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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 ‘revaluation’ 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’.
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## General abbreviations

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

## Translations of the Bible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESV</td>
<td>English Standard Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>Septuagint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASB</td>
<td>New American Standard Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET</td>
<td>New English Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIV</td>
<td>New International Version</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Books of the Bible

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

### Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Macc.</td>
<td>3 Maccabees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Macc.</td>
<td>4 Maccabees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPet.</td>
<td>Gospel of Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GThom.</td>
<td>Gospel of Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps. Sol.</td>
<td>Psalms of Solomon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir.</td>
<td>Book of Sirach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Apostolic Fathers

**Barn.** Epistle of Barnabas

**Clement, Cor.** Clement of Rome, (First) Letter to the Corinthians

**Did.** Didache (The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles)

**Hermas, Man.** Hermas, Shepherd: Mandates

**Hermas, Sim.** Hermas, Shepherd: Similitudes

**Hermas, Vis.** Hermas, Shepherd: Visions

**Ignatius, Eph.** Ignatius, To the Ephesians

**Ignatius, Magn.** Ignatius, To the Magnesians

**Ignatius, Phild.** Ignatius, To the Philadelphians

**Ignatius, Pol.** Ignatius, To Polycarp

**Ignatius, Rom.** Ignatius, To the Romans

**Ignatius, Smyrn.** Ignatius, To the Smyrnaeans

**Ignatius, Trall.** Ignatius, To the Trallians

**Mart. Pol.** Martyrdom of Polycarp

**Papias, Frag.** Papias, Fragmenta (Fragments)

**Polycarp, Phil.** Polycarp, To the Philippians

Tractates in the Mishnah, Tosefta and Talmud

**b.** Babylonian Talmud

**Ber.** Berakot

`Ed. `Eduyyot

**Ketub.** Ketubbot

**m.** Mishnah

**Pesaḥ.** Pesaḥim

**Šabb.** Šabbat

**t.** Tosefta

**Yad.** Yadayim

Greek and Latin Works

**Ap. Const.** Apostolic Constitutions

**Athanasius, Ep. fest.** Athanasius, Epistulae festales (Festal Letters)

**Cicero, Archia** Cicero, Pro Archia Poeta
Clement, *Protr.*  Clement of Alexandria, *Protreptikos*
Diodorus, *Bibl. hist.*  Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca historica*
Diogenes, *Oen.*  Diogenes, *Oenoeandensis* (fragmenta)
Euripides, *Phoen.*  Euripides, *Phoenissae*
Eusebius, *Chron.*  Eusebius, *Chronicon*
Jerome, *De vir. ill.*  Jerome, *De viris illustribus* (On Illustrious Men)
Justin, *I Apol.*  Justin, *Apologia I* (First Apology)
Justin, *Dial.*  Justin, *Dialogue with Tryphone* (Dialogue with Trypo)
Juvenal, *Sat.*  Juvenal, *Satires*
Origen, *Cels.*  Origen, *Contra Celsum* (Against Celsus)
Philo, *Gen.*  Philo, *Quaestiones et solutions in Genesim* (Questions and Answers on Genesis)
Philo, *Sacr.*  Philo, *De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini* (On the Sacrifices of Abel and Cain)
Philo, *Spec.*  Philo, *De Specialibus legibus* (On the Special Laws)
Plato, *Phileb.*  Plato, *Philebus*
Pliny, *Nat. hist.*  Pliny (the Elder), *Naturalis historia* (Natural History)
Pliny, *Ep.*  Pliny (the Younger), *Epistulae* (Letters)
Plutarch, *Is. et Os.*  Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride* (On Isis and Osiris)
Ps.-Athanasius, *De virg.*  Pseudo-Athanasius, *De virginitate* (On virginity)
Seneca, *De prov.*  Seneca (the Younger), *De providentia* (On providence)
Serapion, *Euch.*  Serapion of Thmuis, *Euchologion*
Strabo, *Geogr.*  Strabo, *Geographica* (Geography)
Theodoret, *Dial. Immutab.*  Theodoret, *Dialogue I: The Immutable*
Xenophon, *Mem.*  Xenophon, *Memorabilia*
## Periodicals, Reference Works and Serials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Anchor Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABG</td>
<td>Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABRL</td>
<td>Anchor Bible Reference Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Antike und Christentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Alcuin Club Collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGJU</td>
<td>Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnBib</td>
<td>Analecta Biblica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANRW</td>
<td>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTC</td>
<td>Abingdon New Testament Commentaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AThANT</td>
<td>Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATR</td>
<td>Anglican Theological Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>Die Apostolischen Väter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYBC</td>
<td>Anchor Yale Bible Commentaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZK</td>
<td>Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Biblical Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BECNT</td>
<td>Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETL</td>
<td>Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHGNT</td>
<td>Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJRL</td>
<td>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNTC</td>
<td>Black’s New Testament Commentaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Biblical Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSC</td>
<td>Bible Student’s Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>Bibliothèque Théologique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTS</td>
<td>Biblical Tools and Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZNW</td>
<td>Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBQ</td>
<td>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANE</td>
<td>Culture and History of the Ancient Near East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>Church Historical Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRINT</td>
<td>Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CThM</td>
<td>Calwer theologische Monographien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drev</td>
<td>Downside Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBC</td>
<td>Expositor’s Bible Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECL</td>
<td>Early Christianity and its Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>Erträge der Forschung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EKK</td>
<td>Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EvQ</td>
<td>Evangelical Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExpT</td>
<td>Expository Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBC</td>
<td>Focus on the Bible Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>Foundations and Facets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FKD</td>
<td>Forschungen zur Kirchen-und Dogmengeschichte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FThSt</td>
<td>Freiburger Theologische Studien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNS</td>
<td>Good News Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>Gospel Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNT</td>
<td>Handbuch zum Neuen Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTR</td>
<td>Harvard Theological Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTS</td>
<td>Hervormde Teologiese Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBT</td>
<td>Interpreting Biblical Texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>International Critical Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAC</td>
<td><em>Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBL</td>
<td>Journal of Biblical Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCP</td>
<td>Jewish and Christian Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JECS</td>
<td>Journal of Early Christian Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JETS</td>
<td>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNES</td>
<td>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPEC</td>
<td>Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics, Economics and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JQR</td>
<td>Jewish Quarterly Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR</td>
<td>Journal of Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSNT</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSNTSup</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTS</td>
<td>Journal of Theological Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAV</td>
<td>Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vatern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>Library of Christian Classics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCL</td>
<td>Loeb Classical Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNTS</td>
<td>Library of New Testament Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAC</td>
<td>New American Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBC</td>
<td>New Cambridge Bible Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neot</td>
<td>Neotestamentica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGS</td>
<td>New Gospel Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICNT</td>
<td>New International Commentary on the New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGTC</td>
<td>New International Greek Testament Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIVAC</td>
<td>NIV Application Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NovT</td>
<td>Novum Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NovTSup</td>
<td>Supplements to Novum Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTD</td>
<td>Neue Testament Deutsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTL</td>
<td>New Testament Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTR</td>
<td>New Testament Readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTS</td>
<td>New Testament Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>New Testament Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTTS</td>
<td>New Testament Tools and Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>Pauline Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBM</td>
<td>Paternoster Biblical Monographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNTC</td>
<td>Pillar New Testament Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>Perspectives in Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSB</td>
<td>Părinți și Scriitori Bisericești</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD</td>
<td>Quaestiones disputatae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Revue biblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RestQ</td>
<td>Restoration Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHR</td>
<td>Revue de l’histoire des religions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RivAC</td>
<td>Rivista di archeologica Cristiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNTS</td>
<td>Reading the New Testament Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSR</td>
<td>Recherches de science religieuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTR</td>
<td>Reformed Theological Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>Studien zur außereuropäischen Christentumsgeschichte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SacPag</td>
<td>Sacra Pagina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBL</td>
<td>Society of Biblical Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBLLMS</td>
<td>Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>Stuttgarter Bibelstudien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>Studies in Biblical Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULB</td>
<td>Université libre de Bruxelles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTB</td>
<td>Uni-Taschenbücher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC</td>
<td><em>Vigiliae Christianae</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCSup</td>
<td>Supplements to <em>Vigiliae Christianae</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBC</td>
<td>Word Biblical Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGRWS</td>
<td>Writings from the Greco-Roman World Supplements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS</td>
<td><em>Wiener Studien</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUNT</td>
<td>Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC</td>
<td><em>Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZECNT</td>
<td>Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZKG</td>
<td><em>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZNW</td>
<td><em>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZSNT</td>
<td>Zacchaeus Studies: New Testament Series</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Antioch, the cradle of earliest Christianity¹

