a decisive argument against a dating subsequent to the Council. See below (§ 3.1.3).

³⁶ Most scholars date the Jerusalem Council in 48–49 CE. See the lengthier analysis of Bock, *Acts*, 487–90.

³⁷ Suetonius, *Claudius* 25; Cassius Dio, *History* 60.6.6–7. See (for instance) Ralph Martin Novak, *Christianity and the Roman Empire: Background Texts* (London/New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2001), 18–22 and *passim*.

proconsul of Achaia’ (Acts 18.12).³⁸ Another historical event that may have been indirectly connected to Paul (cf. Acts 11.19–21), yet not mentioned in the NT, is ‘the anti-Jewish disturbance’ in Antioch, under the governorship of Publius Petronius, ‘in the third year of Gaius Caligula’ (39/40 CE).³⁹ Therefore, bringing together the chronological references from Acts, Galatians, and external data provided by other ancient historians, the following time chart is suggested:⁴⁰

Years (ca.)	Events
39/40 CE	Josephus (<i>J.W.</i> 7.3.3.45), mentions multitudes of Greeks being ‘constantly’ converted to Judaism in the periods succeeding Antiochus Epiphanes (164 BCE) ⁴¹ The Jewish pogrom and the destruction of the synagogues, under Publius Petronius (39/40 CE), may explain the conversion of numerous Greeks from Antioch to a religion distinct from Judaism (see Χριστιανοί, Acts 11.26), yet akin to it (Acts 11.19–21) ⁴² This could be the context for the arrival of Barnabas in Antioch, and later for Paul’s (Acts 11.22–26)
41–42 CE	Paul teaches in Antioch ‘for a whole year, to a great multitude of people’ (Acts 11.26)
43–48 CE	Paul’s first missionary journey (Acts 13.1–14.25) ⁴³ The conversion of Sergius Paulus (ca. 43–44 CE), the proconsul of Cyprus (Acts 13.6–12) ⁴⁴ The death of Herod Agrippa I in 44 CE (Acts 12.20–23; Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> 19.343–61) Paul returns to Antioch, where he spends ‘no little time’ (Acts 14.26–28)

³⁸ Seneca, *Moral Epistles* 104.1; Pliny, *Nat. hist.* 31.33. See J. Murphy-O’Connor, *St. Paul’s Corinth: Texts and Archaeology* (GNS 6; Wilmington: Glazier, 1983), 146–52. Cf. § 2.1 (n. 5).

³⁹ Hengel-Schwemer, *Paul between Damascus and Antioch*, xii, 183–96.

⁴⁰ Cf. Robert Jewett, *A Chronology of Paul’s Life* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 99 and *passim*.

⁴¹ Meier, “Antioch,” 31–33.

⁴² G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria: From Seleucus to the Arab Conquest* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), 190–95.

⁴³ Cf. J.B. Polhill, *Paul and His Letters* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999), 80; J. Murphy-O’Connor, *Paul: A Critical Life* (Oxford/New York: OUP, 1996), 24–28.

⁴⁴ See Pliny, *Nat. hist.* 18.68. For other extrabiblical evidence for Sergius Paulus, see Riesner, *Paul’s Early Period*, 138–43. For an earlier dating of Sergius Paulus’ conversion (before 37 CE), see D.A. Campbell, “Possible Inscriptional Attestation to Sergius Paul[us] (Acts 13:6-12), and the Implications for Pauline Chronology,” *JTS* 56 (2005): 1–29. However, in regard to this dating I share the reluctance of James D.G. Dunn, *Christianity in the Making*, vol. 2: *Beginning from Jerusalem* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: W.B. Eerdmans, 2009), 504.

48 CE	Paul visits Jerusalem ‘a second time’ (Gal. 2.1), to bring the financial support from Antioch (cf. Acts 11.29–30) ⁴⁵
48–49 CE	The ‘Antioch incident’ between Paul and Peter (Gal. 2.11–14) The Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15.1–35) ⁴⁶ Paul returns to Antioch, for a very short stay (Acts 15.35–36)
49–52 CE	Paul’s second missionary journey (Acts 15.36–18.22) ⁴⁷ The edict of Claudius (49 CE) that ‘recently’ relocated Aquila and Priscilla in Corinth (Acts 18.2) Paul is brought to the judgment of Gallio (Acts 18.12–17), the proconsul of Achaia (51–52 CE) Paul returns to Antioch, for a short stay (Acts 18.22–23)

Now that the historical reliability of Acts 11.19–26, 13.1, 14.26–28, 15.1–35, and 18.22–23 has been addressed, let us consider the chronological data contained. According to Acts 11.25–26 and 13.1, Paul was one of the teachers of the church of Antioch. There he ‘taught great numbers of people’, at a time when the church was still young and new converts were being added continuously (Acts 11.19–26).⁴⁸ It is impossible to establish the length of period Paul spent in Antioch, since only Acts 11.26 offers a specific amount of time: καὶ ἑνιαυτὸν ὅλον συναχθῆναι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ διδάξαι ὄχλον ἰκανόν (‘for a whole year they met with the church and taught a great multitude of people’). Besides this chronological glimpse, it is also recorded that, for the subsequent nine to ten years (*ca.* 43–52 CE),⁴⁹ the Antiochene church

⁴⁵ Among the scholars identifying Acts 11 with Gal. 2, see Bruce, *Paul*, 475; I. Howard Marshall, *Acts: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC 5; Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1980), 244–45; Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (WBC 41; Dallas: Word, 2002), lxxx–lxxxiii, 71; E.J. Schnabel, *Early Christian Mission* (2 vols.; London: Apollos, 2004), 2:988–89. *Pace* Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul’s Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 81. On the other hand, Betz and others assume this is the visit occasioned by the Council.

⁴⁶ In favour of 48 CE are: Günther Bornkamm, *Paul* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), 31; W.G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1975), § 13 and *passim*.

⁴⁷ Polhill, *Paul and His Letters*, 80–82.

⁴⁸ Why this piece of information is reliable, see Downey, *History of Antioch*, 190–95; Meier, “Antioch”, 30–36.

⁴⁹ Hengel-Schwemer (*Paul between Damascus and Antioch*, 205) argue that the period of Paul and Barnabas’s joint work in Antioch lasted for eight to nine years (*ca.* 39–48 CE). This period is framed historically by the

was the home base of Paul's missionary activity (Acts 14.26–28; 15.35; 18.22–23).⁵⁰ The Lukan litotes of Acts 14.28 (χρόνον οὐκ ὀλίγον)⁵¹ and the use of the imperfect διέτριβον, indicate a longer, undetermined stay in Antioch, as distinct from the aorist διέτριψαν of 14.3, that indicates a stay determined by the perilous events of 14.4–6.⁵² On the other hand, the χρόνον τινά of Acts 18.23 probably describes a stay that is significantly shorter.⁵³ Similarly, Paul's stay in Antioch, following the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15.35–36), is rendered by Luke in 'days': μετὰ δέ τινας ἡμέρας ('after some days').⁵⁴ Unfortunately, these vague references prevent a precise time framing.

Still, considering the broad historical and chronological data above,⁵⁵ it is plausible to estimate that Paul spent *circa* three years in Antioch.⁵⁶ Consequently, it is also plausible that he taught the Lord's Supper tradition to this young and constantly growing church, during the years spent in their midst; after all, this would have been one of his foundational teachings (cf. 1 Cor. 4.17). Moreover, it should be noted that one of Paul's return visits to Antioch succeeded his inaugural visit to Corinth (Acts 18.1–18, 22–23), a visit that included the 'passing on' of the tradition to another recently founded church (1 Cor 11.23a). It should also be noted that, at a certain time during Paul's stay in Antioch, the apostle was involved in a major 'incident', a conflict generated by a separation that occurred at the meal (Gal. 2.11–14). But did this separation affect the Lord's Supper as well? If the answer is positive, for Paul this would have

Jewish pogrom of Antioch, in the third year of Gaius Caligula (39/40 CE) and Paul's mission to Corinth, following the edict of Claudius (49 CE). See also Riesner, *Paul's Early Period*, 322.

⁵⁰ Polhill, *Paul and His Letters*, 97.

⁵¹ C.K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (2 vols.; ICC; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 1:693.

⁵² Barrett, *Acts*, 1:693.

⁵³ The succession of participles in Acts 18.22–23 gives 'an impression of haste'. See F.F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1988), 357.

⁵⁴ Cf. Bruce, *Acts*, 301; Barrett, *Acts*, 2:753.

⁵⁵ Again, it is not the intention of this study to offer an elaborate and thorough chronology of Paul's life and mission.

⁵⁶ Cf. Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul: His Story* (Oxford: OUP, 2004), esp. 38–51.

been a most favourable context to (re)introduce the Lord's Supper tradition to the Antiochenes. So, let us now examine this 'incident' at Antioch to see whether this is the case.

3.1.3 *The Lord's Supper in Antioch: Conflict*

During Paul's stay in Antioch (*ca.* 48–49 CE), there took place a major 'incident', which is depicted in Gal. 2.11–14. It was a dispute between Paul and Peter, regarding the 'separation' at the table. The conflict arose after Peter (and 'other Jews') ceased to eat with the Gentiles, and separated himself from the table (ἀφώριζεν),⁵⁷ for he feared the James-group (2.12): τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς ('those who belonged to the circumcision').⁵⁸ For Schreiner, 'the simplest and most natural reading of Gal. 2:11–14 is that Peter actually ate unclean food—food prohibited by the OT law—before the men from James came'.⁵⁹ So, Peter shared more than the same location; he shared the same food with the Gentiles (Gal. 2.14; cf. Acts 10.10–15): εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων ἐθνικῶς καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆς.⁶⁰ His radical gesture of eating with non-Jews must be understood in the context of 4 Macc. 4.26, in which renunciation of Judaism involves eating food that is unclean (cf. 2.14).⁶¹ Moreover, the imperfect of συνήσθιεν (Gal. 2.12) suggests that Peter acted in this way 'repeatedly and almost habitually'.⁶² Therefore, the continuity of action, indicated by the imperfect tense, offers good grounds to assume that this 'eating' included the Lord's Supper, at least occasionally.⁶³ Although there is no explicit

⁵⁷ The imperfect tense indicates that Peter made a practice of withdrawing and separating himself. So, Martinus C. de Boer, *Galatians: A Commentary* (NTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2011), 132.

⁵⁸ The phrase most probably describes the Jewish Christians who conservatively kept the OT laws (Acts 10.45; 11.2). See Thomas R. Schreiner, *Galatians* (ZECNT; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 143.

⁵⁹ Schreiner, *Galatians*, 141.

⁶⁰ Betz, *Galatians*, 111–12.

⁶¹ Schreiner, *Galatians*, 140–41. Cf. S.A. Cummins, *Paul and the Crucified Christ in Antioch: Maccabean Martyrdom and Galatians 1 and 2* (SNTSMS 114; Cambridge: CUP, 2001), 102, 121 and *passim*.

⁶² Betz, *Galatians*, 107; David A. DeSilva, *Galatians: A Handbook on the Greek Text* (BHGNT; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014), 37.

⁶³ Inter alia: Meier, "Antioch", 40–43; de Boer, *Galatians*, 132 (n. 188); James D.G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1998), 600–601; Philip F. Esler, *Galatians* (NTR; London/New York: Routledge, 2003), esp. 93–140. For more examples, see Schreiner, *Galatians*, 140 (n. 16).

mention of the Lord's Supper in Gal. 2.11–14, we should not deny its implicit existence.⁶⁴ That, in Antioch, the regular meals were closely related to the Lord's Supper is attested by *Did.* 9.1–10.6 and Ignatius, *Smyrn.* 8.1–2.⁶⁵

Therefore, did Peter's decision to separate from the meal (along with 'other Jews') affect the unity of the Lord's Supper as well, or were the regular meals solely affected? Philip Esler⁶⁶ and Michelle Slee⁶⁷ argued for the former. According to Esler, the Jews who conformed to the OT dietary laws refused to share the vessels of food and drink with the non-Jews. To share the location, yet eat separately, was acceptable; but to share the same food or vessels was not. Most conservative Jews feared that the vessels of the non-Jews were defiled by being used to store unclean foods, so sharing them was unacceptable.⁶⁸ Since, at the Lord's Supper, all were supposed to share from 'one cup' and 'one loaf' (cf. 1 Cor 10.16–17), for 'some Jews' this 'sharing' became the reason for the separation (Gal. 2.12–13).⁶⁹ Slee furthers Esler's reconstruction and argues that the Jews in Antioch 'separated' from the Lord's Supper for they were pressured by the church of Jerusalem (cf. Acts 11.3). In her view, the emissaries from James (2.12) asked the Jewish-Christians of Antioch to eat separately even the Lord's Supper, unless 'the Gentiles [...] convert to Judaism.'⁷⁰

Esler and Slee's reconstructions have not won wide acceptance among scholars,⁷¹ a common critique being that both read too much into the text. Slee, for instance, argues that the pressure exerted by the church of Jerusalem came after the James-group 'changed [its] mind'

⁶⁴ Marcel Simon, André Benoît, *Le Judaïsme et le Christianisme antique d'Antiochus Epiphane à Constantin* (Nouvelle Clio 10; Paris: PUF, 1968), 101; Michelle Slee, *The Church in Antioch in the First Century C.E.: Communion and Conflict* (JSNTSup 244; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2003), 44 (n. 20).

⁶⁵ See the lengthier discussions in chapters 7 and 8.

⁶⁶ Esler, *Galatians*, 93–140.

⁶⁷ Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 42–49.

⁶⁸ Esler, *Galatians*, 98 and *passim*.

⁶⁹ Esler, *Galatians*, 106–108, 115 and *passim*. Also, Simon-Benoît, *Judaïsme et Christianisme*, 101; Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 44.

⁷⁰ Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 46.

⁷¹ See G.N. Stanton, "The Early Church in Antioch: Review," *ExpT* 116/9 (2005): 294.

about the rightness of the Jews and non-Jews to share the same cup and loaf.⁷² Also, this ‘change of mind’ took place after the council of Acts 15.⁷³ In my view, Slee’s reading creates some problems. First of all, it is hard to imagine that Peter would approve this ‘change of mind’, all the more as it annulled an apostolic council that 1) reflected his own standpoint (cf. Acts. 15.6–11, 22–23) and 2) was the unanimous deliberation of the Jerusalem church (ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν γενομένοις ὁμοθυμαδόν), under the guidance of the Holy Spirit (ἔδοξεν γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ ἡμῖν).⁷⁴ So, then, one should ask whether James, by himself, would repeal a decision taken by ‘all apostles’ (Acts 15.22–23). A contradictory message as this could cause serious dissension among the apostles (cf. Gal. 2.11, 13). Moreover, since food and eating were vital matters, their inconsistency could also have unpredictable consequences for the whole church.⁷⁵ Therefore, such a ‘change of mind’ could not be justified by ‘the political situation in Jerusalem which was continuing to deteriorate’, i.e., threats that determined the Jerusalem church ‘to tighten the boundaries that separated them from other people.’⁷⁶ Also, it is hard to accept that Paul would fail to mention the council’s decision to the Galatians, given the ‘highly charged polemical atmosphere’ of the ‘incident’ and of the epistle as a whole.⁷⁷ In my opinion, any reconstruction makes better sense if the ‘incident’ depicted in Gal. 2.11–14 preceded the Jerusalem council (Acts 15.1–35).⁷⁸ Still, regarding the historical and chronological issue of whether Galatians was written before or after the Jerusalem council, Douglas Moo correctly

⁷² Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 42–49 (46).

⁷³ Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 36–49.

⁷⁴ See Acts 15.22a, 23b, 25, 28. Slee (*Church in Antioch*, 41), following scholars such as C.K. Barrett and P. Esler, argues that the decree of Acts 15.23–29 ‘actually originated in the Antioch church’.

⁷⁵ The debates over food and eating were fierce in earliest Christianity (see 1 Cor. 8–10). This is not surprising since, in the words of M. Douglas, ‘food has a social component, as well as a biological one’, both of the components being vital for humanity. See Mary Douglas, “Deciphering a Meal,” *Daedalus* 101 (1972): 61–81 (61). Also, Dennis E. Smith, *From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early Christian World* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 9.

⁷⁶ *Contra* Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 46.

⁷⁷ See Douglas J. Moo, *Galatians* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013), 118.

⁷⁸ See § 3.1.2 (n. 35).

concludes: ‘each of these two options are very finely balanced—far more finely balanced than most interpreters acknowledge’.⁷⁹

Notwithstanding the above, in my view, Esler and Slee correctly argue that Peter’s separation may have affected the Lord’s Supper as well.⁸⁰ If this is the case, then there are at least two ‘factions’ that separated at the communal meal in Antioch: Peter’s faction (Gal. 2.13) and Paul’s (Gal. 2.14).⁸¹ Therefore, it should be noticed that this is a context (or situation) which is parallel, if not similar, to 1 Cor. 11.17–22.⁸² As I have argued in the previous chapter, in Corinth, Paul and Peter’s ‘factions’ contributed also to the complexity of the ‘schismatic’ and ‘individualistic’ behaviour at the meal (cf. 1 Cor. 1.11–12).⁸³ Accordingly, it is plausible to expect that Paul would have brought the Lord’s Supper tradition to the attention of the Antiochene church as well, given the similar schismatic context (cf. Gal. 2.20–21).⁸⁴ If the Jerusalem Council was yet to meet (Acts 15.1–5), the Lord’s Supper tradition would have offered Paul perhaps the strongest argument to plead for the unity of the Antiochenes, a unity around ‘one cup’ and ‘one loaf’ (cf. 1 Cor. 10.16–17).

3.1.4. Preliminary conclusions

Up to this point, it has been argued that the Lord’s Supper tradition was ‘foundational’ for Paul (1 Cor. 11.23a): it was one of the universal teachings that he ‘taught in every church’ (1 Cor. 4.17). Since Paul spent *circa* three years teaching in the church of Antioch (cf. Acts 11.19–26; 13.1; 14.26–28; 15.35; 18.22–23), it is highly probable that he ‘passed on’ this tradition while he was there, especially since the ‘incident’ with Peter offered him a great

⁷⁹ Moo, *Galatians*, 118.

⁸⁰ A similar view is defended by Meier, “Antioch”, esp. 40–43; Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 600–601.

⁸¹ Moo, *Galatians*, 143.

⁸² For such a ‘similarity’, see Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 600–601: ‘Similarly with the earlier meals at Antioch, from which Peter and the other Christian Jews separated themselves, and which most likely included the Lord’s Supper at least on some occasions (Gal. 2.11–14).’

⁸³ See above (§ 2.2.1.4.1).

⁸⁴ See the lengthier argumentation of Smith, *From Symposium to Eucharist*, esp. 174–77.

opportunity to use this tradition of 1 Cor. 11.23–25, in order to strengthen his case for unity at the meal (see Gal. 2.11–14). And yet, there is another possible approach: Paul did not teach the Lord’s Supper tradition in Antioch, but was taught the tradition, while there (*ca.* 41–48 CE). To this second scenario I now turn.

3.2 From Antioch to Corinth: ‘For I received... what I passed on to you’

As the bulk of scholars have shown, the introductory formula ‘I received from the Lord what I also passed on to you’ (1 Cor. 11.23a) does not necessarily imply a direct, unmediated revelation from Jesus.⁸⁵ There are, however, certain scholars who prefer this reading.⁸⁶ Geza Vermes, for instance, argues for a personal and direct revelation, emphasizing the phrases ‘I’ and ‘from the Lord’.⁸⁷ Moreover, he compares the introductory formulae of the Lord’s Supper tradition (1 Cor. 11.23–25) and of the early creed of 1 Cor. 15.1–3a:

1 Cor. 11.23a

Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν...

1 Cor. 15.1–3a

¹ Γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν, ὃ καὶ παρελάβετε, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐστήκατε, ² δι’ οὗ καὶ σώζεσθε, τίνι λόγῳ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν εἰ κατέχετε, ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ εἰκῆ ἐπιστεύσατε. ³ παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις, ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον...

Following this comparison, Vermes concludes:

Paul implies that the mythical significance of this meal was revealed to him directly by Christ: ‘I received from the Lord what I also handed on to you’ (1 Cor. 11: 23). He does not say that it came to him through apostolic tradition as the story of the death, burial and resurrection of the Saviour: ‘I handed over to you what I in turn had received’ (1 Cor. 15:3).⁸⁸

⁸⁵ See below (n. 97).

⁸⁶ See (inter alia): Leon Morris, *1 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC 7; Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1985), 157; H. Maccoby, “Paul and the Eucharist,” *NTS* 37 (1991): 247–48; Geza Vermes, *Christian Beginnings: From Nazareth to Nicaea* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2013), 90–92 (91).

⁸⁷ Vermes, *Christian Beginnings*, 91.

⁸⁸ Vermes, *Christian Beginnings*, 91.

In my opinion, the comparison offered by Vermes is inexact, since the Lord's Supper tradition can be traced back to Jesus himself,⁸⁹ while the early creed is the anonymous account of an early Judean community.⁹⁰ In the first case, the authoritative original source can and should be identified (cf. 1 Cor. 7.10, 12, 25),⁹¹ which is not the case for the second. And this is precisely what Paul does in 11.23a: he identifies the primary source of the tradition, in order to emphasize its authoritative character.⁹²

Paul's 'revelatory' language is significantly different.⁹³ See, for instance, Gal. 1.11–12, 2.2, Eph. 3.3–9, and Col. 1.26–27. All these passages show a broad consistency in the use of ἀποκαλύπτω, ἀποκάλυψις, φανερώω and μυστήριον.⁹⁴ In contrast, the semi-technical phrasing concerning the 'receiving from' and the 'passing on' (Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν), in both Jewish and Hellenistic circles,⁹⁵ assumes the use of prior and 'consecrated' traditions (cf. 1 Cor. 15.1–3a).⁹⁶ In this instance, it is a tradition that Paul received from the

⁸⁹ E.g., Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 101, 104; I.H. Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper* (Vancouver: Regent, 2006), 111–12; Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 867; Christine Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus? Analogien zwischen den echten Paulusbriefen und den synoptischen Evangelien* (BZNW 213; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015), 284.

⁹⁰ See (inter alia): Ulrich Wilckens, "Der Ursprung der Überlieferung der Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen," in Wilfried Joest and Wolfhart Pannenberg (eds.), *Dogma und Denkstrukturen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 56–95; Berthold Klappert, "Zur Frage des semitischen oder griechischen Urtextes von 1. Kor. 15.3–5," *NTS* 13 (1966–67): 168–73; John S. Kloppenborg, "An Analysis of the Pre-Pauline Formula in 1 Cor 15:3b-5 in Light of Some Recent Literature," *CBQ* 40 (1978): 351–67; Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 251–54; Collins, *First Corinthians*, 529–33 (531).

⁹¹ Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*, 111–12: 'a liturgical formula which he had handed on to the church when it was founded ... a form of words which was regarded as authoritative in the church generally and was not Paul's own composition.... The origin of the Lord's Supper in the explicit command of Jesus as the Lord is thus emphasized.' Cf. Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 867.

⁹² E.g., Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*, 111–12; Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 866–67; Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 253.

⁹³ Cf. Benjamin L. Gladd, *Revealing the Mysterion: The Use of Mystery in Daniel and Second Temple Judaism with Its Bearing on First Corinthians* (BZNW 160; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), esp. 108–262; Colleen Shantz, *Paul in Ecstasy: The Neurobiology of the Apostle's Life and Thought* (Cambridge: CUP, 2009), esp. 120–21; T.J. Lang, *Mystery and the Making of a Christian Historical Consciousness: From Paul to the Second Century* (BZNW 219; Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2015), 47 (n. 72), 70–81 (76).

⁹⁴ Moo, *Galatians*, 95; Shantz, *Paul in Ecstasy*, 121.

⁹⁵ For Jewish instances, see Josephus, *Ant.* 13.297; 408; *m. Pe'ah* 2.6; 'Ed. 8.7; *Yad.* 4.3. For Hellenistic instances, see Plato, *Phileb.* 16c; *Ep.* 12.359d; Diodorus, *Bibl. hist.* 12.13.2; Plutarch, *Is. et Os.* 352c. See above (§ 2.1).

⁹⁶ See (inter alia): Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 195–96; Wolfgang Schrage, *Der Erste Brief an die Korinther* (EKK VII/1–3; Zürich: Benziger, 1991–1999), 3:29–31; Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 866–67; Marion L. Soards, *1 Corinthians* (NIBC; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999), 239. Most scholars consider the 1 Cor. 11.23–25 tradition to be 'consecrated', for 1) it shares the same vocabulary as Lk. 22.19–20; and 2) it shows signs

previous generation of believers, as the comparison to Lk. 22.17–20 indicates.⁹⁷ An interesting case, however, is represented by 1 Cor. 15.1–8, where Paul brings together, distinctively, the prior tradition (15.1–7) and personal revelation (15.8):

Now, brothers, I want to remind you (γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν) of the gospel I preached to you, which you received (ὃ καὶ παρελάβετε) and on which you have taken your stand.² By this gospel you are saved, if you hold firmly to the word I preached to you. Otherwise, you have believed in vain.³ For what I received (παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν) I passed on to you (ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον) as of first importance: that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures (κατὰ τὰς γραφάς),⁴ that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures (κατὰ τὰς γραφάς),⁵ and that he appeared (ὤφθη) to Cephas, and then to the Twelve.⁶ After that, he appeared (ὤφθη) to more than five hundred of the brothers and sisters at the same time, most of whom are still living, though some have fallen asleep.⁷ Then he appeared (ὤφθη) to James, then to all the apostles,⁸ and last of all he appeared to me also (ὤφθη κάμοί), as to one abnormally born.

In line with 1 Cor. 15.1–8, J.C. Bekker synthesises the two views on the origin of the Lord's Supper tradition, bringing together the prior tradition and the personal revelation: 'Since the risen Jesus is behind the tradition of 1 Cor 11.23–26 [...] human mediation and divine immediacy are related in a complex way'.⁹⁸ Otherwise, if the introductory formula of 1 Cor. 11.23a is considered solely, there are only two possible interpretations: 1) a personal and direct revelation, stressing the 'emphatic I', as Leon Morris calls it,⁹⁹ and the phrase 'from the Lord'; and 2) the reception of a prior and 'consecrated' tradition, emphasizing the technical sense of παρέλαβον and παρέδωκα. As hinted above, in this study I opt for the second: Paul quotes a consecrated tradition he has received from previous believers. And the determining factor for

of 'liturgical' (or ritual) interventions. E.g., Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 114 and *passim*; Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 866.

⁹⁷ Most NT scholars today will defend this view. See (inter alia): Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, esp. 101–104, 186–88; Barrett, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 264–65; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 194–95; Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*, 32; Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 549; Ben Witherington III, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1995), 249–50; Richard B. Hays, *First Corinthians* (Interpretation; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 197; Richard A. Horsley, *1 Corinthians* (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998), 160; Collins, *First Corinthians*, 426; Soards, *1 Corinthians*, 239; Paul Barnett, *1 Corinthians: Holiness and Hope of a Rescued People* (FBC; Fearn: Christian Focus Publications, 2000), 214; Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 866; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 547; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 429–30; Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians* (PNTC; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2010), 548; Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus*, 274–90.

⁹⁸ J. Christiaan Bekker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 122–23.

⁹⁹ Morris, *1 Corinthians*, 157.

this option rests on the similarities between 1 Cor. 11.23–25 and Lk. 22.19–20,¹⁰⁰ both traditions sharing a common Hellenistic and ‘ritual’ source.¹⁰¹ But, if Paul received this tradition from a previous generation of Christians, from whom did he receive it? In the following section, I will focus on three possible answers.

3.2.1 Paul, Damascus, and the foundational traditions

According to I.H. Marshall, there are only three possible locations from which Paul may have received the Lord’s Supper tradition: Antioch, Damascus, and Jerusalem.¹⁰² Indeed, Paul spent the immediate years following his ‘conversion’¹⁰³ mostly in Damascus, Cilicia, and Antioch (Gal. 1.15–24).¹⁰⁴ There was also a short visit to Jerusalem that lasted ‘fifteen days’ (Gal. 1.18). Then, both churches of Damascus and Antioch had Jerusalemite origins and connections, as they were founded by believers scattered from Jerusalem (cf. Acts 9.19b; 11.19–21).¹⁰⁵ However, no such connections are known in the case of Cilicia. Accordingly, on account of the lack of any data, Paul’s native region should be left out of the discussion.¹⁰⁶ Thus, the elimination of Cilicia reduces the area of research to the three locations suggested by Marshall.

¹⁰⁰ E.g., Ben Witherington III, *Making a Meal of It: Rethinking the Theology of the Lord’s Supper* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007), 55.

¹⁰¹ See below (§ 3.2.2.1; § 3.2.2.2; § 3.2.3).

¹⁰² Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord’s Supper*, 32.

¹⁰³ For the view that the so-called ‘Damascus Road Experience’ was a genuine ‘conversion’ see (inter alia): Alan F. Segal, *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1990); Richard N. Longenecker (ed.), *The Road from Damascus: The Impact of Paul’s Conversion on his Life, Thought, and Ministry* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1997); Klaus Haacker, “Paul’s Life,” in James D.G. Dunn (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to St. Paul* (Cambridge: CUP, 2003), esp. 23–24. Contra Krister Stendahl, *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles and Other Essays* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), 12–17.

¹⁰⁴ Hengel-Schwemer, *Paul between Damascus and Antioch*, 24–224.

¹⁰⁵ Hengel-Schwemer, *Paul between Damascus and Antioch*, 221.

¹⁰⁶ Pace G.D. Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy: The Moorhouse Lectures 1975* (Cambridge: CUP, 2008), 23.

The city of Damascus has been suggested especially by Paul Barnett. He considers that Paul received the Lord's Supper tradition 'almost certainly' from the city in which Paul spent the first 'days' following his baptism (Acts 9.18b–19). Barnett writes:

The 'tradition' Paul 'handed over' to them five years earlier he 'received from the Lord'. He is referring here (almost certainly) to the time of his conversion near Damascus and to Ananias' preparation of him for baptism there. I presume that Ananias instructed Paul and 'handed over' this 'tradition'. That teaching went back to the Passover meal when Jesus established his 'dinner' by which his followers could 'remember' him in the time ahead until his Return. Thus the 'tradition' came 'from the Lord', was 'received' by the Twelve who 'delivered' it to members of the Jerusalem Church, from whom (somehow) Ananias 'received' it and taught it to Paul. A decade and a half later Paul 'delivered' this 'tradition' to the Corinthians.¹⁰⁷

If Barnett's hypothesis is correct, then Paul's catechetical training (Acts 9.19–22) could have shaped his foundational teachings, i.e., 'the ways... [he taught] in every church' (1 Cor. 4.17). If this is case, then the scenario suggested in the section above applies here as well: Paul taught the Lord's Supper tradition everywhere; so, Paul taught the Lord's Supper tradition in Antioch.¹⁰⁸ And he did so for the catechetical training, received in Damascus as a new believer, may have become the foundational training he 'passed on' to every new believer.

However, there is no textual evidence to allow a direct connection between 1 Cor. 11.23–25 and the church of Damascus. There is solely the indirect connection between Damascus and some believers scattered from Jerusalem (Acts 9.1–2).¹⁰⁹ Therefore, given the scarce information, I consider that, out of the three locations, Damascus is the hardest to prove.

3.2.2 Paul, Mark, and Jerusalem

According to Marshall, Jerusalem is also a potential location. For him, the Greek phrasing of the tradition could well be the outcome of the Hellenists of Judea (cf. Acts 6.1), that may have translated the Hebrew or Aramaic original source very early.¹¹⁰ Unlike Marshall,

¹⁰⁷ Barnett, *1 Corinthians*, 214.

¹⁰⁸ See above (§ 3.1.1).

¹⁰⁹ Hengel-Schwemer, *Paul between Damascus and Antioch*, 43–47.

¹¹⁰ Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*, 33.

I consider Jerusalem an improbable location. In my view, the thorough Hellenization of the original source, Marshall himself notices, indicates another location, outside the Jewish territories.¹¹¹ A comparison between the words of institution, as they are recorded in Mark 14.22–25 and 1 Cor. 11.23–25, reveals an intentional process of Hellenization, in the latter. It also reveals the later development of a ‘ritual’ phraseology and structure:¹¹²

Mk. 14.22–25

²² Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν, Λάβετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. ²³ καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. ²⁴ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν. ²⁵ ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πῖω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

1 Cor. 11.23–25

²³ Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ παρεδίδοτο ἔλαβεν ἄρτον ²⁴ καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ εἶπεν, Τοῦτό μου ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. ²⁵ ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι λέγων, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινῆ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι. τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὡσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

When the two traditions are compared, a few alterations become apparent: a) the removal of the numerous Semitisms found in Mark: καὶ (‘and’); ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν (‘truly I say to you’); τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ (‘the kingdom of God’); b) the ‘universalization’ of the language, by the removal of the pronoun ‘they’, with reference to Jesus’ disciples;¹¹³ c) the presence of structural parallelism in 1 Cor. 11.24–25 (‘this is... this do in remembrance of me’); and d) the emphasis on the repetition of the rite (‘do this, as often as [ὡσάκις] you drink it, in remembrance of me... For as often as [ὡσάκις] you eat this bread and drink this cup...’), as opposed to Mark (‘I will not drink again of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God’).¹¹⁴

¹¹¹ See below (§ 3.2.2.2).

¹¹² Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 168. I am following here Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, esp. 186–201, who argues that Mark is the ‘most ancient’ tradition. Cf. Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary on the Gospel of Mark* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 653. For the view that Luke is the most ancient eucharistic tradition, see H. Schürmann, *Einer quellenkritischen Untersuchung des lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes*, *Lk 22,7–38*, vol. 2: *Der Einsetzungsbericht*, *Lk 22,19–20* (NA 20/4; Münster: Aschendorff, 1955), 82–132. See the lengthier discussion in Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1996), 1716; Jay M. Harrington, *The Lukan Passion Narrative: The Markan Material in Luke 22.54–23.25. A Historical Survey: 1891–1997* (NTT 30; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000).

¹¹³ Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 254.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Brant Pitre, *Jesus and the Last Supper* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2015), 482–89.

In my opinion, the Markan tradition (Mk. 14.22–25) offers a much better picture of how a tradition with Jerusalemite origins may look.¹¹⁵ It is a Greek translation that kept the Semitisms of the original and also the delimited historical context. This is not the case, however, with the tradition of 1 Cor. 11.23–25: it is ritual, universal and atemporal. To prove this point, I will take a closer look at the two traditions, following the works of Joachim Jeremias and G.D. Kilpatrick.

3.2.2.1 Joachim Jeremias

In his classic work, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*,¹¹⁶ Jeremias argues that the tradition cited in 1 Cor. 11.23–25 is an independent, pre-Pauline tradition¹¹⁷ that goes back to Jesus ‘without interruption’.¹¹⁸ Paul himself may have altered some wording of the tradition; however, his alterations are minor.¹¹⁹ Moreover, a comparison between Mk. 14.22–25 and 1 Cor. 11.23–25 reveals the thorough Hellenization of the tradition cited by Paul, as the Semitisms are considerably fewer.¹²⁰ Another observation from Jeremias has to do with the ‘liturgical’ language of the 1 Cor. 11.23–25 tradition, which denotes a previous liturgical use that affected both its composition and content.¹²¹ For Jeremias, the ‘formulation’ ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς (11.23a) is not narrative, but ‘liturgical’.¹²² Also, the verb παραδίδωμι (‘to hand over’) is a possible *passivum divinum*.¹²³ It may be ‘technical’ and ‘liturgical’, since both passion narratives found in Mark and Matthew’s Gospels are constructed around this verb (Mk. 14.11;

¹¹⁵ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 186–87; Kilpatrick, *Eucharist*, 21–22. See the later discussions (§ 3.2.2.1 and § 3.2.2.2).

¹¹⁶ Ger.: *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1935).

¹¹⁷ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 101.

¹¹⁸ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 104.

¹¹⁹ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 104. For instance, Jeremias (*Eucharistic Words*, 167) argues that τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (1 Cor. 11.24) could be a Pauline addition.

¹²⁰ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 186.

¹²¹ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 137, 186–88.

¹²² Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 112. Also, Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus*, 290.

¹²³ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 112.

15.1, 15; Mat. 26.14–16, 47–50; 27.1–2, 17–18, 26).¹²⁴ All these observations¹²⁵ lead Jeremias to conclude that 1 Cor. 11.23–25 represents a ‘de-paschalization’ of the tradition. The Lord’s Supper tradition is taken out of its original historical context, in order to become universal in time and space.¹²⁶

I am in agreement with Jeremias’ main conclusion. However, some details of his reading require certain nuances. Regardless how the phrase ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἣν παρεδίδετο (‘the Lord Jesus in the night he was handed over/betrayed’) is translated, it still locates this tradition in a paschal context.¹²⁷ Then, the technical use of παραδίδομι hardly indicates a ‘de-paschalization’.¹²⁸ Moreover, in the previous chapters I have criticized the use of the term ‘liturgical’. The reason for my critique is that, to a certain extent, the term could be considered anachronistic, for it allows later ecclesiastical readings back into first-century texts. Instead, I suggested that a more accurate term would be ‘ritual’.¹²⁹

On the other hand, I do agree that the language of 1 Cor. 11.23–25 is ‘ritualistic’, to amend Jeremias.¹³⁰ Indeed, the structural parallelism of 1 Cor. 11.23–25 and its comparison to Lk. 22.17–20, indicate a fixed and consecrated tradition that was used (or was composed to be used) repeatedly. Also, Jeremias is right to notice that the wording of the tradition has a universal vagueness and a general address. Consequently, I am also in agreement that there is an ‘universalisation’ of this tradition, one that reflects the ethos of a community other than Jerusalem.¹³¹

¹²⁴ See John R.W. Stott, *The Cross of Christ* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1986), 58–62.

¹²⁵ For more instances, see Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 114.

¹²⁶ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 115.

¹²⁷ Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 869, 871–874.

¹²⁸ For the use of παραδίδομι in Paul and the Passion narratives see (for instance) Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1988), 549; Hays, *First Corinthians*, 198; Schrage, *Der Erste Brief*, 3:29–35.

¹²⁹ See § 1.3.1 (n. 43). Cf. § 5.1; § 7.1.4 (3).

¹³⁰ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 137.

¹³¹ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 186 and *passim*.

In sum, the Hellenization, ritualization and universalisation of the 1 Cor. 11.23–25 tradition, as was uncovered by Jeremias, indicate that the alterations noted above are the outcome of a Hellenised, well-organized, and mission-oriented community.¹³² Moreover, the ‘universalization’ of the lexicon points to a community that distances itself from its Jewish roots, shaping its new multi-ethnic identity.¹³³ In my opinion, this rules Jerusalem out of the discussion. It also rules out the other Jewish territories.¹³⁴

3.2.2.2 *George Dunbar Kilpatrick*

After undertaking a thorough analysis of the two traditions that are compared above (Mk. 14.22–25; 1 Cor. 11.23–25), G.D. Kilpatrick concludes that 1 Cor. 11.23–25 is ‘the product of a revision’.¹³⁵ Similar to Jeremias, he notices the numerous alterations, regarding both the vocabulary and style:

Mark’s heavy reliance on ‘and’ is not literary Greek, but corresponds to usage in Hebrew and Aramaic. Secondly, in its placing of its adjectives 1 Corinthians is far removed from the idiom of Hebrew and Aramaic. Thirdly, in the placing of genitives Mark follows the grammar of these two languages, while 1 Corinthians does not. The same is true about the placing of the verbs. In all four features 1 Corinthians is contrasted with Mark. Mark is consistently near Semitic idiom and 1 Corinthians is further away [...] Its Greek is more in keeping with normal Greek of the time. This should mean that the Greek of 1 Corinthians is the product of a revision. As we have seen, the tradition about Jesus has to a remarkable extent avoided the elimination of Semitic features and this tradition was probably used catechetically. This being so, the revision of the Greek seen in 1 Corinthians is not likely to be for catechetical reasons. It does not seem to be the work of Paul himself...¹³⁶

Kilpatrick shows that ‘in contrast to Mark’s account, the text of 1 Cor. xi shows signs of revision [...] the avoidance of Semitic idiom and an approach to a more normal Greek.’¹³⁷ In addition to the removal of Semitisms and the normalization of the Greek, there is also the

¹³² Meier, “Antioch,” 32–44.

¹³³ Cf. Burton L. Mack, *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1991), 107–108.

¹³⁴ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, esp. 186–88.

¹³⁵ Kilpatrick, *Eucharist*, 23.

¹³⁶ Kilpatrick, *Eucharist*, 21–22.

¹³⁷ Kilpatrick, *Eucharist*, 23.

emphasis on the εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν repetition (vv. 24–25), which shows ‘a certain parallelism’. This indicates that the Hellenistic revision may have been the natural outcome of a ritual in which ‘a more normal Greek’ was used.¹³⁸

Thus, in line with Jeremias, Kilpatrick considers that the place of revision must be outside Jerusalem or the Jewish territories, probably somewhere from ‘the Levant or Cilicia’.¹³⁹ For him, the tradition recorded in Mk. 14.22–25, that contains numerous Semitisms and reflects a Jewish or Aramaic grammar, offers a good example of what a Jerusalemite Greek translation of the original source (Hebrew or Aramaic) would look like.¹⁴⁰ Such a Greco-Semitic tradition would have circulated in the earliest Jesus communities, throughout the Jewish territories.¹⁴¹ However, the refined Greek of 1 Cor. 11.23–25, unnecessary in the previous geographic context, suggests a location other than Jerusalem, concludes Kilpatrick.¹⁴²

3.2.2.2.1 *A necessary caveat*

It is not my intention to introduce here an artificial, even false Judaism/Hellenism dichotomy. Indeed, from the earliest stages of Christianity, Jerusalem was inhabited by Hellenists who could have formulated the 1 Cor. 11 tradition in the refined Greek identified by Kilpatrick (see Acts 2.5–11; 6.1–5).¹⁴³ However, the extant tradition of Mark 14—which I take to stem from the apostles or their immediate Jerusalemite circle¹⁴⁴—is an indicator that these

¹³⁸ Kilpatrick, *Eucharist*, 20, 23.

¹³⁹ Kilpatrick, *Eucharist*, 23.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*, 33.

¹⁴¹ Cf. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 429.

¹⁴² Kilpatrick, *Eucharist*, 23.

¹⁴³ See (for instance) Craig C. Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews: Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992).

¹⁴⁴ I concur here with Maurice Casey, *Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel* (SNTSMS 102; Cambridge: CUP, 2004), 249–51: ‘[Mark 14.12–26] gives a literally accurate but abbreviated account of the original event, and shows no serious signs of rewriting in the interests of the early church in general, or of the community to which Mark belonged [...] There is therefore a strong probability that Mark's Aramaic source was written by one of the disciples who took part in Jesus' final Passover meal. This is more likely to have happened sooner rather than later, as part of the felt need to explain how and why Jesus died. We may reasonably infer a date c. 27–40 CE for this source, depending on when we date the events narrated.’

Hellenists may have had the lexical ability, but lacked the ecclesial authority/influence to implement another tradition, one that departed from the original *Sitz im Leben* or from the *ipsissima verba*,¹⁴⁵ especially as the apostles ‘gave their attention’ to the teachings of Jesus (cf. Acts 1.21–22, 26 and 6.4).¹⁴⁶

Secondly, it is not the ‘refining’ of language that makes me primarily conclude a non-Jerusalemite source for 1 Cor. 11.23–25. As was suggested above, some of the lexical changes reflect a missiological perspective and multi-ethnic ethos, both of which the earliest church of Jerusalem lacked. For me, this latter point is the most persuasive.

3.2.2.2 Preliminary conclusion

In addition to the inferences above, I would affirm one of Jeremias’ points: that the Markan tradition is independent from both the Lukan and Pauline traditions, although they share a common source.¹⁴⁷ The differences between the traditions are too numerous to question this view. So, following Jeremias and Kilpatrick, I concur that Mark’s tradition points to an Aramaic setting (inside the Jewish territories), while the tradition of Luke and Paul requires a Hellenistic background (outside the Jewish territories).¹⁴⁸ In sum, Jerusalem doesn’t seem the kind of place in which 1 Cor. 11.23–25 could have been revised.

3.2.3 Paul, Luke, and Antioch

If Jerusalem is an unlikely candidate for the place of revision of the 1 Cor. 11.23–25 tradition, the two remaining options are both located in Syria: Damascus and Antioch.¹⁴⁹ Since

¹⁴⁵ Casey, *Aramaic Sources*, 247–51; Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 189–203.

¹⁴⁶ See Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*, vol. 2: *Acts 3:1–14:28* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013), 1269–70.

¹⁴⁷ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 186–87.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 186–87.

¹⁴⁹ See § 3.2.1 (n. 102).

the Damascus hypothesis has already been discussed (and considered impossible to prove), I now turn to the city of Antioch. Virtually all NT scholars admit that there is a strong connection between Paul's tradition and Luke's, although there is no agreement about the character of the connection:

Lk. 22.17–20

¹⁷ καὶ δεξάμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν, Λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς. ¹⁸ λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, [ὅτι] οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως οὗ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ. ¹⁹ καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον. τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. ²⁰ καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι, λέγων, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.¹⁵⁰

1 Cor. 11.23–25

²³ Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ παρεδίδοτο ἔλαβεν ἄρτον ²⁴ καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ εἶπεν, Τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. ²⁵ ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι λέγων, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι. τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὡσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

Jeremias, for instance, argues that the two traditions are independent, but share a common source, Luke's tradition being the older.¹⁵¹ This view was accepted by certain scholars, the independence of these two traditions being sometimes taken for granted.¹⁵² Still, I suggest there is no need to argue for such an independence. A direct contact between Luke and Paul, and also between Luke and the churches that Paul founded or visited, is entirely plausible, as I will attempt to show in the following paragraphs. Furthermore, this recognition will open up the possibility of a direct relationship between their eucharistic traditions.

According to the 'we-passages' of Acts 16.10–17; 20.5–15; 21.1–18 (cf. Col. 4.14; Philem. 24), Luke was the ἀκόλουθος of Paul (so Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 3.1.1–2),¹⁵³ even when

¹⁵⁰ For a defence of the longer version of Luke's tradition, see (inter alia): B.M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London/New York: United Bible Societies, 1994), 148–49; Bradley S. Billings, *Do This in Remembrance of Me: The Disputed Words in the Lukan Institution Narrative (Luke 22.19b-20). An Historico-Exegetical, Theological and Sociological Analysis* (LNTS 314; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2006); Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AYBC 28B; New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2008), 1387–89. In this study the longer version is preferred, following the growing consensus in NT scholarship.

¹⁵¹ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, esp. 115, 156, 188.

¹⁵² Cf. Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*, 112. See the discussion in I.H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster, 1978), 800.

¹⁵³ Already by the end of the second century CE, Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 3.14.1–3) uses the 'we-passages' to defend the paternity of Luke and also the apostolic origin of his Gospel, arguing that 'Luke was always associated with

the apostle founded the church in Philippi (Acts 16.12–15) and when he preached in Troas, at the communion of the Lord’s Supper (Acts 20.7).¹⁵⁴ So, returning to the ‘foundational teachings’ argument, I suggest that Luke could have heard the 1 Cor. 11.23–25 tradition taught by Paul in circumstances such as these. If this is the case, then Bruce Metzger can rightly infer:

[the] similarity between [Lk.] 19b–20 and 1 Cor 11.24b–25 arises from the familiarity of the evangelist with the liturgical practice among Pauline churches, a circumstance that accounts also for the presence of non-Lukan expressions in verses 19b–20.¹⁵⁵

However, I consider that there is a better scenario for the intersection between Paul, Luke, and their traditions: it is the city of Antioch. As Marshall notices, the longer tradition of Luke (22.15–20) indicates that ‘two separate accounts of the meal have been combined’, namely 22.15–18 and 22.19b–20.¹⁵⁶ In regard to this combination, he advances the following hypothesis:

It is a feasible hypothesis that the original form of the eucharistic narrative has been replaced by the liturgically shaped unit attested by Paul [...] This would explain the lack of connection between the two pieces of tradition in Luke.¹⁵⁷

It is also noteworthy that Luke uses Mark extensively as one of his sources,¹⁵⁸ the Lord’s Supper section included (cf. Mk. 14.22–25; Lk. 22.14–20).¹⁵⁹ However, when the words of institution are quoted, Luke departs from his Markan *Vorlage*¹⁶⁰ and cites the tradition that is similar to Paul’s.

[Paul] and inseparable from [Paul].’ See Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 37–38; Riesner, *Paul’s Early Period*, 324: ‘It is especially striking, however, that by far the highest concentration of specific or detailed pieces of information regarding time, namely, festival dates and/or individual, unconventional time spans regarding days, are found in the we-passages...’ Moreover, Luke is mentioned only in those Pauline letters that were written during the ‘we’ periods of mission (Col. 4.14; Philem. 24). Also, Robert H. Stein, *Luke* (NAC 24; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2001), 23.

¹⁵⁴ C.K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (2 vols.; ICC; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 2:950.

¹⁵⁵ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 149.

¹⁵⁶ Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 793.

¹⁵⁷ Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 794.

¹⁵⁸ See the discussion on Luke’s sources in Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 30–31: ‘The view that Luke used Mk. substantially as we have it seems to me to be beyond reasonable doubt.’

¹⁵⁹ See (for instance) Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1386.

¹⁶⁰ E.g., John Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53* (WBC 35C; Dallas: Word, 2002), 1041.

22 Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν, Λάβετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. 23 καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. 24 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν. 25 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πῖω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

14 Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα, ἀνέπεσεν καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι σὺν αὐτῷ. 15 καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς, Ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν. 16 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. 17 καὶ δεξιόμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν, Λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς. 18 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν [ὅτι] οὐ μὴ πῖω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως οὗ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ. 19 καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου [τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον. τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. 20 καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον]. 21 πλὴν ἰδοὺ ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ παραδιδόντος με μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης. 22 ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς μὲν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατὰ τὸ ὄρισμένον πορεύεται, πλὴν οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι' οὗ παραδίδοται.

This sudden change of sources may indicate that Luke was in connection (belonging to or writing for) with a community for which this tradition grew more important.¹⁶¹ If the former is true, i.e., he belonged to such a community, this may shed new light on the question concerning Luke's native place.¹⁶²

In sum, there is an independent tradition (Lk. 22.19–20), that Luke inserts into his narrative account of the Last Supper (Lk. 22.14–18). Furthermore, as scholars have noticed, this tradition is: 1) non-Lukan, in terms of vocabulary; 2) ritual, in structure and style; and 3) similar to Paul's tradition.¹⁶³ Indeed, a 'common source' hypothesis could offer a valid explanation for all these characteristics.¹⁶⁴ However, in my view, a 'common community', makes better sense of Luke's departure from Mark's *Vorlage* and his preference for this particular tradition. But can it be reasonably shown that this 'common community' may have been the church of Antioch?

¹⁶¹ Meier, "Antioch," 25–27 (n. 62).

¹⁶² Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 46.

¹⁶³ E.g., Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, esp. 111–12, 156, 188–89.

¹⁶⁴ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 156.

3.2.3.1 Luke, the Antiochene

As Marshall and others have noticed, Luke is connected to the city of Antioch ‘by a respectable tradition’.¹⁶⁵ Also, this connection is confirmed by solid internal evidence from Acts.¹⁶⁶ In the following, I will consider these two arguments:

(1) The ‘Anti-Marcionite Prologue’ to the third Gospel (dated *ca.* second century CE), offers the following biographical sketch:

Luke was a Syrian of Antioch, by profession a physician, the disciple of the apostles, and later a follower of Paul, until his martyrdom. He served the Lord without distraction, without a wife, and without children. He died at the age of eighty-four in Boeotia, full of the Holy Spirit.¹⁶⁷

Apart from the final phrase (‘full of the Holy Spirit’), which seems to echo Luke’s own writings, there are no serious motives to doubt the reliability of the data found in the ‘Prologue’,¹⁶⁸ especially the data concerning his Antiochene origins.¹⁶⁹ As J. Fitzmyer remarks, ‘The mention of Luke’s Syrian and Antiochene connections in the Ancient Greek Prologue has *in se* no apologetic or theological value.’¹⁷⁰

Furthermore, Luke’s Antiochene origins were later reaffirmed by Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 3.4.6) and Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 7).¹⁷¹ Although their sources remain unknown,¹⁷² the two references at least indicate that Luke’s Antiochene origins were not a matter of debate in the first centuries of the Christian era.¹⁷³ Then, there is another clue in the Western reading of Acts;

¹⁶⁵ Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 31.

¹⁶⁶ Richard Glover, “‘Luke the Antiochene’ and Acts,” *NTS* 11 (1964–65): 97–106.

¹⁶⁷ Kurt Aland, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1964), 533. There are two prologues in *SQE*, 532–33; one is in Latin and one in Greek, and they appear to have separate origins.

¹⁶⁸ The eleven details offered in this sketch denotes a certain degree of confidence.

¹⁶⁹ For the historical reliability of the bulk of the ‘Prologue’ see, Adolf von Harnack, *Luke the Physician: The Author of the Third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles* (trans., J.R. Wilkinson; London: Williams and Norgate, 1908), 4–5; Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 38–39.

¹⁷⁰ Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 46.

¹⁷¹ Von Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, 4.

¹⁷² Von Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, 4.

¹⁷³ To my knowledge, Ephraem of Syria (*Comm. on Acts* 12.25–13.3) would be the first ancient writer (*ca.* 360 CE) to suggest that Luke was from a place different than Syrian Antioch. In this case, Ephraem identifies Luke with ‘Lucius of Cyrene’ (Acts 13.1). See also R.C. Ford, “St. Luke and Lucius of Cyrene,” *ExpT* 32/5 (1920–21): 219–20; John Wenham “The Identification of Luke,” *EvQ* 63 (1991): 3–44. However, the suggestion that Luke is to be identified with Lucius of Cyrene has too much data against it. Cf. D.A. Carson and Douglas J. Moo, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005), 206 (n. 21).

it is preserved in D (it^p; cop^{G67}) and includes an Antiochene ‘we-passage’ in Acts 11.28: *συνεστραμμένων δὲ ἡμῶν* (‘when we were gathered together...’).¹⁷⁴ I am in agreement with the bulk of scholarship, that ‘it is hardly likely that [the] reading is original’.¹⁷⁵ Nevertheless, this textual variant indicates that the *Vorlage* of D might have admitted the Antiochene origins of Luke. So, even with a degree of circumspection, this could also be counted as another instance of external evidence.¹⁷⁶

The external data above could be considered ‘corroborative evidence’, even ‘multiple source attestation’, as some of these ‘traditions’ are independent.¹⁷⁷ Nevertheless, the ‘traditional’ case for Luke’s Antiochene origins remains slim. Still, given the lack of any competitive tradition during the first three centuries CE, this case grows stronger. In my opinion, John Nolland’s conclusion is justified:

[Since there are] no decisive arguments against it [...] In such a situation it would seem best to assume that the early tradition is based on a continuity of memory that goes back to the first readers’ undoubted knowledge of who it was who had produced this Gospel for their use.¹⁷⁸

(2) On the other hand, there are much stronger arguments that could be adduced for Luke’s Antiochene origins, i.e., the internal evidence of Acts.¹⁷⁹ I have already mentioned the conclusion of Glover’s study about Luke’s Antiochene origins: ‘Acts [is] not the history of the early Church, but merely that portion of the Church’s history with which Luke happened to be acquainted.’¹⁸⁰ In order to defend this claim, Glover uses the method of contrasting Luke’s ‘thorough information’ and his ‘notable ignorance’, moving back and forth between the two.

¹⁷⁴ Von Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, 5; Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 344; A. Strobel, “Lukas der Antiochener (Bemerkungen zu Act 11, 28 D),” *ZNW* 49 (1958): 131–34.

¹⁷⁵ Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 46.

¹⁷⁶ Von Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, 5 (n. 1).

¹⁷⁷ Von Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, 2–5.

¹⁷⁸ John Nolland, *Luke 1:1-9:20* (WBC 35A; Dallas: Word, 2002), xxxvii.

¹⁷⁹ See (inter alia): von Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, esp. 26–120; Strobel, “Lukas der Antiochener,” 131–134; Glover, “Luke the Antiochene,” 97–106; Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 46.

¹⁸⁰ Glover, “Luke the Antiochene,” 98.

As Glover remarks, Luke offers an impressive number of details concerning the early years of the Antiochene church (e.g., Acts 11.19–21, 26–28; 13.1), but hardly mentions any detail, after leaving the city (Acts 16.8–10; 16.12; 18.2; 20.5–6):

a) He possesses thorough information about Barnabas, ‘of whom he has more to tell than of any of the apostles, except Peter [and Paul]’: Acts 4.36–37; 9.27; 11.19–20, 22, 25–26, 30; 15.1–23. However, the information ceases as soon as Barnabas (15.39) and, then, Luke leave Antioch (16.8–10, 12).¹⁸¹

b) Furthermore, Luke seems to have collected lots of details about Herod Antipas, details that are not found in the Markan source (cf. Mk. 4.14–16 and Lk. 9.9; Mk. 15.15–20 and Lk. 23.11; Mk. 6.17 and Lk. 3.19;¹⁸² see also: Lk. 3.1; 8.3; 13.31–33; 23.7–8, 12). On the other hand, Luke’s knowledge of Herod Agrippa I is minimal, limited to general news (Acts 12.1–3, 12, 20–23). This unbalanced accumulation of data is easily explained if Manaen, τε Ἡρώδου τοῦ τετραάρχου σύντροφος (‘a lifelong friend/foster brother of Herod the tetrarch’) was Luke’s Antiochene source (Acts 13.1).¹⁸³

c) Even the depiction of Paul’s missionary journeys argues for Luke’s acquaintance with Antioch. As one would expect, the details are thorough in the ‘we-passages’ (Acts 16.10–17; 20.5–15; 21.1–8; 27.1–28.16), much more than in the passages where Paul and Luke are separated:

The difficulty of reconciling Acts with Paul’s own brief biographical note in Gal. i.17–22 has been familiar to theologians at least since the days of Paley. Acts has nothing to tell of most of the floggings or any of the three shipwrecks which Paul had already suffered before he wrote II Cor. xi.24–5, nor of his visiting Colossae, Laodicea or Illyricum.¹⁸⁴

¹⁸¹ Glover, “Luke the Antiochene,” 98–99.

¹⁸² See Josephus, *J.W.* 1.30.70.

¹⁸³ Glover, “Luke the Antiochene,” 101: ‘Manaen’s old relationship with Antipas would seem an excellent reason for his taking up residence in Antioch, the capital of the Roman province of Syria, when the successful rival of his foster-brother became monarch of Judaea.’

¹⁸⁴ Glover, “Luke the Antiochene,” 102; also, Riesner, *Paul’s Early Period*, 324.

There is, however, one notable exception: the first missionary journey of Paul and Barnabas (Acts 13.4–14.26). If one accepts Luke’s Antiochene residence, the explanation for the bulk of details concerning their travels is offered in Acts 14.26–27:

²⁶ and from there they sailed to Antioch, where they had been commended to the grace of God for the work that they had fulfilled.²⁷ And when they arrived and gathered the church together, they declared all that God had done with them (ἀνήγγελλον ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς μετ’ αὐτῶν), and how he had opened a door of faith to the Gentiles.²⁸ And they remained no little time with the disciples (διέτριβον δὲ χρόνον οὐκ ὀλίγον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς).

Furthermore, Glover’s view was convincingly defended by Rainer Riesner, who used a similar method, but rendered his results in figures:

The specific chronological pieces of information are distributed quite disparately within the dual Lukan work [...] only ¼ of the entire dual Lukan work (the we-passages and the remaining, second part of Acts) contains 67 of the *ca.* 103 pieces of chronological information, that is, approximately 66 percent. This relationship shifts even more strongly if one considers that some of this information (about five instances) is found in the first part of Acts, in close association with the collection from Antioch, that is, with that particular city which a whole series of scholars continue to view as the hometown of the author of Acts.¹⁸⁵

As both Glover and Riesner notice, the bulk of information offered by Luke is related especially to the early years of the Antiochene church (40s CE). This is also the ‘deduction’ of Fitzmyer: ‘Luke’s acquaintance with Antioch would have to be limited to an early phase of the church there, as it can be deduced from Acts 11:19–20; 13:1–4; 14:26–28; 15:1–3, 13–40; and 18:22–23.’¹⁸⁶ In other words, Luke was well acquainted with the Antioch that Paul knew as a resident.

In sum, if we give credence to the early Christian tradition, which was undisputed in the first three centuries CE, and corroborate it with the internal evidence of Acts, there is the high probability that Luke was from Antioch. At least, we can conclude with a certain degree of confidence that Luke was a resident of Antioch, during Paul’s stay in the city (early 40s CE). In other words, Luke was there when the apostle may have taught or have been taught the

¹⁸⁵ Riesner, *Paul’s Early Period*, 323–24.

¹⁸⁶ Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 46. Cf. the more recent study of John S. Kloppenborg, “Luke’s Geography: Knowledge, Ignorance, Sources, and Spatial Conception,” in Joseph Verheyden and John S. Kloppenborg (eds.), *Luke on Jesus, Paul, and Earliest Christianity: What Did He Really Know?* (BTS 29; Leuven: Peeters, 2017), 101–43.

Lord's Supper tradition. If this view is correct, then it can be concluded that Paul's tradition and Luke's share more than a 'common source': they share a 'common community'.

Accordingly, given 1) the Hellenised, ritualized, and universalized language of the tradition; 2) the similarities between Paul's tradition and Luke's; and 3) Luke's connection to Antioch (during Paul's stay in the city), numerous scholars have related the tradition of 1 Cor. 11.23–25 to the church of Antioch, from where Paul may have 'received' it.¹⁸⁷ Murphy-O'Connor's conclusion is indicative of this widespread view:

Paul's version is most closely related to that of Luke, and it has been suggested that it records the usage of the church of Antioch. The plausibility of this hypothesis, which is impossible to prove or disprove, rests exclusively on the fact that Paul's closest association was with the church of that city (Acts 11:25–6), even though he also had contacts with the churches in Damascus (Acts 9:19) and Jerusalem (Acts 9:26–30). Antioch was the home to which he invariably returned after his journeys.¹⁸⁸

3.3 Conclusion

This chapter has been an attempt to connect the Lord's Supper tradition of 1 Cor. 11.23–25 to the church of Antioch, suggesting a double scenario: 1) Paul taught this tradition while in Antioch. Since it was one of the 'foundational' teachings that he 'taught in every church' he founded or visited (1 Cor. 4.17), Paul must have also taught this tradition during his stays in the recently established church of Antioch. 2) Paul was taught this tradition while he was in Antioch. As the lexical analysis suggests, the tradition cited in 1 Cor. 11.23–25 was altered, the outcome being a 'ritual' text produced by a Hellenistic community. Moreover, the similarities between Paul's tradition and the tradition of 'Luke, the Antiochene' suggest that

¹⁸⁷ See (inter alia): Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 188; Kilpatrick, *Eucharist*, 23; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 31; Mack, *A Myth of Innocence*, 102–120 (116); Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 548 (n. 18); Hengel-Schwemer, *Paul between Damascus and Antioch*, 286–91; Witherington, *Conflict and Community in Corinth*, 250; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 429; Leonhard Goppelt, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (UTB; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976), 356 and *passim*; Friedrich Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther* (NTD 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), esp. 150, 153, 157–60; J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Keys to First Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues* (Oxford: OUP, 2009), 207.

¹⁸⁸ Murphy-O'Connor, *Keys to First Corinthians*, 207.

this Hellenistic community was none other than Antioch. In conclusion, whether Paul taught this tradition in Antioch or was taught the tradition while there, the connection between 1 Cor. 11.23–25 and Antioch is a reasonable hypothesis. If so, by the time Paul visited Corinth (*ca.* 50–52 CE), the church of Antioch had already been familiar with this tradition (1 Cor 11.23a).

Additionally, it should be noticed that both Paul and Luke cited the Lord's Supper tradition when there were other options. Paul, for instance, could have offered a solution to the Corinthian 'problem' without even alluding to this tradition. As for Luke, he could have used the version of his Markan source. However, they both used this particular tradition. In my view, their choice implies that this tradition was more than familiar; it was important for both of them. Moreover, this importance could have been secured in the earliest days of the Antiochene church. However, this latter observation leaves us with a puzzling question: if the Gospel of Matthew was composed in Antioch, as numerous scholars claim, why then does Matthew cite a different tradition (Matt. 26.26–29)? This shall be focus of the following chapters.

CHAPTER 4

‘THE NEWS ABOUT [JESUS] SPREAD ALL OVER SYRIA’:

ANTIOCH AND THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

During the first centuries of the Christian era, the Gospel of Matthew was the best known and the most influential of the canonical Gospels:¹ ‘It is a well-known fact that the Gospel of Matthew was the most popular Gospel in the ancient church. The so-called “Church’s Gospel” had more citations and more commentaries devoted to it than any of the other Gospels.’² Moreover, according to R.T. France, ‘Matthew seems to have been the only one to have had a normative role, and to have created the climate of Christianity at large [...] it is a fact that mainstream Christianity was, from the early second century on, to a great extent Matthean Christianity.’³

If the early influence of the Gospel is a consensus, scholars disagree about the causative factor: Was it because of the apostolic authorship that was traditionally attributed to the Gospel; or because of the influential church that stood behind this Gospel? In this chapter, I will attempt to argue for the latter.⁴ Furthermore, I will examine the supposition that this influential church was located in Antioch of Syria, a supposition that is favoured by most recent scholars.

¹ See (inter alia): Sancti Irenaei Episcopi Lugdunensis, *Libron quinque adversus haereses, textu graeco in locis nonnullis* (vol. 2; ed. W.W. Harvey; Cambridge: Royal College, 1858), 517–20; Édouard Massaux, *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature Before Saint Irenaeus* (NGS 5/1–3; trans., Norman Belval and Suzanne Hecht; Macon: Mercer University Press, 1990–1993); D.A. Carson, “Matthew,” in Frank E. Gaebelein (ed.), *Matthew, Mark, Luke* (EBC 8; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 19; David C. Sim, “The Rise and Fall of the Gospel of Matthew,” *ExpT* 120/10 (2009): 478–85. See also Jonathan T. Pennington, *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew* (NovTSup 126; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2007), 1: ‘The Gospel of Matthew has been the pride of the church throughout most of her history.’

² Sim, “Rise and Fall of Matthew,” 478.

³ R.T. France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2004), 16, 20.

⁴ There might be a third reason, related to the content of the Gospel or to its catechetical/didactic style. For such a view, see G.D. Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (Wauconda: Bolchazy-Carducci, 2007 [1946]); M.D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* (SLBS; London: SPCK, 1974); France, *Evangelist and Teacher*, 18 and *passim*. In my view, the ambivalent perspective over the Law and Judaism makes this option at least secondary. See (inter alia): Donald Senior, *The Gospel of Matthew* (IBT; Nashville: Abingdon, 1997), 39–44; Clayton N. Jefford, “The Milieu of Matthew, the Didache, and Ignatius of Antioch: Agreements and Differences,” in Huub van de Sandt (ed.), *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 45–46.

4.1 ‘As is recorded in the *Memoirs* of the apostles...’⁵

There is an ongoing debate among scholars on whether the Gospel of Matthew, which is formally anonymous,⁶ ever circulated without a proper title (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μαθθαῖον)⁷ or an appropriate designation (such as κατὰ Μαθθαῖον).⁸ On the one hand, the earliest manuscript title attached to the Gospel could be dated ‘late second/early third century’, as Simon Gathercole argues.⁹ Still, most scholars assume that its title was attached to the Gospel around 125 CE,¹⁰ based on the observation that, prior to 140 CE, the traditional designation was widely known (Papias, *Fragm.* 3.16,¹¹ quoted in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.16).¹² On the other hand, Martin Hengel argues that: 1) the practice of book distribution in the ancient world requiring titles in order to identify the works to which a particular reference was made (Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, 4.2.); and 2) the uniformity of the attribution of the Gospels ‘from Alexandria to Lyons and from Antioch to Carthage’¹³—the Gospel of Matthew has been universally and consistently attributed to Matthew during the late second and early third centuries CE—indicate that titles were part of the four Gospels from the very beginning.¹⁴

It is inconceivable [...] that the gospels could circulate anonymously for up to sixty years, and then in the second century suddenly display unanimous attribution to certain authors. If they had originally been anonymous, then surely there would have been some variation in second-century attributions (as was the case with some of the second-century apocryphal gospels).¹⁵

⁵ Just., *Dial.* 101.3; 103.6–8; 104.1; 105.5–6; 106.3–4; 107.1. Cf. *1 Apol.* 66.3: ‘their *Memoirs*, which are called gospels’.

⁶ D.A. Carson and Douglas J. Moo, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005), 140.

⁷ In some MSS: κατὰ Ματθαῖον.

⁸ See the discussion about the priority of the longer title in Martin Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark* (trans., J. Bowden; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 65–66; Simon Gathercole, “The Earliest Manuscript Title of Matthew’s Gospel (BnF Suppl. gr. 1120 ii 3 / P⁴),” *NovT* 54 (2012): 209–35.

⁹ Gathercole, “Earliest Manuscript Title,” 234.

¹⁰ Cf. J.H. Ropes, *The Synoptic Gospels* (London: OUP, 1960), 103.

¹¹ For some scholars, the reference is *Fragm.* 2.16. This reference follows Bart D. Ehrman (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers* (vol. 2; LCL 25; Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press, 2003), 103.

¹² Carson-Moo, *Introduction*, 140.

¹³ Martin Hengel, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels* (Harrisburg: Trinity, 2000), 54; Carson-Moo, *Introduction*, 140.

¹⁴ Hengel: *The Four Gospels*, 50–56; *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, 64–84; Carson-Moo, *Introduction*, 140. See also France, *Evangelist and Teacher*, 50–80.

¹⁵ Carson-Moo, *Introduction*, 141.

In my view, it is probable that the Gospel circulated without a title or designation during the earliest stages of its distribution (*ca.* 80–125 CE), at least in certain areas of the eastern Mediterranean. As Bart Ehrman has noticed,¹⁶ prior to Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 3.9.3; 3.11.8), the Christian authors of the second century attributed their Gospel’s citations, quotations or allusions¹⁷ not to ‘Matthew’ (the traditional author), but to an unnamed ‘Gospel’ (Ignatius, *Phil.* 5.1–2; 8.2), to ‘the Lord’ (*Did.* 9.5; cf. *Did.* 8.2: ‘As the Lord commanded in his gospel...’), and to ‘the apostles’ (Justin, *Dial.* 101.3; 105.6). Note the following references (most of the writings that quote or allude to Matthew’s Gospel extensively and exclusively are from the East): *1 Clem.* 24.5; 42.1–2; 47.8; *2 Clem.* 2.4; 3.2; 4.2; 6.1–2; 9.11; *Did.* 4.7; 7.1; 8.2; 9.5; 11.3; 14.2; 15.3–4; 16.1–8; Ignatius, *Eph.* 14.2; 17.1; *Smyrn.* 1.1; 6.1; *Pol.* 2.2; *Phld.* 5.1–2; 8.2; etc.; Polycarp, *Phil.* 2.3; 7.2; 14.3; Justin, *1 Apol.* 66.3; 67.3; *Dial.* 35.3–5; 49.3; 51.2–3; 53.2; 100.4; 101.3; 103.6–8; 104.1; 105.5–6; 106.3–4; 107.1.¹⁸ As all of them reveal, during the first period of its use (*ca.* 90–160 CE),¹⁹ none of the references to this Gospel is related to an author named Matthew.

Moreover, virtually all scholars recognize a close connection between the Gospel of Matthew and the *Didache*. Most probably, both writings originated in the same location, as

¹⁶ Bart D. Ehrman, *Jesus Before the Gospels: How the Earliest Christians Remembered, Changed, and Invented Their Stories of the Savior* (New York: HarperOne, 2016), 87–130.

¹⁷ For a distinction between citations, quotations and allusions, see David E. Aune, *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003), 395: ‘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.’

¹⁸ For a complete list of citations, quotations, and allusions, see Jean Allenbach, *Biblia Patristica: Index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique* (Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1975), 1:223–93; Massaux, *Influence*, vol. 1, chs.1–3. For the view that some of these citations made no direct contact to the written Gospel, but to common (oral) traditions, see Helmut Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern* (TU 65; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957). However, it should be noted that Massaux anticipated the objection and based many of his arguments on philological-grammatical criteria (vocabulary, word-order, inflection, etc.), in order to show that there was a direct literary connection, not merely the use of common oral traditions. As the subsequent history of scholarship indicates, most scholars followed Massaux, not Koester.

¹⁹ Scholars date *1 Clement* in the 90s CE, and the writings of Justin Martyr between 150–160 CE.

will be argued mainly in the following chapters.²⁰ The references to the Gospel of Matthew are indeed numerous, exceeding thirty quotations and allusions (*Did.* 1.2–5; 2.2–3; 3.2–3, 7–8; 5.1; 7.1; 8.1–2; 9.5; 11.1–2, 7; 13.1; 14.2; 15.3–4; 16.1–8).²¹ However, of particular relevance for this study are the four references to a particular ‘gospel’ (εὐαγγέλιον): ‘as the Lord commanded in his gospel’ (8.1); ‘as the gospel decrees’ (11.3); ‘as you have it in the gospel’ (15.3); ‘as you have it in the gospel of our Lord’ (15.4). It should be noted that all four references introduce or conclude citations/allusions from the Gospel of Matthew.²² Although there is disagreement among scholars, it seems that at least two of these refer to the written ‘gospel’ (15.3–4; cf. 8.1–2).²³ So, if the *Didache* knew the written Gospel of Matthew, why are its formulae so vague? Why is there no mention of its author, i.e., Matthew? A probable answer is that the *Didache* only knows one ‘gospel’. Indeed, there is no clear evidence of any quotations or allusions from Mark, Luke or John.²⁴ However, there is another explanation—more probable, in my opinion.

Ignatius of Antioch alludes to Matthew’s Gospel, yet he identifies it simply as ‘the gospel’ (*Phild.* 5.1–2; 8.2).²⁵ Furthermore, when Justin Martyr cites or alludes to passages from the same Gospel, he uses introductory formulae such as ‘the words which are recorded in the *Memoirs* of his apostles’ or ‘[these] are thus recorded in the *Memoirs*’: *Dial.* 101.3 and *Matt.* 27.39–43; 105.6 and *Matt.* 5.20; 106.5 and *Matt.* 2.2, 9–11.²⁶ Why would Justin prefer the ambiguous plural (‘of the apostles’) if he had knowledge of the author? Moreover, in *Dial.*

²⁰ See below (§ 4.3.2 and chapters 6 and 7).

²¹ Alan J.P. Garrow, *The Gospel of Matthew’s Dependence on the Didache* (JSNTSS 254; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004), xiv–xxxiii; William Varner, “The *Didache*’s Use of the Old and New Testaments,” *TMSJ* 16/1 (2005): 130–31.

²² Massaux, *Influence*, 3:145; Christopher M. Tuckett, “The *Didache* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament,” in Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (eds.), *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford/New York: OUP, 2005), 95–110.

²³ Tuckett, “The *Didache* and the New Testament,” 105–110.

²⁴ Tuckett, “The *Didache* and the New Testament,” 126–27; Varner, “*Didache*’s Use,” 131–32, 141.

²⁵ Robert Joly, *Le dossier d’Ignace d’Antioche* (Université Libre de Bruxelles 69; Brussels: Éditions de l’Université de Bruxelles, 1979), 66. Cf. William R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 208 (n. 6).

²⁶ Michael Slusser (ed.), *St. Justin Martyr: Dialogue with Trypho* (SFC 3; trans., Thomas B. Falls; Washington: Catholic University of America, 2003), 153, 159–60.

103.6–8, Justin cites two different Gospels—Matt. 4.10 in 103.6 and Lk. 22.44 in 103.8—yet he uses the same formula for both citations: ‘in the *Memoirs* of the apostles’. I suggest that all the instances above point to a necessary conclusion: the attribution κατὰ Μαθθαῖον was not yet attached to the Gospel.²⁷

As I mentioned in a previous footnote,²⁸ there might be another option for explaining the early influence of the Gospel of Matthew, one related to its ecclesial content or to its catechetical style. However, in my opinion, its ambivalent perspective over the Law and Judaism would make such a criterion at least secondary.²⁹ Ignatius of Antioch, for instance, sees the Gospel as being authoritative and yet quotes it selectively, consistently avoiding passages that hold a favourable view on Judaism.³⁰

If this is the case, then the remaining alternative would be to attribute its early fame to the influential church that stood behind the Gospel and made it known widely.³¹ In the words of W.D. Davies and Dale Allison:

The ascription of the First Gospel to an apostle must be deemed secondary. Originally, the gospel was anonymous. How, then, did it manage to succeed in being accepted by the Christian community at large? ‘Anonymity implies that it was originally compiled for the use of some particular church which accepted it at once as a reliable witness, simply because it knew and had confidence in the person or committee who produced it’. Moreover, the gospel would not have been accepted by other churches as having apostolic authority unless it had been sponsored by one of the great churches—such as Rome, Ephesus, or Antioch.³²

²⁷ A similar argument could be adduced from the writings of Ignatius of Antioch. See the later discussions.

²⁸ See above (n. 4).

²⁹ See David L. Turner, *Matthew* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 14, for an introduction to the different views concerning the Gospel of Matthew and Judaism, held by scholars such as Gundry, Stanton, Harrington, Overman, Saldarini, Segal, and Sim. See also (inter alia): A.J. Saldarini, *Matthew’s Christian-Jewish Community* (Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 2–4; Douglas R.A. Hare, “How Jewish is the Gospel of Matthew,” *CBQ* 62/2 (2000): 264–77.

³⁰ Clayton N. Jefford, “The Milieu of Matthew, the *Didache*, and Ignatius of Antioch: Agreements and Differences,” in Huub van de Sandt (ed.), *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 45–46.

³¹ But see the caution of G.N. Stanton, “The Communities of Matthew,” *Int* 46 (1992): 380–81.

³² W.D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (vol. I; ICC; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 144.

There is strong evidence that the Gospel of Matthew was written ‘for all Christians’ (see Matt. 28.18–20), as Richard Bauckham and others have argued.³³ However, this does not exclude the existence of an ‘original... particular church’ or ‘Matthean community’, one that has influenced its redactional process.³⁴ I think H.Y. Gamble is correct to argue for both:

Each Gospel reveals something of the viewpoint from which it was written and thus indirectly the circumstances that served as the occasion of its composition. The careful literary crafting of each, however, and the small size of individual Christian congregations in the first century make it unlikely that any of the Gospels was composed for the strictly local and intramural use of a single community. Broader dissemination in Christian circles, if not beyond, must have been intended from the outset.³⁵

So, the search for the influential ‘Matthean community’ is, in my view, entirely justified. Moreover, quite from the beginning of the quest, we may confidently exclude Rome and Ephesus from the concluding list of Davies-Allison—as they also did.³⁶ Virtually all scholars today are convinced by the force of B.H. Streeter’s argument regarding the ‘negative value’ of the testimonies of Papias and Irenaeus:

The Patristic evidence that Matthew was written in Palestine in Hebrew is impressive—until we reflect that all the Fathers had read the statement of Irenaeus, quoted p. 8 (either in the original or as reproduced by Eusebius), and that Irenaeus himself had read Papias’ dictum on τὰ λόγια. Thus the tradition can be traced back to a single root; and, quite apart from the correctness of our interpretation of Papias, it cannot be authentic, for our Gospel of Matthew being based on the Greek Mark cannot be a translation from the Aramaic. At the same time the evidence of Irenaeus and Papias has a negative value. It proves that Matthew was *not* produced either in Rome or in Asia Minor, but was believed to have originally come from the East.³⁷

³³ Richard Bauckham (ed.), *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (NTS; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1998); H.Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 102; Jeffrey A. Gibbs, *Matthew 1:1–11:1* (Concordia; St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2006), 1–5.