Antioch on the Orontes (Ἀντίόχεια ἡ ἐπὶ Ὄροντου) 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).
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.
⁶ Slee, Church in Antioch, 1.
⁷ Slee, Church in Antioch, 1.
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.\textsuperscript{10} As J.P. Meier notices, ‘Antioch was the first important urban center of the Christian movement outside Jerusalem’ (cf. Acts 11.19–21).\textsuperscript{11} According to Acts 11.26, it was at Antioch that the followers of Jesus were first called Χριστιανοί (‘Christians’).\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{13} For these reasons, certain scholars designated the city of Antioch ‘the cradle of Christianity’\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{15} As Meier concludes his research about the first century of Christianity at Antioch (ca. 40–140 CE),\textsuperscript{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’;\textsuperscript{17} Peter, Matthew,
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.\textsuperscript{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’ (\textit{via media}) that facilitated the ‘Christian unity’ of the ‘universal church’, as it offered a way of keeping together the divergent groups.\textsuperscript{19} This view has largely been accepted by subsequent scholarship, becoming a widespread consensus.\textsuperscript{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 (\textit{ca.} 35–130 CE).\textsuperscript{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, \textit{Did.} 9.1–10.6, and Ignatius, \textit{Phld.} 4.1.

\textsuperscript{18} Meier, “Antioch,” 85.

\textsuperscript{19} Meier, “Antioch,” 85–86.


\textsuperscript{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,” \textit{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 (\textit{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. 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 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, 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, while C.H. Kraeling suggests 45,000 out of a total of 300,000–400,000 inhabitants. In Antioch, therefore, Christianity evolved alongside Judaism—in its various forms. Moreover, as David Sim estimates, not many Jews of Antioch adhered to the emerging Christianity. Rather, there was a growing ‘partition’ since the beginnings of Antiochene Christianity, 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’. Moreover, the separation caused, at times, tensions and
‘conflicts’\textsuperscript{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’.\textsuperscript{33} Their historical analysis is limited to ‘the first interactions between Jews and Christians there’;\textsuperscript{34} or to ‘Christian-Jewish relations’.\textsuperscript{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 (\textit{Magn.} 8.1–2; 10.3; \textit{Phld.} 6.1; 8.2).\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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:\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{39}


\textsuperscript{34} Meeks-Wilken, \textit{Jews and Christians}, 13.

\textsuperscript{35} Meeks-Wilken, \textit{Jews and Christians}, 19.

\textsuperscript{36} Meeks-Wilken, \textit{Jews and Christians}, 13–21.

\textsuperscript{37} Meeks-Wilken, \textit{Jews and Christians}, 18.

\textsuperscript{38} Meeks-Wilken, \textit{Jews and Christians}, 18.

\textsuperscript{39} Meeks-Wilken, \textit{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). However, this exacerbated separation should not be interpreted as a ‘decisive break’. If such a separation did take place around 70, it certainly did not mean the once-for-all isolation of the Judaic-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.

Throughout their study, Meeks-Wilken mention only one ‘liturgical’ 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’. ‘… his holy and faithful ones, whether among Jews or Gentiles, in the one body of his church’ (see Gal. 3.27–28). Although this could be fundamental for the church of Antioch in the early second century (ca. 100–130 CE), 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).

---

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.  
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. Consequently, for a more elaborate reconstruction of the early church of Antioch, he adds the Gospel of Matthew (ca. 80–90 CE), for it offers ‘reliable information about the period in-between’. 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.

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’. Therefore, he sees the church of Antioch as the place in which ‘divergent theological traditions’ came together and were ‘balanced’ and harmonized (‘synthesized’). It was also the place in which divergent Christian groups learned to cohabit, despite their differences. To prove these points, he focuses on Peter (representing the first generation), Matthew (second generation), and Ignatius (third generation). Following B.H. Streeter and B. Holmberg, 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.’

---

49 Meier’s arguments for the Antiochene provenance of Matthew are listed in “Antioch,” 15–27.
52 Meier, “Antioch,” 85.
53 Meier, “Antioch,” 57, 86.
55 Streeter, Four Gospels, 504, 511–16.
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,

---

⁶⁴ Meier, “Antioch,” 74.
⁶⁷ Meier, “Antioch,” 79.
Ignatius’ theology] relies… on a strategy of inclusiveness. 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…

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. 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’. Moreover, although there was only one Antiochene church, he admits that, even since the time of Paul and Peter, the divergent groups of Antioch held the Eucharists separately. 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. 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’. Moreover, she considers her addition of the Didache a ‘relatively unprecedented step’. In her own words, Slee aims to ‘examine the problem of Gentile entry into the church in

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.
72 Meier, “Antioch,” 40, 80.
73 Meier, “Antioch,” 40, 80.
74 Meier, “Antioch,” 80.
76 Slee, Church in Antioch, 3.
Antioch during the period 50–100 CE and the related issue of Jewish–Gentile tablefellowship’.\textsuperscript{77} So, adding the \textit{Didache} to the existing list of ‘primary resources’, the ‘key texts’ Slee examines are ‘Acts 15, Gal. 2.1-14, the \textit{Didache}, and the Gospel of Matthew’.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{80} Also, the placing of Matthew’s Gospel after the \textit{Didache} has not gained wide acceptance among NT scholars.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{82} At the same time, she does not connect Paul’s eucharistic form (1 Cor. 11.23–

\textsuperscript{77} Slee, \textit{Church in Antioch}, 1.
\textsuperscript{78} Slee, \textit{Church in Antioch}, 1.
\textsuperscript{79} Slee, \textit{Church in Antioch}, 1.
\textsuperscript{80} Slee, \textit{Church in Antioch}, 118–55.
26) to the church of Antioch, a view with a much larger acceptance.\textsuperscript{83} The only section in which a eucharistic text receives adequate attention is the section on the \textit{Didache}.\textsuperscript{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’.

\textit{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,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{86} Moreover, with every new study, there is a new primary source that is added, i.e., Matthew (1983) and the \textit{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 (\textit{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


\textsuperscript{84} Slee, \textit{Church in Antioch}, 94–100.

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

\textsuperscript{86} Meier, “Antioch,” 22 (n. 51); Slee, \textit{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


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’.\(^1\) Instead, earliest Christianity was characterized by a generalized diversity from its very beginnings, so that there was no ‘orthodoxy’ nor ‘heresy’, Bauer argued.\(^2\) There were no theological, confessional, or traditional streams that could be traced back to Jesus and the apostles.\(^3\) In other words, it was a view in which ‘heresy preceded orthodoxy’ or ‘diversity preceded unity’.\(^4\)

(2) Bauer’s seminal work has gained remarkable acceptance among scholars.\(^5\) J.M. Robinson and H. Koester (1971),\(^6\) 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’.\(^7\) 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.\(^8\)


\(^{93}\) Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, xxv.

\(^{94}\) Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, xxii–xxiii.


\(^{97}\) Hurtado, “Interactive Diversity,” 446.

(3) The works of Bauer and Robinson-Koester have the merit of emphasising the ‘diversity’ of earliest Christianity.\footnote{Hurtado, “Interactive Diversity,” 452: ‘Bauer’s 1934 book has been credited with making some scholars more aware of early Christian diversity.’} Virtually all subsequent critics of the ‘Bauer thesis’ admit that ‘there was variety of belief in the first century’,\footnote{I.H. Marshall, “Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earlier Christianity,” Them 2 (1976): 13; Köstenberger-Kruger, Heresy of Orthodoxy, 35.} or that Bauer’s study provided ‘an adequate basis for [the] conclusion […] that early Christianity was diverse’.\footnote{Thomas A. Robinson, The Bauer Thesis Examined: The Geography of Heresy in the Early Christian Church (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1988), 28.} 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’.\footnote{Arland J. Hultgren, The Rise of Normative Christianity (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 22; Köstenberger-Kruger, Heresy of Orthodoxy, 37.} Hultgren agrees that there was diversity in earliest Christianity, but also suggested six major unifying elements: Christology, soteriology, the church as community, etc.\footnote{Hultgren, Normative Christianity, 87–103.} For him, these unifying elements point to the existence of a ‘normative tradition’, that can be attested since the earliest stages of Christianity.\footnote{Hultgren, Normative 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.\footnote{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.} One of the fixed elements was the ‘realistic experience of the Eucharist’.\footnote{Turner, Pattern of Christian Truth, 28–31.} 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.\footnote{Kaufman, “Diverging Trajectories,” 118; Köstenberger-Kruger, Heresy of Orthodoxy, 30.} Consequently,
Robinson-Koester attempted to remedy this shortcoming, and trace the diverse traditions of the second century back to their first-century ‘trajectorial’ streams. However, it was James D.G. Dunn (1977) who applied Bauer’s thesis particularly to the NT, i.e., to ‘earliest Christianity’. Following Bauer’s line, Dunn argued that, in the NT, it is the diversity that prevails. 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. As part of his investigation, Dunn approaches the issue of the Eucharist (‘the Lord’s supper’) in the NT. In his view, the NT shows both the ‘continuity’ and the ‘developments’ of the earliest eucharistic traditions. 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. 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. 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.’ However, in Dunn’s reconstruction, the diversity that
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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.
115 Dunn, Unity and Diversity, 182–83.
116 Dunn, Unity and Diversity, 180 (emphasis original).
is examined is ‘canonical diversity’ and the ‘divergent traditions’ are ‘apostolic traditions’, belonging solely to the NT.

(5) Since the discovery of the Didache (1873), scholars have struggled to place this writing in the larger context of the early Christian diversity. 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. Moreover, the eucharistic elements, which appear in the reversed order cup–bread, are nowhere related to Jesus’ blood or body. In the words of A.B. McGowan, these are ‘texts which present evidence that simply falls outside the paradigm’. To solve the peculiarities, earlier scholars tended to date this tradition later (second/third century CE) or to reject its eucharistic function. Nowadays, however, most scholars admit both the primitive dating of Did. 9–10 (ca. 50–70 CE) and its eucharistic character. 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).

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

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. 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. 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.

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.

(6) For L.W. Hurtado (2013), the diversity of early Christianity is ‘undeniable’. 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’. 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.’ Accordingly, Hurtado proposes an ‘interactive diversity
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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.
132 Hurtado, “Interactive Diversity,” 446.
model’, that ‘more adequately reflects the complex nature of early Christianity’. 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.’ What makes Hurtado’s view particularly interesting for this study is that he distinguishes between the ‘trans-local diversity’ (Acts 8.1–28.31) and ‘intra-church diversity’, as shown in 1 Cor. 11.17–34. However, the latter model is applied solely to Corinth and the participants at the ‘Lord’s Supper’. 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. 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’, 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

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).’
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.’ Moreover, in order to integrate Did. 9–10 into the ‘Q trajectory’, Schwiebert had to reject its Antiochene provenance.

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’. 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. 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
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140 Schwiebert, Knowledge, 98.
141 Schwiebert, Knowledge, 13 (n. 32).
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
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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. Thus, the intention of this study is to further research on the church of Antioch and its eucharistic traditions, by offering several working assumptions.

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), tradition that he has previously ‘passed on’ to the Corinthians, most probably when he founded this church (Acts 18.1–18). This is indicated by the use of the technical verbs of 11.23a, παρέλαβον… δ και 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. 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), 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 δείνον in 1 Cor. 11.20, see Andreas Lindemann, Der Erste Korintherbrief (HNT 9/1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 251. According to Lindemann, κυριακὸν δείνον could be technical, for it has no article.

2 For a chronology of Paul, see § 3.1.2.


Moreover, most scholars date the writing of 1 Corinthians between 54–56 CE. 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. 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 ἔγω 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; 


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). 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.

Indeed, 1 Cor. 11.17–34 was likewise intended as a solution to a particular ‘problem’; 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).
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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.


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).\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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 ἁκοῦσε σχίσματα ἐν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχειν (‘in the first place, I hear that, when you come together as a church, there are divisions among you’).\textsuperscript{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’.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{12} Schreiner, New Testament Theology, 731.
\textsuperscript{13} Dunn, 1 Corinthians, 76.
\textsuperscript{14} Fee, First Epistle to the Corinthians, 266–67.
\textsuperscript{15} Note the distinction between ‘you wrote’ (7.1; cf. 8.1; 11.16; 12.1; 16.1) and ‘I hear’ (11.18).
This striking lack of awareness has led numerous scholars, following the influential works of Günther Bornkamm\textsuperscript{17} and especially Gerd Theissen,\textsuperscript{18} to hypothesize that this ‘behaviour’ has to do with the discriminatory social stratification that the Corinthians kept during their common meal.\textsuperscript{19} By doing so, they mirrored the ‘formalized meals’ of the Greco-Roman society, meals that were marked by boundaries: stratification \emph{versus} equality, exclusion \emph{versus} inclusion, etc.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.