³⁴ See John P. Meier, “Antioch,” in Raymond E. Brown and John P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (New York: Paulist Press, 2004), 15–27, 45–72; Craig L. Blomberg, “The Gospels for Specific Communities and All Christians,” in E.W. Klink III (ed.), *The Audience of the Gospels: The Origin and Function of the Gospels in Early Christianity* (LNTS 353; London: T&T Clark, 2010), 111–33. Cf. David C. Sim, *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism: The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Community* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 40 (n. 73): ‘The view offered in Bauckham (ed.), *Gospel for All Christians*, that the Gospels were written for all Christians, seems to confuse their subsequent effect with their initial focus.’

³⁵ Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church*, 102. Cf. Stanton, “Communities of Matthew,” 379–82.

³⁶ Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:143.

³⁷ B.H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: Macmillan, 1930), 500 (emphasis original).

Therefore, the following sub-chapters will focus on the identification of the influential eastern church that stood behind the text of Matthew. And I will attempt to identify it by following the internal and redactional clues, and the external evidence of its earliest reception.

4.2 Locating the Gospel of Matthew: A history of scholarship

From the very beginning, it should be stated that ‘Given the nature of the available evidence, it is quite impossible to be fully persuaded on the issue at hand [i.e., the place of composition]. We shall never know beyond a reasonable doubt where the autograph of Matthew was completed.’³⁸ There seems to be a ‘widespread consensus’ that the Gospel of Matthew originated in the Syrian region.³⁹ As we have seen, this theory is supported by the testimonies of Papias and Irenaeus,⁴⁰ and also by the earliest references to Matthew’s Gospel. At the same time, some of the competitive proposals are also noteworthy, especially Palestine.

Ulrich Luz rightly assesses that ‘The numerous hypotheses all have in common that they are based on very weak arguments’.⁴¹ Still, he agrees with Davies-Allison, that ‘some of the proposals are more credible than others’.⁴² So, in the following sections I will attempt to identify the strengths and the weaknesses of the various hypotheses advanced by scholars.⁴³

³⁸ Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:139. Also, Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1–7: A Commentary* (trans., James E. Crouch; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 56: ‘Where the Gospel was composed cannot be answered conclusively; the information on the subject is too meager.’ Similarly, C.E.W. Vine, *The Audience of Matthew: An Appraisal of the Local Audience Thesis* (LNTS 496; London: Bloomsbury, 2014). This recent study also concludes that scholars cannot currently determine the audience of Matthew’s Gospel.

³⁹ Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 56.

⁴⁰ Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 3.1.1: ‘Matthew also issued a written Gospel among the Hebrews in their own dialect while Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome and laying the foundations of the church.’

⁴¹ Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 56–57.

⁴² Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:139; Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 56.

⁴³ Pace Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 57: ‘The arguments have so little merit that a discussion of the individual suggestions is not worthwhile.’

4.2.1 *From Alexandria to Antioch*

Davies-Allison offer a helpful list of scholars that are representative for the major theories concerning the location of the Gospel, to which I will add other names, mostly belonging to subsequent scholarship:

- Alexandria: S.G.F. Brandon, S. van Tilborg, P.K. Pohjala;
- Phoenicia (Tyre or Sidon): G.D. Kilpatrick, H.B. Green;
- Transjordan (Pella): R.T. Herford, H.J. Schoeps, H.D. Slingerland;
- Jerusalem or Palestine: M. Albertz, W.C. Allen, A. Schlatter, T.H. Robinson, J. Schniewind, W. Michaelis, A. Wikenhauser, M. Hengel (tentatively), J.A. Overman, B. Witherington III, G. Maier;
- Caesarea Maritima: B.T. Viviano;
- Syria: F.V. Filson, P. Bonnard, G. Strecker, W. Marxsen, D. Hill, N. Perrin, L. Goppelt, W.G. Kümmel, M.D. Goulder, E. Lohse, E. Schweizer, D. Hill, G. Künzel, D. Harrington, S. Freyne, D. Hagner, R.T. France;
- Edessa: B.W. Bacon (tentatively), J. Kennard, R.E. Osborne;
- Antioch: J. Weiss, B.H. Streeter, M.S. Enslin, A.H. McNeile, R.H. Fuller, W.R. Farmer, R. Stark, R.E. Brown, J.P. Meier, R.H. Gundry, J. Zumstein, U. Luz, D. Senior, A.J. Saldarini, D.C. Sim, M.J. Wilkins, W. Carter, M. Slee, D. Garland.⁴⁴

(1) Since this history of scholarship⁴⁵ begins with Alexandria and ends with Antioch, I shall introduce a caveat concerning the methodology of historical reconstruction, with special reference to the constant danger of ‘parallelomania’.⁴⁶ At times, scholars may reject a reliable

⁴⁴ Cf. Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:138.

⁴⁵ For an extended and helpful evaluation of these theories, see Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 40–62. As readers may notice, my evaluation closely follows Sim’s.

⁴⁶ The term was introduced into the area of biblical studies by Samuel Sandmel, “Parallelomania,” *JBL* 81/1 (1962): 1–13.

thesis because the data is scarcer than they expect;⁴⁷ at other times, they may create artificial connections because there is enough data that—used selectively and arbitrarily—support any conceived scenario. Could the former be true in the case of Alexandria and the latter of Antioch?

Brandon’s Alexandrian hypothesis (1951)⁴⁸ has not gained wide acceptance among scholars,⁴⁹ partly because ‘our knowledge of the Christian movement in Alexandria, either before or after the Jewish war, is almost non-existent [...] the severe lack of knowledge regarding the origin and development of the Christian movement [in Alexandria].’⁵⁰ Could the reverse be true for the Antiochene place of composition—could it be widely accepted simply because there is enough data to construct numerous parallels? Note Donald Hagner’s caution:

It may be, on the other hand, that Antioch is such an attractive hypothesis simply because we happen to know so much more about it than about most other cities. It is worth reminding ourselves that Antioch is only a good guess.⁵¹

Sim’s conclusion is also noteworthy:

Hagner, *Matthew*, I, p. lxxv, makes the observation that Antioch presents itself as an attractive hypothesis because we know more about it than most other cities. This is a valid point. Were we to possess more evidence about the early Christian movement in, for example, Alexandria, then we might be compelled to revise the whole issue of Matthew’s provenance. But we are forced to work with the material we have, and Antioch is the best hypothesis in view of the evidence at our disposal.⁵²

Therefore, this acknowledgement should lead to greater caution when the case for the Antiochene provenance is considered.

With regard to the external evidence for the Alexandrian provenance, since the writings of Philo were most of the ‘material we have’, certain scholars rejected the hypothesis based on

⁴⁷ This is particularly true for the ‘Historical Jesus’ studies. See the objection raised by the radical scepticism, that there is not sufficient historical data about Jesus of Nazareth outside of the canonical gospels.

⁴⁸ S.G.F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church* (London: SPCK, 1951), 217–43.

⁴⁹ Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:138.

⁵⁰ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 50–52.

⁵¹ Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 1–13* (WBC 33; Dallas: Word, 2002), lxxv.

⁵² Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 62 (n. 88).

the fact that the Gospel of Matthew shows no Philonic influence, as does the book of Hebrews, for instance.⁵³ More recently, P.K. Pohjala (2006) attempted to address this issue and argue for ‘similarities of redaction’ between the Gospel of Matthew and various texts of Philo (cf. Matt. 5.13–16 and *Spec.* 1.285–298; Matt. 6.19–24 and *Leg. alleg.* 3.162–172; Matt. 12.43–45 and *Gen.* 27.30; Matt. 20.1–16 and *Sacr.* 11–49).⁵⁴ The similarities Pohjala identifies, however, constitute proper instances of ‘parallelomania’. Nevertheless, being in agreement with Sim, I consider the argument of the non-existent philonic influences to be insignificant:

The strength of this objection is not altogether certain, however. We must not presume that all Jews or Christian Jews in Alexandria stood necessarily in the tradition of Philo. The absence of Philonic influence in Matthew’s Gospel is therefore of no real significance.⁵⁵

Brandon, instead, tries to fill in the gaps of knowledge of the Christian movement in Alexandria by 1) rejecting the historicity of Acts 18.24–28;⁵⁶ and 2) by assigning to this location the composition of James, Hebrews, *Barnabas* and *2 Clement*.⁵⁷ But his case has been considered ‘weak’ and ‘speculative’ by exegetes.⁵⁸ As for the internal evidence, Brandon’s attempts to show that 1) the flight to Egypt in the infancy narrative (Matt. 2.13–15, 19–21) would be relevant to the Christians that fled to Alexandria during the Jewish war, or that 2) Peter, the most prominent character-disciple in the Gospel, was associated with Alexandria,⁵⁹ are rightly considered ‘uncorroborated speculation[s]’.⁶⁰ Actually, there is no ‘hard evidence’ in any of Brandon’s adduced arguments.⁶¹ Paradoxically, his case was (directly or indirectly)

⁵³ Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:139.

⁵⁴ Pasi K. Pohjala, *Similarities of Redaction of the Gospel according to Matthew, with texts of Philo Alexandrinus* (Liskeard: Exposure/Diggory Press, 2006).

⁵⁵ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 51.

⁵⁶ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 50: ‘[Brandon, *Fall of Jerusalem*, 24–26] dismisses the basic historicity of this narrative, preferring to view it as an apologetic move on the part of Luke to promote the superiority of the Pauline Gospel over its Alexandrian counterpart which the influential Apollos represented.’

⁵⁷ Brandon, *Fall of Jerusalem*, 237–42. Cf. Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 50.

⁵⁸ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 50; Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:139; W.D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: CUP, 1964), 317–24.

⁵⁹ Brandon, *Fall of Jerusalem*, 210–12.

⁶⁰ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 50.

⁶¹ Cf. Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 50.

refuted by S. van Tilborg (1972),⁶² one of the very few scholars that accepted the Alexandrian hypothesis.⁶³

Furthermore, there is an internal hint that may rule out Alexandria as the place of provenance. According to Matt. 12.42, the ‘southern’ area (νότος), which most probably refers to the lands of Egypt and Ethiopia (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 8.165–73), is considered to be ‘the ends of the earth’ (cf. Jer. 6.20; Joel 3.8).⁶⁴ Moreover, the Matthean text presupposes some departure from the South: ὅτι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς (‘for [the Queen of the South] came from [ἐκ] the ends of the earth’). If the Gospel was written in the southern area, the author could well have edited this saying of Jesus.

In conclusion, ‘there is nothing substantial in either the internal or external evidence to warrant the location of the Gospel [in Alexandria].’⁶⁵ The placement of Matthew’s Gospel in the capital city of Egypt has almost nothing in its favour⁶⁶ and much against it, as will become evident in the following sections.

(2) G.D. Kilpatrick (1946) rejects Streeter’s Antiochene hypothesis, arguing that there are no traces of Pauline thought in the Gospel, Antioch being an important Pauline church (cf. Gal. 2.11–14). Also, there are no connections between Ignatius of Antioch and this profoundly Jewish Gospel.⁶⁷ To these objections I shall return later, when the case for Antioch will be assessed.

⁶² S. van Tilborg, *The Jewish Leaders in Matthew* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972), 172.

⁶³ France, *Evangelist and Teacher*, 93; Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 49.

⁶⁴ Carson, “Matthew,” 297.

⁶⁵ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 51.

⁶⁶ John M.G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 48–80. Alexandria had a very large Jewish population and it was a Greek-speaking urban location, two of the features that correspond to the composition of the Gospel. See the later discussions, e.g., § 4.2.1 (5).

⁶⁷ See Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 130–34.

Instead, Kilpatrick suggests a Phoenician place of provenance, more specifically Tyre or Sidon.⁶⁸ To argue his case, Kilpatrick makes a distinction between the ἡ θάλασσα of Mark 5.13, that describes the sea of Galilee, and τὰ ὕδατα, that Matt. 8.32 and 14.28–29 use for the same geographical reference. Instead, suggests Kilpatrick, Matthew uses ἡ θάλασσα to describe the more important Mediterranean Sea (18.6). For instance, Matthew changes Mk. 9.42 (βέβληται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν) into καταποντισθῆ ἐν τῷ πελάγει τῆς θαλάσσης (18.6), which Kilpatrick takes to refer to the Mediterranean. For Kilpatrick, such a distinction points to a port city as the location for Matthew’s Gospel.⁶⁹

However, this distinction is not as obvious as Kilpatrick argues. In Matt. 4.18 and 15.29 there is the clear reference to ἡ θάλασσα τῆς Γαλιλαίας (cf. Mk. 1.16). Moreover, Matt. 8.32 (καὶ ἰδοὺ ὄρμησεν πᾶσα ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ ἀπέθανον ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν) follows Mk. 5.13 (καὶ ὄρμησεν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ὡς δισχίλιοι, καὶ ἐπνίγοντο ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ), ἡ θάλασσα being another clear reference to the sea of Galilee (cf. Matt. 8.28). As for the alteration of Mk. 9.42 in Matt. 18.6, I’m in agreement with Sim that ‘Matthew’s rewriting [...] probably owes more to the evangelist’s emphasis on the severity of the punishment, a key theme right throughout the Gospel, than to any desire to describe the Mediterranean Sea’⁷⁰ (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 14.15.10).

A second argument adduced in favour of Phoenicia has to do with Matthew’s alteration of Mk. 7.26, in which the Syro-Phoenician/Greek woman becomes ‘Canaanite’ (Matt. 15.22). Kilpatrick suggests that this alteration is best explained by Matthew’s intention to protect his readers’ sensitivities. Since the ‘Greek’ woman described in Mk. 7.26 had ‘Syro-Phoenician origins’, this detail may have been offensive to the proudly-Hellenized inhabitants of the coastal cities, such as Tyre or Sidon (Matt. 15.21). So, by calling her ‘Canaanite’ (15.22),

⁶⁸ Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 134.

⁶⁹ Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 131–33.

⁷⁰ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 49. Similarly, Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 14–28* (WBC 33B; Dallas: Word, 2002), 522: ‘ἐν τῷ πελάγει, “in the depth” or “open (sea),” is added by Matthew for effect.’

Matthew identifies the woman with the less-Hellenized people of the hinterland.⁷¹ However, Kilpatrick brings no evidence that such a distinction existed between the hinterland and the coast.⁷² As for Matthew's alteration, the preference for her ancestral designation ('Canaanite') should be read in the context of Jesus' initial declination to ministry to the Gentiles (Matt. 15.23–24; cf. Mk. 7.24), which creates an even greater contrast to the final appreciation of her faith (Matt. 15.28).⁷³

If Kilpatrick's arguments in favour of Phoenicia are rather weak, the arguments against it appear to be stronger. In Matt. 11.22–24, Jesus compares the unprivileged cities of Tyre and Sidon to the infamous Sodom.⁷⁴ As Sim concludes, 'This text is hardly in keeping with a Phoenician provenance for the Gospel, and almost certainly excludes Tyre and Sidon from consideration.'⁷⁵ Moreover, Tyre and Sidon are excluded in Matthew's alteration of Mk. 3.8 (cf. Matt. 4.25), in which multitudes from this area are healed by Jesus. This omission is consistent with their unprivileged status in Matt. 11.20–21 and with Jesus' refusal expressed in Matt. 15.23–24. Also, the omission should be considered in the context of Matthew's editorial addition 'the news about [Jesus] spread all over Syria' (Matt. 4.24; cf. Mk. 3.7–8), a point to which I shall return later. All these alterations or omissions would be inexplicable if the Phoenician cities were indeed the Gospel of Matthew's place of provenance.

(3) The strongest case for Transjordan (Pella) was made by H.D. Slingerland (1979).⁷⁶ Two texts are particularly important for his argument, namely Matt. 4.15 (Γῆ Ζαβουλὼν καὶ γῆ

⁷¹ Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 132–33.

⁷² Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 49: 'the distinction he draws between the hellenised cities of the coast and the less-hellenised hinterland is precarious to say the least.' Also, Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:142; B. Lifschitz, "L'hellénisation des Juifs de Palestine," *RB* 72 (1965): 520–38.

⁷³ Carson, "Matthew", 354–56. For Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 57, 'The Syrophoenician woman of Mark 7:26 becomes a Canaanite woman in Matt 15:22, the term the Phoenicians used for themselves in their own Semitic language [...] All of these things speak decisively for Syria.' See the later discussion, § 4.2.1 (5).

⁷⁴ Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 313; Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:142.

⁷⁵ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 49; Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:142.

⁷⁶ H.D. Slingerland, "The Transjordanian Origin of Matthew's Gospel," *JSNT* 3 (1979): 18–28. Cf. Carson-Moo, *Introduction*, 152; G.N. Stanton, "The Origin and Purpose of Matthew's Gospel: Matthean Scholarship from

Νεφθαλίμ, ὁδὸν θαλάσσης, πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν) and Matt. 19.1 (Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους, μετήρην ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου). According to Slingerland, these verses betray the author's eastern perspective (he is looking westward, towards Palestine), as he situates both Galilee (4.15) and Judea (19.1) on the other side of the Jordan. For Slingerland, the most probable place of composition was Pella, in Decapolis. According to later traditions, it was the city in which many Christians from Jerusalem found shelter before the outbreak of the Jewish war (66–73 CE).⁷⁷

However, as Slingerland admits, both texts are problematic, as their sources (LXX Isa. 8.23 for Matt. 4.15; Mk. 10.1 for Matt. 19.1) have variant readings. Some variants of both Mk. 10.1 and LXX Isa. 8.23 introduce the conjunction καί, that distinguishes between Galilee, Judea, 'and the area beyond Jordan'.⁷⁸ According to this reading, both texts adopt a western perspective—looking eastward across the river, towards Transjordan. In order to defend his case, Slingerland suggests that the omission of the connective καί in both Matt. 4.15 and 19.1 is redactional, indicating Matthew's current location.⁷⁹ Although his explanation is possible, more probable solutions have been suggested by D.A. Hagner and Davies-Allison. Hagner suggests that the phrase 'beyond the Jordan' could be a standard/popular designation for the territories east of the river Jordan, as certain contemporary sources indicate (cf. Jn. 1.28; 3.26; 10.40; Josephus, *Ant.* 7.198; 12.222; 14.277).⁸⁰ If this is the case, then the phrase πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου in Matt. 4.15 and 19.1 is not used to qualify either Galilee or Judea, Davies-Allison argue.⁸¹ In favour of this reading, Davies-Allison point to Matt. 4.25, the only other Matthean

1945–1980," *ANRW* II.25.3 (1985): 1942; Gerd Theissen, *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992), 249–50; Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:142.

⁷⁷ Slingerland, "Transjordanian Origin," 26.

⁷⁸ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 42–43.

⁷⁹ Slingerland, "Transjordanian Origin," 21–22.

⁸⁰ Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 73; Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 43.

⁸¹ Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:383.

text in which πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου is used. Here Matthew follows Mk. 3.7–8, yet keeps the connective καί, clearly distinguishing between Galilee, Judea, ‘and [the area] beyond the Jordan’: ὄχλοι πολλοὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Δεκαπόλεως καὶ Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ Ἰουδαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου. So, Matt. 4.25 challenges Slingerland’s view on Matthew’s editorial care in the other verses (4.15; 19.1).⁸² Moreover, the omission of Mark’s references to Decapolis in Matt. 8.34 (cf. Mk. 5.20) and 15.29 (cf. Mk. 7.31) weakens even more his argument of redactional care.⁸³ Therefore, I conclude that the Transjordanian hypothesis has very little in its favour.

Still, there are several arguments against this hypothesis. I will summarize three of the arguments, following Sim.⁸⁴ According to Josephus (*J.W.* 2.458–9), during the Roman-Jewish war, the Jewish combatants attacked and damaged the cities of Decapolis, Pella included. In return, the Gentile population of these cities began severe reprisals against their Jewish citizens (*J.W.* 2.466–68, 478). Given these circumstances, it is debatable whether numerous Jewish Christians, fleeing from Judea, would settle in the insecure area of Decapolis, as the later traditions claim.⁸⁵

Secondly, there is the issue of language. If the Gospel of Matthew was written among the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem that settled in Decapolis, then the language of the composition should have been Aramaic, not Greek.⁸⁶ Indeed, Papias (*Fragm.* 3.16) affirms that ‘Matthew composed the sayings in the Hebrew tongue’ (Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἐβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο), which led certain scholars to postulate the existence of an Aramaic/Hebrew *Ur*-Matthew.⁸⁷ However, as was noted above, most scholars today would

⁸² Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 43. Cf. J.T. Sanders, “Jewish Christianity in Antioch Before the Time of Hadrian: Where does the Identity Lie?,” in E.H. Lovering (ed.), *Society of Biblical Literature 1992 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 352 (n. 13).

⁸³ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 44.

⁸⁴ See the lengthier discussion in Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 44–45.

⁸⁵ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 45.

⁸⁶ Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:143.

⁸⁷ E.g., J.J. Griesbach, *Commentatio qua Marci evangelium totum e Matthaei et Lucae commentariis decerptum esse monstratur* (Jena, 1794); J.G. Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das neue Testament* (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1804); James

argue that the Gospel of Matthew, was composed in Greek: ‘Matthew agrees with the Greek text of Mark verbatim throughout his account. The only way that would be possible is if he was copying the Greek text into his Greek text.’⁸⁸

And thirdly, Peter’s primacy in the Gospel of Matthew suggests a different area, for in the area of Decapolis James superseded Peter’s influence.⁸⁹ However, in the Gospel of Matthew there is only one obscure reference to James (Matt. 13.55).

(4) The Palestinian provenance is supported by an impressive number of modern scholars.⁹⁰ This is not surprising, since Matthew’s Gospel is the most Jewish of all.⁹¹ Moreover, this appears to be the traditional view of the early Church, as numerous patristic authors followed Papias (*Fragm.* 3.16), assuming a gospel that was originally in Aramaic (cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 3.1.1–2; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.24.6; 3.25.4; 5.8.2; 5.10.3; 6.25.3–4; Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 3, 36). Narrowing the area of composition, Jerome (347–420 CE) affirms a Judean location (*De vir. ill.* 3). J.A. Overman (1990)⁹² and B. Witherington III (2006)⁹³ suggested specific

R. Edwards, *The Hebrew Gospel and the Development of the Synoptic Tradition* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2009).

⁸⁸ Ehrman, *Jesus Before the Gospels*, 308 (n. 32).

⁸⁹ E. Schweizer, *Matthäus und seine Gemeinde* (SBS 71; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1974), 139; B.W. Bacon, *Studies in Matthew* (London: Constable, 1930), 17; Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 45.

⁹⁰ Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (2 vols.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1974), 1:105; France, *Evangelist and Teacher*, 93. For more examples, see the list offered by Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:138.

⁹¹ Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News According to Matthew* (trans., David E. Green; Atlanta: John Knox, 1975), 16: ‘The Jewish background is plain. Jewish customs are familiar to everyone, the debate about the law is a central question, and the Sabbath is still observed. The dispute with the Pharisees serves primarily as a warning to the community; but a reference to leading representatives of the Synagogue is not far below the surface. Above all, the method of learned interpretation of the Law, which “looses” and “binds,” was still central for Matthew and his community. Preservation of sayings, such as 23:2-3, which support the continued authority of Pharisaic teaching, and above all the special emphasis placed on the requirement not to offend those who still think in legalistic terms, shows that dialogue with the Jewish Synagogue had not broken off. On the other hand, a saying like 27:25 shows that the Christian community had conclusively split with the Synagogues, even though hope for the conversion of Jews was not yet totally dead.’

⁹² J.A. Overman, *Matthew’s Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 158–60. Overman suggests both Sepphoris and Tiberias, but prefers the former. See also J.A. Overman, *Church and Community in Crisis: The Gospel According to Matthew* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1996), 16–19.

⁹³ Ben Witherington III, *Matthew* (SHBC 19; Macon: Smith & Helwys, 2006), 26–28.

locations in Galilee—Capernaum, Sepphoris, or Tiberias.⁹⁴ B.T. Viviano (1979) has advanced the hypothesis of Caesarea Maritima.⁹⁵

Among the recurrent arguments adduced by scholars, I will summarize the following: the Jewishness of Matthew's Gospel (e.g., Matt. 1.1–17; 5.17–48);⁹⁶ the testimony of the early church;⁹⁷ the Aramaic/Hebrew language of composition (cf. Papias, *Fragm.* 3.16);⁹⁸ the extensive use of Greek language in Jewish Palestine;⁹⁹ the inclusion of some untranslated Aramaic words (e.g., 5.22; 6.24; 27.46); the assumption of some Jewish customs (15.2); the prominence of Galilee in Matthew's Gospel (e.g., 3.13–19.1; 28.1–7, 16–20);¹⁰⁰ the emphasis on the conflicts with the Pharisees (23.1–36), that were disturbing the Matthean community;¹⁰¹ and the bilingual character of the text forms when the OT is cited.¹⁰²

However, many of the arguments above could be adequately explained by asserting the Jewishness of the author and of the Gospel's recipients, as most scholars would argue. There is no need to assume also a Jewish/Palestinian place of provenance. Moreover, there are at least two major arguments that could be adduced against the Palestinian hypothesis. The first counter-argument regards the language of composition. Despite the already repeated testimonies of Papias and Irenaeus, there is undeniable evidence that the language of Matthew's

⁹⁴ As most scholars would agree, there is a major emphasis on Galilee throughout Matthew's Gospel. Overman, *Matthew's Gospel*, 159.

⁹⁵ B.T. Viviano, "Where was the Gospel According to Matthew Written?," *CBQ* 41/4 (1979): 533–46.

⁹⁶ See (for instance) Frederick J. Murphy, "The Jewishness of Matthew: Another Look," in A.J. Avery-Peck, D. Harrington, J. Neusner (eds.), *When Judaism and Christianity Began: Essays in Memory of Anthony J. Saldarini* (vol. 1; Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2004), 377–403.

⁹⁷ Note the unconvincing case for Caesarea Maritima, based on the possible 'suggestions' of the patristic authors in Viviano, "Where was Matthew Written," 542–46. The fact that Eusebius, who was a resident of Caesarea, does not connect Matthew's Gospel to this location invalidates Viviano's patristic argument.

⁹⁸ A. Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Matthäus: Seine Sprache, sein Ziel, seine Selbständigkeit* (6th ed.; Stuttgart: Calwer, 1963); P. Gaechter, *Die literarische Kunst im Matthäusevangelium* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1966); John Wenham, "Gospel Origins," *TrinJ* 7 (1978): 112–34.

⁹⁹ Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:105–106.

¹⁰⁰ Overman, *Matthew's Gospel*, 159.

¹⁰¹ Inter alia: Davies, *Sermon on the Mount*, 256–315; Overman, *Matthew's Gospel*, 158–59. Note the phrase 'their synagogue' that could indicate a separation from Palestinian or Pharisaic Judaism: 4.23; 7.29; 9.35; 10.17; 12.9; 13.54; 23.34; 28.15.

¹⁰² Carson-Moo, *Introduction*, 151.

Gospel was Greek. Again, this is a universal consensus among all the scholars that defend the priority of Mark.¹⁰³

For certain, Hengel is correct to notice the presence of bilingualism in first-century Palestine.¹⁰⁴ However, as J.P. Meier¹⁰⁵ and J. Fitzmyer¹⁰⁶ have shown, Aramaic was the first language of most Palestinians. Moreover, only a few of them could read Aramaic; even fewer could read Greek.¹⁰⁷ Therefore, the use of Greek in ‘literary works’ indicates a place of composition that was outside the Jewish territories.¹⁰⁸ In my opinion, the untranslated words of 5.22; 6.24; 27.46 might suggest that Aramaic was the second language of Matthew’s *diaspora* readers.¹⁰⁹

Secondly, there is the long-standing debate over the dating of Matthew’s Gospel. Unfortunately, there are no decisive arguments on either side of the pre/post-70s debate.¹¹⁰ So, following the dominant view of modern scholarship, I suggest that: 1) Matthew used the Gospel

¹⁰³ E.g., H.N. Ridderbos, *Matthew* (BSC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987), 7: ‘the Gospel in its present form cannot be a direct translation of an Aramaic original. Instead we must first view it in connection with the Greek text of Mark.’

¹⁰⁴ M. Hengel: *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:83–106; *The “Hellenization” of Judaea in the First Century after Christ* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2003), 19–29.

¹⁰⁵ John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, vol. 1: *The Roots of the Problem and the Person* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 255–68; Meier, “Antioch,” 19.

¹⁰⁶ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (SBLMS 25; Chico: Scholars Press, 1979), 29–47.

¹⁰⁷ See Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine* (TSAJ 81; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 2001). For a different view, see Brian J. Wright, *Communal Reading in the Time of Jesus: A Window into Early Christian Reading Practice* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2017).

¹⁰⁸ See Bart D. Ehrman, *Forged: Writing in the Name of God—Why the Bible’s Authors Are Not Who We Think They Are* (New York: HarperOne, 2012), 73: ‘for the entire first century CE (the time of Jesus and Simon Peter), we know for certain of only two authors in Palestine who produced literary works (i.e., educated compositions other than tax documents, land deeds, or marriage certificates, etc.): the Jewish historian Josephus and a man named Justus of Tiberius. We still have Josephus’s writings, but Justus’s don’t survive. Both of these men were in the upper echelons of society, and both were inordinately well educated. We know of no other literary authors for the entire century.’ As for Josephus, the historian admits the inferior quality of his Greek (*Ant.* 20.262–64). In my view, three of the traditional authors of the Gospels could also be writers of Palestinian origin (although the editorial intervention of certain *amanuenses* should not be excluded). Still, Ehrman’s argument could be used to argue for the scarcity of Palestinian readers. For the latter view, see Richard J. Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2017).

¹⁰⁹ See Jeremias, TDNT, 6:974; Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 116: ‘the retention of ρακά [Matt. 5.22] in a Greek document points to a Syrian provenance for the Gospel, since only there were Greeks found in an oriental milieu where the word would be understandable.’

¹¹⁰ See the extensive list of scholars (on both sides of the debate) in Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: W.B. Eerdmans, 2009), 42 (n. 125–26).

of Mark;¹¹¹ 2) Mark was written in the mid-60s (cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 3.1.1–2; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 2.15.1–2; 6.14.6–7);¹¹² 3) therefore, Matthew could not have been written before the outbreak of the Jewish war (66 CE).¹¹³

If this is the case, then Palestine—during or after the war—becomes an unlikely location.¹¹⁴ For instance, Josephus (*J.W.* 2.284–92) mentions the severe persecution that banished most of the Jews from Caesarea Maritima, soon after the war began.¹¹⁵ And, as Viviano admits,¹¹⁶ there is no evidence that they resettled the area, after the war ended. Nevertheless, ‘It may be speculated that casualty rates were higher in Judaea than in the other Jewish districts of the country, Galilee, Peraea, and Idumaea’¹¹⁷ (cf. Josephus, *J.W.* 6.420–21). To reiterate the above point, a decimated and desolated place, such as Palestine was during 66–73 CE (cf. Josephus, *J.W.* 7.43), could hardly be the place of provenance for Matthew’s Gospel.¹¹⁸ As Sim notices,

Matthew does not focus on the Jewish war as much as we might expect had he and his readers *directly* witnessed the conflict. He has, as noted above, a single reference to the war and the fate of Jerusalem. The fact that the description in 22:7 is general in nature and not specific suggests that the evangelist and his community were not themselves caught up in these events.¹¹⁹

Certain scholars argued that the destruction of the entire city in the parable of the wedding feast (Matt. 22.7), a punishment which is highly disproportionate to the offence (cf. 22.2–6), could

¹¹¹ R.T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2007), 20–22.

¹¹² E.g., Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 6; France, *Evangelist and Teacher*, 24–49; Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, 12–28.

¹¹³ Scholars who date Matthew earlier would usually follow the ‘Griesbach hypothesis’ or J.A.T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976), 13–30, 88–92.

¹¹⁴ Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:140.

¹¹⁵ Meier, “Antioch,” 20.

¹¹⁶ Viviano, “Where was Matthew Written,” 540 (n. 32).

¹¹⁷ Seth Schwartz, “Political, Social and Economic Life in the Land of Israel, 66–c. 235,” in Steven T. Katz (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, vol. 4: *The Late Roman-Rabbinic Period* (Cambridge: CUP, 2006), 23–25.

¹¹⁸ Meier, “Antioch,” 18. As various scholars have shown, the Matthean community appears to be prosperous, not affected by a recent war. Kilpatrick (*Origins*, 124), for instance, calls it a ‘well-to-do city church’, noticing the usage of *στατήρ*, *τάλαντον*, *κρυστός*, etc. See also, Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, lxxv.

¹¹⁹ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 41.

be an editorial interpolation and retrospective reference to the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE (cf. Matt. 24.1–35). Note Schweizer’s influential argument:

The wrath of the host is mentioned by both evangelists, but it is impossible to conceive of the king coming with his army not only to slay those who had been invited but to burn down their city (not “cities”), and doing all this while the feast stands ready for the newly invited. The parable deals with ordinary citizens, who buy fields and use oxen, not with men who rule entire cities. After his punishment, furthermore, the verdict of the king in verse 8 is pointless. Verses 6-7 are thus clearly an interpolation in the narrative, which earlier passed directly from verse 5 to the wrath of the king (beginning of vs. 7), and then to verse 8. Here the events of A.D. 70—the taking and burning of Jerusalem by Roman armies—have coloured the language of the parable.¹²⁰

However, Carson-Moo, reversing the argument, conclude:

the language of Matthew 22:7, including the reference to the burning of the city, is the standard language of both the Old Testament and the Roman world describing punitive military expeditions against rebellious cities. Granted that Jesus foresaw the destruction of Jerusalem (as did many prophets before him), the language he used does not in any detail depend on specific knowledge as to how things actually turned out in A.D. 70. In fact, Robinson goes so far as to argue that the synoptic prophecies about the fall of Jerusalem, including Matthew 22:7, are so restrained that they *must* have been written before 70. Otherwise, he insists, we should expect to see some indication that the prophecies had actually been fulfilled.¹²¹

Moreover, the several indicators that the Temple was still standing (Matt. 5.23–24; 12.5–7; 17.24–27; 23.16–22; cf. 26.60–61), might point to a date before 70 CE.¹²² Admittedly, the pre-70s date is a minority view in modern scholarship, yet the arguments advanced by scholars such as Gundry,¹²³ France,¹²⁴ and Carson-Moo¹²⁵ are solid.¹²⁶ Therefore, I tentatively suggest that the Gospel of Matthew was written after 66,¹²⁷ but before 70 CE, following Carson-Moo:

¹²⁰ Schweizer, *Good News According to Matthew*, 418.

¹²¹ Carson-Moo, *Introduction*, 153 (emphasis original). Cf. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament*, 13–30.

¹²² Carson-Moo, *Introduction*, 155.

¹²³ R.H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1994), 599–609.

¹²⁴ France, *Evangelist and Teacher*, 82–91.

¹²⁵ Carson-Moo, *Introduction*, 152–56.

¹²⁶ France, *Matthew*, 19: ‘A pre-70 date for Matthew remains a minority view, but one which has been strongly supported, and which is usually dismissed not so much by specific arguments as on the basis of a preferred overall dating scheme [...] Gundry, 599–609, has assembled an impressive range of arguments to this effect, and while some of them depend on specific points of exegesis which are questionable, I am not aware that the argument as a whole has been seriously answered.’

¹²⁷ In my view, Matthew was composed shortly after Mark, based on the following reasoning: 1) ca. 90-95% of Mark’s Gospel was copied into Matthew; 2) Mark was unknown to the earliest authors that knew and quoted Matthew (see for instance the *Didache* and Ignatius); 3) therefore, I suggest that Matthew may have incorporated Mark (very) soon after Mark was written and before it circulated independently—especially in the eastern Mediterranean.

‘the preponderance of evidence suggests that Matthew was published before 70, but not long before.’¹²⁸ Again, there is no conclusive evidence for this dating.

Therefore, the Gospel of Matthew has most probably been composed after the outbreak of the Jewish war (66 CE), and possibly before the destruction of the Temple (70 CE). But even if it was written after the ceasing of the war (post-70s),¹²⁹ the dating still makes Palestine an improbable place of provenance—as long as it is dated after 66 CE. In my opinion, Sim is correct to suggest that Matthew’s lack of reflection on the hostilities indicates some distance from the war zone.¹³⁰ Indeed, phrases such as ‘their cities’ (11.1), ‘that land’ (9.26, 31), ‘that place’ (14.35), ‘[Judas’ field] was called the Field of Blood unto this day’ (27.8), ‘[the rumour about the theft of Jesus’ corpse] was spread abroad among the Jews until this day’ (28.15), might indicate a distant place of composition: ‘the impression the reader receives is not what one would expect from a resident of the country writing for residents.’¹³¹

(5) There are various reasons why the majority of scholars place the composition of Matthew’s Gospel in Syria.¹³² First, it is the wide agreement on the ‘negative value’ of the testimonies of Papias (*Fragm.* 3.16) and Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 3.1.1–2). As we have seen, ‘[They prove] that Matthew was *not* produced either in Rome or in Asia Minor, but was believed to have originally

¹²⁸ Carson-Moo, *Introduction*, 156.

¹²⁹ Although he accepts a pre-70s dating, Grant R. Osborne, *Matthew* (ZECNT; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 35, enlists some of the post-70s arguments he considers ‘strong’: 1) Matthew’s diatribe against the Pharisees fits the later date, as in the 60s they may have been somewhat tolerant of ‘law-keeping Jewish Christians’. 2) The Jewish worldview of Matthew fits the rabbinic movement of the 70s and 80s. 3) Mark probably dates in the mid-60s, which would place Matthew in the 70s. 4) Matthew separates the disciples’ question in 24.3, unlike Mark 13.2–4, and points to further reflection on the scene.

¹³⁰ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 41.

¹³¹ Bacon, *Studies in Matthew*, 17–18.

¹³² Among the scholars who place the composition of Matthew’s Gospel in Syria, I mention: D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NCBC; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1972), 50–52; Schweizer, *The Good News According to Matthew*, 15–17; W.G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1975), 119; M.D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2004), 9–13, 149–52; F.V. Filson, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (BNTC; London: A&C Black, 1977), 14–15; G. Künzel, *Studien zur Gemeindeverständnis des Matthäusevangeliums* (CThM 10; Stuttgart: Calwer, 1978), 251–56; D. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew* (SacPag 1; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1991), 73; Luz, *Matthew*, 1–7, 57.

come from the East.¹³³ Then, due to the ‘improbable nature’ of the alternative eastern locations, such as Alexandria, Phoenicia, Transjordan, or Palestine (as it was shown above), Syria ‘appears to be the only remaining option’.¹³⁴ Also, Syria had the largest concentration of Jewish population outside Palestine, especially in Antioch (Josephus, *J.W.* 7.43). Syria was also the place of provenance for the writings that first quoted and alluded extensively to this Gospel, namely the *Didache* and the letters of Ignatius.¹³⁵

For internal evidence, scholars often point to Matt. 4.24a: καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν Συρίαν (‘the news about him spread all over Syria/his fame spread throughout all Syria’). Matt. 4.23–25 is largely based on Mk. 3.7–8. However, Matthew eliminates from Mark’s list Idumaea, as well as Tyre and Sidon.¹³⁶ In their stead, he adds Decapolis, ‘possibly on the basis of Mark 5:20 or 7:31 (the word being otherwise unattested in the NT), and reports at 4:24 in an otherwise unparalleled passage that Jesus’ “fame spread throughout all Syria.” [...] Syria is the only geographical region mentioned at 4:23–25 that is not explicitly derived from Mark.’¹³⁷ As Carter,¹³⁸ Sim,¹³⁹ and others have shown, it is likely that this ‘unparalleled’ redactional intervention ‘functions as a type of authorial signature, analogous to 13:52.’¹⁴⁰ Also, according to Luz, “‘Nazarene’ (Ναζωραῖος, 2:23) is a Syrian term for “Christian.” [...] The Syrophoenician woman of Mark 7:26 becomes a Canaanite woman in Matt 15:22, the term the Phoenicians used for themselves in their own Semitic language.’¹⁴¹

Moreover, based on the criterion of language, the Syriac places of provenance could be narrowed to urban locations. In order to defend the Antiochene hypothesis, Meier advances the

¹³³ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 500; Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:143.

¹³⁴ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 51.

¹³⁵ Keener, *Matthew*, 41.

¹³⁶ See the discussion above, § 4.2.1 (2).

¹³⁷ J.R.C. Cousland, *The Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew* (NovTSup 102; Leiden/New York: E.J. Brill, 2002), 54.

¹³⁸ Warren Carter, *Matthew and the Margins: A Socio-Political and Religious Reading* (JSNTSup 204; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 15.

¹³⁹ For Sim (*Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 51), it is ‘[a] very minor point in favour of this hypothesis’.

¹⁴⁰ Cousland, *Crowds in Matthew*, 53–57 (54–55).

¹⁴¹ Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 57.

argument of the ‘most commonly used language of the ordinary people’.¹⁴² While Greek, the language of composition of Matthew’s Gospel, was not used widely by the common people living in the countryside, Antioch was ‘the centre of Hellenistic learning and the Greek language’, notices Meier,¹⁴³ following B.M. Metzger: ‘Outside the gates of Antioch, Syriac was the language of the people’.¹⁴⁴

In my view, the criterion of language could be confidently used only to argue for an urban location in Syria, but not exclusively Antioch. As Sebastian Brock¹⁴⁵ and Fergus Millar¹⁴⁶ have shown, from the time of the Seleucids onwards, Syria became more and more Hellenized, above all in cities. Both scholars point to the numerous Greek inscriptions found all over the place west of the Euphrates, including a plethora of Greek-Palmyrene bilingual inscriptions from Palmyra.¹⁴⁷ Moreover, Edessa was considered ‘a Hellenistic stronghold’ receiving a Greek name since 304 BCE.¹⁴⁸ So, all the evidence points to several urban areas in Syria in which bilingualism was far more widespread than Meier would admit. Accordingly, Antioch cannot be singularized on the criterion of the ‘most commonly used language of the ordinary people’, as other Syrian cities have similarly been inhabited by Greek speaking populations. Still, Meier is correct to notice the absence of any Syriac pre-Christian and Christian literature that was written in Greek.¹⁴⁹

The implied use of Greek in Edessa led B.W. Bacon (1930) to suggest the location as an alternative to Antioch:

¹⁴² Meier, “Antioch,” 20–21.

¹⁴³ Meier, “Antioch,” 21.

¹⁴⁴ B.M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977), 5.

¹⁴⁵ S.P. Brock, “Greek and Latin Words in Palmyrene Inscriptions: A Comparison with Syriac,” in E. Cussini (ed.), *A Journey to Palmyra: Collected Essays to Remember Delbert R. Hillers* (CHANE 22; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2005), 11–25.

¹⁴⁶ Fergus Millar, *Rome, the Greek World, and the East*, vol. 3: *The Greek World, the Jews, and the East* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 3–31.

¹⁴⁷ Brock, “Palmyrene Inscriptions,” 12–25; Millar, *Rome, the Greek World, and the East*, 12–27.

¹⁴⁸ Amir Harrak, “The Ancient Name of Edessa,” *JNES* 51/3 (1992): 209–210, remarks that many Near Eastern cities that received Greek or Latin names continued to use the original name for some time, ‘but this does not seem to be the case with Edessa’.

¹⁴⁹ Meier, “Antioch,” 21.

As an example of the spread of the gospel eastward from Antioch in the earliest times into this bilingual region, where in the cities Greek was still the dominant language, so that even synagogues of the large Jewish population employed it in public worship, we may take Edessa, metropolis of Osroene.¹⁵⁰

Still, Bacon's major point is built around the author's aptitude for 'targuming', by which he means that the words of Jesus were translated often with an accompanying explanation. For him, 'targuming' points to some Christian communities of north-eastern Syria, where the practice was particularly prominent.¹⁵¹ His narrowing, however, was not accepted by scholars.¹⁵²

As for the arguments against Edessa, Bacon admits that 'The earliest beginnings of Christian history [in Edessa] are lost.' The only traces left are the disputable legends of the letter of Edessa's king Abgar the Black (13–50 CE) to Jesus, and of the subsequent conversion of Abgar, under the preaching of Addai, one of the seventy disciples (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 1.13).¹⁵³ It is no surprise, then, that Bacon offers no direct evidence in favour of his tentative Edessan hypothesis.¹⁵⁴

Instead, some of his arguments actually strengthen the case for Antioch. First of all, he accepts Streeter's point that the early dissemination of Matthew's Gospel would require an influential 'centre of distribution', which he agrees must have been Antioch.¹⁵⁵ Then, in close connection to this point, Bacon agrees that the Gospel was formally anonymous, and concludes: 'In the original home of the first Gospel it required no special name or title. It circulated, like

¹⁵⁰ Bacon, *Studies in Matthew*, 151. This view was rejected by Meier, "Antioch," 21: 'As far as we can ascertain, the Christianity of Edessa always used Aramaic or Syriac.' Also, Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:143: 'the earliest full literary texts we have from Edessa are in Syriac, as are the remains of the pre-Christian literature.'

¹⁵¹ Bacon, *Studies in Matthew*, 13–14, 17, 22–23.

¹⁵² Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 52. See also: R.H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel: With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967), 172–74; Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*, 28–46; A.J. Saldarini, *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society: A Sociological Approach* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2001); C.A. Evans (ed.), *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity* (SSEJC 7; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 375–89; L.M. Wills, "Scribal Methods in Matthew and *Mishnah Abot*," *CBQ* 63 (2001): 241–57; C.A. Evans, "Targumizing Tendencies in Matthean Redaction," in Avery-Peck, Harrington, Neusner (eds.), *When Judaism and Christianity Began*, 93–116.

¹⁵³ Bacon, *Studies in Matthew*, 15–16.

¹⁵⁴ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 52.

¹⁵⁵ Bacon, *Studies in Matthew*, 20.

similar compositions among Gnostic one-gospel men [...], simply as “the” Gospel.’¹⁵⁶ Yet he incorrectly assumes that the Gospel received its designation (‘According to Matthew’) in Antioch, ‘to distinguish it from gospels already in circulation at that great metropolis of Gentile Christianity.’¹⁵⁷ In the earliest reception of Matthew’s Gospel, however, the *Didache* and the letters of Ignatius—all of them being related to Antioch—1) there is no Matthean attribution: the author’s name is never mentioned; 2) there is the constant use of the singular ‘gospel’; and 3) there are no instances of quotations or allusions from the other three canonical Gospels. This point shall be elaborated in the following section. Consequently, the evidence that Bacon adduced, should have led him to another conclusion, namely Antioch.

Bacon’s hypothesis has attracted few supporters, among which are J. Kennard (1949)¹⁵⁸ and R.E. Osborne (1973).¹⁵⁹ For, Kennard—following Kilpatrick and Brandon¹⁶⁰—Antioch is an improbable location, due to the strong Jewish character of the Gospel, and its fierce anti-Paulinism. And, as the letters of Ignatius show, the church of Antioch was still Pauline during the time of Ignatius.¹⁶¹ This theory has been challenged by Meier,¹⁶² a point to which I shall return in the following section. Moreover, following Bacon, Kennard accepts the point that Antioch was the influential centre from where the Gospel was disseminated.¹⁶³ As Sim shows, this is ‘an unnecessary complication of Streeter’s Antiochene hypothesis’.¹⁶⁴

As for Osborne, he ignores the preceding arguments of Bacon and Kennard, and introduces some unconvincing parallels to the eastern traditions, notably Mithraism (cf. Matt. 13.43), Zoroastrianism (cf. Matt. 2.1–12) and Buddhism (cf. Matt. 5.21–48), parallels that are

¹⁵⁶ Bacon, *Studies in Matthew*, 20.

¹⁵⁷ Bacon, *Studies in Matthew*, 20–21.

¹⁵⁸ J. Kennard, “The Place of Origin of Matthew’s Gospel,” *ATR* 31 (1949): 243–46.

¹⁵⁹ R.E. Osborne, “The Provenance of Matthew’s Gospel,” *SR* 3 (1973): 220–35.

¹⁶⁰ See the discussion above, § 4.2.1 (1) and (2).

¹⁶¹ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 52.

¹⁶² Meier, “Antioch,” 62–63.

¹⁶³ Kennard, “Place of Origin,” 243–46.

¹⁶⁴ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 52; Meier, “Antioch,” 25.

‘either not very close or not very relevant.’¹⁶⁵ As Craig Keener notices, ‘Palestinian Jewish parallels seem far stronger’.¹⁶⁶ In conclusion, Osborne’s theory may be viewed as another instance of ‘parallelomania’.

4.2.2 Concluding remarks

The Gospel of Matthew was composed in the East, as the testimonies of Papias and Irenaeus indicate. As my history of scholarship has shown, Syria remains the best eastern hypothesis. Moreover, we may confidently narrow the area to the urban locations of Syria. Scholars have often argued for an urban place of provenance based on three major points. Following Kilpatrick, scholars noticed Matthew’s use of the word πόλις (‘city’)—twenty-six times, while Mark has only eight. At the same time the word κόμη (‘village’) is used only three times in Matthew (Mark has seven).¹⁶⁷ Four of these references to the ‘city’ are redactional (8.34, 9.35, 21.10, 17). Of more significance could be Matt. 10.23 and 23.34, two verses that describe the flight of the disciples ‘from city to city’.¹⁶⁸ Not all scholars have found this argument convincing. For Stanton, ‘these statistics are no more than straws in the wind’.¹⁶⁹ The second point concerns the rapid dissemination and the early popularity of the Gospel, both requiring a large and influential Christian centre:¹⁷⁰ ‘the smaller and more remote a community of Matthew is, the more difficult it is to explain the rapid spread of the Gospel of Matthew.’¹⁷¹ Still, the strongest argument (the third) has to do with the language of composition. As the evidence shows, Greek was used above all in the larger cities of Syria.

So, up to this point, I will conclude with the words of Luz:

¹⁶⁵ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 52. Cf. Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:143.

¹⁶⁶ Keener, *Matthew*, 41.

¹⁶⁷ Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 124–25.

¹⁶⁸ Stanton, “Communities of Matthew,” 390 (n. 8).

¹⁶⁹ Stanton, “Communities of Matthew,” 380. Also, Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 57: ‘that means absolutely nothing’.

¹⁷⁰ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 500–504.

¹⁷¹ Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 57. For Luz, the rapid spread of the Gospel is a ‘decisive’ argument for an urban location.

It originated certainly in a larger Syrian city whose lingua franca was Greek. In my opinion Antioch is not the worst hypothesis. Thus perhaps the Gospel of Matthew comes from a (!) church of Antioch, but that is no more than a hypothesis.¹⁷²

Indeed, Antioch is ‘no more than a hypothesis’. This is indisputable. However, in the coming section I seek to further the discussion beyond this rather pessimistic point: ‘Antioch is not the worst hypothesis’. Could it be that Antioch is the best hypothesis that scholars can work with? To this question I now turn.

4.3 Locating the Gospel of Matthew: The case for Antioch

Antioch has been for a while ‘[the] most favoured specific provenance for the evangelist and his community’.¹⁷³ And the first influential modern attempt to locate the Gospel of Matthew in the Syrian capital was that of B.H. Streeter (1930),¹⁷⁴ numerous scholars still finding (most of) his arguments persuasive: ‘Streeter’s hypothesis has attracted a large and faithful following, and its popularity shows no sign of waning.’¹⁷⁵ So, in the following, I will offer a survey of Streeter’s hypothesis. But first, two brief observations: 1) since his case was so influential, some repetition of the arguments already introduced is unavoidable; 2) since Sim has already summarized, in a most helpful manner, Streeter’s arguments,¹⁷⁶ I will broadly interact with his survey:

¹⁷² Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 57.

¹⁷³ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 53; Slingerland, “Transjordanian Origin,” 18: ‘It is the consensus of modern scholarship that the Gospel of St. Matthew was written in Syrian Antioch.’

¹⁷⁴ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 500–24.

¹⁷⁵ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 54. See (inter alia): W. Farmer, “The Post-Sectarian Character of Matthew and its Post-War Setting in Antioch of Syria,” *PRS* 3 (1976): 235–47; J. Zumstein, “Antioche sur l’Oronte et l’évangile selon Matthieu,” *SNTU A5* (1980): 122–38; M.H. Crosby, *House of Disciples: Church, Economics and Justice in Matthew* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1988), 37; Meier, “Antioch,” 22–27; Gundry, *Matthew*, 509–609; Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:143–47; M. Slee, *The Church in Antioch in the First Century C.E.: Communion and Conflict* (JSNTSup 244; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2003), 118–25. Cf. J.D. Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story* (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 152.

¹⁷⁶ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 53–58.

(1) Streeter dismisses all the patristic evidence that favours a Palestinian provenance, for all of it could be traced back to ‘a single root’, i.e., Papias of Hierapolis (*via* Irenaeus). As for this singular ‘root’, ‘it cannot be authentic, for our Gospel of Matthew being based on the Greek Mark cannot be a translation from the Aramaic.’¹⁷⁷ At the same time, he acknowledges the ‘negative value’ of the evidence of Irenaeus and Papias: ‘It proves that Matthew was not produced either in Rome or in Asia Minor, but was believed to have originally come from the East.’¹⁷⁸

(2) The original anonymity of the Gospel, its rapid dissemination, and its instant acceptance point to an influential church that was behind its composition. Sim conveniently summarizes Streeter’s argument in these words:

only representatives of a well-known and respected church would compile and circulate a document with no hint of authorship, since they would be confident that the original readers would have trusted their judgement and accepted their authority [...] Matthew would not have been accepted as apostolic in later times had it not been supported by a major and influential church.¹⁷⁹

After ‘excluding’ from consideration the alternative influential churches, such as Rome, Ephesus, Alexandria, Caesarea and Jerusalem,¹⁸⁰ Streeter infers that Antioch is ‘the only one left’¹⁸¹ or that ‘[of] the greater Churches all but Antioch are excluded.’¹⁸²

(3) Peter’s notable prominence in the Gospel (‘[he] is far more prominent in this Gospel than in Mark, although that was written by his own disciple’),¹⁸³ points again to Antioch (cf. Gal. 2.11–14), for this church ‘follows Peter and stands for the *via media* between the Judaistic

¹⁷⁷ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 500.

¹⁷⁸ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 500.

¹⁷⁹ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 53.

¹⁸⁰ For some of Streeter’s arguments, see the discussion above (§ 4.2).

¹⁸¹ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 500–503 (503).

¹⁸² Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 502.

¹⁸³ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 504.

intolerance of those who called James master and the all but antinomian liberty claimed by some of the followers of Paul.’¹⁸⁴

(4) Being ‘a city with an enormous Jewish population’, Antioch seems to fit optimally the atmosphere of the Gospel. Although it is ‘saturated with Jewish feeling’, it recognizes ‘that Christianity is for all nations’.¹⁸⁵

(5) Another argument in favour of the Antiochene provenance, that Streeter considers ‘infinitesimal’, is related to the stater’s various weights and values, depending on the districts: ‘only in Antioch and Damascus did the official stater exactly equal two didrachmae, as is implied in Mt. xvii. 24-27.’¹⁸⁶

(6) The apparently exclusive reception of Matthew in Ignatius of Antioch is another argument for the city. Ignatius alludes repeatedly to the Gospel of Matthew (e.g., *Eph.* 17.1 and Matt. 26.7; *Eph.* 19.2 and Matt. 2.2–10; *Smyrn.* 1.1 and Matt. 3.15; *Pol.* 2.2 and Matt. 10.16);¹⁸⁷ moreover, he ‘frequently speaks of “the Gospel” as if this were the name of a [single] book’ (*Phld.* 5.1–2; 8.2).¹⁸⁸ There are no quotations/allusions to Mark, only parallels that are closer to Matthew.¹⁸⁹ As for the other Gospels, the ‘possible allusions to Luke [...] are very uncertain’.¹⁹⁰ In the case of John,

He has some rather remarkable points of contact with John; but even if these are quotations, he quotes John rarely, and refrains from doing so in certain doctrinal arguments where we should have expected it if he regarded the Fourth Gospel as an authority.¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁴ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 504.

¹⁸⁵ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 504.

¹⁸⁶ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 504. Cf. Warren Carter, “Paying the Tax to Rome as Subversive Praxis: Matthew 17.24-27,” *JSNT* 76 (1999): 11–26.

¹⁸⁷ Cf. J. Smit Sibinga, “Ignatius and Matthew,” *NovT* 8/2.4 (1966): 263–83 (266 and 282).

¹⁸⁸ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 505–506.

¹⁸⁹ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 505.

¹⁹⁰ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 505 (emphasis original).

¹⁹¹ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 505.

So, if Ignatius knew with certainty only one gospel, which he calls ‘the Gospel’, Streeter concludes the following:

The real significance, then, of the use of the term “the Gospel” in Ignatius is that it probably implies that at Antioch in his day there was as yet only one Gospel recognised as “the Gospel” by the Church – a state of things which still existed among Aramaic-speaking Christians in Jerome’s time.¹⁹²

(7) After Ignatius, Streeter analyses the *Didache*, a writing that ‘arose somewhere in Syria or Palestine [...] not later than A.D. 100’.¹⁹³ As in the case of Ignatius, he argues that the *Didache* was dependent upon the text of Matthew’s Gospel (*Did.* 8.1–3; 11.3–4; 11.7; 13.1; 14.2; 15.3; 16.1–8).¹⁹⁴ Also, ‘[the] author of the *Didache* seems not only to have read Matthew, but also, like Ignatius, to refer to it under the title of “The Gospel.”’¹⁹⁵ The only reference from the Gospels that is closer to Luke than to Matthew is *Did.* 16.1 (cf. Lk. 12.35); but this Lukan reference can be confidently traced back to Q, which ‘was the original gospel of the Church of Antioch’.¹⁹⁶

After the brief analysis of the early reception of Matthew’s Gospel in Syria, Streeter concludes:

Both Ignatius and the *Didache*, the earliest Syrian documents we possess, habitually speak of “the Gospel” as if it was the name of a book having a certain authority; also whenever the same sayings occur in Matthew and in either of these, their versions are always secondary.¹⁹⁷

(8) Streeter’s last arguments are based upon the content of the Gospel. The second to last, which he calls ‘the Petrine compromise’,¹⁹⁸ attempts to show that ‘the very nature of the Gospel itself is said to stand as evidence for its composition in Antioch’.¹⁹⁹ In the way it blends its sources

¹⁹² Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 507.

¹⁹³ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 507.

¹⁹⁴ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 508–11.

¹⁹⁵ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 507.

¹⁹⁶ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 511.

¹⁹⁷ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 511.

¹⁹⁸ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 511.

¹⁹⁹ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 54.

(Mark, Q, and 'M'), the Gospel of Matthew actually follows in the footsteps of Peter, striving to reconcile the law-observant party of James with the law-free gospel of Paul.²⁰⁰

(9) The last argument concerns the apocalyptic tone of the Gospel (cf. Matt. 24.15–30; *Did.* 16.1–8), which Streeter closely connects to the geographical location of Antioch. He argues that 'the shock of A.D. 70' produced, in both Jewish and Christian circles, 'an intense revival of Apocalyptic interest',²⁰¹ which culminated in the expectation of the Anti-Christ and the *Nero redivivus* speculations. Being 'the eastern gate of the Roman Empire', such fears 'affected [Antioch] at an earlier date':

Antioch was the eastern gate of the Roman Empire, and, here more than elsewhere, the popular mind was constantly perturbed by rumours that Nero, at the head of the Parthian hosts, was marching against Rome. The belief that Nero had not really died but was hidden in Parthia awaiting his revenge, or, as the myth developed, that he had died but would rise again [...] was not unpopular with the multitude in the provinces; but the Christians [...] regarded him as the incarnation of the hostility of Satan to the Church of God. Very soon they combined the popular Nero-redivivus myth with that conception of the Anti-Christ which they had derived from Jewish Apocalyptic. This fusion is already effected in the Apocalypse, and it is there connected with invasions of the Roman Empire from the Euphrates. Antioch, which was far more Jewish than Asia, and which would be first to feel the brunt if the Euphrates line was broken, would certainly be affected by such fears at an earlier date.²⁰²

4.3.1 Antioch after B.H. Streeter

(1) J.P. Meier (1983) agrees with Streeter, whom he calls 'the great champion of Antioch as the place of composition of the twentieth century',²⁰³ that 'the Church from which Matthew's Gospel came "must have been one of great influence, or the gospel would not have secured universal acceptance so soon."²⁰⁴ Moreover, he argues that this influential church could only be Antioch,²⁰⁵ based on the 'predominant' use of Greek in the city.²⁰⁶ In fact, the

²⁰⁰ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 511–16.

²⁰¹ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 516–17.

²⁰² Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 523.

²⁰³ Meier, "Antioch," 22 (n. 51). In spite of the complimentary tone, Meier 'does not [embrace] all of Streeter's theories'.

²⁰⁴ Meier, "Antioch," 21 (n. 45).

²⁰⁵ Following Kümmel, Brown, and Kingsbury, Meier ("Antioch," 22) considers Antioch 'the common view today'.

²⁰⁶ Meier, "Antioch," 22.

use of Greek language becomes a key criterion for Meier's rejection of the competing views.²⁰⁷ He goes so far as to eliminate all other locations in Syria, save for Antioch, based on this criterion.²⁰⁸ However, as was shown above, Meier's thesis (i.e., outside of the Antioch, Greek was not used in Syria) is not confirmed by the numerous Greek and bilingual inscription found west of the Euphrates,²⁰⁹ but only by the lack of Greek pre-Christian and Christian literature.²¹⁰

With regard to the content of Matthew's Gospel, Antioch had the largest Jewish population in Syria,²¹¹ which explains 'the Jewish tone of the gospel, with its echoes of Semitic usage, its interest in Jewish customs and rites, its Jewish mode of argumentation, its great concern over the Mosaic Law, its heavy emphasis on the fulfillment of prophecy, and its disputes with pharisaic Judaism'.²¹² At the same time, it sees the inclusion of the gentiles in a favourable light (Matt. 2.1–12; 8.5–13; 15.21–28; 27.54).²¹³ In the words of Meier, 'As a whole [...] Matthew's gospel reflects a meeting place and a melting pot of Jewish and Gentile influences. Antioch is a perfect location for this encounter and clash.'²¹⁴

Then, in the early church of Antioch, founded in the late 30s, there were disputes between the law-keeping party of James and the circumcision-free party of Paul (Gal. 2.11–14),²¹⁵ disputes that can be traced in the 'various strata of tradition that we find in Matthew's gospel'.²¹⁶ See, for instance, the editorial interventions by which Matthew modifies Mark (Matt. 16.12 and Mk. 8.21; Matt. 15.10–18 and Mk. 7.17; Matt. 21.43 and Mk. 12.11–12).²¹⁷ Moreover, the use of 'M' suggests an ambivalent view towards the mission to the gentiles

²⁰⁷ Meier, "Antioch," 18–22.

²⁰⁸ Meier, "Antioch," 21.

²⁰⁹ Brock, "Palmyrene Inscriptions," 12–25.

²¹⁰ Meier, "Antioch," 21.

²¹¹ Meier, "Antioch," 22. Also, C.H. Kraeling, "The Jewish Community at Antioch," *JBL* 51 (1932): 130–60; Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 249–58.

²¹² Meier, "Antioch," 23.

²¹³ Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:144: 'Matthew [...] breathes a Jewish atmosphere and yet looks upon the Gentile mission in a most favourable light.'

²¹⁴ Meier, "Antioch," 23.

²¹⁵ Meier, "Antioch," 22, 46–50.

²¹⁶ Meier, "Antioch," 23.

²¹⁷ Meier, "Antioch," 61.

(Matt. 2.1–12; 5.17–48; 10.5–6; 15.12–14, 24; 23.2–3; 28.18–20), an ambivalence that points to similar conflicts and disputes over this issue, in the Matthean community.²¹⁸

Furthermore, Meier follows Streeter to argue that ‘the special Petrine traditions preserved in the gospel and the special place Matthew gives Peter in his redaction’²¹⁹ favour also an Antiochene provenance. Similarly, the early use of the Gospel in Ignatius, which calls the written Gospel of Matthew ‘the Gospel’, shows that it was known and authoritative in Antioch from its earliest period.²²⁰ Since Antioch was its place of dissemination, to pose the composition to an unknown or obscure location ‘seems a useless complication of theories’.²²¹

Moreover, Meier answers the main objection against the Antiochene provenance, showing that ‘Paul’s heritage in Antioch was not completely lost’,²²² for ‘the practical results of Paul’s theology and Matthew’s theology are surprisingly similar’.²²³

Both advocate a universal mission without circumcision imposed on the Gentiles. Both make radical moral demands centered on radical love. Both advocate the need for some church order while disliking any hint of tyrannical domination. Even in theological views there is some general agreement. Both see the death-resurrection of Jesus as the pivotal eschatological event of salvation history. Both hold on to the revelation of God in Jewish history and the Jewish Scriptures, while exalting the definitive revelation brought by Jesus Christ. Both advocate a relatively high christology, which has its impact on their view of the church. If Paul and Matthew cannot be simplistically harmonized, neither can they be played off against each other.²²⁴

Meier also addresses a major objection against Antioch, which is of particular interest to our study:

²¹⁸ Meier, “Antioch,” 53–54.

²¹⁹ Meier, “Antioch,” 23–24.

²²⁰ Meier, “Antioch,” 25.

²²¹ Meier, “Antioch,” 25.

²²² Meier, “Antioch,” 63.

²²³ Meier, “Antioch,” 62. A similar view is defended (inter alia) by Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*, 153–170; Roger Mohrjang, *Matthew and Paul: A Comparison of Ethical Perspectives* (Cambridge: CUP, 2004), 7–47 (42–47), 126–32.

²²⁴ Meier, “Antioch,” 62. Also, Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:146 (n. 126): ‘Another objection might be this: Matthew shows no Pauline influence and there are significant differences between the First Gospel and Ignatius’ epistles. But (1) Paul may well have not succeeded in Antioch; (2) Ignatius was a Gentile, Matthew a Jew; and (3) Antioch ca. 100 may well have been a church in transition. See further Meier, *Antioch*. He reconstructs a credible history of early Antiochian Christianity that makes sense of the order, Paul—Matthew—Ignatius.’ Similarly, David A. deSilva, *An Introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, Methods and Ministry Formation* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2004), 238 (n. 11). Meier’s reconstruction is called a ‘magisterial treatment of the history of the Antioch church’.

the Matthean form of the eucharistic words at the Last Supper (Matt 26:26-29) as opposed to the form found in Paul (I Cor 11:23-26) and echoed in Luke (22:17-20). If Paul's form represents the form used in Antioch in the 40s, as J. Jeremias claims, why is it that in the 80s Matthew copies, with modifications, the form found in Mark?²²⁵

The answer to this question shall be the focus of the next chapter.

(2) Not all of Streeter's arguments are equally cogent,²²⁶ as Davies-Allison (1988) have shown.²²⁷ They rejected three of Streeter's arguments (7–9), yet considered the remaining six (1–6) to have 'considerable cumulative force'.²²⁸ To these six arguments, Davies-Allison added two further:

a) The author of the Gospel could have belonged to an Antiochene school of Jewish-Christian scribes, experts in the exegesis of the OT.²²⁹ Such scribal expertise is well attested and largely consistent in the later Antiochene church: Theophilus of Antioch (*ca.* 180); Lucian (*ca.* 300–315); Dorotheus (*ca.* 390–405).²³⁰ So, based on the noticed consistency of the exegetical methods, it could be traced back to the final decades of the first century CE, all the more as,

Around the time of Matthew, Antioch had a large Jewish population as well as a significant Jewish-Christian population (cf. Ignatius, *Phil.* 6:1; *Magn.* 10:3), and the city was known even among pagans as a centre of learning with an important library (cf. Cicero, *Archia* 3 §4). Thus first-century Antioch is a natural place to locate a document such as Matthew.²³¹

²²⁵ Meier, "Antioch," 25–26.

²²⁶ Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 56 (n. 277). Luz, for instance, refuted the fact that 'only in Antioch and Damascus does the official stater equal exactly two double drachmas'.

²²⁷ Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:143.

²²⁸ Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:144.

²²⁹ Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 124–42; Krister Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew* (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968); Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*, 3–27; Gundry, *Old Testament in Matthew*, 151–59.

²³⁰ Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:145.

²³¹ Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:145. Also, Meier, "Antioch," 23 (n. 54).

b) There are significant parallels between Lucian's recension of the Septuagint and Matthew's citations of the OT. Since Lucian used an earlier text, which may have been authoritative in Antioch, this could indicate that Matthew's Gospel was also written there.²³²

None of the arguments adduced by Davies-Allison actually strengthens the case for the Antiochene provenance. In my view, Sim's assessment is fair:

while there is no doubt that there are interesting parallels between the scribal activity of the Matthean community and the later Antiochene church, it is a long leap to postulate that the former was the antecedent of the latter. Much the same can be said of their second argument. The points of contact between Matthew and Lucian are suggestive, but one cannot infer from this that they were residents of the same city. The evidence of Lucian and the other later Antiochene scribes is no doubt consistent with placing Matthew in Antioch, but it does not necessarily do so.²³³

(3) D.C. Sim (1998) offers perhaps the most thorough review of all the arguments adduced by Streeter, 'in order to separate the chaff from the wheat'.²³⁴ After a careful examination, he finds strengths and weaknesses in most of them.²³⁵ (I will not revisit his points, since they have been mentioned extensively throughout this chapter.) Still, six of these arguments are still considered partially 'valid',²³⁶ even after the detection of their weaknesses. Similar to Davies-Allison, Sim considers Streeter's last two arguments (8–9) to be essentially weak, eventually rejecting them,²³⁷ while '[Streeter's] strongest argument is the Petrine connection,'²³⁸ followed by the 'important piece of evidence produced by Streeter [...] that the success of the Gospel must have been accomplished by the backing of a major eastern church.'²³⁹ Based on these two arguments, Sim concludes: 'These two arguments alone, even without the support of the others

²³² Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:145. Cf. Stendahl, *School of St. Matthew*, 38–39, 69–72; Gundry, *Old Testament in Matthew*, 18–28.

²³³ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 58.

²³⁴ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 55–57 (55).

²³⁵ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 55–57.

²³⁶ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 58. Sim only enumerates eight arguments, treating Ignatius and the *Didache* as one. Cf. Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 504–11.

²³⁷ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 57.

²³⁸ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 58.

²³⁹ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 59.

presented by Streeter and Davies and Allison, are sufficient in themselves to confer some substantial degree of probability on this location.²⁴⁰

(4) M. Slee (2003) does not bring any new arguments to defend the Antiochene hypothesis, yet she helpfully identifies and summarizes the six arguments that most scholars who favour Antioch would accept: 1) the testimonies of Papias and Irenaeus show that the Gospel was believed to have originated in the East; 2) the Gospel was originally anonymous, so its early spread and acceptance could be explained by the influential and mission-oriented church that stood behind its text; this church was not Jerusalem, since the Gospel was composed in Greek, after the 70s CE; 3) the Gospel contains both positive and negative statements in regard to the mission to the gentiles, which indicates conflicts and disputes over this issue inside the Matthean community; 4) the Jewish character of the text also points to Antioch, a city that was predominantly Gentile, yet had a very large Jewish population; 5) Peter is given an important role in the Gospel, which accords well with the apostle's status and influence in Antioch (Gal. 2.11–14); according to the later traditions, he was the first bishop of Antioch (e.g., Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.36.2; Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 6);²⁴¹ 6) Ignatius of Antioch only knew one 'gospel', and that was the Gospel of Matthew.²⁴²

As this brief history of post-Streeter scholarship shows, the six arguments summarized by Slee and accepted by Meier, Davies-Allison, Sim (with reservations), and others constitute a scholarly consensus today. Nine decades after Streeter, these are the six arguments that have stood the test of time. To these six arguments, I would add a seventh.

²⁴⁰ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 59.

²⁴¹ According to the Pseudo-Clementines, Peter's 'cathedra' was in Antioch. See Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 57 (n. 208).

²⁴² Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 119–22.

4.3.2 Matthew and the Didache: Two documents from the same Jewish-Christian milieu

I have already noted the close connection between Matthew and the *Didache*,²⁴³ a connection that Streeter himself recognized.²⁴⁴ However, when Streeter published his study (1930), the *Didache* scholarship was still young.²⁴⁵ Back in those days, for instance, Jan Greyvenstein (1919) was the only scholar to suggest that the *Didache* was composed in Antioch.²⁴⁶ As for Streeter, we have seen, he suggested that the *Didache* ‘arose somewhere in Syria or Palestine [...] not later than A.D. 100’.²⁴⁷ Today the situation is rather different. After over a hundred and thirty years of research, the Antiochene provenance of the *Didache* is widely accepted.²⁴⁸ There is also the growing consensus that the two writings ‘evolved’ together, since the *Didache* inserts material from both pre-Matthean sources and the written Gospel in its final form.²⁴⁹ Therefore, the complex literary connections between the two writings has led an international group of fifty-five scholars of related fields (NT, early Christianity, Second Temple Judaism, Patristic studies, liturgical studies) to conclude that

²⁴³ Jonathan A. Draper, “Conclusion: Missing Pieces in the Puzzle or Wild Goose Chase? A Retrospect and Prospect,” in Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford (eds.), *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity* (ECL 14; Atlanta: SBL, 2015), 534–36.

²⁴⁴ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 508–11.

²⁴⁵ See Fernand Cabrol, Henri Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d’archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* (vol. 4/1; Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1920), 794–98.

²⁴⁶ Clayton N. Jefford, “Locating the *Didache*,” *FF* 3/1 (2014): 49–59 (53).

²⁴⁷ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 507.

²⁴⁸ Cf. Clayton N. Jefford, “Introduction: Dynamics, Methodologies, and Progress in *Didache* Studies,” in Draper-Jefford, *Didache*, 4–8.

²⁴⁹ Inter alia: Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 159–60, and *passim*; Jean-Paul Audet, *La Didachè: Instructions des apôtres* (Études Bibliques; Paris: Gabalda, 1958), 166–86; Willy Rordorf, “Does the *Didache* Contain Jesus Tradition Independently of the Synoptic Gospels?,” in Henry Wansbrough (ed.), *Jesus and the Oral Synoptic Tradition* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 394–423; André Tuilier, “La Didachè et le problème synoptique,” in Clayton N. Jefford (ed.), *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission* (NovTSup 77; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), 111–20; Jonathan A. Draper, “The Jesus Tradition in the *Didache*,” in Jonathan A. Draper (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research* (AGJU 37; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), 72–91; Christopher M. Tuckett, “Synoptic Tradition in the *Didache*,” in Draper, *Didache in Modern Research*, 92–128; Vicky Balabansky, *Eschatology in the Making: Mark, Matthew and the Didache* (SNTSMS 97; Cambridge: CUP, 1997), 183.

Matthew and the *Didache* originated ‘from the same Jewish-Christian milieu’,²⁵⁰ which most probably was Antioch (2003).

Consequently, I suggest that the *Didache* should become the seventh argument for Antioch. As the history of scholarship indicates, not many NT scholars have seriously considered this argument. Meier, for instance, thinks that ‘it is impossible to place [the final form of the *Didache*] at Antioch in Syria.’²⁵¹ As for Slee, although she argues convincingly for the Antiochene provenance of the *Didache*, she does not use the data in order to defend the similar provenance of Matthew, which she considers to be later than the *Didache*.²⁵²

On the other hand, following the influential work of J.-P. Audet (1958),²⁵³ the *Didache* scholars have extensively used the Gospel of Matthew to argue for the Antiochene origin of the *Didache*.²⁵⁴ In fact, 1) the Antiochene origin of Matthew’s Gospel and 2) the close and complex literary relationship between Matthew and the *Didache*, are considered among the strongest arguments for the Antiochene origin of the *Didache*.²⁵⁵ So, is it possible to use the *Didache* to argue for the Antiochene origin of Matthew’s Gospel, while avoiding a circular argument?

In my view, there is such a possibility. As I will show in the next chapters, that argue for the Antiochene origin of the *Didache*, if the important argument regarding the close and complex relationship between Matthew’s Gospel and the *Didache* is removed, there is still enough evidence to point out the following: 1) the *Didache* was universally believed to have originated in the East (*Did.* 9.4);²⁵⁶ 2) the *Didache* is anonymous (*Did.* 1.1), so its spread and

²⁵⁰ Huub van de Sandt (ed.), *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005); Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen K. Zangenberg (eds.), *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings* (Atlanta: SBL, 2008).

²⁵¹ Meier, “Antioch,” 83.

²⁵² Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 55–57, 118–22.

²⁵³ Audet, *Didachè*, 166–86.

²⁵⁴ Jefford, “Locating the *Didache*,” 59–66.

²⁵⁵ Jefford, “Locating the *Didache*,” 59–62.

²⁵⁶ Inter alia: Adolf von Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius* (2 vols.; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1893–1897), 2/1:431; Rudolf Knopf, *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel. Die zwei Clemensbriefe* (HNT/AV 1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1920), 3; Gregory Dix, “Didache and Diatessaron,” *JTS* 34 (1933): 242–50 (249);

acceptance could be explained by the influential mission-oriented church that stood behind its text (see Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.25.4–6; Athanasius, *Ep. fest.* 39.7; *Ap. Const.* 7.1.2–7.32.4);²⁵⁷ also, this church had to be outside the Jewish territories, since the *Didache* was composed in Greek;²⁵⁸ 3) the Jewish character of the text and its concern for the integration of the Gentiles (*Did.* 1.1–6.3) also point to Antioch, a city that was predominantly Gentile, yet had a very large Jewish population;²⁵⁹ 4) there are Petrine influences in the eucharistic prayers that were used by this church (see *Did.* 9.1–5);²⁶⁰ 5) most probably Ignatius of Antioch knew the *Didache* from its earliest period.²⁶¹

If the Gospel of Matthew is removed from the six post-Streeter arguments, the remaining five still point to Antioch. Therefore, NT scholars should consider the data offered by the *Didache* studies and include this writing in their arguments for the Antiochene provenance of Matthew's Gospel.

4.4 Conclusion

When 'nothing of importance hangs on the decision'²⁶² of locating the Gospel of Matthew, scholars tend to leave the question open. For indeed, 'it is quite impossible to be fully persuaded on the issue at hand. We shall never know beyond a reasonable doubt where the autograph of

Johannes Quasten, *Patrology* (3 vols.; Utrecht/Antwerp: Spectrum, 1975), 1:37; Willy Rordorf, André Tuilier, *La Doctrine des douze apôtres (Didachè)* (SC 248; Paris: Cerf, 1998), 97–98; Klaus Wengst, *Didache (Apostellehre), Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Klemensbrief, Schrift an Diognet* (SUC 2; München: Kösel, 1984), 62. See the lengthier discussion in Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache: A Commentary* (trans., Linda M. Maloney; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 52–54.

²⁵⁷ Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 4–29, 228.

²⁵⁸ Philip Schaff, *The Oldest Church Manual, Called the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1885), 95–113.

²⁵⁹ Jonathan A. Draper, "Torah and Troublesome Apostles in the *Didache* Community," *NovT* 33/4 (1991): 347–372; Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity* (CRINT 3/5; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2002), 28–35, 238–70; Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 77–116.

²⁶⁰ William Varner, *The Way of the Didache: The First Christian Handbook* (Lanham: University Press of America, 2007), 91–94.

²⁶¹ Clayton N. Jefford, "Did Ignatius of Antioch Know the *Didache*?" in Jefford, *Didache in Context*, 330–51.

²⁶² Carson-Moo, *Introduction*, 152.

Matthew was completed.²⁶³ Or, in the words of Luz, ‘Where the Gospel was composed cannot be answered conclusively; the information on the subject is too meager.’²⁶⁴ On the other hand, when some exegetical or historical decisions depend upon the place of provenance, most scholars point to Antioch in Syria; and that for a good reason.