\textbf{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 ἔδινον δείπνων προλαμβάνει ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν) and 11.33 (ὅστε, ἀδέλφοι μου, συνερχόμενοι εἰς τὸ φαγεῖν ἄλληλους ἐκδέχεσθε) in a temporal manner.\textsuperscript{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’).\textsuperscript{23} It also

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{18} Theissen, \textit{Social Setting}, 145–68.
\item \textsuperscript{19} On the influence of Bornkamm and Theissen, see Lindemann, \textit{Der Erste Korintherbrief}, 252.
\item \textsuperscript{21} E.g., Fee, \textit{First Epistle to the Corinthians}, 532–33.
\item \textsuperscript{23} BDAG, 872; Theissen, \textit{Social Setting}, 151.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
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 (συνέρχομαι) 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 συνέρχομαι being ‘one of the key words that holds the argument together’:29 ὁτι οὐκ εἰς τὸ κρείσσον ἀλλὰ εἰς τὸ ἰσόν συνέρχεσθε (v. 17); πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ συνερχόμενον ὑμᾶν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ (v. 18); Συνερχόμενοι εἰς τὸ φαγεῖν ἀλλῆλους 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, I 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, I 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, I 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 Herrenmahlüberlieferungen 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’.
29 Fee, First Epistle to the Corinthians, 536.
be a synonym for ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό (v. 20), 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.’


\(^{36}\) Lampe, “Eucharist,” 39 (emphasis original).
view, it was the simple compliance of the social *status quo.*

If Lampe’s *eranos* proposal is adopted (v. 21: ἔκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἵδιον δεῖπνον προλαμβάνει ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν), then the temporal rendering of προλαμβάνω becomes redundant. If one does not share his/her food (τὸ ἵδιον 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.

Furthermore, it is argued by certain scholars, προλαμβάνω should be translated ‘to eat’, ‘to partake’ or ‘to devour’. Thus, it was an issue of sharing, not of synchronizing. 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.

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. 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).

---

37 See Dunn, *1 Corinthians*, 76.
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 ἔνεστοσαν 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.\(^{49}\)


\(^{46}\) E.g., Dunn, *I Corinthians*, 77; Garland, *I Corinthians*, 533: ‘The Lord’s Supper should accent and intensify group solidarity; the Corinthians’ supper accented and intensified social differences.’

\(^{47}\) Dunn, *I Corinthians*, 77.


(1) However, this widespread agreement has been challenged by Andreas Lindemann.\textsuperscript{50} Lindemann questions Theissen’s social reconstruction,\textsuperscript{51} as the distinction between ‘the rich’ and ‘the poor’ is hardly evident in the text itself (see 11.18–19).\textsuperscript{52} In his opinion, the \textit{οἱ μὴ ἔχοντας} (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.\textsuperscript{53} Furthermore, if social discrimination truly existed, Paul would have addressed the issue explicitly.\textsuperscript{54} His silence on the matter would be inexplicable (cf. 1.26–29), thinks Lindemann.\textsuperscript{55} Consequently, he argues, the Corinthians’ problem was ‘individualism’ (11.21),\textsuperscript{56} since 1 Cor. 11.17–34 concerns the whole community (cf. 11.21, 28),\textsuperscript{57} not only those who were ‘wealthier’.\textsuperscript{58}

(2) Another scholarly \textit{quasi}-consensus\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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

\begin{small}
\textsuperscript{50} Lindemann, \textit{Der Erste Korintherbrief}, 248–61.
\textsuperscript{53} If I understand Lindemann correctly, there seems to be inconsistencies in his interpretation of \textit{προλαμβάνω}. Cf. Lindemann, \textit{Der Erste Korintherbrief}, 251 and 260.
\textsuperscript{54} Lindemann, \textit{Der Erste Korintherbrief}, 253, 260–61.
\textsuperscript{55} Lindemann, \textit{Der Erste Korintherbrief}, esp. 253.
\textsuperscript{56} Lindemann, \textit{Der Erste Korintherbrief}, 253.
\textsuperscript{57} Lindemann, \textit{Der Erste Korintherbrief}, 249, 253. Lindemann refutes H. Probst, \textit{Paulus und der Brief: Die Rhetorik des Antiken Briefes als Form des Paulinischen Korintherkorespondenz} (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.
\textsuperscript{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).
\textsuperscript{59} I call this a \textit{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,” \textit{NTS} 50 (2004): 353 (n. 15).
\end{small}
the *triclinium*, while the large majority, i.e., ‘the poor’, ate while standing in the *atrium.* His reconstruction was immediately assumed by numerous scholars, becoming a largely accepted view. In 2004, however, David Horrell rightly brought into question this assumption, affirming the ‘considerable uncertainty concerning the scenario that Murphy-O’Connor depicts’.

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.

Instead, Horrell puts forward another ‘imaginative context’ and suggests different (hypothetical) places for the meetings of the Corinthian church, namely the upper-storey rooms on the East Theater Street. 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’, 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 σχήματα.

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

---

remain – unable to ascertain any architectural explanation for the Corinthian σχισματα’) 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). 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 (εὐγενής; 1.26), or should be limited to the prosperous ‘middle class’ of merchants, craftsmen, etc. Since there is no strong evidence for the former case (1.26), 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). 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. 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.
of ambiguous status’. In sum, I think Lindemann is correct to reject this too simplistic, rigid, and difficult to prove upper-lower class distinction.

However, I differ from Lindemann’s interpretation of οἱ μὴ ἔχοντας (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 ἔχοντας (11.22b) is a syntactic continuation of the οἶκιας οὐκ ἔχετε (11.22a). Apparently, the ‘have-nots’ had no homes (cf. 11.22, 34). Moreover, the participants were expected to bring τὸ ἵδιον δεῖπνον (‘their own supper’), as 11.21 indicates. Yet the ‘have-nots’ brought no food to the table, so they ‘hungered’ (11.21b). 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’. 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). 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 ἔχοντας) 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).
81 Lindemann, Der Erste Korintherbrief, 253. Cf. Thiselton, First Epistle to the Corinthians, 862.
the food with Peter’s (σχίσματα ἐν ὑμῖν … αἵρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν; cf. 1.10–16; Gal. 2.11–14), although some of their adherents could have shared similar social positions. b) Second, ‘individualism’ makes better sense of the apostle’s depiction of the problem (v. 21): ἐκαστῷς γὰρ τὸ ἕνοικον δείκτων 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): δοκιμαζότω δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτὸν (‘let everyone examine himself’). 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… αἵρέσεις 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).

(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 πείνα, 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.


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.
ἐσθίετε ('if anyone is hungry, he should eat at home').

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. This proposal is consistent with his general view, that 1 Cor. 11.17–34 (v. 34 included) addresses the whole community, 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 ώς ἃν ἔλθω διατάξομαι; 11.34b), Paul considers that the solution he just offered is sufficient (11.34a).

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 (ὁς μὲν πεινᾷ) is not an aftermath of poverty. 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.
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

---

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 οίκῳ ἐσθίετω (‘one should eat at home’). 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 οίκῳ ἐσθίετω 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. 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. 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’.

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’. 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. 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 οἶκος/οίκος (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 (δείπνον), a meal which Paul would have conform to Jesus’ model of self-sacrifice to become a meal that is ‘of the Lord (κυριακὸν δείπνον).’
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 ἔσθιετο 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 ἔσθιετο regulation (11.34a) becomes the hermeneutical lens of the text, its generic and conclusive language (ὡςτε, ἀδέλφοι 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’

---

\(^ {105}\) 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.
\(^ {109}\) Lampe, “Eucharist,” 42.
majority (σχίσματα ἐν ὑμῖν… αἱρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν), rather than the assumed wealthy minority. Consequently, 11.21 (ἔκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἱδιον 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 αἱρέσεις 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 (ἔκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἱδιον 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 κοινονία ἐστίν) in the blood of Christ? The bread that we break (τὸν ἄρτον ὑπὸ κλώμεν), is it not a participation in the body of Christ (οὐχὶ κοινονία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστίν)? Because there is one bread (ὅτι ἕν ἄρτος), we who are many are one body (ἐν σώμα), for we all partake of the one bread (ἐκ τοῦ ἕνος 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. 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). Therefore, for Paul, it was the ‘schismatic’ character of the regular meal (τῶν ἱδιῶν δεῖπνων) 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.
‘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, τοὶς (‘those’) depict the few poor (οἱ μὴ ἔχοντας) 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):

17 But 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. 18 For, 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, 19 for there must be factions among you (ἐν ὑμῖν) in order that those who are genuine among you (ἐν ὑμῖν) may be recognized. 20 When you come together in the same place (συνερχομένων οὖν ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό), it is not the Lord’s Supper that you eat. 21 For in eating, each one goes ahead with his own meal. One goes hungry, another gets drunk. 22 What! 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.
115 Thiselton, First Epistle to the Corinthians, 848.
poverty, 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.’ Moreover, Fiensy’s general appraisal fits the Corinthian context particularly well, as it was the wealthiest city of the Ancient Greek world (Strabo, *Geogr.* 8.6.20). Even the average tradesmen, craftsmen, unskilled labourers and peasants enjoyed ‘relatively high wealth’, as Donald Engels and others have shown. Consequently, I consider that ‘the poor’ (οἱ μὴ ἔχοντας) were a small minority in the church, the large majority could afford to ignore or neglect (cf. 1 Cor. 16.1–2). 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). 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 (προλαμβάνοι). But even the ‘humiliation’ of the lowest few makes the Lord’s Supper

119 Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 1.
122 Both verbs support multiple meanings. See (again) the discussion in Winter, “The Lord’s Supper at Corinth,” 74–78; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 540–41, 554.
impossible (11.20–22). Accordingly, the many are to ‘wait in order to share’ (ἐκδέχομαι)\textsuperscript{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’.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 ἐσθίετω 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 ἐσθίετω 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

\textsuperscript{124} Lampe, “Eucharist,” 42.
\textsuperscript{125} Garland, \textit{1 Corinthians}, 541.
\textsuperscript{126} Schreiner, \textit{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 οίκῳ ἐσθίεσθαι 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). Wolfgang Schrage, for instance, rightly notes that v. 33 forms an inclusio with v. 21: while 11.21 identifies the practical offence, 11.33 provides the practical correction to the offence. Yet similar correspondences are also evident in vv. 22 and 34, as the following set of parallel columns reveals:

Συνερχομένοι οὖν ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ οὐκ ἔστιν κυριακὸν δείπνον φαγεῖν. ἕκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἱδίον δείπνον προλαμβάνει ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν, καὶ δὲ μὲν πεινᾷ... μὴ γὰρ οἰκίας οὐκ ἔχετε εἰς τὸ ἐσθίεσθαι... (11.20–22)

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 form the OT are ‘part of a carefully constructed chiastic structure’: 1 Cor. 1.19; 1.31; 6.16; 9.9–10; 10.7; 10.26; 15.25, 27. Thus, it is peculiar to Paul to quote older and authoritative traditions at the centre of his problem–tradition–solution argument. Moreover, similar yet larger chiastic partitions are suggested by Gordon Fee and

---

128 Schrage, *Der Erste Brief*, 3:56.
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.

---


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.’
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 Perkins and Ciampa-Rosner.

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)

Garland isolates the Lord’s Supper’s tradition (11.23–26) and broadly connects 11.17–22 and 11.27–34. 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). 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.

Therefore, if the lexical correspondences and the internal logic of the argument are considered, I suggest that Paul’s ἐν οἴκῳ ἐσθίεις 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 γάρ 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

---

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.
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 οίκῳ ἐσθένετω 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 οίκῳ ἐσθένετω 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. 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. 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.’ For Hays, Paul restates the tradition ‘to spotlight the death of Jesus as the central meaning of the Supper.’ 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”.

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. 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.” 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. 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. 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). 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’. 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.\textsuperscript{156} Paul’s worldview is integrative, holistic, and profoundly theological, as Ben Witherington III and others have shown.\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{160} Similarly, the ‘individualistic’ reading I propose admits that the behaviour manifested at the Lord’s Supper was a serious matter for Paul,\textsuperscript{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).’\textsuperscript{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 despicable behaviour of the church of God’ (v. 22): τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ θεοῦ καταφρονεῖτε. Also, as Lindemann suggests, the identification of the


\textsuperscript{158} Hays, \textit{First Corinthians}, 179.

\textsuperscript{159} According to Bailey (\textit{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).

\textsuperscript{160} Marshall, \textit{Last Supper and Lord’s Supper}, 111.

\textsuperscript{161} Cf. Lindemann, \textit{Der Erste Korintherbrief}, 252.

\textsuperscript{162} Dunn, \textit{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 ἱδιον 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 ἐσθῶτω 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).\textsuperscript{169} It has primarily to do with Paul’s integrative understanding of what the Lord’s Supper is (11.23–29).\textsuperscript{170} Paul’s evaluation and critique have an overarching conclusion (11.20): what the Corinthians were eating was not the Lord’s Supper (οὐκ ἐστιν 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’).\textsuperscript{171} As James Dunn puts it, ‘Paul cites old tradition as the basis for his understanding of the Supper’.\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{173} How much more, then, is he expected to cite a tradition when such a direct relation exists: οὐκ ἐστιν κυριακὸν δεῖπνον… Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου (11.20, 23).\textsuperscript{174}

Robertson-Plummer connect the subordinating conjunction of 11.23 (γὰρ) with the previous ἐν τῷ τῷ ὧν ἐπικυνήσατε (11.22).\textsuperscript{175} However, this connection is weak and ignores the

\textsuperscript{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.


\textsuperscript{171} L. Morris call this ‘the emphatic “I” (ego)’. See Leon Morris, I Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary (TNCT 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.


\textsuperscript{173} Heil, Rhetorical Role of Scripture, 14–15.

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

\textsuperscript{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 δείπνον (11.20) and Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου (11.23). The concluding οὖν of v. 20 suggests that οὐκ ἔστιν κυριακὸν δείπνον 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 […] δ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν) and should be for all Corinthians (cf. 11.20, 26): ἔστιν κυριακὸν δεῖπνον φαγεῖν… ὅσα καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν). 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.

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, 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. 