Indeed, as Luz has noticed, ‘The numerous hypotheses all have in common that they are based on very weak arguments’,²⁶⁵ including the Antiochene hypothesis. Still, Luz continues and states: ‘However, the arguments against Antioch are no more convincing’.²⁶⁶ In my view, all the arguments against Antioch are significantly weaker than the arguments in its favour. In conclusion, although this hypothesis is inconclusive, I agree with Davies-Allison that Antioch is ‘the best educated guess’²⁶⁷ or with Sim that ‘the extant evidence we possess makes Antioch by far the most probable place where Matthew composed his Gospel’.²⁶⁸

Scholars would like to have more evidence, that could lead to a conclusive argument. In the lack of such evidence, ‘we are forced to work with the material we have, and Antioch is the best hypothesis in view of the evidence at our disposal.’²⁶⁹ Moreover, it is an entirely reasonable hypothesis.

²⁶³ Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:139.

²⁶⁴ Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 56.

²⁶⁵ Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 56–57.

²⁶⁶ Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 57.

²⁶⁷ Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:146.

²⁶⁸ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 62.

²⁶⁹ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 62 (n. 88).

CHAPTER 5

‘FOR THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS’:

MATTHEW, ANTIOCH, AND THE LAST SUPPER TRADITION

In the previous chapter, I argued that Syrian Antioch is the best and most reasonable hypothesis for the provenance of Matthew’s Gospel. Still, as J.P. Meier has noticed,¹ a solid argument against the Antiochene hypothesis concerns Matthew’s Last Supper tradition (Matt. 26.26–29).² If the Gospel of Matthew was composed in Antioch, why is it that Matthew follows Mark (cf. Mk. 14.22–25) and not the Antiochene form found in Paul (1 Cor. 11.23–25),³ as Luke—a contemporary of Matthew⁴—does (Lk. 22.14–20; cf. Mk. 14.22–25)?

Virtually all scholars admit the close connection between the accounts of Matthew (26.26–29) and Mark (14.22–25).⁵ Also, most of them limit their analysis to the similarities and the differences between the two accounts.⁶ Very few scholars, even of those who accept the Antiochene provenance, attempt to explain the connection between the Matthean form and

¹ John P. Meier, “Antioch,” in Raymond E. Brown and John P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (New York: Paulist Press, 2004), 25–26.

² I will refer to Matthew’s tradition as the ‘Last Supper’ (see Matt. 26.29), since there is no mention of a ‘Lord’s Supper’, as in Paul (cf. 1 Cor. 11.20). Moreover, the verb εὐχαριστέω (Matt. 26.27) is used non-technically, as a synonym of εὐλογέω (Matt. 26.26). See the ‘liturgical parallelism’ in W.D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (vol. 3; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 471–72. When the reference will be general, concerning two or more traditions, I will use the generic ‘eucharistic’.

³ Meier, “Antioch,” 25: ‘Paul’s form represents the form used in Antioch in the 40s.’

⁴ Jerome Kodell, *The Eucharist in the New Testament* (ZSNT; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1988), 93. Most scholars date the writing of Luke’s Gospel between the 60s and 75–85. See D.A. Carson and Douglas J. Moo, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005), 207–10.

⁵ *Contra* John M. Rist, *On the Independence of Matthew and Mark* (Cambridge: CUP, 2005), 85: ‘if these early versions were somewhat influenced by ritual use, that argues against Matthew taking his from Mark or vice versa.’

⁶ There are brief references to the Pauline-Lukan parallels, but not extended analyses. See (inter alia): D.A. Carson, “Matthew,” in Frank E. Gaebelien (ed.), *Matthew, Mark, Luke* (EBC 8; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 535–36; Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 14–28* (WBC 33B; Dallas: Word, 2002), 771–72; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 21–28: A Commentary* (trans., James E. Crouch; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 365; I. Howard Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord’s Supper* (Vancouver: Regent, 2006), 99; R.T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2007), 987–88; W.F. Albright and C.S. Mann, *Matthew: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AYBC; New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2008), 321; David L. Turner, *Matthew* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 625; Grant R. Osborne, *Matthew* (ZECNT; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 960.

the Pauline-Lukan.⁷ Therefore, it is the aim of this chapter 1) to further the discussion beyond the widespread Matthew-Mark comparison; and 2) to further the discussion even beyond the Matthean-Pauline-Lukan connection, by adding Peter into the context of a common location, which is considered to be Antioch.

5.1 Beyond Matthew and Mark: The literary connection, the ritual separation

Matthew's tradition of the Last Supper is taken from Mark.⁸ This is indisputable, as the following comparison shows:

Matt. 26.26–29

²⁶ Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον καὶ εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ δούς τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἶπεν, Λάβετε φάγετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. ²⁷ καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, ²⁸ τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. ²⁹ λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ πῖω ἀπ' ἄρτι ἐκ τούτου τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω μεθ' ὑμῶν καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου.

Mk. 14.22–25

²² Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν, Λάβετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. ²³ καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. ²⁴ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν. ²⁵ ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πῖω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

Given the resemblances of the two pericopae, D.A. Hagner is entitled to conclude that 'Matthew's relatively conservative preservation of his source attests to its importance to him.'⁹

And yet there are six 'substantive differences' in Matthew. Hagner summarizes the differences as follows:

⁷ Meier, "Antioch," 25–26. Surprisingly, M. Slee, *The Church in Antioch in the First Century C.E.: Communion and Conflict* (JSNTSup 244; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2003), 126–155, although follows the eucharistic themes in Antioch (Galatians—the *Didache*–Matthew), completely ignores the issue.

⁸ Following the dominant view in modern scholarship, I assume the Markan priority. See the classic argument of B.H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: Macmillan, 1930), 149–332. Also, R.T. France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2004), 24–49; W.D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (vol. 1; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 98–114. For the dependence of Matthew's Last Supper tradition upon Mark, see (for instance) R. Pesch, *Das Abendmahl und Jesu Todesverständnis* (QD 80; Freiburg: Herder, 1978), 24–25.

⁹ Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, 771. Also, Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*, 99.

Three additions are made: φάγετε, “eat,” in v. 26, a natural addition, but the present pericope is the only eucharist narrative with this imperative (cf. Mark 14:22); εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, “for the forgiveness of sins,” in v. 28, implied in the preceding phrase, “poured out for many,” but made explicit only in Matthew (cf. 1:21); and μεφ’ ὑμῶν, “with you,” in v. 29, again unique to Matthew and recalling the reunion of Jesus with his disciples (cf. 24:31; 25:34). Matthew makes two significant alterations: he turns Mark’s statement that all drank from the cup (Mark 14:23) into an imperative, πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, “drink of it, all” (v. 27), thus bringing about parallelism with the imperative “eat” (v. 26) no doubt through liturgical influence; second, he changes Mark’s reference to τῆ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, “the kingdom of God,” at the very end of the pericope (Mark 14:25) to τῆ βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς μου, “the kingdom of my Father” (v. 29; cf. a similar expression in 13:43). One omission may also be noted, that of Mark’s ἀμὴν, “truly” (Mark 14:25), in v. 29, which thereby avoids the common formula (but it is difficult to know why). Other alterations of the Markan text are small and insignificant.¹⁰

In the following section, I will attempt to distinguish more clearly between the redactional interventions of Matthew and the variations already present in the pre-Matthean material inserted in Matt. 26.26–29. For now, I will keep the matter open (and ambiguous) and simply introduce three of the differences, that are particularly important at this point in the study,¹¹ as I seek to establish the ‘ritual’ character of the Matthean form: 1) the addition of the imperative φάγετε (‘eat’), in Matt. 26.26;¹² 2) the alteration of the descriptive καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες (‘and they all drank from it’; Mk. 14.23), into the prescriptive or imperative πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες (‘drink from it, all of you’; Matt. 26.27), ‘bringing about parallelism with the imperative “eat” (v. 26)’;¹³ 3) the omission of Mark’s ἀμὴν (14.25), ‘which thereby avoids the common formula’¹⁴ (cf. Matt. 26.29).

Hagner believes that the first two alterations were made ‘no doubt through liturgical influence’.¹⁵ As for the omission of ἀμὴν in Matt. 26.29, it remains a puzzle for him: ‘it is

¹⁰ Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, 771.

¹¹ Some of the variations in Matthew’s account will be discussed below (§ 5.2).

¹² As Hagner (*Matthew 14–28*, 771) notes, ‘the present pericope is the only eucharist narrative with this imperative’.

¹³ Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, 771.

¹⁴ Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, 771.

¹⁵ Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, 771. Similarly, Luz, *Matthew 21–28*, 365: ‘Changes based on the church’s liturgy might be the imperative “eat” (φάγετε) and the parallel “drink” (πίετε), which has been reformulated to an imperative. Thus the liturgist invites the congregation to eat and drink.’ Also, H. Patsch, *Abendmahl und historischer Jesus* (CThM A1; Stuttgart: Calwer, 1972), 69–70; Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), 111–14 (113). For the view that the historical accounts of the Last Supper, in the synoptics, were replaced by liturgical traditions, see Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord’s Supper*, 34–35, 100.

difficult to know why'.¹⁶ Unlike Hagner, D.A. Carson challenges the liturgical influence on Matthew's tradition, stating:

Matthew is usually judged more 'liturgical' (Lohmeyer, Stendahl, Hill). This, though possible, is no more than a guess; we know almost nothing about first-century liturgy, and the variations are no more revealing in this regard than variations between Mark and Matthew in 'nonliturgical' sections [...] Appeal to liturgical influence is commonplace in current NT scholarship, and therefore the frequent assumption of such influence lends credibility to the claim; but it is in urgent need of re-examination. There may have been considerable diversity in the formulations used in church worship even *within each congregation*, as today in many non-liturgical denominations. Once again we must confess that our sources are inadequate for a confident conclusion.¹⁷

In my view, it is precisely Matthew's omission of ἀμήν (26.29) that could have strengthened Hagner's case for the 'liturgical influence'. It should be noted that the phrase ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν is typical of Matthew (5.18, 26; 6.2, 5, 16; 8.10; 10.15, 23, 42; 11.11; 13.17; 16.28; 17.20; 18.3, 13, 18; 19.23, 28; 21.21, 31; 23.36; 24.2, 34, 47; 25.12, 40, 45; 26.13; esp. 26.21, 34). Moreover, when Matthew follows Mark closely, the phrase ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν is commonly inserted (cf. Matt. 10.15 and Mk. 6.11; Matt. 10.42 and Mk. 9.41; Matt. 16.28; Mk. 9.1; Matt. 18.3 and Mk. 10.15; Matt. 23.36, 24.34 and Mk. 13.30; Matt. 26.13 and Mk. 14.9), including the insertions of the Last Supper narrative (cf. Matt. 26.21 and Mk. 14.18; Matt. 26.34 and Mk. 14.30). If these aspects are considered, then the omission of ἀμήν in Matt. 26.29 seems peculiar. In the words of Luz, 'The omission of his favorite "amen" in v. 29 can hardly be attributed to Matthew.'¹⁸ So, I suggest the most probable explanation for this omission is the 'ritual' influence, to amend Hagner and others. As I noticed in one of the previous chapters, the use of the term 'liturgical' may be anachronistic for a first-century setting, as Carson implies. A better term would be 'ritual'. If, according to the ritual of certain church that was known to Matthew,¹⁹ the pre-Matthean tradition was followed by a closing ἀμήν (cf. Did.

¹⁶ Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, 771.

¹⁷ Carson, "Matthew," 535–36. Carson follows (inter alia): H. Schürmann, *Einer quellenkritischen Untersuchung des lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes*, Lk 22,7–38, vol. 2: *Der Einsetzungsbericht*, Lk 22,19–20 (NA 20/4; Münster: Aschendorff, 1955), 2–7; Pesch, *Abendmahl*, 24–25; D. Senior, *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990), 64–71.

¹⁸ Luz, *Matthew 21–28*, 365.

¹⁹ In the next section, I will attempt to argue that this church is Antioch. See below (n. 22).

10.6),²⁰ then its omission in Matt. 26.29 would make perfect sense. If this point is correct, then there are in some sense two sources behind Matthew's account; not one, as scholars usually assert:²¹ 1) the highly predominant Markan source; 2) certain ritualistic snippets of a community yet unknown.²²

Other arguments for the ritual character of the Matthean or pre-Matthean²³ form concern the 'familiar liturgical sequence [of the verbs]'²⁴ or the 'eucharistic language',²⁵ the internal structure of the tradition (Matt. 26.26–28a),²⁶ and the individualization of Jesus' words and actions.²⁷ As Ulrich Luz notes,

v. 26 and vv. 27–28a—that is, the bread and cup sections—are almost exactly parallel. Only the ending of the cup saying, v. 28b, breaks the symmetry. Formally the entire text is a rather strict 'report.' It tells only what Jesus does and says. It is not said that the disciples ate the bread and drank from the cup nor how the disciples reacted to Jesus' words. That makes it easier for the readers to relate Jesus' commands to their own church practice [...] Is Matt 26:26–29 primarily a report about a past event in the passion of Jesus or the founding report of the church's Lord's Supper celebrated in the present? Of course, the verses depict an episode from Jesus' passion story. However, the Matthean story of Jesus is basically transparent for the present. What makes that especially clear in our text is that the entire emphasis lies on the words of Jesus. The elements of the report limit themselves almost solely to the previous situation in which Jesus speaks the words that are constitutive for every celebration of the Lord's Supper in the church.²⁸

²⁰ For the probability of a final 'Amen', see Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 109–10.

²¹ See (for instance) the perceptible contradiction of John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2005), 1085: 'There is nothing to suggest a second source, but the early Christian liturgical practice of reenacting in its Eucharistic practice the core part of the Last Supper means that the form of this reenactment with which Matthew was familiar may have influenced his reproduction of the Markan material.'

²² See above (n. 19).

²³ According to Kodell (*Eucharist*, 97) most of the variations found in Matt. 26.26–29 were already present in the tradition the evangelist quotes. I will return to this point later (§ 5.2.3).

²⁴ France, *Gospel of Matthew*, 988.

²⁵ France, *Gospel of Matthew*, 988: 'The four verbs concerning the bread ("took," "blessed," "broke," "gave") which we have seen repeated carefully in the accounts of the feeding miracles in 14:19 and 15:36 represent a familiar liturgical sequence, and the further verb "gave thanks" (as in 15:36) associated with "took" and "gave" in relation to the wine completes the range of eucharistic language.'

²⁶ G.D. Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy: The Moorhouse Lectures 1975* (Cambridge: CUP, 2008), 10: 'Matthew changes the last clause to direct speech "and gave it to them saying: "All of you drink of it."' This change brings the text on the cup into line with that on the bread, "Take, eat", and is an instance of the tendency to conform the two parts of the narrative into line with each other.' Cf. Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 3:471–72, who illustrate the '(liturgical?) parallelism between vv. 26 and 27'.

²⁷ Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*, 100.

²⁸ Luz, *Matthew 21–28*, 383.

As I have shown previously, the ‘universalization’ of the eucharistic tradition also appears in Paul (1 Cor. 11.23–25) and Luke (22.17–20),²⁹ in which the alteration of the pronoun ‘they’ (with reference to Jesus’ disciples) is more pronounced than in Matthew.³⁰ In this regard, the Matthean form appears to be ritualistically less developed (cf. Matt. 26.26; 1 Cor. 11.23).

The same is true in regard to Matt. 26.29 (cf. Mk. 14.25): λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ πίω ἄπ’ ἄρτι ἐκ τούτου τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω μεθ’ ὑμῶν καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου. There is no explicit reference to the repetition of the rite, as in 1 Cor. 11.24–25 and Lk. 22.17–19 (τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν), but only to the final earthly participation of Jesus.³¹ However, Luz, following Klaus Berger,³² may be correct to assume that ‘we must probably designate it [i.e., the Matthean tradition] form-critically as a cult etiology’.³³ Moreover, there is the addition of the Matthean μεθ’ ὑμῶν (‘with you’) in Matt. 26.29 (cf. 1.23; 18.20; 28.20), which scholars such as Luz³⁴ and J.T. Pennington³⁵ relate to the ‘ecclesiological’ Matt. 18.20, thus implying a continuous fellowship of the meal, until the full consummation of the βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς μου.³⁶ According to Kodell, this reading might be confirmed by the replacement of the Markan οὐκέτι (‘no more, no longer’; Mk. 14.25) with the Matthean ἄπ’ ἄρτι (‘from now on’; Matt. 26.29):

²⁹ See above (§ 3.2.2.1).

³⁰ Andreas Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief* (HNT 9/I; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 253–54.

³¹ Cf. Brant Pitre, *Jesus and the Last Supper* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2015), 482–97.

³² Klaus Berger, *Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments* (Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1984), 330–31. For a recent critique of the form criticism (*Formgeschichte*), see: C.M. Tuckett, “Form Criticism,” in W.H. Kelber and S. Byrskog (eds.), *Jesus in Memory: Traditions in Oral and Scribal Perspectives* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009), 21–38; Eric Eve, *Behind the Gospels: Understanding the Oral Tradition* (London: SPCK, 2013), 27–32; M.F. Bird, *The Gospel of the Lord: How the Early Church Wrote the Story of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2014), 113–24; Richard J. Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2017), 13957–14141 [Kindle Locations].

³³ Luz, *Matthew 21–28*, 364. Also, Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 3:465; Osborne, *Matthew*, 966.

³⁴ Luz, *Matthew 21–28*, 382–83.

³⁵ Jonathan T. Pennington, “The Lord’s Supper in the Fourfold Witness of the Gospels,” in Thomas R. Schreiner and Matthew R. Crawford (eds.), *The Lord’s Supper: Remembering and Proclaiming Christ until He Comes* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Academic, 2010), 59–60.

³⁶ See also, Margaret Davies, *Matthew* (2nd ed.; Readings; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009), 209.

Matthew uses the phrase *ap arti* (from now on) in place of Mark's *ouketi* (no more): "I shall not drink *from now on* of this fruit of the vine until the day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom" (v 29). In Matthew, this expression is used to look forward to the time of the Church after the death and resurrection of Jesus (see 23:39), and here is probably meant to indicate the eucharistic banquet which is being eaten regularly in the Church to which he writes. The addition of "with you" is an emphasis in the same direction.³⁷

I would point to the fact that, even if the points above were valid,³⁸ the repetition of the rite is still far less explicit than in the Pauline and Lukan forms; therefore, it appears that Matthew's account is, again, ritualistically less developed.³⁹ In conclusion, I suggest that Matthew renders a tradition that is ritualistically superior to Mark (cf. Mk. 14.22–25),⁴⁰ but inferior to Paul and Luke (cf. 1 Cor. 11.23–25; Lk. 22.17–20). It is precisely this intermediary stage that makes the issue so puzzling. On the one hand, Matthew 26.26–29 renders a ritualistic form; on the other hand, he ignores the more ritualistic form, found in Antioch during the 40s.⁴¹ The attempt to explain this conundrum shall be the focus of the next section.

5.2 Beyond Matthew, Paul, and Luke: The Antiochene connection, the ritual separation

Let us return to the question that was posed at the beginning of the chapter: if Matthew's Gospel was composed in Antioch, why is it that Matthew follows Mark (cf. Mk. 14.22–25) and not the Antiochene form found in Paul (1 Cor. 11.23–25) and Luke (22.14–20)? In my view, there are at least⁴² three possible answers:

³⁷ Kodell, *Eucharist*, 102 (emphasis original).

³⁸ Pennington ("The Lord's Supper," 60), for instance, admits the risk of reading too much into the μεθ' ὑμῶν addition.

³⁹ For some scholars, the Pauline and Lukan forms are earlier than the Matthean form. Moreover, the community that composed the tradition of Matthew (26.26–29) might have known these earlier forms, and was already 'remembering' the words of institution in its rituals, so there was no need for the addition τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. For a brief discussion concerning the chronology of the four eucharistic traditions (Matt. 26.26–29; Mk. 14.22–25; Lk. 22.17–20; 1 Cor. 11.23–25), see Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 186–89; Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 3:466.

⁴⁰ For the 'liturgical' character of Mark 14.22–25, see Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 113. Cf. Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary on the Gospel of Mark* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 653.

⁴¹ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 188.

⁴² I will discuss other possible scenarios in the final chapter.

5.2.1 Several churches, several traditions

Ulrich Luz, among other scholars, offers what is probably the simplest answer: at the time of the Gospel of Matthew's composition, in Antioch there were several churches.⁴³ This is indeed possible, as the letters of Paul attest to the existence of several house-churches in the larger cities,⁴⁴ such as Rome (Rom. 16.3–15),⁴⁵ Corinth (1 Cor. 16.15, 19),⁴⁶ Ephesus (1 Cor. 16.9; cf. Acts 18.18–19, 24–26),⁴⁷ Colossae (Phlm. 1.2),⁴⁸ and Laodicea (Col. 4.15).⁴⁹ Since Antioch was the third largest city in the Roman Empire (Josephus, *J.W.* 3.2.4.29),⁵⁰ there could have been several locations where Christians met (cf. Acts 11.25;⁵¹ Ignatius, *Smyrn.* 6.1, 8.2; *Phil.* 4.1).⁵² Note the assumption of Luz:

⁴³ Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1–7: A Commentary* (trans., James E. Crouch; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 57.

⁴⁴ E.g., Gerhard Delling, "Zur Taufe von 'Häusern' im Urchristentum," *NovT* 7 (1965): 306–11; Wayne E. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 75–77.

⁴⁵ James D.G. Dunn, *Romans 9–16* (WBC 38B; Dallas: Word, 2002), 887, 893.

⁴⁶ Robert Banks, *Paul's Idea of Community: The Early House Churches in Their Cultural Setting* (rev. ed.; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), 164–65; Richard A. Horsley, "Paul's Assembly in Corinth: An Alternative Society," in Daniel N. Schowalter and Steven J. Friesen (eds.), *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth: Interdisciplinary Approaches* (HTS 53; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005), 394: 'the movement in Corinth and Ephesus, at least, took the form of sub-assemblies based in particular households (e.g., of Prisca and Aquila, or of Stephanas: Rom 16:5; 1 Cor 16:15, 19). That Paul makes a distinction between these smaller groups and "the whole assembly" suggests that the household-based "assemblies" functioned separately in some respects.'

⁴⁷ Pheme Perkins, *First Corinthians* (Paideia; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 202; Paul Trebilco, *The Early Christians in Ephesus from Paul to Ignatius* (WUNT 166; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 589–90.

⁴⁸ Eduard Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon: A Commentary on the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 190.

⁴⁹ Lohse, "Colossians," 174.

⁵⁰ Wayne A. Meeks and R.L. Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era* (SBL; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), 1. Meeks-Wilken estimate that Antioch was 'one of the three or four most important cities in the Roman Empire'. See § 1.1 (n. 2).

⁵¹ Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1998), 370 (n. 21): 'The verb συναχθῆναι could mean they were entertained or were the guests of the Antioch church for a year.' But could the verb imply the existence of a house-church in Antioch? See also Warren Carter, *Households and Discipleship: A Study of Matthew 19–20* (JSNTSup 103; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 9: 'In [Matt.] 19–20 the audience encounters a series of pericopes which employ the four standard subjects of household codes: the rule of husband over wife, of father over children, of master over slave, and the task of acquiring wealth. This pattern, though, is employed only to be subverted [...] The audience thus hears a proposal for an alternative household pattern which contrasts with the conventional hierarchical household patterns of late first-century Antiochene society.' Again, could this household pattern indicate the existence of house-churches in Antioch? Unfortunately, we are left with the two questions, as the evidence is very slim.

⁵² The letters of Ignatius (e.g., *Smyrn.* 6.1, 8.2; *Phil.* 4.1) seem to imply the existence of various house churches in Antioch, holding different Eucharists. See William R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 240; Paul F. Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins* (ACC 80; London: SPCK, 2004), 88.

Antioch was a large metropolis which did not even have a central synagogue, much less a central point of assembly for Christians. It is highly conceivable that there were many house churches in Antioch with little contact between them.⁵³

Consequently, there could have been several eucharistic traditions, according to the ritual of each location. If Luz's thesis is correct, then the Matthean (26.26–29), and Pauline (1 Cor. 11.23–25) or Lukan (22.17–20) traditions could have been used concurrently, yet in different locations.

5.2.2 Singular church, several traditions

Like many other scholars, I find J.P. Meier's historical reconstruction to be credible.⁵⁴ Framing a history of the early church of Antioch that would make sense of the order Paul/Peter-Matthew-Ignatius, Meier argues that writings such as Galatians (2.11–14), Acts (11.26–27; 13.1; 14.26; 15.22–23, 30, 35; 18.22–23), Gospel of Matthew (16.18; 18.15–20), and the letters of Ignatius (*Phild.* 10.1; *Smyrn.* 11.1; *Pol.* 7.1; cf. *Rom.* 2.2) imply the existence of a singular church, and not 'a number of different, organized churches existing side by side in the same place.'⁵⁵ Still, he admits that this church (sg.) held, at times, separate meals, including the eucharistic meals (cf. Gal. 2.11–14).⁵⁶

As was shown above, D.A. Carson suggested that there was 'considerable diversity in the formulations [of the eucharistic tradition] used in church worship *even within each congregation*'.⁵⁷ Unfortunately, considering the 'sources [to be] inadequate for a confident

⁵³ Ulrich Luz, *Theology of the Gospel of Matthew* (NTT; Cambridge: CUP, 1995), 147. For Luz, the lack of a central synagogue in Antioch is the decisive argument for the existence of Christian house-churches. See Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 57 (n. 282): 'Almost certainly there were different Christian house churches [...] Unlike Alexandria, there also was no central synagogue.' Also, Magnus Zetterholm, *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch: A Social-Scientific Approach to the Separation Between Judaism and Christianity* (London/New York: Routledge, 2003), 37–38 (38): 'there is enough substance in the reasoning to support the view of the existence, during the first century CE, of twenty to thirty synagogues in Antioch.'

⁵⁴ E.g., Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:146 (n. 126); David A. deSilva, *An Introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, Methods and Ministry Formation* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2004), 238 (n. 11).

⁵⁵ Meier, "Antioch," 13–14; Thomas A. Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch and the Parting of the Ways: Early Jewish-Christian Relations* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009), 79.

⁵⁶ Meier, "Antioch," 40.

⁵⁷ Carson, "Matthew," 536 (emphasis original).

conclusion’, Carson offers no evidence for his claim, but only a reference to the present-day situation: ‘as today in many non-liturgical denominations’.⁵⁸ However, if Meier’s assumption is correct—i.e., that the church of Antioch held, at times, separate eucharistic meals—the periods of separation could have facilitated the consecration of several eucharistic traditions. For instance, the ‘liberal’ party of Paul could have continued to use the tradition taught by the apostle (1 Cor. 11.23–25), while the ‘conservative’ party of James or the ‘middle/mediatory’ party of Peter could have adopted different traditions.⁵⁹ Of course, this is no more than a supposition.⁶⁰

Furthermore, since neither Matthew nor Luke followed the Markan tradition, although they had direct access to it, this indicates a certain degree of ritual fluidity, during the first decades of the Christian era.⁶¹ For both authors appear more interested in preserving the traditions of some local communities, than to securing a singular tradition, from a presumably Jerusalemite source.⁶² A similar mixture of fluidity and co-existence is indicated by the two eucharistic prayers of the *Didache* (*Did.* 9.1–10.6). According to these prayers, the church of Antioch adopted a new eucharistic tradition (*Did.* 9.1–5), but also kept the previous tradition (*Did.* 10.1–6).⁶³ Moreover, the charismatic itinerants that visited the community are allowed to alter or even replace the two eucharistic prayers, and ‘introduce the Eucharist as they wish’: τοῖς δὲ προφήταις ἐπιτρέπετε εὐχαριστεῖν ὅσα θέλουσιν (*Did.* 10.7).⁶⁴ Similarly, since the

⁵⁸ See Carson, “Matthew,” 535–36.

⁵⁹ So, Meier, “Antioch,” 36–44.

⁶⁰ In the following section (§ 5.2.3), I will attempt to argue for a Petrine eucharistic tradition, in Antioch.

⁶¹ See especially Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins*, 1–15; Paul F. Bradshaw and Maxwell E. Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies: Their Evolution and Interpretation* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2012), 1–24. Bradshaw argues for the ‘diversity’ (or ‘variety’) of the ‘eucharistic liturgies’, from the earliest stages of Christianity. See also Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 186–87.

⁶² Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 186–203; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AYBC 28B; New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2008), 1393–95.

⁶³ See below (§ 7.1.4).

⁶⁴ Most scholars today argue that the section 9.1–10.6 belongs to the first layer of the *Didache*, and place it between 50–70 CE. See (for instance) Alan J.P. Garro, *The Gospel of Matthew’s Dependence on the Didache* (JSNTSS 254; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 10–12. See the lengthier discussion in chapters 6 and 7.

prophets and teachers of Antioch were still ‘charismatic figures’ (cf. Acts 13.1–3), Meier concludes that they probably used various formulations of the words of institution:

it is questionable whether we should suppose that in the second decade of Christianity (the 40s) the Antiochene church or any other Christian group knew and used one and only one formulation of the words of institution. A number of forms might well have circulated in the missionary church at Antioch during the first generation [...] But even in Matthew’s church we probably should not suppose that the prophets and teachers—still charismatic figures—always used exactly the same formulation of the words of institution.⁶⁵

Given the data above, a ‘confident conclusion’ regarding the existence of various eucharistic traditions within the same community may not be possible, after all. Still, the evidence is much stronger than Carson admits.

5.2.3 Singular church, singular tradition

I have suggested above that some of the variations that appear in the pre-Matthean tradition inserted in Matt. 26.26–29 are the outcome of a community known to Matthew, yet unknown to us. But is it possible to show that this community was located in Antioch? In the following, I will attempt to answer this question, following a scenario not yet considered by scholars.

Up to this point, I have left ambiguous the matter of distinguishing between the redactional interventions of Matthew and the variations already present in the pre-Matthean material.⁶⁶ So, I will now return to the six ‘substantive differences’ identified by Hagner.⁶⁷ First of all, I am in agreement with Kodell⁶⁸ and Luz, who argue that most of these variations are pre-Matthean. As Luz notes,

Changes based on the church’s liturgy might be the imperative “eat” (φάγετε) and the parallel “drink” (πίετε), which has been reformulated to an imperative. Thus the liturgist invites the congregation to eat and drink. “This” (τούτου) in v. 29 might also have a liturgical character; in the liturgy one can refer to the cup. The omission of his favorite “amen” in v. 29 can hardly be attributed to Matthew. “For the

⁶⁵ Meier, “Antioch,” 26.

⁶⁶ See above (§ 5.1).

⁶⁷ Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, 771.

⁶⁸ Kodell, *Eucharist*, 97.

forgiveness of sins” in v. 28 is difficult to explain. Although the addition corresponds completely to the Matthean understanding that Christ and the church are authorized to forgive sins, it is just as conceivable that Matthew’s statements about the forgiveness of sins have been suggested by the eucharistic liturgy used in his church.⁶⁹

For Luz, changes that may be attributed to Matthean redaction are: in v. 26, δέ, ὁ Ἰησοῦς, and μαθηταί;⁷⁰ in v. 27, λέγων; in v. 28, γάρ; in v. 29, δέ, ἀπ’ ἄρτι (cf. 23.39), μεθ’ ὑμῶν (cf. 1.23; 18.20; 28.20), and [τῆ βασιλεία τοῦ] πατρός μου⁷¹ (cf. 13.43; also, 7.21; 25.34).⁷²

For the scenario I am following, the most relevant ‘substantive difference’ is the addition of εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (Matt. 26.28), precisely the phrase that Luz finds ‘difficult to explain’. While Luz admits both scenarios, i.e., Matthean redaction and ‘eucharistic’ or ‘liturgical’ influence, I am inclined to argue for the latter. As J. Nolland has shown, ἄφεσις (‘forgiveness’) is a *hapax legomenon* in Matthew’s Gospel, while in the LXX the term does not mean ‘forgiveness’.⁷³ Hence, in my opinion, εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν may not be Matthean; and, since it is neither from the LXX, it could have originated in the creedal or ‘liturgical’/ritual formulations of early Christianity: Col. 1.14;⁷⁴ Lk. 24.47;⁷⁵ cf. Eph. 1.7 [τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων];⁷⁶ see also: Mk. 1.4; Lk. 3.3; Acts 2.38; 5.31; 10.43; 13.38. According to F.F. Bruce, the phrase could have been ‘standard Christian language [...] possibly in the form of a primitive confession of faith’.⁷⁷

⁶⁹ Luz, *Matthew 21–28*, 365.

⁷⁰ Cf. Kodell, *Eucharist*, 97; R.H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1994), 527–28.

⁷¹ I shall discuss this addition later and offer a nuanced view. See § 5.2.3 (2).

⁷² Luz, *Matthew 21–28*, 365 (n. 8).

⁷³ Nolland, *Matthew*, 1081 (n. 136).

⁷⁴ Jerry L. Sumney, *Colossians: A Commentary* (NTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008), 58.

⁷⁵ I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1978), 904: ‘Taylor, *Passion*, 114, is right in concluding that while “these are ideas congenial to Luke, in presenting them he is only underlining beliefs present in the primitive tradition”; this verdict is better founded than theories which essentially regard the section as a Lucan composition.’

⁷⁶ As Clinton Arnold observes, with reference to Eph. 1.7, ‘[the] noticeable shift of tenses away from the aorist, which Paul used to describe God’s past actions of blessing, to the present tense’ could also indicate the insertion of a creedal tradition. Clinton E. Arnold, *Ephesians* (ZECNT; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 85. Also, F.F. Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1984), 54.

⁷⁷ Bruce, “Colossians,” 54; Ernst Percy, *Die Probleme der Kolosser – und Epheserbriefe* (SHVL 39; Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1946), 85–86.

To strengthen the case for the creedal or ritual origin of εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν in Matt. 26.28, I will point to the fact that the phrase is previously omitted in Matt. 3.6 (cf. Mk. 1.4; Lk. 3.3). As scholars have noticed, Matthew omits the phrase in 3.6 in order to connect it to the death of Jesus (26.28), not to the baptism of John.⁷⁸ But the argument can be furthered: Matthew omits the phrase in 3.6 precisely because he knows of its existence in the ritual material—already in the use of his church, and yet to be rendered in his Gospel (26.28).⁷⁹ Consequently, I suggest the phrase εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν is ‘standard’, ritual, and pre-Matthean.⁸⁰ Moreover, most of the NT appearances of εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν⁸¹ are connected to rituals, namely baptism (Mk. 1.4; Lk. 3.3; Acts 2.38) and Eucharist (Matt. 26.28), and to creedal or kerygmatic formulae (e.g., Lk. 1.77;⁸² 24.47; Acts 5.31;⁸³ 10.43;⁸⁴ 13.38;⁸⁵ 26.18; Col. 1.14; cf. Eph. 1.7).

⁷⁸ Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord’s Supper*, 100; Daniel M. Gurtner, *The Torn Veil: Matthew’s Exposition of the Death of Jesus* (Cambridge: CUP, 2007), 134; F.W. Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew: A Commentary* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1981), 509: ‘the forgiveness of sins is not given in baptism, but is effected by Christ’s offering of his life in sacrifice.’ For a recent and extended analysis of this perspective, see Mothy Varkey, *Salvation in Continuity: Reconsidering Matthew’s Soteriology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2017). But note the ‘several cautions’ of Carson, ‘Matthew,’ 538.

⁷⁹ Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord’s Supper*, 100. Marshall (indirectly) assumes that Matthew knew about the subsequent addition of εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν in Matt. 26.28, when he omitted the phrase in 3.6.

⁸⁰ Cf. Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 173. Jeremias considers the phrase to be ‘a liturgical formula which perhaps stems from the baptismal rite’.

⁸¹ εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (with slight variations) appears 11 times in the NT. For a brief discussion on the phrase, see R.N. Longenecker, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2016), 500–501.

⁸² Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 93; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AB 28A; New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2008), 376, 386. For Marshall, ‘the phraseology is reminiscent of the apostolic preaching in Acts 4:10-12; 5:31f.; 13:38’. For Fitzmyer, it comes from a pre-Lukan ‘Jewish Christian source’.

⁸³ E. Plümacher, *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller* (SUNT 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 72; Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 42; Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1998), 232. Acts 5.30–32 renders a summary of Peter’s sermon from 2.22–40. So, the creedal source of 5.31 and 2.38 must be the same. Also, Darrell L. Bock, *Acts* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 244: ‘This material probably reflects tradition, even though Luke has presented it in his own way (Jervell 1998: 213).’ Similarly, Jacob Jervell, *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles* (NTT; Cambridge: CUP, 1996), 10: ‘We [...] have in the speeches elements from tradition.’

⁸⁴ Richard I. Pervo, *Acts: A Commentary on the Book of Acts* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009), 280, notes the ‘careless’ presence of ‘we’ (i.e., the ‘apostolic plural’) in Acts 10.39–43, that indicates a pre-Lukan apologetic tradition. Moreover, Pervo, *Acts*, 266, argues that the pre-Lukan sources of Acts 10 originated in Antioch (cf. Acts 10.9–16 and the dietary laws in Syrian Antioch). For a similar view, see Hans-Josef Klauck, *Magic and Paganism in Early Christianity: The World of the Acts of the Apostles* (trans., Brian McNeil; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 33–34.

⁸⁵ F.F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles* (3rd ed.; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1990), 263. For Bruce, both Acts 10.43 and 13.38 come from a pre-Lukan source, i.e., ‘basic gospel’. Similarly, C.K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (2 vols.; ICC; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 1:650:

To further this point, it should be noted that εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν could also have originated from the actual preaching/teaching of Peter (Acts 2.38; 5.31; 10.43),⁸⁶ not just from the 'primitive traditions' (rituals and creeds) of early Christianity.⁸⁷ While all the speeches in Acts show clear marks of Lukan redaction,⁸⁸ in reference to Acts 2.38, J.B. Polhill correctly notices that,

the usual connection of the forgiveness of sins in Luke-Acts is with repentance and not with baptism at all (cf. Luke 24:47; Acts 3:19; 5:31). In fact, in no other passage of Acts is baptism presented as bringing about the forgiveness of sins. If not linked with repentance, forgiveness is connected with faith (cf. 10:43; 13:38f.; 26:18).⁸⁹

In fact, the connection between the 'forgiveness of sins' and 'baptism' could be traced back to Mk. 1.4 (καὶ κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν), whom the author of Acts follows in Lk. 3.3 (κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν).⁹⁰ If we accept the traditional view that Peter was the source of Mark's Gospel (Papias, *Fragm.* 3.16),⁹¹ then the connection 'forgiveness of sins-baptism' appears to be a Petrinism (Mk. 1.4; Acts 2.38). As I mentioned above, scholars agree that this phrase represents 'standard Christian language [...] of a primitive confession of faith',⁹² but I suggest we could be more specific. Luke attributes the phrase three times to Peter's preaching (Acts 2.38; 5.31; 10.43),⁹³ giving the impression

'Paul's sermon agrees with Peter's, and Luke is probably following a preaching source.' Also, Pervo, *Acts*, 334. *Contra* B.W. Bacon, *The Story of St. Paul: A Comparison of Acts and Epistles* (Boston/New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1904), 103. Bacon argues that Paul's speech in the synagogue of Pisidian Antioch could not be authentic because it is too Petrine. Cf. Bruce, *Acts*, 35.

⁸⁶ So, Bruce, *Acts*, 263. Cf. Tom (N.T.) Wright, *Acts for Everyone*, Part 1: *Chapters 1–12* (London: SPCK, 2008), 167–68.

⁸⁷ C.H. Dodd, *History and the Gospel* (London: James Nisbet, 1938), 73. Cf. G.N. Stanton, *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching* (SNTSMS 27; Cambridge: CUP, 2004), 67–85 (80–81).

⁸⁸ Jervell, *Theology of Acts*, 10. For a comprehensive discussion concerning the speeches in Acts, including the detection of the Petrinisms and Paulinisms in the speeches, see Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*, vol. 1: *Introduction and Acts 1:1–2:47* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 258–319 (313–16). See also Stanton, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 70–84.

⁸⁹ John B. Polhill, *Acts* (NAC 26; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2001), 117.

⁹⁰ Marshall, *Luke*, 135.

⁹¹ For a recent defence of a Petrine perspective in the Gospel of Mark, see Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 4036–4506 [Kindle locations]. For the reliability of the testimony of Papias regarding Mark and Peter, see *Ibid.*, 515–981, 5076–5763 [Kindle locations].

⁹² Bruce, "Colossians," 54.

⁹³ See Bruce, *Acts*, 263; Jervell, *Theology of Acts*, 47–48.

that there is a certain connection between the two.⁹⁴ In my view, if the phrase εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν became a ‘standard [...] confession of faith’, it was especially because of its widespread and influential use by the apostles, such as Peter and Paul. Hence, I conclude that we could go back in time, before the pre-Lukan ‘primitive’ and ‘confessional’ language, to the even-earlier kerygmatic language of Peter—and probably Paul.⁹⁵

So, if the supposition that εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν could have been a Petrinism, both in Mk. 1.4 and in Acts 2.38, is true, could this be also true for Matt. 26.28 (cf. Matt. 3.6)? Unfortunately, any certainty is impossible. Yet there are a few points I suggest create a coherent picture:

(1) First, all the writers who use the phrase εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν could be connected to Antioch: Paul (Eph. 1.7; Col. 1.14; cf. Acts 13.38; 26.18),⁹⁶ Luke (Lk. 24.47; cf. Lk. 3.3), Peter (Mk. 1.4; Acts 2.38; 5.31; 10.43), and Matthew (Matt. 26.28).

(2) Then, as I have shown above, all of them use this phrase in the context of a ritual and creedal or kerygmatic tradition. Based on these two observations, I suggest that the pre-Matthean ritual tradition of Matt. 26.26–29 has also originated in Antioch, for it fits the pattern.

Two additional arguments could be adduced in favour of the Antiochene origin of the pre-Matthean tradition. Regrettably, both of them are inconclusive. As Senior,⁹⁷ Carson,⁹⁸ and

⁹⁴ In Acts 10.42–43, there is the explicit connection between the phrase εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (v. 43) and the apostolic preaching (v. 42). See I. Howard Marshall, *Acts: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC 5; Nottingham: InterVarsity Press, 1980), 205.

⁹⁵ Cf. Stanton, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 70–84.

⁹⁶ I consider the letters to Ephesians and Colossians to be Pauline. See (for instance) the detailed defence of Harold W. Hoehner et al., *Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 & 2 Thessalonians, Philemon* (Cornerstone 16; Carol Stream: Tyndale House, 2008), 2–13. But note R.P. Martin, “An Epistle in Search for a Life-Setting,” *ExpT* 79 (1968): 296–302, who argues for the Lukan redaction of Ephesians. If Martin is correct, then εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, in Eph. 1.7, could also be Lukan. A similar argument could be adduced for Col. 1.14 (cf. Eph. 5.19–6.9; Col. 3.13–25). However, regardless of the authorship, scholars largely agree that Eph. 1.7 and Col. 1.14 are primitive, pre-Pauline traditions. Cf. Martin, “An Epistle,” 300.

⁹⁷ Senior, *Passion in Matthew*, 64–71.

⁹⁸ Carson, “Matthew,” 536.

others have shown, all the variations of the Last Supper tradition (26.26–29) can be explained on redactional grounds, for similar alterations are made elsewhere in the Gospel.⁹⁹ So, given the consistency of the redactional interventions, scholars admit it is impossible to conclude whether the modifications of the Last Supper tradition came from the hand of Matthew or from the ritual of the church. Note Davies-Allison’s conclusion:

The main issue is whether Matthew’s alterations of the words of institution reflect liturgical usage or are rather purely redactional. Most commentators have thought the former. For it is reasonable to assume that when the evangelist came to the Lord’s Supper, a known liturgical piece, he reproduced the version known in his own religious services. Senior, however, has observed that all of the changes *can* be explained on redactional grounds: the sorts of modifications made in vv. 26–9 are made elsewhere. So we have the same question posed by 6:9–13: are the changes liturgical and so pre-Matthean or rather redactional? Unfortunately we have found no way to answer the question.¹⁰⁰

If the above scholars are correct, and all the differences are redactional (Matthean), then the Antiochene origin of the tradition results straightforwardly.¹⁰¹ However, as I have shown above, in my view, the arguments for a ritual influence are stronger than those for the redactional intervention.¹⁰² So, I suggest there could be another explanation for the consistency of the alterations acknowledged by these scholars. It might be so difficult to distinguish between the authorial redaction and the community ritual (cf. Matt. 6.9–13; 26.26–29) precisely because they intertwine. If Matthew’s redactional interventions were influenced by the language and the setting of the community, as scholars would agree,¹⁰³ just as the rituals were influenced in the same way (cf. Matt. 28.19; *Did.* 7.1),¹⁰⁴ then a distinction would indeed

⁹⁹ Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 3:455.

¹⁰⁰ Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 3:455.

¹⁰¹ If the Antiochene origin of Matthew’s Gospel is accepted.

¹⁰² I am following Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, 771 (for the alteration of the verbs), and Luz, *Matthew 21–28*, 365 (for the omission of ‘amen’). See also G.D. Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (Wauconda: Bolchazy-Carducci, 2007), 72–100 (77).

¹⁰³ For instance, Meier, “Antioch,” 41–42, 61; Allen Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Martyr Bishop and the Origin of Episcopacy* (London/New York: T&T Clark Continuum, 2007), 23–26.

¹⁰⁴ Jean-Paul Audet, *La Didachè: Instructions des apôtres* (Études Bibliques; Paris: Gabalda, 1958), 209; Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 127; Willy Rordorf, “Baptism According to the Didache,” in Jonathan A. Draper (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research* (AGJU 37; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), 212–22 (217–18). Helmut Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern* (TU 65; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957), 191. For Koester, the baptismal formula comes from the ‘praxis of the [Matthean] community’, not from the Gospel of Matthew, which the formula predates.

be difficult, if not impossible. So, I consider that the Antiochene community could have been the common source for the modifications of both its ritualistic language and some of the language of the Gospel of Matthew.¹⁰⁵

The second argument concerns the addition of [τῆ βασιλεία] τοῦ πατρὸς μου (Matt. 26.29; cf. Mk. 14.24: τῆ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ). While most scholars consider the addition to be Matthean,¹⁰⁶ Nolland correctly notices that ‘Matthew does not use “kingdom of my Father” elsewhere’.¹⁰⁷ Βασιλεία and πατήρ are indeed associated in 13.43 (ἐν τῆ βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν) and in 25.34 (οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρὸς μου, κληρονομήσατε τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου),¹⁰⁸ but are these associations enough to justify Matthew’s alteration of a phrase that is similar (τῆ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ [Mk. 14.24])?¹⁰⁹ Why would Matthew replace θεός with πατήρ?¹¹⁰

It is noteworthy that the eucharistic prayers of the *Didache* (*Did.* 9.1–10.6), which most scholars consider predate Matthew’s Gospel (*ca.* 50–70 CE),¹¹¹ only refer to θεός once (*Did.* 10.6); but the manuscript tradition of *Did.* 10.6 is highly problematic.¹¹² Moreover, *Did.* 10.1–

¹⁰⁵ In my opinion, there might have been certain communal influences on Matthew’s writing, but not as significant as Kilpatrick and Stendahl assume. See Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 124–39; K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew* (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968). Cf. D.A. Carson and Douglas J. Moo, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005), 151.

¹⁰⁶ Senior, *Passion in Matthew*, 70 (n. 31).

¹⁰⁷ Nolland, *Matthew*, 1085.

¹⁰⁸ Nolland, *Matthew*, 1085.

¹⁰⁹ Note (again) Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, 771: ‘Matthew’s relatively conservative preservation of his source attests to its importance to him.’

¹¹⁰ I don’t think Matthew uses πατήρ instead of θεός out of reverence (cf. Matt. 6.33; 12.28; 19.24; 21.31). See Thomas R. Schreiner, *New Testament Theology: Magnifying God in Christ* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 46: ‘It is quite unlikely that Matthew used the term “heaven” to avoid referring to God out of reverence, for he refers to God over fifty times elsewhere in the Gospel and actually uses “kingdom of God” on four occasions.’ See also Jonathan T. Pennington, *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew* (NovTSup 126; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2007), 2–3, 67–76.

¹¹¹ E.g., Audet, *Didachè*, 187–210; Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 10–12; Eugene LaVerdiere, *The Eucharist in the New Testament and the Early Church* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996), 135–38; Aaron Milavec, *The Didache: Faith, Hope & Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50–70 C.E.* (New York/Mahwah: Newman Press, 2003), xxii–xxxii; Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2003), 615; Nancy Pardee, *The Genre and Development of the Didache* (WUNT II/339; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 155–86 (184).

¹¹² Philotheos Bryennios, *Διδαχή τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροσολυμιτικοῦ χειρογράφου νῦν πρῶτον ἐκδιδομένη μετὰ προλεγόμενων καὶ σημειώσεων ἐν οἷς καὶ τῆς Συνόψεως τῆς Π. Δ., τῆς ὑπὸ Ἰωάνν. τοῦ Χρυσσοστόμου, σύγκρισις καὶ μέρος ἀνέκδοτον ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ χειρογράφου* (Constantinople: Voutyra, 1883), 38; Kurt Niederwimmer, ‘Textprobleme der Didache,’ *WS* 16 (1982): 114–30.

6, which is the older prayer, could be pre-Antiochene.¹¹³ Instead, the *πατήρ* language dominates the prayers (*Did.* 9.2, 3; 10.2), especially in the later section, which very likely was composed in Antioch (*Did.* 9.1–5).¹¹⁴ It is impossible to prove that the language of these eucharistic prayers influenced the pre-Matthean tradition or Matthew’s writing, but the relationship between *Did.* 9.1–5 and other pre-Matthean sources is certain (cf. *Did.* 9.5; Matt. 7.6).¹¹⁵ If my connection to *Did.* 9.1–5 is correct, then the addition of *τοῦ πατρὸς μου* (Matt. 26.29) could be pre-Matthean. It could still be Matthean, as most scholars assume. But, more importantly, it could be Antiochene.¹¹⁶

(3) Up to this point, I have suggested that the pre-Matthean ritual tradition (Matt. 26.26–29) could have originated in Antioch. But can we narrow the argument and suggest that it was—at least partially—Petrine? As virtually all scholars admit, there is no canonical Gospel to offer Peter a more prominent place than the Gospel of Matthew, Mark’s Gospel included.¹¹⁷ So, given the high status of Peter, both in the church of Antioch and also in his Gospel (cf. Matt. 16.17–19),¹¹⁸ I suggest Matthew omits the Petrine *εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν* in 3.6 (cf. Mk. 1.4) precisely because he has access to another tradition that would preserve the phrase, which the

¹¹³ E.g., J.W. Riggs, “From Gracious Table to Sacramental Elements: The Tradition-History of Didache 9 and 10,” *SecCent* 4/2 (1984): 83–102 (93); J.D. Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 361–64; Huub van de Sandt, “Was the Didache Community a Group Within Judaism? An Assessment on the Basis of its Eucharistic Prayers,” in Marcel Poorthuis and Joshua Schwartz (eds.), *A Holy People: Jewish and Christian Perspectives on Religious Communal Identity* (JCPS 12; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2006), 88. Since *Did.* 9.1–5 (the latter prayer) was most probably composed in Antioch, I tentatively call *Did.* 10.1–6 ‘pre-Antiochene’. Still, there are arguments that *Did.* 10.1–6 could also have been composed in Antioch. See the discussion in the next chapters (e.g., § 7.1.4.1).

¹¹⁴ See the arguments for the Antiochene provenance of *Did.* 9.1–5 in the next chapter (§ 6.2.1).

¹¹⁵ 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,” *VC* 56/3 (2002): 225–31.

¹¹⁶ So, Audet, *Didachè*, 209.

¹¹⁷ *Contra* Robert H. Gundry, *Peter: False Disciple and Apostate according to Saint Matthew* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2015). Virtually all scholars rejected Gundry’s main thesis, which is detectable from the very title of the monograph. For an extended discussion regarding the Matthean redaction of Mark’s Petrine sections, see M. Wilkins, *The Concept of Disciple in Matthew’s Gospel* (NovTSup 59; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1988), 175–209.

¹¹⁸ Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 28–29: ‘The author of Matthew’s proposed solution [to the internal conflicts of the Antiochene church] is imagined in the idealized description that he gives of Peter.’

evangelist inserts later, in 26.28. If this suggestion is correct, it could offer another explanation for Matthew's use of a ritual tradition that is different from Luke's.

M. Slee's thesis,¹¹⁹ that considers 'the "Antioch incident" (Gal 2:11–14) had a very considerable aftermath', is undoubtedly correct.¹²⁰ And yet, as Stanton admits, 'the details will always elude us'.¹²¹ However, there is the widespread view among scholars that Paul's influence in Antioch diminishes severely, after the 'incident' (cf. Acts 18.22–23),¹²² while Peter's increases.¹²³ Moreover, scholars attempt to place Matthew's Gospel in the context of the 'considerable aftermath' of the incident; yet there is no consensus.¹²⁴ For some scholars, Matthew largely stands in the tradition of Paul;¹²⁵ for others, his Gospel shows clear signs of anti-Paulinism.¹²⁶ For Gundry, Matthew's Gospel is anti-Petrine.¹²⁷ Other scholars see Matthew continuing the 'Petrine compromise', i.e., representing the *via media* between the law-observant party of James and the law-free gospel of Paul;¹²⁸ others see his Gospel

¹¹⁹ Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 42–52, 154–64.

¹²⁰ G.N. Stanton, "The Early Church in Antioch: Review," *ExpT* 116/9 (2005): 294.

¹²¹ Stanton, "Early Church in Antioch," 294.

¹²² Meier, "Antioch," 38–41. As Acts 18.22–23 indicates, after the 'incident', Paul's returns to Antioch are fewer and shorter. See Meeks-Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch*, 17; Conzelmann, *Acts*, 156; Barrett, *Acts*, 2:881; Pervo, *Acts*, 456: '[The] presence of six participles (against two finite verbs) in vv. 22–23 enhances the sense of rapidity.'

¹²³ Meier, "Antioch," 38–41.

¹²⁴ Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 146–55.

¹²⁵ E.g., Meier, "Antioch," 44, 62–63; Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:146 (n. 126); M.D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2004), 153–70; Roger Mohrlang, *Matthew and Paul: A Comparison of Ethical Perspectives* (Cambridge: CUP, 2004), 7–47 (42–47).

¹²⁶ E.g., David C. Sim, *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism: The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Community* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 165–213: 'the Matthean community was in conflict with a resurgent Pauline mission in Antioch, a situation made possible by the fall of the Jerusalem church and the loss of its protection to other Christian Jewish groups.'

¹²⁷ Gundry, *False Disciple and Apostate*, 3–5, and *passim*.

¹²⁸ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 511–16. For Brent (*Ignatius of Antioch*, 29) Matthew's Peter stands between the local interpreters of the Scripture (teachers) and the messengers of the Spirit (prophets): 'the author of Matthew asserts his Petrine model. Peter was the scribe who could discern the correct interpretation of Scripture and so declare that Jesus was the Christ of prophecy. But, like the charismatics, he had also experienced a supernatural revelation that "flesh and blood" of themselves could not have afforded him.' See Matt. 16.17–19 (cf. Acts 13.1–2).

complementing both Paul and Peter.¹²⁹ Still, there is the broad consensus that Peter was a very influential figure in Antioch, at the time of Matthew's Gospel composition.¹³⁰

If this is the case, then Matthew's Last Supper tradition could also reflect the consolidation of the influence of Peter and the fading of Paul's. After the 'Antioch incident' and the departure of Paul (cf. Acts 18.22–23), it is possible that the tradition of the Lord's Supper, as Paul taught it in Antioch (cf. 1 Cor. 11.23–25), was eventually replaced by Peter's teaching. As numerous scholars notice, the tradition inserted by Matthew (26.26–29) may have been influential in Antioch, at the time of the Gospel's composition.¹³¹ Yet, I suggest that this tradition (at least in part) came from Peter. This is why Matthew follows Mk. 14.22–25 so closely¹³² and also adds the Antiochene/Petrine phrase εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (cf. Matt. 3.6). In conclusion, if the second hypothesis suggested a 'concurrent traditions' paradigm, this one suggests 'consecutive traditions'.

(4) But what about Luke? If Luke's writing is contemporary to Matthew's, why does he follow the pre-Petrine Antiochene tradition (Lk. 22.17–20),¹³³ similar to Paul (1 Cor. 11.23–25)? As we have seen in a previous chapter, Luke has the same Markan source (cf. Mk. 14.22–25)¹³⁴ as Matthew, but follows a different formula. Moreover, similar to Matthew's Gospel, Peter is a major character in Acts (1.15–12.19), set in parallel to Paul (13.1–28.31).¹³⁵ Yet, in spite of

¹²⁹ For various views related to this point, see D. Marguerat, *Le Jugement dans l'évangile de Matthieu* (Le Monde de la Bible; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1981), 212–35; Mohrlang, *Matthew and Paul*, 126–32; Luz, *Theology of Matthew*, 93–100, 146–53; A. Sand, *Das Matthäusevangelium* (EF 275; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1991), 159–60. See the extended discussion in Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 199–211.

¹³⁰ Inter alia: Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 121, 145–55; Wilkins, *Concept of Disciple*, 175–209.

¹³¹ Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, 771. Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 3:455: 'The main issue is whether Matthew's alterations of the words of institution reflect liturgical usage or are rather purely redactional. Most commentators have thought the former. For it is reasonable to assume that when the evangelist came to the Lord's Supper, a known liturgical piece, he reproduced the version known in his own religious services.'

¹³² E.g., Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*, 99; Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, 771; Osborne, *Matthew*, 960.

¹³³ I call Luke's tradition 'pre-Petrine' because, in Antioch, it chronologically predates the ritual use of the (assumed) tradition of Peter.

¹³⁴ Marshall, *Luke*, 792. Also, Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1996), 1716–17.

¹³⁵ Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (RNTS; Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2005), xxvii–xxix.

his (relatively) high view of Peter,¹³⁶ Luke does not follow any of the supposedly Petrine forms, like Mark or Matthew.

As we have seen from the works of R. Glover,¹³⁷ J. Fitzmyer,¹³⁸ and R. Riesner,¹³⁹ Luke most probably left Antioch in the mid-40s, intermittently accompanying Paul in his missionary travels (cf. Acts 16.10–17; 20.5–15; 21.1–8; 27.1–28.16).¹⁴⁰ Note again Fitzmyer's conclusion: 'Luke's acquaintance with Antioch would have to be limited to an early phase of the church there, as it can be deduced from Acts 11:19–20; 13:1–4; 14:26–28; 15:1–3, 13–40; and 18:22–23.'¹⁴¹ If Fitzmyer is correct, then Luke has left Antioch before the consolidation of Peter's influence, and the consecration of his eucharistic tradition. Moreover, Luke spent most of his subsequent years, i.e., the 50s and early 60s, in the milieu of the Pauline communities,¹⁴² which most probably 'received' the same tradition as the Corinthians (1 Cor. 11.23; cf. 1 Cor. 4.17).¹⁴³ Also, as Meier and others assume, Theophilus' community (Lk. 1.1–4; Acts 1.1–2) could have been part of Paul's network.¹⁴⁴ All this explains why Luke uses the pre-Petrine ritual tradition.

Note Meier's conclusion:

Luke is probably writing for a church which stands in the Pauline tradition, be it located in Asia Minor or in Greece. It is hardly surprising, then, that Luke uses a modified Pauline formulation, even though he has the text of Mark in front of him. All this says nothing against the origin of Matthew's gospel at Antioch.¹⁴⁵

¹³⁶ Talbert, *Reading Acts*, xxix.

¹³⁷ Richard Glover, "Luke the Antiochene' and Acts," *NTS* 11 (1964–65): 97–106.

¹³⁸ Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 46.

¹³⁹ Rainer Riesner, *Paul's Early Period: Chronology, Mission Strategy, Theology* (trans., Doug Stott; Grand Rapids/Cambridge: W.B. Eerdmans, 1998), 323–26.

¹⁴⁰ For the reliability of the 'we-passages', see (again) Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 3.14.1–3; Riesner, *Paul's Early Period*, 323–26 (324). See the discussion above (§ 3.2.3).

¹⁴¹ Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 46.

¹⁴² Riesner, *Paul's Early Period*, 318–21.

¹⁴³ Schreiner, *New Testament Theology*, 730; William S. Campbell, "Universality and Particularity in Paul's Understanding and Strategy of Mission," in Trevor J. Burke and Brian S. Rosner (eds.), *Paul as Missionary: Identity, Activity, Theology, and Practice* (LNTS 420; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2011), 195.

¹⁴⁴ Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 59; Meier, "Antioch," 26.

¹⁴⁵ Meier, "Antioch," 26–27 (n. 62).

5.3 Conclusion

Although it was barely mentioned, one of the keywords of this chapter is ‘beyond’, a word which appears in the title of both sections. In this chapter, I have tried to further the discussion concerning the Last Supper tradition (Matt. 26.26–29), ‘beyond’ its Markan (Mk. 14.22–25), and even its Pauline (1 Cor. 11.23–25) and Lukan (Lk. 22.17–20) parallels. By adding Peter (and his preaching or teaching) to the discussion, I have advanced a theory that would respond to the objection anticipated by Meier: ‘If Paul’s form represents the form used in Antioch in the 40s [...] why is it that in the 80s Matthew copies, with modifications, the form found in Mark?’¹⁴⁶

A lot could have happened in the church of Antioch within three decades (*ca.* 40–70 CE);¹⁴⁷ and, to paraphrase Stanton, many of the details still elude us.¹⁴⁸ Therefore, while admitting that some of the details of the hypothetical reconstruction I have sketched above are tentative, I suggest that the overall argument is plausible. If Matthew’s Gospel was composed in Antioch, and there was only one Antiochene church, then there are only two convincing explanations for Matthew’s ignorance of the Pauline/Lukan tradition: 1) various traditions existed simultaneously (the ‘concurrent paradigm’), but Matthew preferred the non-Pauline tradition, perhaps under a certain Petrine influence (cf. Mk. 14.22–25; Acts 2.38; 5.31; 10.43); or 2) the later pre-Matthean tradition replaced the earlier Pauline tradition (the ‘consecutive paradigm’), perhaps under a similar Petrine influence. Again, a lot could have happened in thirty years in the church of Antioch, but we don’t possess other significant data; except for the material used in the formulation of these theories. And, to quote Sim once more, ‘we are forced to work with the material we have.’¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁶ Meier, “Antioch,” 25–26.

¹⁴⁷ As was mentioned above, I tentatively date the composition of Matthew’s Gospel between 66–70 CE.

¹⁴⁸ Stanton, “Early Church in Antioch,” 294.

¹⁴⁹ Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 62 (n. 88).

Still, as I anticipated in the preceding section, the eucharistic traditions of the *Didache* (*Did.* 9.1–10.6) were also Antiochene, predating Matthew's Gospel. So, where do they fit in this historical reconstruction? The answer to this question shall be the focus of the next chapters.

CHAPTER 6

‘THE BROKEN BREAD SCATTERED UPON THE MOUNTAINS’:

ANTIOCH AND THE *DIDACHE*

The *Didache* (also called *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*) is among the oldest Christian writings left outside the NT canon.¹ Moreover, according to J. Quasten it is ‘the most important document of the subapostolic period.’² The popularity this writing enjoyed in the first Christian centuries (cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.25.4–6; Athanasius, *Ep. fest.* 39.7),³ followed by a somewhat inexplicable disappearance,⁴ created around it a mixture of mystery and scholarly curiosity. It is why the discovery of the *Didache*, by the Metropolitan Philotheos Bryennios, in 1873, in a manuscript found in the library of the Holy Sepulchre from Constantinople, constituted a genuine ‘eureka moment’.⁵ A text that was well known to the early Christians, yet was subsequently concealed from the eyes of numerous scholars, who considered it to be

¹ As will be shown below (§ 6.1), there is general agreement that the *Didache* is a composite work. As for the sources of composition (i.e., the pre-Didachic material), it is also a widespread consensus that most of these could be dated ca. 50–70 CE. See (inter alia): Jean-Paul Audet, *La Didachè: Instructions des apôtres* (Études Bibliques; Paris: Gabalda, 1958), 187–210; Klaus Wengst, *Didache (Apostellehre), Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Klemensbrief, Schrift an Diognet* (SUC 2; München: Kösel, 1984), esp. 18–43; Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache: A Commentary* (trans., Linda M. Maloney; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 52–54 [Ger.: *Die Didache* (KAV 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)]; Willy Rordorf, André Tuilier, *La Doctrine des douze apôtres (Didachè)* (SC 248; Paris: Cerf, 1998), 17–21; Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity* (CRINT 3/5; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2002), 48–52; Aaron Milavec, *The Didache: Faith, Hope & Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50–70 C.E.* (New York/Mahwah: The Newman Press, 2003), xxvi–xxxiii and *passim*; Alan J.P. Garrow, *The Gospel of Matthew’s Dependence on the Didache* (JSNTSS 254; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004), esp. 150–56; Michelle Slee, *The Church in Antioch in the First Century C.E.: Communion and Conflict* (JSNTSup 244; London: T&T Clark, 2003), 54–76; Thomas O’Loughlin, *The Didache: A Window on the Earliest Christians* (London: SPCK, 2010), esp. 24–27; Nancy Pardee, *The Genre and Development of the Didache* (WUNT II/339; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 184–86.

² Johannes Quasten, *Patrology* (3 vols.; Utrecht/Antwerp: Spectrum, 1975), 1:30.

³ According to Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 3.25.6), the *Didache* is ὁμως δὲ παρὰ πλείστοις τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν γνωσκομένης (‘known to most ecclesiastics/churchmen’). As for Athanasius (*Ep. fest.* 39.7), the writing should be read by the catechumens: ὡς ὅτι ἔστιν καὶ ἕτερα βιβλία τούτων ἔξωθεν. οὐ κανονιζόμενα μὲν τεπωπόμενα δὲ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἀναγινώσκεισθαι τοῖς ἄρτι προσερχομένοις καὶ βουλομένοις κατηχεῖσθαι τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγον (‘there are other books besides these [i.e., the canonical books previously listed] not indeed included in the Canon, but appointed by the Fathers to be read by those who newly join us, and who wish for instruction in the word of godliness’). Cf. Didymus the Blind, *Comm. Ps.* 34.20. See the later discussions, § 6.1.2 (2).

⁴ For O’Loughlin (*Didache*, 19–23), the *Didache* has in a sense never disappeared. Since it was originally an oral (living) ‘training’, the writing was later absorbed into various church orders (e.g., *Ap. Const.* 7.1.2–32.4).

⁵ O’Loughlin, *Didache*, 1–5 (1); Bart D. Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers* (vol. 1; LCL 24; Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press, 2003), 405.

lost for fifteen centuries,⁶ finally returned to scholarly investigation, following the publication of its *editio princeps*, in 1883.⁷

Adolf von Harnack's enthusiastic assertion made in 1884, 'the *Didache* has finally brought us light',⁸ with reference to the importance of the *Didache* for the better understanding of the NT and of nascent Christianity,⁹ was paradoxically followed by an immediate and interminable series of academic disputes: 'opposite hypothesis, challenges, controversies, rejections, and denials of authenticity'.¹⁰ In fact, no other Christian writing was so intensely disputed, in such a short amount of time.¹¹ However, despite the numerous controversies and challenges, that touched every section and every subject of the text,¹² the bulk of contemporary scholarship continues to consider that the *Didache* plays an important role in the task of understanding the dynamics, 'trajectories' and evolution of early Christianity.¹³

As with most topics of the *Didache*, the place(s) of provenance or composition remains even today a matter of academic dispute.¹⁴ This chapter, therefore, seeks to address this issue and propose several pieces of evidence that favour Syrian Antioch as the place of composition

⁶ The *Didache* becomes public property in 1887, following the publication of the facsimile text in R.J. Harris, *The Teaching of the Apostles (Didache tōn Apostolōn): Newly Edited, with Facsimile Text and a Commentary* (London: Clay & Sons, 1887). Cf. O'Loughlin, *Didache*, 5.

⁷ Philotheos Bryennios, *Διδαχή τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροσολυμιτικοῦ χειρογράφου νῦν πρῶτον ἐκδιδόμενη μετὰ προλεγομένων καὶ σημειώσεων ἐν οἷς καὶ τῆς Συνόψεως τῆς Π. Δ., τῆς ὑπὸ Ἰωάνν. τοῦ Χρυσσοστόμου, σύγκρισις καὶ μέρος ἀνέκδοτον ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ χειρογράφου* (Constantinople: Voutyra, 1883).

⁸ Adolf von Harnack, "Prolegomena," in *Lehre der zwölf Apostel nebst Untersuchungen zur ältesten Geschichte der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts* (TU 2/1–2; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1884), 94.

⁹ Von Harnack, "Prolegomena," 94. Also, Dumitru Fecioru, *Scrierile Părinților apostolici* (PSB 1; Bucharest: EIBMBOR, 1979), 17.

¹⁰ Fecioru, *Părinții apostolici*, 17.

¹¹ Cf. Fernand Cabrol, Henri Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* (vol. 4/1; Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1920), 794–98; Joan Hazelden Walker, "Reflections on a New Edition of the *Didache*," *VC* 35/1 (1981): 35–42 (35); Marcello Del Verme, *Didache and Judaism: Jewish Roots of an Ancient Christian Jewish Work* (London/New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), 5–111.

¹² Cabrol-Leclercq, *Dictionnaire*, 794–98; Del Verme, *Didache and Judaism*, 5–111.

¹³ See (inter alia): D. Jeffrey Bingham, "The *Didache* as a Source for the Reconstruction of Early Christianity: A Response," in Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford (eds.), *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity* (ECL 14; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 515–28; Jonathan A. Draper, "Conclusion: Missing Pieces in the Puzzle or Wild Goose Chase? A Retrospect and Prospect," in Draper-Jefford, *Didache*, 529–43; Thomas O'Loughlin, "The *Didache* as a Source for Picturing the Earliest Christian Communities: The Case of the Practice of Fasting," in Kieran J. O'Mahony (ed.), *Christian Origins: Worship, Belief and Society* (JSNTSup 241; New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 83–112.

¹⁴ Clayton N. Jefford, "Locating the *Didache*," *FF* 3/1 (2014): 49–59.

of the *Didache*. Firstly, I will seek to connect the *Didache* (the whole text) and the city of Antioch, briefly interacting with the history of scholarship. Secondly, a similar yet more detailed connection will be attempted, between *Did.* 9–10—chapters that render the ‘eucharistic’ traditions—and Syrian Antioch. For the purpose of this study, to prove only the latter connection should be sufficient.

6.1 Locating the *Didache*: The case for Syrian Antioch

That the *Didache* is a composite work is beyond reasonable dispute: ‘The *Didache* cannot, of course, be considered a homogenous text. Even those who attempt to attribute it to a single author must unhesitatingly grant that older material is used in it’.¹⁵ This means that its sources (the ‘older material’) may have originated ‘in various places, at various times’, as the vast majority of scholars concede.¹⁶ If this is the case, then the prolonged lack of consensus regarding its dating or location is somewhat understandable: ‘As the document is composed of very different traditional items and redaction, neither a precise dating nor a consensus regarding its place of origin has yet been reached.’¹⁷

However, with regard to the dating of the *Didache*, the academic consensus today is stronger than ever. Few contemporary scholars would date the final redaction of the *Didache* later than the end of the first century CE or beginning of the second.¹⁸ This, of course, situates

¹⁵ W. Rordorf, “Does the *Didache* Contain Jesus Tradition Independently of the Synoptic Gospels?,” in H. Wansborough (ed.), *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition* (JSNTSup 64; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 396. Also, Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 10–12 (10): ‘That the *Didache* was not composed by one author at one time is almost universally acknowledged.’ Kurt Niederwimmer, “Der Didachist und seine Quellen,” in Clayton N. Jefford (ed.), *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission* (NovTSup 77; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), 15–36; Jonathan A. Draper, “The Jesus Tradition in the *Didache*,” in J.A. Draper (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research* (AGJU 37; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), 72–91.

¹⁶ E.g., Christopher M. Tuckett, “Synoptic Tradition in the *Didache*,” in Draper, *Didache in Modern Research*, 92–128; Carsten Claussen, “The Eucharist in the Gospel of John and in the *Didache*,” in Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (eds.), *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: OUP, 2005), 138.

¹⁷ Claussen, “Eucharist in John and the *Didache*,” 138.

¹⁸ See (inter alia): Philip Schaff, *The Oldest Church Manual, Called the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1885), 122; Albert Ehrhard, *Die altchristliche Litteratur und ihre Erforschung*

the pre-Didachic sources sometime earlier, even as early as 50–70 CE, as J.-P. Audet, Aaron Milavec, Alan Garrow and others have suggested.¹⁹ Since the topic of the dating of the *Didache* has been extensively investigated by scholars, I will not address the issue in this chapter, but simply acknowledge the strong consensus and point to the detailed bibliography that is available.²⁰ Still, several arguments in favour of an early dating will surface indirectly, in the following sections. Moreover, I will address the issue of dating *Did.* 9–10 also in the following sections, since the eucharistic traditions are considered among the oldest pre-Didachic sources.²¹ For now, I will focus my attention on the place of composition or redaction, since there are not many studies that examine this topic in particular.

Even after a hundred and thirty-five years of research, ‘most scholars retain only a hazy conviction as to the circumstances of the composition of the writing, being primarily dependent on the views of other researchers’.²² Since there is no definitive (or conclusive) evidence to support one of the two hypothetical places of origin that dominated the debate since the discovery of the *Didache* (i.e., Egypt²³ and Syria),²⁴ the safest academic position is the one

von 1884–1900, vol. 1: *Die vornicänische Litteratur* (STS 1; Freiburg: Herder, 1900), 62–65; Audet, *Didachè*, 187–210; Wengst, *Didache*, 63; Rordorf-Tuilier, *Doctrine*, 91–99; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 52; Georg Schöllgen, Wilhelm Geerlings, *Didache: Zwölf-Apostel-Lehre. Traditio Apostolica: Apostolische Überlieferung* (Freiburg: Herder, 2000), 82–85.

¹⁹ Audet, *Didachè*, 187–210; Milavec, *Didache*, xxvi–xxxiii; Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 150–56 and *passim*.

²⁰ See above (n. 18). For more examples, see Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 52–53.

²¹ E.g., Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, esp. 11, 13–28; Pardee, *Genre and Development*, 184–86; Enrico Mazza, “*Didache* 9–10: Elements of a Eucharistic Interpretation,” in Draper, *Didache in Modern Research*, 278–83.

²² Jefford, “Locating the *Didache*,” 39.

²³ Among the scholars arguing for an Egyptian place of composition, see: R.D. Middleton, “The Eucharistic Prayers of the *Didache*,” *JTS* 36 (1935): 259–67; Richard Glover, “The *Didache*’s Quotations and the Synoptic Gospels,” *NTS* 5 (1958–59): 12–29; Robert A. Kraft, *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary*, vol. 3: *Barnabas and the Didache* (New York: Thomas Nelson, 1965), 77. It should be noted that most scholars that favour the Egyptian origin follow von Harnack, “Prolegomena,” 159–60, 167–70. However, von Harnack himself will later question this hypothesis. Cf. Adolf von Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius* (2 vols.; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1893–1897), 2/1:431. On the other hand, a Syrian place of provenance is favoured by a large majority of scholars. See below (n. 24).

²⁴ Among the scholars arguing for a Syrian place of composition, see: Ehrhard, *Altchristliche Literatur*, 66; Rudolf Knopf, *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel. Die zwei Clemensbriefe* (HNT/AV 1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1920), 3; B.H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church: Studied with Special Reference to the Origins of the Christian Ministry* (New York: Macmillan, 1929), 279–87; Dom Gregory Dix, “*Didache* and Diatessaron,” *JTS* 34 (1933): 242–50 (249); Robert M. Grant, *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary*, vol. 1: *An Introduction* (New York: Thomas Nelson, 1964), 75–76; Quasten, *Patrology*, 1:37; Rordorf-Tuilier, *Doctrine*, 97–98; Wengst, *Didache*, 62.

formulated by T. O’Loughlin: ‘attempts to isolate its place of origin are fruitless! The alternative is to say that it belongs to the Graeco-Roman world or the Mediterranean world—but the same can be said about every early Christian document.’²⁵ Perspectives like this are not rare. Note, for instance, Clayton Jefford’s remark, following his synthetic history of scholarship:

In conclusion, not so many contemporary scholars have put in writing a firm conjecture on the date and location of the *Didache*. This is fair enough. Such conjectures receive easy rebuttal and mostly serve to limit a researcher’s explorations into the text, investigations that hold together more easily when the writing and its traditions remain murky.²⁶

However, such a defensive approach, although it is admittedly safe and ‘fair’, is of little utility for the advance of scholarship, especially when topics like ‘the eucharist’ or ‘the unity/diversity of early Christianity’ are under investigation.²⁷ Therefore, while 1) admitting that the approach presented below is merely hypothetical and 2) acknowledging the risk of ‘easy rebuttals’, this chapter aims to establish stronger connections between the *Didache* and the city of Antioch. For I suggest that, although there are no conclusive arguments, there is circumstantial evidence that can be adduced, evidence that allows the postulation of a Syrian place of provenance;²⁸ even more, it allows for the postulation of an Antiochene place of origin.²⁹

²⁵ O’Loughlin, *Didache*, 24.

²⁶ Jefford, “Locating the *Didache*,” 59.

²⁷ Cf. Draper, “Missing Pieces,” 529–43.

²⁸ Jürgen K. Zangenberg, “Reconstructing the Social and Religious Milieu of the *Didache*: Observations and Possible Results,” in Huub van de Sand and Jürgen K. Zangenberg (eds.), *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings* (Atlanta: SBL, 2008), 43–69.

²⁹ It should be noted that this view has become a widespread consensus in contemporary scholarship. See Jonathan A. Draper, “The Apostolic Fathers: The *Didache*,” *ExpT* 117/5 (2006): 178: ‘it is now widely accepted that the text originates in the general area of Syria, or more narrowly in Antioch.’ However, as Jefford notices, not many scholars offer solid evidence for their ‘acceptance’.

6.1.1 Was the *Didache* composed in Antioch?

Since Jefford has only recently offered a comprehensive history of scholarship regarding the provenance and the location of the *Didache*,³⁰ I will follow his work closely, with a special focus on Antioch. Among the first scholars to suggest that the *Didache* was composed in the capital of Syria are Jan Greyvenstein (1919), F.E. Vokes (1938), and William Telfer (1939).³¹ Although these scholars agreed on the place of composition, they differed significantly on the dating and purpose of the writing. Greyvenstein, for instance, dates the *Didache* towards the end of the first century, a date that has become widely accepted in the last decades, but attributes the writing to the school of James.³² As for Vokes and Telfer, they prefer a much later date, toward the end of the second century or the beginning of the third.³³ However, the later dates the two scholars suggested have found very little acceptance. Among other issues, it was the problematic dating that also affected the credibility of their Antiochene proposal. For Greyvenstein, it was his too narrow ascription, i.e., the school of James.³⁴

It is the monumental study of J.-P. Audet (1958) that became truly influential on locating the *Didache* in the area of Antioch.³⁵ Audet came to this conclusion after comparing the text of the *Didache* with certain Matthean parallels.³⁶ Moreover, he identified three stages of composition that covered a few decades, thus offering the compelling hypothesis of ‘an evolved text’.³⁷ Audet’s view has become dominant nowadays,³⁸ due to the influence of

³⁰ Jefford, “Locating the *Didache*,” 39–68. Also, Nancy Pardee, “Visualizing the Christian Community at Antioch,” *FF* 3/1 (2014): 69–90.