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. 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).’ 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. 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. However, was the Lord’s Supper tradition part of Paul’s universal teachings?

1 See § 2.2.2.1 and § 2.2.2.2.
3 See above (§ 2.2.2.2).
6 Raymond F. Collins, First Corinthians (SacPag 7; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999), 201.
(1) According to 1 Cor. 11.23a (ὅ 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 Schreiner\(^9\) 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.

---


\(^10\) 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.’


\(^12\) 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, καθός παρέδοκα ύμιν). But how often should Paul have expected

---

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 παραδόσεις 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 (καθός παρέδοκα ύμιν, τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε) … But in the following instructions (τοῦτο δὲ παραγγέλλων) I do not commend you’. See Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 866.
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). 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). 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. 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. In part, this is so because there is uncertainty about the reliability of Luke’s writings. 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).
section makes substantial use of the book of Acts,\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{30} So, in all

\textsuperscript{25} Contra Douglas A. Campbell, \textit{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 (\textit{Framing Paul}, 20–21) does. Still, there is the anticipation of a second volume that will consider Luke’s writing.


\textsuperscript{29} Riesner, \textit{Paul’s Early Period}, 318–33. See the later discussions (§ 3.2.3).

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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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);\textsuperscript{33} the death of Herod Agrippa I (Acts 12.20–25);\textsuperscript{34} the ‘Antioch incident’ between Paul and Peter (Gal. 2.11–14);\textsuperscript{35} the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15.1–35);\textsuperscript{36} the edict of Claudius, by which the Jews were expelled from Rome (Acts 18.2);\textsuperscript{37} and Paul’s mission to Corinth (Acts 18.18–22), ‘while Gallio was

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{31} Fitzmyer, Luke I-IX, 46.
\item \textsuperscript{32} Cf. Riesner, Paul’s Early Period, 322.
\item \textsuperscript{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.
\item \textsuperscript{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.
\item \textsuperscript{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).
\item \textsuperscript{36} Most scholars date the Jerusalem Council in 48–49 CE. See the lengthier analysis of Bock, Acts, 487–90.
\item \textsuperscript{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.
\end{itemize}
proconsul of Achaia’ (Acts 18.12). 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). Therefore, bringing together the chronological references from Acts, Galatians, and external data provided by other ancient historians, the following time chart is suggested:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years (ca.)</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 39/40 CE    | Josephus (J.W. 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 11.19–21)\(^{43}\)  
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) |
The conversion of Sergius Paulus (ca. 43–44 CE), the proconsul of Cyprus (Acts 13.6–12)\(^{44}\)  
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.  
\(^{41}\) Meier, “Antioch,” 31–33.  
\(^{44}\) 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 Paulus (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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48 CE</td>
<td>Paul visits Jerusalem ‘a second time’ (Gal. 2.1), to bring the financial support from Antioch (cf. Acts 11.29–30)(^{45})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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 ἐνιαυτὸν ὅλον συναχθῆναι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ διδάξαι ὅλον ἱκανόν (‘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

\(^{47}\) 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). The Lukan litotes of Acts 14.28 (χρόνον οὐκ ὀλίγον) 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. On the other hand, the χρόνον τινά of Acts 18.23 probably describes a stay that is significantly shorter. Similarly, Paul’s stay in Antioch, following the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15.35–36), is rendered by Luke in ‘days’: μετὰ δὲ τινάς ἡμέρας (‘after some days’). Unfortunately, these vague references prevent a precise time framing.

Still, considering the broad historical and chronological data above, it is plausible to estimate that Paul spent circa three years in Antioch. 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

---

50 Polhill, Paul and His Letters, 97.
52 Barrett, Acts, 1:693.
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.
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 (ἀφορίζων), for he feared the James-group (2.12): τούς ἐκ περιτομῆς (‘those who belonged to the circumcision’). 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’. 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 ἐθνικὸς καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαῖος ζῇς. 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). Moreover, the imperfect of συνήσθιεν (Gal. 2.12) suggests that Peter acted in this way ‘repeatedly and almost habitually’. 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. Although there is no explicit

59 Schreiner, *Galatians*, 141.
60 Betz, *Galatians*, 111–12.
mention of the Lord’s Supper in Gal. 2.11–14, we should not deny its implicit existence.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 Esler\textsuperscript{66} and Michelle Slee\textsuperscript{67} 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.\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{70}

Esler and Slee’s reconstructions have not won wide acceptance among scholars,\textsuperscript{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’

\textsuperscript{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).
\textsuperscript{65} See the lengthier discussions in chapters 7 and 8.
\textsuperscript{66} Esler, Galatians, 93–140.
\textsuperscript{67} Slee, Church in Antioch, 42–49.
\textsuperscript{68} Esler, Galatians, 98 and passim.
\textsuperscript{69} Esler, Galatians, 106–108, 115 and passim. Also, Simon-Benoît, Judaïsme et Christianisme, 101; Slee, Church in Antioch, 44.
\textsuperscript{70} Slee, Church in Antioch, 46.
about the rightness of the Jews and non-Jews to share the same cup and loaf.\footnote{Slee, \textit{Church in Antioch}, 42–49 (46).} Also, this ‘change of mind’ took place after the council of Acts 15.\footnote{Slee, \textit{Church in Antioch}, 36–49.} 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 (ἐδοξεν ἡμῖν γενομένος ὁμοθυμαδόν), under the guidance of the Holy Spirit (ἐδοξεν γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἄγιῳ καὶ ἡμῖν).\footnote{See Acts 15.22a, 23b, 25, 28. Slee (\textit{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’.} 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.\footnote{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,” \textit{Daedalus} 101 (1972): 61–81 (61). Also, Dennis E. Smith, \textit{From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early Christian World} (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 9.} 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’.\footnote{Contra Slee, \textit{Church in Antioch}, 46.} 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.\footnote{See Douglas J. Moo, \textit{Galatians} (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013), 118.} 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).\footnote{See § 3.1.2 (n. 35).} Still, regarding the historical and chronological issue of whether Galatians was written before or after the Jerusalem council, Douglas Moo correctly
concludes: ‘each of these two options are very finely balanced—far more finely balanced than most interpreters acknowledge’.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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).

\textbf{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 \textit{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

\textsuperscript{79} Moo, \textit{Galatians}, 118.
\textsuperscript{80} A similar view is defended by Meier, “Antioch”, esp. 40–43; Dunn, \textit{Theology of Paul}, 600–601.
\textsuperscript{81} Moo, \textit{Galatians}, 143.
\textsuperscript{82} For such a ‘similarity’, see Dunn, \textit{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).’
\textsuperscript{83} See above (§ 2.2.1.4.1).
\textsuperscript{84} See the lengthier argumentation of Smith, \textit{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. There are, however, certain scholars who prefer this reading. Geza Vermes, for instance, argues for a personal and direct revelation, emphasizing the phrases ‘I’ and ‘from the Lord’. 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Cor. 11.23a</th>
<th>1 Cor. 15.1–3a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν…</td>
<td>1 Γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν, ὃ καὶ παρελάβετε, ἐν ὧ καὶ ἐστίκατε, 2 δὴ ὦ καὶ σῶζεσθε, τίνι λόγῳ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν εἰ κατέχετε, ἕκτος ἢ μὴ εἰκῇ ἐπιστεύσατε. 3 παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις, ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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).  

---

85 See below (n. 97).
In my opinion, the comparison offered by Vermes is inexact, since the Lord’s Supper tradition can be traced back to Jesus himself,⁹⁹ 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 ἀποκάλυπτο, ἀποκάλυψις, φανερόω and μυστήριον.⁹⁴ In contrast, the semi-technical phrasing concerning the ‘receiving from’ and the ‘passing on’ (‘Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον … ὁ 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

⁹⁸ cf. above (§ 2.1).
⁹⁹ 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, Bibli. hist. 12.13.2; Plutarch, Is. et Os. 352c. See above (§ 2.1).
⁹⁰ See (inter alia): Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, 95–96; Wolfgang Schrage, Der Erste Brief an die Korinther (EKK VII/1–3; Zürich: Benziger, 1991–1999), 3:29–31; Thielson, 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. 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 (ὅ καί παρέλαβες) 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 γραφὰς), 4 that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures (κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς); 5 and that he appeared (ὁφθη) to Cephas, and then to the Twelve. 6 After that, he appeared (ὁφθη) 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 (ὁφθη) to James, then to all the apostles, 8 and last of all he appeared to me also (ὁφθη κύμιοι), 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’. 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, 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; Farm: 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 (PNCT; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2010), 548; Jacobi, Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus, 274–90.


99 Morris, 1 Corinthians, 157.
this option rests on the similarities between 1 Cor. 11.23–25 and Lk. 22.19–20, both traditions sharing a common Hellenistic and ‘ritual’ source. 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. Indeed, Paul spent the immediate years following his ‘conversion’ mostly in Damascus, Cilicia, and Antioch (Gal. 1.15–24). 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). 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. 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.
104 Hengel-Schwemer, Paul between Damascus and Antioch, 24–224.
105 Hengel-Schwemer, Paul between Damascus and Antioch, 221.
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,

₁⁰⁸ See above (§ 3.1.1).
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. 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:

**Mk. 14.22–25**

22 Καὶ ἐσθίοντες αὐτὸν λαβὸν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασαν καὶ ἐδώκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν, Λάβετε, τούτῳ ἔστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. 23 καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπεισεν ἐκ αὐτοῦ πάντες. 24 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τούτῳ ἔστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκρυνόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν. 25 ὃ μὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκείστι οὐ μὴ πιοί ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμέλους ἔκεινς ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνῃ καίνυν ἐν τῇ βασίλειᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

**1 Cor. 11.23–25**

23 Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέδωκαν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ο καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, ὅτι ο κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ παρεδόθη ἔλαβεν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ εἶπεν, Τούτῳ μοι ἔστιν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. τούτῳ ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν μνήμην ἀνάμνησιν. 24 ὅσαυτις καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετά τὸ δεσποτήριον λέγων, τούτῳ τὸ ποτήριον ἤ καιν ἡ διαθήκη ἐστίν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ ἀματί. τούτῳ ποιεῖτε, ὅσακείν εἰς πίνητε, εἰς τὴν μνήμην ἀνάμνησιν.

When the two traditions are compared, a few alterations become apparent: a) the removal of the numerous Semitisms found in Mark: καὶ (‘and’); ὃ μὴν λέγω ὑμῖν (‘truly I say to you’); τῇ βασίλειᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ (‘the kingdom of God’); b) the ‘universalization’ of the language, by the removal of the pronoun ‘they’, with reference to Jesus’ disciples; 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 [ὁσάκες] you drink it, in remembrance of me… For as often as [ὁσάκες] 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’).

111 See below (§ 3.2.2.2).
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. 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, Jeremias argues that the tradition cited in 1 Cor. 11.23–25 is an independent, pre-Pauline tradition that goes back to Jesus ‘without interruption’. Paul himself may have altered some wording of the tradition; however, his alterations are minor. 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. 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. For Jeremias, the ‘formulation’ ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς (11.23a) is not narrative, but ‘liturgical’. Also, the verb παραδίδωμι (‘to hand over’) is a possible passivum divinum. 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; 21.

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

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 νυκτί ἦν παραδίδετο (‘the Lord Jesus in the night he was handed over/betrayed’) is translated, it still locates this tradition in a paschal context. Then, the technical use of παραδίδωμι hardly indicates a ‘de-paschalization’. 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’.

On the other hand, I do agree that the language of 1 Cor. 11.23–25 is ‘ritualistic’, to amend Jeremias. 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.

---

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 παραδίδωμι 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. Moreover, the ‘universalization’ of the lexicon points to a community that distances itself from its Jewish roots, shaping its new multi-ethnic identity. In my opinion, this rules Jerusalem out of the discussion. It also rules out the other Jewish territories.

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’. 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…

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.’ In addition to the removal of Semitisms and the normalization of the Greek, there is also the

---

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.\textsuperscript{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’.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{140} Such a Greco-Semitic tradition would have circulated in the earliest Jesus communities, throughout the Jewish territories.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{143} However, the extant tradition of Mark 14—which I take to stem from the apostles or their immediate Jerusalemite circle\textsuperscript{144}—is an indicator that these

\textsuperscript{138} Kilpatrick, \textit{Eucharist}, 20, 23.
\textsuperscript{139} Kilpatrick, \textit{Eucharist}, 23.
\textsuperscript{140} Cf. Marshall, \textit{Last Supper and Lord’s Supper}, 33.
\textsuperscript{141} Cf. Fitzmyer, \textit{First Corinthians}, 429.
\textsuperscript{142} Kilpatrick, \textit{Eucharist}, 23.
\textsuperscript{143} See (for instance) Craig C. Hill, \textit{Hellenists and Hebrews: Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church} (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992).
\textsuperscript{144} I concur here with Maurice Casey, \textit{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*, especially as the apostles ‘gave their attention’ to the teachings of Jesus (cf. Acts 1.21–22, 26 and 6.4).

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. 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). 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. Since

---

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 ποτίριον εὐχαριστήσας ἐδείκτης, ἐκάθετο τότε καὶ διαμερίστης εἰς ἑαυτούς. 18 λέγω γάρ ὑμῖν, ὃτι οὐ μή πιὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενόμενος τῆς ἁμαρτίας τὸς ἁμαρτών τις ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐλθῃ. 19καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἐκλαβεν καὶ ἐδοκεν αὐτοῖς λέγον. Τούτῳ ἐπεί τὸ σῶμα μου τὸ ὕπερ ὑμῶν διδόμενον. τούτῳ πιήτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. 20καὶ τὸ ποτίριον ἄσαυτὸς μετὰ τὸ διεπνήσας, λέγον. Τούτῳ τὸ ποτίριον ἢ κακὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου τὸ ὕπερ ὑμῶν εἰρηνόδεμεν.