³¹ Jan Greyvenstein, “The Original ‘Teaching of the Twelve Apostles’: Its Text and Origins,” (Unpublished PhD Diss.; Chicago: University of Chicago, 1919), 123–30; F.E. Vokes, *The Riddle of the Didache: Fact or Fiction, Heresy or Catholicism?* (CHS 32; London: SPCK, 1938), 209–10 and *passim*; W. Telfer, “The *Didache* and the Apostolic Synod of Antioch,” *JTS* 40 (1939): 133–46.

³² Greyvenstein, “Teaching,” esp. 123–30.

³³ Vokes, *Riddle of the Didache*, esp. 86–87, 216; Telfer, “*Didache* and Antioch,” 133.

³⁴ See Jefford, “Locating the *Didache*,” 51–54.

³⁵ Audet, *Didachè*, 206–10.

³⁶ Audet, *Didachè*, 187–210. Cf. Huub van de Sand (ed.), *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2005); van de Sandt-Zangenberg, *Matthew, James and the Didache*, 13–32, 43–69 and *passim*.

³⁷ Audet, *Didachè*, esp. 121–86.

³⁸ See (again) Draper, “Apostolic Fathers,” 178.

scholars such as Clayton Jefford,³⁹ Jonathan Draper,⁴⁰ Huub van de Sandt⁴¹ and David Flusser,⁴² Michelle Slee,⁴³ Allan Garrow,⁴⁴ and Nancy Pardee.⁴⁵ Their compelling arguments, adduced in favour of an Antiochene place of provenance, have made Egypt almost a forgotten hypothesis nowadays;⁴⁶ hence my omission of discussing Egypt as a probable place of origin, at this point. Nevertheless, the Egyptian hypothesis will be addressed shortly, when I will offer a thorough analysis on the provenance of *Did.* 9–10.

So, in the following section, I will offer several arguments for the Antiochene provenance of the *Didache*. The arguments are offered in abbreviated form, mainly summarising the works of the scholars listed above:

(1) Already by the end of the first century CE, the city of Antioch had a variety of Gentile Christian and Jewish Christian groups, a considerable Christian population that had not been previously converted to Judaism ('proselytes'), a stream of Hellenistic and Jewish-Hellenistic ideas, and intense missionary activity.⁴⁷ The Jewish features of the *Didache* (*Did.* 1.1–6.3),

³⁹ C.N. Jefford: "Did Ignatius of Antioch Know the *Didache*?", in Jefford, *Didache in Context*, 330–51; "Conflict at Antioch: Ignatius and the *Didache* at Odds," *StPatr* 36 (2001): 262–69; "The Milieu of Matthew, the *Didache*, and Ignatius of Antioch: Agreements and Differences," in van de Sandt, *Matthew and the Didache*, 35–47; "Social Locators as a Bridge between the *Didache* and Matthew," in Gregory-Tuckett, *Trajectories*, 245–64; "Locating the *Didache*," 39–68.

⁴⁰ J.A. Draper: "Torah and Troublesome Apostles in the *Didache* Community," *NovT* 33/4 (1991): 347–72; "Ritual Process and Ritual Symbol in *Didache* 7–10," *VC* 54 (2000): 121–58; "Do the *Didache* and Matthew Reflect an 'Irrevocable Parting of the Ways' with Judaism?," in van de Sandt, *Matthew and the Didache*, 217–41; "Apostolic Fathers," 177–81 (178); "The *Didache*," in Paul Foster (ed.), *The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2007), 13–20; "Apostles, Teachers, and Evangelists: Stability and Movement of Functionaries in Matthew, James, and the *Didache*," in van de Sandt-Zangenberg, *Matthew, James and the Didache*, 137–74.

⁴¹ H. van de Sandt: "Was the *Didache* Community a Group Within Judaism? An Assessment on the Basis of its Eucharistic Prayers," in Marcel Poorthuis and Joshua Schwartz (eds.), *A Holy People: Jewish and Christian Perspectives on Religious Communal Identity* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2006), 104; "Matthew and the *Didache*," in D.C. Sim and B. Repschinski (eds.), *Matthew and His Christian Contemporaries* (London/New York: T&T Clark International, 2008), 123–38.

⁴² Van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 48–52.

⁴³ Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 55–76.

⁴⁴ Garrow, *Matthew's Dependence*, 1–8 and *passim*.

⁴⁵ Pardee: *Genre and Development*, 186–91; "Visualizing the Christian Community at Antioch," 69–90.

⁴⁶ Cf. Zangenberg, "Milieu of the *Didache*," 45. According to Schaff (*Oldest Church Manual*, 123), at the end of the nineteenth century, Egypt was preferred by the majority of scholars.

⁴⁷ See (for instance) W.A. Meeks and R.L. Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era* (SBL; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), 1–18.

together with its persistent interest in Gentiles joining the church (*Did.* 1.1a; 1.1b–6.3),⁴⁸ could suggest the city of Antioch as a possible place of origin.⁴⁹

(2) In close connection to the missionary focus that characterized the early church of Antioch (see Acts 11.20; 13.1–3; 14.26–28; 18.22–23),⁵⁰ there is the ‘universalizing direction’ of the *Didache*, as noticed by Stephen Finlan.⁵¹ As the numerous verses throughout the writing reveal, the language of the *Didache* has been intentionally ‘denationalized’ and ‘internationalized’ (*Did.* 2.7; 3.8; 4.14; 6.2; 9.4; 10.3–5; 11.11; 14.3): the universalization of all ‘Israel-specific images [that] are used in the *Didache*’: 9.2–3; 9.4; 10.3; 10.5; the repeated use of the terms γῆ (‘earth’) and κόσμος (‘world’): 3.7; 8.2; 16.4; 16.8; the use of ‘non-national terms’, such as ἄνθρωποι (‘humans’), for believers and non-believers (16.3; 16.5); etc.⁵² This ‘denationalization’ and ‘internationalization’ of the language could well have originated in a cosmopolitan and missionary church, such as Antioch.⁵³

(3) Sometimes explicit (*Did.* 8.1–3) and sometimes implicit (*Did.* 6.1–3; 10.5; 14.1), the *Didache* indicates tensions and even separations between the Jewish groups and the growing Hellenistic factions of Christianity.⁵⁴ This is consistent with the trajectory of Jewish

⁴⁸ The manuscript discovered by Bryennios in 1873 has two titles. The longer title is: Διδαχή κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (‘The Teaching of the Lord Transmitted through the Twelve Apostles to the Nations’). Originally, this title could have belonged to the ‘Two Ways’ tractate (1.1–6.3), a pre-Didachic ethical guide, composed for the initiation of ‘gentiles’ that have converted to Judaism. See the lengthier discussion in Audet, *Didachè*, 91–103; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 35–41, 56–57; van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 21.

⁴⁹ See the lengthier discussion in van de Sandt, “The *Didache* Community,” 104.

⁵⁰ E.g., Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Early Christian Mission* (2 vols.; London: Apollos, 2004), esp. Part V: ‘Pioneer Missionary Work: The Mission of the Apostle Paul’.

⁵¹ Stephen Finlan, “Identity in the *Didache* Community,” in Draper-Jefford, *Didache*, 29–31.

⁵² Finlan, “Identity in the *Didache* Community,” 27–31.

⁵³ Van de Sandt, “The *Didache* Community,” 102–104.

⁵⁴ E.g., Del Verme, *Didache and Judaism*, 143–188; Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 77–116; Magnus Zetterholm, *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch: A Social-Scientific Approach to the Separation Between Judaism and Christianity* (London/New York: Routledge, 2003), 234; Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2003), 616.

Christianity in Antioch (cf. Gal. 2.11–14; Matt. 5.17–20; Ignatius, *Phil.* 6.1).⁵⁵ Some of the Christians in Antioch, for instance, were still practising Torah and keeping the Jewish Festivals in the Synagogue even in the second half of the fourth century, as the writings of John Chrysostom unequivocally show (*Adv. Jud.* 1.3.1; 1.4.4; 1.5.2; 1.7.2; 2.1.4; and *passim*).⁵⁶

(4) As was shown in the previous chapters, Matthean scholars have often identified Antioch as the place where the Gospel of Matthew was written and where the Matthean community was at home, though the question of the social and historical location of the community has by no means been definitively resolved.⁵⁷ Furthermore, virtually all scholars admit a close connection between the *Didache* and the Gospel of Matthew,⁵⁸ although there is no consensus regarding the sort of connection: oral tradition,⁵⁹ use of common sources⁶⁰ or literary dependence.⁶¹ Regarding these aspects, Vicky Balabansky correctly identifies two general tendencies: 1) on the one hand, the NT scholars, who suggest a literary dependence (the *Didache* depending on

⁵⁵ See (inter alia): Zetterholm, *Christianity in Antioch*, 231–35 and *passim*; Thomas A. Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch and the Parting of the Ways: Early Jewish-Christian Relations* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009), 13–88.

⁵⁶ E.g., Robert L. Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late Fourth Century* (TCH 4; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983); Isaac W. Oliver, *Torah Praxis after 70 CE: Reading Matthew and Luke-Acts as Jewish Texts* (WUNT II/355; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013).

⁵⁷ See above (§ 4.3).

⁵⁸ See (inter alia): Schaff, *Oldest Church Manual*, 82–88; Ehrhard, *Altchristliche Litteratur*, 58–60; Audet, *Didachè*, 166–86; Sherman E. Johnson, “A Subsidiary Motive for the Writing of the *Didache*,” in Massey H. Shepherd and Sherman E. Johnson (eds.), *Munera Studiosa: Studies Presented to W.H.P. Hatch on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday* (Cambridge: Episcopal Theological School, 1946), 107–22; Leslie W. Barnard, “The Dead Sea Scrolls, Barnabas, the *Didache* and the Later History of the ‘Two Ways’,” in *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966), 87–107; John S. Kloppenborg, “*Didache* 16.6–8 and Special Matthean Tradition,” *ZNW* 70 (1979): 54–67; Édouard Massaux, *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Saint Irenaeus* (NGS 5/1–3; trans., Norman Belval and Suzanne Hecht; Macon: Mercer University Press, 1990–1993); Cristopher M. Tuckett, “Synoptic Tradition in the *Didache*,” in Draper, *Didache in Modern Research*, 92–128; Udo Schnelle, *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 335; Martin Hengel, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 2000), 64; van de Sandt, *Matthew and the Didache*, 1, 7 and *passim*; van de Sandt-Zangenberg, *Matthew, James and the Didache*, 1–9 and *passim*; Draper, “Missing Pieces,” 534–36.

⁵⁹ Milavec, *Didache*, 695–739.

⁶⁰ E.g., Helmut Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern* (TU 65; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957), 159–60 and *passim*; Audet, *Didachè*, 166–86; Rordorf-Tuilier, *Doctrine*, 83–91; Willy Rordorf, “Does the *Didache* Contain Jesus Tradition Independently of the Synoptic Gospels?,” in Henry Wansbrough (ed.), *Jesus and the Oral Synoptic Tradition* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 394–423.

⁶¹ E.g., Tuckett, “Synoptic Tradition in the *Didache*,” 127–28; Schnelle, *History and Theology*, 335; Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 64.

Matthew); 2) on the other hand, the ‘Didachists’, who argue for the literary independence and the use of common sources, whether oral or written.⁶²

Indisputably, the *Didache* shares numerous points of contact with Matthew (*Did.* 1.3b–d and Matt. 5.44, 46–47; *Did.* 1.4b–e and Matt. 5.39; *Did.* 1.5a–d and Matt. 5.25–26, 42; *Did.* 8.2 and Matt. 6.9–13; *Did.* 9.5b and Matt. 7.6; *Did.* 11.7 and Matt. 12.31; *Did.* 13.1–2 and Matt. 10.10; *Did.* 16.3–8 and Matt. 24.10–30).⁶³ As numerous scholars have demonstrated, this close familiarity is especially with the traditions underlying the Gospel, rather than the Gospel of Matthew in its written form;⁶⁴ but there are some notable exceptions (see e.g., *Did.* 15.3–4; 16.3–8).⁶⁵ Accordingly, in recent scholarship, special attention has been given to the *Didache*’s use of Q,⁶⁶ to the use of ‘M’ (the community traditions that are peculiar to Matthew),⁶⁷ but also to the εὐαγγέλιον passages (8.2; 11.3; 15.3–4), as the latter suggest direct knowledge of both pre-Matthean traditions (8.2; 11.3)⁶⁸ and Matthean texts (15.3, 4): ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (‘as you have it in the gospel of our Lord’).⁶⁹ All this ambiguity, regarding the (pre)Matthean sources, complicates the scholarly discussions, as one may easily conclude in favour of either: 1) the *Didache*’s familiarity with (pre)Matthean traditions; and 2) its familiarity with the text of Matthew.

⁶² Vicky Balabansky, *Eschatology in the Making: Mark, Matthew and the Didache* (SNTSMS 97; Cambridge: CUP, 1997), 183.

⁶³ Cf. William Varner, *The Way of the Didache: The First Christian Handbook* (Lanham: University Press of America, 2007), 44–51.

⁶⁴ Most scholars follow here Koester’s influential study (*Synoptische Überlieferung*). Cf. Draper, “Jesus Tradition in the *Didache*,” 79–91.

⁶⁵ See the persuasive argument of Balabansky, *Eschatology in the Making*, 191–97.

⁶⁶ Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 159–241; André Tuilier, “La Didachè et le problème synoptique,” in Jefford, *Didache in Context*, 120–22; John S. Kloppenborg, “The Use of the Synoptics or Q in *Did.* 1.3b–2.1,” in van de Sandt, *Matthew and the Didache*, 105–29.

⁶⁷ Jefford, “Locating the *Didache*,” 59–62 (61): ‘the Didachist seems quite familiar with material that is otherwise unique to Matthew and yet at the same time does not recognize Matthean settings or nuances.’

⁶⁸ E.g., Knopf, *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel*, 23; Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 10; Tuilier, “Le problème synoptique,” 120–22; Richard Glover, “The *Didache*’s Quotations and the Synoptic Gospels,” *NTS* 5 (1958–59): 12–29 (28).

⁶⁹ Massaux, *Influence*, 3:145; Christopher M. Tuckett, “The *Didache* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament,” in Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (eds.), *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford/New York: OUP, 2005), 107, 109–110. Cf. Rordorf-Tuilier, *Doctrine*, 88; Draper, “Jesus Tradition in the *Didache*,” 76; Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 131–32; Wengst, *Didache*, 26.

In my opinion, it is precisely this ‘complex relationship between Matthew and the *Didache*’⁷⁰ that determined scholars to conclude that behind the two writings there stands a single community.⁷¹ Moreover, both Matthean and *Didache* communities reveal a process of transition from a Jewish to a Gentile milieu (cf. Matt. 4.23; 7.29; 9.35; 10.17; 12.9; 13.54; 23.34; 28.15; *Did.* 1.1–6.3 [6.1–3]; 8.1–3; 14.1).⁷² Then, both documents are bound up together in the early trajectory of Jewish Christianity, as they address the same kinds of issues in the same kinds of way.⁷³ And finally, there is the remarkable overlap of tradition, although not in terms of verbal identity, but in terms of concepts, values and practices.⁷⁴ In conclusion, it is reasonable—even more, it is the safest academic position—to see the two writings stemming from the same community, yet reflecting different stages of this community’s evolution.⁷⁵ As Jefford asserts,

Despite the differences between Matthew and the *Didache*, the similarities that have traditionally been recognized between the two works indicate a core perspective that bound the writings together within a single metropolitan situation.⁷⁶

A similar conclusion comes from Draper, who focuses not on the literary relationship between Matthew and the *Didache*, but on the single community that produces both texts:

A number of scholars, including myself, have argued for a more complex relationship between Matthew and the *Didache* as an “evolved text,” namely, a text which has had a long history of redaction as the community rule of a living and developing community, so that the earliest layers of the text may be among Matthew’s sources, while the latest layers of the text may reflect a knowledge of Matthew [...] Perhaps instead of trying to determine the direction of their literary composition, future research should read the evidence of Matthew and the *Didache* (and possibly the epistle of James) together as data for the reconstruction of the praxis and beliefs of a particular community or set of communities that stand in the same early Christian trajectory.⁷⁷

⁷⁰ Draper, “Missing Pieces,” 534.

⁷¹ E.g., Pardee, *Genre and Development*, 178: ‘a Matthean source or a proto-Gospel that hales from the same community.’ Cf. Jefford, “Locating the *Didache*,” 58.

⁷² Van de Sandt, “The *Didache* Community,” 102–104: ‘the *Didache* thus shows indications of a community which has ceased to consider itself a variety of Judaism [...] By the time the document was composed, so many gentiles had already been baptized and adopted that the community became sociologically a gentile Christian group.’

⁷³ Draper: “‘Irrevocable Parting of the Ways,’” 217–41 (239–41); “Missing Pieces,” 535.

⁷⁴ Cf. Milavec, *Didache*, 698–719.

⁷⁵ So, Draper, “Missing Pieces,” 534.

⁷⁶ Jefford, “Social Locators,” 263; Pardee, “Visualizing the Christian Community at Antioch,” 70.

⁷⁷ Draper, “Missing Pieces,” 534–35.

So, while various aspects of this debate remain unresolved,⁷⁸ at least there is general acceptance of the close connection between Matthew and the *Didache*, that leads to the growing consensus of a common place of provenance. For most scholars, this common place is Syrian Antioch.⁷⁹

(5) A similar, although lesser connection, was established with the letter of James, based on criteria similar to Matthew.⁸⁰ Of course, this attempt assumes an Antiochene provenance for the letter of James.⁸¹

(6) *Did.* 6.2–3 reflects on the ‘apostolic decree’ of Acts 15.23–29,⁸² a decree in the form of a letter that was sent by the church of Jerusalem to that of Antioch (see Acts 15.22–30), in the mid-first century CE.⁸³ The apostolic letter itself could have been the source for the Lukan

⁷⁸ E.g., Milavec, *Didache*, 720–39; van de Sandt-Zangenberg, *Matthew, James and the Didache*, 8; Draper, “Missing Pieces,” 536.

⁷⁹ E.g., Draper, “Apostolic Fathers,” 178; Jefford, “Locating the *Didache*,” 66.

⁸⁰ See Oda Wischmeyer, “Reconstructing the Social and Religious Milieu of James: Methods, Sources, and Possible Results,” in van de Sandt-Zangenberg, *Matthew, James and the Didache*, 33–41.

⁸¹ Among the exegetes arguing for an Antiochene origin of the ‘two-stage’ James, see Ralph P. Martin, *James* (WBC 48; Waco: Word, 1988), lxi–lxxvii. Cf. R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (vol. 2; New York: Scribner’s, 1955), 143; Peter H. Davids, *The Epistle of James: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1982), 28–34; Andrew Chester and Ralph P. Martin, *The Theology of the Letters of James, Peter, and Jude* (NTT; Cambridge: CUP, 1994), 14 (n. 25); Scot McKnight, *The Letter of James* (NICNT; Grand Rapids/Cambridge: W.B. Eerdmans, 2011), 15 (n. 61).

⁸² Inter alia: Audet, *Didachè*, 209, 354–57; Marcel Simon, “De l’observance rituel à l’asceticism: Recherches sur le décret Apostolique,” *RHR* 193 (1978): esp. 89–90; Clayton N. Jefford, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (VCSup 11; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1989), 96–97; van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 238–70. Cf. Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 123 (n. 38); Matti Myllykoski, “Without Decree: Pagan Sacrificial Meat and the Early History of the *Didache*,” in Draper-Jefford, *Didache*, 429–53.

⁸³ Cf. M. Dibelius, “The Apostolic Council,” in *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (London: SCM Press, 1956), 93–111; B. Reicke, “Der geschichtliche Hintergrund des Apostelkonzils und der Antiocheia-Episode,” in J.N. Sevenster and W.C. van Unnik (eds.), *Studia Paulina in honorem J. de Zwaan* (Haarlem: Erven F. Bohn, 1953), 172–87; Ernst Haenchen, “Quellenanalyse und Kompositionsanalyse in Act 15,” in W. Eltester (ed.), *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für J. Jeremias* (BZNW 30; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964), 153–64; M. Simon, “The Apostolic Decree and its Setting in the Ancient Church,” *BJRL* 52 (1969–70): 437–60; Ernst Bammel, “Der Text von Apostelgeschichte 15,” in J. Kremer (ed.), *Les actes des apôtres: Traditions, rédaction, théologie* (BETL 48; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1979), 439–46; C.K. Barrett, “Apostles in Council and in Conflict,” in *Freedom and Obligation: A Study of the Epistle to the Galatians* (London: SPCK, 1985), 91–108.

account⁸⁴ (since it was shown that Luke was from Antioch),⁸⁵ and also for *Did.* 6.2–3.⁸⁶ Since there is no ‘compelling evidence’ that the redactor/compiler of the *Didache* (henceforth ‘the Didachist’)⁸⁷ knew the book of Acts,⁸⁸ there remains the unique explanation of a common source that leads back to Antioch.⁸⁹

(7) In *Did.* 12.4 there is the use of the ‘uncommon’ Χριστιανός.⁹⁰ The term is identified by the author of Acts as first used to designate ‘the disciples’ at Antioch (Acts 11.26).⁹¹ Except for Acts 11.26, Χριστιανός appears in the NT writings in only two other instances: Acts 26.28 and 1 Peter 4.16.⁹² Interestingly enough, the only two writers that use the term, Luke and Peter, are both connected to the church of Antioch (see Gal 2.11–14; Acts 11.19–20; 13.1–4; 14.26–28; 15.1–3, 13–40; 18.22–23). Moreover, as Pardee infers, that the use of the rare term may indicate Antioch as the milieu ‘is strengthened by the fact that Χριστιανός occurs five times in the letters of Ignatius [*ca.* 107 CE] but nowhere else that early.’⁹³ In sum, every time Χριστιανός appears in the earliest Christian writings, there is an Antiochene connection.

⁸⁴ E.g., Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AYBC 31; New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2008), 562: ‘the text of the letter that Luke incorporates here (vv 23b–29) was undoubtedly the main thing that he acquired from his Antiochene source.’

⁸⁵ See above (§ 3.2.3.1).

⁸⁶ Audet, *Didachè*, 354.

⁸⁷ Among the numerous exegetes that postulate a unique compiler of the *Didache*, conventionally called ‘the Didachist’, see: Niederwimmer, “Der Didachist und seine Quellen,” 15–36; Georg Schöllgen, “The *Didache* as a Church Order: An Examination of the Purpose for the Composition of the *Didache* and Its Consequences for Its Interpretation,” in Draper, *Didache in Modern Research*, 64–67; van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 28–48; Slee, *Church in Antioch*, 55–76; Milavec, *Didache*, xii–xxxiii; Varner, *Didache*, 58; Pardee, *Genre and Development*, 53. Cf. Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 42–52; Aaron Milavec, “The Pastoral Genius of the *Didache*: An Analytical Translation and Commentary,” in J. Neusner, E.S. Frerichs and A.J. Levine (eds.), *Religious Writings and Religious Systems*, vol. II: *Christianity* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 89–126.

⁸⁸ Tuckett, “*Didache* and NT Writings,” 89–90: ‘There is thus no compelling evidence to show that *Didache* knew or used Acts.’

⁸⁹ Cf. Telfer, “*Didache* and Antioch,” 133–46; Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 96–98; van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 269; Pardee, “Visualizing the Christian Community at Antioch,” 69.

⁹⁰ Pardee, “Visualizing the Christian Community at Antioch,” 69.

⁹¹ E.g., Justin Taylor, “Why Were the Disciples First Called ‘Christians’ at Antioch? (Ac 11, 26),” *RB* 101/1 (1994): 75–94; Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer, *Paul between Damascus and Antioch: The Unknown Years* (trans., John Bowden; London: SCM Press, 1997), 225–30.

⁹² E.g., EDNT, 3:477–78. For the earliest non-Christian sources, see, e.g., Josephus, *Ant.* 18.3.3.64; Pliny, *Ep.* 10.96–97; Tacitus, *Ann.* 15.44; Suetonius, *Nero* 16.2; Lucian, *Alexander* 25, 38.

⁹³ Pardee, “Visualizing the Christian Community at Antioch,” 69. Cf. BDAG, ‘Χριστιανός,’ 1090.

(8) Since its publication (1883), scholars have used the internal geographic references, in order to locate the final layer of the *Didache*.⁹⁴ For instance, one of the arguments for the Syrian provenance considers the itinerant ‘apostles’ that are not allowed to lodge in a community more than a day; a ‘two days lodging’ is allowed for exceptional cases only (*Did.* 11.4–5). At their departure, the itinerants are to take bread as their singular provision, only as is needed until they reach the next community, on the following day: ‘until [the] next night of lodging’ (*Did.* 11.6). Since the concern for the itinerants’ provision is limited to the next day’s needs, there must be ‘networks’ of communities indicated,⁹⁵ located at the distance of a day (or less than a day) away from each other. Such a density of Christian communities suggests a Syrian-Palestinian setting.⁹⁶ On the other hand, the permission to use ‘standing water’ for baptism, when the ‘running water’ is absent (*Did.* 7.2), for certain scholars indicates yet another setting for the provenance of the text, namely Egypt.⁹⁷ Their preference seems to be confirmed by *Ap. Const.* VII (a later redacted text of the *Didache*, ‘almost certainly of Syrian provenance’),⁹⁸ which removes this exception for the ‘standing water’ (*Ap. Const.* 7.22).⁹⁹

Given the ambiguities above, I consider that the internal data per se can hardly be used to support either conclusion,¹⁰⁰ if the final stage of composition is viewed. For it contains data that appears to be contradictory. It is no surprise, then, that some scholars are reticent to infer much based on the geography of the writing.¹⁰¹ On the other hand, if the *Didache* is ‘an effort to harmonize ancient and revered traditions of the church with new ecclesial necessities’, as

⁹⁴ E.g., Schaff, *Oldest Church Manual*, 124. See the discussion in Jefford, “Locating the *Didache*,” 39–40; O’Loughlin, *Didache*, 24–27.

⁹⁵ Cf. O’Loughlin, *Didache*, esp. 105–20.

⁹⁶ Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 53–54; van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 51–52.

⁹⁷ Jefford, “Locating the *Didache*,” 39–40. Cf. Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 53; van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 51.

⁹⁸ F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone (eds.), “Apostolic Constitutions,” in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (3rd ed.; Oxford: OUP, 2005).

⁹⁹ Cf. Stephen Gero, “The So-Called Ointment Prayer in the Coptic Version of the *Didache*: A Re-Evaluation,” *HTR* 70 (1977): 80–81.

¹⁰⁰ For a similar view, see Jefford, “Locating the *Didache*,” 40.

¹⁰¹ O’Loughlin, *Didache*, 25.

Kurt Niederwimmer argues,¹⁰² or if it ‘has a limited purpose in its composition and is, as a selective church order, a [...] text on particular problems of community life’, as Georg Schöllgen claims,¹⁰³ then the scattered geographical hints may become significant in the attempt to circumscribe its ancient, pre-Didachic traditions.

Niederwimmer, for instance, thinks that the final layer of the *Didache* ‘appears to have only local situations in view’ and ‘preserves the archaic traditions of a particular locality’.¹⁰⁴ However, if the *Didache* is a composite text, as Audet and others have definitely shown,¹⁰⁵ these ‘archaic traditions’ have most likely been composed in various places, at various times.¹⁰⁶ For reasons like these, the geographical approaches are of little use; again, if the final stage of composition is considered. On the other hand, if these pre-Didachic traditions are recognized individually, and if Niederwimmer’s view is rejected, i.e., that these traditions are the product of ‘a particular locality’, then the geographical references could facilitate the attempt to circumscribe the provenance of a particular tradition. Moreover, it also solves the inconvenience of the contradictory data. Following this approach, there is no contradiction in agreeing that the fragments about the itinerant ‘apostles and prophets’ (*Did.* 11.4–6) could have originated in the Syrian-Palestinian area, while the exception concerning the water for baptism could have originated in Egypt (*Did.* 7.2–3).¹⁰⁷ This approach, based upon the individuality of each pre-Didachic tradition, will be resumed below,¹⁰⁸ when I will examine the eucharistic traditions of *Did.* 9–10.

¹⁰² Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 3.

¹⁰³ Schöllgen, “*Didache* as a Church Order, 63 [Ger.: “Die *Didache* als Kirchenordnung: Zur Frage des Abfassungszweckes und seinen Konsequenzen für die Interpretation,” *JAC* 29 (1986): 5–26].

¹⁰⁴ Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 3.

¹⁰⁵ Audet, *Didachè*, 104–86; Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 10–12.

¹⁰⁶ Claussen, “Eucharist in John and the *Didache*,” 138: ‘different sections may stem not just from different times but also from a variety of localities.’

¹⁰⁷ There are, however, scholars who locate the composition of the *Didache* in Syria, based on the same passage (*Did.* 7.2–3). See (for instance) Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 53; van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 51. Indeed, the baptistry discovered at the house-church in Dura-Europos, in which only sprinkling or pouring could have taken place, supports this reading. See Ramsay MacMullen, *The Second Church: Popular Christianity, A.D. 200–400* (WGRWS; Atlanta: SBL, 2009).

¹⁰⁸ See § 6.2.1 (4).

(9) In his 1995 essay, Clayton Jefford convincingly argued that Ignatius, the bishop of Syrian Antioch (Ignatius, *Rom.* 2.2), ‘[had] full knowledge of the materials which were incorporated into the *Didache* from the collected Christian traditions of the community in Antioch.’¹⁰⁹ He also concluded that,

it seems remotely possible [...] that Ignatius knew the *Didache* in its present form [...] Nevertheless [...] it appears much more plausible that Ignatius knew some early form of the *Didache* (a form which now is lost to us) and even more likely that he was familiar with materials and traditions which eventually were compiled by the Didachist. In any case, the argument against the association of the Didachist with the city of Antioch because of the supposed absence of the *Didache* within the thought and writings of Ignatius should no longer be considered as an automatic criterion upon which to evaluate the provenance of the text.¹¹⁰

Indeed, as Jefford himself admits, a more convincing approach is to show Ignatius’ familiarity with individual pre-Didachic traditions, especially if an earlier dating for the Ignatian corpus is preferred (*ca.* 105–115 CE). However, more recently, scholars like Andreas Lindemann, Allen Brent, Paul Foster, and Timothy Barnes, to name but a few, argued for a later dating of Ignatius’ letters, namely 120–140 CE.¹¹¹ If their reassessment is correct, then the familiarity of the bishop with the final composition of the *Didache* is even more probable.¹¹² At the same time, it should be noted that Jefford’s safer conclusion, i.e., the familiarity of Ignatius with ‘materials and traditions which eventually were compiled by the Didachist’¹¹³ offers enough data to postulate a connection between the *Didache* and Antioch, regardless of the dating of Ignatius’ writings. This latter point shall be developed in the next section.¹¹⁴ Again, for the purpose of this study, to show that Ignatius knew the eucharistic traditions of *Did.* 9–10 is sufficient.

¹⁰⁹ Jefford, “Did Ignatius Know the *Didache*,” 350.

¹¹⁰ Jefford, “Did Ignatius Know the *Didache*,” 351.

¹¹¹ See the discussion in chapter 8 (§ 8.1.1).

¹¹² Jefford: “Did Ignatius Know the *Didache*,” 351; “Conflict at Antioch,” 262–69.

¹¹³ Jefford, “Did Ignatius Know the *Didache*,” 351.

¹¹⁴ See § 6.2.1 (12).

6.1.2 From Syria to Antioch. Further narrowing arguments

As may be noted, some of the arguments above fit the general region of Syria. Why, then, is there the insistence to narrow the area to the urban Antioch?¹¹⁵

(1) As we have seen in the previous chapters, in order to defend the Antiochene provenance of Matthew's Gospel, J.P. Meier adduced the argument of the 'most commonly used language of the ordinary people' in Syria. While Greek was not used largely by the common people living in Syriac countryside, Antioch was 'the centre of Hellenistic learning and the Greek language'.¹¹⁶ If Meier is correct, since the *Didache* was composed in Greek,¹¹⁷ the observations above would allow the narrowing of the place of composition to an urban Greek speaking location of Syria, which fits Antioch best. However, I have already mentioned the position of Sebastian Brock and Fergus Millar, i.e., that the city of Antioch cannot be distinguished on the criteria of the 'most commonly used language of the ordinary people', since other Syrian cities have similarly been inhabited by Greek-speaking populations.¹¹⁸

I suggest that a better way to approach the criterion of language is to consider the language of the addressee only secondarily and give prominence to the language/vocabulary behind the text. According to Philip Schaff,

The *Didache* contains 2,190 words. Its vocabulary comprises 552 words. Of the whole number 504 are New Testament words, 497 are classical, and 479 occur in the LXX. 15 occur for the first time in the *Didache*, but are found in later writers. 1 occurs only in the *Didache*. 14 occur in the New Testament with a different meaning.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁵ Some scholars, such as K. Wengst, W. Rordorf and A. Tuilier have argued that the *Didache* was composed in a rural setting, based on passages like *Did.* 13.3–7. See Wengst, *Didache*, 62; Rordorf-Tuilier, *Doctrine*, 97–98. Cf. Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 53 (n. 77); van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 52. However, G. Schöllgen refutes the view, convincingly showing (according to most scholars) that an urban setting is more likely. See Georg Schöllgen, "Die *Didache* — ein frühes Zeugnis für Landgemeinden?" *ZNW* 76 (1985): 140–43.

¹¹⁶ Meier, "Antioch," 20–21. Cf. § 4.2.1 (5).

¹¹⁷ Schaff, *Oldest Church Manual*, 95–113; Niederwimmer, "Der Didachist und seine Quellen," 22–36.

¹¹⁸ S.P. Brock, "Greek and Latin Words in Palmyrene Inscriptions: A Comparison with Syriac," in E. Cussini (ed.), *A Journey to Palmyra: Collected Essays to Remember Delbert R. Hillers* (CHANE 22; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2005), 11–25; Fergus Millar, *Rome, the Greek World, and the East*, vol. 3: *The Greek World, the Jews, and the East* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 3–31. Cf. Meier, "Antioch," 21.

¹¹⁹ Schaff, *Oldest Church Manual*, 97.

Although there are words that occur also in the LXX or classical literature, the vocabulary of the *Didache* differs from these two ‘by the deeper Christian meaning of words and phrases’, as Schaff notices.¹²⁰ Such words and phrases ‘betray familiarity with apostolic ideas’ more than with the LXX,¹²¹ as the comparison with the *Epistle of Barnabas* reveals:

Of the *Didache* 91½ per cent, of the vocabulary is New Testament; of Barnabas, 91½ per cent. The agreement of the *Didache* and of Barnabas with reference to their percentage of New Testament words is remarkable [...] But with reference to LXX. words there is quite a discrepancy, the vocabulary of Barnabas being much closer to that of the LXX. than the vocabulary of the *Didache* is.¹²²

These figures indicate that a lexical influence from certain Christian sources is more likely than from the LXX, for both the *Didache* and *Barnabas*. In sum, Schaff suggests that the vocabulary of the *Didache* ‘is essentially the same as that of the New Testament’.¹²³ Nevertheless, the Didachist undoubtedly knows certain writings from the LXX (cf. *Did.* 14.3; 16.7).¹²⁴ He also knows and uses, even more extensively, various Christian motifs (*Did.* 9.2; 10.6), oral traditions (*Did.* 8.2; 9.1–10.6), and written sources (*Did.* 1.1–6.3 [1.3b–2.1]), including significant (pre)Matthean material (see *Did.* 1.3b–d; 1.4b–e; 1.5a–d; 8.2; 9.5b; 11.7; 13.1–2; 16.3–8).¹²⁵ So, the bulk of his vocabulary comes from all these sources.¹²⁶ This observation, I suggest, narrows the search for a place of provenance to Antioch, for there are not many Greek speaking urban locations in Syria, during the second half of the first century CE, that would have collected all these sources.

(2) Secondly, there is the criterion of influence. Prior to its discovery (in 1873), the existence of the *Didache* was attested in the lists of the Christian writings that are not included in the

¹²⁰ Schaff, *Oldest Church Manual*, 96.

¹²¹ Schaff, *Oldest Church Manual*, 97.

¹²² Schaff, *Oldest Church Manual*, 98.

¹²³ Schaff, *Oldest Church Manual*, 96–97.

¹²⁴ Varner: *Didache*, 42–44; “The *Didache*’s Use of the Old and New Testaments,” *TMSJ* 16/1 (2005): 127–51.

¹²⁵ Van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 28–31.

¹²⁶ Cf. Schaff, *Oldest Church Manual*, 95–113; van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 28–48.

canon of the NT. Eusebius of Caesarea (*Hist. eccl.* 3.25.4–6), for instance, lists the *Didache*, (the ‘so-called Teaching of the Apostles’; Gk. τῶν ἀποστόλων αἱ λεγόμεναι Διδαχαί), together with the Acts of Paul, the *Shepherd* of Hermas, Pseudo-Barnabas, and the Gospel to the Hebrews, among the writings that are disputed (ἀντιλεγόμενα) and apocryphal (νόθα). Although it is not accepted among the canonical books of the NT, nor has it been assigned any apostolic paternity (αἱ λεγόμεναι), the *Didache* is still popular, being ‘known to most ecclesiastics’: ὅμως δὲ παρὰ πλείστοις τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν γνωσκομένης.¹²⁷ Most likely, Eusebius refers not only to the contemporary church leaders, but also to those preceding him.¹²⁸

In *Festal Letter 39* (written in 367 CE), after he enumerates the canonical books of the OT and NT, Athanasius of Alexandria brings to discussion those books that were left outside the canon and yet are recommended ‘by the Fathers’, to be read during the catechumenal training (*Ep. Fest.* 39.7). Among the books mentioned by Athanasius are the *Shepherd* of Hermas and the *Didache*, or the ‘so-called *Teaching of the Apostles*’ (Διδαχή καλουμένη τῶν ἀποστόλων). In line with Eusebius, Athanasius rejects the apostolic paternity of the writing (καλουμένη), while he also recognizes its popularity and admits its spiritual benefit: ὡς ὅτι ἔστιν καὶ ἕτερα βιβλία τούτων ἔξωθεν. οὐ κανονιζόμενα μὲν τετυπωμένα δὲ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἀναγινώσκεισθαι τοῖς ἄρτι προσερχομένοις καὶ βουλομένοις κατηχεῖσθαι τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγον (‘there are other books besides these [i.e., the canonical books previously listed] not indeed included in the Canon, but appointed by the Fathers to be read by those who newly join us, and who wish for instruction in the word of godliness’).¹²⁹

¹²⁷ Eusebius, “Church History, Life of Constantine the Great, and Oration in Praise of Constantine,” in Philip Schaff (ed.), *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (vol. 2/1; Oak Harbor: Logos, 1997), 157.

¹²⁸ Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 4.

¹²⁹ Athanasius, “Select Works and Letters,” in Philip Schaff (ed.), *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (vol. 2/4; Oak Harbor: Logos, 1997), 552.

Both Eusebius and Athanasius admit that the *Didache* has no apostolic paternity, as is presupposed by its title.¹³⁰ Still, they both refer to prior Christian leaders (‘ecclesiastics’, ‘Fathers’) that have known and recommended the *Didache* as part of the pre-baptismal training, thus acknowledging its large-scale influence. So, since there was no recognized apostolic authority behind this text, I suggest that the *Didache* became both popular and influential for it was the outcome of a popular and influential Christian community, such as Syrian Antioch.¹³¹ If its anonymous compiler (the Didachist) was not an influential leader, his community must have been.¹³² This assertion is confirmed by the full insertion of the *Didache* in the larger collection of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, a church order originating from Syria (ca. 300 CE),¹³³ whose full (redacted) insertion (cf. *Ap. Const.* 7.1.2–32.4) reaffirms the authority of the *Didache* in the area.¹³⁴

6.1.3 Preliminary conclusions

I suggest this condensed approach is sufficient to hint that the region of Syria (in general) and Antioch (in particular) are probable candidates for the place of provenance of the *Didache*’s composition. Admittedly, few of the arguments adduced here are convincing in themselves, as some of them fit other locations as well.¹³⁵ However, taken together, these arguments create a coherent picture that makes Antioch the most probable candidate.

¹³⁰ According to A. Adam and K. Niederwimmer, in the days of Eusebius and Athanasius (fourth century CE), the title of this writing was διδαχὴ/διδασκαλί τῶν ἀποστόλων. See Alfred Adam, “Erwägungen zur Herkunft der Didachè,” *ZKG* 68 (1957): 1–47; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 56.

¹³¹ B.H. Streeter, J.P. Meier, and others use the same argument for the Antiochene origin of Matthew’s Gospel. See § 4.3 (2).

¹³² The enduring anonymity of the redactor/compiler, and his numerous references to older, authoritative traditions, indicate its limited popularity and influence. *Pace* Niederwimmer (*Didache*, 228), who suggests that the Didachist could have been a local bishop, highly influential in the area.

¹³³ E.g., F.X. Funk (ed.), *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum* (vols. 1–2; Paderborn: Ferdinand Schoeningh, 1905), 1:xv–xlvi, 386–423.

¹³⁴ Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 17, 28–29.

¹³⁵ Cf. Adam, “Erwägungen zur Herkunft,” esp. 37–42. Adam suggests Pella as a possible place of composition.

Compared to other possible locations, the cumulative evidence for the capital of Syria is far superior.

6.2 Locating the eucharistic traditions of *Didache* 9–10: The case for Syrian Antioch

As was stated in the preceding section, for the purpose of this study it will suffice to limit the scope of research to *Didache* 9–10 and pursue similar connections to the city of Antioch. Moreover, since the *Didache* was a composite work, in which various sources may have originated in various places and at various times,¹³⁶ this approach is the most convincing.

6.2.1 Was *Didache* 9–10 composed in Antioch?

In the following section, I will bring to attention several arguments, in order to suggest that the eucharistic traditions of *Did.* 9–10 were not only inserted in the final layer of the writing, but also were composed or redacted in the city of Antioch; at least, one of the two traditions.

(1) The eucharistic traditions/prayers of *Did.* 9–10 begin with these very words: *περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας, οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε...* (‘with respect to the Eucharist, you shall eucharisticize as follows’). Philip Schaff was among the first scholars to draw attention to the fact that, in *Did.* 9.1, the Didachist uses the term ‘eucharist’ differently than it is used in the NT.¹³⁷ In the *Didache*, the term is more technical, loaded with ecclesiastical and liturgical meaning (*Did.*

¹³⁶ Claussen, “Eucharist in John and the *Didache*,” 138.

¹³⁷ Claussen, “Eucharist in John and the *Didache*,” 141–42: ‘Although *εὐχαριστία* appears in the New Testament altogether fifteen times, mainly in the Pauline and deutero-Pauline literature, it is never used as a *terminus technicus* for the Eucharist or the eucharistic elements.’

10.7).¹³⁸ At present, most scholars would recognize the technicality of the term, especially because of its use in *Did.* 9.1 and 9.5.¹³⁹ Note, for instance, van de Sandt's reasonable inference:

In this verse [*Did.* 9.5] the word εὐχαριστία not only refers to the utterance of the blessings like the one in 9.1, but also to the eucharistic food over which the blessing is spoken: "Let no one eat or drink of your Eucharist." Since the prayer does not give any explanation for this nomenclature, one may assume that the term "Eucharist" was used in the Christian milieu of the *Didache* in this technical sense.¹⁴⁰

To further the argument, I suggest that 'Eucharist' became a technical term in the church of Antioch.¹⁴¹ At least this is hinted at by the evidence of the earliest Christian literature. The first writer to use 'Eucharist' in the same technical sense as in the *Didache* was Ignatius of Antioch: *Eph.* 13.1; *Phil.* 4.1; *Smyrn.* 7.1; 10.1.¹⁴² As for the NT, the term first appears in the Lord's Supper tradition that Paul and Luke received from Antioch (1 Cor. 11.24/Lk. 22.19): καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ εἶπεν... The utterance in 1 Cor. 11/Lk. 22 may have constituted the origin of the designation, since only Paul and Luke use εὐχαριστέω, whereas Mark and Matthew prefer εὐλογέω.¹⁴³

(2) When reading the prayers of *Did.* 9–10, one of the first details that may strike the reader with some knowledge of the eucharistic practice concerns the reversed order of cup and bread (*Did.* 9.2–3): 'First, concerning the cup [...] Next, concerning the broken bread...' Based upon this reversal, Joachim Jeremias categorically concludes that *Did.* 9–10 cannot describe a proper Eucharist, but one regular *agape* meal, since 'There never was a Eucharist with the sequence

¹³⁸ Schaff, *Oldest Church Manual*, 58, 111.

¹³⁹ E.g., Garrow, *Matthew's Dependence*, 20: 'the technical language [of *Did.* 9.1], parallel to the language concerning baptism (*Did.* 7.1).'

¹⁴⁰ Huub van de Sandt, "Baptism and Holiness: Two Requirements Authorizing Participation in the *Didache*'s Eucharist," in Draper-Jefford, *Didache*, 148.

¹⁴¹ Cf. Andrew B. McGowan, "Naming the Feast: The Agape and the Diversity of Early Christian Meals," *StPatr* 30 (1997): 314–18.

¹⁴² Schaff, *Oldest Church Manual*, 58.

¹⁴³ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AYBC 32; New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2008), 436–37.

Wine—Bread’.¹⁴⁴ In response, Andrew McGowan criticizes Jeremias for ignoring passages like Luke 22.15–20 (esp. 17–19a), 1 Cor. 10.16, and also a quotation from Papias of Hierapolis, preserved in Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 5.33.3–4.¹⁴⁵ According to McGowan, all these references indicate a certain cup–bread sequence.¹⁴⁶ Moreover, they indicate the presence of a cup–bread pattern especially in Syria, but also in other regions.¹⁴⁷ However, there are several problems with McGowan’s construct. First of all, it is very unlikely that

If in 10: 16 Paul is making a conscious effort to present what he understands to be the communal meal practice of the Corinthians and to link it with his own, the use of the order cup–bread in his argument then becomes somewhat difficult unless he actually believes this is their custom, just as he uses their terminology or a shared but (for him) not wholly adequate terminology.¹⁴⁸

As most Pauline scholars argue, Paul inverts the order of the traditional elements for rhetorical purposes: ‘to permit an expansion on the bread word in 1 Cor. 10:17’.¹⁴⁹ Actually, McGowan himself admits ‘That the reason for the reversal at 10:16 is [more likely] incidental or rhetorical’.¹⁵⁰ Therefore, it is highly improbable that the Corinthians celebrated a cup–bread Eucharist, as McGowan presupposes,¹⁵¹ especially if Paul taught them the 1 Cor. 11.23–25 tradition when the church was founded (1 Cor. 11.23a).¹⁵²

As for the quotation from Papias (Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 5.33.3–4),¹⁵³ McGowan also admits that: ‘If a eucharistic allusion can be identified only with caution, it is with still further

¹⁴⁴ Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (trans., Norman Perrin; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), 118 (n. 5).

¹⁴⁵ Andrew B. McGowan, “‘First Regarding the Cup...’: Papias and the Diversity of Early Eucharistic Practice,” *JTS* 46 (1995): 551–55.

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Andrew B. McGowan, “The Inordinate Cup: Issues of Order in Early Eucharistic Drinking,” *StPatr* 35 (2001): 283–91.

¹⁴⁷ McGowan, “‘First Regarding the Cup,’” 554; Joseph Ysebaert, “The Eucharist as a Love-meal (agape) in *Didache* 9–10, and Its Development in the Pauline and in the Syrian Tradition,” in A. Hilhorst (ed.), *The Apostolic Age in Patristic Thought* (Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2004), 11.

¹⁴⁸ McGowan, “‘First Regarding the Cup,’” 553.

¹⁴⁹ So, PHEME PERKINS, *First Corinthians* (Paideia; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 126.

¹⁵⁰ McGowan, “‘First Regarding the Cup,’” 552.

¹⁵¹ McGowan, “‘First Regarding the Cup,’” 553–54.

¹⁵² McGowan, “‘First Regarding the Cup,’” 552.

¹⁵³ Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 5.33.3–4: ‘Days are coming, in which vines will spring up each having ten thousand branches, and on one branch [will be] ten thousand twigs, and indeed on one twig ten thousand shoots, and on each shoot ten thousand bunches, and on each bunch ten thousand grapes, and each grape when pressed will give twenty-five measures of wine. And when one of the saints takes a bunch from among them, another bunch will

hesitation that the passage can be taken to mean that Papias is referring to a Eucharist with the cup–bread pattern.’¹⁵⁴ To make such a speculative reading persuasive, one needs to postulate the existence of cup–bread patterns in various early churches, including Hierapolis, where Papias was bishop.¹⁵⁵ Thus, McGowan’s reasoning here becomes circular: Papias’ quotation needs to be interpreted as referring to a Eucharist, in order to prove such patterns. On the other hand, the cup–bread patterns are presupposed in order to read eucharistic allusions into Papias’ quotation. Therefore, I suggest that Irenaeus’ quotation is of little use in the attempt to search for an inverse pattern.

The other passage that McGowan adduces in favour of a cup–bread pattern is Lk. 22.17–19a, the shorter reading of the institution narrative: ‘The original text is not what is of concern here, but rather the fact that whichever text is read, some knowledge of a «cup–bread» tradition is at least possible for Luke or for those responsible for the textual problems.’¹⁵⁶ Unfortunately, McGowan does not address the ‘textual problems’. Consequently, I will develop his argument further, for these textual variations are helpful in the attempt to locate the cup–bread pattern.

In addition to the shorter readings preserved in D and its Italic allies (It^{adff2i1}), in which verses 19b and 20 are omitted and thereby present the sequence of cup–bread, certain variations of Lk. 22.17–20 also appear in a few Syriac manuscripts: the Curetonian Syriac (syr^c), the Sinaitic Syriac (syr^s), and the Peshitta Syriac (syr^p).¹⁵⁷ The variations of the Syriac copies are set forth below in parallel columns, as presented by B.M. Metzger:¹⁵⁸

call out: “I am better, pick me, bless the Lord through me.” Similarly, also a grain of wheat will produce ten thousand ears, and each ear will have ten thousand grains, and each grain five double-pounds of fine white flour...’

¹⁵⁴ McGowan, “‘First Regarding the Cup’,” 554.

¹⁵⁵ There is no evidence of such patterns in the church of Papias. See Monte A. Shanks, *Papias and the New Testament* (Eugene: Pickwick, 2013).

¹⁵⁶ McGowan, “‘First Regarding the Cup’,” 551–52.

¹⁵⁷ B.M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London/New York: United Bible Societies, 1994), 148.

¹⁵⁸ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 148.

Lk. 22 (syr^c)

¹⁹ καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔλεγεν, Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

¹⁷ καὶ δεξάμενος τὸ ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν, Λάβετε τοῦτο, διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς.

¹⁸ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐ μὴ πῖω ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τούτου τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως οὗ ἔλθῃ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

Lk. 22 (syr^s)

¹⁹ καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔλεγεν, Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

20a. καὶ μετὰ τὸ δειπῆσαι.

¹⁷ δεξάμενος τὸ ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν, Λάβετε τοῦτο, διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς.

^{20b} τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου ἡ διαθήκη ἡ καινή.

¹⁸ λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐ μὴ πῖω ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τούτου ἕως οὗ ἔλθῃ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

Lk. 22 (syr^p)

¹⁹ καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔλεγεν, Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

²⁰ καὶ ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπῆσαι, λέγων, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.

The syr^c modifies the shorter text by placing v.19a before v. 17, thus securing the bread–cup sequence. Also, the text is enlarged with an interpolation from 1 Cor. 11.24, that is added to v. 19a. Hence the possible conclusion that the Lukan text was rearranged under the influence of the Pauline tradition.¹⁵⁹ Similar variations also appear in syr^s, which places both v. 19 and v. 20a before v. 17.¹⁶⁰ As for the syr^p, it preserves the longer reading of vv. 19–20, but omits vv. 17–18. As may be noticed, the Syriac manuscripts preserve variations of both shorter and longer readings of Luke’s institution narrative. And yet, all the variations are rearranged so as to secure the traditional bread–cup sequence and eliminate all instances in which the cup appears first.

Bart Ehrman often argues that there are instances of textual variations (‘corruptions’), in which one can read the theological disputes of early Christianity: ‘theological disputes about the nature of God, the disposition of the material world, the person of Christ, and the status of Scripture’.¹⁶¹ These variations were mostly produced by scribes ‘not isolated from the

¹⁵⁹ Ysebaert, “The Eucharist as a Love-meal,” 11. Cf. Bart D. Ehrman, “The Cup, the Bread, and the Salvific Effect of Jesus’ Death in Luke-Acts,” in *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (NTTS 33; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2006), 172. Ehrman comes to similar conclusion with D and the Italics.

¹⁶⁰ E.g., Bradley S. Billings, *Do This in Remembrance of Me: The Disputed Words in the Lukan Institution Narrative (Luke 22.19b-20). An Historico-Exegetical, Theological and Sociological Analysis* (LNTS 314; London: T&T Clark, 2006), 7.

¹⁶¹ Ehrman, “The Cup, the Bread, and the Salvific Effect,” 177.

implications of these disputes'.¹⁶² So, following Westcott and Hort's famous 'Western non-interpolations',¹⁶³ Ehrman considers D to be authentic, while Lk. 22.19–20 represents

a corruption effected by Christian scribes of the second century, scribes who wanted to stress, in the face of various kinds of docetic Christologies, that Christ really did shed blood and die, and that this shed blood and death were themselves salvific [...] the work of proto-orthodox scribes seeking to make the evangelist's message even more applicable to the polemical context of their own day.¹⁶⁴

However, when he mentions the Syriac manuscripts, Ehrman admits that these versions could have been altered to '[reverse] the sequence of cup and bread'.¹⁶⁵

Not many scholars today would hold to the views of Westcott-Hort or Ehrman, one of the recent exponents of the 'short reading' theory.¹⁶⁶ Still, when the Syriac manuscripts are considered, there is large agreement that the three witnesses infer certain polemics over the order of the eucharistic elements.¹⁶⁷ So, Ehrman's previous suggestion, that one can read certain polemics or disputes into the textual variations of the manuscripts, is correct in this particular instance. Consequently, since there is this scribal attempt to secure the traditional bread–cup sequence, at least it shows that a reversed order was currently being practised in Syria.¹⁶⁸

Furthermore, similar polemics may be read into the Syrian redaction of *Ap. Const.* 7.25, in which there is a certain ambiguity regarding the sequence of the elements:

[...] in respect to the Eucharist, say thus: We thank thee, our Father, for that life which thou hast made known to us by Jesus thy Son, by whom thou madest all things, and takest care of the whole world; whom thou hast sent to become man for our salvation; whom thou hast permitted to suffer and to die; whom thou hast raised up, and been pleased to glorify, and hast seated at thy right hand; by whom also thou hast promised us the resurrection of the dead. Do thou, Lord Almighty, everlasting God, so gather together thy church from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom, as this was once scattered, and is now become one loaf. We also, our Father, thank thee for the precious blood of Jesus Christ, which was shed

¹⁶² Ehrman, "The Cup, the Bread, and the Salvific Effect," 177.

¹⁶³ B.F. Westcott and J.F.A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1881), esp. 175–77.

¹⁶⁴ Ehrman, "The Cup, the Bread, and the Salvific Effect," 176.

¹⁶⁵ Ehrman, "The Cup, the Bread, and the Salvific Effect," 157.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. B.S. Billings: *Do This in Remembrance of Me*, esp. 7–21; "The Disputed Words in the Lukan Institution Narrative (Luke 22:19b–20): A Sociological Answer to a Textual Problem," *JBL* 125/3 (2006): 507–26.

¹⁶⁷ Billings, *Do This in Remembrance of Me*, esp. 61–81.

¹⁶⁸ Ysebaert, "The Eucharist as a Love-meal," 11.

for us, and for his precious body, of which we celebrate these representations, as he himself appointed us, 'to show forth his death'.

In the first part of the prayer any reference to the cup is removed, although there is the mention of the suffering and death of Jesus. However, these are not associated with the wine, as the gathering of the church is associated with the 'loaf'. On the other hand, when the prayer becomes even more eucharistic, the thanksgiving over 'the precious blood of Jesus Christ' precedes the thanksgiving over 'his precious body', albeit there is one clear reference to 1 Cor. 11.26 ('to show forth his death'), a text that accounts for the opposed sequence: 'body–blood/bread–cup'.¹⁶⁹

I suggest, therefore, that this ambiguity also reflects some disputes concerning the order of the elements, even in fourth century Syria.¹⁷⁰ This would certainly explain the Syriac alterations of the Lukan texts in which, regardless of the reading, the loaf always precedes the cup. It could also explain the references to Paul, both in syr^c and *Ap. Const.* 7.25, as 1 Cor. 11.23–25 was most probably used to consolidate the Lukan alterations and the bread–cup sequence. In conclusion, given the 'polemical milieu', as Ehrman calls it, scholars may confidently connect *Did.* 9.2–3 ('First, concerning the cup [...] Next, concerning the broken bread...') to the region of Syria.

There is another way in which *Did.* 9.2–3 can be associated with the Syrian region. According to McGowan, there is also a cultural link with the Jewish meal practices, which better fits with Syria.¹⁷¹ As virtually all scholars agree, there is some form of antique Jewish

¹⁶⁹ Cf. Paul F. Bradshaw and Maxwell E. Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies: Their Evolution and Interpretation* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2012), 123–29.

¹⁷⁰ Enrico Mazza, *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer* (trans., Robert E. Lane; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1995), 42–61.

¹⁷¹ McGowan, "Inordinate Cup," 286–88; Willy Rordorf, "The Didache," in Willy Rordorf et al., *The Eucharist of the Early Christians* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990), 8–9, 20 (n. 17). Cf. Gerard Rouwhorst, "The Roots of the Early Christian Eucharist: Jewish Blessings or Hellenistic Symposia?," in Albert Gerhards and Clemens Leonhard (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Liturgy and Worship: New Insights into its History and Interaction* (JCP 15; Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2007), 295–308.

prayers behind the traditions of *Did.* 9–10.¹⁷² Under the influence of Louis Finkelstein,¹⁷³ to consider these prayers a Christianized *Birkat Ha-Mazon* became almost a consensus.¹⁷⁴ More recently, however, this view has repeatedly been challenged.¹⁷⁵ So, at present, most scholars would recognize the fluidity of the Jewish prayers in the first century CE, fluidity that makes any strict association impossible.¹⁷⁶ However, there is still the recognition that behind the two eucharistic prayers one may identify Jewish patterns of prayers for the meal.¹⁷⁷

Furthermore, ‘[t]here is general recognition of similar cup–first patterns in Jewish meal practices’.¹⁷⁸ The priority of the cup, for instance, appears in the order of the Passover’s Seder, as prescribed in the *Mishna* (*m. Pes.* 10.1–9). Then, *Tosefta* and the Talmud, when prescribing the order of the meal, also offer priority to the blessing of the cup (*b. Ber.* 43a).¹⁷⁹ There is, of course, the issue of anachronism, as the Mishnaic literature is later than the first century CE.¹⁸⁰ However, the cup–bread polemics from the second to the fourth centuries CE show the lasting persistence of the inverse pattern.¹⁸¹ Thus, the same inference works backwards, into a much more Jewish second half of the first century, especially since Lk. 22.17–20 confirms the existence of the pattern at that time.¹⁸²

¹⁷² E.g., R.D. Middleton, “The Eucharistic Prayers of the *Didache*,” *JTS* 37 (1935): 259–67.

¹⁷³ Louis Finkelstein, “The Birkat Ha-Mazon,” *JQR* 19 (1928–29): 211–62; Str-B 4:631–32.

¹⁷⁴ E.g., Mazza, *Origins*, 17: ‘Since the studies of Finkelstein, Dibelius, and Hruby the connection between the *Birkat Ha-Mazon* and *Didache* 10 no longer requires demonstration.’ Among the supporters of this view, see: M. Dibelius; K. Hruby; R.D. Middleton; A. Baumstark; R. Grant and C. Richardson; J.-P. Audet; L. Bouyer; H. Koester; A. Vööbus; T. Talley; A.F. Verheul; W. Rordorf and A. Tuilier. See the references to these scholars in J.W. Riggs, ‘From Gracious Table to Sacramental Elements: The Tradition-History of *Didache* 9 and 10’, *SecCent* 4 (1984): 83–102 (91); Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 155 (n. 2); Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 17 (n. 17).

¹⁷⁵ See the discussion in Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship* (Oxford/New York: OUP, 1992), 158; Milavec, *Didache*, esp. 416–21.

¹⁷⁶ Milavec, *Didache*, 419–21. Cf. Joseph Heinemann, *Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns* (Studia Judaica 9; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977), 39–43 and *passim*.

¹⁷⁷ Milavec, *Didache*, 421.

¹⁷⁸ McGowan, “Inordinate Cup,” 286.

¹⁷⁹ McGowan, “Inordinate Cup,” 287.

¹⁸⁰ Milavec, *Didache*, 419–20.

¹⁸¹ See (for instance) Dom Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London/New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), 173–207.

¹⁸² McGowan, “‘First Regarding the Cup’,” 551–52.

In sum, it is reasonable to conclude that the eucharistic prayers of the *Didache* were composed in a dominant Jewish-Christian milieu, reflecting the Jewish meal practices of the day. This does not connect directly the eucharistic prayers to the city of Antioch, nor even to the region of Syria; but it leaves the possibility open, since such a milieu fits well Syrian Antioch in the first century CE.¹⁸³ However, the reversed cup–bread order of the eucharistic meals could narrow the Jewish-Christian milieu down to the region of Syria. Moreover, given the endurance of the cup–bread pattern, in spite of the similarly enduring polemics, we may conclude that the pattern originated in a highly influential church from Syria. In my opinion, Antioch should be the first location to be considered.

(3) Another detail that may also strike the reader with some knowledge of the eucharistic traditions concerns the absence of the words of institution, in both *Did.* 9 and 10.¹⁸⁴ This notable absence could be another argument for the Antiochene provenance of *Did.* 9–10, or at least for a Syrian location. This is indicated by the comparison to the Syriac *Anaphora of Addai and Mari*, which also lacks the eucharistic words.¹⁸⁵

(4) Returning to the geographical references of the (individual) pre-Didachic sources, there is the mention of the ‘broken bread [...] scattered upon the mountains’ (*Did.* 9.4a). This reference indicates a place of composition with either hills or mountains, at least for one of the two prayers (*Did.* 9.1–5; cf. *Ap. Const.* 7.25.3).¹⁸⁶ First of all, it would be quite unusual for a liturgical tradition, in its original form, to reflect the geography of a different area.¹⁸⁷ Then, it

¹⁸³ E.g., C.H. Kraeling, “The Jewish Community at Antioch,” *JBL* 51 (1932): 130–60.

¹⁸⁴ E.g., M.D. Larsen, “Addressing the Elephant That’s Not in the Room: Comparing the Eucharistic Prayers in *Didache* 9-10 and the Last Supper Tradition,” *Neot* 45/2 (2011): 252–74.

¹⁸⁵ See the lengthier discussion in Stephen B. Wilson, “The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari,” in Paul F. Bradshaw (ed.), *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1997), 19–38.

¹⁸⁶ Schaff, *Oldest Church Manual*, 124.

¹⁸⁷ To my knowledge, there are no such instances.

should be noticed that the reference to the ‘mountains’ was later removed from *Ap. Const.* 7.25, as this church order was devised to become more universal. Accordingly, I suggest that *Did.* 9.4 reflects an instance of ‘instinctive geography’, certainly unintentional, for it is unnecessary to the whole argument of the stanza. That the theological point of the stanza (i.e., the unity of the church) does not necessitate a geographical correspondent, and hence the necessity to invent surrounding hills or mountains, is evident from the redaction of *Ap. Const.* 7.25.3: ὡςπερ ἦν τοῦτο διεσκορπισμένον καὶ συναχθὲν ἐγένετο εἰς ἄρτος (‘As this was scattered and brought together as one bread’). Instead, it is the geographical familiarity that inspired the metaphor. The broken bread that was shared at the Eucharist has once been grain harvested on the hills that surrounded the area where the prayer was composed.¹⁸⁸ As for the ancient city of Antioch, it was surrounded by hills and mountains.¹⁸⁹

Secondly, Richard Bauckham has recently introduced the discipline of mental or cognitive mapping to the study of the Gospel’s origins.¹⁹⁰ According to Bauckham, people in antiquity described their world in terms of mental maps, quite different from the cartographical maps used in the modern world. One of the differences is that a cognitive map is centred on the dwelling place of the author, which is where all the routes begin or end. To this observation, it may be added that, in some cases, there were also theological, cultural or imperial consciousnesses of geographical centrality. For the Jews, for instance, the centre of their world would be Jerusalem (cf. Lk. 9.51–19.44, 24.44–53; Acts 1.8; 6.7; 9.31; 12.24; 28.14),¹⁹¹ while for the Roman citizens the centre would be Rome, the ‘Caput Mundi’.¹⁹²

¹⁸⁸ Pace O’Loughlin, *Didache*, 24, who suggests that the source of the metaphor is the prophetic language of the OT (e.g., Ezek. 36.4; Nah. 3.18).

¹⁸⁹ Ancient Antioch was situated on the slopes of Mount Silpius. See Jørgen Christensen-Ernst, *Antioch on the Orontes: A History and a Guide* (Lanham: Hamilton, 2012), 178.

¹⁹⁰ Richard Bauckham, “Mark’s Geography and the Origin of Mark’s Gospel” (Lecture delivered at Laidlaw College, 7 August, 2014). The lecture is to be published in a forthcoming monograph.

¹⁹¹ Cf. Raphael Jospe, “The Significance of Jerusalem: A Jewish Perspective,” *JPEC* 2/2 (1995): 32–40; R.J. Werblowsky, *The Meaning of Jerusalem to Jews, Christians and Muslims* (Jerusalem: Israeli Universities Study Group for Middle Eastern Affairs, 1983), 7–9 and *passim*.

¹⁹² E.g., Horia Bernea, Teodor Baconsky, *Roma Caput Mundi* (Bucharest: Humanitas, 2000).

Unfortunately, there is not much geographical data to be analysed in the eucharistic section. Apart from the reference to the ‘mountains’, there is the notable reference to τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς (‘the very ends of the earth’), also found in *Did.* 9.4. Such phrasing indicates a certain departure from the margins and some degree of closeness to the theological centre: ‘into Your kingdom, from (ἀπό) the very ends of the earth’. In the NT, only three writers use the phrase ‘the ends of the earth’, with slight variations: Matthew (Matt. 12.42, τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς), Luke (Acts 1.8; 13.47, ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς), and Paul (Rom. 10.18, τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης).¹⁹³ Again, it should be noted that all three writers have Antioch in common. Moreover, Matthew and the *Didache* use the very same phrasing: τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς. As we have seen in the preceding chapters, according to Matt. 12.42, the ‘southern’ area (νότος), which probably refers to the lands of Egypt and Ethiopia (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 8.165), is considered to be ‘the ends of the earth’.¹⁹⁴ So, the mental mapping of *Did.* 9.4, not only rules out Egypt as the place of composition for this prayer, but also points to Antioch as a possible location, given its Matthean correspondences.

(5) If the geographical references make Egypt an improbable candidate for the place of composition of the eucharistic prayers, then there is the need to explain the technical use of κλάσμα (‘fragment’) in *Did.* 9.3–4 (‘concerning the κλάσμα [...] as the κλάσμα was once scattered over the mountains...’), for this term echoes the language of the Egyptian liturgy.¹⁹⁵

¹⁹³ For the use of these phrases in antiquity, see the extended discussion in Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*, vol. 1: *Introduction and Acts 1:1-2:47* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 704–708.

¹⁹⁴ E.g., D.A. Carson, “Matthew,” in Frank E. Gaebelin (ed.), *Matthew, Mark, Luke* (EBC 8; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 297. In Ps. Sol. 8.16, for instance, ‘from the ends of the earth’ means ‘from Rome’.

¹⁹⁵ Inter alia: Erik Peterson, *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis: Studien und Untersuchungen* (Freiburg/Vienna: Herder, 1959), 99–100; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 148; Claussen, “Eucharist in John and the *Didache*,” 158.

A large majority of scholars, including A. Vööbus,¹⁹⁶ K. Niederwimmer,¹⁹⁷ K. Wengst,¹⁹⁸ and J. Schwiebert,¹⁹⁹ persuasively argue that κλάσμα is, in fact, a later replacement of the original ἄρτος. This is well attested in certain indirect traditions prior to H54,²⁰⁰ such as *Ap. Const.* 7.25–26 (7.25.3), Serapion, *Euch.* 13.13, *P. Dêr Balizeh* II/v. 3–4,²⁰¹ and Ps.-Athanasius, *De virg.* 13. Note Vööbus’ plain conclusion:

The real situation is now fully in view. The reading κλάσμα of the Greek manuscript – which let us remember, is of the year 1056 A.D. – is completely isolated and stands by itself. All the other sources unanimously support the reading ‘bread’. These sources are not only centuries older but they give a reading which cannot upon intrinsic grounds be adjudged suspect. The Greek codex therefore contains a reading which must have intruded into the text as a result of the process of adaptation. It betrays itself as a secondary reading.²⁰²

In conclusion, the use of κλάσμα offers no clues as to the origin of the eucharistic prayers, but can only be used to establish the probable Egyptian location for the *Vorlage* of H54.²⁰³

(6) The instruction in *Did.* 9.5 limits the participation at the Eucharist to those previously baptized: ‘Allow no one to eat or drink of your Eucharist (τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὑμῶν), unless they have been baptized in the name of the Lord.’ The restraint to take part in the Eucharist is then justified by the appeal to an authoritative saying: ‘For concerning this, the Lord has said, “Do not give what is holy to dogs.”’ The same *logion* appears word for word in Matt. 7.6 (and in

¹⁹⁶ A. Vööbus: “Regarding the Background of the Liturgical Traditions in the Didache: The Question of Literary Relation between Didache IX,4 and the Fourth Gospel,” *VC* 23/2 (1969): 81–87 (83); *Liturgical Traditions in the Didache* (ETSE 16; Stockholm: ETSE, 1968), 89, 146–48.

¹⁹⁷ K. Niederwimmer: “Textprobleme der *Didache*,” *WS* 16 (1982): 124–25; *Didache*, 148.

¹⁹⁸ Wengst, *Didache*, 78, 97–98.

¹⁹⁹ Jonathan Schwiebert, *Knowledge and the Coming Kingdom: The Didache’s Meal Ritual and its Place in Early Christianity* (LNTS 373; London: T&T Clark, 2008), 61–62 and *passim*.

²⁰⁰ The manuscript/codex discovered by P. Bryennios (1873) was later (in 1887) transferred to the Library of the Greek Patriarchate of Jerusalem (Hierosolyma), where it was catalogued under the signature Κῶδ. πατρ. 54. Hence its scholarly code, H54 (or *Hierosolymitanus* 54). The manuscript/codex is dated 11 June 1056, by Leon the scribe (fol. 120a). See Bryennios, *Διδαχή, ζε’–ςζ’* (65–66); Robert E. Aldridge, “The Lost Ending of the *Didache*,” *VC* 53/1 (1999): 3 (n. 6).

²⁰¹ “Euchologium Serapionis XIII,13,” in J. Quasten (ed.), *Monumenta Eucharistica et Liturgica Vetustissima* (Bonn: Hanstein, 1935), 62.

²⁰² Vööbus, “Background,” 83.

²⁰³ Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 148.

Matthew alone); yet it appears in a wholly different context, and as the first part of a more extensive saying (see Matt. 7.1–6).²⁰⁴ Not for this reason alone, it is unlikely that the saying is borrowed from the Gospel.²⁰⁵ According to W.D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, the *logion* circulated independently of Matthew, being part of the Q material, as indicated by the comparison with the Gospel of Thomas.²⁰⁶

Matt. 7.6–8

GThom. 92–94

⁶ Μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσὶν μηδὲ βάλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας ὑμῶν ἐμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων, μήποτε καταπατήσουσιν αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς ποσὶν αὐτῶν καὶ στραφέντες ῥήξουσιν ὑμᾶς.

⁷ Αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν, ζητεῖτε καὶ εὕρησετε, κρούετε καὶ ἀνοιγήσεται ὑμῖν.

⁸ πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει καὶ ὁ ζητῶν εὕρισκει καὶ τῷ κρούοντι ἀνοιγήσεται.

⁹² Jesus said, ‘Seek and you will find. In the past, however, I did not tell you the things about which you asked me then. Now I am willing to tell them, but you are not seeking them.

⁹³ Don’t give what is sacred to dogs, for they might throw them upon the manure pile. Don’t throw pearls [to] pigs, or they might . . . it [. . .].

⁹⁴ Jesus [said], ‘One who seeks will find, and for [one who knocks] it will be opened.’

It may be noticed that GThom. 92 recalls Matt. 7.7, while GThom. 94 recalls Matt. 7.8. The contexts are proximate, but the author of GThom. places the saying in the corresponding section of Matt. 7.7–11, rather than 7.1–6. There is also the addition ‘for they might throw them upon the manure pile’, not found in Matthew. All these variations of context and wording suggest a common source, most probably oral, rather than a literary dependence.²⁰⁷

Unfortunately, the very different contexts of *Did.* 9.5 and Matt. 7.6 are of little use in our attempt to postulate a common source, as with the Gospel of Thomas. However, there are other ways to support such a postulation; and one of them is statistics. 80% of all the quotations of and allusions to the *Didache*—that is 25 out of a total of 31 literary references—are found

²⁰⁴ See the extended discussion in 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,” *VC* 56/3 (2002): 223–46 (225).

²⁰⁵ Milavec, *Didache*, 700.

²⁰⁶ W.D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (vol. 1; London/New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), 674.

²⁰⁷ W.D. Davies, *Christian Origins and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962), 123; James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester, *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 182 (n. 83); van de Sandt, “‘Do Not Give What Is Holy to the Dogs’,” 226–31.

in only two sections of Matthew: Matt. 5–7 (‘The Sermon on the Mount’) and Matt. 24–25 (‘The Apocalyptic Discourse’).²⁰⁸ Thus, *Did.* 9.5 provides one of the few explicit quotations in the *Didache*, following an introductory formula (see 1.6; 8.2; 11.3; 14.3; 15.3–4; 16.7).²⁰⁹ With the exception of 1.6, 14.3 and 16.7, all quotations are also found in Matthew. Moreover, as I have already shown, the four references where the term εὐαγγέλιον (‘gospel’) is used as part of an introductory formula (8.2, ‘as the Lord commanded in his gospel’; 11.3, ‘as the gospel decrees’; 15.3, ‘as you have it in the gospel’; 15.4, ‘as you have it in the gospel of our Lord’) are also found in Matthew. Since at least two of the four quotations seem to indicate a written source (15.3–4),²¹⁰ André Tuilier suggests that the *Didache* used the same collection of *logia* that Matthew used to compose his Gospel, i.e., the one that Papias refers to in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.15–16.²¹¹ Bringing the argument further, Tuilier identifies the pre-Matthean collection of *logia* with the hypothetical Q.²¹²

As W. Varner notices, Tuilier’s hypothesis has the merit of allowing for both a written source behind the quotation from Matthew and for an early date of the *Didache*.²¹³ However, there are several problems with this hypothesis. As numerous scholars have shown, the quotations from the *Didache* are most probably rendered from memory.²¹⁴ Hence, all attempts to prove a certain literary dependence are questionable. Still, since the data presented above shows a significant overlap of tradition, to conclude a common source behind both *Did.* 9.5

²⁰⁸ Varner, *Didache*, 46; Draper, “Jesus Tradition in the *Didache*,” 90.

²⁰⁹ Van de Sandt, “‘Do Not Give What Is Holy to the Dogs,’” 226.

²¹⁰ Cf. *Did.* 15.4 (‘as you have it in the gospel of our Lord’) and 9.5 (‘concerning this, the Lord has said’). In the latter formula, there is a clearer indication of orality.

²¹¹ Tuilier, “Le problème synoptique,” 121.

²¹² Tuilier, “Le problème synoptique,” 120–22. Cf. Alan J.P. Garrow, “An Extant Instance of ‘Q,’” *NTS* 62/3 (2016): 398–417; Draper, “Ritual Process,” 121: ‘Here [i.e., in *Did.* 9–10] we may have the eucharistic prayers of the “Q” community.’

²¹³ Varner, *Didache*, 51. Cf. Rordorf-Tuilier, *Doctrine*, 96.

²¹⁴ Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament* (Oxford/New York: OUP, 1968), 87. Metzger strongly argues for the Father’s habits of citing from memory, showing that in the writing the same passage is cited with variations. Cf. Varner, *Didache*, 47–48.

and Matt. 7.6 is entirely reasonable.²¹⁵ Again, the point of intersection for Matthew and the *Didache*, the place of origin for this common source, could be Antioch.²¹⁶

(7) In 1963, Oscar Cullman coined the term ‘Paidology’, in order to describe one of the earliest Christologies of the primary church, ‘the most ancient period of early Christianity[’s] explanation of the person and work of Jesus’, in which Jesus is defined as the *ebed Yahweh* (παῖς θεοῦ) of Isaiah 52–53.²¹⁷ As Cullman notices, the Isaianic ‘paidological’ quotations and allusions, attributed to Jesus himself,²¹⁸ appear especially in the context of the Lord’s Supper traditions: Mk. 14.24; Matt. 26.28; Lk. 22.20, 37; 1 Cor. 11.24.²¹⁹ From this perspective, it is striking that the *Didache* introduces (and is limited to) a similar παῖς-Christology (‘Paidology’) in its own eucharistic fragments or traditions (*Did.* 9.2–3; 10.2):²²⁰

First, concerning the cup: We thank you, our Father, for the holy vine of David your servant, which you made known to us through Jesus your servant (διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου). To you be the glory forever [...] Next, concerning the broken bread: We thank you, our Father, for the life and knowledge which you made known to us through Jesus your servant (διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου). To you be the glory forever [...] We thank you, holy Father, for your holy name which you enshrined in our hearts, and for the knowledge and faith and immortality that you made known to us through Jesus your servant (διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου). To you be the glory forever.

Furthermore, since the ‘Paidology’ belongs to the earliest phase of the Christological construct (cf. Acts 3.13, 26; Acts 8.32–38),²²¹ it suggests a very early date for the Christianized eucharistic prayers of *Did.* 9.1–10.7.²²² Also, it should be noted that outside the eucharistic

²¹⁵ Robinson-Koester, *Trajectories*, 182.

²¹⁶ Further arguments are found in Huub van de Sandt, “Why does the Didache Conceive of the Eucharist as a Holy Meal?,” *VC* 65 (2011): 1–20.

²¹⁷ Oscar Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (trans., Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A.M. Hall; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1959), 73. Cf. J. Jeremias, “pais theou,” in *TDNT*, 5:712–17; Joachim Jeremias and Walther Zimmerli, *The Servant of God* (London: SCM Press, 1957); James D. G. Dunn, *Christianity in the Making*, vol. 1: *Jesus Remembered* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: W.B. Eerdmans, 2003), 809–18.

²¹⁸ See H.W. Wolff, *Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum* (TVG 233; Gießen: Brunnen-Verlag, 1984), 57.

²¹⁹ Cullmann, *Christology*, 69–79.

²²⁰ Cullmann, *Christology*, 75; Jonathan A. Draper, “Ursprung und Theologie der Didache,” in W. Pratscher (ed.), *Theologie der Apostolischen Väter* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 26–28.

²²¹ Cullmann, *Christology*, 73.

²²² Some scholars have argued that the archaic character of the prayers could indicate a date of composition as early as the 30s CE. Rordorf (“Didache,” 19), for instance, accepts the possibility of such a dating, considering the ‘very early’ *pais*-Christology to be the main argument for its archaic character. However, as most scholars

traditions of the Gospels, the παῖς-Christology is peculiar to Peter’s κήρυγμα (cf. Acts 3.13, 26; 4.27, 30; 1 Pet. 2.21–25).²²³ Interestingly enough, in Peter’s preaching, the ‘servant David’ and the ‘servant Christ’ are introduced together (Acts 4.25, 27), similarly to *Did.* 9.2: ‘the holy vine of David your servant [Δαυειδ τοῦ παιδός σου], which you made known to us through Jesus your servant [διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου]’. This very rare apposition could suggest a Petrine influence upon the eucharistic prayers of the *Didache*.²²⁴ If such an influence did exist, then Antioch would have been the most probable common ground for both the Petrine παῖς-Christology and the composition of the eucharistic prayers.

(8) In 1932, during the excavations at Dura-Europos in the east Syrian desert, Clark Hopkins and Henry Pearson uncovered ‘the world’s oldest extant Christian church’.²²⁵ Among the frescos discovered on the walls of the normal domestic house that was converted for worship sometime between 230 and 250 CE,²²⁶ on the main panel of the southern wall of the baptistery, there is the (poor preserved) painting of David beheading Goliath.²²⁷ As Kurt Weitzmann admits, this is ‘a choice rather unexpected in a Christian baptistery and not easy to explain.’²²⁸ In response to Weitzmann, Michael Peppard argues that the belligerent scene of the baptistery ‘can indeed be explained and, at Dura-Europos, perhaps even be expected.’²²⁹ I will not follow here the complex—and compelling, to my estimation—argument of Peppard,²³⁰ but simply

suggest, the 50s CE is more likely. See the extended discussion in Mazza, “*Didache* 9–10,” 278–83 (279); van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 325.

²²³ There remains, of course, the issue of the Lukan redaction of the speeches in Acts. However, as scholars have shown, the *pais*-Christology does not appear to be Lukan, but more likely it is a Petrinism. See Cullmann, *Christology*, esp. 73–74; Keener, *Acts*, 1:313 (n. 462); Jacob Jervell, *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles* (NTT; Cambridge/New York: CUP, 1996), 26; Andrew Chester and Ralph P. Martin, *The Theology of the Letters of James, Peter, and Jude* (NTT; Cambridge/New York: CUP, 1994), 110.

²²⁴ So, Varner, *Didache*, 94. Cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.36.2; 3.22.

²²⁵ Michael Peppard, *The World’s Oldest Church: Bible, Art, and Ritual at Dura-Europos, Syria* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016), 1.

²²⁶ Peppard, *World’s Oldest Church*, 16–20.

²²⁷ Peppard, *World’s Oldest Church*, 44 and *passim*.

²²⁸ Kurt Weitzmann and Herbert L. Kessler, *The Frescoes of the Dura Synagogue and Christian Art* (Dumbarton Oaks Studies 28; Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1990), 84.

²²⁹ Peppard, *World’s Oldest Church*, 62.

²³⁰ See Peppard, *World’s Oldest Church*, 46–85.

note that, under the fresco of the victorious David, the converts at Dura-Europos received the pre-baptismal anointing (see 1 Sam. 16.1–13; 17.12–58).²³¹ Furthermore, Peppard connects the fresco to the eucharistic prayers of *Did.* 9–10, especially *Did.* 9.2 (‘the holy vine of David, your child, which you made known to us through Jesus, your child’)²³² and *Did.* 10.6 (‘May grace come and this world pass away. Hosanna to the God [or house, or Son] of David!’).²³³ Peppard’s connection is legitimate for the walls of the same baptistry are decorated with frescoes of a victorious Jesus caring for his followers: ‘The Good Shepherd’, ‘Healing of the paralytic’, ‘Christ and Peter walking on the water’, ‘Women at the empty tomb’.²³⁴ After connecting the fresco and the eucharistic prayers, Peppard concludes: ‘What David was to Christ, Christ became for Christians: the archetype of a chosen, anointed son in God’s kingdom.’²³⁵ So, when they accepted the pre-baptismal anointing, the converts confessed their membership of the family of God and their adhesion to a victorious kingdom (cf. Ignatius, *Eph.* 17.1).²³⁶ It should be noted that both motifs appear in the eucharistic prayers of the *Didache* (9.2–3; 10.5–6). Moreover, an anointing with oil also appears in these prayers, in some manuscript variants of *Did.* 10.[8], most notably in the *Vorlage* of the Syrian *Ap. Const.* (7.22.2).²³⁷

²³¹ Peppard, *World’s Oldest Church*, 49.

²³² Peppard translates τοῦ παιδός σου as ‘your child’, not ‘your servant’.

²³³ For a discussion concerning the original wording of *Did.* 10.6, see Martin Dibelius, “Die Mahl-Gebete der *Didache*,” in Heinz Kraft, Günther Bornkamm (eds.) *Botschaft und Geschichte*, vol. 2: *Zum Urchristentum und zur hellenistischen Religionsgeschichte* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1956), 116 (n. 10); Niederwimmer, “Textprobleme,” 126–27.

²³⁴ See also S.G.F. Brandon, “Christ in Verbal and Depicted Imagery: A Problem of Early Christian Iconography,” in J. Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults II* (SJLA 12; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975), 166–67.

²³⁵ Peppard, *World’s Oldest Church*, 63.

²³⁶ Peppard, *World’s Oldest Church*, esp. 84–85.

²³⁷ Cf. E. Peterson, “Über einige Probleme der *Didache*-Überlieferung,” *RivAC* 27 (1951): 37–68; Karl Bihlmeyer, *Die apostolischen Väter* (vol. 1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1970), xx; S. Gero, “The So-called Ointment Prayer in the Coptic Version of the *Didache*: A Re-evaluation,” *HTR* 70 (1977): 80–84; S. Jones and P.A. Mirecki, “Considerations on the Coptic papyrus of the *Didache*,” in Jefford, *Didache in Context*, 47–87; Joseph Ysebaert, “The So-Called Coptic Ointment Prayer of *Didache* 10.8 Once More,” *VC* 56/1 (2002): 1–10; Kraft, *Barnabas and the Didache*, 169; Audet, *Didachè*, esp. 28–34, 67–70; Vööbus, *Liturgical Traditions*, 54–56; Wengst, *Didache*, 59, 82 and *passim*; Rordorf-Tuilier, *Doctrine*, 47–48; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 165–67.

Since I have not addressed this issue in depth, I will limit my conclusion to simply noting that, in the region of Syria, there were long-lasting liturgical and creedal connections between Jesus and David.²³⁸ Even if the connection to Dura-Europos is considered unconvincing, there is still the connection to Ignatius of Antioch (*Eph.* 17.1). Similar to the prayers of *Did.* 9–10, the teachings of Ignatius concerning the Eucharist connect Jesus to David repeatedly (e.g., *Eph.* 20.2; *Trall.* 8.1–9.1; *Rom.* 7.3), in what appears to be language derived either from ‘liturgical formulae’ or ‘short creed-like statements’ (see *Eph.* 18.2, 20.2; *Trall.* 9.1; *Rom.* 7.3; *Smyrn.* 1.1).²³⁹ Consequently, this could be another indicator that the prayers of *Did.* 9–10 originated in the region of Syria.

(9) During the same excavations at Dura-Europos, the archaeologists unearthed fragments of parchment scrolls of what J.L. Teicher considered to be archaic Christian eucharistic prayers.²⁴⁰ Teicher connected these prayers so closely with the prayers in the *Didache*, that he actually used *Did.* 9–10 to fill the lacunae in the Hebrew scrolls:

The contents of the Dura-Europos texts are very closely connected with the eucharistic prayers in the *Didache* 10, 3-4; to such an extent, indeed, that the text of the Christian Prayers offers excellent guidance as to how the mutilated Hebrew texts ought to be read and reconstructed. This in itself is a direct proof that the texts of the Dura-Europos parchment are Christian, not Jewish [...] The close similarity between the contents of the prayer in *Didache* 10, 3 and the text in the Dura-Europos Fragment A and the almost perfect verbal identity of the first three lines of the Hebrew and the Greek are so striking that no room is left to doubt that Fragment A contains a Christian eucharistic prayer.²⁴¹

Given the ‘rather fluid pattern’ of ancient Jewish meal prayers,²⁴² Teicher’s textual reconstruction is mostly unconvincing.²⁴³ Still, it can be used to indicate a certain knowledge

²³⁸ E.g., Leonhard Goppelt, *Theology of the New Testament*, vol. 2: *The Variety and Unity of the Apostolic Witness to Christ* (trans., John Alsup; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1982), 220.

²³⁹ E.g., J.H. Srawley, *The Epistles of St. Ignatius* (London: SPCK, 1900), 17, 29. See below (§ 8.2.1).

²⁴⁰ J.L. Teicher, “Ancient Eucharistic Prayers in Hebrew (Dura-Europos Parchment D. Pg. 25),” *JQR* 54/2 (1963): 103–109.

²⁴¹ Teicher, “Ancient Eucharistic Prayers,” 103, 105.

²⁴² E.g., Claussen, “Eucharist in John and the *Didache*,” 148 (n. 16). See the earlier discussion, § 6.2.1 (2).

²⁴³ Cf. J. Neusner, *A History of Jews in Babylonia* (vol. 1; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965), 161 (n. 3): ‘If anything may be concluded from these texts, it is that they indicate a broad variety of ancient meal-prayers.’

of the eucharistic prayers of *Did.* 9–10 in Eastern Syria, at least by the late second century CE.²⁴⁴ The very high probability of such knowledge is confirmed by the insertion of these prayers in *Ap. Const.* 7.2.25–26.

(10) In recent years, Jonathan Draper and John Clabeaux noticed the close connection between the Lord’s Prayer of *Did.* 8.2 and the eucharistic prayers of *Did.* 9–10.²⁴⁵ Moreover, both scholars identified the similarities between the Lord’s Prayer in the *Didache* and in Matt. 6.9b–13, as opposed to the one in Lk. 11.2b–4.²⁴⁶ So, before approaching the similarities between the Lord’s Prayer and the eucharistic prayers, a few observations are introduced, concerning the three recensions of the prayer, namely Lk. 11.2b–4, Matt. 6.9b–13, and *Did.* 8.2:

Lk. 11.2b–4	Matt. 6.9b–13[b]	<i>Did.</i> 8.2
Πάτερ,	Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς,	Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ,
ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου,	ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου,	ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου,
ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου.	ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου, γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς.	ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου, γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς·
τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ’ ἡμέραν	τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον.	τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸ ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον.
καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν, καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίομεν παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν,	καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν,	καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν τοῖς οφειλέταις ἡμῶν,
καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκης ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν. ²⁴⁷	καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκης ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, ἀλλὰ ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.	καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκης ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, ἀλλὰ ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.

²⁴⁴ Cf. Teicher, “Ancient Eucharistic Prayers,” 108–109.

²⁴⁵ Draper, “Ritual Process,” 121–58; John J. Clabeaux, “The Ritual Meal in *Didache* 9–10: Progress in Understanding,” in Draper-Jefford, *Didache*, 209–30.

²⁴⁶ Draper, “Ritual Process,” 128–38; Clabeaux, “Ritual Meal,” 214–21.

²⁴⁷ Note the (unprovable) view of J.B. Bauer, “Aspekte des Kanonproblems,” in I. Seybold (ed.), *Meqor Hajjim: Festschrift für Georg Molin zum 75. Geburtstag* (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1983), 30–31: ‘However the problem now stands, whether the Didachist knew the Gospel of Matthew or not, that he records the Matthean form can also be understood in this way: He knew not only this longer version but also the shorter text of the Our Father as it is found in Luke, and he wished, so to speak, to inculcate the longer version as canonical.’

[ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ²⁴⁹
ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.]²⁴⁸

Regarding the recensions of Matthew and Luke, J. Jeremias has suggested that the two derive from different catechetical traditions: ‘Matthew has transmitted to us a catechism for Jewish-Christian, Luke one for Gentile-Christian prayer instruction.’²⁵⁰ Then, H.D. Betz notices the oral character and the fluidity of the three recensions, stating:

The three recensions, therefore, represent variations of the prayer in the oral tradition. When they were written down, these variant forms of the prayer became textually fixed. As a result I can state that there was never only *one original written* Lord’s Prayer. The somewhat fluid state of the textual tradition, which one can observe in the critical apparatus of the editions of the New Testament as well as the church fathers, means that the oral tradition continued to exert an influence on the written text of the New Testament well into later times.²⁵¹

Note also his repeated conclusion:

In all probability the three recensions are textually independent of each other; this view does not exclude the fact that they are related in their dependence on common tradition [...] The three extant recensions have come from the respective church traditions in which they were in use: the churches of Matthew, Luke, and the *Didache* [...] The differences among the three recensions point to an independent transmission prior to the fixations in writing, so that I do not assume that any one of them is *textually* dependent on another.²⁵²

Furthermore, Betz criticizes Ulrich Luz for being inconsistent, when Luz assumes that the *Didache* knew Matthew, but quoted the text of the Gospel from memory:

Did. 8.1–2 is one of the passages that make it probable that the *Didache* presupposes the Gospel of Matthew, because it is familiar with the connection of the Lord’s Prayer with Matt 6:5–6, 16–17. To be sure, the Didachist does not copy Matthew directly; he quotes the texts of the Gospel as he remembers them from the community’s worship.²⁵³

²⁴⁸ On whether the Matthean prayer had originally a closing doxology, see Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1–7: A Commentary* (trans., James E. Crouch; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 323: ‘the two-part doxology of *Did.* 8.2, customary in the *Didache* (10.5), show that in the Greek church the Lord’s Prayer was prayed with a doxology from the very beginning. Jewish prayers are also inconceivable without a concluding doxology.’ See below (n. 271).

²⁴⁹ See the similar comparison in Hans Dieter Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain (Matthew 5:3-7:27 and Luke 6:20-49)* (ed., Adela Yarbro Collins; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 372; Peter J. Tomson, “The Lord’s Prayer (Didache 8) at the Faultline of Judaism and Christianity,” in Draper-Jefford, *Didache*, 166–68.

²⁵⁰ See the extended argument in J. Jeremias, *The Prayers of Jesus* (trans., John Bowden et al.; SBT 2/6; London: SCM Press, 1967), esp. 88. Betz (*Sermon on the Mount*, 372) concurs with Jeremias.

²⁵¹ Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 370 (emphasis original).

²⁵² Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 370–71.

²⁵³ Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 310; Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 371 (n. 328).

In sum, both Betz and Luz assume a connection between the recensions of Matthew and the *Didache*. Moreover, Betz admits the possibility of a ‘common tradition’,²⁵⁴ but postulates the existence of various communities: ‘both *Didache* and Matthew knew the prayer from their respective church traditions’; ‘the respective church traditions in which they were in use: the churches of Matthew, Luke, and the *Didache*’.²⁵⁵ Also, he opines that ‘the *Didache* was familiar with the pre-Matthean Lord’s Prayer, which Matthew also took over from his church tradition’.²⁵⁶ On the other hand, Luz assumes a closer connection between *Did.* and the text of Matthew’s Gospel, since the vocabulary of the petitions is peculiar to Matthew, the author/editor: ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς; γίνομαι [esp. γενηθήτω]; θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς; οὐρανός – γῆ; πονηρός.²⁵⁷ These peculiarities, that indicate a redactional intervention from the author himself, appear also in the *Didache*.²⁵⁸ Nevertheless, similarly to Betz, Luz continues to postulate the existence of different communities, although he accepts a direct connection between them: ‘the *Didache* comes from a community influenced by Matthew’.²⁵⁹

At the risk of over-simplification, it may be concluded that Betz stresses the idea of the common tradition, while Luz stresses the idea of the connected communities. I suggest the better way is to assume both. Given the awareness of the fluidity of prayers in the first century (cf. Lk. 11.2b–4), the similarities of the vocabulary between Matt. 6.9b–13 and *Did.* 8.2 are remarkable.²⁶⁰ Moreover, it should be noted that both Matthew and the *Didache* insert their prayers in a similar context, unlike Lk. 11.1–2a.²⁶¹ In Matthew, the Lord’s prayer is framed by

²⁵⁴ Niederwimmer (*Didache*, 136) concurs with this view: ‘a common liturgical tradition’.

²⁵⁵ Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 370–71.

²⁵⁶ Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 371 (n. 328).

²⁵⁷ Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 309–11. *Contra* Michael D. Goulder, “The Composition of the Lord’s Prayer,” *JTS* 14 (1963): 32–45, who assumes that this prayer is entirely a creation of the evangelists. See Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 311: ‘The Lord’s Prayer comes from Jesus, an assumption shared by most scholars.’

²⁵⁸ Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 309. For an extended list of scholars who agree and disagree with Luz, see Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 136 (n. 10).

²⁵⁹ Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 371.

²⁶⁰ E.g., Massaux, *Influence*, 3:154–55.

²⁶¹ Tomson, “Lord’s Prayer,” 166–68. Cf. Dale Allison, who suggests that Luke 11.1 is the *Sitz im Leben* of the Lord’s Prayer. See Dale C. Allison, *The Sermon on The Mount: Inspiring the Moral Imagination* (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1999), 131–32.

the instructions ‘not to pray’, nor ‘to fast like the hypocrites’ (Matt. 6.5, 16).²⁶² Similarly, in the *Didache*, ‘the Lord instructs in his gospel’ not ‘to fast’, nor ‘to pray like the hypocrites’ (*Did.* 8.1–2).²⁶³ So, I suggest that the similarities of context and vocabulary are better explained by postulating both a common tradition and a single community.

Furthermore, as Niederwimmer,²⁶⁴ Draper,²⁶⁵ Clabeaux²⁶⁶ and others have shown, there are significant parallels of language and motifs between the Lord’s Prayer of *Did.* 8.2 and the eucharistic prayers of *Did.* 9–10. The following parallel columns are reproduced, in order to facilitate the identification of the commonalities:

<i>Did.</i> 8.2	<i>Did.</i> 9.1–4	<i>Did.</i> 10.1–5
οὕτω προσεύχεσθε...	οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε...	οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε...
Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου, ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου, γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς.	Εὐχαριστοῦμεν σοι, πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας ἀμπέλου Δαυεὶδ τοῦ παιδός σου.	Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἅγιε, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁγίου ὀνόματος σου, οὐ κατεσκίνωσας ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς γνώσεως καὶ πίστεως καὶ ἀθανασίας, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου.
	σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.	σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.
τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸ ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον. καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν, καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν,	περὶ δὲ τοῦ ἄρτου [κλάσματος] Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ γνώσεως, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου.	σύ, δέσποτα παντοκράτορ, ἔκτισας τὰ πάντα ἐνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός σου, τροφήν τε καὶ ποτὸν ἔδωκας τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν, ἵνα σοὶ εὐχαριστήσωσιν, ἡμῖν δὲ ἐχαρίσω πνευματικὴν τροφήν καὶ ποτὸν καὶ ζῶην αἰώνιον διὰ τοῦ παιδός σου. πρὸ πάντων εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, ὅτι δυνατὸς εἶ.
	σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.	σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

²⁶² Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 309: ‘It was certainly Matthew who located the prayer in the center of the Sermon on the Mount following vv. 7–8. The major question is whether the evangelist on his own initiative redactionally edited a text as anchored in the community’s liturgy as was the Lord’s Prayer. It appears that the possibility is not excluded in principle, and in the case of Luke, whose version of the Lord’s Prayer nowhere appears as part of a community liturgy, it is even probable. Is that also true for Matthew? It speaks for such a possibility that the vocabulary of the special petitions is largely Matthean.’

²⁶³ Cf. Del Verme, *Didache and Judaism*, 148–76; Willy Rordorf, ‘The Lord’s Prayer in the Light of Its Liturgical Use in the Early Church,’ *SL* 14 (1980–81): 1–19; R.T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2007), 241.

²⁶⁴ Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 136–38.

²⁶⁵ Draper, ‘Ritual Process,’ 129–30.

²⁶⁶ Clabeaux, ‘Ritual Meal,’ 215–16.

<p>ἀλλὰ ρύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.</p>	<p>ὥσπερ ἦν τοῦτο τὸ ἄρτος [κλάσμα] διεσκορπισμένον ἐπάνω τῶν ὀρέων καὶ συναχθὲν ἐγένετο ἓν, οὕτω συναχθήτω σου ἡ ἐκκλησία ἀπὸ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν.</p>	<p>μνήσθητι, κύριε, τῆς ἐκκλησίας σου, τοῦ ρύσασθαι αὐτὴν ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ καὶ τελειῶσαι αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ σου, καὶ σύναξον αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων, τὴν ἀγιασθεῖσαν, εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν, ἣν ἠτοίμασας αὐτῇ.</p>
<p>ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.</p>	<p>ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ δύναμις διὰ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.</p>	<p>ὅτι σου ἐστὶν ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.</p>

Considering the similarities of language and motifs, Draper is entitled to consider that the three prayers were produced by the same community.²⁶⁷ However, it is very difficult to determine whether the prayers of *Did.* 9–10 were the sources of the Lord’s Prayer in *Did.* 8 or it happened the other way around.²⁶⁸ Let us consider, for instance, the doxological ending of the Lord’s Prayer: ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Given the absence of the βασιλεία formula (see the ‘majority text’ of Matt. 6.13),²⁶⁹ which was very common among the Jewish doxologies of the time,²⁷⁰ and the repeated two-part formula ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα (*Did.* 8.2; 9.4 [in reversed order]; 10.5), Niederwimmer concludes: 1) that the eucharistic prayers represent the original *Sitz im Leben* of the doxology; and 2) that ‘it was transferred from there to the Lord’s Prayer’.²⁷¹ Such a ‘transfer’ could be possible; however, I suggest that it is quite improbable. Clabeaux correctly, in my view, suggests the reverse: the ‘closing doxology of the Lord’s Prayer could have served as the model for both the short and long doxologies in the meal prayers.’²⁷² As Jeremias, Allison-Davies, Luz, and others have convincingly shown, the Lord’s Prayer must have had at least one closing doxology (probably more), given that the

²⁶⁷ Draper, “Ritual Process,” 121, 127.

²⁶⁸ See the discussion in Clabeaux, “Ritual Meal,” 218.

²⁶⁹ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 13–14; Joël Delobel, “The Lord’s Prayer in the Textual Tradition,” in Jean-Marie Sevrin (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity* (BETL 86; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 293–309.

²⁷⁰ Str-B 1:423–24; W.D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: CUP, 1964), 451–53.

²⁷¹ Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 138.

²⁷² Clabeaux, “Ritual Meal,” 218.

ancient Jewish prayers were inconceivable without such concluding doxologies (*m. Ber.* 1.4).²⁷³ The doxology also rendered in *Did.* 8.2 may well be one of those that concluded the Lord's prayer from the very beginning (cf. 2 Tim. 4.18),²⁷⁴ although 'a fixed form for the doxology appears for the first time here in the *Didache*'.²⁷⁵

Furthermore, the Lord's prayer is introduced with the formula 'as the Lord commanded in his gospel, you should pray as follows...' (*Did.* 8.2). This implies that the closing doxology belonged to this 'gospel' source, whether oral or written. As Peter Tomson notices,

Nothing in the two versions of the Lord's Prayer defines it as a Christian text. This becomes abundantly clear from the contrast with the Trinitarian doxology found in one of the manuscripts. By form and vocabulary, the Lord's Prayer is altogether Jewish.²⁷⁶

As the later manuscript tradition shows, the Lord's Prayer was Christianized precisely by the addition of the Trinitarian doxology: 'for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit for ever. Amen.'²⁷⁷ So, given the tendency of the *Didache* community to Christianize prior Jewish traditions (cf. *Did.* 1.1–6.3 [1.3a–2.1]; *Did.* 9.1–10.5),²⁷⁸ shouldn't one expect some form of a Christianized doxology in this case (cf. *Did.* 7.3)? Unless, of course, there was the awareness that this form of prayer belonged to 'the gospel of the Lord', and that the two-part formula ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα belonged to the same authoritative 'gospel' source.

In my view, it was the language of the Lord's prayer that predates and influences the language of the eucharistic prayers.²⁷⁹ Also, it was the frequent use of the former that created the familiar, even the liturgical vocabulary of the latter. If this doxology was repeated three

²⁷³ Jeremias, *Prayers of Jesus*, 106. For Jeremias, it is inconceivable that the Lord's Prayer could have ever been prayed without some closing doxology; also, it would have been unthinkable for Jews to end any prayer with words like 'temptation' and 'evil.' Also, Davies-Allison, *Matthew*, 1:615 (n. 54); Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 323.

²⁷⁴ Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 323.

²⁷⁵ Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 137.

²⁷⁶ Tomson, "Lord's Prayer," 171. For a similar view, see Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 410: 'This prayer clearly expresses rabbinic theology.'

²⁷⁷ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 13–14.

²⁷⁸ E.g., Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 42–52; van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 55–80, 271–364.

²⁷⁹ So, Clabeaux, "Ritual Meal," 218.

times a day (*Did.* 8.3), it is not difficult to imagine that, because of its frequent use, it became both familiar and popular in the community of the *Didache*. Accordingly, it may have been used for other prayers as well, not only for this standard oration. Therefore, this communal and liturgical familiarity could well explain its insertion into the eucharistic prayers of *Did.* 9–10.

If this is the case, and the language and the motifs of the Lord’s prayer were behind the composition of the eucharistic prayers, then Clabeaux finds it ‘hard to understand why forgiveness of sin is absent from the meal prayers’ (cf. *Did.* 8.2; Matt. 6.12, 14–15).²⁸⁰ His observation becomes even more intriguing when the confession and the forgiveness of sins, requirements to participate at the meal, are considered in *Did.* 14.1–2:

On the Lord’s own day [κατὰ κυριακὴν δὲ κυρίου], when you gather together, break bread and give thanks [κλάσατε ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσατε] after you have confessed your unlawful deeds, that your sacrifice may be pure [ὅπως καθαρὰ ἡ θυσία ὑμῶν ἦ]. Let no one quarrelling with his neighbour join you until they are reconciled, that your sacrifice may not be defiled [ἵνα μὴ κοινωθῇ ἡ θυσία ὑμῶν].

In response to Clabeaux’ objection, I suggest that the practices of confession and reconciliation described in *Did.* 14.1–2 (cf. Jam. 5.16) predate the redaction of the eucharistic prayers (cf. *Did.* 14.3; Mal. 1.11, 14).²⁸¹ So, the well-established practice of confession and reconciliation made unnecessary the inclusion of any reference to forgiveness into the form of the eucharistic prayers. The lack of forgiveness and the failure to reconcile become further conditions that limit the access to the meal: ‘Let no one [...] join you until they are reconciled’ (*Did.* 14.2). Consequently, I see here a coherent internal dynamic. The language and motifs of the consecrated/model prayer, such is the Lord’s prayer (*Did.* 8.2), highly influences the language and motifs of the eucharistic prayers (*Did.* 9.1–10.5). When some of the motifs are missing, as are the motifs of forgiveness and reconciliation, it is so because they are already present in the praxis that precedes the prayers/meals (*Did.* 14.1–2). Therefore, following

²⁸⁰ Clabeaux, “Ritual Meal,” 218.

²⁸¹ For an extended argumentation, see van de Sandt, “Eucharist as a Holy Meal,” 1–20 (18–20); Rordorf, “Didache,” 5.

Draper, I conclude that the internal coherence and dynamic point to a single community that is behind the three prayers (*Did.* 8.2; 9.1–10.5).²⁸² Moreover, the close connection between these prayers and Matthew (Matt. 6.9b–13 and *Did.* 8.2) indicates that this community could be Antioch.

(11) Although it is not part of the eucharistic prayers, *Did.* 14.1–2 is related to the practice of the Eucharist; so, I will address here some aspects related to it. As could be noted, in *Did.* 14.1 the ‘Eucharist’ is also called ‘the breaking of the bread’: κλάσατε ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσατε. Niederwimmer rightly considers that this double expression is a hendiadys, reflecting the early Eucharist that was celebrated in the setting of a regular meal (the *agape*).²⁸³ His observation is of great relevance, since it shows that the phrase κλάσατε ἄρτον became consecrated in a particular Christian community,²⁸⁴ hence its hendiadys construction.²⁸⁵ The same terminology is used in similar technical terms in Paul (1 Cor. 10.16; 11.24), Luke (Lk. 22.19; Acts 2.42, 46; 20.7; cf. Acts 27.35),²⁸⁶ and Ignatius of Antioch (e.g., *Eph.* 20.2: συνέρχεσθε ... ἓνα ἄρτον κλώντες).²⁸⁷ Again, it should be noted that all three authors have Antioch in common. In other words, there seems to be a preference among the authors connected to the Antiochene church for the ‘breaking of the bread’ terminology.²⁸⁸ Moreover, the affixing of εὐχαριστέω and [ἄρτον] κλάω appears in some of the references listed above, especially in Lk. 22.19 (καὶ λαβὼν

²⁸² Draper, “Ritual Process,” 121. But note my nuanced approach, concerning the place of origin for *Did.* 10.1–6, in the next section (§ 6.2.2) and chapter (§ 7.1.4.1).

²⁸³ Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 195–96. *Contra* Audet, *Didachè*, 460–61. For Audet, κλάσατε ἄρτον refers to ‘the minor eucharist’, while εὐχαριστήσατε refers to the Eucharist proper (‘the greater eucharist’). See § 7.1.4.

²⁸⁴ Ysebaert, “The Eucharist as a Love-meal,” 14.

²⁸⁵ For the general (non-technical) use of the phrase in ancient Judaism, see Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 195 (n. 10). But see John Koenig, *The Feast of the World’s Redemption: Eucharistic Origins and Christian Mission* (Harrisburg: Trinity, 2000), 91: “‘breaking of bread’ was not a standard Jewish designation for a full meal.’ Similarly, Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 118–22; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AYBC 31; New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2008), 270.

²⁸⁶ Cf. R. Orlett, “The Breaking of Bread in Acts,” *TBT* 1 (1962): 108–13.

²⁸⁷ See the lengthier argument in McGowan, “Inordinate Cup,” 284.

²⁸⁸ Cf. Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 118–22; C.K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (2 vols.; London/New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), 1:164–65.

ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν) and 1 Cor. 11.24 (καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν).²⁸⁹ Since the tradition of the Lord's Supper, as recorded in Luke 22.19–20 and 1 Cor. 11.23–25, was already consecrated in Antioch prior to the 50s CE,²⁹⁰ it may have been the source for this hendiadys: 'to break bread and eucharisticize'.

(12) As indicated above, Clayton Jefford argues that Ignatius of Antioch had 'full knowledge of the materials which were incorporated into the *Didache*'.²⁹¹ This, of course, includes his knowledge of the two eucharistic prayers of *Did.* 9–10.²⁹² In my own estimation, a particular knowledge of *Did.* 9–10 is unprovable, since there are no explicit citations, nor clear references.²⁹³ All that scholars can infer, based on circumstantial evidence, is a certain indirect knowledge.

Similar to *Did.* 9.2 (τῆς ἁγίας ἀμπέλου Δαυεὶδ τοῦ παιδός σου, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου), in Ignatius (*Eph.* 18.2, 20.2; *Trall.* 9.1; *Rom.* 7.3; *Smyrn.* 1.1) Jesus is said to be 'of the seed/race of David'. Also similar to *Did.* 9.2, these creedal statements are mainly introduced in the eucharistic context (see *Eph.* 20.2; *Trall.* 8.1–9.1; *Rom.* 7.3). However, since Ignatius' assertions are 'stereotyped expressions drawn from the Church tradition of his time' or fragments of 'liturgical formulae or short creed-like statements',²⁹⁴ a direct connection to *Did.* 9–10 is impossible to make. All that can be conjectured, based upon the slim evidence of the similar eucharistic context, is that a common church could have been the origin for both traditions.

²⁸⁹ Fitzmyer, *Acts of the Apostles*, 271: 'in Acts, *hē klasis tou artou* seems to be the formal reference to celebration of the Lord's Supper, as in 1 Cor 10:16: *ton arton hon klōmen*, "the bread that we break." By Luke's day (Stage III of the gospel tradition) it had become an abstract expression and perhaps has been read back by him into earlier stages of that tradition. This is the interpretation of many commentators...'

²⁹⁰ Meier, "Antioch," 25–26. See the extended discussion in the previous chapters (e.g., § 3.3).

²⁹¹ Jefford, "Did Ignatius Know the *Didache*," 350.

²⁹² Jefford, "Did Ignatius Know the *Didache*," esp. 347–48.

²⁹³ However, there is also the possibility that Ignatius omits on purpose the eucharistic passages in the *Didache*, for he disagrees with their theology. Cf. Jefford: "Did Ignatius Know the *Didache*," 338–39; "Conflict at Antioch," 262–69. See the later discussions (§ 8.2.2).

²⁹⁴ Srawley, *Epistles of St. Ignatius*, 17, 29.

A stronger connection seems to be *Did.* 4.8 (εἰ γὰρ ἐν τῷ ἀθανάτῳ κοινωνοὶ ἐστε, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ἐν τοῖς θνητοῖς), *Did.* 10.2–3 (καὶ ἀθανασίας ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου... ἡμῖν δὲ ἐχαρίσω πνευματικὴν τροφὴν καὶ ποτὸν καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ τοῦ παιδός σου) and Ignatius, *Eph.* 20.2 (ἓνα ἄρτον κλώντες, ὅς ἐστιν φάρμακον ἀθανασίας). As Jefford notices, ἀθανασία is rarely used within early Christianity, and even rarer in the context of the shared meal of thanksgiving.²⁹⁵ Actually, one can limit the connection of ἀθανασία to food and drink to Ignatius and the *Didache*.²⁹⁶ For Jefford, *Did.* 4.8 reiterates, in the form of a *qal wa-homer* argument, that believers who partake in the ‘imperishable (eucharistic food)’ should even more share the ‘perishable (food)’ with those in need.²⁹⁷ So, in a sense, *Did.* 4.8 is reaffirming Paul’s view of 1 Cor. 11.17–34.²⁹⁸ However, it is unclear to me why Jefford limits *Did.* 4.8 to food sharing, when the context clearly suggests a more general idea of sharing (see *Did.* 4.5–8). Moreover, Jefford ignores *Did.* 10.2–3, a text that connects more explicitly ἀθανασία and the eucharistic food.²⁹⁹ Still, I concur with his conclusion, namely that ‘both authors agree upon a certain technical language by which to reflect an understanding of the thanksgiving meal’,³⁰⁰ although I believe that such a conclusion is more valid when *Did.* 10.2–3 and Ignatius, *Eph.* 20.2 are compared. Moreover, the peculiar use of ἀθανασία in *Did.* 10.2–3 suggests a Hellenistic Jewish place of composition, while the correspondences with 4 Macc. (14.5; 16.13) could point to Antioch.³⁰¹ In sum, ‘In the absence of any similar usage [...] elsewhere in early Christian literature’,³⁰² the technical language that connects ἀθανασία and the eucharistic

²⁹⁵ Jefford, “Did Ignatius Know the *Didache*,” 345.

²⁹⁶ Jefford, “Did Ignatius Know the *Didache*,” 345. Cf. A.D. Nock, “Liturgical Notes,” *JTS* 30 (1929): 392 (n. 1); William R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 98.

²⁹⁷ Jefford, “Did Ignatius Know the *Didache*,” 345.

²⁹⁸ Cf. P. Lampe, “The Eucharist: Identifying with Christ on the Cross,” *Int* 48 (1994): 42; David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 541–42, 554.

²⁹⁹ Dibelius, “Mahl-Gebete,” 37.

³⁰⁰ Jefford, “Did Ignatius Know the *Didache*,” 345.

³⁰¹ Claussen, “Eucharist in John and the *Didache*,” 153.

³⁰² Jefford, “Did Ignatius Know the *Didache*,” 345.

elements point out to the church of Antioch, to which both Ignatius and *Did.* 9–10 are related. More direct knowledge is difficult to prove.³⁰³

Then, I have already mentioned, there is the use of the ‘breaking of the bread’, both in *Did.* 14.1 (συναχθέντες κλάσατε ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσατε) and Ignatius, *Eph.* 20.2 (ἐν χάριτι ἐξ ὀνόματος συνέρχεσθε ἐν μιᾷ πίστει [...] ἕνα ἄρτον κλώντες),³⁰⁴ which reflects a preference for this terminology, at least in the church of Antioch (cf. 1 Cor. 11.24; Lk. 22.19).³⁰⁵ The terminology can be connected only indirectly to *Did.* 9.3–4 (περὶ δὲ τοῦ κλάσματος [...] ὥσπερ ἦν τοῦτο τὸ κλάσμα διεσκορπισμένον ἐπάνω τῶν ὀρέων καὶ συναχθὲν ἐγένετο ἕν); however, it is of little use in the attempt to ascertain Ignatius’ direct knowledge of *Did.* 9–10. Furthermore, there is the peculiar wording κατὰ κυριακὴν δὲ κυρίου (‘according to the Lord’s day of the Lord’) that appears also in *Did.* 14.1. As numerous scholars argue, the pleonastic phrasing most probably indicates a technical use of the word κυριακή (cf. Rev. 1.10).³⁰⁶ The technical term κυριακή appears also in Ignatius, *Magn.* 9.1, in which ‘the Lord’s day’ replaces the Sabbath: μηκέτι σαββατίζοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ κυριακὴν ζῶντες (cf. *Did.* 8.1).³⁰⁷ Moreover, as scholars have observed, κυριακή is used not only technically, but also rarely, in early Christian literature. And this uncommonness is truly helpful, when scholars try to locate the provenance of the term. As Willy Rordorf notices, all the writings in which the technical κυριακή is used are located in the region of Syria: *Did.* 14.1; Ignatius, *Magn.* 9.1; GPet. 9.35, 13.50.³⁰⁸

³⁰³ For other possible connections between ἀθανασία, eucharistic meals, and Syria, see R.D. Richardson, “Eastern and Western Liturgies: The Primitive Basis of Their Later Differences. A Note for the Study of Eucharistic Origins,” *HTR* 42/2 (1949): 125–48 (126).

³⁰⁴ Jefford, “Did Ignatius Know the *Didache*,” 347.

³⁰⁵ See § 6.2.1 (11).

³⁰⁶ E.g., Rordorf-Tuilier, *Doctrine*, 65; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 195; Neville Tidwell, “*Didache* 14:1 (KATA KYPIAKKHN ΔΕ KYPIOY) Revisited,” *VC* 53 (1999): 197–207; Jonathan A. Draper, “Pure Sacrifice in *Didache* 14 As Jewish Christian Exegesis,” *Neot* 42/2 (2008): 223–52. I consider the phrase ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ (Rev. 1.10) to be semi-technical, of non-Syriac origins. See Richard J. Bauckham, “The Lord’s Day,” in D.A. Carson (ed.), *From Sabbath to Lord’s Day* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982), 221–50 (225).

³⁰⁷ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 123 (n. 3).

³⁰⁸ Willy Rordorf, *Sunday: The History of the Day of Rest and Worship in the Earliest Centuries of the Christian Church* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968), 212–13; also, Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 195; Tidwell, “*Didache* 14:1,” 206–207.

Moreover, according to Jefford, ‘it is logical to assume’ that the technical κυριακή was derived from the phrase κυριακὸν δεῖπνον (1 Cor. 11.20).³⁰⁹ If this assumption is correct,³¹⁰ it could help one confine the area to those Syrian churches in which Paul’s teachings were known or the phrase κυριακὸν δεῖπνον was used technically;³¹¹ and Syrian Antioch would be a primary candidate.

As the three instances above have shown, a direct knowledge of *Did.* 9–10 is difficult to prove. All we could infer from these parallels is limited to Ignatius’ familiarity with the technical vocabulary and with the practice of the Eucharist, as they appear in other texts originating from Syria and Antioch. Still, I suggest it is sufficient to connect *Did.* 9–10 to the Antiochene church, as the eucharistic prayers contain similar terminology and describe similar praxis (cf. *Did.* 10.1; Ignatius, *Smyrn.* 8.1–2).

On the other hand, as has been shown above, Jefford rightfully argues that Ignatius was in ‘full knowledge of the materials which were incorporated into the *Didache*’.³¹² The many lexical similarities he identifies (cf. *Did.* 1.1 and *Magn.* 5.1; *Did.* 4.1 and *Eph.* 6.1; *Did.* 4.8 and *Eph.* 20.2; *Did.* 4.11 and *Trall.* 3.1; *Magn.* 6.1; *Did.* 11.2 and *Eph.* 7.1; *Did.* 14.1 and *Magn.* 9.1; *Did.* 15.1 and *Eph.* 2.1; 4.1; 15.1; *Magn.* 12.1; *Rom.* 10.2) suggest such a ‘full knowledge’.³¹³ This indirectly denotes that Ignatius knew the eucharistic prayers of *Did.* 9–10.³¹⁴

In sum, it is possible to infer an indirect connection between Ignatius and *Did.* 9–10. For my part, I would rather limit this connection to the hypothesis of a ‘common church’, which

³⁰⁹ Jefford, “Did Ignatius Know the *Didache*,” 347. Jefford follows Rordorf, *Sunday*, 221.

³¹⁰ See the critique of Bauckham, “Lord’s Day,” 226–27.

³¹¹ For the technical use of κυριακὸν δεῖπνον in 1 Cor. 11.20, see (again) A. Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief* (HNT 9/I; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 251. Cf. § 2.1 (n. 1).

³¹² Jefford, “Did Ignatius Know the *Didache*,” 350.

³¹³ Jefford, “Did Ignatius Know the *Didache*,” 343–49.

³¹⁴ Possible reasons why Ignatius omits these eucharistic traditions are analysed in chapter 8. See § 8.2 (2).

most probably is Syrian Antioch. This hypothesis offers adequate explanation for both the common terminology and similar practices.

6.2.2 Preliminary conclusions

In this chapter, I have sought to argue that the city of Antioch was the place of origin/composition for the eucharistic traditions of *Did.* 9–10. Firstly, it was suggested that the city of Antioch was the place where the writing was edited in its final form. This view has become a strong consensus among scholars today.³¹⁵ Then, special attention was given to *Did.* 9–10. I suggested that the historical, social, and ecclesiastical context (the *Sitz im Leben*), the internal evidence (the vocabulary, the geographical hints, etc.), and the close connection to the writings of Matthew and Ignatius, point to the capital of ancient Syria, as the place from which *Did.* 9–10 originated. Actually, for Jefford the connective triad Matthew-Didache-Ignatius is the decisive argument in favour of Antioch.³¹⁶

However, there is another, more nuanced way, of reading the data above. As can be noticed, most of the arguments adduced in favour of an Antiochene place of composition are taken from *Did.* 9.1–5. At the same time, the close parallelism of ‘structure, wording and concepts’, acknowledged by virtually all scholars,³¹⁷ indicate direct contact between the two prayers, that is best explained by the hypothesis of a unique community. Still, there is the possibility that the prayer of *Did.* 10.2–6, the older of the two prayers,³¹⁸ was composed elsewhere, as a reworking of an archaic Jewish meal prayer.³¹⁹ Still, it was adopted by the church of Antioch and used there as a eucharistic prayer, at the time when the prayer of *Did.*

³¹⁵ Draper, “Apostolic Fathers,” 178.

³¹⁶ Jefford: “Social Locators,” 245–64; “Milieu of Matthew, the *Didache*, and Ignatius,” 35–47; “Locating the *Didache*,” 59–66.

³¹⁷ E.g., van de Sandt, “Baptism and Holiness,” 140; Draper “Ritual Process,” 139; Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 27; Claussen, “Eucharist in John and the *Didache*,” 142.

³¹⁸ E.g., Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 17. See the discussion in the next chapter (§ 7.1.4).

³¹⁹ So, Mazza, *Origins*, 17.

9.2–4 was composed by this community, under the direct influence of *Did.* 10.2–6. I shall return to this hypothesis in the next chapter.

6.3 Conclusion

It should be reaffirmed that the attempt to locate the *Didache* or the eucharistic prayers of *Did.* 9–10 remains hypothetical. On the one hand, there is no direct evidence to support the city of Antioch as the place of provenance or composition. On the other hand, I suggest that the circumstantial evidence presented in this chapter creates a coherent argument and makes Antioch the most reliable hypothesis and the most probable location. As far as I am concerned, while acknowledging once again the risk of ‘easy rebuttals’,³²⁰ I share Jefford’s ‘confidence’ that concludes his elaborate and persuasive attempt to locate the *Didache*: ‘I am convinced that the *Didache* derives from the ancient, original Christian-Jewish community of Antioch’.³²¹

³²⁰ Jefford, “Locating the *Didache*,” 59. See above (§ 6.1).

³²¹ Jefford, “Locating the *Didache*,” 66.

CHAPTER 7

‘YOU SHALL KEEP THE EUCHARIST AS FOLLOWS’:

ANTIOCH AND THE EUCHARISTIC TRADITIONS OF THE *DIDACHE*

At the beginning of the previous chapter there was a reference to the numerous academic disputes (‘the opposing hypotheses, challenges, controversies, rejections, and denials of authenticity’) that immediately followed the publication of the *Didache* (codex H54), in 1883.¹ These debates—some of them still ongoing—covered all the divisions and all the significant topics of the *Didache*.² However, in Gerard Rouwhorst’s estimation, chapters 9 and 10 ‘belong to the most difficult and debated parts of the *Didache*’.³ To the present day, important aspects of the eucharistic prayers are still in search of scholarly agreement.⁴

In his 2005 study, Rouwhorst has offered an excellent summary of the debates concerning *Did.* 9–10. In a very helpful manner, he categorized three main areas of debate, in the history of scholarship: 1) the shape and the content of the ritual meal, as reproduced in the extant text of the *Didache*; 2) the development of the eucharistic prayers, prior to their final redaction or compilation; 3) the place of the ritual described in the *Didache* in the larger context of other ritual meals and in the overall development of the Eucharist, in early Christianity.⁵ Following Rouwhorst’s categories, this chapter aims to explore especially the second area of debate, focusing on the following questions: what made the Didachist keep and insert both eucharistic traditions (*Did.* 9.1–5; 10.1–6), given their similarities and even unique function?

¹ Dumitru Fecioru, *Scriverile Părinților apostolici* (PSB 1; Bucharest: EIBMBOR, 1979), 17.

² E.g., Clayton N. Jefford (ed.), *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission* (NovTSup 77; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995); Jonathan A. Draper (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research* (AGJU 37; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996); Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford (eds.), *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity* (ECL 14; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015).

³ Gerard Rouwhorst, “Didache 9–10: A Litmus Test for the Research on Early Christian Liturgy Eucharist,” in Huub van de Sandt (ed.), *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 144.

⁴ E.g., John J. Clabeaux, “The Ritual Meal in Didache 9–10: Progress in Understanding,” in Draper-Jefford, *Didache*, 209–30.

⁵ Rouwhorst, “Didache 9–10,” 143–56.

And what does the decision to insert both traditions in the *Didache* tell us about the Antiochene church, at the end of the first century CE?

7.1 Two traditions, one function: Before the ‘before’ and ‘after’

Before we begin to analyse *Did.* 9–10, the two eucharistic prayers shall be quoted below, set forth in parallel columns, in order to facilitate the process of identifying the similarities:

Did. 9.1–5

¹ Περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας, οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε.

² πρῶτον περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου.

Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀγίας ἀμπέλου Δαυεὶδ τοῦ παιδὸς σου, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδὸς σου. σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

³ Περὶ τοῦ κλάσματος.

Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ γνώσεως, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδὸς σου. σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

⁴ Ὡσπερ ἦν τοῦτο τὸ κλάσμα διεσκορπισμένον ἐπάνω τῶν ὀρέων καὶ συναχθὲν ἐγένετο ἓν, οὕτω συναχθήτω σου ἡ ἐκκλησία ἀπὸ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν. ὅτι σου ἐστὶν ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ δύναμις διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

⁵ Μηδεὶς δὲ φαγέτω μηδὲ πιέτω ἀπὸ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὑμῶν, ἀλλ’ οἱ βαπτισθέντες εἰς ὄνομα κυρίου. καὶ γὰρ περὶ τούτου εἶρηκεν ὁ κύριος. Μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς कुσί.

Did. 10.1–7

¹ Μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆσαι, οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε.

² Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἅγιε, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀγίου ὀνόματός σου, οὗ κατεσκήνωσας ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν,

καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς γνώσεως καὶ πίστεως καὶ ἀθανασίας, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδὸς σου. σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ³ σύ, δέσποτα παντοκράτορ, ἔκτισας τὰ πάντα ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός σου, τροφήν τε καὶ ποτὸν ἔδωκας τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν, ἵνα σοὶ εὐχαριστήσωσιν, ἡμῖν δὲ ἐχαρίσω πνευματικὴν τροφήν καὶ ποτὸν καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ τοῦ παιδὸς σου. ⁴ πρὸ πάντων εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, ὅτι δυνατὸς εἶ. σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

⁵ μνήσθητι, κύριε, τῆς ἐκκλησίας σου, τοῦ ρύσασθαι αὐτὴν ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ καὶ τελειῶσαι αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ σου, καὶ συναζον αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων, τὴν ἁγιασθεῖσαν, εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν, ἣν ἠτοίμασας αὐτῇ· ὅτι σου ἐστὶν ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

⁶ ἐλθέτω χάρις καὶ παρελθέτω ὁ κόσμος οὗτος. Ὡσαννά τῷ θεῷ Δαυίδ. εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω. εἴ τις οὐκ ἐστὶ, μετανοεῖτω. μαρὰν ἀθά. ἀμήν.

⁷ Τοῖς δὲ προφήταις ἐπιτρέπετε εὐχαριστεῖν ὅσα θέλουσιν.

In regard to this parallel reading, Huub van de Sandt notes the following:

[The two prayers] begin with an expression of thanksgiving addressed to God in nearly identical wording, and when we read these prayers side by side throughout, the resemblances in phraseology and content will become quite obvious. Because their similarity is not restricted to a casual analogy but appears to

pervade the whole pattern of the two prayers, certain phrases that at first sight do not seem to share similar content may nevertheless clarify one another.⁶

Alan Garrow arrives at a similar conclusion, following his own comparative reading. He states:

The two prayers correspond structurally, verbally and conceptually. In both cases there is a three strophe pattern. In both cases there are exact verbal parallels and parallel imagery. In both cases a full meal is followed by a transitional prayer leading into a eucharist of spiritual food and drink, or cup and fragment. In both cases there is a prohibition with respect to the members of the community who may or may not take part in the following event.⁷

So, how are we to explain the obvious similarities of structure, wording, imagery and themes? In the previous chapter, I have argued that the two eucharistic prayers could be the creation of the same community, namely Syrian Antioch.⁸ Undoubtedly, acknowledging a ‘unique community’ could offer a satisfactory explanation for many of the similarities.⁹ In this chapter, however, I want to bring the argument further and test the hypothesis of a ‘unique function’: is it possible that both eucharistic traditions were, prior to their insertion in the *Didache*, prayers to be uttered ‘before’ the eucharist?

As they are reproduced in the *Didache*, *Did.* 9.1–5 is to be used before the Eucharist (9.1: Περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας, οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε), while *Did.* 10.1–6 is to be used ‘after’ (10.1: Μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆσαι, οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε). However, the rubrics of *Did.* 9.1 and 10.1 that (re)arrange the prayers ‘before’ and ‘after’ the eucharistic meal, are clearly the redactional interventions of the Didachist; they were not part of the original traditions/prayers, as most scholars admit.¹⁰ So, is it possible that both traditions had initially the same function,

⁶ Huub van de Sandt, “Baptism and Holiness: Two Requirements Authorizing Participation in the Didache’s Eucharist,” in Draper-Jefford, *Didache*, 140.

⁷ Alan J.P. Garrow, *The Gospel of Matthew’s Dependence on the Didache* (JSNTSS 254; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 27.

⁸ Jonathan A. Draper, “Ritual Process and Ritual Symbol in *Didache* 7–10,” *VC* 54 (2000): 121, 127.

⁹ E.g., Jonathan Schwiebert, *Knowledge and the Coming Kingdom: The Didache’s Meal Ritual and its Place in Early Christianity* (LNTS 373; London: T&T Clark, 2008), esp. 113–47; A. Vööbus, “Regarding the Background of the Liturgical Traditions in the Didache: The Question of Literary Relation between Didache IX,4 and the Fourth Gospel,” *VC* 23/2 (1969): 87; Michelle Slee, *The Church in Antioch in the First Century C.E.: Communion and Conflict* (JSNTSup 244; London: T&T Clark, 2003), 95.

¹⁰ E.g., Georg Schöllgen, “The *Didache* as a Church Order: An Examination of the Purpose for the Composition of the *Didache* and Its Consequences for Its Interpretation,” in Draper, *Didache in Modern Research*, 49–50, 66.

both serving as prayers to be uttered ‘before’ the Eucharist? The answer to this question shall be the concern of the following sections.

7.1.1 ‘After you have eaten enough... Come!’

In 2004, following mainly the works of J.-P. Audet,¹¹ J. Betz,¹² J.W. Riggs,¹³ K. Niederwimmer,¹⁴ and E. Mazza,¹⁵ Alan Garrow revisited the dilemma of the incompatibility of the ‘five liturgical actions’ of *Did.* 9–10 (cf. 9.1 and 10.1; 9.2–4 and 10.2–5; 9.5 and 10.6).¹⁶ In his own words,

When these verses are considered independent of their context within *Did.* 9 and 10, the actions described may be identified relatively straightforwardly. However [...] confusion arises when attempts are made to combine all five actions within one liturgical event.¹⁷

According to Garrow, the five incompatible liturgical actions are:

- 1) *Did.* 9.1–4: a thanksgiving prior to the eucharistic meal (Περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας, οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε... πρῶτον περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου... περὶ δὲ τοῦ κλάσματος);
- 2) *Did.* 9.5: the eating of the eucharistic meal (μηδεὶς δὲ φαγέτω μηδὲ πιέτω ἀπὸ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὑμῶν, ἀλλ’ οἱ βαπτισθέντες εἰς ὄνομα κυρίου);
- 3) *Did.* 10.1: the ‘filling’ *agape* meal (Μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆσαι, οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε);
- 4) *Did.* 10.2–3a, 4–5: a thanksgiving after the *agape* meal (τροφὴν τε καὶ ποτὸν ἔδωκας τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν);

¹¹ J.-P. Audet, *La Didachè: Instructions des apôtres* (Études Bibliques; Paris: Gabalda, 1958), 372–433.

¹² J. Betz, “The Eucharist in the Didache,” in Draper, *Didache in Modern Research*, 244–75.

¹³ J.W. Riggs, “From Gracious Table to Sacramental Elements: The Tradition-History of Didache 9 and 10,” *SecCent* 4/2 (1984): 83–102.

¹⁴ Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache: A Commentary* (trans., Linda M. Maloney; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 139–67.

¹⁵ E. Mazza: *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer* (trans., Robert E. Lane; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996); “*Didache* 9–10: Elements of a Eucharistic Interpretation,” in Draper, *Didache in Modern Research*, 276–99.

¹⁶ Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 13–28. The current chapter closely follows Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, chapter 2.

¹⁷ Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 14.

5) *Did.* 10.3b, 6: preparation for, and invitation to the eucharistic meal (ἡμῶν δὲ ἐχαρίσω πνευματικὴν τροφήν καὶ ποτόν... εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω. εἴ τις οὐκ ἔστι, μετανοεῖτω).¹⁸

For Garrow, the comparison between *Did.* 9.1 (1) and 10.6 (5) reveals that both prayers appear to have been composed in order to introduce the same eucharistic meal.¹⁹ Following his observation, I shall analyse these incompatibilities, but in reverse order, from 10.6 backwards, since *Did.* 10.6 is a genuine *crux interpretum*, when considered in its larger context (i.e., *Did.* 9.1–10.6).²⁰ Note Niederwimmer’s approach, with which I concur: ‘It seems to me that if we are to reach a conclusion in this matter we must begin with *Did.* 10.6, a text that must be placed before the sacramental Communion.’²¹

The invitation ‘to come’ (ἐρχέσθω) that ends the prayer of *Did.* 10,²² is limited to those ‘who are holy’ (εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν) and have ‘repented’ of their unholy deeds (εἴ τις οὐκ ἔστι, μετανοεῖτω). Similarly, the prayer of *Did.* 9 ends with a reference to ‘the holy’ (τὸ ἅγιον).²³ According to van de Sandt, in *Did.* 9.5 τὸ ἅγιον describes ‘the eucharistic food’ that is ‘essentially equal to a sacrificial ritual’ of ancient Judaism.²⁴ Accordingly, only those ‘who are holy’ (10.6) are permitted to partake in ‘what is holy’ (9.5).

The same principle is reiterated in 14.1–2: ‘break bread and give thanks after you have confessed your unlawful deeds, that your sacrifice (ἡ θυσία ὑμῶν) may be pure [...] Let no one [...] join you until they are reconciled, that your sacrifice (ἡ θυσία ὑμῶν) may not be defiled’.²⁵

¹⁸ Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 21.

¹⁹ Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 14–15.

²⁰ Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity* (CRINT 3/5; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2002), 301.

²¹ Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 143.

²² Virtually all scholars agree that *Did.* 10.7 comes from the hand of the final editor, the Didachist.

²³ Cf. van de Sandt, “Baptism and Holiness,” 140–46.

²⁴ 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,” *VC* 56/3 (2002): 238, 242.

²⁵ Huub van de Sandt, “Why does the Didache Conceive of the Eucharist as a Holy Meal?,” *VC* 65 (2011): 1–20.

In *Did.* 9.5, the sacrificial language is implicit (τὸ ἅγιον); in 14.1–2, the language is explicit (ἡ θυσία).²⁶ The Eucharist is a ‘holy sacrifice’ (9.5; 14.1–2); therefore, it is only for those ‘who are holy’ and ‘repented’ of their ‘unlawful deeds’ (10.6; 14.1–2). So, given the larger ideological context,²⁷ the natural reading of 10.6 points to an invitation to the eucharistic meal (εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω).²⁸

This assertion is strengthened by the editorial rubric of 10.1, in which the Didachist explicitly places the prayer after the ‘filling’ meal (μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆσαι, οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε). As Garrow observes, ‘there is almost universal agreement among scholars that this verse [*Did.* 10.1] should be seen as referring back to a literally filling meal’.²⁹ Moreover, *Did.* 10.3 appears to render a transition from the regular to the eucharistic food: τροφήν τε καὶ ποτὸν ἔδωκας τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν, ἵνα σοι εὐχαριστήσωσιν, ἡμῖν δὲ ἐχαρίσω πνευματικὴν τροφήν καὶ ποτὸν. As Niederwimmer states, ‘Πνευματικὴ τροφή or (πνευματικὸν) ποτὸν is not a “spiritualizing” expression, but can be understood as a look ahead to the sacramental Lord’s Supper, for which this prayer is a transitional preparation’.³⁰ It is not incidental, therefore, that numerous scholars considered *Did.* 10.6 to anticipate (and invite to) the eucharistic meal. Note, for instance, Joachim Jeremias’ inference:

The liturgical ejaculations in 10.6, which greet the coming Lord, and the warning ‘if anyone is holy, let him come; if he is not let him repent’ are meaningful only as the introduction to the Eucharist (not as the conclusion of an Agape or a Eucharist).³¹

A similar conclusion is drawn by Niederwimmer:

The expressions in 10.6b (the formula of invitation and warning) apparently do not belong at the end of the Communion but rather at the beginning. Thus v. 6 is an important indication that now, and only now,

²⁶ Van de Sandt, “Eucharist as a Holy Meal,” esp. 18–20.

²⁷ See the thorough analysis of this context in van de Sandt, “Eucharist as a Holy Meal,” 6–17.

²⁸ See the lengthier argument and history of scholarship in Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 15–17.

²⁹ Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 14. Cf. Mazza, *Origins*, 16–17; Betz, “Eucharist in the Didache,” 249.

³⁰ Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 158.

³¹ Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (trans., Norman Perrin; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), 118 (n. 5), 134.

is the communion of the Lord's Supper beginning—that is, that the preceding meal was an *agape* or a celebration similar to an *agape*.³²

Even Klaus Wengst, who argued that *Did.* 9–10 depicts ‘nothing but a full-course meal’,³³ admits that ‘originally’ *Did.* 10.6 might have been ‘a fragment of a Lord's Supper liturgy’.³⁴ To give a final example, for Betz, ‘The command in 10:6, that only the holy should come [...], presents the eucharist as only now happening, not as already having happened.’³⁵

In conclusion, for most scholars it obvious that *Did.* 10.6 originally renders a restrictive invitation to the Eucharist: εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω.³⁶ As I will also show below, this is the natural and most convincing interpretation. However, such a reading creates a major ‘incompatibility’, to which I now turn.

7.1.2 ‘With regard to the Eucharist, you shall keep [it] as follows...’

If earlier commentators had contrasting views on whether *Did.* 9.1–5 introduces a Eucharist or simply a regular meal (*agape*),³⁷ recent scholarship inclines to the former, in most cases.³⁸ And rightly so, for the arguments in favour of the eucharistic character of the prayer are indeed forceful. I will list only a few in the following:

(1) I have already argued in the previous chapter for the technicality of the term ‘Eucharist’ in *Did.* 9.1 and 9.5: Περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας, οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε [...] μηδεὶς δὲ φαγέτω μηδὲ πιέτω ἀπὸ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὑμῶν, ἀλλ’ οἱ...³⁹ Moreover, it should be noted that the technical

³² Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 161.

³³ So, Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 142. See also Klaus Wengst, *Didache (Apostellehre), Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Klemensbrief, Schrift an Diognet* (SUC 2; München: Kösel, 1984), 43–56 (45).

³⁴ Wengst, *Didache*, 47. Cf. Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 142 (n. 46).

³⁵ Betz, “Eucharist in the Didache,” 249, 271.

³⁶ For several other examples, see Draper, “Ritual Process,” 141–42.

³⁷ See the history of scholarship in Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 140–43; Paul F. Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins* (ACC 80; London: SPCK, 2004), 26–32.

³⁸ E.g., Garrow, *Matthew's Dependence*, 13–14, 19–21; van de Sandt, “Baptism and Holiness,” 140.

³⁹ Van de Sandt, “Baptism and Holiness,” 148. Similarly, Dietrich-Alex Koch, “Eucharistic Meal and Eucharistic Prayers in Didache 9 and 10,” *StTheol* 64 (2010): 204.

language of *Did.* 9.1 (Περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας, οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε) closely parallels the rubric that introduces the rite of baptism in *Did.* 7.1: Περὶ δὲ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, οὕτω βαπτίσατε.⁴⁰ Such parallelism indicates that *Did.* 9.1 introduces a ritual, not just a regular meal.⁴¹

(2) In *Did.* 10.3, there is also the mention of the daily food, that God provides for the whole of humanity: τροφήν τε καὶ ποτὸν ἔδωκας τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν. In *Did.* 9.1–5, however, any reference to regular food is absent. There is only the reference to ‘the cup’ (περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου) and the ‘fragment [of bread]’ (περὶ δὲ τοῦ κλάσματος). For Garrow and others, ‘A meal prayer concerning a cup and a fragment of bread is already suggestive of a eucharist.’⁴²

Note also Betz’s inference:

The sayings in these verses offer a pronounced eucharistic colour which can hardly be ignored. Thus, the fact that the bread and cup, the specific eucharistic elements, are blessed, though not conclusive in itself, is nevertheless noteworthy. If, however, the text speaks of the holy ‘vine’ of David, of *klasma*, of life and immortality, of spiritual food and (likewise) drink, then it not only alludes distantly to the eucharist which only appears in 10.6, but reveals a close and immediate reference to such a kind of sacramental Lord’s meal.⁴³

Moreover, the early replacement of ἄρτος (‘bread’) with κλάσμα (‘fragment [of bread]’), a technical term belonging to the Egyptian eucharistic liturgy,⁴⁴ shows that this element (i.e., ‘the broken bread’ of *Did.* 9.3–4) was understood in eucharistic terms, at least in Egypt, from the earliest stages of the reception.⁴⁵

⁴⁰ Draper, “Ritual Process,” 128–29; Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 20.

⁴¹ Draper, “Ritual Process,” 131–32.

⁴² Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 20.

⁴³ Betz, “Eucharist in the Didache,” 249.

⁴⁴ Cf. Niederwimmer: “Textprobleme der *Didache*,” *WS* 16 (1982): 124–25; *Didache*, 148. Also, Wengst, *Didache*, 78, 97–98; Schwiebert, *Knowledge*, 61–62 and *passim*. See the discussion above, § 6.2.1 (5).

⁴⁵ See (for instance) the arguments of A. Vööbus: “Background,” 83; *Liturgical Traditions in the Didache* (ETSE 16; Stockholm: ETSE, 1968), 89, 146–48.

(3) Joachim Jeremias' objection, according to which *Did.* 9–10 cannot describe a proper Eucharist, for 'There never was a Eucharist with the sequence Wine—Bread',⁴⁶ was convincingly refuted by A. McGowan,⁴⁷ as shown in the previous chapter. McGowan contends that the reverse order 'cup—bread' was indeed in use, especially in the eastern regions, such as Syria.⁴⁸

(4) The argument that *Did.* 9.1–5 cannot introduce a proper Eucharist, for it lacks any reference to the words of institution or to the passion narratives (cf. 1 Cor. 11.23–25), will not be addressed at this point, since the same is true for *Did.* 10.1–6.⁴⁹ Otherwise, this argument could be adduced only to challenge the eucharistic character of both prayers (*Did.* 9–10), as earlier commentators of the *Didache* did.⁵⁰ At present, few scholars would hold this view, since there is the general acceptance of the diversity within the earliest Christian 'liturgies'. And such diversity includes the eucharistic meals that made no use of the eucharistic words.⁵¹ As for the specific lack of the words of institution in *Did.* 9–10, the issue will be addressed in the final chapter.

(5) The scholars considering that *Did.* 10.6 introduces the proper Eucharist defend their position by pointing to the 'only the holy' restriction of participation: εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω. However, a similar restriction ends the prayer of *Did.* 9, as has been already noted:

⁴⁶ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 118 (n. 5).

⁴⁷ Andrew B. McGowan: "'First Regarding the Cup...': Papias and the Diversity of Early Eucharistic Practice", *JTS* 46 (1995): 551–55; "The Inordinate Cup: Issues of Order in Early Eucharistic Drinking," *StPatr* 35 (2001): 283–91.

⁴⁸ McGowan, "Inordinate Cup," 286–88. Cf. Joseph Ysebaert, "The Eucharist as a Love-meal (agape) in *Didache* 9–10, and Its Development in the Pauline and in the Syrian Tradition," in A. Hilhorst (ed.), *The Apostolic Age in Patristic Thought* (Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2004), 11.

⁴⁹ Cf. M.D. Larsen, "Addressing the Elephant That's Not in the Room: Comparing the Eucharistic Prayers in *Didache* 9-10 and the Last Supper Tradition," *Neot* 45/2 (2011): 252–74. See above, § 6.2.1 (3).

⁵⁰ Cf. Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 140–43.

⁵¹ The view of multiple eucharistic origins is due to the influential work of Hans Lietzmann, *Mass and the Lord's Supper: A Study in the History of the Liturgy* (trans., Dorothea H.G. Reeve; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979), 142, 195–206. See the analysis of Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins*, esp. 1–32.

μηδεὶς δὲ φαγέτω μηδὲ πιέτω ἀπὸ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὑμῶν, ἀλλ’ οἱ βαπτισθέντες εἰς ὄνομα κυρίου. καὶ γὰρ περὶ τούτου εἶρηκεν ὁ κύριος: Μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσί. Niederwimmer, for instance, who strongly argues that *Did.* 9.1–4 introduces the ‘nonsacramental meal of the community’ (*agape*), finds the ‘rubrical comment’ of 9.5⁵² problematic for this view and offers, at this point, a nuanced position:

It is not clear whether here [i.e., *Did.* 9.5] εὐχαριστία means the entire meal celebration or the foods themselves. It is also uncertain whether εὐχαριστία at this point refers simply to the nonsacramental meal of the community (which has been the subject thus far), or whether (and recall that we are looking at a redactional text) the term already includes the sacramental Lord’s Supper that will follow at 10.6. I consider the latter more probable.⁵³

Still, for most scholars today the restriction ἀλλ’ οἱ βαπτισθέντες εἰς ὄνομα κυρίου clearly indicates participation in the proper Eucharist.⁵⁴ Following the scholarly consensus, I also suggest that this is the natural reading of *Did.* 9.5.

(6) In *Ap. Const.* 7.25–26, the prayer that introduces the ‘communion’ is the one taken from *Did.* 9.1–5 (cf. *Ap. Const.* 7.25), and not the one from *Did.* 10.1–6 (cf. *Ap. Const.* 7.26). The former prayer is augmented by the thanksgivings for ‘the precious blood of Jesus Christ, which was shed for us and for His precious body’ (*Ap. Const.* 7.25.4) and also by the addition of 1 Cor. 11.26, 29 (*Ap. Const.* 7.25.4–6). As for the latter prayer (*Ap. Const.* 7.26.1), it replaces *Did.* 10.1 (Μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆσαι, οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε) with a *post communionem* rubric (Μετὰ δὲ τὴν μετάληψιν, οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε), explicitly placing the tradition of *Did.* 10.1–6 after the Eucharist. Still, *Ap. Const.* 7.26.6 preserves the enigmatic ending of *Did.* 10.6, with slight variations: εἴ τις ἅγιός, προσερχέσθω.⁵⁵ The early receptions, therefore, both Syrian (see

⁵² Betz (“Eucharist in the *Didache*,” 249) differs: this is ‘old tradition, not first composed by the redactor of the *Didache* but taken over’.

⁵³ Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 152.

⁵⁴ E.g., van de Sandt, “Baptism and Holiness,” 140–46, 157 and *passim*.

⁵⁵ E.g., Vööbus, *Liturgical Traditions*, 54–56 and *passim*.

Ap. Const. 7.25–26) and Egyptian (see κλάσμα in 9.3–4), consider the prayer of *Did.* 9.1–5 to introduce a Eucharist.

Given all the arguments above, I concur with Garrow’s inference: ‘When *Did.* 9.1–5 is considered independently of its proximity to *Did.* 10, it gives no indication that it serves as a prelude to a filling meal.’⁵⁶ However, this conclusion, correlated with the conclusion of the previous sub-chapter, creates precisely the ‘incompatibilities’ noted by Garrow,⁵⁷ as both *Did.* 9.1–5 and 10.6 seem to introduce a proper Eucharist.

7.1.3 Making sense of the incompatibilities: A history of scholarship

In order to solve the incompatibilities noted above, scholars have taken two principal paths,⁵⁸ one offering alternative readings for *Did.* 9.1–5, the other for *Did.* 10.6. In the first case, numerous scholars argued that *Did.* 9.1–5 introduces a regular (‘filling’) meal, rather than a Eucharist. This view was defended by earlier scholars, such as T. Zahn (1881),⁵⁹ A.D. Nock (1929),⁶⁰ J. Jeremias (1935),⁶¹ R.H. Connolly (1937),⁶² M. Dibelius (1938),⁶³ A. Arnold (1939),⁶⁴ G. Dix (1945),⁶⁵ R. Bultmann (1948),⁶⁶ P. Vielhauer (1965),⁶⁷ and S. Gero.⁶⁸ Among

⁵⁶ Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 20.

⁵⁷ Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 21.

⁵⁸ I have omitted those scholars who reject the eucharistic character of both *Did.* 9 and 10.

⁵⁹ Theodor Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur* (3 vols.; Erlangen: Deichert, 1881–1884), 3:293–98.

⁶⁰ A.D. Nock, “Liturgical Notes,” *JTS* 30 (1929): 390–91.

⁶¹ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 117–18, 134.

⁶² Richard H. Connolly, “Agape and Eucharist in the Didache,” *DRev* 55 (1937): 477–89.

⁶³ Martin Dibelius, “Die Mahl-Gebete der Didache,” *ZNW* 37 (1938): 126–27: ‘the special sacred action, whatever its makeup, did not occur between 9 and 10, but after 10.6. Between 9 and 10 is only the meal proper.’

⁶⁴ August Arnold, *Der Ursprung des christlichen Abendmahls im Lichte der neuesten liturgiegeschichtlichen Forschung* (2nd ed.; FThSt 45; Freiburg: Herder, 1939), 26–31.

⁶⁵ Dom Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London/New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), 90.

⁶⁶ Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (2 vols.; trans., Kendrick Grobel; New York: Scribner’s, 1951–1955), 1:151.

⁶⁷ Philipp Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur: Einleitung in das Neue Testament, die Apokryphen und die apostolischen Väter* (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1975), 38–39.

⁶⁸ S. Gero, “The So-called Ointment Prayer in the Coptic Version of the Didache: A Re-evaluation,” *HTR* 70 (1977): 82.

the more recent scholars, I would mention W. Rordorf and A. Tuilier,⁶⁹ who hold the view ‘with caution’, and K. Niederwimmer.⁷⁰

Since the arguments for the eucharistic character of *Did.* 9.1–5 were listed above, I will not pursue another critique of the views expressed by these scholars. Instead, I will simply note that their view has been convincingly refuted by the large majority of contemporary scholars, including: E. Mazza,⁷¹ C. Claussen,⁷² J. Draper,⁷³ C. Jefford,⁷⁴ A. Milavec,⁷⁵ H. van de Sandt,⁷⁶ J. Schwiebert,⁷⁷ A. Garrow,⁷⁸ D.-A. Koch,⁷⁹ T. O’Loughlin,⁸⁰ and J. Clabeaux.⁸¹ Among the earlier scholars that hold this view are A. von Harnack (1896),⁸² H. Lietzmann (1926),⁸³ K. Völker (1927),⁸⁴ A. Greiff (1929),⁸⁵ R.D. Middleton (1935),⁸⁶ J.M. Creed (1938),⁸⁷ G. Bosio (1940),⁸⁸ C.C. Richardson (1953),⁸⁹ R. Glover (1958),⁹⁰ R. Kraft (1965),⁹¹ and J. Betz (1969).⁹²

⁶⁹ Willy Rordorf, André Tuilier, *La Doctrine des douze apôtres (Didachè)* (SC 248; Paris: Cerf, 1998), 40–41; Willy Rordorf, “The Didache,” in Willy Rordorf et al., *The Eucharist of the Early Christians* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990), 3–14.

⁷⁰ Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 141.

⁷¹ Mazza, “*Didache* 9–10,” 283–94.

⁷² Carsten Claussen, “The Eucharist in the Gospel of John and in the *Didache*,” in Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (eds.), *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford/New York: OUP, 2005), 141–42: ‘there is no need to doubt that at least *Did.* 9 refers to a eucharistic ritual.’

⁷³ Draper, “Ritual Process,” 126–35, 138–43.

⁷⁴ Clayton N. Jefford, “The Librarian’s Guide to the Apostolic Fathers,” *TheoLib* 5/1–2 (2011–12): 65.

⁷⁵ Aaron Milavec, *The Didache: Faith, Hope & Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50–70 C.E.* (New York/Mahwah: Newman Press, 2003), 354–421.

⁷⁶ Van de Sandt, “Baptism and Holiness,” 140.

⁷⁷ Schwiebert, *Knowledge*, 4–12, 98–110.

⁷⁸ Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 13–28.

⁷⁹ Koch, “Eucharistic Meal,” 200–208.

⁸⁰ Thomas O’Loughlin, *The Didache: A Window on the Earliest Christians* (London: SPCK, 2010), esp. 85–88.

⁸¹ Clabeaux, “The Ritual Meal,” 209–18.

⁸² Adolf von Harnack, “Prolegomena,” in *Lehre der zwölf Apostel nebst Untersuchungen zur ältesten Geschichte der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts* (TU 2/1–2; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1884), 58–60.

⁸³ Lietzmann, *Mass and Lord’s Supper*, esp. 188–94. But see the discussion below, § 7.1.3 (1).

⁸⁴ Karl Völker, *Mysterium und Agape: Die gemeinsamen Mahlzeiten in der Alten Kirche* (Gotha: Klotz, 1927), esp. 105–107, 126–28.

⁸⁵ Anton Greiff, *Das älteste Pascharituaie der Kirche, Did 1–10, und das Johannesevangelium* (Johanneische Studien 1; Paderborn: Schoeningh, 1929), 109–11 and *passim*.

⁸⁶ R.D. Middleton, “The Eucharistic Prayers of the *Didache*,” *JTS* 37 (1935): 259–61.

⁸⁷ John M. Creed, “The *Didache*,” *JTS* 39 (1938): 374, 386–87.

⁸⁸ Guido Bosio, *I Padri apostolici*, vol. 1: *Dottrina degli Apostoli, San Clemente Romano, Lettera di Barnaba* (CPSG 7; Turin: Società Editrici Internazionale, 1940), 21.

⁸⁹ Cyril C. Richardson, “The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, Commonly Called the *Didache*,” in *The Early Christian Fathers* (New York: Macmillan, 1970), 165–66.

⁹⁰ Richard Glover, “The *Didache*’s Quotations and the Synoptic Gospels,” *NTS* 5 (1958–59): 26–27.

⁹¹ Robert A. Kraft, *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary*, vol. 3: *Barnabas and the Didache* (New York: Thomas Nelson, 1965), 168.

⁹² Betz, “Eucharist in the *Didache*,” 246–53.

As this brief history of scholarship shows, in the years following the discovery and publication of H54 (1883) there has been large disagreement among scholars in regard to the character of *Did.* 9.1–5. At present, there is a large consensus regarding its eucharistic character. If the earlier scholars offered alternative readings for *Did.* 9.1–5, for many considered *Did.* 10.6 to introduce a Eucharist proper, in recent scholarship the approach has been reversed. As I have already mentioned, most scholars today defend the eucharistic character of *Did.* 9.1–5: there are too many major aspects to be ignored, if this view is rejected. Instead, these scholars prefer to offer alternative readings to the ‘enigmatic’ 10.6c (εἴ τις ἄγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω), since it is not that explicit in its eucharistic character.⁹³

(1) Before interacting with contemporary scholarship, I will briefly mention Hans Lietzmann’s isolated view. According to Lietzmann, *Did.* 9.1–5 introduces a Eucharist, while *Did.* 10.1–5 introduces an *agape* meal.⁹⁴ In order to defend this view, against all textual evidence, Lietzmann relocates *Did.* 10.6, placing it between *Did.* 9.4 and 9.5.⁹⁵ Since there is no variant to support Lietzmann’s relocation (cf. *Ap. Const.* 7.26.6), his indefensible point has been rejected by virtually all subsequent scholars.⁹⁶ So, these scholars had to come up with reasonable explanations, while preserving the integrity of the text.

(2) Unlike Lietzmann, van de Sandt defends the location of *Did.* 10.6, but considers it to be a later addition: ‘These injunctions do not seem to belong to the eucharistic prayers and are likely to serve as liturgical rubrics’.⁹⁷ For van de Sandt-Flusser, these rubrics come from the hand of the final editor.⁹⁸ However, there are several problems with this view. First, the exclamations

⁹³ See Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 22–23.

⁹⁴ Lietzmann, *Mass and Lord’s Supper*, 189–90.

⁹⁵ Lietzmann, *Mass and Lord’s Supper*, 192–93.

⁹⁶ Cf. Betz, “Eucharist in the Didache,” 247; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 141; Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 22.

⁹⁷ Van de Sandt, “Do Not Give What Is Holy to the Dogs’,” 225.

⁹⁸ Van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 301–302.

ἐλθέτω χάρις καὶ παρελθέτω ὁ κόσμος οὗτος and the archaic μαρὰν ἀθά reflect the earliest eschatological expectations of the followers of Jesus (1 Cor. 16.22; cf. *Did.* 16.1–8).⁹⁹ Also, they are consonant with the eschatology depicted in *Did.* 9.4, 10.5, and 16.1–8, eschatology that better fits the period before the end of the first century CE.¹⁰⁰ Then, why would the Didachist himself add these ‘liturgical rubrics’, including the rubric εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω. εἴ τις οὐκ ἔστι, μετανοεῖτω (10.6c; cf. 9.5), if he has already placed the prayer of *Did.* 10.1–5 after the ‘filling’ meal (10.1)? As Sandt-Flusser admit, the connection and parallelism between *Did.* 10.6 and 9.5 are obvious: ‘the ἅγιός (“holy”) in *Did.* 10.6 refers to the baptized persons of 9.5’.¹⁰¹ Should one suspect the final editor of such inconsistency? Milavec argues against this.¹⁰² In the light of these considerations, I suggest that it is reasonable to consider these interjections as part of the original prayer or at least predating the final stage of composition, and not as later ‘liturgical rubrics’ belonging to the Didachist.¹⁰³

As for the meaning of εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω, Sandt-Flusser offer an elegant, but unconvincing explanation.¹⁰⁴ On the one hand, this phrase is ‘hardly meant to be an invitation to participate in the Lord’s Supper’; nevertheless, ‘[it] is an invitation to come but without saying where.’¹⁰⁵ On the other hand, it is an invitation to participate in the Eucharist; but it is the invitation of the final editor. It is the Didachist himself who calls his current (and

⁹⁹ Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 163–64. Cf. K.G. Kuhn, “Maranatha,” in TDNT, 4:466–72; J.A.T. Robinson, “Traces of a Liturgical Sequence in 1 Cor. 16.20–24,” *JTS* 4 (1953): 38–41; G. Bornkamm, “The Anathema in the Early Christian Lord’s Supper Liturgy,” in *Early Christian Experience* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), 169–76, 178–79.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Jonathan A. Draper, “Eschatology in the Didache,” in J. van der Watt (ed.), *Eschatology of the New Testament and Some Related Documents* (WUNT II/315; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 569–72, 581; Vicky Balabansky, *Eschatology in the Making: Mark, Matthew and the Didache* (SNTSMS 97; Cambridge: CUP, 1997), 200–202; Marcello Del Verme, *Didache and Judaism: Jewish Roots of an Ancient Christian Jewish Work* (London/New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), 226–27.

¹⁰¹ Van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 302; van de Sandt, “Baptism and Holiness,” 140–45.

¹⁰² Aaron Milavec, “The Pastoral Genius of the *Didache*: An Analytical Translation and Commentary,” in J. Neusner, E.S. Frerichs and A.J. Levine (eds.), *Religious Writings and Religious Systems*, vol. II: *Christianity* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 89–126.

¹⁰³ See further counter-arguments in Schwiebert, *Knowledge*, 74.

¹⁰⁴ Van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 301–302. See Schwiebert, *Knowledge*, 74: ‘additional explanations of 10.6 also ultimately fail to convince.’

¹⁰⁵ Van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 302.

subsequent) readers to prepare for their Eucharist.¹⁰⁶ By adding these later ‘liturgical rubrics’, the Didachist invites his future readers to the Eucharist (those who are ‘holy’) or to baptism (those who need to ‘repent’; cf. *Did.* 9.5).¹⁰⁷ Of course, this explanation invalidates the argument of inconsistency referred to above. But still, it creates more problems than it solves. I will only mention two, in addition to those already mentioned, i.e., the archaic eschatology and parallelism to 9.5.

First, following Lietzmann,¹⁰⁸ Dibelius,¹⁰⁹ Audet,¹¹⁰ Wengst,¹¹¹ and Niederwimmer,¹¹² J. Schwiebert has convincingly shown that *Did.* 10.6 comprises strong indications of a ritual dialogue (‘antiphonal’), including a ‘congregational’ response:¹¹³

Leader: Let grace come,
and let this world pass away.
Participants: Hosanna to the God of David.
Leader: If anyone is holy, let him come.
If anyone is not; let him repent.
Participants: Maranatha! Amen.¹¹⁴

Thus, the oral character of these ‘eschatological exclamations’ indicates a liturgical and congregational use, rather than a primary written appeal to certain readers. Schwiebert’s conclusion is noteworthy:

the structural balance of these exclamations [...] suggests a period of oral development, of trial and error in performance, rather than a fresh literary fabrication. In other words, these exclamations most likely represent actual ritual dialogue familiar to a member of a community, who also used these meal prayers.¹¹⁵

¹⁰⁶ Van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 302. The same solution was introduced earlier by Vööbus, *Liturgical Traditions*, 73–74, 102.

¹⁰⁷ Van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 302.

¹⁰⁸ Lietzmann, *Mass and Lord’s Supper*, 193.

¹⁰⁹ Dibelius, “Mahl-Gebete,” 125.

¹¹⁰ Audet, *Didachè*, 411–12.

¹¹¹ Wengst, *Didache*, 46.

¹¹² Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 161–62.

¹¹³ Schwiebert, *Knowledge*, 66, 72–74. Cf. Dibelius, “Mahl-Gebete,” 125.

¹¹⁴ Schwiebert, *Knowledge*, 72. Cf. Koch, “Eucharistic Meal,” 205.

¹¹⁵ Schwiebert, *Knowledge*, 75.

Furthermore, as several scholars have pointed out, the Didachist is remarkably conservative when he cites earlier Christian traditions.¹¹⁶ As I will argue later, this is particularly true with respect to the eucharistic traditions/prayers of *Did.* 9–10.¹¹⁷ To suggest that *Did.* 10.6 comes from his hand, implies the expectation of uncharacteristic behaviour on the part of the Didachist.

Thus, I conclude that *Did.* 10.6 was part of the original prayer or at least predates the editorial interventions of the Didachist (*Did.* 9.1; 10.1). Accordingly, I suggest that the scholars seeking to offer an explanation for the problematic εἴ τις ἄγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω (10.6c) ought to take into account the fact that *Did.* 10.6 predates the *post communionem* editorial rubric of 10.1 (μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆσαι, οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε). Nevertheless, I am in partial agreement with van de Sandt-Flusser, namely that *Did.* 10.6 ‘is an invitation to come but without saying where’.¹¹⁸ To this point I shall return later.

(3) A. Garrow mentions another reading of *Did.* 10.6, that used to represent Draper’s view.¹¹⁹ Draper considered *Did.* 10.6 to be a ‘liturgy of dismissal’, ‘[acting] as a closing liturgy that sends the congregation out into the world’.¹²⁰ However, as Garrow notices, ‘it is difficult to read “come” in an opposite sense, and problems are created as to the fate of the unholy, who may not ‘come’’.¹²¹ Since Draper has changed his position on the meaning of 10.6,¹²² I will only mention this unlikely reading without further elaboration.

¹¹⁶ Cf. Kurt Niederwimmer, “Der Didachist und seine Quellen,” in Jefford, *Didache in Context*, 15–36.

¹¹⁷ See below (§ 7.1.4).

¹¹⁸ Van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 302.

¹¹⁹ See Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 16 (n. 14).

¹²⁰ Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 16.

¹²¹ Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 22.

¹²² Jonathan A. Draper, “Performing the Cosmic Mystery of the Church in the Communities of the *Didache*,” in Jonathan Knight and Kevin Sullivan (eds.), *The Open Mind: Essays in Honour of Christopher Rowland* (LNTS 522; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), 37–57 (46).

More recently, Draper has suggested that the invitation of *Did.* 10.6 (εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω) introduces participation in the equivalent of a Greek symposium after the meal, at which prophets might prophesy or apostles might read out letters sent from other communities. Holiness would be required for such a performance by the prophets.¹²³ I find this reading equally unconvincing, as I see no need for such a fundamental separation between the ‘holy’ and those in need of ‘repentance’, with regard to participation in a symposium, if there was one.¹²⁴

(4) For D.-A. Koch, the invitation of *Did.* 10:6c (εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω) does not introduce the Eucharist; it is the invitation of those who are ‘holy’, and have participated in the Eucharist, to add their thanksgiving prayers at the end of the ritual meal, similarly to the prophets (*Did.* 10.7).¹²⁵ According to Koch,

After the fixed prayers held by the leader of the meal were finished, there followed an open situation that gave the possibility to other participants of the ritual meal to contribute to the liturgy, by joining in the liturgical exclamations as: ‘May grace come and may this world pass away,’ or: ‘Hosanna to the God of David’ or short liturgical shouts as: ‘Maranatha’ or ‘Amen.’ The prophets, too, could contribute to the liturgy by making their thanksgiving prayers. And here it is interesting to see that the main emphasis in 10:7 is not on the fact that the prophets have the right to say their thanksgiving prayer, but that they have the right to do this without restrictions (‘as much as they want’). This is a special right for the prophets. But there is no reason at all to assume that only the prophets were allowed to add thanksgiving prayers. It is much more probable that the other participants had not only the right to shout but that they were invited by the leader of the Eucharist to ‘come,’ which means in this liturgical situation to add their prayers as the prophets did, but only those who are ‘holy,’ and not unrestricted as the prophets.¹²⁶

In order to defend this view, Koch argues that the ‘liturgical exclamations occur only in 10:6 and [...] have no parallel in chapter 9.’¹²⁷ So, he distinguishes between *Did.* 10.6, which is ‘an invitation directed by the leader of the meal to the participants’, and *Did.* 9.5, which is ‘an

¹²³ Draper, “Performing the Cosmic Mystery,” 45–53.

¹²⁴ Cf. Gerard Rouwhorst, “The Roots of the Early Christian Eucharist: Jewish Blessings or Hellenistic Symposia?,” in Albert Gerhards and Clemens Leonhard (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Liturgy and Worship: New Insights into its History and Interaction* (JCP 15; Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2007), 295–308.

¹²⁵ Koch, “Eucharistic Meal,” 200, 214.

¹²⁶ Koch, “Eucharistic Meal,” 211.

¹²⁷ Koch, “Eucharistic Meal,” 205.

instruction for the leader'.¹²⁸ Such a distinction leads Koch to affirm 'the unique character of 10:6c within the liturgy of *Did.* 9 and 10'.¹²⁹

First of all, the distinction between *Did.* 9.5, as being 'an instruction for the leader', and 10.6 as 'an instruction [...] to the participants', would be artificial, given the fact that most probably *Did.* 10.1–6 predates *Did.* 9.1–5. So, there is a gap of time between the two prayers.¹³⁰ Then, *Did.* 10.6 is part of the original prayer, while 9.5 could be an editorial intervention of the Didachist, belonging to the final stage of composition.¹³¹ Accordingly, *Did.* 10.6c does not echo *Did.* 9.5, but vice-versa. Moreover, Koch himself indirectly admits the weaknesses of his argument, assuming the 'unique character of 10.6c'.

Secondly, Koch supposes a similarity of (re)action between the prophets and the participants at the meal: 'the other participants had not only the right to shout but [...] they were invited by the leader of the Eucharist to "come," which means in this liturgical situation to add their prayers as the prophets did.' However, his reading goes against the text, which explicitly creates a contrast between the two: 'but permit the prophets to give thanks' (τοῖς δὲ προφήταις ἐπιτρέπετε εὐχαριστεῖν). The language of contrast (the adversative particle δέ) and of 'permission' (ἐπιτρέπω) indicates an exceptional case.¹³² Moreover, 10.6 was part of the original prayer, or at least predates the final stage of composition,¹³³ while 10.7 comes from the later hand of the Didachist.¹³⁴ Again, the time gap between the two verses makes the reading of 10.6 (the earlier tradition) in the light of 10.7 (the later addition), as Koch reads it, problematic.

¹²⁸ Koch, "Eucharistic Meal," 206.

¹²⁹ Koch, "Eucharistic Meal," 206.

¹³⁰ Mazza, "*Didache* 9–10," 277–83.

¹³¹ Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 152. Cf. Betz, "Eucharist in the *Didache*," 249.

¹³² Cf. Milavec, *Didache*, 428–35.

¹³³ Cf. Van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 325–29.

¹³⁴ E.g., Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 164–65: 'The appearance, without explanation, of the key word προφήται ("prophets") reveals 10.7 as an addition by the hand of the Didachist.'

And thirdly, as Schwiebert and others have shown, the ἐρχέσθω of *Did.* 10.6c is part of the doxology, not an invitation to it.¹³⁵ Moreover, the ἀμήν that ends the exclamations of *Did.* 10.6 seems to terminate the congregational participation, rather than introduce it.¹³⁶ It is precisely in this post-ἀμήν context that the Didachist will later insert the contrasting exception regarding ‘the prophets’ (10.7).¹³⁷

7.1.3.1 Preliminary conclusions

All the scholars mentioned above have offered elegant and creative solutions to a highly problematic text. Their effort to offer plausible solutions to *Did.* 10.6 has been made for the sake of defending the eucharistic character of *Did.* 9.1–5; and this is commendable. Even Lietzmann’s indefensible decision to relocate the text shows the certainty that the prayer(s) of *Did.* 9 introduces a Eucharist proper.¹³⁸ However, I see major weaknesses in all the proposals above. For one thing, there are no persuasive arguments for one reading over the other. In conclusion, the meaning of the εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω invitation remains hidden. In the words of van de Sandt, ‘[it] is an invitation to come but without saying where’.¹³⁹ Of this most scholars can be certain.

There is, however, another way to approach the problematic 10.6c. An approach that offers a plausible reading for the invitation, at least with regard to the initial stages of this prayer, while at the same time defending the eucharistic character of *Did.* 9.1–5. This approach will be unfolded in the following section.

¹³⁵ Schwiebert, *Knowledge*, 72. Similarly, Dibelius, “Mahl-Gebete,” 125.

¹³⁶ Dibelius, “Mahl-Gebete,” 125.

¹³⁷ Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 164–65.

¹³⁸ Lietzmann, *Mass and Lord’s Supper*, 190.

¹³⁹ Van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 302.

7.1.4 Making sense of the incompatibilities: A proposal

(1) J.-P. Audet is, to my knowledge, the first commentator to suggest that both prayers, *Did.* 9.1–5 and *Did.* 10.1–6, introduce two Eucharists.¹⁴⁰ In this way, the French scholar attempted to maintain the eucharistic character of *Did.* 9.1–5 and offer a satisfactory solution to the ‘mystery’ of 10.6c.¹⁴¹ Hence, Audet distinguished between the ‘breaking of the bread’ (*Did.* 14.1), which is ‘the minor eucharist’ and is not to be considered an *agape*, and the Eucharist itself (‘the greater eucharist’) which follows the transitional formula of *Did.* 10.6. So, following the ἐρχέσθω invitation (10.6c), those who were baptized (‘holy’) moved to another room for the celebration of the second Eucharist.¹⁴²

Audet’s theory of two Eucharists has found no supporters.¹⁴³ As Vööbus emphatically notes, Audet’s proposal has ‘not one shred of evidence in its support’.¹⁴⁴ Nevertheless, Garrow’s appraisal seems to me more appropriate:

However, it should be noted, as with Lietzmann, that Audet’s theory is not the result of a crazed fancy, but the response of a respected scholar to a very puzzling circumstance. Audet’s response is unsatisfactory, but it does at least attempt to deal with the evidence, rather than forcing it into the convenient mould of an ‘agape’.¹⁴⁵

Moreover, Audet is to be commended not only for his ‘attempt to deal with the [incompatible] evidence’, but also for determining the alternative possibility of reading these prayers:¹⁴⁶ What if both prayers introduce one Eucharist, rather than two?

(2) In the previous section, I cited two conflicting views from J. Betz. In the first instance, Betz argued that ‘the command in 10:6 [...] presents the eucharist as only now happening, not as

¹⁴⁰ Audet, *Didachè*, 410–24.

¹⁴¹ Audet, *Didachè*, 410.

¹⁴² Audet, *Didachè*, 405–407, 414–20.

¹⁴³ Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 23.

¹⁴⁴ Vööbus, *Liturgical Traditions*, 64.

¹⁴⁵ Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 23.

¹⁴⁶ Note his excellent work on *Didache* as an ‘evolved text’.

already having happened'.¹⁴⁷ In his second quotation, Betz defended the eucharistic character of *Did.* 9.1–5:

these verses offer a pronounced eucharistic colour which can hardly be ignored [...] [The text] not only alludes distantly to the eucharist which only appears in 10.6, but reveals a close and immediate reference to such a kind of sacramental Lord's meal.¹⁴⁸

Similar to Audet, Betz attempted to deal with the internal incompatibilities of *Did.* 9.1–5 and 10.6, altering the argument of two Eucharists:

If one considers the texts as isolated units, in terms of their content and development, not according to their external place in the framework of the Didache's celebration, then it leads to the conclusion that they are genuine eucharistic prayers and that the meal ordered by them is a genuine Lord's meal. They have also been evaluated in this way by a row of reputable researchers for a long time.¹⁴⁹

Nevertheless, Betz came to an alternative conclusion, i.e., that both prayers were originally primitive eucharistic prayers, since '[only] a eucharistic interpretation will really do justice to them'.¹⁵⁰ In time, however, the prayers of *Did.* 9.2–10.5 became redundant, as the eucharistic theology developed.¹⁵¹ Yet, rather than to discard the outdated prayers, 'they were transformed and revalued from original eucharistic prayers to mere agape prayers'.¹⁵² So, it is only *Did.* 10.6 that introduces the Eucharist proper.¹⁵³

Betz's reconstruction has been criticized by J.W. Riggs.¹⁵⁴ Overall, I concur with Garrow, who considers that Riggs' critique, mainly his three editorial stages alternative, '[require] an even more unlikely turn of events'.¹⁵⁵ However, I still think that Riggs is correct to suggest that *Did.* 10.2–5 is the older tradition, predating *Did.* 9.2–4.¹⁵⁶ To state it again, this

¹⁴⁷ Betz, "Eucharist in the Didache," 249.

¹⁴⁸ Betz, "Eucharist in the Didache," 249.

¹⁴⁹ Betz, "Eucharist in the Didache," 250. Among the 'reputable researchers', Betz mentions G. Rauschen, P. Batiffol, K. Volker, C. Ruch, O. Casel, M. Goguel, H.C. Snape, J. Quasten, G. Rietschel and P. Graff, B. Reicke, F. Cayre, H. Lilje, and H. Lietzmann.

¹⁵⁰ Betz, "Eucharist in the Didache," 274.

¹⁵¹ Betz, "Eucharist in the Didache," 274–75.

¹⁵² Betz, "Eucharist in the Didache," 251–53 (251); Garrow, *Matthew's Dependence*, 23.

¹⁵³ Betz, "Eucharist in the Didache," 274.

¹⁵⁴ See the extended critique in Riggs, "From Gracious Table," 83–101.

¹⁵⁵ Garrow, *Matthew's Dependence*, 24.

¹⁵⁶ Riggs, "From Gracious Table," esp. 93.

view is shared by various scholars who analysed the origins and development of these traditions.¹⁵⁷ Therefore, I consider that Betz should have kept a clearer distinction between *Did.* 9.2–4 and *Did.* 10.2–5, given their parallel composition.¹⁵⁸ In my opinion, it was the eucharistic prayer of *Did.* 10.1–6 that was ‘downgraded’ or ‘revalued’,¹⁵⁹ thus becoming a thanksgiving prayer ‘after’ the Eucharist (10.1), after the more explicit eucharistic prayer originated within the same community (*Did.* 9.1–4). Still, I am in complete agreement with Betz’s major point, that both prayers were originally prayers that introduced the Eucharist.¹⁶⁰

(3) As was previously stated, this chapter follows closely Garrow’s approach to ‘the five incompatible actions of *Did.* 9.1–10.6’.¹⁶¹ Unlike Betz, Garrow distinguishes between the prayers, noting the significant parallelism: ‘the striking level of similarity between the structure and wording of each chapter [...] The two prayers correspond structurally, verbally and conceptually.’¹⁶² Furthermore, in order to solve the problem of the incompatibilities (especially *Did.* 9.2–5 and 10.6), he advances the ‘previously unconsidered solution [...] that they represent two separate accounts of the same liturgical event’.¹⁶³ Garrow calls this approach ‘the parallel liturgy theory’, as the two eucharistic prayers circulated in the form of ‘separate first-century Christian liturgies’.¹⁶⁴

Did. 9 and 10 belonged to two separate layers of tradition which, when joined together in the *Didache*, were juxtaposed by subject. It is therefore possible that, during the period when these liturgies were in regular use, such a juxtaposition would not have caused any confusion. However, as this form fell out of use it is understandable that these chapters came to be seen as a continuous whole. This is clearly the interpretation made in *Apostolic Constitutions* VII where, however, those aspects of *Did.* 9 and 10 that make such a running together impractical have been modified.¹⁶⁵

¹⁵⁷ E.g., van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 313; Mazza, *Origins*, 17; J.D. Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 361–64.

¹⁵⁸ See Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 26–27.

¹⁵⁹ Betz, “Eucharist in the *Didache*,” 251; Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 23.

¹⁶⁰ Betz, “Eucharist in the *Didache*,” 251.

¹⁶¹ Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 21.

¹⁶² Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 26–27.

¹⁶³ Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 25.

¹⁶⁴ Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 28.

¹⁶⁵ Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 28.

As Garrow himself admits, this thesis is ‘open to criticism’.¹⁶⁶ And one of the weaknesses comes from the ‘the remarkably similar language in both chapters [that] is taken by several scholars as an indication that the parallel sections of these chapters were written at the same time by the same author(s)’.¹⁶⁷ Garrow responds to the anticipated criticism suggesting that ‘liturgical language forms are often preserved by a sequence of authors who wish to maintain, and express their membership of, the stream of liturgical tradition’.¹⁶⁸ However, there is a much easier and more probable solution, namely that both prayers were composed by the same community. Or, at least, that the latter prayer of *Did.* 9.2–5 was composed within a community that knew and used the earlier prayer of *Did.* 10.2–5.¹⁶⁹ And this community was Antioch, as I have argued.¹⁷⁰

Furthermore, if the two eucharistic prayers were composed in Antioch, then Garrow’s ‘parallel liturgy theory’ needs to be redefined. Firstly, the two prayers were not ‘parallel’, in the sense of being ‘separate liturgies’ or ‘two separate accounts of the same liturgical event’. It is precisely their parallelism in ‘structure, wording and concepts’, acknowledged by Garrow, that suggests a direct interaction, during the process of composition.¹⁷¹ Second, I suggest that Garrow uses the term ‘liturgy’ anachronistically.¹⁷² If these prayers were primitive, belonging to earliest Christianity, as Garrow himself admits (‘separate first-century Christian liturgies’),¹⁷³ then a more appropriate term would be ‘traditions’. So, instead of ‘parallel liturgies’, I suggest they should be considered ‘complementary traditions’. However, Garrow’s major point remains valid and is similar to the view hold by Betz: both prayers circulated as first-century eucharistic prayers, originally ‘performing identical functions’.¹⁷⁴ He is also

¹⁶⁶ Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 28.

¹⁶⁷ Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 28.

¹⁶⁸ Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 28.

¹⁶⁹ Draper, “Ritual Process,” 121, 127.

¹⁷⁰ See the previous chapter (§ 6.2).

¹⁷¹ So, Riggs, “From Gracious Table,” 93; van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 313.

¹⁷² Cf. § 1.3.1 (n. 43); § 3.2.2.1; § 5.1.

¹⁷³ Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 28.

¹⁷⁴ Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 28.

correct to suggest that, following the ‘downgrading’ of *Did.* 10.1–6, the invitation of *Did.* 10.6c (εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω) eventually lost its meaning, as is apparent from *Ap. Const.* 7.26.6.¹⁷⁵

7.1.4.1 Preliminary conclusions

Based on the work of the three scholars above, I propose the following reconstruction:

a) Both prayers may have been composed within the same community, namely Syrian Antioch. Or, at least, it can be inferred that the Antiochene church had adopted and used *Did.* 10.2–6 for some time. The same community later composed *Did.* 9.2–4, under the direct influence of *Did.* 10.2–6, or as a reworking of it. This assumption explains better the close parallelism in structure, wording and concepts.

b) Originally, both prayers were eucharistic traditions, both introducing the Eucharist. This explains better the eucharistic character of *Did.* 9.1–5 and the invitation to ‘come’, limited to those who are ‘holy’ or ‘baptized’ (*Did.* 9.5; 10.6c).

c) *Did.* 10.2–6 is the older prayer, being composed during the earliest stages of Christianity, possibly as a reworking of an archaic form of the *Birkat Ha-Mazon*. At that time, there was no separation between the Eucharist and the ‘filling’ meal (*agape*), not even within the prayers introducing this singular meal (*Did.* 10.3; cf. *m. Ber.* 6.1).

d) *Did.* 9.2–4 is the more ‘evolved’ prayer. It distinguishes between the elements of the Eucharist and it eliminates the reference to the ‘universal food’ (9.2–3; cf. 10.3). Still, it introduces a ‘Eucharist’ (9.1) that was, at the same time, a ‘filling’ meal (10.1).

¹⁷⁵ Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 28 (n. 37).

e) Following its composition, the prayer of *Did.* 9.2–4 became preeminent. Still, the ‘outdated’ *Did.* 10.2–6 was not ‘discarded’ but ‘revalued’, being used as a thanksgiving prayer ‘after’ the meal (10.1).

f) In time, the meaning of 10.6c (εἰ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω), that initially introduced the Eucharist proper, has been lost, as is reflected in its earlier reception (*Ap. Const.* 7.26.6). It still remained ‘an invitation to come, but without saying where’.

g) The changes suggested above are not produced, but simply acknowledged by the Didachist, at the time of the insertion of the prayers into the *Didache* (*Did.* 9.1, 5; 10.1, 7). His editorial interventions do not alter the pre-Didachic traditions.¹⁷⁶

7.2 The eucharistic traditions of the *Didache* and the church of Antioch

I have argued thus far that both prayers recorded in *Did.* 9–10 originally had ‘identical functions’, both introducing the Eucharist. Moreover, the archaic vocabulary and concepts (10.6), together with the primitive, even transitional eucharistic formulations (10.3), suggest that *Did.* 10.2–5 is the older prayer.¹⁷⁷ Moreover, as Schwiebert has persuasively argued, ‘the structural balance of these exclamations [...] suggests a period of oral development, of trial and error in performance’.¹⁷⁸ Unfortunately, it is impossible to estimate the length of the developing period.¹⁷⁹ Still, if *Did.* 9.2–4 has been composed under the influence of *Did.* 10.2–5, as the parallelism of structure, wording and concepts indicates, and if both prayers were

¹⁷⁶ *Contra Slee*, *Church in Antioch*, 98.

¹⁷⁷ E.g., Riggs, “From Gracious Table,” 93; van de Sandt-Flusser, *Didache*, 313.

¹⁷⁸ Schwiebert, *Knowledge*, 75.

¹⁷⁹ Cf. Mazza, “*Didache* 9–10,” 278–83; Betz, “Eucharist in the *Didache*,” 245, 252.

inserted into the text of the *Didache* around the end of the first century CE, then it is reasonable to infer a period of composition of these prayers after the mid-first century (*ca.* 50–70 CE).¹⁸⁰

Furthermore, I have advanced a dual hypothesis: 1) both prayers of *Did.* 9–10 were composed in Antioch; 2) the prayer of *Did.* 9.2–4 was composed in Antioch, under the direct influence of *Did.* 10.2–6, the eucharistic prayer that was in use at the time. So, what does this reconstruction reveal about the church of Antioch and its attitude toward the eucharistic traditions?

First, I have suggested that *Did.* 10.2–6 was being used in the Antiochene church, when the prayer of *Did.* 9.2–4 was composed. If the two prayers are compared, it shows that the alterations of the latter relate to: 1) the individualization of each eucharistic element (‘the cup’ and ‘the *klasma*’); 2) the emphasis on the reversed order (cup–*klasma*);¹⁸¹ and 3) the removal of the reference to the regular food (see 10.3). Still, the communal meal remained both a Eucharist and a ‘filling’ *agape* (10.1). In my view, all these alterations were determined by the internal realities of the church. Reading between the lines, they reveal the need for a clearer distinction between the eucharistic elements (9.2–3) and the rest of the food (10.3; cf. Ignatius, *Rom.* 7.3).¹⁸² Apparently, at some point, the celebration of the *agape* had become so central that the significance of the Eucharist was almost nullified. So, there was the need to re-emphasise the meaning of the elements (9.2, 3).¹⁸³ Moreover, by the time of the Didachist (*ca.* 90–120 CE), it seems that the Eucharist was suppressed by the *agape* up to the point that even the unbaptized participated (*Did.* 9.5).¹⁸⁴ So, given the two realities (and ongoing challenges), the formulation of a new eucharistic prayer was a must (*Did.* 9.2–4). In a sense, it was a ‘reactive creativity’.

¹⁸⁰ Mazza, “*Didache* 9–10,” 278–83.

¹⁸¹ Betz, “Eucharist in the *Didache*,” 252; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 158 (n. 37): ‘Note the sequence “food—drink” [*Did.* 10.3] in contrast to *Did.* 9.2–3, but in harmony with 9.5. The prayer has regard for the eucharistic elements.’

¹⁸² Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 158.

¹⁸³ Riggs, “From Gracious Table,” 101; Mazza, “*Didache* 9–10,” 297–98; Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 24.

¹⁸⁴ Van de Sandt, ““Do Not Give What Is Holy to the Dogs,’” 230, 238.

Second, there is the issue of preservation. As scholars have shown, the outdated prayer of *Did.* 10.2–6 was not discarded after the composition of *Did.* 9.2–4, but revalued and used as a thanksgiving prayer ‘after’ the eucharistic *agape* (10.1), in spite of the resulting inconsistencies (10.6c). Moreover, certain themes from the earlier prayer were inserted into the latter, such as: the knowledge and immortality of God, revealed through Christ; the unity of the church; and the imminence of the eschaton (9.2–4; 10.2–5). Were these the main emphases of their Eucharist? Some scholars answer affirmatively.¹⁸⁵

In my opinion, the preservation of *Did.* 10.2–5 indicates at least two scenarios: 1) the prayer was also composed in the Antiochene church; or 2) the prayer had been used by the church for some time, as Schwiebert argues,¹⁸⁶ so it became part of the local heritage. Either way, I suggest that the introduction of the latter prayer (9.2–4) might have been accepted only through the preservation of the earlier (10.2–5). I would call this ‘open/progressive conservation’.

In conclusion, the reconstruction I propose in the preceding section uncovers a Christian community that is both conservative and creative: creative enough as not to be entirely conservative; and conservative enough as not to be entirely creative. Admittedly, the reconstruction itself is difficult to prove. Nevertheless, in my opinion, it offers satisfactory explanations for the continuities and discontinuities of the two prayers that originally had ‘identical functions’. Moreover, it is an improvement on existing scholarly positions.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸⁵ Betz, “Eucharist in the Didache,” 258–75; Schwiebert, *Knowledge*, 247–50.

¹⁸⁶ Schwiebert, *Knowledge*, 75.

¹⁸⁷ Again, it should be noted that, especially with the *Didache*, scholars are engaging with an area of scholarship that is both shifting and unstable. Therefore, advances in this field are unlikely to be on the basis of assured new conclusions, but only ‘on-balance’ conclusions.

7.3 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have argued that the best explanation for the incompatibilities between *Did.* 9.1 (Περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας, οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε) and 10.6c (εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω) is the existence of two traditions/prayers (9.1–5; 10.1–6), that originally were used to introduce the same eucharistic meal. Then, I have shown that at least one of the prayers (*Did.* 9.1–5) was composed in Antioch, yet both of them were known to and used by this church. So, the concurrent replacement and preservation of the two traditions allow for some insights into a community that was both reactive and conservative. But is this paradigm useful to explain the other eucharistic traditions of Antioch?

As we have seen above, if the date that scholars suggest for the composition of the eucharistic traditions (i.e., 50–70 CE) is correct, then they are, to a great extent, contemporary to (or even earlier than) the eucharistic traditions of Matthew (Matt. 26.26–29) and Luke (Lk. 22.17–20). So, how does this paradigm contribute to the larger setting of the eucharistic traditions' use in Antioch? I will attempt to address this question in the final chapter.

CHAPTER 8

‘PARTICIPATE IN ONLY ONE EUCHARIST’:

IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH AND THE EUCHARISTIC TRADITIONS

In the preceding chapters, the Antiochene provenance of the eucharistic traditions of 1 Cor. 11.23–25, Matt. 26.26–29, and *Did.* 9.1–10.6 has been discussed extensively. Such an approach was necessary, given the hypothetical character of the task, for it could constitute the Achilles’ heel of the whole argument.¹ In a sense, proving his Antiochene connections should be unnecessary for Ignatius ‘of Antioch’. Nevertheless, the challenges of identifying the use of eucharistic traditions in Ignatius’ Antioch are not that different. First of all, the letters of Ignatius were written outside the city of Antioch, to churches other than the church of Antioch. Then, there are no explicit citations of the eucharistic traditions, in any of his letters. So, given these two aspects, is it possible to uncover the eucharistic tradition(s) used in the church of Antioch, during the episcopacy of Ignatius? The answer to this question shall be the focus of the current chapter. But before we approach this question, some aspects concerning Ignatius’ milieu should be considered, as they are necessary for the better understanding of the use of the eucharistic traditions.

8.1 ‘One church, one bishop’: Ignatius and the church of Antioch

Little is known about the historical, social, and even religious background of Ignatius of Antioch and the Antiochene church, whose bishop he was.² Most of the information we possess

¹ See above (§ 1.4).

² For a reconstruction of the historical, political, and religious background of Antioch during Ignatius’ episcopacy see (inter alia): L.W. Barnard, “The Background of Ignatius of Antioch,” *VC* 17/4 (1963): 193–206; D.S. Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch: A Study of Early Christian Thought in the East* (Cambridge: CUP, 1982), 19–26.

about Ignatius and his church comes from the seven letters³ written while he was ‘in chains’ (e.g., *Phld.* 5.1; *Smyrn.* 4.2), on the way to Rome, where he expected to be martyred in the arena (*Trall.* 10.1; *Rom.* 4.1–3).⁴ Four of these letters were presumably written from Smyrna (to the churches of Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, and Rome; see *Eph.* 21.1; *Magn.* 15.1; *Trall.* 1.1; 12.1; *Rom.* 10.1), and three letters from Troas (to the churches of Philadelphia and Smyrna, and to Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna; see *Phld.* 11.1; *Smyrn.* 12.1; *Pol.* 8.1).⁵

Also, there are pieces of information found in the writings of Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 3.22; 3.36.1–14) and Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 16).⁶ However, both of these mostly depend on the Ignatian correspondence. Then, throughout the seven letters, there is scant information about Ignatius himself and the church of Antioch. So, given the lack of adequate data, it is not surprising that scholars find little agreement with regard to Ignatius’ life and episcopacy.⁷

³ I am following the widespread consensus of the so-called ‘middle recension’, considering the seven letters written to the churches of Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Rome, Philadelphia, Smyrna, and to Polycarp, to be authentic. For a defence of the ‘middle recension’, see (inter alia): Theodor Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien* (Gotha: Perthes, 1873); J.B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, vol. II.1: *S. Ignatius; S. Polycarp* (London: Macmillan, 1889), 233–79; William R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 3–7; Allen Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Martyr Bishop and the Origin of Episcopacy* (London/New York: T&T Clark Continuum, 2007), 95–143. The ‘generally but not universally accepted’ academic consensus regarding the ‘middle recension’ has recently been challenged by: Reinoud Weijenborg (1969); Joseph Rius-Camps (1977); Robert Joly (1979); Thomas Lechner (1999); Reinhard Hübner and Markus Vinzent (1999). For a critique of their views, see Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 95–143. Cf. C.P. Hammond Bammel, “Ignatian Problems,” *JTS* 33 (1982): 62–97.

⁴ Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 15: ‘Ignatius, in looking forward to an execution by being exposed to the wild beasts in the arena rather than by beheading, reveals that he was not a Roman citizen. So, as a non-citizen and a provincial, why was he not simply executed in Antioch? The answer would appear to be that it was normal practice to transport condemned criminals from the provinces in order to offer spectator sport in the Colosseum at Rome.’

⁵ There is also the letter of Polycarp to the Philippians (*Phil.*), immediately following the Ignatian correspondence (*Pol.* 13.2); yet the information it offers is inconveniently scarce. See (for instance) *Pol.* 13.2c: ‘As for Ignatius himself and those with him, if you learn anything more definite, let us know.’

⁶ For a brief discussion about the reception of the Ignatian corpus in the patristic literature, see Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 1–2.

⁷ Note the interesting assumption of S. Laeuchli: ‘Ignatius on that trip to Rome had lost full contact with his legal reality – which is one of the reasons why it has been impossible for scholarship to solve from his own words the puzzle of his condemnation and his extradition to Rome.’ See Maurice S. Friedman, Thomas Patrick Burke, Samuel Laeuchli (eds.), *Searching in the Syntax of Things: Experiments in the Study of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), 107.

8.1.1 Ignatius of Antioch: One bishop?

Since the seven letters of Ignatius are the primary sources for this study, I will begin by citing their historical setting, following Ignatius' departure from Antioch. Where they are identifiable, I will add to the reconstruction of W.R. Schoedel the appropriate textual references:

He was possibly taken first by ship from Antioch to a port on the southern coast of Asia Minor. From that point on if not before the band travelled by land. The plan may have been to go on to Ephesus and to disembark from there to Rome.⁸ But the group turned north at the fork in the road near the juncture of the Lycus and Maeander rivers, passed through Philadelphia (where Ignatius had the opportunity to meet with Christians of that community),⁹ and reached Smyrna sometime in August (where there was a providential delay). Ignatius gained the support of the local Christians and Polycarp, their bishop.¹⁰ He received visitors from Ephesus, Magnesia, and Tralles (who may have expected to contact him closer to home), and he wrote letters to each of these communities in return.¹¹ He also wrote to the church of Rome at this time.¹² The next step was Troas where the stay was apparently shorter and abruptly terminated.¹³ There Ignatius learned that "peace" had been restored to the Christians in Antioch.¹⁴ And there he wrote letters to the Philadelphians, the Smyrnaeans, and Polycarp.¹⁵ The abrupt departure was for Neapolis, the seaport of Philippi; and we learn from Polycarp's letter to the latter community that two other Christian prisoners had been added to the band by the time Ignatius was received by the Philippians (Pol. *Phil.* 9.1). There we lose sight of him.¹⁶

After this historical-epistolary sketch, I shall now address some biographical issues. In the letter to the Romans (*Rom.* 2.2; cf. 9.1), Ignatius presents himself as τὸν ἐπίσκοπον Συρίας ('the bishop of Syria').¹⁷ According to Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 3.22.1), he was the second (or the third) bishop of Antioch, succeeding Evodius (cf. 3.36).¹⁸ Moreover, in *Hist. eccl.* 3.36, his episcopate, following Peter's, and his martyrdom are placed during the reign of the Emperor Trajan (98–117 CE):¹⁹

⁸ *Eph.* 1.1–3.

⁹ *Phld.* 1.1–2; 11.1–2.

¹⁰ *Smyrn.* 10.2; 13.1–2.

¹¹ *Eph.* 21.1; *Magn.* 15.1; *Trall.* 1.1; 12.1.

¹² *Rom.* 10.1.

¹³ *Pol.* 8.1.

¹⁴ *Phld.* 10.1; *Smyrn.* 11.2; *Pol.* 7.1.

¹⁵ *Phld.* 11.1; *Smyrn.* 12.1; *Pol.* 8.1.

¹⁶ *Pol.* 13.2. See Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 11.

¹⁷ Mark J. Edwards, *Catholicity and Heresy in the Early Church* (Farnham/Burlington: Ashgate, 2009), 3: '[he] styles himself Ignatius, Bishop of Syria (*Romans* 2); posterity has assumed that his see was Antioch, since he alludes to it as his home.'

¹⁸ For certain inaccuracies in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.22 and 3.36, see Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 4.

¹⁹ More specifically, Eusebius (*Chron.*) places Ignatius' martyrdom in 107 CE, the tenth year of Trajan's reign. Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 16), dates it during the eleventh year of Trajan: 'He was put to death in the eleventh year of

After Nerva had reigned for a little more than a year, he was succeeded by Trajan ... Moreover, at the time mentioned, Ignatius was famous as the second bishop of Antioch after St Peter ... At this time flourished in Asia Polycarp, companion of the apostles, who had been appointed to the bishop of the church in Smyrna by the eyewitnesses and ministers of the Lord. Distinguished men at the same time were Papias ... and Ignatius ... The story goes that he [i.e., Ignatius] was sent from Syria to Rome to be eaten by wild beasts in testimony to Christ. He was taken through Asia under most careful guard, and strengthened by his speech and exhortation the diocese of each city in which he stayed.²⁰

For Theodoret (*Dial. Immutab.* 1.4.33), Ignatius was appointed bishop by the apostle Peter himself, who was Antioch's first bishop. Yet, according to *Ap. Const.* 7.46, Peter ordained Evodius as bishop of Antioch, while Paul ordained Ignatius for the same office (cf. *Eph.* 12.2).²¹ Furthermore, Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 16) is the first writer to give a reason for Ignatius' arrest and martyrdom: 'he was condemned to the wild beasts and sent in chains to Rome in the course of a persecution instigated by Trajan.'²² Most of these traditional views, however, were challenged by modern scholars.²³

(1) For instance, note the lack of consensus with regard to the date of the Ignatian correspondence.²⁴ Earlier scholars, such as T. Zahn (1873), J.B. Lightfoot (1889),²⁵ and Adolf von Harnack (1904)²⁶ followed the traditional view, placing Ignatius and his writings during

Trajan and the remains of his body lie in Antioch outside the Daphnitic gate in the cemetery.' See J.B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, vol. II.2: *S. Ignatius; S. Polycarp* (London: Macmillan, 1889), 449.

²⁰ Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.36. I am reproducing here the excerpts of Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 2.

²¹ Hammond Bammel, "Ignatian Problems," 77. Notably, both Theodoret and the *Apostolic Constitutions* come from Antioch. So, note the caveat of Paul Foster, "The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch (Part 1)," *ExpT* 117/12 (2006): 490: 'The historical value of this tradition is questionable, and it may be more concerned to demonstrate apostolic succession than to represent accurate history.'

²² Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 19–20: 'Neither Irenaeus nor Origen, nor Eusebius nor any other early writer, gives us any indication of the reasons for Ignatius' trial nor the charges against him. It is only around AD 400 that Jerome informs us that.' See also, Eugene LaVerdiere, *The Eucharist in the New Testament and the Early Church* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996), 164 (n. 3).

²³ T.J. Lang, *Mystery and the Making of a Christian Historical Consciousness: From Paul to the Second Century* (BZNW 219; Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2015), 131. For the study of Ignatius in modern scholarship, see Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 2.

²⁴ For a survey of scholarship since 1880, see W.R. Schoedel, "Polycarp of Smyrna and Ignatius of Antioch," *ANRW II* 27/1 (1993): 272–358, 286–92, 347–49.

²⁵ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers II.1*, 2–69.

²⁶ A. von Harnack, *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius* (vol. 1/2; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1904), esp. 379, 388–406. But note von Harnack's earlier view (1878), suggesting an intermediary period, between the reigns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius. A. von Harnack, *Die Zeit des Ignatius* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1878), 2–3.

the reign of Trajan (98–117 CE).²⁷ Unlike these scholars, Andreas Lindemann (2005), after evaluating the state of modern scholarship,²⁸ concludes:

the traditional dating of the letters (going back to Euseb. *HE* 3.36.2–4) very early in the second century in the time of the emperor Trajan is probably no longer acceptable. On the other hand, there are no convincing reasons to date the letters late in the second century.²⁹

So, following Lindemann's time frame, I will mention a few fairly recent contributions to the issue of dating. For Paul Foster (2006), 'the letters could have been composed at some stage during the second quarter of the second century, i.e. 125–50 CE, roughly corresponding to Hadrian's reign or the earlier part of Antoninus Pius' period in office.'³⁰ Similar datings were suggested by Allen Brent (2006)—who places Ignatius' arrest and martyrdom in the 130s CE, during the reign of Hadrian (117–138 CE)³¹—and Timothy Barnes (2008), who suggests the 140s CE, during the reign of Antoninus Pius (138–161 CE).³² Later dates (*ca.* 165–175 CE) have been suggested by Robert Joly (1979),³³ Reinhard Hübner (1997),³⁴ Markus Vinzent (1999),³⁵ and Thomas Lechner (1999).³⁶

²⁷ Among the more recent scholars who hold the traditional view, see Edwards, *Catholicity and Heresy*, 3; LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 164 (n. 3); Stevan L. Davies, "The Predicament of Ignatius of Antioch," *VC* 30/3 (1976): 175–80.

²⁸ Lindemann emphasises the discussions published in *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* (1997–1998), following R.M. Hübner, "Thesen zur Echtheit und Datierung der sieben Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochien," *ZAC* 1 (1997): 44–72. See A. Lindemann, "Antwort auf die 'Thesen zur Echtheit und Datierung der sieben Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochien'," *ZAC* 1 (1997): 185–94; G. Schöllgen, "Die Ignatianen als pseudepigraphisches Briefcorpus: Anmerkung zu den Thesen von Reinhard M. Hübner," *ZAC* 2 (1998): 16–25; M.J. Edwards, "Ignatius and the Second Century: An Answer to R. Hübner," *ZAC* 2 (1998): 214–26.

²⁹ Andreas Lindemann, "Paul's Influence on 'Clement' and Ignatius," in Andrew F. Gregory and Cristopher M. Tuckett (eds.), *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford/New York: OUP, 2005), 17. Cf. Lang, *Mystery*, 131.

³⁰ Foster, "Epistles of Ignatius (1)," 492.

³¹ Allen Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch and the Second Sophistic: A Study of an Early Christian Transformation of Pagan Culture* (STAC 36; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 318.

³² Timothy D. Barnes, "The Date of Ignatius," *ExpT* 120/3 (2008): 127–28.

³³ R. Joly, *Le dossier d'Ignace d'Antioch* (Université Libre Bruxelles 69; Bruxelles: Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1979).

³⁴ Hübner, "Datierung der sieben Briefe," 44–72.

³⁵ M. Vinzent, "'Ich bin kein körperliches Geistwesen.' Zum Verhältnis von Greek a, 'Doctrina Petri', Greek b und IgnSm 3," in R. Hübner, *Der Paradox Eine: Antignostischer Monarchianismus im zweiten Jahrhundert* (VCSup 50; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1999), 241–86.

³⁶ T. Lechner, *Ignatius adversus Valentinianos? Chronologische und theologiegeschichtliche Studien zu Briefen des Ignatius von Antiochen* (VCSup 47; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1999), 306–307. I have only mentioned scholars who consider the possibility of the 'middle recension'. See Barnes, "Date of Ignatius," 122. Cf. J. Rius-Camps, *The Four Authentic Letters of Ignatius* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1980).

It is beyond the purpose of this study to address all the arguments of the above scholars; so, my interaction will be limited to the datings I consider more probable, i.e., those of Foster, Brent, and Barnes. For Foster,

The problem with a date in the first or second decade of the second century is not based on doubts about the occurrence of martyrdoms during this period; they undoubtedly took place and are well documented. Rather, it is the theological character of the very writings of Ignatius which seem somewhat discordant with what is known of early second-century Christian writers. If the year AD 110 were indeed the correct date, it needs to be remembered that some of the New Testament writings would be roughly contemporaneous. The Gospel of Luke may have been written only twenty years earlier, the Pastorals towards the end of the first century, the Johannine epistles around the start of the second century, and 2 Peter maybe as late as AD 130. The problem is that the ecclesial concepts so prominent in the seven epistles of Ignatius are noticeable by their absence from these supposedly contemporary Christian writings. The later New Testament writings and the Epistles of Ignatius appear to inhabit different thought worlds and very different stages in the development of church order in Christian congregations.³⁷

First of all, I tend to date these NT writings much earlier than Foster does.³⁸ Then, in my view, it is precisely Ignatius' use of the NT that suggests an earlier date, as long as we consider first the NT writings that Ignatius actually uses, not the ones entirely absent from his corpus (such as Luke's Gospel or 2 Peter). As Foster himself concludes, it is very likely that Ignatius only knew one Gospel (Matthew)³⁹ and four Pauline epistles: 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, 1 Timothy, and 2 Timothy.⁴⁰ As I will show later, he may also have used some oral traditions underlying John's Gospel.⁴¹ On the one hand, it is difficult to deduce what NT writings Ignatius knew, based only on his epistolary quotations and references. As Foster assesses, '[these letters] were produced while the writer was *en route* to his martyrdom [...]' Such circumstances in all probability prevented Ignatius from consulting those texts which he might have had at his disposal in Antioch'.⁴² Then, there was the sudden ('unexpected')

³⁷ Foster, "Epistles of Ignatius (1)," 491.

³⁸ See D.A. Carson and Douglas J. Moo, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005), 207–210, 554–84, 659–63, 676–77.

³⁹ Paul Foster, "The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch and the Writings that Later formed the New Testament," in Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (eds.), *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford/New York: OUP, 2005), 173–81, 186. As *Smyrn.* 3.1–3 indicates, it is possible that Ignatius also knew the Gospel of Peter.

⁴⁰ Foster, "Ignatius and the New Testament," 172, 186.

⁴¹ LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 151. See the later discussion (§ 8.2.2).

⁴² Foster, "Ignatius and the New Testament," 185.

departure from Troas, that prevented him from writing to all churches and imposed brevity for the letters he managed to write (*Pol.* 8.1). These two aspects should nuance any conclusion regarding Ignatius' knowledge of the NT (cf. *Eph.* 5.3; *Magn.* 12.1; *Trall.* 8.2).⁴³ On the other hand, it is very likely that Ignatius only knew one Gospel, which he consistently calls 'the Gospel' (*Phil.* 5.1–2; 8.2; cf. *Eph.* 14.2; 17.1; *Smyrn.* 1.1; 6.1; *Pol.* 2.2).⁴⁴ So, Ignatius' use of this limited NT 'canon',⁴⁵ and especially of a single Gospel, could imply an earlier date for his writings. Nevertheless, some of Ignatius' concerns about the church order seem to follow those of the *Didache* (see 15.1–2), whose final stage of composition is dated around 90–110 CE.⁴⁶ Also, as C. Jefford suggested, it is highly probable that Ignatius knew the *Didache* in its final form.⁴⁷

Furthermore, Brent persuasively argues that Ignatius should be interpreted within the intellectual background of the second sophistic movement.⁴⁸ Consequently, he dates Ignatius' writings to the 130s CE, during the reign of Hadrian, for 'both Hadrian and Ignatius may be said to be riding a common cultural wave'.⁴⁹ However, the second sophistic can be traced back at least to Dio Chrysostom, who lived under Trajan (*ca.* 40–115 CE).⁵⁰ Barnes, as I mentioned, dates Ignatius' writings even later, in the 140s CE.⁵¹ His main argument comes from *Pol.* 3.2,⁵² which he takes to render a direct reference to the teachings of Ptolemaeus (cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1.1.1), a disciple of Valentinus (*ca.* 100–160), being therefore the 'decisive proof' against

⁴³ There are also very few OT quotations or allusions: *Eph.* 5.3; *Magn.* 12.1; *Trall.* 8.2.

⁴⁴ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 9–10. For the use of Matthew's Gospel, see § 8.2.2 (2).

⁴⁵ Foster, "Ignatius and the New Testament," 186.

⁴⁶ Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 53.

⁴⁷ Clayton N. Jefford, "Did Ignatius of Antioch Know the *Didache*?" in Clayton N. Jefford (ed.), *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission* (NovTSup 77; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), 330–51.

⁴⁸ Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch and the Second Sophistic*, 318–26.

⁴⁹ Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch and the Second Sophistic*, 318. Cf. Heinrich Schlier, *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatiusbriefen* (BZNW 8; Gießen: Töpelmann, 1929), 155–57.

⁵⁰ Philostratus, *The Lives of the Sophists* (trans., W.C. Wright; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961); Bruce W. Winter, *Philo and Paul Among the Sophists* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2002).

⁵¹ Barnes, "Date of Ignatius," 127–28.

⁵² *Pol.* 3.2: τὸν ὑπὲρ καιρὸν προσδόκα, τὸν ἄχρονον, τὸν ἀόρατον, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς ὀρατόν, τὸν ἀψηλάφητον, τὸν ἀπαθῆ, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς παθητόν, τὸν κατὰ πάντα τρόπον δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπομείναντα. ('Wait for the one who is above temporality and outside time, who is unseeable, though for our sake seeable, untouchable, though for our sake touchable, impassible, though for our sake passible, and who for our sake suffered in every way.')

the traditional dating.⁵³ Other passages, especially *Smyrn.* 2.1–3.3 could ‘reflect a repudiation of the teachings of Marcion’ (see *Phld.* 8.2).⁵⁴ However, as Sebastian Moll⁵⁵ and T.J. Lang⁵⁶ have shown, Barnes’ argument for direct influence could be reversed.⁵⁷ As for the repudiation of the teachings of Marcion, the theory is highly unlikely.⁵⁸ Therefore, following Lang,⁵⁹ I concur with Moll’s assessment: ‘the appearance of such men as Ptolemy and Marcion remains the *terminus ante not post quem*’.⁶⁰

In conclusion, considering all the aspects above, I tentatively suggest that Ignatius wrote his letters between 115–130 CE, during the reigns of Trajan or Hadrian.⁶¹

(2) As all his letters reveal, the episcopal authority is of crucial importance for Ignatius (*Eph.* 2.1–2; 3.2; 4.1; 5.3; 6.1; 20.2; *Magn.* 2.1; 3.1–2; 4.1; 6.1–2; 7.1; 13.2; *Trall.* 2.1–2; 3.1; 7.1–2; 12.2; 13.2; *Rom.* 9.1; *Phld.* 1.1; 3.2; 4.1; 7.1–2; 8.1; *Smyrn.* 8.1–2; 9.1; *Pol.* 6.1),⁶² given the complete disappearance of the first generation of Christians,⁶³ and the turbulent times the churches were experiencing (e.g., *Eph.* 12.1; *Magn.* 8.1–10.3; *Phld.* 3.1–3; 4.1; 7.1–2; *Smyrn.* 5.1–8.2; 11.1–2; *Pol.* 7.1).⁶⁴ And yet he does not claim any apostolic succession (*Magn.* 6.1; *Trall.* 2.2, 3.1; *Phld.* 5.1), nor any authority stemming from Peter and Paul (cf. *Eph.* 12.2; *Ap. Const.* 7.46).⁶⁵ Instead, when he compares himself to Peter and Paul (and to their apostolic authority) there is an obvious downgrading, and even discontinuity (*Rom.* 4.3; cf. *Eph.* 3.1;

⁵³ Barnes, “Date of Ignatius,” 128.

⁵⁴ Barnes, “Date of Ignatius,” 126. Cf. Vinzent, “Körperliches Geistwesen,” 265–73, 286. Vinzent suggests that ‘Ignatius’ follows Marcion in some respects.

⁵⁵ Sebastian Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion* (WUNT I/250; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 136 (n. 2).

⁵⁶ Lang, *Mystery*, 131–32.

⁵⁷ Moll, *Arch-Heretic Marcion*, 136 (n. 2); Lang, *Mystery*, 132 (n. 6).

⁵⁸ Lang, *Mystery*, 132 (n. 6); Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 16.

⁵⁹ Lang, *Mystery*, 132 (n. 6).

⁶⁰ Moll, *Arch-Heretic Marcion*, 136 (n. 2).

⁶¹ Cf. Lang, *Mystery*, 132: ‘the theological profile of the letters fits best within first half of the second century’.

⁶² Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 22–23.

⁶³ Raymond Johanny, “Ignatius of Antioch,” in Willy Rordorf et al., *The Eucharist of the Early Christians* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990), 48.

⁶⁴ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 15–17.

⁶⁵ Foster, “Epistles of Ignatius (1),” 490.

Trall. 3.3): οὐχ ὡς Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος διατάσσομαι ὑμῖν: ἐκεῖνοι ἀπόστολοι, ἐγὼ κατάκριτος ('I do not give you commands like Peter and Paul: they were apostles, I am a convict').⁶⁶

Moreover, when he mentions Paul's enduring impact in Ephesus, Ignatius hopes 'to be found in his footsteps'; but he acknowledges that only in death is such imitation possible (*Eph.* 12.2; cf. *Mart. Pol.* 22.1).⁶⁷ In the words of R.F. Stoops, 'wherever Ignatius explicitly compared his [...] activity to the activity of the apostles, he did so in order to deny the applicability of the comparison'.⁶⁸

Rather, his episcopal authority is given by his charismatic endowments, as evident in *Phld.* 7.1–2 (cf. *Rom.* 7.2; *Eph.* 20.1–2; *Trall.* 4.1, 5.1–2; *Pol.* 2.2):⁶⁹

For even though certain people wanted to deceive me, humanly speaking, nevertheless the Spirit is not deceived, because it is from God; for it knows from where it comes and where it is going, and exposes the hidden things (τὰ κρυπτὰ ἐλέγχει). I called out when I was with you; I was speaking with a loud voice, God's voice (θεοῦ φωνῆ): "Pay attention to the bishop, the council of presbyters, and the deacons." To be sure, there were those who suspected that I said these things because I knew in advance about the division caused by certain people (οἱ δὲ ὑποπεύσαντές με ὡς πειδόμενα τὸν μερισμὸν τινῶν λέγειν ταῦτα). But the one for whose sake I am in chains is my witness that I did not learn this from any human being. No, the Spirit itself was preaching (ὅτι ἀπὸ σαρκὸς ἀνθρωπίνης οὐκ ἔγνων; τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐκήρυσσεν), saying these words: "Do nothing without the bishop. Guard your bodies as the temple of God. Love unity. Flee from divisions. Become imitators of Jesus Christ, just as he is of his Father."

So, there is the authority of the one who claims to speak directly from God, through the Spirit (θεοῦ φωνῆ... τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκήρυσσεν λέγον τάδε).⁷⁰ Also, there is the special authority given by his status of condemned prisoner and soon-to-be martyr (*Rom.* 2.2; cf. *Rom.* 4.1; *Eph.* 3.1):⁷¹ 'God has judged the bishop from Syria worthy [to be poured out as an offering... while there is still an altar ready]'. For Ignatius, his martyrdom is the divine, yet visible confirmation of his 'worthiness' (*Rom.* 2.2).⁷² And it is by virtue of this confirmatory martyrdom that he is

⁶⁶ Robert F. Stoops, "If I Suffer... Epistolary Authority in Ignatius of Antioch," *HTR* 80/2 (1987): 168–73. See *Trall.* 3.3: 'I did not think myself qualified for this, that I, a convict, should command as though I were an apostle.'

⁶⁷ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 73.

⁶⁸ Stoops, "Epistolary Authority," 168.

⁶⁹ See Harry O. Maier, "The Charismatic Authority of Ignatius of Antioch: A Sociological Analysis," *SR* 18/2 (1989): 185–99.

⁷⁰ F.J. Dolger, "Theou Phone," *AC* 5 (1936): 218–23; Maier, "Charismatic Authority," 190.

⁷¹ Hammond Bammel, "Ignatian Problems," 79; Stoops, "Epistolary Authority," 170–78.

⁷² Candida R. Moss, *The Other Christs: Imitating Jesus in Ancient Christian Ideologies of Martyrdom* (Oxford/New York: OUP, 2010), 41.

‘writing to all the churches’ (*Rom.* 4.1; cf. *Pol.* 8.1; Polycarp, *Phil.* 15.1–2), ‘exhorting’⁷³ them to obey and submit to the local bishop (*Eph.* 2.1–2; 3.2; 4.1; 5.3; 6.1; 20.2; *Magn.* 2.1; 3.1–2; 4.1; 6.1–2; 7.1; 13.2; *Trall.* 2.1–2; 3.1; 7.1–2; 12.2; 13.2; *Rom.* 9.1; *Phld.* 1.1; 3.2; 4.1; 7.1–2; 8.1; *Smyrn.* 8.1–2; 9.1; *Pol.* 6.1). So, only through this martyrdom in Rome could he be like Peter and Paul (*Eph.* 12.2; *Rom.* 4.3).⁷⁴ Note Stoops’ conclusion, that brings together the sources of Ignatius’ authority:

The condemnation of Ignatius did not create a radically new kind of authority—that of a martyr—but gave him an opportunity to give final and decisive proof that God had spoken and continued to speak through him [...] Ignatius believed that the authority of his exhortations, both those spoken in the churches and those contained in his letters, would be determined according to the outcome of his life. If his faithfulness could be demonstrated, then there would be no question that he had spoken the authoritative word of God. Ignatius, finding himself in the footsteps of Paul and hoping to continue on that path to its end, wrote letters as Paul had done.⁷⁵

There is also the authority conferred by the use of Scripture and, especially, by the use of the ‘apostolic doctrines’.⁷⁶ But to this topic I shall return later.

For now, it should be noted that these observations have led numerous scholars to argue that Ignatius was actually the first ‘bishop’ (sg.) of Antioch (cf. *Did.* 15.1–2; *Pol. Phil.* 5.3), in the sense of being the first (who tried) to impose a mono-episcopal hierarchy in the church (*Phld.* 4.1; cf. *Rom.* 9.1; *Smyrn.* 9.1; *Pol. Phil.* 5.3):⁷⁷ μία γὰρ σὰρξ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ

⁷³ For the use of different verbs denoting authority, see Stoops, “Epistolary Authority,” 169: ‘The apostles ‘command’ (διατάσσειν, *Trall.* 3.3; *Rom.* 4.3), and ‘give orders’ (δόγματα, *Magn.* 13.1; or *Trall.* 7.1). Ignatius on the other hand ‘gave orders’ (ἐντέλλειν) only concerning himself (*Rom.* 4.1). Ignatius characterized his letters as ‘speaking’ to his addressees (προσλαλεῖν, *Eph.* 3.1–2; *Magn.* 1.1; or προσομιλεῖν, *Eph.* 9.2) or most characteristically as ‘exhortation’ (παρακαλεῖν, *Eph.* 3.2; *Magn.* 14.1; *Trall.* 6.1; 12.2; *Rom.* 4.1; *Phld.* 8.2; *Pol.* 1.2; 7.3). The epistolary use of παρακαλεῖν conveyed a personal tone. However, the word also appeared regularly in official correspondence where compliance with the request was obligatory. This ambiguity suited Ignatius’s purposes well; he was a “nobody” (*Eph.* 3.1), but he communicated the will of God (*Rom.* 8.3).’

⁷⁴ See Stoops, “Epistolary Authority,” 171–72.

⁷⁵ Stoops, “Epistolary Authority,” 176–78.

⁷⁶ Daniel Hoffman, “The Authority of Scripture and Apostolic Doctrine in Ignatius of Antioch,” *JETS* 28/1 (1985): 71–79; M.W. Mitchell, “In the Footsteps of Paul: Scriptural and Apostolic Authority in Ignatius of Antioch,” *J ECS* 14/1 (2006): 27–45.

⁷⁷ E.g., B.H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church: Studied with Special Reference to the Origins of the Christian Ministry* (New York: Macmillan, 1929), 164–183 (164, 181); Hammond Bammel, “Ignatian Problems,” 77–80 (79); Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 19–43. For Foster, “The vigorous manner in which Ignatius advocates this system may well suggest that this pattern was somewhat of an innovation, at least in terms of the hierarchical structure being described, or that it had come under attack.” See Paul Foster, “The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch (Part 2),” *ExpT* 118/1 (2006): 2–11 (2). Cf. Edwards, *Catholicity and Heresy*, 39–40: ‘Ignatius of Antioch is the earliest writer who professes to be a bishop.’

Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐν ποτήριον εἰς ἔνωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, ἐν θυσιαστήριον, ὡς εἷς ἐπίσκοπος ('for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup that leads to unity through his blood; there is one altar, just as there is one bishop').⁷⁸ This attempt caused serious tensions in the church (*Smyrn.* 9.1; *Magn.* 4.1; *Phld.* 7.2; 10.1; *Pol.* 7.1),⁷⁹ that eventually led to his arrest, condemnation, and martyrdom.⁸⁰

(3) In his own words, Ignatius was 'a convict' (κατάκριτος; see *Rom.* 4.3; *Trall.* 3.3; *Eph.* 12.1). As we have seen, according to the traditional view, he was arrested during the sporadic persecution in Antioch (Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 16), and sent off to Rome 'bound to ten leopards' (*Rom.* 5.1), in a public display that would demoralize eastern Christianity (cf. *Eph.* 10.1–2).⁸¹ However, most scholars today would argue that his 'conviction' was the result of the 'internal politics' or '[resounding] scandals' of his church:⁸² 'Such was the disorder that arose within the Christian community, and spilled over into external, pagan society, that the civil power had to intervene to restore public order.'⁸³ The key passages for this view are *Phld.* 10.1, *Smyrn.* 11.2, and *Pol.* 7.1, passages that describe the immediate restoration of 'peace', following Ignatius' departure from Antioch.⁸⁴ While some scholars argue that the restoration of 'peace' describes the end of the persecution,⁸⁵ there are hints that such a reading is unlikely. First of all, the persecution is an external factor; so, the persecuted church could hardly hail its sudden

⁷⁸ Thomas A. Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch and the Parting of the Ways: Early Jewish-Christian Relations* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009), 99–102, argues against the view that Ignatius established the mono-episcopate in Antioch, for the office was already established in the Eastern Mediterranean.

⁷⁹ *Smyrn.* 9.1: 'The one who honours the bishop is honoured by God; the one who does anything behind the bishop's back serves the devil.' As Donahue argues, the division in Philadelphia also implies 'resistance to episcopal authority'. See P.J. Donahue, "Jewish Christianity in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch," *VC* 32/2 (1978): 92.

⁸⁰ Streeter, *Primitive Church*, 181; Percy Neale Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philipppians* (Cambridge: CUP, 1936), 85–88; Hammond Bammel, "Ignatian Problems," 79; Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 20–22.

⁸¹ Davies, "Predicament of Ignatius," 175–80. Cf. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 11–12.

⁸² Inter alia: Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 85–88; Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 10; Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 19–22.

⁸³ Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 21.

⁸⁴ Frederic W. Schlatter, "The Restoration of Peace in Ignatius' Antioch," *JTS* 35 (1984): 465–69.

⁸⁵ Inter alia: Davies, "Predicament of Ignatius," 178; LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 161; Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 163–202.

ending, in the lack of an official edict. And there is no evidence that such an edict was issued in Antioch.⁸⁶

The report to Ignatius can hardly describe the mere cessation of persecution, since such a gradual process would not provide the kind of public event which was definite enough for churches near Antioch to acknowledge. A specific proclamation issued by the government would serve this purpose, but nothing in our knowledge of Roman practice justifies this possibility for an *inlicita factio*.⁸⁷

Moreover, before he has heard about the restoration of peace,⁸⁸ Ignatius asks the Magnesians (*Magn.* 14.1) to pray εἰς τὸ ἀξιοθῆναι τὴν ἐν Συρίᾳ ἐκκλησίαν (‘that the church of Syria may be judged worthy [of being refreshed]’), a rather negative evaluation.⁸⁹ After he has heard about the restoration of peace (*Smyrn.* 11.2; cf. *Pol.* 7.1–2), he asks the church of Smyrna to send ‘a godly ambassador’ (θεοπροεβύτην) to visit the church of Antioch and συγχαρῆναι αὐτοῖς [...] ἀπέλαβον τὸ ἴδιον μέγεθος καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη αὐτοῖς τὸ ἴδιον σωματεῖον (‘rejoice together [...] for they have regained their own greatness and their corporate body has been restored’). For F.W. Schlatter and others, the difficult phrase ἀπεκατεστάθη αὐτοῖς τὸ ἴδιον σωματεῖον (*Smyrn.* 11.2) could describe the reunion of a church that was previously divided.⁹⁰ Much clearer, however, is the meaning of εἰρηνεύω (‘to be at peace’), that marks the ending of internal conflicts. As Allen Brent notices, ‘in the early fathers “peace” is always used of the cessation of strife within the Christian community, not as cessation of a war with those who are without’ (cf. Clement, *Cor.* 15.1; 44.2; 63.4; Hermas, *Man.* 27[III].3; *Vis.* 14[III.6].3; 17[III.9].2; 20[III.12].3; *Sim.* 73[VIII.7].2; *Barn.* 19.12; *Did.* 4.3).⁹¹

In conclusion, it is likely that, prior to his arrest, Ignatius ‘lost control of the church in Antioch’, as scholars assume (cf. *Magn.* 4.1).⁹² Hence the numerous statements of

⁸⁶ See Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 14–19.

⁸⁷ Schlatter, “Restoration of Peace,” 467.

⁸⁸ See the epistolary chronology in LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 149–150; Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 11.

⁸⁹ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 132.

⁹⁰ Schlatter, “Restoration of Peace,” 467; Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 21.

⁹¹ Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 21; Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 84 (n. 3).

⁹² Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 10. Similarly, Streeter, *Primitive Church*, 181; Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 85–88; Hammond Bammel, “Ignatian Problems,” 79; Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 20–22. For a different view, see Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 111–26; Trevett, *Study of Ignatius*, 48–52.

unworthiness, when he refers to his Antiochene membership (*Eph.* 21.2; *Magn.* 14.1; *Trall.* 13.1; *Rom.* 9.2; *Smyrn.* 11.1).⁹³ And hence the prayer request he makes—that after his departure, the church of Antioch would only have one bishop, which is Jesus Christ (*Rom.* 9.1): Μνημονεύετε ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ ὑμῶν τῆς ἐν Συρίᾳ ἐκκλησίας, ἣτις [ἀντὶ ἐμοῦ] ποιμένι α τῷ θεῷ χρῆται. μόνος αὐτὴν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐπισκοπήσει (‘Remember in your prayers the church in Syria, which has God for its shepherd, in my place. [Pray that] Jesus Christ alone will be its bishop’).⁹⁴ A prayer request like this could point to the existence of a concurrent bishop, that Ignatius had not approved (cf. *Smyrn.* 6.1).⁹⁵ As for the restoration of ‘peace’, he received the news after he had written *Rom.* 9.1; so, this could mean that an approved successor has gained the acceptance of the whole church.⁹⁶

In his own words, Ignatius was a ‘convict’ (*Rom.* 4.3; *Trall.* 3.3), a largely negative term that ‘strangely combines the notion of his civil status and his spiritual condition’ (cf. *Eph.* 12.1).⁹⁷ He suffers a civic conviction, because of an ecclesial conflict. And his martyrdom is God’s way of proving him ‘worthy’ (*Rom.* 2.2), when he sees himself unworthy (*Rom.* 9.1–2).⁹⁸ Most probably, Walter Bauer exaggerates when he argues that Ignatius was bishop over a minority faction at Antioch, i.e., the Gentile Christian party (cf. *Ap. Const.* 7.46).⁹⁹ As T.A. Robinson shows, Ignatius’ status of τὸν ἐπίσκοπον Συρίας was unchallenged in the churches of Asia Minor.¹⁰⁰ Also, he appears to have enjoyed the support of several ‘presbyters and

⁹³ Trevett, *Study of Ignatius*, 59–66; Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 10, 190. Note also the use of ἔκτρομα (*Rom.* 9.2; cf. 1 Cor. 15.8–9; Philo, *Leg. alleg.* 1.76), ‘used more broadly of moral and spiritual failings’.

⁹⁴ Schlatter, “Restoration of Peace,” 468.

⁹⁵ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 240.

⁹⁶ Schlatter, “Restoration of Peace,” 469.

⁹⁷ Schlatter, “Restoration of Peace,” 467.

⁹⁸ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 10: ‘the bishop’s reactions to his situation reveal a person whose self-understanding had been threatened and who was seeking to reaffirm the value of his ministry by what he did and said as he was taken to Rome. One probable cause of Ignatius’ self-doubts was his loss of control of the church in Antioch and the emergence of a group opposed to his authority.’

⁹⁹ Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 60–80; Hammond Bammel, “Ignatian Problems,” 77.

¹⁰⁰ Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 99–102, 112. Similarly, Edwards, *Catholicity and Heresy*, 4: ‘Nowhere, however, do the letters testify to any defiance of episcopacy as an institution; his opponents, who “acknowledge the bishop in name and yet do everything without him” seem to differ only in contesting the qualifications of a particular incumbent and in claiming the right to gather for worship and teaching in his absence.’

deacons' of his church (cf. *Trall.* 2.2–3.1; *Phld.* 4.1).¹⁰¹ Yet there are good reasons to consider that his mono-episcopate was not accepted by all in Antioch (cf. *Rom.* 9.1; *Magn.* 4.1; *Smyrn.* 9.1);¹⁰² hence Ignatius' conspicuous insistence on the 'one bishop' rule (*Phld.* 4.1; cf. *Eph.* 2.1–2; 3.2; 4.1; 5.3; 6.1; 20.2; *Magn.* 2.1; 3.1–2; 4.1; 6.1–2; 7.1; 13.2; *Trall.* 2.1–2; 3.1; 7.1–2; 12.2; 13.2; *Rom.* 9.1; *Phld.* 1.1; 3.2; 7.1–2; 8.1; *Smyrn.* 8.1–2; 9.1; *Pol.* 6.1).¹⁰³

8.1.2 Ignatius' Antioch: One church?

The letters of Ignatius offer numerous insights into the life setting of the six churches he writes to: Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Rome, Philadelphia, and Smyrna.¹⁰⁴ However, as virtually all scholars notice, there are also references and allusions to the church of Antioch (*Phld.* 10.1; *Smyrn.* 11.1–2; *Pol.* 7.1–2). So, some of the details about the Antiochene church are explicit in the epistolary corpus (e.g., *Phld.* 10.1), while others need to be read between the lines. As, Wayne Meeks and Robert Wilken show,

although his letters address directly the problems of the Asian churches to which he is writing and speak only allusively of the situation in Antioch, [Ignatius] nevertheless allows some inferences to be drawn for [the church of Antioch].¹⁰⁵

Similarly, T.A. Robinson concludes: 'Although Ignatius' letters are not addressed to the church in Antioch, it can be argued that they reflect, to some extent, matters and attitudes shaped in the environment of the Christian community there.'¹⁰⁶

¹⁰¹ Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 112.

¹⁰² As Lang (*Mystery*, 131 [n. 1]) notices, Ignatius never claims the designation 'bishop of Antioch', but only τὸν ἐπίσκοπον Συρίας (*Rom.* 2.2). Cf. Edwards, *Catholicity and Heresy*, 3. This designation could imply that he was 'overseeing' other churches of the area, but his episcopacy may have not been accepted by all (cf. *Phld.* 10.2). See also Hammond Bammel, "Ignatian Problems," 89.

¹⁰³ Cf. John P. Meier, "Antioch," in Raymond E. Brown and John P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (New York: Paulist Press, 2004), 75 (n. 166); also, Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 101–102.

¹⁰⁴ Two letters are sent to the same church: to Smyrna and to Polycarp, its bishop.

¹⁰⁵ W.A. Meeks and R.L. Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era* (SBL; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), 19.

¹⁰⁶ Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 69 (n. 85), 104.

These remarks entail a short digression, for they bring to attention a matter of methodology. How accurate is this reading between the lines, i.e., to project upon the church of Antioch the issues of other churches, mostly from Asia Minor? In my view, the ‘criterion of consistency’ could offer a possible answer to the question. If there are teachings (exhortations, use of apostolic traditions, etc.) that Ignatius gives consistently throughout his letters, it is very likely that the same teachings were given in Antioch (cf. *Rom.* 9.1 and *Phld.* 1.1–2.1). Moreover, if certain teachings are based on the consecrated apostolic ‘doctrines’ (cf. *Magn.* 13.1), it is almost certain that these ‘doctrines’ were familiar to the church of Antioch (*Smyrn.* 1.1–2; cf. Matt. 3.15). I would call this the ‘criterion of doctrinal consistency’, considering it the strongest criterion to be used for the uncovering of certain aspects of the Antiochene church. It is this criterion that I will apply later, in the attempt to identify the use of the eucharistic traditions in Antioch.

So, based on the criterion of consistency,¹⁰⁷ Robinson identifies some ‘glimpses of Ignatius’s church life’, such as: the three-part hierarchy of leadership: ‘one bishop, together with presbyters and deacons’ (cf. *Phld.* 4.1);¹⁰⁸ the membership composition of the church: widows, virgins, orphans, slaves and free men, married and celibates, the sick and the poor (cf. *Smyrn.* 6.2); and the gathering of the church (and celebration of the Eucharist) ‘in accordance to the Lord’s day’, i.e., on the first day of the week (*Magn.* 9.1).¹⁰⁹ To these, Meeks-Wilken add the use of certain ‘apostolic creeds’ and ‘liturgical traditions’,¹¹⁰ such as the baptismal confession of *Smyrn.* 1.1–2:

For you are fully convinced (πεπληροφορημένους) about our Lord, that he was truly (ἀληθῶς) from the family of David according to the flesh, Son of God according to the will and power of God, truly (ἀληθῶς) born from a virgin, and baptized by John that all righteousness might be fulfilled by him (ἵνα πληρωθῇ πᾶσα δικαιοσύνη ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ). In the time of Pontius Pilate and the tetrarch Herod, he was truly (ἀληθῶς) nailed for us in the flesh—we ourselves come from the fruit of his divinely blessed suffering—

¹⁰⁷ Robinson (*Ignatius of Antioch*, 105) does not identify the criterion explicitly, but infers: ‘these [teachings] would have been, for the most part, ineffective if Ignatius’s own church were not engaged [in similar practices]’.

¹⁰⁸ In *Phld.* 4.1 the three-part hierarchy of leadership is said to be ‘according to God’.

¹⁰⁹ Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 59 (n. 58), 81.

¹¹⁰ Meeks-Wilken, *Jews and Christians*, 19. This topic I will resume later. See § 8.2.1.

so that through his resurrection he might eternally lift up the standard for his holy and faithful ones, whether among Jews or Gentiles, in the one body of his church (εἴτε ἐν Ἰουδαίοις εἴτε ἐν ἔθνεσιν, ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτοῦ).¹¹¹

However, scholars disagree on whether Ignatius' church that is reflected in these letters was 'the' church of Antioch, or whether it was 'a' church among others. Scholars such as V. Corwin,¹¹² P.J. Donahue,¹¹³ Ulrich Luz,¹¹⁴ and others have argued for the existence of several, 'independent' churches in Antioch, that 'rarely met together'.¹¹⁵ For instance, in *Magn.* 9.1, Ignatius criticizes some Jewish Christians for gathering on the Sabbath, which is taken by most scholars to reflect the situation in Antioch (cf. *Magn.* 11.1).¹¹⁶ Donahue's conclusion is indicative to this view:

Early Christianity was an extremely varied movement, a spectrum spanning the range from an extreme Jewish Christianity which rejected Gentile Christianity altogether to a dualism which cut Christianity's ties to Judaism. The middle ground was occupied at every point. As long as the private home remained the principal locus for Christian worship, Christians in a metropolis like Antioch could go their diverse ways with a minimum of conflict. Christians from different religious and social backgrounds tended to form different congregations. These congregations developed theologically to some extent independent of one another.¹¹⁷

As Robinson notices, this view has become dominant in modern scholarship.¹¹⁸ Nevertheless, I concur with Meier,¹¹⁹ Robinson,¹²⁰ and others¹²¹ that emphasise the singularity of the 'Great Church'¹²² of Antioch, despite the existing factions (cf. *Smyrn.* 1.1–2; 8.2; Origen, *Cels.* 5.61–62).¹²³ Indeed, there are hints that scissions and separate gatherings did take place in Antioch,

¹¹¹ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 223: '[Ignatius] is dependent on traditional materials here.'

¹¹² Virginia Corwin, *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), 52–87.

¹¹³ Donahue, "Jewish Christianity," 81–93 (92).

¹¹⁴ Ulrich Luz: *Theology of the Gospel of Matthew* (NTT; Cambridge: CUP, 1995), 147; *Matthew 1–7* (trans., James E. Crouch; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 57 (n. 282): 'Almost certainly there were different Christian house churches [in Antioch]'.
¹¹⁵ So, Corwin, *St. Ignatius*, 49. Cf. Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 77.

¹¹⁶ Donahue, "Jewish Christianity," 84, 88.

¹¹⁷ Donahue, "Jewish Christianity," 92.

¹¹⁸ Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 77.

¹¹⁹ Meier, "Antioch," 13–14, 40.

¹²⁰ Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 76–88.

¹²¹ E.g., Cyril C. Richardson, "The Church in Ignatius of Antioch," *JR* 17/4 (1937): 428–43.

¹²² So, Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 77 (n. 118).

¹²³ Note Ignatius' use of the term Χριστιανισμός ('Christianity'; *Magn.* 10.1, 3; *Rom.* 3.3; *Phld.* 6.1) and also the phrase μάθωμεν κατὰ Χριστιανισμὸν ζῆν ('let us learn to live according to Christianity'; *Magn.* 10.1). At least for

as in other churches (e.g., *Phld.* 4.1; 7.2; *Magn.* 4.1; 6.1–10.3; *Smyrn.* 7.2). But, in Ignatius’ corpus, these divisions appear to be recent and unacceptable.¹²⁴ Most probably, most of these occurred during his episcopacy and ended soon after his arrest and departure (*Smyrn.* 11.2).¹²⁵ Also, the radical stance of Ignatius, and the vehemence of his critiques, could likewise indicate that he was dealing with a situation both ‘new’ and ‘intolerable’ (e.g., *Magn.* 8.1; 9.1–10.3).¹²⁶ As for ‘go[ing] their diverse ways with a minimum of conflict’, that was hardly the case (e.g., *Trall.* 6.1–8.1; *Smyrn.* 9.1).¹²⁷ In sum, Ignatius does not consider the separate assemblies a *status-quo*.¹²⁸ As Robinson infers,

If Christianity had been characterized from its earliest days by numerous independent assemblies, it would have made little sense for Ignatius to speak with such shock about schism or separation, for a new schism would constitute merely another independent group in the midst of many. If they had been long-standing, separate assemblies would be nothing unusual for the Christian movement—the normal situation rather than the abnormal and objectionable.¹²⁹

Yet, even if certain groups did leave the Antiochene church during Ignatius’ episcopacy (*Smyrn.* 11.2; cf. *Phld.* 3.3; *Magn.* 4.1), they were ‘factions of the church’ (*Phld.* 3.1, 3; 7.2; *Smyrn.* 1.1–2; cf. 1 Cor. 1.2, 10–16).¹³⁰ And they were recent, transitory, abnormal, and consistently associated with the ‘great church’.¹³¹ In conclusion, the mono-episcopal hierarchy that Ignatius tried to impose was rejected by certain groups of the Antiochene church (sg.)¹³²

Ignatius and his addressees the term described a singular movement. For the singularity of the church, see his reference to ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία (‘the universal church’) in *Smyrn.* 8.2.

¹²⁴ Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 80. Cf. Edwards, *Catholicity and Heresy*, 174: ‘to Ignatius and Irenaeus the church which they defended was not one denomination, but the saving ark, while the dissidents were the flotsam of a transient cataclysm.’

¹²⁵ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 10; Trevett, *A Study of Ignatius*, 52.

¹²⁶ *Magn.* 8.1: εἰ γὰρ μέχρι νῦν κατὰ Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ζῶμεν (‘For if we have lived according to Judaism until now...’).

¹²⁷ Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 21.

¹²⁸ Donahue, “Jewish Christianity,” 87–92.

¹²⁹ Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 80.

¹³⁰ Corwin, *St. Ignatius*, 52–87. Similarly, Paul writes to the ‘church (sg.) of Corinth’ (1 Cor. 1.2), although there were multiple house-churches (16.15), divisions (11.18), and various parties (1.10–16).

¹³¹ Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 76–87.

¹³² As I will show later (§ 8.2.2 [2]), among the separatists is the Jewish Christian group. See Corwin, *St. Ignatius*, 52–87.

and, possibly, by other Syrian churches from around (*Rom.* 2.2; 9.1; cf. *Eph.* 21.2; *Magn.* 14.1; *Trall.* 13.1; *Phld.* 10.2).¹³³

Moreover, as Allen Brent has shown, some of these groups rejected not only Ignatius' episcopacy, but also his view of the Eucharist (*Phld.* 4.1).¹³⁴ Consequently, they celebrated the eucharistic meals separately, on a different day or in a different location (e.g., *Phld.* 4.1; *Magn.* 7.1–2; *Smyrn.* 7.1–8.1).¹³⁵ Still, we should not limit these groups to the docetists or Judaizers. It is highly possible that Ignatius' Eucharist was also rejected by groups holding 'orthodox doctrines', as Polycarp, *Phil.* 1.1 (cf. *Magn.* 6.1–7.2) implies:

Polycarp did not like the typology so reminiscent of pagan processions, so he would not use the language of προκαθήμενος εἰς τύπον [cf. Ignatius, *Magn.* 6.2]. He certainly would have found bewildering the way in which Ignatius has poured his theology of Christian order and cult into such a pagan-shaped mould, as implied by such epithets. He prefers instead to reinterpret Ignatian theology far more ambiguously, with his reference to τὰ μυστήρια τῆς ἀληθοῦς ἀγάπης. For Ignatius to define ecclesial order as specifically threefold—and that because they are τύποι of Father, Son, and Spirit-filled apostolic council—is for him a too radical a *rapprochement* with pagan theological culture.¹³⁶

Following Brent's deduction, a major reason for this rejection was that Ignatius' eucharistic celebration had been shaped by the pagan theological culture or its mystery cults (cf. *Magn.* 6.1–7.2 and *Phld.* 4.1).¹³⁷ So, in the words of M. Holmes, 'Ignatius's contemporaries neither fully understood nor agreed with [his view of the Eucharist]'.¹³⁸

Indeed, this could well be a reason why certain groups celebrated the Eucharist separately. In the next section, I will indicate another reason for rejecting Ignatius' view. But, before we move to it, there is another question that needs to be asked, for it refocuses this study: could these different understandings of the Eucharist, that constituted a major reason for the

¹³³ Hammond Bammel, "Ignatian Problems," 89.

¹³⁴ A. Brent: *Ignatius of Antioch*, 79–94; "Ignatius and Polycarp: The Transformation of New Testament Traditions in the Context of Mystery Cults," in Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (eds.), *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford/New York: OUP, 2005), 347.

¹³⁵ Foster, "Epistles of Ignatius (2)," 3; R.M. Grant, *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary*, vol. 4: *Ignatius of Antioch* (Camden: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1966), 120.

¹³⁶ Brent, "Ignatius and Polycarp," 347.

¹³⁷ See also the persuasive argument of Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 79–94.

¹³⁸ Michael W. Holmes, "Ignatius of Antioch: A Martyr Bishop and the Origin of Episcopacy (Review)," *RSR* 35/3 (2009): 193.

separate celebrations (cf. *Smyrn.* 7.1; 8.1), have hardened the use of different eucharistic traditions? To this question I now turn.

8.2 ‘One Eucharist, one flesh, one cup’: Ignatius and the eucharistic traditions

As Meeks-Wilken argued, we can trace back to the church of Antioch the use of certain apostolic ‘doctrines’ and ‘liturgical traditions’,¹³⁹ given their consistent use throughout the Ignatian corpus (e.g., *Eph.* 18.2; 20.2; *Magn.* 1.1; *Trall.* 9.1; *Rom.* 7.3; *Smyrn.* 1.1–2; 3.2–3).¹⁴⁰ So, before I begin to analyse the use of the eucharistic traditions, which are not referred to explicitly in the letters, I will briefly observe the use of certain apostolic ‘doctrines’ that are explicit, in the attempt to identify a possible ‘tradition-use pattern’.

8.2.1 Apostolic traditions

I mentioned in the section above a third source of Ignatius’ episcopal authority: the use of Scripture and apostolic ‘doctrines’.¹⁴¹ At this point, I will focus mainly on the latter.¹⁴² There is the general recognition that Ignatius made numerous references, quotations and allusions, to earlier apostolic ‘doctrines’ and creeds. It is also generally agreed that ‘he placed a very high value’ on these consecrated traditions.¹⁴³ For instance, in *Phld.* 5.1–2, Ignatius writes:

I have taken refuge in the ‘Gospel’, as in the flesh of Jesus, and in the ‘Apostles’ (καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις),¹⁴⁴ as in the council of presbyters of the church. And the ‘Prophets’, let us love them too (καὶ τοὺς προφήτας δὲ ἀγαπῶμεν), because they anticipated the ‘Gospel’ in their preaching and set their hope on him and waited for him; because they also believed in him, they were saved, since they belong to the unity centred

¹³⁹ Meeks-Wilken, *Jews and Christians*, 19.

¹⁴⁰ In the section above (§ 8.1.2), I called this the ‘criterion of doctrinal consistency’.

¹⁴¹ Hoffman, “Apostolic Doctrine,” 71–79; Mitchell, “Footsteps of Paul,” 27–45.

¹⁴² For the use of Scripture in Ignatius, see (inter alia): W.R. Inge, “Ignatius,” in Oxford Society of Historical Theology (ed.), *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), 61–83; Robert M. Grant, “Scripture and Tradition in St. Ignatius of Antioch,” *CBQ* 25 (1963): 322–35; Hoffman, “Apostolic Doctrine,” 71–79; Mitchell, “Footsteps of Paul,” 27–45; Foster, “Ignatius and the New Testament,” 159–86.

¹⁴³ Hoffman, “Apostolic Doctrine,” 76.

¹⁴⁴ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers II.2*, 260: ‘The expression obviously points to some authoritative writings of the New Testament. The “Apostles,” like the “Prophets,” must have been represented in some permanent form to which appeal could be made.’

in Jesus Christ, saints worthy of love and admiration, approved by Jesus Christ and included in the ‘Gospel’ of our shared hope.

The ‘Apostles’ could refer to the second division of the NT (following the ‘Gospel’ division), as Hoffman thinks.¹⁴⁵ However, since there are very few NT writings echoed by Ignatius,¹⁴⁶ it is probably anachronistic to expect this canonical division.¹⁴⁷ More likely, ‘Apostles’ could refer both to some of the writings of the apostles (such as 1 Corinthians)¹⁴⁸ and to the oral traditions of the church, that were associated with the apostles.¹⁴⁹ Regardless of what Ignatius means by the ‘Apostles’, it appears that their ‘doctrines’ are elevated above the writings of the OT: καὶ τοὺς προφήτας δὲ ἀγαπῶμεν (‘let us love the “Prophets” too’; see *Smyrn.* 7.2).¹⁵⁰ For reasons like this, some of the Jewish Christians of Antioch rejected his teachings (*Phld.* 8.2):

For I heard some people say, ‘If I do not find it in the “Archives” (ἐν τοῖς ἀρχείοις), I do not believe it in the “Gospel.”’ And when I said to them, ‘It is written,’ they answered me, ‘That is precisely the question.’ But for me, the “Archives” are Jesus Christ (ἐμοὶ δὲ ἀρχεῖα ἐστὶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός), the unalterable “Archives” (τὰ ἄθικτα ἀρχεῖα) are his cross and death and his resurrection and the faith that comes through him; by these things I want, through your prayers, to be justified (δικαιωθῆναι).

For Ignatius, these ‘unalterable archives’ are vital for the preservation and affirmation of the genuine apostolic faith (*Magn.* 11.1):¹⁵¹

be fully convinced (πεπληροφορηθῆσθαι) about the birth and the suffering and the resurrection that took place during the time of the governorship of Pontius Pilate. These things were truly and most assuredly done by Jesus Christ (πραχθέντα ἀληθῶς καὶ βεβαίως ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), our hope, from which may none of you ever be turned aside (ἧς ἐκτραπήναι μηδενὶ ὑμῶν γένοιτο).

The ‘archives’ of the apostles preserved and summarized the historical and theological truths about Jesus Christ, i.e., ‘the central elements of Christianity’:¹⁵² his divinity (*Eph.* 18.2); his

¹⁴⁵ Hoffman, “Apostolic Doctrine,” 76.

¹⁴⁶ Foster, “Ignatius and the New Testament,” 159–86.

¹⁴⁷ So, Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers II.2*, 260.

¹⁴⁸ Foster, “Ignatius and the New Testament,” 164–67.

¹⁴⁹ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 8–9; Hoffman, “Apostolic Doctrine,” 74.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. *Smyrn.* 7.2: προσέχρειν δὲ τοῖς προφήταις, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ (‘pay attention to the “Prophets”, and above all to the “Gospel”’).

¹⁵¹ Cf. Edwards, *Catholicity and Heresy*, 40.

¹⁵² Hoffman, “Apostolic Doctrine,” 77.

humanity and Davidic genealogy (*Eph.* 18.2; 20.2; *Trall.* 9.1; *Smyrn.* 1.1); his virgin birth (*Eph.* 18.2; 20.2; *Trall.* 9.1); his baptism by John (*Smyrn.* 1.1); his passion and death on the cross, during the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate and the reign of Herod the tetrarch (*Magn.* 1.1; *Trall.* 9.1; *Smyrn.* 1.2); his resurrection on the Lord's day (*Magn.* 9.1; cf. *Trall.* 9.1); his post-resurrection appearances, in which he ate and drank with the apostles (*Smyrn.* 3.2–3).¹⁵³ It is not surprising, then, that Ignatius frequently appeals to these traditions when he defends his own beliefs against the challenges of Judaizers and the docetists (e.g., *Smyrn.* 2.1; *Magn.* 11.1).¹⁵⁴ Note also his insistence that all Christians would be ‘firmly grounded in the doctrines (ἐν τοῖς δόγμασιν) of the Lord and the apostles’ (*Magn.* 13.1).

Furthermore, although he is a bishop worthy of obedience (e.g., *Eph.* 2.2; *Smyrn.* 8.1; 9.1), and a charismatic teacher speaking directly from God (*Phld.* 7.1–2), Ignatius clearly differentiates between the authority of his own teachings and of the apostles (*Eph.* 3.1; *Trall.* 3.3), as the former are subjected to error (*Eph.* 3.1). In fact, in *Eph.* 2.2–3.1 (cf. *Trall.* 3.1–3), the distinction is rendered in the same paragraph:

For it is fitting for you in every way to give glory to Jesus Christ, the one who glorified you, so that you may be holy in all respects, being made complete through a single subjection (κατὰ πάντα τρόπον δοξάζειν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν δοξάσαντα ὑμᾶς, ἵνα ἐν μιᾷ ὑποταγῇ κατηρτισμένοι), being subject (ὑποτασσόμενοι) to the bishop and the council of presbyters [...] I am not giving you orders, as if I were someone important (ὡς ὢν τις). For even though I have been bound in chains because of his Name, I have not yet been perfected (οὐπω ἀπέρτισμαι) in Jesus Christ.

This is why, when he calls the churches to obedience, unity, and the rejection of ‘evil teachings’, Ignatius generally follows this ‘tradition-use pattern’: first, he cites or alludes to the apostolic teachings (rarely to the OT); then, he draws his own applications (or ‘exhortations’), concerning obedience, unity, and orthodoxy.¹⁵⁵ Note, for instance, *Eph.* 16.1–2:

¹⁵³ Corwin, *St. Ignatius*, 94–104; Hoffman, “Apostolic Doctrine,” 76–77.

¹⁵⁴ For the identity of Ignatius’ opponents, see (for instance): Corwin, *St. Ignatius*, 52–87; Foster, “Epistles of Ignatius (1),” 492–94; Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 113–26; Edwards, *Catholicity and Heresy*, 39–40.

¹⁵⁵ Hoffman, “Apostolic Doctrine,” 78.

Do not be deceived, my brothers: ‘those who corrupt their households will not inherit the kingdom of God.’¹⁵⁶ If, then, those who do such things according to the flesh die, how much more the one who corrupts the faith of God through an evil teaching, the faith for which Jesus Christ was crucified? Such a person is filthy and will depart into the unquenchable fire; so too the one who listens to him.

So, it appears that, when the ‘the central [doctrines] of Christianity’ are challenged by the docetists or Judaizers, Ignatius defends these doctrines by using a pattern that includes a consistent reference to the apostolic traditions.¹⁵⁷ But what about the Eucharist? Why are there no apostolic eucharistic traditions that Ignatius quotes?

8.2.2 Eucharistic traditions

As virtually all scholars agree, the Eucharist is ‘central’ to the life and teaching of Ignatius (see *Eph.* 5.2; 13.1; *Phld.* 4; *Smyrn.* 7.1; 8.1).¹⁵⁸ Moreover, ‘the entire thinking of Ignatius [concerning his own martyrdom] is a dynamic prolongation of the eucharist’.¹⁵⁹ As the culmination of his ‘perfection’ (*Rom.* 4.2; cf. *Eph.* 3.1), Ignatius becomes the eucharistic food (*Rom.* 4.1):

Allow me to be bread for the wild beasts; through them I am able to attain to God (δι’ ὧν ἔνεστιν θεοῦ ἐπιτυχεῖν).¹⁶⁰ I am the wheat of God that is ground by the teeth of the wild beasts, so that I may be found to be the pure bread of Christ (ἵνα καθαρὸς ἄρτος εὔρεθῶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ).

On the other hand, the docetists rejected Ignatius’ view of the Eucharist and celebrated it separately (*Smyrn.* 8.1–2). It was so because of their inferior Christology, that affected their understanding of the elements (i.e., the bread and wine): if Christ had no real body, the Eucharist could not become Christ’s real body.¹⁶¹ In the words of Raymond Johanny,

¹⁵⁶ Cf. 1 Cor. 6.9.

¹⁵⁷ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 8–9; Hoffman, “Apostolic Doctrine,” 78–79.

¹⁵⁸ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 21: ‘The eucharist is the center of worship for Ignatius.’

¹⁵⁹ Johanny, “Ignatius of Antioch,” 65.

¹⁶⁰ Cf. Richard A. Bower, “The Meaning of ἐπιτυγχάνω in the Epistles of St. Ignatius of Antioch,” *VC* 28/1 (1974): 1–14.

¹⁶¹ Paul F. Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins* (ACC 80; London: SPCK, 2004), 88.

Having thus done away with the scandal of a God taking flesh, that is, with the scandal of the incarnation, the docetists logically proceeded to empty the eucharist of its meaning: Christ did not take flesh, and therefore his flesh could not be present in the eucharist.¹⁶²

For Ignatius, at the heart of the docetic (mis)understanding of the Eucharist there is a Christology that he refuted repeatedly, by consistently going back to the apostolic traditions (*Eph.* 18.2; 20.2; *Magn.* 1.1; 13.1; *Trall.* 9.1; *Rom.* 7.3; *Smyrn.* 1.1–2; 3.2–3). So, given the above observations, and the ‘tradition-use pattern’ identified above—that involved the use of Christological anti-docetic affirmations (e.g., *Magn.* 11.1; *Trall.* 9.1; *Smyrn.* 2.1)¹⁶³—the lack of any explicit quotation of the eucharistic traditions is surprising (cf. *Rom.* 7.3).¹⁶⁴ For there are internal clues that such traditions were used in Ignatius’ Antioch.

There are numerous references to Eucharist throughout the Ignatian corpus, as he mentions it in all the letters, save for the personal letter sent to Polycarp (*Eph.* 5.2; 13.1; 20.2; *Magn.* 7.2; *Trall.* 8.1; *Rom.* 7.3; *Phld.* 4.1; 5.1; *Smyrn.* 7.1; 8.1; 12.2).¹⁶⁵ However, I will begin the analysis with the four paragraphs in which the term ‘Eucharist’ appears explicitly, namely *Eph.* 13.1, *Phld.* 4.1, and *Smyrn.* 7.1 and 8.1:

Therefore, make every effort to come together (συνέρχεσθαι) more frequently to give thanks [or: celebrate the Eucharist] and glory to God (εἰς εὐχαριστίαν θεοῦ καὶ εἰς δόξαν). For when you gather frequently as a congregation (ὅταν γὰρ πυκνῶς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ γίνεσθε), the powers of Satan are destroyed, and his destructive force is vanquished by the unanimity of your faith (ἐν τῇ ὁμονοίᾳ ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως) (*Eph.* 13.1).

And so, take care to participate in only one Eucharist (μᾶ εὐχαριστία χρῆσθαι). For there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup that brings the unity of his blood (μία γὰρ σὰρξ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἓν ποτήριον εἰς ἕωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ), and one altar, as there is one bishop together with the council of the presbyters and the deacons, my fellow slaves. Thus, whatever you do, do according to God (κατὰ θεὸν πράσσητε) (*Phld.* 4.1).

those who hold heretical opinions (ἑτεροδοξοῦντας) about the grace of Jesus Christ that came to us [...] abstain from the Eucharist and prayer, since they do not confess that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ (Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχονται, διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα

¹⁶² Johanny, “Ignatius of Antioch,” 57.

¹⁶³ According to Johanny (“Ignatius of Antioch,” 57), in *Smyrn.* 7.1 Ignatius introduces an anti-docetic Eucharist.

¹⁶⁴ Bradshaw, for instance, hardly mentions Ignatius throughout his studies that are focused on the eucharistic ‘liturgies’. E.g., Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins*, 87–88; Paul F. Bradshaw and Maxwell E. Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies: Their Evolution and Interpretation* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2012), 25–59.

¹⁶⁵ LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 152.

εἶναι τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν), which suffered on behalf of our sins and which the Father raised in his kindness. And so, those who dispute the gift of God perish while still arguing the point (*Smyrn.* 6.2–7.1).

Let no one do anything involving the church without the bishop. Let only that Eucharist be considered valid, that occurs under the bishop (ἐκείνη βεβαία εὐχαριστία ἠγείσθω, ἢ ὑπὸ ἐπίσκοπον οὔσα ἢ ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψη); or the one to whom he entrusts it. Let the congregation be wherever the bishop is; just as wherever Jesus Christ is, there also is the universal church (*Smyrn.* 8.1–2).

It should be noted that the term ‘Eucharist’ has various meanings,¹⁶⁶ and perhaps the most debated meaning is in *Eph.* 13.1. Johanny, for instance, following A. Hamman and J. de Watteville,¹⁶⁷ argues for the technical use of the term,¹⁶⁸ while other scholars consider that εὐχαριστία should be translated ‘thanksgiving’.¹⁶⁹ In my view, W. Schoedel is correct to argue for both, keeping the ambiguity of P.T. Camelot:¹⁷⁰

“thanksgiving” (εὐχαριστίαν) here calls to mind the sacred meal (see also *Phd.* 4; *Sm.* 7.1; 8.1). But it is also to be observed that, as in other early sources, “thanksgiving” and “glory” are both still primarily terms for prayer to God that is employed at the celebration of the eucharist (Justin *Apol.* 1.65.3; cf. *Did.* 9.1). The sacred meal for Ignatius is but one element in a whole pattern of worship and prayer.¹⁷¹

Similarly, ‘in *Sm.* 8.1 the term serves as a general designation for the whole complex of liturgical acts and prayers that constitute the celebration of the sacred meal’.¹⁷²

So, according to *Eph.* 13.1 and *Smyrn.* 8.1, εὐχαριστία describes the ‘whole pattern of worship and prayer’ or ‘the whole complex of liturgical acts and prayers’ that included the common meal (both *agape* and Eucharist),¹⁷³ but also included certain eucharistic prayers.¹⁷⁴

This reading is confirmed by related texts, such as *Eph.* 5.2¹⁷⁵ and *Smyrn.* 7.1: Εὐχαριστίας καὶ

¹⁶⁶ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 240.

¹⁶⁷ A.G. Hamman, *La prière*, vol. II: *Les trois premiers siècles* (BT; Paris: Desclée & Cie, 1963), 96–97; Jean de Watteville, *Le sacrifice dans les textes eucharistiques des premiers siècles* (BT; Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1966), 50–51.

¹⁶⁸ Johanny, “Ignatius of Antioch,” 51–52.

¹⁶⁹ In *Eph.* 13.1, both B. Ehrman and M. Holmes translate εὐχαριστία as ‘thanksgiving’.

¹⁷⁰ Pierre T. Camelot, *Ignace d’Antioche* (SC 10; Paris: Cerf, 1958), 82.

¹⁷¹ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 240.

¹⁷² Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 240 (n. 7).

¹⁷³ *Smyrn.* 8.2: ‘It is not permissible either to baptize or to hold a love feast (οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν) without the bishop.’

¹⁷⁴ Hamman, *La prière*, 97; LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 158.

¹⁷⁵ *Eph.* 5.2: ἐὰν μὴ τις ἦ ἐντὸς τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, ὑστερεῖται τοῦ ἄρτου τοῦ θεοῦ. εἰ γὰρ ἐνὸς καὶ δευτέρου προσευχῆ τοσαύτην ἰσχὺν ἔχει, πόσω μᾶλλον ἢ τε τοῦ ἐπισκόπου καὶ πάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας (‘Anyone who is not

προσευχῆς ἀπέχονται ('the abstaining from the Eucharist and prayers'). Moreover, the eucharistic prayers of *Did.* 9.1–10.6 and Justin *Apol.* 1.65–67 confirm this 'pattern':

Then we all rise together and pray, and, as we before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, and the people assent, saying "Amen"; and there is a distribution to each...

In a previous chapter, following C.N. Jefford, I suggested the possibility that Ignatius knew the prayers of *Did.* 9.1–10.6.¹⁷⁶ Unfortunately, there is no way to prove that these were among the prayers that *Eph.* 5.2 and *Smyrn.* 7.1 allude to. However, there are textual connections indicating that they were (cf. *Did.* 10.2–3 and *Eph.* 20.2; *Did.* 9.3–4, 14.1 and *Eph.* 20.2; *Did.* 8.1, 14.1 and *Magn.* 9.1).¹⁷⁷ Moreover, LaVerdiere notices that some eucharistic prayers are to be said before the meal, while others are to be said afterwards (*Eph.* 5.2), similar to *Did.* 9.1; 10.1.¹⁷⁸ Also, the phrase ἡ τε τοῦ ἐπισκόπου καὶ πάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας ('that [sg.] of both the bishop and entire church') could indicate an antiphonal oration (cf. *Did.* 10.6).¹⁷⁹ Nonetheless, any certainty is impossible.

However, there is another possible scenario. Following Corwin,¹⁸⁰ Jefford suggests that Ignatius' opponents in Antioch were 'highly influenced by Essene Judaism'.¹⁸¹ Moreover, it was this faction (the 'party of the right') that was responsible for *Didache's* final stage of composition,¹⁸² a composition that 'reflects some flavor of Essene Judaism'.¹⁸³ Among the

inside the altar lacks the bread of God. For if the prayer of one or two persons has such power, how much more will that of the bishop and the entire church.')

¹⁷⁶ Jefford, "Did Ignatius Know the *Didache*," 345, 347–48.

¹⁷⁷ Jefford, "Did Ignatius Know the *Didache*," 345–48.

¹⁷⁸ Cf. LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 158.

¹⁷⁹ Jonathan Schwiebert, *Knowledge and the Coming Kingdom: The Didache's Meal Ritual and its Place in Early Christianity* (LNTS 373; London: T&T Clark, 2008), 60–73.

¹⁸⁰ Corwin, *St. Ignatius*, 52–87 (61–64).

¹⁸¹ C.N. Jefford, "Conflict at Antioch: Ignatius and the *Didache* at Odds," *StPatr* 36 (2001): 262.

¹⁸² Jefford, "Conflict at Antioch," 262.

¹⁸³ Jefford, "Conflict at Antioch," 263. As scholars have shown, there is a strong connection between the *Didache* and the Dead Sea Scrolls. See (for instance) J.-P. Audet: "Affinités littéraires et doctrinales du 'Manuel de Discipline'," *RB* 59 (1952): 219–238; *La Didachè: Instructions des apôtres* (Études Bibliques; Paris: Gabalda, 1958). Also, Jonathan A. Draper, *A Commentary on the Didache in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents* (Unpublished PhD Diss.; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1983).

‘traits of the opponents of Ignatius that Corwin believes to be reflective of Essene Judaism’, Jefford analyses the observance of the Sabbath (*Did.* 14.1; cf. *Magn.* 9.1) and the participation in a common meal (*Did.* 9.1–10.6; 14.1), which Ignatius did not consider ‘valid’ Eucharist (*Magn.* 4.1).¹⁸⁴ If Jefford’s hypothesis, which he considers ‘not definitive, [but] certainly suggestive’,¹⁸⁵ is correct, then Ignatius did know the eucharistic prayers of the *Didache*, as I indicated above, but did not use these prayers at the celebration of the Eucharist, for they were used by one of the opposing factions. As a final remark, both theories need further investigation, in search for greater certainty.

Nevertheless, the use of the eucharistic prayers, in the context of the ‘whole complex of liturgical acts’, is certain enough (*Eph.* 5.2; *Smyrn.* 7.1). But what about the use of apostolic eucharistic traditions?

(1) First of all, it should be noted that Ignatius juxtaposes his views on the Eucharist with the apostolic ‘doctrines’ cited above (*Rom.* 7.3; *Eph.* 20.2; *Smyrn.* 7.1). So, I will briefly comment on three such juxtapositions:

a) *Rom.* 7.3: ‘I have no pleasure in the food that perishes nor in the pleasures of this life. I desire the bread of God, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, from the seed of David (ἄρτον θεοῦ θέλω, ὃ ἐστὶν σὰρξ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυεὶδ); and for drink I desire his blood, which is (ὃ ἐστὶν) imperishable love.’

As Johanny notices, ‘Ignatius’ letters are full of short and highly compact phrases’ and ‘[his] style is rough’.¹⁸⁶ In other words, his language sounds creedal enough to hinder clear distinctions between his own teachings and the allusions to prior tradition.¹⁸⁷ Such is the case

¹⁸⁴ Jefford, “Conflict at Antioch,” 263.

¹⁸⁵ Jefford, “Conflict at Antioch,” 268.

¹⁸⁶ Johanny, “Ignatius of Antioch,” 49.

¹⁸⁷ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 8: ‘Ignatius’ rhetorical background makes it difficult to identify semi-creedal patterns or hymnic elements in his letters with assurance.’

with *Rom.* 7.3.¹⁸⁸ On the one hand, the reference to σπέρματος Δαυεΐδ (‘the seed of David’) indicates the use of a prior tradition (cf. *Eph.* 18.2; 20.2; *Trall.* 9.1; *Smyrn.* 1.1). It could be that Ignatius repeatedly linked this creedal echo to his eucharistic teachings in the context of the docetic threats (cf. *Smyrn.* 6.2–7.1).¹⁸⁹ Similarly, the parallel use of ὃ ἐστίν (‘which is’) could also indicate a creedal formula: ‘bread of God, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ [...] his blood, which is imperishable love.’¹⁹⁰ On the other hand, the lack of symmetry, noticed by Zahn and Schoedel, could indicate that the bulk of the statement comes from Ignatius himself:

There is a curious lack of symmetry in the statement. We expect a comparison between bread and flesh and between drink and blood (John 6:51, 55) or a comparison between flesh and faith and between blood and love (Tr. 8.1). Zahn thought the lack of symmetry significant and argued that the expression “which is incorruptible love” must refer to both the bread and drink and thus represent a reference to ἀγάπη as the “love-feast” (cf. Sm. 7.1; 8.2). But Ignatius’ use of the linking formula “which is” is against this solution (see on Eph. 20.2). It is more likely that the two sets of comparisons referred to above simply became conflated in the course of Ignatius’ dictation of the passage.¹⁹¹

That this is the case is confirmed by Ignatius’ distinctive link of ‘blood’ and ‘love’ (cf. *Trall.* 8.1).¹⁹² As for the ‘bread of God’, it could also be a reminiscence of a prior apostolic tradition (cf. Jn. 6.33; *Rom.* 4.1; *Eph.* 5.2).¹⁹³ So, in my view, in *Rom.* 7.3 Ignatius offers a personal interpretation of the eucharistic elements (‘it is the flesh of Jesus Christ’; ‘it is imperishable love’), that is constructed upon the linguistic structure of prior traditions: ‘of the seed of David...’; ‘the bread of God, which is...’; ‘his blood, which is...’.

b) *Eph.* 20.2: ‘All of you, individually and collectively, gather together as one in grace, in one faith, and in Jesus Christ—who was a descendant of David according to the flesh (τῷ κατὰ

¹⁸⁸ Cf. Johanny, “Ignatius of Antioch,” 62–63.

¹⁸⁹ LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 151, 155, 162.

¹⁹⁰ As Schoedel (*Ignatius of Antioch*, 98) shows, the phrase ‘which is’ (ὃ ἐστίν, ἥτις ἐστίν) is certainly Ignatian. For ὃ ἐστίν, see *Eph.* 17.2; 18.1; 20.2; *Magn.* 7.1; 10.2; *Trall.* 8.1; 11.2; *Rom.* 5.1; 7.3; *Smyrn.* 5.3. For ἥτις ἐστίν, see *Eph.* 14.1; *Trall.* 6.1. Still, this could be a linguistic reflex (or pattern), indebted to the extensive use of creedal affirmations.

¹⁹¹ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 185–86.

¹⁹² Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 24–26, 185.

¹⁹³ LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 151–52.

σάρκα ἐκ γένους Δαυεΐδ), who is Son of Man and Son of God—in order that you may obey the bishop and the council of presbyters with an undisturbed mind, breaking one bread (ἓνα ἄρτον κλώντες), which is the medicine of immortality (ὅς ἐστὶν φάρμακον ἀθανασίας), the antidote we take in order not to die (ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν), but to live forever in Jesus Christ.’

As in *Rom. 7.3*, Ignatius juxtaposes fragments of the apostolic ‘doctrines’ (cf. *Rom. 1.3*) and his own teaching on the Eucharist. For him, the unity of the faith, i.e., the faith in the ‘doctrinal’ Christ (‘one faith... in Jesus Christ’), should lead to the unity of the eucharistic celebration (‘with an undisturbed mind, breaking one bread’). And this is precisely the role of the bishop (and of the council of presbyters): to facilitate the unity of faith and celebration (e.g., *Phld. 4.1*; *Smyrn. 8.1*).¹⁹⁴ As in *Rom. 7.3*, Ignatius uses the explanatory ὅς ἐστὶν (‘which is’). Yet the ‘breaking of the bread’ receives an unexpected interpretation, as the language of the interpretative phrase is dominated by medical terms:

Schermann pointed out that not only are the words “medicine” and “antidote” medical terms but that the word “immortality” itself is also the name of a drug. Since Isis was said to have discovered the drug and to have used it to raise Horus from the dead (Diodorus Sic. 1.25.6), Schermann suggested that Ignatius was pitting the eucharist against the claims of a rival religion. But since that would seem to involve opposition also to the drug itself, Schermann probably overemphasized the importance of the parallel. *Athanasia* (“immortality”) was a concoction very closely related to, if not identical with, a famous medicine attributed to the Pontic king Mithridates VI. It served as a panacea against poisons, venomous bites, and problems of internal organs. Though it was technically an “antidote,” it is also frequently called simply a “medicine” (φάρμακον). Ignatius’ emphasis here on the “one bread” harks back to the “one physician” of *Eph. 7.2* and suggests that there too the panacea dispensed by the one physician against the bite of mad dogs (false teachers) was being compared to the fabled drug (for a special connection between Mithridates’ antidote and rabies see Pliny *Nat. hist.* 23.77.149).¹⁹⁵

So, it is not the eucharistic element (i.e., the bread) that is the ‘medicine of immortality’; but the whole act of ‘breaking the bread together’. For the eucharistic ‘togetherness’ is the confirmation of the unity of faith, in the ‘doctrinal’ Christ, and in obedience to the bishop. And only those who adhere to the episcopal unity of faith and celebration are protected against the deadly poison of the false (‘evil’) teachings. In other words, to obtain ‘the eternal life in Jesus

¹⁹⁴ Cf. Johanny, “Ignatius of Antioch,” 59.

¹⁹⁵ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 97. Similarly, Johanny, “Ignatius of Antioch,” 61.

Christ’, one must remain in ‘one faith’, celebrating ‘one Eucharist’, under ‘one bishop’ (see *Phld.* 3.2–4.1).

But what about the sources of Ignatius’ medical language? Are these colloquial or ‘liturgical’? Again, a definitive answer is impossible. On the one hand, the fame of the drug called ‘Athanasia’ in the ancient world,¹⁹⁶ and the independent, widespread use of the term ‘medicine of life’, in both medical and non-medical contexts (cf. Euripides, *Phoen.* 893; Diogenes, *Oen.* fragm. 2 [5.14–6.2]; Seneca, *De Prov.* 3.2; Sir. 6:16; Clement, *Protr.* 10.106.2; *Strom.* 7.11, 61.5), suggest that Ignatius borrowed the phrase from the colloquial language of the day and used it for his own agenda.¹⁹⁷ On the other hand, since the phrases ‘medicine of life’ or ‘medicine of immortality’ appear in later eucharistic liturgies (e.g., Serapion, *Euch.* 13.15),¹⁹⁸ Schoedel suggests ‘the possibility of a liturgical source for our passage’.¹⁹⁹ In my opinion, the evidence is much stronger for the former. So, I take the phrase ὅς ἐστιν φάρμακον ἀθανασίας, ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν (‘which is the medicine of immortality, the antidote we take in order not to die’) to be Ignatian. In conclusion, similar to *Rom.* 7.3, Ignatius offers his own view on the Eucharist, following the explanatory ὅς ἐστιν. Again, there is the creedal structure that shapes his personal interpretation.

c) *Smyrn.* 7.1: ‘[those who hold heretical opinions about the grace of Jesus Christ that came to us] abstain from the Eucharist and prayer, since they do not confess (διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν) that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ (τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), which suffered on behalf of our sins and which the Father raised in his kindness.’

¹⁹⁶ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 97.

¹⁹⁷ Cf. A.D. Nock, “Liturgical Notes,” *JTS* 30 (1929): 392 (n. 1).

¹⁹⁸ For more references, see Hans Lietzmann, *Mass and the Lord’s Supper: A Study in the History of the Liturgy* (trans., Dorothea H.G. Reeve; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979), 153, 210 (n. 2).

¹⁹⁹ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 98.

It could be that the phrase τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν τῆ χρηστότητι ὁ πατὴρ ἤγειρεν ('which suffered on behalf of our sins and which the Father raised in his kindness') is creedal, as is indicated by the parallelism: sins–humans–passion and goodness–God–resurrection.²⁰⁰ If this is the case, then Ignatius brings together once more an apostolic 'doctrine' and his view on the Eucharist. However, a more significant phrase for this study is τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ('the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ'), as it is introduced by a 'confession' formula: διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν ('for they do not confess'). It appears that in Ignatius' church the participation in the Eucharist was conditioned and possibly preceded²⁰¹ by this ὁμολογία ('confession').²⁰² This theory explains best Ignatius' insistence and consistency on the issue: *Eph.* 20.2; *Rom.* 7.3; *Trall.* 8.1; *Phld.* 4.1.

Moreover, as the comparison to *Smyrn.* 2.1–3.3 indicates, Ignatius connects the 'real presence' in the eucharistic elements specifically with the crucified and the resurrected 'flesh' of Jesus ('which suffered... and which the Father raised').²⁰³ However, such a narrow view was rejected, especially by the docetists; but not by the docetists alone (cf. *Smyrn.* 7.2–8.2).²⁰⁴ As Schoedel concludes, Ignatius' specific and narrow view could well have constituted a major reason for separation:

Here again [Ignatius'] charge is exaggerated. For it is clear enough from *Sm.* 8 that the docetists celebrated their own eucharists or love-feasts. It is not even fair to say that that in itself necessarily represented a divisive act. For the group seems to have been led by an elder (see on *Sm.* 6.1), and there can be little doubt that separate meetings in different houses were usual in the early period. At the same time, it would be hard to deny that this particular group had gained a distinct identity and avoided eucharists in other settings because of the eucharistic theology involved. It seems only logical that they would not be willing to identify the eucharist as the flesh of Christ any more than they were willing to accept Christ's death and resurrection as physical realities. For once this does not seem to be a logic imposed by Ignatius on his opponents. The argument presupposes that he could count on wide agreement in Smyrna with a realistic doctrine of the presence of Christ in the elements of the eucharist. And from

²⁰⁰ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 242.

²⁰¹ Johanny, "Ignatius of Antioch," 55.

²⁰² Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 240 (n. 8): 'Although the verb ὁμολογεῖν ("confess") means little more than "admit" in *Mag.* 8.1, it seems to have a more technical significance in our passage (and in *Sm.* 5.2) and to refer to the affirmation of true doctrine.'

²⁰³ Edwards, *Catholicity and Heresy*, 62–63.

²⁰⁴ For other reasons, see (again) Brent: *Ignatius of Antioch*, 79–94; "Ignatius and Polycarp," 347.

that he works back to the reality of the passion and the resurrection. In the process it is likely that he goes beyond usual expectations. For when he identifies the eucharist with the flesh that suffered and was raised, he harks back to his longer discussion of *Sm.* 2–3 and in so doing draws what even many of his friends may have regarded as an overly direct line between the presence of Christ in the bread (and wine) of the eucharist and the resurrected body of Christ. (Note the considerably more subtle connection drawn by Tertullian in *Adv. Marc.* 4.40.3 and even by Irenaeus in *Adv. haer.* 5.2.2–3.)²⁰⁵

In my understanding, Ignatius cites again the apostolic Christological ‘doctrines’ in connection to the Eucharist, for the ‘confession’ of a real ‘flesh’ present in the eucharistic elements was both crucial and critical. It was crucial because Ignatius considered it the *sine qua non* condition for the participation in the Eucharist (*Smyrn.* 6.2–7.1; cf. *Eph.* 20.2; *Rom.* 7.3; *Trall.* 8.1; *Phld.* 4.1). Perhaps for the same reason, in *Trall.* 8.1 he juxtaposes the terms ‘faith’ and ‘flesh’: ἐν πίστει ὃ ἐστὶν σὰρξ τοῦ κυρίου (‘in faith, which is the flesh of the Lord’). The ‘faith’ is the one that confesses the ‘flesh’. And it was critical for it caused the separation of the Antiochene church (cf. *Smyrn.* 6.1–7.1; *Magn.* 6.1–11.1), a situation he hopes not to emulate in the churches of Asia Minor (cf. *Phld.* 7.2; *Smyrn.* 7.1–2).²⁰⁶

But why cite only Christological ‘doctrines’? Why not cite eucharistic traditions as well? Did Ignatius know such traditions?

(2) After more than a century of modern scholarship regarding the use of the NT in the writings of Ignatius,²⁰⁷ contemporary scholars are not as optimistic as W.R. Inge was back in 1905, when he identified 104 correspondences of varying degrees of affinity, between the two collections.²⁰⁸ Today there is a widespread consensus that Ignatius only knew the Gospel of Matthew and four Pauline letters, as was concluded by Paul Foster, in his 2005 study that replaced Inge’s.²⁰⁹ Among the four letters of Paul that were used by Ignatius, scholars

²⁰⁵ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 240.

²⁰⁶ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 240.

²⁰⁷ I consider that the volume *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, issued by the Oxford Society of Historical Theology (1905), marks the beginning of what I call here ‘modern scholarship’.

²⁰⁸ Inge, “Ignatius,” 63–83; Foster, “Ignatius and the New Testament,” 160.

²⁰⁹ Foster, “Ignatius and the New Testament,” 172, 185–86.

confidently include 1 Corinthians (cf. *Eph.* 15.1 and 1 Cor. 6.9; *Eph.* 18.1 and 1 Cor. 1.20, 23; *Magn.* 10.2 and 1 Cor. 5.7–8; *Trall.* 5.1 and 1 Cor. 3.1–2; *Rom.* 5.1 and 1 Cor. 4.4; *Rom.* 9.2 and 1 Cor. 15.8–9; *Phld.* 3.3 and 1 Cor. 6.8–9; *Phld.* 7.1 and 1 Cor. 2.10).²¹⁰ In fact, Inge was so impressed by the large number of ‘quotations’ and ‘echoes’ from 1 Corinthians that he concluded: ‘Ignatius must have known this Epistle almost by heart’.²¹¹ Likewise, R.M. Grant, who identified forty-six ‘allusions’, concluded that Ignatius knew 1 Corinthians ‘practically by heart’.²¹² With regard to the Gospel of Matthew,²¹³ Eugene LaVerdiere reiterated the previous conclusions: ‘As the bishop of Antioch, [Ignatius] surely knew Matthew’s Gospel, most likely from memory’ (cf. *Eph.* 5.2 and Matt. 18.20; *Eph.* 14.2 and Matt. 12.33; *Eph.* 17.1 and Matt. 26.7; *Eph.* 19.2 and Matt. 2.2–10; *Smyrn.* 1.1 and Matt. 3.15; *Pol.* 2.2 and Matt. 10.16).²¹⁴ To conclude the memorisation of the entire writing is perhaps no exaggeration, especially if his overall canon of apostolic writings was limited. Anyway, the numerous references listed above are indicators of an excellent knowledge of both Matthew and 1 Corinthians, considering it is unlikely that Ignatius had any access to the written texts on his way to Rome (cf. *Pol.* 8.1).²¹⁵

²¹⁰ E.g., Foster, “Ignatius and the New Testament,” 172; Johanny, “Ignatius of Antioch,” 54; LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 151; Mitchell, “Footsteps of Paul,” 28. Cf. Albert E. Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941), 170.

²¹¹ Inge, “Ignatius,” 67; Foster, “Ignatius and the New Testament,” 161.

²¹² Robert M. Grant, *After the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), 39. Cf. Hoffman, “Apostolic Doctrine,” 74.

²¹³ For the view that Ignatius knew the Gospel of Matthew in its final form, see Édouard Massaux, *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature Before Saint Irenaeus* (NGS 5/1–3; trans., Norman Belval and Suzanne Hecht; Macon: Mercer University Press, 1990–1993), 85–122. Two competing views are also noteworthy: 1) Ignatius had access to some of the written sources that Matthew also used, especially the ‘M’ source; 2) Ignatius had access to ‘Matthean-flavoured Antiochene oral traditions’. For these views, see (inter alia): Helmut Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern* (TU 65; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957), 24–61; J. Smit Sibinga, “Ignatius and Matthew,” *NovT* 8/2.4 (1966): 263–83; D.A. Hagner, “The Sayings of Jesus in the Apostolic Fathers and Justin Martyr,” in D. Wenham (ed.), *The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels* (GP 5; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 233–68; Richard J. Bauckham, “The Study of Gospel Traditions Outside the Canonical Gospels: Problems and Prospects,” in Wenham, *Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels*, 369–403. But note that, even scholars who date Matthew’s Gospel sometime later (ca. 80–100 CE), still admit a gap of decades between the writings. In my opinion, since the time gap could span up to six decades (ca. 70–120/130 CE), Massaux’s view is the most probable.

²¹⁴ LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 151.

²¹⁵ According to *Pol.* 8.1, the letters to Polycarp, Smyrna and Philadelphia were written in haste: ‘I have not been able to write to all the churches [...] I am unexpectedly to set sail from Troas to Neapolis.’

Furthermore, there is an ongoing debate on whether Ignatius knew the Gospel of John, as there are ‘remarkable points of contact with John’ (cf. *Magn.* 7.2 and Jn. 16.28; *Rom.* 7.2–3 and Jn. 4.10; 6.51–56; *Phld.* 7.1 and Jn. 3.8; *Phld.* 9.1 and Jn. 10.7, 9).²¹⁶ Despite these ‘points of contact’, most scholars would argue against a direct knowledge.²¹⁷ As we have seen in the previous chapters, B.H. Streeter’s argument, that Ignatius ‘refrains [to quote John] in certain doctrinal arguments where we should have expected it if he regarded the Fourth Gospel as an authority’,²¹⁸ still stands.²¹⁹

So, following these observations, there is a high probability that Ignatius knew the eucharistic traditions of 1 Cor. 11.23–25²²⁰ and Matt. 26.26–29. And yet he does not quote any of these traditions. Still, some scholars suggest that we could identify certain echoes of traditions. LaVerdiere, for instance, believes that *Smyrn.* 8.2 echoes 1 Cor. 11.17–22, 23–25.²²¹ I find his view very unlikely, as there are no significant correspondences between the two passages.²²² Furthermore, Johanny suggested that 1 Cor. 10.16 and 11.25 were behind *Phld.* 4.1.²²³ Unlike the view of LaVerdiere, Johanny’s could partially be defended by textual comparison:

²¹⁶ B.H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: Macmillan, 1930), 505. Cf. LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 151.

²¹⁷ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 505; Foster, “Ignatius and the New Testament,” 183–84; Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 9; Jefford, “Did Ignatius Know the *Didache*,” 337. Cf. Inge, “Ignatius,” 83. See also: Paul Dietze, “Die Briefe des Ignatius und das Johannesevangelium,” *ThStK* 78 (1905): 563–603; H.J. Bardsley, “The Testimony of Ignatius and Polycarp to the Writings of St. John,” *JTS* 14 (1913): 207–20, 489–500; Walter Burghardt, “Did Saint Ignatius of Antioch Know the Fourth Gospel?” *TS* 1 (1940): 1–26, 130–56; C. Maurer, *Ignatius von Antiochien und das Johannesevangelium* (AThANT 18; Zürich: Zwingli, 1949).

²¹⁸ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 505. A similar argument was previously adduced by Inge (“Ignatius,” 83): ‘Ignatius’s use of the Fourth Gospel is highly probable, but falls some way short of certainty. The objections to accepting it are mainly [...] The paucity of phrases which recall the language of the Gospel, and the absence of direct appeals to it; phenomena which are certainly remarkable when we consider the close resemblance between the theology of Ignatius and that of the Fourth Gospel. It is difficult, for example, to think of any reason why Ignatius did not quote John 20 in *Smyrn.* iii.2.’

²¹⁹ For a more recent argument for Ignatius’ knowledge of John’s Gospel, see Charles E. Hill, *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* (New York: OUP, 2004), 421–43.

²²⁰ LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 152; Johanny, “Ignatius of Antioch,” 54.

²²¹ LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 153.

²²² As far as I am aware, no other scholar holds this view.

²²³ Johanny, “Ignatius of Antioch,” 54.

Σπουδάσατε οὖν μᾶ ἐὺχαριστία χρῆσθαι. μία γὰρ σὰρξ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐν ποτήριον εἰς ἕωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, ἐν θυσιαστήριον, ὡς εἷς ἐπίσκοπος ἅμα τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ καὶ διακόνους τοῖς συνδούλοις μου. ἵνα, ὁ ἐὰν πράσσητε, κατὰ θεὸν πράσσητε.

τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία ἐστὶν τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ; τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστίν; ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος, ἐν σώμα οἱ πολλοὶ ἐσμεν, οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν... ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων: Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι...

However, it should be noted that Ignatius makes no reference to any apostolic source, as he does in the next verse, *Phld.* 5.1 (cf. *Eph.* 11.2; *Magn.* 13.1; *Trall.* 2.2; 3.1; 7.1; *Smyrn.* 8.1).²²⁴ Instead, the source of his exhortation appears to be God himself: ὁ ἐὰν πράσσητε, κατὰ θεὸν πράσσητε ('whatever you do, do according to God'). Note also Ignatius' claims in *Phld.* 7.1–2, about the charismatic endowments by which he receives exhortations directly from God, exhortations that also concern the submission to the bishop and avoidance of divisions: Χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν ποιεῖτε, τὴν σάρκα ὑμῶν ὡς ναὸν θεοῦ τηρεῖτε, τὴν ἔνωσιν ἀγαπᾶτε, τοὺς μερισμοὺς φεύγετε ('Do nothing apart from the bishop; keep your flesh as the Temple of God; love unity; flee divisions'). So, given this literary context (*Phld.* 5.1–7.2), it appears that Ignatius himself should be considered the primary source of *Phld.* 4.1. Hence the recurrent emphasis on the 'oneness': 'one Eucharist... one flesh... one cup... one altar... one bishop'. If, indeed, 1 Cor. 10.16 and 11.25 are behind *Phld.* 4.1, then Ignatius 'reworked' the traditions, building upon their structure his own emphases, exactly as he did with the apostolic Christological 'doctrines' that were discussed above.²²⁵ LaVerdiere's conclusion is noteworthy: 'The passage [i.e., *Phld.* 4.1] is a fine example of how Ignatius drew on tradition, the life of the Church, and personal experience to form a unique theological, pastoral, and spiritual synthesis.'²²⁶

²²⁴ *Phld.* 5.1: 'I flee to the "Gospel" as to the flesh of Jesus, and to the "Apostles" as to the presbytery of the church.'

²²⁵ LaVerdiere (*Eucharist*, 152) describes Ignatius as an 'original mind, immersed in tradition'. So, there is both preservation and innovation.

²²⁶ LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 160.

Given that this reading is correct, I suggest that 1 Cor. 11.23–25 was used in Ignatius’ Antioch during ‘the whole complex of liturgical acts and prayers that constitute the celebration of the sacred meal’.²²⁷ This assumption fits well with Ignatius’ high appreciation for the apostle Paul (*Eph.* 12.2);²²⁸ with his extensive use of 1 Corinthians (e.g., *Eph.* 15.1, 18.1; *Magn.* 10.2; *Trall.* 5.1; *Rom.* 5.1; 9.2; *Phld.* 3.3; 7.1); and with the use of Pauline vocabulary, that sets the context of the eucharistic meetings (1 Cor. 11.20; cf. *Eph.* 5.3; 8.1; *Magn.* 7.1; *Phld.* 6.2; 10.2): συνερχομένων... ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό.²²⁹

As for the eucharistic tradition of Matt. 26.26–29, there is no textual evidence that it was mentioned by Ignatius, not even implicitly. This recognition leads us back to Jefford’s significant observation, regarding Ignatius’ ‘selective use’ of the Gospel of Matthew.²³⁰ In a previous chapter, I have noted Jefford’s conclusion, that Ignatius deliberately avoids passages that were used (or could be used) by those who held antagonistic views, i.e., his opponents.²³¹ I suggest Jefford’s observation could be extrapolated to our case. It could be that Ignatius omitted Matt. 26.26–29 since it was used in the eucharistic meetings of the Antiochene separatists. This view fits well with the omission of eucharistic prayers of *Did.* 9.1–10.6, given the strong connections between the community that produced the *Didache* and Matthew’s Gospel.²³² Unfortunately, in both cases, all the answers we can get are hypothetical.²³³

²²⁷ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 240 (n. 7); LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 160.

²²⁸ Edwards (*Catholicity and Heresy*, 49) calls Ignatius ‘[Paul’s] admirer’ par excellence.

²²⁹ LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 152. Cf. Everett Ferguson, “‘When You Come Together’: *Epi to auto* in Early Christian Literature,” *RestQ* 16 (1973): 202–208.

²³⁰ Jefford, “Did Ignatius Know the *Didache*,” 338–39 (339): ‘To argue that Ignatius knows and uses the Gospel of Matthew is not sufficient [...] The more important consideration is with the way in which he uses the gospel.’

²³¹ Jefford, “Did Ignatius Know the *Didache*,” 339, 342. See § 4.1.

²³² For this connection, see (for instance): Huub van de Sandt (ed.), *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005); also, Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen K. Zangenberg (eds.), *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings* (Atlanta: SBL, 2008); Clayton N. Jefford, “Locating the *Didache*,” *FF* 3/1 (2014): 49–59; Alan J.P. Garrow, *The Gospel of Matthew’s Dependence on the Didache* (JSNTSS 254; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004).

²³³ Jefford, “Conflict at Antioch,” 262–69. I will introduce another scenario in the final chapter (§ 9.1).

If this reconstruction is valid, then another tradition-paradigm would surface. Until now, I have inferred 1) a ‘concurrent paradigm’, in which the eucharistic traditions of 1 Cor. 11.23–25 and Matt. 26.26–29 were used simultaneously, by various local assemblies; and 2) a ‘consecutive paradigm’, in which the later pre-Matthean tradition replaced the earlier Pauline tradition. Yet in this case we could infer 3) a ‘competing paradigm’, in which the two eucharistic traditions were used antagonistically, by various groups of Antiochenes.²³⁴

Furthermore, there are scholars such as Johanny,²³⁵ LaVerdiere,²³⁶ and Bradshaw who identify echoes of Johannine ‘traditions’ in the eucharistic passages of Ignatius. For Bradshaw,

The author’s choice of the word “flesh” (*sarx*) here [i.e., *Phld.* 4.1] rather than “body” (*soma*) reveals a greater affinity with the eucharistic thought of the Fourth Gospel than that of the synoptics or Paul, which he shows no sign of knowing.²³⁷

Inconsistently, Bradshaw concludes the Johannine influence, based only on the ‘choice’ of one word (σάρξ), and at the same time assumes that there is ‘no sign’ of Pauline influence, ignoring all the allusions noted above.²³⁸ However, it should be noted that Bradshaw refers to ‘the eucharistic thought of the Fourth Gospel’, suggesting ambiguously a non-literary influence. A similar ambiguity is preferred by Johanny: ‘the Johannine inspiration of these texts [i.e., *Rom.* 7.2–3 and *Smyrn.* 7.1] is evident’.²³⁹ If I understand him correctly, Johanny also argues for a non-literary source.²⁴⁰ LaVerdiere also speaks of ‘[Ignatius’] creative use of Eucharistic traditions, in particular the Pauline tradition and the Johannine’.²⁴¹ Fortunately, LaVerdiere becomes more explicit when he claims that Ignatius was ‘steeped in the letters of Paul, in particular 1 Corinthians, and in the living tradition of the Church, especially that underlying

²³⁴ Cf. Jefford, “Conflict at Antioch,” 262–63.

²³⁵ Johanny, “Ignatius of Antioch,” 62–63.

²³⁶ LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 151–52, 160.

²³⁷ Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins*, 87. Bradshaw follows Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 198: ‘the reference to “flesh” (rather than “body”) strikes a Johannine note (John 6:52–59)’.

²³⁸ Cf. LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 151–53, 158, 160.

²³⁹ Johanny, “Ignatius of Antioch,” 63.

²⁴⁰ Johanny, “Ignatius of Antioch,” 62–63.

²⁴¹ LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 152.

John's Gospel'.²⁴² However, he appears similarly ambiguous, when he states: '[in *Phld.* 4.1] the reference to the Lord's flesh and blood was inspired by John 6:51c-58 or a tradition underlying that passage.'²⁴³ Still, as I have shown, he considers that the Johannine 'tradition' that underlies *Phld.* 4.1 was 'creatively' altered through 'the life of the Church, and personal experience'.²⁴⁴

In my view, all these scholars rightly suggest a non-literary source.²⁴⁵ Yet, to offer more clarity on the issue, I would go back to Streeter's argument against the use of John's Gospel: '[Ignatius] refrains [to quote John] in certain doctrinal arguments where we should have expected it'.²⁴⁶ Given Ignatius' radical critique of the docetic view on the Eucharist (*Smyrn.* 7.1), the Johannine traditions would indeed be expected (cf. Jn. 6.51–56).²⁴⁷ Instead, such references are entirely absent. Moreover, Ignatius appeals exclusively to the Gospel of Matthew, the only 'Gospel' (sg.) he knows (*Smyrn.* 7.2): προσέχειν [...] ἔξαιρέτως δὲ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, ἐν ᾧ τὸ πάθος ἡμῶν δεδήλωται καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις τετελείωται ('pay attention [...] especially to the "Gospel", in which the passion is clearly shown to us and the resurrection is perfected').²⁴⁸

In conclusion, it is possible that there is a Johannine 'living tradition' behind *Phld.* 4.1; but the evidence is slim.²⁴⁹ It is equally possible that the 'choice of the word "flesh" (*sarx*) [...] rather than "body" (*soma*)' originated in the context of the enduring anti-docetic debates, and not *via* Johannine traditions. There is no way to know.²⁵⁰

²⁴² LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 151.

²⁴³ LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 160.

²⁴⁴ LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 160 (cf. 152).

²⁴⁵ See also Henning Paulsen, *Studien zur Theologie des Ignatius von Antiochien* (FKD 29; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 36–37.

²⁴⁶ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 505. Cf. Inge, "Ignatius," 83.

²⁴⁷ Johanny, "Ignatius of Antioch," 62; LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 160.

²⁴⁸ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 505–507. That 'Gospel' refers to the Gospel of Matthew is a widespread consensus.

²⁴⁹ The evidence for Ignatius' use of 1 Cor. 11.23–25 is also slim; but, at least in the case of 1 Corinthians, there is the certainty that Ignatius knew and used it.

²⁵⁰ Paulsen, *Studien*, 36–37; Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 8–9, 198–99.

8.3 Conclusion

Ignatius' mono-episcopacy was not accepted by all Antiochenes, perhaps because of its very recent establishment (cf. *Did.* 15.1–2). As scholars indicate, it is reasonable to conclude that it was challenged especially by the Jewish Christians. Moreover, not only his mono-episcopacy was rejected, but also his view of the Eucharist. There are at least two reasons for such a rejection: 1) the celebration of the rite by the mould of the mystery cults; 2) the too narrow view on the real presence of Christ's 'flesh' in the Eucharist. As Polycarp, *Phil.* 1.1 implies, Ignatius' view of the Eucharist could have been challenged not only by the docetists (*Smyrn.* 7.1–8.1) and Judaizers (*Magn.* 4.1; 6.2–10.2), but also by certain adherents to the 'orthodox doctrines' (cf. Polycarp, *Phil.* 1.1; *Magn.* 6.1–7.2).²⁵¹ Unfortunately, a more precise identification of the three groups is impossible.

These two factors have eventually led to separatism: the celebration of the Eucharist in different locations, and on different days (*Magn.* 7.1–2). In my opinion, it is probable that this separatism has also demarcated the use of the eucharistic traditions. For the group(s) that accepted Ignatius' mono-episcopacy, the tradition could have been 1 Cor. 11.23–25, while the opposing groups could have used Matt. 26.26–29 and *Did.* 9.1–10.6. As most scholars assume, this reflects the situation of the Antiochene church, not just that of the churches of Asia Minor.

While this reconstruction is difficult to prove, I suggest it is both coherent and reasonable. Moreover, it makes better sense of the existing data.

²⁵¹ See (again) Brent, "Ignatius and Polycarp," 347.

CHAPTER 9

CONCLUSIONS: THE CHURCH OF ANTIOCH AND THE EUCHARISTIC TRADITIONS (*ca.* 35–130 CE)

In the previous chapters, I have shown that most of the eucharistic traditions recorded in the earliest Christian writings (1 Cor. 11.23–25/Lk. 22.17–20; Matt. 26.26–29; *Did.* 9.1–10.6) originated or were used in Antioch, between *ca.* 35–70 CE. In chapters 2–3, the eucharistic tradition of 1 Cor. 11.23–25 was connected to the church of Antioch, following a double scenario: 1) Paul may have taught this tradition; or 2) Paul may have been taught this tradition, while he was in Antioch, in the early 40s CE. There was a slight preference for the second scenario (i.e., Paul had been taught this tradition in Antioch), given the ritualistic language and structure of this tradition (e.g., τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν), and its similarities to Lk. 22.17–20, which—it was argued—also stem from Antioch. Regardless of the scenario, it is likely that 1 Cor. 11.23–25 was known to the Antiochene church by the early 50s, when Paul ‘passed on’ the Lord’s Supper tradition to the newly founded church of Corinth (Acts 18.1–18; 1 Cor. 11.23).

In chapters 4–5, I argued that the Gospel of Matthew was composed in Antioch, including the Last Supper tradition (Matt. 26.26–29). Similar to Luke, Matthew follows his Markan source closely (cf. Mk. 14.12–25; Matt. 26.17–29; Lk. 22.7–20), up to the insertion of the eucharistic words. However, when the words of institution are cited, both Matthew and Luke depart from Mark and follow their own sources, both reflecting the rituals of their community. If this is the case, then Matt. 26.26–29 could have been used in Antioch in the 60s–80s CE, perhaps under Petrine influence.

In chapters 6–7, it was shown that the *Didache* was compiled in Antioch, most probably at the end of the first century CE or the beginning of the second. However, since the *Didache*

is a composite work, many of the materials predate its composition, including *Did.* 9–10. As for these two eucharistic prayers, they are among the oldest pre-Didachic materials, dated by scholars around 50–70 CE. Moreover, it is likely that *Did.* 9.2–4 was composed in Antioch, while *Did.* 10.2–6 was being used there by the time the later prayer (*Did.* 9.2–4) was composed. In other words, *Did.* 9.2–10.6 and Matt. 26.26–29 were largely contemporaneous.

In chapter 8, it was suggested that Ignatius of Antioch knew the eucharistic traditions of 1 Cor. 11.23–25, Matt. 26.26–29, and *Did.* 9.1–10.6. However, the slim evidence that we have indicates that Ignatius may have used only 1 Cor. 11.23–25 (cf. *Phld.* 4.1), ignoring the other two traditions (Matt. 26.26–29; *Did.* 9.1–10.6). There is also the possibility that he may have used some traditions underlying Jn. 6.52–59.

In this concluding chapter, I shall bring together the findings of the previous chapters, aiming 1) to uncover the internal dynamics of these traditions; and 2) to place the internal dynamics into the larger context of ‘diversity in earliest Christianity’.

9.1 Antioch and the eucharistic traditions: Internal dynamics

First of all, it should be reaffirmed that this study presupposes the existence of a single Antiochene church, the ‘Great Church’.¹ So, if this is the case, why is there ‘considerable diversity in the formulations [of the eucharistic tradition] used in church worship even within each congregation’,² over a relatively short period of time (*ca.* 40–70 CE)? And how does the distinctive tradition of *Did.* 9–10 fit into the bigger picture? In the attempt to answer these questions, I will examine three possible scenarios:

¹ Thomas A. Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch and the Parting of the Ways: Early Jewish-Christian Relations* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009), 77 (n. 118).

² D.A. Carson, “Matthew,” in Frank E. Gaebelein (ed.), *Matthew, Mark, Luke* (EBC 8; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 535–36.

(1) According to A.B. McGowan, ‘the institution narratives as presented in the Synoptic Gospels (Matt 26:26-29; Mark 14:22-26; Luke 22:14-23) and 1 Corinthians (11:23-26) [were not] texts for liturgical recitation over bread and cup at the eucharistic meal.’³ Thus, McGowan challenges the acknowledged dominant view of the form critics,⁴ arguing against the ‘liturgical *Sitz im Leben*’ of these traditions. In favour of his view, he points to the complete absence of the institution narratives within the eucharistic liturgies of the first two centuries:

this liturgical assumption about [the traditions] faces a serious historical problem. Students of early liturgy have long had to struggle with the fact that, leaving aside these NT texts, the earliest eucharistic prayers might not have included the institution narratives at all. The Eucharist of the *Didache* (chaps. 9-10) and that described in Justin Martyr (1 *Apol.* 65), which are probably the best two pieces of second-century evidence we have, involve extended prayers of thanksgiving that have been likened to the Jewish prayer forms of *beraka* or *hodaya* but do not include the words of the institution narratives. If these prayers were indeed typical, any supposed liturgical use of these texts must have ceased abruptly after the composition of the Gospels, and therefore any liturgical intent of an author of the narratives would have been almost as irrelevant, historically speaking...⁵

Instead, argues McGowan, the traditions of Matt. 26.26–29, Mk. 14.22–26, Lk. 22.14–23, and 1 Cor. 11.23–26 had ‘catechetical’ purposes.⁶ Unfortunately, he only examines Paul’s use of 1 Cor. 11.23–26 in the Corinthian church, concluding that ‘the narrative [was] read and heard at Corinth for purposes other than actual liturgical recitation’:⁷

Paul cites the tradition of “the Lord’s Supper” in the course of his argument concerning food offered to idols and the proper conduct of the Christian assembly. Unlike the earliest presentations of that tradition in the Gospels, this text does not tell the story of the meal in the course of actually recounting Jesus’ passion and death, but invokes the narrative for an explicit and particular purpose regarding the life of the community at Corinth, that is, the proper ordering of the eucharistic assembly [...] There is no doubt that the institution narrative is here presented as of some liturgical significance, broadly speaking, but it is also clear that the problem at Corinth was one of ethics as much as or more than of ritual; nor, for that matter, is there any statement to the effect that the Corinthian Christians ought now to pronounce these words over cup and bread, whether to solve their ethical disorders or otherwise [...] The narrative functions here as a piece of teaching that interprets the meal and seeks to dictate the conduct of the assembly, not via mimesis only but via catechesis.⁸

³ A.B. McGowan, “‘Is There a Liturgical Text in This Gospel?’: The Institution Narratives and their Early Interpretive Communities,” *JBL* 118/1 (1999): 73.

⁴ McGowan, “Is There a Liturgical Text,” 73–74.

⁵ McGowan, “Is There a Liturgical Text,” 75.

⁶ McGowan, “Is There a Liturgical Text,” 74.

⁷ McGowan, “Is There a Liturgical Text,” 79.

⁸ McGowan, “Is There a Liturgical Text,” 78–79.

In sum, in McGowan's view, *Did.* 9–10 was used 'liturgically', while Matt. 26.26–29, Mk. 14.22–26, Lk. 22.14–23, and 1 Cor. 11.23–26 were used 'catechetically'. But does this reading fit the context of a single setting, such as Antioch?

If we apply McGowan's findings to the Antiochene context, this could explain the juxtaposition of Matt. 26.26–29 and *Did.* 9–10. As I have argued in the previous chapters, Matthew's Gospel and the *Didache* were composed within the same community, around the same period.⁹ So, if Matthew intended his text to be read 'catechetically', there should be no problem if *Did.* 9–10 was being used concurrently, for its function was different, i.e., ritualistic.

However, following H. Patsch, J. Jeremias, I.H. Marshall, D.A. Hagner, U. Luz and others, I have shown that most of the Matthean alterations are ritual, not catechetical.¹⁰ So, there could be a 'ritualistic' reason why Matthew departs from his Markan source (cf. Mk. 14.22–26).¹¹ Furthermore, in contrast to McGowan, I have argued that Paul's use of 1 Cor. 11.23–25 in Corinth is not ethical, but rather '(*sine qua non*) conditional'. Also, the language of 1 Cor. 11.23–25 is highly ritualistic.¹² Moreover, there is Luke's departure from the same Markan source, following a tradition similar to 1 Cor. 11.23–25. Therefore, the only text that McGowan examines, in order to argue for the catechetical function of all, could hardly be considered as such. At least in the case of Matt. 26.26–29, Lk. 22.14–23, and 1 Cor. 11.23–26 their composition indicates, to quote McGowan, 'some liturgical significance'. In other words, it is precisely the three traditions related to Antioch that show signs of ritual use.

⁹ E.g., Alan J.P. Garrow, *The Gospel of Matthew's Dependence on the Didache* (JSNTSS 254; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004).

¹⁰ H. Patsch, *Abendmahl und historischer Jesus* (CThM A1; Stuttgart: Calwer, 1972), 69 and *passim*; Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (trans., Norman Perrin; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), 111–14 (113); I. Howard Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper* (Vancouver: Regent, 2006), 34–35, 100; D.A. Hagner, *Matthew 14–28* (WBC 33B; Dallas: Word, 2002), 771; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 21–28: A Commentary* (trans., James E. Crouch; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 365.

¹¹ Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, 771.

¹² G.D. Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy: The Moorhouse Lectures 1975* (Cambridge: CUP, 1983), 23. Kilpatrick also argues that 'the revision of the Greek seen in 1 Corinthians is not likely to be for catechetical reasons.'

So, this is the first possible scenario: that, in Antioch, some of the eucharistic traditions were used for catechetical or ethical purposes, while others were used for ritual ('liturgical') purposes. I call this the 'different functions' scenario. Indeed, such a reading could explain both the diversity and juxtaposition of these traditions. However, in my opinion, the evidence for this is rather slim.¹³

(2) Secondly, there is the 'different locations' scenario. Having taken into account the opinions of V. Corwin, G. Delling, P.J. Donahue, W. Meeks, U. Luz, M. Zetterholm and others, I have concluded the high probability that, in Antioch, there were various house-churches.¹⁴ If these house-churches were 'independent', 'rarely [meeting] together',¹⁵ having 'little contact between them'¹⁶ as Corwin and Luz have argued, then the diversity and even juxtaposition of the eucharistic traditions is easily explained. Moreover, this scenario could likewise explain the distinctiveness of *Did.* 9–10. Hans Lietzmann, for instance, in his influential *Messe und Herrenmahl* (1926),¹⁷ argued for a dual origin of the Eucharist: 1) the Pauline memorial meal, focused on the death of Jesus; 2) the Palestinian fellowship meal, focused on Jesus' companionship meals.¹⁸ Lietzmann's approach was found to be too simplistic by later scholarship,¹⁹ yet it secured the notion of multiple eucharistic origins.²⁰ So, if we read the

¹³ See also M.D. Larsen, "Addressing the Elephant That's Not in the Room: Comparing the Eucharistic Prayers in *Didache* 9-10 and the Last Supper Tradition," *Neot* 45/2 (2011): 257.

¹⁴ Virginia Corwin, *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), 52–87; Gerhard Delling, "Zur Taufe von 'Häusern' im Urchristentum," *NovT* 7 (1965): 306–311; P.J. Donahue, "Jewish Christianity in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch," *VC* 32/2 (1978): 92; Wayne E. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 75–77; Ulrich Luz, *Theology of the Gospel of Matthew* (NTT; Cambridge: CUP, 1995), 147; Magnus Zetterholm, *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch: A Social-Scientific Approach to the Separation Between Judaism and Christianity* (London/New York: Routledge, 2003), 37–38.

¹⁵ Corwin, *St. Ignatius*, 49.

¹⁶ Luz, *Theology of Matthew*, 147.

¹⁷ Hans Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl* (AZK 8; Bonn: Marcus and Weber, 1926); ET: *Mass and the Lord's Supper: A Study in the History of the Liturgy* (trans., Dorothea H.G. Reeve; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979).

¹⁸ Lietzmann, *Mass and Lord's Supper*, 142, 195–206.

¹⁹ See (for instance) the critique of Jonathan Schwiebert, *Knowledge and the Coming Kingdom: The Didache's Meal Ritual and its Place in Early Christianity* (LNTS 373; London: T&T Clark, 2008), esp. chaps. 7–9.

²⁰ E.g., Paul F. Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins* (ACC 80; London: SPCK, 2004); A.B. McGowan, "First Regarding the Cup...': Papias and the Diversity of Early Eucharistic Practice," *JTS* 46/2 (1995): 551–55.

multiple eucharistic origins model through the lens of ‘the different locations scenario’, this model could be traced back to a single location, which is Antioch.

Furthermore, I have also mentioned J. Schwiebert’s attempt to locate *Did.* 9–10 within Robinson-Koester’s ‘trajectories’ model. Yet, in order to include the two prayers into the ‘Q trajectory’, Schwiebert rejected their Antiochene origin.²¹ However, if the ‘different locations scenario’ is correct, and the Antiochene house-churches were mostly independent, having no mutual influence, then Robinson-Koester’s model still works, even if it is applied to a single location. So, applying the models above to our case, we could identify in Antioch a Pauline tradition (1 Cor. 11.23–25/ Lk. 22.17–20), a Petrine tradition (Matt. 26.26–29), and a *Didache* tradition (*Did.* 9.1–10.6). Since these traditions were ‘independent’ from each other or ‘isolated’, there is no need to search for any interaction between them, or to debate the legitimacy of the latter.²²

In the introductory chapter, I noted L.W. Hurtado’s critique of the ‘trajectories’ model.²³ According to Hurtado, Robinson-Koester’s model does not adequately reflect the complexity of the interaction within earliest Christianity. In his understanding, the NT shows instances of ‘interactive diversity’, diversity that was both ‘trans-local’ and ‘intra-church’.²⁴ Similarly, I am not convinced about the existence of such ‘independent’ or ‘isolated’ trajectories; at least not in the case of Antioch. As Matthew’s Gospel, the *Didache*, and the Ignatian corpus indicate, there was substantial interaction between the assumed Antiochene house-churches.²⁵ Indeed, there could have been various factions of the church, located in different areas of the city; yet all of them shared a sense of belonging to the ‘Great Church’.²⁶

²¹ Schwiebert, *Knowledge*, 13 (n. 32).

²² For some helpful reviews on the evaluation of the character of *Did.* 9–10, see (for instance) Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins*, 26–32; Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache: A Commentary* (trans., Linda M. Maloney; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 141–42.

²³ Larry W. Hurtado, “Interactive Diversity: A Proposed Model of Christian Origins,” *JTS* 64 (2013): 447–52.

²⁴ Hurtado, “Interactive Diversity,” 453.

²⁵ J.P. Meier, “Antioch,” in Raymond E. Brown and John P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (New York: Paulist Press, 2004), 13–14, 40; Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 76–88.

²⁶ Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 77 (n. 118).

(3) Thirdly, there is the ‘different Eucharists’ scenario. As numerous scholars have shown, it is probable that, at its earliest stages of development, the focus was on the praxis (τοῦτο ποιεῖτε), rather than on the traditions of the Eucharist. This view was proposed in 1945 by Dom Gregory Dix.²⁷ For Dix, it is impossible to trace back a single origin of the eucharistic traditions. Instead, scholars can detect four universal actions (‘taking, blessing, breaking, and giving’), that developed in the apostolic period from Jesus’ actions recounted at the Last Supper.²⁸ However, Dix’s view was later challenged by scholars such as Paul Bradshaw and A.B. McGowan, both of them pointing to the greater diversity of practice that characterized the earliest Eucharists.²⁹ The reversed order cup–bread, found also at Antioch (Lk. 22.17–20; *Did.* 9.1–5), is an instance of this diversity of practice.³⁰ Far from being faultless, this scenario better explains what Carson called the ‘considerable diversity in the formulations used in church worship even within each congregation’.³¹ In some instances, it was the diversity of practice that stood behind the diversity of formulation. So, in the following section I will apply this scenario to Antioch.

According to J.D.G. Dunn, the NT shows the diversity of the Eucharist: in different regions, earliest Christians had various degrees of separation between the Eucharist proper and the full meal, various degrees of transforming the meal ‘into a ritual act’, and various degrees of understanding the significance of the distinctive elements.³² It should be noted that all the variety that Dunn identified concerns primarily the practice of the Eucharist.³³ However, if we consider that most of the NT texts examined by Dunn originated in Antioch (Matt. 26.26–29,

²⁷ Dom Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London/New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015).

²⁸ Dix, *Shape of the Liturgy*, 48–50.

²⁹ Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins*, 59–60. See also the works of A.B. McGowan: “‘First Regarding the Cup’,” 551–55; *Ascetic Eucharists: Food and Drink in Early Christian Ritual Meals* (OECS; New York: OUP, 1999); “Rethinking Eucharistic Origins,” *Pacifica* 23 (2010): 173–91.

³⁰ McGowan, “‘First Regarding the Cup’,” 551–52.

³¹ Carson, “Matthew,” 535–36.

³² James D.G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity* (3rd ed.; London: SCM Press, 2006), 182–83.

³³ Dunn himself sees them as variations of practice, mirroring the variation of the textual traditions.

Lk. 22.17–20, 1 Cor. 11.23–25), then we could narrow Dunn’s findings to a single ‘region’. As I mentioned in the introductory chapter, Antioch attracted numerous Christians from various regions of the East (Acts 11.19–20; 13.1). When these Christians settled in Antioch, they brought with them this diversity of practice. While it is impossible to prove the point, it could be that Lk. 22.17–19 and 1 Cor. 10.16 indicate the existence of such diversity in the 40s. At least, they hint to a fluidity of the order bread–cup/cup–bread.³⁴ Also, if the Eucharist and the *agape* were not yet distinguished from each other (Gal. 2.11–14), such a fluidity is entirely plausible. This view is consistent with *Did.* 9.1–5 and 10.1–6, the two eucharistic prayers that could have circulated in Antioch as early as the 50s.³⁵ It is also consistent with the fact that, in Antioch, there were separate Eucharists held from the earliest period (Gal. 2.11–14).³⁶

Furthermore, since neither Matthew nor Luke follows their Markan source when they record their eucharistic traditions (Matt. 26.26–29, Lk. 22.17–20; cf. Mk. 14.22–25), I have concluded that, during the first decades of the Christian era, there was no concern for a unifying formulation. Moreover, if the phrase εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (Matt. 26.28) is Petrine, it could be that Matt. 26.26–29 could have been used as early as the 40s. So, given the lack of additional data, I conclude that, during the 40s–50s, in Antioch there were at least two eucharistic traditions (1 Cor. 11.23–25/Lk. 22.17–20 and Matt. 26.26–29) and several eucharistic practices.

Given the Corinthian precedent (cf. 1 Cor. 11.23), it is possible that, after the departure of Paul, this Hellenistic tradition was used less and less, being partially or locally replaced by

³⁴ McGowan, “First Regarding the Cup,” 551–53.

³⁵ See (inter alia): Jean-Paul Audet, *La Didachè: Instructions des apôtres* (Études Bibliques; Paris: Gabalda, 1958), 187–210; Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 10–12; Eugene LaVerdiere, *The Eucharist in the New Testament and the Early Church* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996), 135–38; Aaron Milavec, *The Didache: Faith, Hope & Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50–70 C.E.* (New York/Mahwah: Newman Press, 2003), xxii–xxxii; Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2003), 615; Nancy Pardee, *The Genre and Development of the Didache* (WUNT II/339; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 155–86 (184).

³⁶ Meier, “Antioch,” 40, 80.

Matt. 26.26–29 and the eucharistic prayer of *Did.* 10.1–6,³⁷ a prayer that echoes the Jewish meal benediction (*berakha*).³⁸ However, *Did.* 10.1–6 shows only an incipient distinction between the regular food and the ‘spiritual food and drink’ (πνευματικὴν τροφήν καὶ ποτόν). As this distinction developed, *Did.* 10.1–6 was replaced by *Did.* 9.1–5, the former being revalued as a benediction following the communal meal (*Did.* 10.1). As for the *Did.* 9.1–5, it not only distinguished the eucharistic elements from the rest of the food, but it also reinforced the cup–bread order, unlike Matt. 26.26–29. If, however, Matt. 26.26–29 was composed mainly by Matthew himself (*ca.* 66–70 CE),³⁹ then his later tradition refocuses on the commemoration of Jesus’ death and reinforces the bread–cup order, unlike *Did.* 9.1–5.

In my view, the juxtaposition of the various traditions (1 Cor. 11.23–25/Lk. 22.17–20, Matt. 26.26–29, and *Did.* 9.1–10.6) proves the interaction between the various practices. At times, this interaction led to conflict, as Gal. 2.11–14 shows. For me, however, it is impossible to prove conclusively that certain conflicts stood behind the composition of Matt. 26.26–29 and *Did.* 9.1–10.6. Still, Matthew’s concern to preserve not his Markan source-tradition, but the tradition used in his community, as well as the preservation and revaluation of *Did.* 10.1–6, indicate the possibility of such conflicts. If these conflicts did exist, however, I suggest that the primary cause was the existence of the different practices, rather than different traditions. Still, by the time of Ignatius (*ca.* 100–130 CE), there are hints that 1 Cor. 11.23–25, Matt. 26.26–29 and *Did.* 9.1–10.6 became competitive traditions.

³⁷ As *Phld.* 4.1 indicates, Paul’s tradition was probably kept by some of Ignatius’ faction.

³⁸ This could indicate the growing influence of the Jewish Christians. Cf. *Did.* 1.1–6.3.

³⁹ E.g., D. Senior, *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990), 64–71.

9.2 Antioch and the eucharistic traditions: Internal diversity

The hypothetical reconstruction from the above section shows how difficult it is to identify patterns or paradigms in earliest Christianity. The narrower the area of research is, the more difficult the task becomes. Then, there is the frustrating lack of adequate data. To paraphrase R. Glover,⁴⁰ in a sense this is not a study about the eucharistic traditions in Antioch. It is a study about the extant traditions, as we have them in the scant primary sources. How scholars fit these traditions together remains a matter of debate, as some ‘details will always elude us’.⁴¹ However, at the end of this research journey there are a few matters I can confidently conclude:

(1) First of all, I believe that the eucharistic traditions of Matt. 26.26–29, Lk. 22.17–20, 1 Cor. 11.23–25, and *Did.* 9.1–10.6 can be confidently traced back to Antioch, between the 40s and 70s CE. For me, their complex dynamic certainly leaves scope for further research, but I suggest that the scenario proposed above is plausible: the diversity of eucharistic formulations could largely be explained by the diversity of eucharistic practices.⁴²

(2) Secondly, I agree that L.W. Hurtado offered a ‘more adequate model’ for the interpretation of diversity in earliest Christianity. If all these traditions could be traced back to Antioch, then it was the ‘apostolic’ diversity (Matt. 26.26–29, Lk. 22.17–20, 1 Cor. 11.23–25), that preceded the ‘peri-apostolic diversity’ (*Did.* 9.1–10.6),⁴³ that preceded the ‘apostolic divergence’

⁴⁰ I am referring here to R. Glover’s assertion, that Acts is ‘not the history of the early Church, but merely that portion of the Church’s history with which Luke happened to be acquainted’. Richard Glover, “‘Luke the Antiochene’ and Acts,” *NTS* 11 (1964–65): 97–106. See (again) § 3.1.2 (1).

⁴¹ G.N. Stanton, “The Early Church in Antioch: Review,” *ExpT* 116/9 (2005): 294.

⁴² This scenario admits the possibility of multiple house-churches, but not ‘isolated’ or ‘independent’ from each other.

⁴³ D. King calls the *Didache* ‘pericanonical’, arguing that the writing was largely accepted in the early Church because of its orthodoxy, usefulness, and closeness to the canon, being dependent on the canonical Gospels. David D.M. King, “Intertextuality and the Pericanonicity of the *Didache*: The Dependence and Commentary of *Didache* 1:2-6 on the Canonical Gospels of Matthew and Luke” (unpublished article).

(Ignatius, *Phld.* 4.1).⁴⁴ In other words, W. Bauer's thesis does not work, when applied to this particular case.

Furthermore, if these traditions could be traced back to Antioch, then it is highly unlikely that they circulated 'independently' or 'isolated' from each other. In my view, the extant evidence shows a clear interaction between them. In other words, the 'trajectory' model, proposed by J.M. Robinson-H. Koester and applied to *Did.* 9.1–10.6 by J. Schwiebert, could also be refuted.

While the eucharistic traditions of 1 Cor. 11.23–25, Lk. 22.17–20 and *Did.* 9.1–5 were composed in Antioch, it is possible that Matt. 26.26–29 and *Did.* 10.1–6 were partially imported there from the Jewish territories. Then, sometime after their adoption, both Matt. 26.26–29 and *Did.* 10.1–6 caused various changes in the formulation of the traditions (cf. *Did.* 9.1–5; *Phld.* 4.1). In other words, there was a 'trans-local diversity' that later became an 'intra-church diversity'.⁴⁵ In my opinion, Hurtado's 'interactive diversity' model explains most adequately the case of Antiochene eucharistic traditions.

(3) Finally, as was stated in the introductory chapter, I believe that Meier's influential view needs to be nuanced. To resume it, there were 'divergent theological traditions', of various Jewish and Gentile groups, that came together in the church of Antioch. Yet there, these traditions were 'balanced' and 'synthesized'. So, from Antioch, there emerged a 'middle position' (*via media*) that facilitated the 'Christian unity' of the 'universal church', as it offered a way of keeping together the divergent groups.

In my view, this study entails a different conclusion. Indeed, there were various eucharistic traditions that came together in Antioch. Also, there is some concern regarding the

⁴⁴ Clayton N. Jefford, "Conflict at Antioch: Ignatius and the *Didache* at Odds," *StPatr* 36 (2001): 262.

⁴⁵ Hurtado, "Interactive Diversity," 453.

unity of the church (Gal. 2.11–14; *Phld.* 4.1; cf. 1 Cor. 10.16–17). However, when these eucharistic traditions are considered, there is no process of ‘balancing’ or ‘synthesizing’; there is no *via media eucharistica*. The pattern I have uncovered is rather different. A good starting point for the identification of this pattern would be *Did.* 9.1–10.6. As I have shown in the previous chapters, the two prayers originally had the same function, i.e., to introduce the Eucharist. When *Did.* 9.1–5 replaced *Did.* 10.1–6, the latter was not discarded, but revalued as a benediction *post-cenam*. In my view, there was only the ‘addition’ and ‘revaluation’. Furthermore, I suggest that this instance is indicative of the whole pattern. In Antioch, the eucharistic traditions were not ‘balanced’ or ‘synthesized’; there was only the addition of a recent tradition to the already existing traditions. This is how the Antiochene church sought to consolidate its unity. In sum, the eucharistic traditions of 1 Cor. 11.23–25/Lk. 22.17–20, Matt. 26.26–29, and *Did.* 9.1–10.6 were concurrent (ca. 40–80 CE), until they became competitive (ca. 90–130). But there was no ‘synthesizing’ process; at least not in the first century of Christianity.

Meier might be correct about other Antiochene traditions. But in regard to the eucharistic traditions, his pattern is not supported by evidence. However, as was stated above, the narrower the area of research gets, the more difficult it is to determine such a pattern. Nevertheless, I envisage that other Antiochene traditions could also fit the pattern suggested above (cf. Matt. 6.9–13; Lk. 11.1–4; *Did.* 8.2). Therefore, such particular traditions could be the objective of future research.

Some closing thoughts

As Philip Yancey put it, ‘Christ bears today the wounds of the church, His body, just as He bore in the past the wounds of crucifixion. I sometimes wonder which have hurt worse.’⁴⁶ The

⁴⁶ Philip Yancey, *The Jesus I Never Knew* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995), 236.

Church today is a broken body.⁴⁷ In too many cases, diversity simply means ‘adversity’.⁴⁸ This is certainly true in my native Romanian context, with regard to the Eucharist.

For decades, the earliest church of Antioch had different, even divergent, eucharistic traditions and practices. At times, this diversity generated conflicts and disputes. Yet, the ‘Great Church’ did not lose its sense of unity. Moreover, in order to consolidate this unity, the Antiochenes chose the way of ‘addition’ and ‘reevaluation’. And, for decades, this way was effective. So, what are we to learn today from their pattern? How could this study contribute to the contemporary dialogue concerning the Eucharist and ecumenism?⁴⁹ These important questions require further reflection.

⁴⁷ See Francis J. Moloney, *A Body Broken for a Broken People: Eucharist in the New Testament* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997).

⁴⁸ Lat. *adversus, adversitas*: ‘against’; ‘opposition’.

⁴⁹ Cf. B.F. Meyer (ed.), *One Loaf, One Cup: Ecumenical Studies of 1 Cor. 11 and Other Eucharistic Texts* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1993).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adam, Alfred. "Erwägungen zur Herkunft der Didachè." *ZKG* 68 (1957): 1–47.
- Aland, Kurt. *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1964.
- Albright, W.F. and C.S. Mann. *Matthew: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. AYBC 26. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Aldridge, Robert E. "The Lost Ending of the *Didache*." *VC* 53/1 (1999): 1–15.
- Alexander, Loveday C.A. "Mapping Early Christianity: Acts and the Shape of Early Church History." *Int* 57 (2003): 163–173.
- Allenbach, Jean. *Biblia Patristica: Index des citations et allusions Bibliques dans la littérature Patristique*. Vol. 1. Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1975.
- Allison, Dale C. *The Sermon on The Mount: Inspiring the Moral Imagination*. New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1999.
- Arnold, August. *Der Ursprung des christlichen Abendmahls im Lichte der neuesten liturgiegeschichtlichen Forschung*. 2nd ed. FThSt 45. Freiburg: Herder, 1939.
- Arnold, Clinton E. *Ephesians*. ZECNT. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010.
- Audet, Jean-Paul. "Affinités littéraires et doctrinales du 'Manuel de Discipline'." *RB* 59 (1952): 219–238.
- *La Didachè: Instructions des apôtres*. Études Bibliques. Paris: Gabalda, 1958.
- Aune, David E. *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003.
- Bacon, B.W. *Studies in Matthew*. London: Constable, 1930.
- *The Story of St. Paul: A Comparison of Acts and Epistles*. Boston/New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1904.
- Bailey, Kenneth E. "Recovering the Poetic Structure of I Cor. 1.17-2.2: A Study in Text and Commentary." *NovT* 17 (1975): 265–296.
- "The Structure of 1 Corinthians and Paul's Theological Method with Special Reference to 4:17." *NovT* 25/2 (1983): 152–181.
- *Paul through Mediterranean Eyes: Cultural Studies in 1 Corinthians*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2011.
- Balabansky, Vicky. *Eschatology in the Making: Mark, Matthew and the Didache*. SNTSMS 97. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Balz, Horst and Gerhard Schneider, eds. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1994.

- Bammel, Ernst. "Der Text von Apostelgeschichte 15," 439–446. In: J. Kremer, ed. *Les actes des apôtres: Traditions, redaction, theologie*. BETL 48. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1979.
- Banks, Robert. *Paul's Idea of Community: The Early House Churches in Their Cultural Setting*. Rev. ed. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Barclay, John M.G. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.
- Bardsley, H.J. "The Testimony of Ignatius and Polycarp to the Writings of St. John." *JTS* 14 (1913): 207–220, 489–500.
- Barnard, Leslie W. "The Background of Ignatius of Antioch." *VC* 17/4 (1963): 193–206.
- . "The Dead Sea Scrolls, Barnabas, the *Didache* and the Later History of the 'Two Ways'," 87–107. In: *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1966.
- Barnes, Timothy D. "The Date of Ignatius." *ExpT* 120/3 (2008): 119–130.
- Barnett, Albert E. *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941.
- Barnett, Paul. *1 Corinthians: Holiness and Hope of a Rescued People*. FBC. Fearn: Christian Focus Publications, 2000.
- Barrett, C.K. "Apostles in Council and in Conflict," 91–108. In: *Freedom and Obligation: A Study of the Epistle to the Galatians*. London: SPCK, 1985.
- . *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. 2 vols. ICC. London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004.
- . *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. BNTC. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1968.
- Bauckham, Richard J. "The Lord's Day," 221–250. In: D.A. Carson, ed. *From Sabbath to Lord's Day*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982.
- . "The Study of Gospel Traditions Outside the Canonical Gospels: Problems and Prospects," 369–403. In: D. Wenham, ed. *The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels*. GP 5. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984.
- . *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2017.
- Bauckham, Richard J., ed. *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*. NTS. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1998.
- Bauer, Johannes B. "Aspekte des Kanonproblems," 25–42. In: I. Seybold, ed. *Meqor Hajjim: Festschrift für Georg Molin zum 75. Geburtstag*. Graz: Akademische Druck-und Verlagsanstalt, 1983.
- Bauer, Walter. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
- . *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*. Tübingen: Siebeck Mohr, 1934.
- Bauer, W., F.W. Danker, W.F. Arndt, and F.W. Gingrich, eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.
- Beare, F.W. *The Gospel According to Matthew: A Commentary*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1981.

- Becker, Jürgen. *Paulus: Der Apostel der Völker*. UTB. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1998.
- Bekker, J. Christiaan. *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.
- Bennema, Cornelis. "The Ethnic Conflict in Early Christianity: An Appraisal of Bauckham's Proposal on the Antioch Crisis and the Jerusalem Council." *JETS* 56/4 (2013): 753–763.
- Berger, Klaus. *Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments*. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1984.
- Bernea, Horia and Teodor Baconsky. *Roma Caput Mundi*. Bucharest: Humanitas, 2000.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- . *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain (Matthew 5:3-7:27 and Luke 6:20-49)*. Adela Yarbro Collins, ed. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.
- Betz, Johannes. "The Eucharist in the Didache," 244–75. In: Jonathan A. Draper, ed. *The Didache in Modern Research*. AGJU 37. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996.
- Bihlmeyer, Karl. *Die apostolischen Väter*. Vol. 1. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1970.
- Billings, Bradley S. "The Disputed Words in the Lukan Institution Narrative (Luke 22:19b-20): A Sociological Answer to a Textual Problem." *JBL* 125/3 (2006): 507–526.
- . *Do This in Remembrance of Me: The Disputed Words in the Lukan Institution Narrative (Luke 22.19b-20). An Historico-Exegetical, Theological and Sociological Analysis*. LNTS 314. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Bingham, D. Jeffrey. "The Didache as a Source for the Reconstruction of Early Christianity: A Response," 515–528. In: Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, eds. *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*. ECL 14. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015.
- Bird, Michael F. *The Gospel of the Lord: How the Early Church Wrote the Story of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2014.
- Blomberg, Craig L. "The Gospels for Specific Communities and All Christians," 111–133. In: E.W. Klink III, ed. *The Audience of the Gospels: The Origin and Function of the Gospels in Early Christianity*. LNTS 353. London: T&T Clark, 2010.
- . *1 Corinthians*. NIVAC. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.
- Blue, Bradley B. "The House Church at Corinth and the Lord's Supper: Famine, Food Supply, and the Present Distress." *CTR* 5/2 (1991): 221–239.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Acts*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- . *Luke 9:51–24:53*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1996.
- Bornkamm, Günther. "Herrenmahl und Kirche bei Paulus," 138–176. In: *Studien zu Antike und Christentum: Gesammelte Aufsätze*. Vol. II. München: Kaiser, 1959.
- . *Paul*. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

- . “The Anathema in the Early Christian Lord’s Supper Liturgy,” 169–76. In: *Early Christian Experience*. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.
- Bosio, Guido. *I Padri apostolici*, vol. 1: *Dottrina degli Apostoli, San Clemente Romano, Lettera di Barnaba*. CPSG 7. Turin: Società Editrici Internazionale, 1940.
- Bower, Richard A. “The Meaning of ἐπιτρυγᾶνω in the Epistles of St. Ignatius of Antioch.” *VC* 28/1 (1974): 1–14.
- Bradshaw, Paul F. *Eucharistic Origins*. ACC 80. London: SPCK, 2004.
- . *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Bradshaw, Paul F. and Maxwell E. Johnson. *The Eucharistic Liturgies: Their Evolution and Interpretation*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2012.
- Brandon, S.G.F. “Christ in Verbal and Depicted Imagery: A Problem of Early Christian Iconography,” 164–172. In: J. Neusner, ed. *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults*. Vol. 2. SJLA 12. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975.
- . *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*. London: SPCK, 1951.
- Brent, Allen. “Ignatius and Polycarp: The Transformation of New Testament Traditions in the Context of Mystery Cults,” 325–349. In: Andrew F. Gregory and Cristopher M. Tuckett, eds. *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- . *Ignatius of Antioch and the Second Sophistic: A Study of an Early Christian Transformation of Pagan Culture*. STAC 36. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- . *Ignatius of Antioch: A Martyr Bishop and the Origin of Episcopacy*. London/New York: T&T Clark Continuum, 2007.
- Brock, Sebastian P. “Greek and Latin Words in Palmyrene Inscriptions: A Comparison with Syriac,” 11–25. In: E. Cussini, ed. *A Journey to Palmyra: Collected Essays to Remember Delbert R. Hillers*. CHANE 22. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2005.
- Bruce, F.F. “The First Epistle to the Corinthians: An Expanded Paraphrase.” *EvQ* 32/2 (1960): 114–118.
- . *Paul: Apostle of the Free Spirit*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 1977.
- . *The Acts of the Apostles*. 3rd ed. NICNT. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1990.
- . *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1984.
- Bryennios, Philotheos. *Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροσολυμιτικοῦ χειρογράφου νῦν πρῶτον ἐκδιδομένη μετὰ προλεγόμενων καὶ σημειώσεων ἐν οἷς καὶ τῆς Συνόψεως τῆς Π. Δ., τῆς ὑπὸ Ἰωάνν. τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου, σύγκρισις καὶ μέρος ἀνέκδοτον ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ χειρογράφου*. Constantinople: Voutyra, 1883.

- Bultmann, Rudolf. *Theology of the New Testament*. 2 vols. Trans., Kendrick Grobel. New York: Scribner's, 1951–1955.
- Burghardt, Walter. "Did Saint Ignatius of Antioch Know the Fourth Gospel?" *TS* 1 (1940): 1–26, 130–156.
- Cabrol, Fernand and Henri Leclercq. *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*. Vol. 4/1. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1920.
- Camelot, Pierre T. *Ignace d'Antioche*. SC 10. Paris: Cerf, 1958.
- Campbell, Douglas A. *Framing Paul: An Epistolary Biography*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2014.
- , "Possible Inscriptional Attestation to Sergius Paul[us] (Acts 13:6-12), and the Implications for Pauline Chronology." *JTS* 56 (2005): 1–29.
- Campbell, William S. "Universality and Particularity in Paul's Understanding and Strategy of Mission," 195–208. In: Trevor J. Burke and Brian S. Rosner, eds. *Paul as Missionary: Identity, Activity, Theology, and Practice*. LNTS 420. London/New York: T&T Clark International, 2011.
- Caragounis, Chrys C. "A House Church in Corinth? An Inquiry into the Structure of Early Corinthian Christianity," 365–418. In: Constantine J. Belezos, ed. *Saint Paul and Corinth: 1950 Years Since the Writings of the Epistles to the Corinthians*. Vol. 1. Athena: Psychogios, 2009.
- Carson, D.A., "Matthew," 3–599. In: Frank E. Gaebelein, ed. *Matthew, Mark, Luke*. EBC 8. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984.
- Carson, D.A. and Douglas J. Moo. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.
- Carter, Warren. "Paying the Tax to Rome as Subversive Praxis: Matthew 17.24-27." *JSNT* 76 (1999): 11–26.
- , *Households and Discipleship: A Study of Matthew 19-20*. JSNTSup 103. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.
- , *Matthew and the Margins: A Socio-Political and Religious Reading*. JSNTSup 204. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Casey, Maurice. *Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel*. SNTSMS 102. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Chester, Andrew and Ralph P. Martin. *The Theology of the Letters of James, Peter, and Jude*. NTT. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Christensen-Ernst, Jørgen. *Antioch on the Orontes: A History and a Guide*. Lanham: Hamilton, 2012.
- Ciampa, Roy E. and Rosner, Brian S. *The First Letter to the Corinthians*. PNTC. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: W.B. Eerdmans, 2010.
- Clabeaux, John J. "The Ritual Meal in Didache 9–10: Progress in Understanding," 209–230. In: Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, eds. *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*. ECL 14. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015.

- Clarke, Andrew D. *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1–6*. PBM. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006.
- Claussen, Carsten. “The Eucharist in the Gospel of John and in the *Didache*,” 135–163. In: Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett, eds. *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Collins, John J. “Chiasmus, the ‘ABA’ Pattern, and the Text of Paul,” 2:575–584. In: *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus 1961. AnBib* 17–18. Rome: BIP, 1963.
- Collins, Raymond F. *First Corinthians*. SacPag 7. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999.
- Connolly, Richard H. “Agape and Eucharist in the *Didache*.” *DRev* 55 (1937): 477–489.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- . *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- Corwin, Virginia. *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.
- Cousland, J.R.C. *The Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew*. NovTSup 102. Leiden/New York: E.J. Brill, 2002.
- Coutsoumpos, Panayotis. “Paul, the Corinthians’ Meal and the Social Context,” 285–300. In: Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Land, eds. *Paul and His Social Relations*. PAST 7. Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2013.
- Creed, John M. “The *Didache*.” *JTS* 39 (1938): 370–387.
- Crosby, M.H. *House of Disciples: Church, Economics and Justice in Matthew*. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1988.
- Cross, F.L. and E.A. Livingstone, eds. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Crossan, J.D. *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
- Crowe, J. *From Jerusalem to Antioch: The Gospel Across Cultures*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1997.
- Cullmann, Oscar. *The Christology of the New Testament*. Trans., Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A.M. Hall. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1959.
- Cummins, Stephen A. *Paul and the Crucified Christ in Antioch: Maccabean Martyrdom and Galatians 1 and 2*. SNTSMS 114. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Dauids, Peter H. *The Epistle of James: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1982.
- Davies, Margaret. *Matthew*. 2nd ed. Readings. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009.
- Davies, Stevan L. “The Predicament of Ignatius of Antioch.” *VC* 30/3 (1976): 175–180.
- Davies, W.D. *Christian Origins and Judaism*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962.
- . *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.

- Davies, W.D. and Dale C. Allison. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. Vols. 1–3. ICC. London/New York: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- De Boer, Martinus C. *Galatians: A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2011.
- De Watteville, Jean. *Le sacrifice dans les textes eucharistiques des premiers siècles*. BT. Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1966.
- Del Verme, Marcello. *Didache and Judaism: Jewish Roots of an Ancient Christian Jewish Work*. London/New York: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- Delling, Gerhard. “Zur Taufe von ‘Häusern’ im Urchristentum.” *NovT* 7 (1965): 285–311.
- Delobel, Joël. “The Lord’s Prayer in the Textual Tradition,” 293–309. In: Jean-Marie Sevrin, ed. *The New Testament in Early Christianity*. BETL 86. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989.
- DeSilva, David A. *An Introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, Methods and Ministry Formation*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2004.
- . *Galatians: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. BHGNT. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014.
- Dibelius, Martin. “Die Mahl-Gebete der Didache,” 117–127. In: Heinz Kraft and Günther Bornkamm, eds. *Botschaft und Geschichte*, vol. 2: *Zum Urchristentum und zur hellenistischen Religionsgeschichte*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1956.
- . “Die Mahl-Gebete der Didache.” *ZNW* 37 (1938): 32–41.
- . “The Apostolic Council,” 93–111. In: *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- Dietze, Paul. “Die Briefe des Ignatius und das Johannesevangelium.” *ThStK* 78 (1905): 563–603.
- Dix, Dom Gregory. “Didache and Diatessaron.” *JTS* 34 (1933): 242–250.
- . *The Shape of the Liturgy*. London/New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015.
- Dodd, C.H. *History and the Gospel*. London: James Nisbet, 1938.
- Dolger, Franz Joseph. “Theou Phone.” *AC* 5 (1936): 218–223.
- Donahue, Paul J. “Jewish Christianity in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch.” *VC* 32/2 (1978): 81–93.
- Douglas, Mary. “Deciphering a Meal.” *Daedalus* 101 (1972): 61–81.
- Downey, G. “The Size of the Population of Antioch.” *TAPA* 89 (1958): 84–91.
- . *A History of Antioch in Syria: From Seleucus to the Arab Conquest*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.
- Draper, Jonathan A. “Apostles, Teachers, and Evangelists: Stability and Movement of Functionaries in Matthew, James, and the *Didache*,” 137–174. In: Huub van de Sand and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, eds. *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- . “Conclusion: Missing Pieces in the Puzzle or Wild Goose Chase? A Retrospect and Prospect,” 529–544. In: Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, eds. *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*. ECL 14. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015.

- . “Do the *Didache* and Matthew Reflect an ‘Irrevocable Parting of the Ways’ with Judaism?,” 217–241. In: Huub van de Sandt, ed. *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- . “Eschatology in the *Didache*,” 567–582. In: J. van der Watt, ed. *Eschatology of the New Testament and Some Related Documents*. WUNT II/315. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- . “Performing the Cosmic Mystery of the Church in the Communities of the *Didache*,” 37–57. In: Jonathan Knight and Kevin Sullivan, eds. *The Open Mind: Essays in Honour of Christopher Rowland*. LNTS 522. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015.
- . “Pure Sacrifice in *Didache* 14 As Jewish Christian Exegesis.” *Neot* 42/2 (2008): 223–252.
- . “Ritual Process and Ritual Symbol in *Didache* 7–10.” *VC* 54 (2000): 121–158.
- . “The Apostolic Fathers: The *Didache*.” *ExpT* 117/5 (2006): 177–181.
- . “The *Didache*,” 13–20. In: Paul Foster, ed. *The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2007.
- . “The Jesus Tradition in the *Didache*,” 72–91. In: Jonathan A. Draper, ed. *The Didache in Modern Research*. AGJU 37. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996.
- . “Torah and Troublesome Apostles in the *Didache* Community.” *NovT* 33/4 (1991): 347–372.
- . “Ursprung und Theologie der *Didache*,” 17–38. In: W. Pratscher, ed. *Theologie der Apostolischen Väter*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.
- . *A Commentary on the Didache in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents*. Unpublished PhD Diss. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1983.
- Draper, Jonathan A., ed. *The Didache in Modern Research*. AGJU 37. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996.
- Draper, Jonathan A. and Clayton N. Jefford, eds. *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*. ECL 14. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2015.
- Dunn, James D.G. *1 Corinthians*. London/New York: T&T Clark, 1999.
- . *Christianity in the Making*, vol. 1: *Jesus Remembered*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: W.B. Eerdmans, 2003.
- . *Christianity in the Making*, vol. 2: *Beginning from Jerusalem*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: W.B. Eerdmans, 2009.
- . *Romans 9–16*. WBC 38B. Dallas: Word, 2002.
- . *The Partings of the Ways Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity*. 2nd ed. London: SCM Press, 2006.
- . *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1998.
- . *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity*. 3rd ed. London: SCM Press, 2006.
- Edwards, James R. *The Hebrew Gospel and the Development of the Synoptic Tradition*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2009.

- Edwards, Mark J. "Ignatius and the Second Century: An Answer to R. Hübner." *ZAC* 2 (1998): 214–226.
- . *Catholicity and Heresy in the Early Church*. Farnham/Burlington: Ashgate, 2009.
- Ehrhard, Albert. *Die altchristliche Litteratur und ihre Erforschung von 1884–1900*, vol. 1: *Die vornicänische Litteratur*. STS 1. Freiburg: Herder, 1900.
- Ehrman, Bart D. "The Cup, the Bread, and the Salvific Effect of Jesus' Death in Luke-Acts," 156–177. In: *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. NTTS 33. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2006.
- . *Forged: Writing in the Name of God—Why the Bible's Authors Are Not Who We Think They Are*. New York: HarperOne, 2012.
- . *Jesus Before the Gospels: How the Earliest Christians Remembered, Changed, and Invented Their Stories of the Savior*. New York: HarperOne, 2016.
- . *Lost Christianities: The Battles for Scriptures and the Faiths We Never Knew*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Ehrman, Bart D., ed. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Vol. 1. LCL 24. Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Eichhorn, J.G. *Einleitung in das neue Testament*. Leipzig: Weidmann, 1804.
- Engels, Donald W. *Roman Corinth: An Alternative Model for the Classical City*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- Eriksson, Anders. *Traditions as Rhetorical Proof: Pauline Argumentation in 1 Corinthians*. CBNT 29. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1998.
- Esler, Philip F. *Galatians*. NTR. London/New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Evans, C.A., ed. *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity*. SSEJC 7. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- . "Targumizing Tendencies in Matthean Redaction," 93–116. In: A.J. Avery-Peck, D. Harrington, J. Neusner, eds. *When Judaism and Christianity Began: Essays in Memory of Anthony J. Saldarini*. Vol. 1. Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2004.
- Eve, Eric. *Behind the Gospels: Understanding the Oral Tradition*. London: SPCK, 2013.
- Farmer, William. "The Post-Sectarian Character of Matthew and Its Post-war Setting in Antioch of Syria." *PRS* 3 (1976): 235–247.
- Fecioru, Dumitru. *Scrierile Părinților apostolici*. PSB 1. Bucharest: EIBMBOR, 1979.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1987.
- Ferguson, Everett. "'When You Come Together': *Epi to Auto* in Early Christian Literature." *RestQ* 16 (1973): 202–208.
- Fiensy, David A. "What Would You Do for a Living?," 555–574. In: Anthony J. Blasi, Jean Duhaime, Paul-André Turcotte, eds. *Handbook of Early Christianity: Social Science Approaches*. Walnut Creek: Altamira Press, 2002.

- Filson, F.V. *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. BNTC. London: A&C Black, 1977.
- Finkelstein, Louis. "The Birkat Ha-Mazon." *JQR* 19 (1928–29): 211–262.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays*. SBLMS 25. Chico: Scholars Press, 1979.
- . *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AYBC 32. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2008.
- . *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AYBC 31. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2008.
- . *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. AB 28A. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2008.
- . *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. AB 28B. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Ford, R.C. "St. Luke and Lucius of Cyrene." *ExpT* 32/5 (1920–21): 219–220.
- Foster, Paul. "The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch (Part 1)." *ExpT* 117/12 (2006): 487–495.
- . "The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch (Part 2)." *ExpT* 118/1 (2006): 2–11.
- . "The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament," 159–186. In: Andrew F. Gregory and Cristopher M. Tuckett, eds. *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- . *Colossians*. BNTC. London/New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016.
- France, R.T. *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2004.
- . *The Gospel of Matthew*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2007.
- Friedman, Maurice S., Thomas P. Burke and Samuel Laeuchli, eds. *Searching in the Syntax of Things: Experiments in the Study of Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.
- Funk, F.X., ed. *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*. Vols. 1–2. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schoeningh, 1905.
- Gaechter, P. *Die literarische Kunst im Matthäusevangelium*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1966.
- Gamble, H.Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1995.
- Garland, David E. *1 Corinthians*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.
- Garnsey, Peter and Greg Woolf. "Patronage of the Rural Poor in the Roman World," 153–170. In: Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, ed. *Patronage in Ancient Society*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Garrow, Alan J.P. "An Extant Instance of 'Q'." *NTS* 62/3 (2016): 398–417.
- . *The Gospel of Matthew's Dependence on the Didache*. JSNTSS 254. London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Gathercole, Simon G. "The Earliest Manuscript Title of Matthew's Gospel (BnF Suppl. gr. 1120 ii 3 / P^4)." *NovT* 54 (2012): 209–235.

- Gero, Stephen. "The So-called Ointment Prayer in the Coptic Version of the Didache: A Re-evaluation." *HTR* 70 (1977): 67–84.
- Gibbs, Jeffrey A. *Matthew 1:1–11:1*. Concordia. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2006.
- Gilchrist, J.M. "Paul and the Corinthians: The Sequence of Letters and Visits." *JSNT* 34 (1988): 47–69.
- Gladd, Benjamin L. *Revealing the Mysterion: The Use of Mystery in Daniel and Second Temple Judaism with Its Bearing on First Corinthians*. BZBW 160. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.
- Glover, Richard. "'Luke the Antiochene' and Acts." *NTS* 11 (1964–65): 97–106.
- "The Didache's Quotations and the Synoptic Gospels." *NTS* 5 (1958–59): 12–29.
- Goppelt, Leonhard. *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. UTB 850. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976.
- *Theology of the New Testament, vol. 2: The Variety and Unity of the Apostolic Witness to Christ*. Trans., John Alsup. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1982.
- Goulder, Michael D. "The Composition of the Lord's Prayer." *JTS* 14 (1963): 32–45.
- *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2004.
- Grant, Robert M. "Scripture and Tradition in St. Ignatius of Antioch." *CBQ* 25 (1963): 322–335.
- *After the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
- *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary, vol. 1: An Introduction*. New York: Thomas Nelson, 1964.
- *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary, vol. 4: Ignatius of Antioch*. Camden: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1966.
- Greiff, Anton. *Das älteste Pascharitiale der Kirche, Did 1–10, und das Johannesevangelium*. Johanneische Studien 1. Paderborn: Schoeningh, 1929.
- Greyvenstein, Jan. "The Original 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles': Its Text and Origins." Unpublished PhD Diss. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1919.
- Griesbach, J.J. *Commentatio qua Marci evangelium totum e Matthaei et Lucae commentariis decerptum esse monstratur*. Jena, 1794.
- Gundry, R.H. *Matthew: A Commentary on his Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1994.
- *Peter: False Disciple and Apostate according to Saint Matthew*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2015.
- *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel: With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967.
- Gurtner, Daniel M. *The Torn Veil: Matthew's Exposition of the Death of Jesus*. SNTSMS 139. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

- Haacker, Klaus. "Paul's Life," 19–33. In: James D.G. Dunn, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to St. Paul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Haenchen, Ernst. "Quellenanalyse und Kompositionsanalyse in Act 15," 153–164. In: W. Eltester, ed. *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für J. Jeremias*. BZNW 30. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964.
- Hagner, D.A. *Matthew 1–13*. WBC 33A. Dallas: Word, 2002.
- *Matthew 14–28*. WBC 33B. Dallas: Word, 2002.
- "The Sayings of Jesus in the Apostolic Fathers and Justin Martyr," 233–268. In: D. Wenham, ed. *The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels*. GP 5. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984.
- Hamman, A.G. *La prière*, vol. II: *Les trois premiers siècles*. BT. Paris: Desclée & Cie, 1963.
- Hammond Bammel, C.P. "Ignatian Problems." *JTS* 33 (1982): 62–97.
- Hare, Douglas R.A. "How Jewish is the Gospel of Matthew." *CBQ* 62/2 (2000): 264–277.
- Harrak, Amir. "The Ancient Name of Edessa." *JNES* 51/3 (1992): 209–214.
- Harrington, Daniel J. "The Reception of Walter Bauer's Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity during the Last Decade." *HTR* 73 (1980): 289–298.
- *The Gospel of Matthew*. SacPag 1. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Harrington, Jay M. *The Lukan Passion Narrative: The Markan Material in Luke 22.54–23.25. A Historical Survey: 1891–1997*. NTT 30. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000.
- Harris, R.J. *The Teaching of the Apostles (Didache tōn Apostolōn): Newly Edited, with Facsimile Text and a Commentary*. London: Clay & Sons, 1887.
- Harrison, P.N. *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936.
- Hays, Richard B. *First Corinthians*. Interpretation. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.
- Heil, John P. *The Rhetorical Role of Scripture in 1 Corinthians*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- Heinemann, Joseph. *Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns*. Studia Judaica 9. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977.
- Henderson, S. Watts "'If Anyone Hungers ...': An Integrated Reading of 1 Cor 11.17–34." *NTS* 48/2 (2002): 195–208.
- Hengel, Martin. *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity*. Trans., John Bowden. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2003.
- *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. 2 vols. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1974.
- *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*. Trans., John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
- *The "Hellenization" of Judaea in the First Century after Christ*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2003.
- *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 2000.

- Hengel, Martin and Anna Maria Schwemer. *Paul between Damascus and Antioch: The Unknown Years*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.
- Hezser, Catherine. *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*. TSAJ 81. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2001.
- Hill, Charles E. *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Hill, Craig C. *Hellenists and Hebrews: Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Hill, D. *The Gospel of Matthew*. NCBC. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1972.
- Hoehner, Harold W. et al. *Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 & 2 Thessalonians, Philemon*. Cornerstone 16. Carol Stream: Tyndale House, 2008.
- Hoffman, Daniel. "The Authority of Scripture and Apostolic Doctrine in Ignatius of Antioch." *JETS* 28/1 (1985): 71–79.
- Hofius, Otfried. "The Lord's Supper and the Lord's Supper Tradition: Reflections on 1 Corinthians 11:23b–25," 75–115. In: B.F. Meyer, ed. *One Loaf, One Cup: Ecumenical Studies of 1 Cor. 11 and Other Eucharistic Texts*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1993.
- Holmberg, Bengt. *Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.
- Holmes, Michael W. "Ignatius of Antioch: A Martyr Bishop and the Origin of Episcopacy (Review)." *RSR* 35/3 (2009): 193.
- Horrell, David G. "Domestic Space and Christian Meetings at Corinth: Imagining New Contexts and the Buildings East of the Theatre." *NTS* 50 (2004): 349–369.
- . *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.
- Horsley, Richard A. "Paul's Assembly in Corinth: An Alternative Society," 371–395. In: Daniel N. Schowalter and Steven J. Friesen, eds. *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth: Interdisciplinary Approaches*. HTS 53. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005.
- . *1 Corinthians*. ANTC. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998.
- Hübner, R.M. "Thesen zur Echtheit und Datierung der sieben Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochien." *ZAC* 1 (1997): 44–72.
- Hultgren, Arland J. *The Rise of Normative Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.
- Hundley, Michael B. *Gods in Dwellings: Temples and Divine Presence in the Ancient Near East*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.
- Hurtado, Larry W. "Interactive Diversity: A Proposed Model of Christian Origins." *JTS* 64 (2013): 445–462.
- . *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2003.

- Inge, W.R. "Ignatius," 61–83. In: *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Oxford Society of Historical Theology. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905.
- Jacobi, Christine. *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus? Analogien zwischen den echten Paulusbriefen und den synoptischen Evangelien*. BZNW 213. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015.
- Jefford, Clayton N. "Conflict at Antioch: Ignatius and the *Didache* at Odds," 262–269. In *Studia Patristica* 36. Leuven: Peeters, 2001.
- "Did Ignatius of Antioch Know the *Didache*?" 330–351. In: Clayton N. Jefford, ed. *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission*. NovTSup 77. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.
- "Introduction: Dynamics, Methodologies, and Progress in *Didache* Studies," 1–16. In: Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, eds. *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*. ECL 14. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015.
- "Locating the *Didache*," *FF* 3/1 (2014): 39–68.
- "Social Locators as a Bridge between the *Didache* and Matthew," 245–264. In: Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett, eds. *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- "The Librarian's Guide to the Apostolic Fathers," *TheoLib* 5/1–2 (2011–12): 59–66.
- "The Milieu of Matthew, the *Didache*, and Ignatius of Antioch: Agreements and Differences," 35–47. In: Huub van de Sandt, ed. *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- *The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. VCSup 11. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1989.
- Jefford, Clayton N., ed. *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission*. NovTSup 77. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "pais theou." TDNT, 5:712–717.
- *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. Trans., Norman Perrin. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.
- *The Prayers of Jesus*. Trans., John Bowden et al. SBT 2/6. London: SCM Press, 1967.
- Jeremias, Joachim and W. Zimmerli. *The Servant of God*. London: SCM Press, 1957.
- Jervell, Jacob. *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles*. NTT. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Jewett, Robert. *A Chronology of Paul's Life*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Johanny, Raymond. "Ignatius of Antioch," 48–70. In: Willy Rordorf et al. *The Eucharist of the Early Christians*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990.
- Johnson, Sherman E. "A Subsidiary Motive for the Writing of the *Didache*," 107–122. In: Massey H. Shepherd and Sherman E. Johnson, eds. *Munera Studiosa: Studies Presented to W.H.P. Hatch on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*. Cambridge: Episcopal Theological School, 1946.

- Joly, Robert. *Le dossier d'Ignace d'Antioche*. ULB 69. Bruxelles: Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1979.
- Jones, S. and Mirecki, P.A. "Considerations on the Coptic papyrus of the Didache," 47–87. In: Clayton N. Jefford, ed. *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission*. NovTSup 77. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.
- Jongkind, Dirk. "Corinth in the First Century AD: The Search for Another Class." *TynBul* 52/1 (2001): 139–148.
- Jospé, Raphael. "The Significance of Jerusalem: A Jewish Perspective." *JPEC* 2/2 (1995): 32–40.
- Kaufman, John. "Diverging Trajectories or Emerging Mainstream? Unity and Diversity in Second Century Christianity," 113–128. In: Reidar Hvalvik and John Kaufman, eds. *Among Jews, Gentiles and Christians in Antiquity and the Middle Ages: Studies in Honour of Professor Oskar Skarsaune on his 65th Birthday*. Trondheim: Tapir Academic Press, 2011.
- Keener, Craig S. *1–2 Corinthians*. NCBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*, vol. 1: *Introduction and Acts 1:1–2:47*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.
- *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*, vol. 2: *Acts 3:1–14:28*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013.
- *The Gospel of Matthew: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: W.B. Eerdmans, 2009.
- Kennard, J. "The Place of Origin of Matthew's Gospel." *ATR* 31 (1949): 243–246.
- Kilpatrick, G.D. *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy: The Moorhouse Lectures 1975*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew*. Wauconda: Bolchazy-Carducci, 2007.
- Kingsbury, J.D. *Matthew as Story*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- Kittel, G. and G. Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 vols. Trans., G.W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1964–1976.
- Klappert, Berthold. "Zur Frage des semitischen oder griechischen Urtextes von 1. Kor. 15.3–5." *NTS* 13 (1966–67): 168–173.
- Klauck, Hans-Josef. *Magic and Paganism in Early Christianity: The World of the Acts of the Apostles*. Trans., Brian McNeil. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000.
- Kloppenborg, John S. "An Analysis of the Pre-Pauline Formula in 1 Cor 15:3b-5 in Light of Some Recent Literature." *CBQ* 40 (1978): 351–67.
- "Didache 16.6–8 and Special Matthaean Tradition." *ZNW* 70 (1979): 54–67.
- "Luke's Geography: Knowledge, Ignorance, Sources, and Spatial Conception," 101–143. In: Joseph Verheyden and John S. Kloppenborg, eds. *Luke on Jesus, Paul, and Earliest Christianity: What Did He Really Know?*. BTS 29. Leuven: Peeters, 2017.

- . “Precedence at the Communal Meal in Corinth.” *NovT* 58/2 (2016): 167–203.
- . “The Use of the Synoptics or Q in Did. 1.3b-2.1,” 105–129. In: Huub van de Sandt, ed. *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- Knopf, Rudolf. *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel. Die zwei Clemensbriefe*. HNT. AV 1. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1920.
- Koch, Dietrich-Alex. “Eucharistic Meal and Eucharistic Prayers in Didache 9 and 10.” *StTheol* 64 (2010): 200–218.
- Kodell, Jerome. *The Eucharist in the New Testament*. ZSNT. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1988.
- Koenig, John. *The Feast of the World’s Redemption: Eucharistic Origins and Christian Mission*. Harrisburg: Trinity, 2000.
- Koester, Helmut. “ΤΝΩΜΑΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΟΙ: The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity.” *HTR* 58/3 (1965): 279–318.
- . *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern*. TU 65. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J. and Michael J. Kruger. *The Heresy of Orthodoxy: How Contemporary Culture’s Fascination with Diversity Has Reshaped Our Understanding of Early Christianity*. Wheaton: Crossway, 2010.
- Kraeling, C.H. “The Jewish Community at Antioch.” *JBL* 51 (1932): 130–160.
- Kraft, Robert A. *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary*, vol. 3: *Barnabas and the Didache*. New York: Thomas Nelson, 1965.
- Kruger, Michael J. *Christianity at the Crossroads: How the Second Century Shaped the Future of the Church*. London: SPCK, 2017.
- Kuhn, K.G. “Maranatha.” *TDNT*, 4:466–472.
- Kümmel, W.G. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1975.
- Künzel, G. *Studien zur Gemeindeverständnis des Matthäusevangeliums*. CThM 10. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1978.
- Lampe, Peter. “Das korinthische Herrenmahl im Schnittpunkt hellenistisch-römischer Mahlpraxis und paulinischer Theologia Crucis (1 Kor 11,17–34).” *ZNW* 82 (1991): 183–213.
- . “The Eucharist: Identifying with Christ on the Cross.” *Int* 48 (1994): 36–49.
- Lang, Friedrich. *Die Briefe an die Korinther*. NTD 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994.
- Lang, T.J. *Mystery and the Making of a Christian Historical Consciousness: From Paul to the Second Century*. BZNTW 219. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2015.
- Larsen, M.D. “Addressing the Elephant That’s Not in the Room: Comparing the Eucharistic Prayers in *Didache* 9-10 and the Last Supper Tradition.” *Neot* 45/2 (2011): 252–274.

- LaVerdiere, Eugene. *The Eucharist in the New Testament and the Early Church*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996.
- Lechner, T. *Ignatius adversus Valentinianos? Chronologische und theologiegeschichtliche Studien zu Briefen des Ignatius von Antiochen*. VCSup 47. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1999.
- Lietzmann, Hans. *An die Korinther*. Vol. I/II. HNT 9. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1949.
- , *Mass and the Lord's Supper: A Study in the History of the Liturgy*. Trans., Dorothea H.G. Reeve. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979.
- , *Messe und Herrenmahl: Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Liturgie*. AZK 8. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1955.
- Lieu, Judith M. *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco Roman World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Lifschitz, B. "L'hellénisation des Juifs de Palestine." *RB* 72 (1965): 520–538.
- Lightfoot, J.B. *The Apostolic Fathers*, vol. II.1–2: *S. Ignatius; S. Polycarp*. London: Macmillan, 1889.
- Lindemann, Andreas. "Antwort auf die 'Thesen zur Echtheit und Datierung der sieben Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochien'." *ZAC* 1 (1997): 185–194.
- , "Paul's Influence on 'Clement' and Ignatius," 9–24. In: Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett, eds. *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- , *Der Erste Korintherbrief*. HNT 9/1. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Lohse, Eduard. *Colossians and Philemon: A Commentary on the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. WBC 41. Dallas: Word, 1990.
- , *The Epistle to the Romans*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2016.
- Longenecker, Richard N., ed. *The Road from Damascus: The Impact of Paul's Conversion on his Life, Thought, and Ministry*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1997.
- Lüdemann, Gerd. *Early Christianity According to the Traditions in Acts: A Commentary*. Trans., John Bowden. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.
- Lund, N.W. *Chiasmus in the New Testament: A Study in the Form and Function of Chiastic Structures*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1992.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 1–7: A Commentary*. Vol. 1. Trans., James E. Crouch. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
- , *Matthew 21–28: A Commentary*. Vol. 3. Trans., James E. Crouch. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- , *Theology of the Gospel of Matthew*. NTT. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Maccoby, Hyam. "Paul and the Eucharist." *NTS* 37 (1991): 247–267.
- Mack, Burton L. *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1991.

- MacMullen, Ramsay. *The Second Church: Popular Christianity, A.D. 200–400*. WGRWS. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.
- Maier, Harry O. “The Charismatic Authority of Ignatius of Antioch: A Sociological Analysis.” *SR* 18/2 (1989): 185–199.
- Malherbe, A.J. *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Marguerat, D. *Le Jugement dans l'évangile de Matthieu*. Le Monde de la Bible. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1981.
- Marshall, I. Howard. “Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earlier Christianity.” *Them* 2 (1976): 5–14.
- . “Antioch and Rome: Book Review.” *JSNT* 8/25 (1985): 125–126.
- . *Acts: An Introduction and Commentary*. TNTC 5. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1980.
- . *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*. Vancouver: Regent, 2006.
- . *Luke: Historian and Theologian*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1970.
- . *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Exeter: Paternoster, 1978.
- Martin, Dale B. “Review Essay: Justin J. Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*.” *JSNT* 84 (2001): 51–64.
- Martin, Ralph P. “An Epistle in Search for a Life-Setting.” *ExpT* 79 (1968): 296–302.
- . *James*. WBC 48. Waco: Word, 1988.
- Martyn, J.L. *Galatians: A New Translation and Introduction with Commentary*. AB 33. New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- Massaux, Édouard. *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Saint Irenaeus*. Trans., Norman Belval and Suzanne Hecht. NGS 5/1–3. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1990–1993.
- Maurer, C. *Ignatius von Antiochien und das Johannesevangelium*. AThANT 18. Zürich: Zwingli, 1949.
- Mazza, Enrico. “*Didache* 9–10: Elements of a Eucharistic Interpretation,” 278–283. In: Jonathan A. Draper, ed. *The Didache in Modern Research*. AGJU 37. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996.
- . *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer*. Trans., Robert E. Lane. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1995.
- McGowan, Andrew B. “‘First Regarding the Cup...’: Papias and the Diversity of Early Eucharistic Practice.” *JTS* 46 (1995): 551–555.
- . “‘Is There a Liturgical Text in This Gospel?’: The Institution Narratives and their Early Interpretive Communities.” *JBL* 118/1 (1999): 73–87.
- . “Naming the Feast: The Agape and the Diversity of Early Christian Meals,” 314–318. In: *Studia Patristica* 30. Leuven: Peeters, 1997.
- . “The Inordinate Cup: Issues of Order in Early Eucharistic Drinking,” 283–291. In: *Studia Patristica* 35. Leuven: Peeters, 2001.
- McKnight, Scot. *The Letter of James*. NICNT. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: W.B. Eerdmans, 2011.

- Meeks, Wayne E. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.
- Meeks, Wayne A. and Robert L. Wilken. *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era*. SBL. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978.
- Meggitt, Justin J. *Paul, Poverty and Survival*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Meier, John P. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, vol. 1: *The Roots of the Problem and the Person*. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- . "Antioch," 12–86. In: Raymond E. Brown and John P. Meier. *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity*. New York: Paulist Press, 2004.
- Metzger, Bruce M. "Antioch-on-the-Orontes." *BA* 11 (1948): 69–88.
- . *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. London/New York: United Bible Societies, 1994.
- . *The Early Versions of the New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1977.
- . *The Text of the New Testament*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Meyer, Ben F., ed. *One Loaf, One Cup: Ecumenical Studies of 1 Cor. 11 and Other Eucharistic Texts*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1993.
- Middleton, R.D. "The Eucharistic Prayers of the *Didache*." *JTS* 37 (1935): 259–267.
- Milavec, Aaron. "The Pastoral Genius of the *Didache*: An Analytical Translation and Commentary," 89–126. In: J. Neusner, E.S. Frerichs and A.J. Levine, eds. *Religious Writings and Religious Systems*, vol. II: *Christianity*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- . *The Didache: Faith, Hope & Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50–70 C.E.* New York/Mahwah: Newman Press, 2003.
- Millar, Fergus. *Rome, the Greek World, and the East*, vol. III: *The Greek World, the Jews, and the East*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
- Miller, S.G. "A Mosaic Floor from a Roman Villa at Anaploga." *Hesperia* 41 (1972): 332–354.
- Mitchell, M.W. "In the Footsteps of Paul: Scriptural and Apostolic Authority in Ignatius of Antioch." *J ECS* 14/1 (2006): 27–45.
- Mitchell, Margaret M. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993.
- Mohrlang, Roger. *Matthew and Paul: A Comparison of Ethical Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Moll, Sebastian. *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*. WUNT I/250. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Moloney, Francis J. *A Body Broken for a Broken People: Eucharist in the New Testament*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997.
- Moo, Douglas J. *Galatians*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013.
- Morris, Leon. *1 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*. TNTC 7. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1985.

- Moss, Candida R. *The Other Christs: Imitating Jesus in Ancient Christian Ideologies of Martyrdom*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Murphy, Frederick J. "The Jewishness of Matthew: Another Look," 377–403. In: A.J. Avery-Peck, D. Harrington and J. Neusner, eds. *When Judaism and Christianity Began: Essays in Memory of Anthony J. Saldarini*. Vol. 1. Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2004.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. *Keys to First Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- . *Paul: A Critical Life*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- . *Paul: His Story*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- . *Paul the Letter-Writer: His World, His Options, His Skills*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1995.
- . *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology*. GNS 6. Wilmington: Glazier, 1983.
- Myllykoski, Matti. "Without Decree: Pagan Sacrificial Meat and the Early History of the Didache," 429–453. In: Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, eds. *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*. ECL 14. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015.
- Neusner, Jacob. *A History of Jews in Babylonia*. Vol. 1. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965.
- Niederwimmer, Kurt. "Der Didachist und seine Quellen," 15–36. In: Clayton N. Jefford, ed. *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission*. NovTSup 77. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.
- . "Textprobleme der *Didache*." WS 16 (1982): 114–130.
- . *Die Didache*. KAV 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.
- . *The Didache: A Commentary*. Trans., Linda M. Maloney. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.
- Nock, A.D. "Liturgical Notes." *JTS* 30 (1929): 381–395.
- Nolland, John. *Luke 1:1-9:20*. WBC 35A. Dallas: Word, 2002.
- . *Luke 18:35-24:53*. WBC 35C. Dallas: Word, 2002.
- . *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2005.
- Novak, Ralph Martin. *Christianity and the Roman Empire: Background Texts*. London/New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2001.
- O'Loughlin, Thomas. "The Didache as a Source for Picturing the Earliest Christian Communities: The Case of the Practice of Fasting," 83–112. In: Kieran J. O'Mahony, ed. *Christian Origins: Worship, Belief and Society*. JSNTSup 241. New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.
- . *The Didache: A Window on the Earliest Christians*. London: SPCK, 2010.
- Oliver, Isaac W. *Torah Praxis after 70 CE: Reading Matthew and Luke-Acts as Jewish Texts*. WUNT II/355. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

- Orlett, Raymond. "The Breaking of Bread in Acts." *TBT* 1 (1962): 108–113.
- Orr, William F. and James Arthur Walther. *I Corinthians: A New Translation, Introduction, With a Study of the Life of Paul, Notes, and Commentary*. AB 32. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Osborne, Grant R. *Matthew*. ZECNT. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010.
- Osborne, R.E. "The Provenance of Matthew's Gospel." *SR* 3 (1973): 220–235.
- Overman, J.A. *Church and Community in Crisis: The Gospel According to Matthew*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1996.
- . *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.
- Pardee, Nancy. *The Genre and Development of the Didache*. WUNT II/339. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- . "Visualizing the Christian Community at Antioch." *FF* 3/1 (2014): 69–90.
- Patsch, H. *Abendmahl und historischer Jesus*. CThM A1. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1972.
- Paulsen, Henning. *Studien zur Theologie des Ignatius von Antiochien*. FKD 29. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.
- Pennington, Jonathan T. "The Lord's Supper in the Fourfold Witness of the Gospels," 31–67. In: Thomas R. Schreiner and Matthew R. Crawford, eds. *The Lord's Supper: Remembering and Proclaiming Christ until He Comes*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Academic, 2010.
- . *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew*. NovTSup 126. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2007.
- Peppard, Michael. *The World's Oldest Church: Bible, Art, and Ritual at Dura-Europos, Syria*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016.
- Percy, Ernst. *Die Probleme der Kolosser – und Epheserbriefe*. SHVL 39. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1946.
- Perkins, PHEME. *First Corinthians*. Paideia. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Pervo, Richard I. *Acts: A Commentary on the Book of Acts*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009.
- Pesch, R. *Das Abendmahl und Jesu Todesverständnis*. QD 80. Freiburg: Herder, 1978.
- Peterson, Erik. "Über einige Probleme der Didache-Überlieferung." *RivAC* 27 (1951): 37–68.
- . *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis: Studien und Untersuchungen*. Freiburg/Vienna: Herder, 1959.
- Pitre, Brant. *Jesus and the Last Supper*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2015.
- Plümacher, E. *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller*. SUNT 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.
- Pohjala, Pasi K. *Similarities of Redaction of the Gospel according to Matthew, with texts of Philo Alexandrinus*. Liskeard: Exposure/Diggory Press, 2006.
- Polhill, John B. *Acts*. NAC 26. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2001.

- . *Paul and His Letters*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999.
- Probst, Hermann. *Paulus und der Brief: Die Rhetorik des Antiken Briefes als Form des Paulinischen Korintherkorrespondenz (1 Kor 8–10)*. WUNT II/45. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991.
- Quasten, Johannes, ed. “Euchologium Serapionis XIII,13,” 48–68. In: *Monumenta Eucharistica et Liturgica Vetustissima*. Bonn: Hanstein, 1935.
- . *Patrology*. 3 vols. Utrecht/Antwerp: Spectrum, 1975.
- Rau, Eckhard. *Von Jesus zu Paulus: Entwicklung und Rezeption der antiochenischen Theologie im Urchristentum*. Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln: W. Kohlhammer, 1994.
- Reicke, B. “Der geschichtliche Hintergrund des Apostelkonzils und der Antiocheia-Episode,” 172–187. In: J.N. Sevenster and W.C. van Unnik, eds. *Studia Paulina in honorem J. de Zwaan*. Haarlem: Erven F. Bohn, 1953.
- Richards, J.R. “Romans and I Corinthians: Their Chronological Relationship and Comparative Dates.” *NTS* 13 (1966–67): 14–30.
- Richardson, Cyril C. “The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, Commonly Called the *Didache*,” 159–179. In: *The Early Christian Fathers*. LCC 1. New York: Macmillan, 1970.
- . “The Church in Ignatius of Antioch.” *JR* 17/4 (1937): 428–443.
- Richardson, R.D. “Eastern and Western Liturgies: The Primitive Basis of Their Later Differences. A Note for the Study of Eucharistic Origins.” *HTR* 42/2 (1949): 125–148.
- Ridderbos, Hermann N. *Matthew*. BSC. Grand Rapids: Regency/Zondervan, 1987.
- Riesner, Rainer. *Paul’s Early Period: Chronology, Mission Strategy, Theology*. Trans., Doug Stott. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: W.B. Eerdmans, 1998.
- Riggs, J.W. “From Gracious Table to Sacramental Elements: The Tradition-History of *Didache* 9 and 10.” *SecCent* 4/2 (1984): 83–102.
- Rist, John M. *On the Independence of Matthew and Mark*. SNTSMS 32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Rius-Camps, J. *The Four Authentic Letters of Ignatius*. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1980.
- Robertson, Archibald and Alfred Plummer. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*. ICC. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1911.
- Robinson, James M. and Helmut Koester. *Trajectories through Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
- Robinson, J.A.T. “Traces of a Liturgical Sequence in 1 Cor. 16.20–24.” *JTS* 4 (1953): 38–41.
- . *Redating the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976.
- Robinson, Thomas A. *Ignatius of Antioch and the Parting of the Ways: Early Jewish-Christian Relations*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009.

- . *The Bauer Thesis Examined: The Geography of Heresy in the Early Christian Church*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1988.
- Ropes, J.H. *The Synoptic Gospels*. London: Oxford University Press, 1960.
- Rordorf, Willy. "Baptism According to the Didache," 212–222. In: Jonathan A. Draper, ed. *The Didache in Modern Research*. AGJU 37. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996.
- . "Does the *Didache* Contain Jesus Tradition Independently of the Synoptic Gospels?," 394–423. In: Henry Wansbrough, ed. *Jesus and the Oral Synoptic Tradition*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- . "The Didache," 1–23. In: Willy Rordorf et al. *The Eucharist of the Early Christians*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990.
- . "The Lord's Prayer in the Light of Its Liturgical Use in the Early Church." *SL* 14 (1980–81): 1–19.
- . *Sunday: The History of the Day of Rest and Worship in the Earliest Centuries of the Christian Church*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968.
- Rordorf, Willy and André Tuilier. *La Doctrine des douze apôtres (Didachè)*. SC 248. Paris: Cerf, 1998.
- Rordorf, Willy et al. *The Eucharist of the Early Christians*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990.
- Rothschild, Clare K. *Luke–Acts and the Rhetoric of History*. WUNT II/175. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Rouwhorst, Gerard. "Didache 9–10: A Litmus Test for the Research on Early Christian Liturgy Eucharist," 143–156. In: Huub van de Sandt, ed. *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- . "The Roots of the Early Christian Eucharist: Jewish Blessings or Hellenistic Symposia?," 295–308. In: Albert Gerhards and Clemens Leonhard, eds. *Jewish and Christian Liturgy and Worship: New Insights into its History and Interaction*. JCP 15. Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2007.
- Saldarini, A.J. *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*. Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- . *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society: A Sociological Approach*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2001.
- Sand, A. *Das Matthäusevangelium*. EF 275. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1991.
- Sanders, E.P. *Paul: The Apostle's Life, Letters, and Thought*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015.
- Sanders, J.T. "Jewish Christianity in Antioch before the time of Hadrian: Where does the Identity Lie?," 346–361. In: E.H. Lovering, ed. *Society of Biblical Literature 1992 Seminar Papers*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Sandmel, Samuel. "Parallelomania." *JBL* 81/1 (1962): 1–13.
- Schaff, Philip. *The Oldest Church Manual, Called the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1885.

- Schaff, Philip, ed. *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Vol. 2/1–4. Oak Harbor: Logos, 1997.
- Schlatter, Adolf. *Der Evangelist Matthäus: Seine Sprache, sein Ziel, seine Selbständigkeit*. 6th ed. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1963.
- Schlatter, Frederic W. “The Restoration of Peace in Ignatius’ Antioch.” *JTS* 35 (1984): 465–469.
- Schlier, Heinrich. *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatiusbriefen*. BZNW 8. Gießen: Töpelmann, 1929.
- Schnabel, Eckhard J. *Early Christian Mission*. 2 vols. London: Apollos, 2004.
- Schnelle, Udo. *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.
- Schoedel, William R. “Polycarp of Smyrna and Ignatius of Antioch.” *ANRW II* 27/1 (1993): 272–358.
- . *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
- Schöllgen, Georg. “Die Ignatianen als pseudepigraphisches Briefcorpus: Anmerkung zu den Thesen von Reinhard M. Hübner.” *ZAC* 2 (1998): 16–25.
- . “Die *Didache* — ein frühes Zeugnis für Landgemeinden?.” *ZNW* 76 (1985): 140–143.
- . “Die *Didache* als Kirchenordnung: Zur Frage des Abfassungszweckes und seinen Konsequenzen für die Interpretation.” *JAC* 29 (1986): 5–26.
- . “The *Didache* as a Church Order: An Examination of the Purpose for the Composition of the *Didache* and Its Consequences for Its Interpretation,” 43–71. In: Jonathan A. Draper, ed. *The Didache in Modern Research*. AGJU 37. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996.
- Schöllgen, Georg and Wilhelm Geerlings. *Didache: Zwölf-Apostel-Lehre. Traditio Apostolica: Apostolische Überlieferung*. Freiburg: Herder, 2000.
- Schrage, Wolfgang. *Der Erste Brief an die Korinther*. EKK VII/1–3. Zürich: Benziger, 1991–1999.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *Galatians*. ZECNT. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010.
- . *New Testament Theology: Magnifying God in Christ*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.
- Schroeter, Jens. “Die Funktion der Herrenmahlsüberlieferungen im 1. Korintherbrief: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Rolle der ‘Einsetzungsworte’ in frühchristlichen Mahltexten.” *ZNW* 100/1 (2009): 78–100.
- Schürmann, Heinz. *Einer quellenkritischen Untersuchung des lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes, Lk 22,7–38*, vol. 2: *Der Einsetzungsbericht, Lk 22,19–20*. NA 20/4. Münster: Aschendorff, 1955.
- Schwartz, Seth. “Political, Social and Economic Life in the Land of Israel, 66–c. 235,” 23–52. In: Steven T. Katz, ed. *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, vol. 4: *The Late Roman-Rabbinic Period*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Schweizer, Eduard. *Matthäus und seine Gemeinde*. SBS 71. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1974.
- . *The Good News According to Matthew*. Trans., David E. Green. Atlanta: John Knox, 1975.
- Schwiebert, Jonathan. *Knowledge and the Coming Kingdom: The Didache’s Meal Ritual and its Place in Early Christianity*. LNTS 373. London: T&T Clark, 2008.

- Segal, Alan F. *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Senior, D. *The Gospel of Matthew*. IBT. Nashville: Abingdon, 1997.
- . *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990.
- Shanks, Monte A. *Papias and the New Testament*. Eugene: Pickwick, 2013.
- Shantz, Colleen. *Paul in Ecstasy: The Neurobiology of the Apostle's Life and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Sibinga, J. Smit. "Ignatius and Matthew." *NovT* 8/2.4 (1966): 263–283.
- Sim, David C. "How Many Jews Became Christians in the First Century? The Failure of the Christian Mission to the Jews." *HTS* 61 (2005): 417–440.
- . "The Rise and Fall of the Gospel of Matthew." *ExpT* 120/10 (2009): 478–485.
- . *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism: The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Community*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Simon, Marcel. "De l'observance rituel à l'asceticism: Recherches sur le décret Apostolique." *RHR* 193 (1978): 27–104.
- . "The Apostolic Decree and its Setting in the Ancient Church." *BJRL* 52 (1969–70): 437–460.
- Simon, Marcel and André Benoît. *Le Judaïsme et le Christianisme antique d'Antiochus Epiphane à Constantin*. Nouvelle Clío 10. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1968.
- Slee, Michelle. *The Church in Antioch in the First Century C.E.: Communion and Conflict*. JSNTSup 244. London/New York: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Slingerland, H.D. "The Transjordanian Origin of Matthew's Gospel." *JSNT* 3 (1979): 18–28.
- Slusser, Michael, ed. *St. Justin Martyr: Dialogue with Trypho*. SFC 3. Trans., Thomas B. Falls. Washington: Catholic University of America, 2003.
- Smith, Dennis E. *From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early Christian World*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- Soards, Marion L. *1 Corinthians*. NIBC. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999.
- Srawley, J.H. *The Epistles of St. Ignatius*. London: SPCK, 1900.
- Stanton, G.N. "The Communities of Matthew." *Int* 46 (1992): 371–391.
- . "The Early Church in Antioch: Review." *ExpT* 116/9 (2005): 294.
- . "The Origin and Purpose of Matthew's Gospel: Matthean Scholarship from 1945-1980." *ANRW* II.25.3 (1985): 1889–1951.
- . *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching*. SNTSMS 27. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Stark, Rodney. *The Rise of Christianity: How the Obscure, Marginal Jesus Movement Became the Dominant Religious Force in the Western World in a Few Centuries*. San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1997.
- Stein, Robert H. *Luke*. NAC 24. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2001.

- Stendahl, Krister. *The School of St. Matthew*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.
- . *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles and Other Essays*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.
- Stoops, R.F. "If I Suffer... Epistolary Authority in Ignatius of Antioch." *HTR* 80/2 (1987): 161–178.
- Stott, John R.W. *The Cross of Christ*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1986.
- Strack, H.L. and P. Billerbeck. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. 6 vols. München: Beck, 1922–1961.
- Streeter, B.H. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*. London: Macmillan, 1930.
- . *The Primitive Church: Studied with Special Reference to the Origins of the Christian Ministry*. New York: Macmillan, 1929.
- Strobel, A. "Lukas der Antiochener (Bemerkungen zu Act 11, 28 D)." *ZNW* 49 (1958): 131–134.
- Sumney, Jerry L. *Colossians: A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008.
- Talbert, Charles H. *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. RNTS. Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2005.
- Taylor, Justin. "Why Were the Disciples First Called 'Christians' at Antioch? (Ac 11, 26)." *RB* 101/1 (1994): 75–94.
- Taylor, N.H. *Paul, Antioch and Jerusalem: A Study in Relationships and Authority in Earliest Christianity*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- Taylor, Vincent. *The Passion Narrative of St Luke: A Critical and Historical Investigation*. SNTSMS 19. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Teicher, J.L. "Ancient Eucharistic Prayers in Hebrew (Dura-Europos Parchment D. Pg. 25)." *JQR* 54/2 (1963): 103–109.
- Telfer, William. "The *Didache* and the Apostolic Synod of Antioch." *JTS* 40 (1939): 133–146.
- Theissen, Gerd. *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992.
- . *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity*. Trans., J.H. Schütz. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2000.
- . *The Living Paul: An Introduction to the Apostle and His Thought*. London: SPCK, 2009.
- Thomson, Ian H. *Chiasmus in the Pauline Letters*. JSNTSup 111. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Tidwell, Neville L. "*Didache* 14:1 (KATA KYPIAKKHN ΔΕ KYPIOY) Revisited." *VC* 53 (1999): 197–207.
- Tomson, Peter J. "The Lord's Prayer (*Didache* 8) at the Faultline of Judaism and Christianity," 165–188. In: Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, eds. *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*. ECL 14. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015.

- Trebilco, Paul. *The Early Christians in Ephesus from Paul to Ignatius*. WUNT II/166. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2004.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. "Synoptic Tradition in the *Didache*," 92–128. In: Jonathan A. Draper, ed. *The Didache in Modern Research*. AGJU 37. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996.
- . "The *Didache* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament," 83–127. In: Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett, eds. *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- . "Form Criticism," 21–38. In: W.H. Kelber and S. Byrskog, eds. *Jesus in Memory: Traditions in Oral and Scribal Perspectives*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009.
- Tuilier, André. "La Didachè et le problème synoptique," 110–130. In: Clayton N. Jefford, ed. *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission*. NovTSup 77. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.
- Turner, David L. *Matthew*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.
- Turner, Henry E.W. *The Pattern of Christian Truth: A Study in the Relations between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church*. London: A.R. Mowbray, 1954.
- Van de Sand, Huub. "'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." *VC* 56/3 (2002): 223–246.
- . "Baptism and Holiness: Two Requirements Authorizing Participation in the *Didache*'s Eucharist," 139–164. In: Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, eds. *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*. ECL 14. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015.
- . "Matthew and the *Didache*," 123–138. In: D.C. Sim and B. Repschinski, eds. *Matthew and His Christian Contemporaries*. London/New York: T&T Clark International, 2008.
- . "Was the *Didache* Community a Group Within Judaism? An Assessment on the Basis of its Eucharistic Prayers," 85–107. In: Marcel Poorthuis and Joshua Schwartz, eds. *A Holy People: Jewish and Christian Perspectives on Religious Communal Identity*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2006.
- . "Why does the *Didache* Conceive of the Eucharist as a Holy Meal?." *VC* 65 (2011): 1–20.
- Van de Sandt, Huub, ed. *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- Van de Sand, Huub and David Flusser. *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity*. CRINT 3/5. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2002.
- Van de Sandt, Huub and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, eds. *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- Van Tilborg, S. *The Jewish Leaders in Matthew*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972.

- Varkey, Mothy. *Salvation in Continuity: Reconsidering Matthew's Soteriology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2017.
- Varner, William. "The Didache's Use of the Old and New Testaments." *TMSJ* 16/1 (2005):127–151.
- . *The Way of the Didache: The First Christian Handbook*. Lanham: University Press of America, 2007.
- Vermes, Geza. *Christian Beginnings: From Nazareth to Nicaea*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2013.
- Vielhauer, Philipp. *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur: Einleitung in das Neue Testament, die Apokryphen und die apostolischen Väter*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1975.
- Vine, C.E.W. *The Audience of Matthew: An Appraisal of the Local Audience Thesis*. LNTS 496. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.
- Vinzent, M. "'Ich bin kein körperliches Geistwesen.' Zum Verhältnis von Greek a, 'Doctrina Petri', Greek b und IgnSm 3," 241–286. In: R. Hübner, *Der Paradox Eine: Antignostischer Monarchianismus im zweiten Jahrhundert*. VCSup 50. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1999.
- Viviano, B.T. "Where was the Gospel According to Matthew Written?." *CBQ* 41/4 (1979): 533–546.
- Vokes, F.E. *The Riddle of the Didache: Fact or Fiction, Heresy or Catholicism?*. CHS 32. London: SPCK, 1938.
- Völker, Karl. *Mysterium und Agape: Die gemeinsamen Mahlzeiten in der Alten Kirche*. Gotha: Klotz, 1927.
- Von Harnack, Adolf. *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*, vol. 1/2: *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1904.
- . *Die Zeit des Ignatius*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1878.
- . *Lehre der zwölf Apostel nebst Untersuchungen zur ältesten Geschichte der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts*. TU 2/1–2. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1884.
- . *Luke the Physician: The Author of the Third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles*. Trans., J.R. Wilkinson. London: Williams and Norgate, 1908.
- Vööbus, Arthur. "Regarding the Background of the Liturgical Traditions in the Didache: The Question of Literary Relation between Didache IX,4 and the Fourth Gospel." *VC* 23/2 (1969): 81–87.
- . *Liturgical Traditions in the Didache*. ETSE 16. Stockholm: ETSE, 1968.
- Walker, Joan Hazelden. "Reflections on a New Edition of the Didache." *VC* 35/1 (1981): 35–42.
- Wallace-Hadrill, D.S. *Christian Antioch: A Study of Early Christian Thought in the East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Weitzmann, Kurtz and Herbert L. Kessler. *The Frescoes of the Dura Synagogue and Christian Art*. Dumbarton Oaks Studies 28. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1990.
- Wengst, Klaus. *Didache (Apostellehre), Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Klemensbrief, Schrift an Diognet*. SUC 2. München: Kösel, 1984.

- Wenham, John W. "Gospel Origins." *TrinJ* 7 (1978): 112–134.
- , "The Identification of Luke." *EvQ* 63 (1991): 3–44.
- Werblowsky, R.J. *The Meaning of Jerusalem to Jews, Christians and Muslims*. Jerusalem: Israeli Universities Study Group for Middle Eastern Affairs, 1983.
- Westcott, B.F. and J.F.A. Hort. *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1881.
- Whitley, W.T. "Luke of Antioch in Pisidia." *ExpT* 21 (1909–10): 164–166.
- Wilckens, Ulrich. "Der Ursprung der Überlieferung der Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen," 56–95. In: Wilfried Joest and Wolfhart Pannenberg, eds. *Dogma und Denkstrukturen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963.
- Wilken, Robert L. "Diversity and Unity in Early Christianity." *SecCent* 1 (1981): 101–110.
- , *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late Fourth Century*. TCH 4. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- Wilkins, M. *The Concept of Disciple in Matthew's Gospel*. NovTSup 59. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1988.
- Wills, L.M. "Scribal Methods in Matthew and *Mishnah Abot*." *CBQ* 63 (2001): 241–257.
- Wilson, Stephen B. "The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari," 19–38. In: Paul F. Bradshaw, ed. *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1997.
- Winter, Bruce W. "Secular and Christian Responses to Corinthian Famines." *TynBul* 40 (1989): 88–106.
- , "The Lord's Supper at Corinth: An Alternative Reconstruction." *RTR* 37 (1978): 73–82.
- , *After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2001.
- , *Philo and Paul Among the Sophists*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2002.
- Wischmeyer, Oda. "Reconstructing the Social and Religious Milieu of James: Methods, Sources, and Possible Results," 33–41. In: Huub van de Sand and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, eds. *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- Witherington III, Ben. *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1995.
- , *Making a Meal of It: Rethinking the Theology of the Lord's Supper*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007.
- , *Matthew*. SHBC 19. Macon: Smith & Helwys, 2006.
- , *Paul's Narrative Thought World: The Tapestry of Tragedy and Triumph*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994.
- , *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1998.

- Witherington III, Ben, ed. *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Wolff, H.W. *Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum*. TVG 233. Gießen: Brunnen-Verlag, 1984.
- Woodhouse, W.J. "Antioch," 184–186. In: T.K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black, eds. *Encyclopaedia Biblica: A Dictionary of the Bible*. Vol. 1. Toronto: George N. Morang & Co, 1899.
- Wright, Brian J. *Communal Reading in the Time of Jesus: A Window into Early Christian Reading Practice*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2017.
- Wright, Tom (N.T.). *Acts for Everyone, Part 1: Chapters 1–12*. London: SPCK, 2008.
- . *Paul for Everyone: 1 Corinthians*. London: SPCK, 2004.
- . *The Meal Jesus Gave Us: Understanding Holy Communion*. London: SPCK, 2014.
- Yancey, Philip. *The Jesus I Never Knew*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995.
- Yarbro Collins, Adela. *Mark: A Commentary on the Gospel of Mark*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
- Ysebaert, Joseph. "The Eucharist as a Love-meal (agape) in *Didache* 9–10, and Its Development in the Pauline and in the Syrian Tradition," 11–27. In: A. Hilhorst, ed. *The Apostolic Age in Patristic Thought*. Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2004.
- . "The So-Called Coptic Ointment Prayer of *Didache* 10.8 Once More." *VC* 56/1 (2002): 1–10.
- Zahn, Theodor. *Ignatius von Antiochien*. Gotha: Perthes, 1873.
- . *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur*. 3 vols. Erlangen: Deichert, 1881–1884.
- Zangenberg, Jürgen K. "Reconstructing the Social and Religious Milieu of the *Didache*: Observations and Possible Results," 43–69. In: Huub van de Sand and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, eds. *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- Zetterholm, Magnus. *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch: A Social-Scientific Approach to the Separation Between Judaism and Christianity*. London/New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Zetterholm, Magnus and Samuel Byrskog, eds. *The Making of Christianity: Conflicts, Contacts, and Constructions*. CBNTS 47. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2012.
- Zumstein, J. "Antioche sur l'Oronte et l'évangile selon Matthieu." *SNTU* A5 (1980): 122–138.