**1 Cor. 11.23–25**

23 Εγὼ γάρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὁ δὲ παρέδεικτο ἐκλαβεν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἐκλαβεν, Τούτῳ μοι ἐκάθετο τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸ ὕπερ ὑμῶν. τούτῳ πιήτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. 25 ὃσαύτους καὶ τὸ ποτίριον μετὰ τὸ δεπνήσας λέγον. Τούτῳ τὸ ποτίριον ἢ κακὴ διαθήκη ἐκάθετο ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι. τούτῳ πιήτε. ὡσάκει ὡς πιήτε, 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. This view was accepted by certain scholars, the independence of these two traditions being sometimes taken for granted. 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), even when...

---


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


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). 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

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. 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

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

York: T&T Clark, 2004), 2:950.
155 Metzger, Textual Commentary, 149.
substantially as we have it seems to me to be beyond reasonable doubt.’
159 See (for instance) Fitzmyer, Luke X-XXIV, 1386.
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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{163} Indeed, a ‘common source’ hypothesis could offer a valid explanation for all these characteristics.\textsuperscript{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?

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{161} Meier, “Antioch,” 25–27 (n. 62).
  \item \textsuperscript{162} Fitzmyer, Luke I-IX, 46.
  \item \textsuperscript{163} E.g., Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, esp. 111–12, 156, 188–89.
  \item \textsuperscript{164} Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 156.
\end{itemize}
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’. Also, this connection is confirmed by solid internal evidence from Acts. 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.

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’, especially the data concerning his Antiochene origins. 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.’

Furthermore, Luke’s Antiochene origins were later reaffirmed by Eusebius (Hist. eccl. 3.4.6) and Jerome (De vir. ill. 7). Although their sources remain unknown, 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. Then, there is another clue in the Western reading of Acts;

---

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.
it is preserved in D (it\textsuperscript{p}; cop\textsuperscript{G67}) and includes an Antiochene ‘we-passage’ in Acts 11.28: συνεστραμμένων δὲ ἡμῶν (‘when we were gathered together…’).\textsuperscript{174} I am in agreement with the bulk of scholarship, that ‘it is hardly likely that [the] reading is original’.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{176}

The external data above could be considered ‘corroborative evidence’, even ‘multiple source attestation’, as some of these ‘traditions’ are independent.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{175} Fitzmyer, \textit{Luke I-IX}, 46.
\textsuperscript{176} Von Harnack, \textit{Luke the Physician}, 5 (n. 1).
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).\footnote{Glover, “Luke the Antiochene,” 98–99.}

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;\footnote{See Josephus, J.W. 1.30.70.} 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 Ἡρῴδου τοῦ τετραρχοῦ σύντροφος (‘a lifelong friend/foster brother of Herod the tetrarch’) was Luke’s Antiochene source (Acts 13.1).\footnote{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.’}

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.\footnote{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 (ἀνηγγέλλων δόσι ἐποίησαν ο θεός 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 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-passage 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.
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. 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.

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

---


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.

---


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


4.1 ‘As is recorded in the Memoirs of the apostles…’

There is an ongoing debate among scholars on whether the Gospel of Matthew, which is formally anonymous, ever circulated without a proper title (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μαθθαῖον) or an appropriate designation (such as κατὰ Μαθθαῖον). On the one hand, the earliest manuscript title attached to the Gospel could be dated ‘late second/early third century’, as Simon Gathercole argues. Still, most scholars assume that its title was attached to the Gospel around 125 CE, based on the observation that, prior to 140 CE, the traditional designation was widely known (Papias, Fragm. 3.16, quoted in Eusebius, Hist. eccl. 3.39.16). 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’—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.

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).

---

5 Just., Dial. 101.3; 103.6–8; 104.1; 105.5–6; 106.3–4; 107.1. Cf. I Apol. 66.3: ‘their Memoirs, which are called gospels’.
7 In some MSS: κατὰ Μαθθαῖον.
9 Gathercole, “Earliest Manuscript Title,” 234.
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.
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, 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 allusions 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. As all of them reveal, during the first period of its use (ca. 90–160 CE), 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

---

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 litterature 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.\textsuperscript{20} The references to the Gospel of Matthew are indeed numerous, exceeding thirty quotations and allusions (\textit{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).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{23} So, if the \textit{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 \textit{Didache} only knows one ‘gospel’. Indeed, there is no clear evidence of any quotations or allusions from Mark, Luke or John.\textsuperscript{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’ (\textit{Phild}. 5.1–2; 8.2).\textsuperscript{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 \textit{Memoirs} of his apostles’ or ‘[these] are thus recorded in the \textit{Memoirs}’: \textit{Dial}. 101.3 and Matt. 27.39–43; 105.6 andMatt. 5.20; 106.5 and Matt. 2.2, 9–11.\textsuperscript{26} Why would Justin prefer the ambiguous plural (‘of the apostles’) if he had knowledge of the author? Moreover, in \textit{Dial}.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{20} See below (§ 4.3.2 and chapters 6 and 7).
\item \textsuperscript{23} Tuckett, “The Didache and the New Testament,” 105–110.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Michael Slusser (ed.), \textit{St. Justin Martyr: Dialogue with Trypho} (SFC 3; trans., Thomas B. Falls; Washington: Catholic University of America, 2003), 153, 159–60.
\end{itemize}
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 catechetic 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).
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. However, this does not exclude the existence of an ‘original… particular church’ or ‘Matthean community’, one that has influenced its redactional process. 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.

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. 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.

---


36 Davies-Allison, Matthew, 1:143.

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.’

There seems to be a ‘widespread consensus’ that the Gospel of Matthew originated in the Syrian region. As we have seen, this theory is supported by the testimonies of Papias and Irenaeus, 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’. Still, he agrees with Davies-Allison, that ‘some of the proposals are more credible than others’. So, in the following sections I will attempt to identify the strengths and the weaknesses of the various hypotheses advanced by scholars.

---


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.’


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;
- Caesarea Maritima: B.T. Viviano;
- Edessa: B.W. Bacon (tentatively), J. Kennard, R.E. Osborne;

(1) Since this history of scholarship\(^{45}\) 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

\(^{45}\) 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; 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) has not gained wide acceptance among scholars, 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].’ 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.

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.

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.
the fact that the Gospel of Matthew shows no Philonic influence, as does the book of Hebrews, for instance. 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). 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.

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; and 2) by assigning to this location the composition of James, Hebrews, Barnabas and 2 Clement. But his case has been considered ‘weak’ and ‘speculative’ by exegetes. 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, are rightly considered ‘uncorroborated speculation[s]’. Actually, there is no ‘hard evidence’ in any of Brandon’s adduced arguments. Paradoxically, his case was (directly or indirectly)

53 Davies-Allison, Matthew, 1:139.
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.
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),\textsuperscript{62} one of the very few scholars that accepted the Alexandrian hypothesis.\textsuperscript{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, \textit{Ant.} 8.165–73), is considered to be ‘the ends of the earth’ (cf. Jer. 6.20; Joel 3.8).\textsuperscript{64} Moreover, the Matthean text presupposes some departure from the South: ὅτι ἐλθεν 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].’\textsuperscript{65} The placement of Matthew’s Gospel in the capital city of Egypt has almost nothing in its favour\textsuperscript{66} 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.\textsuperscript{67} To these objections I shall return later, when the case for Antioch will be assessed.

\textsuperscript{62} S. van Tilborg, \textit{The Jewish Leaders in Matthew} (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972), 172.
\textsuperscript{63} France, \textit{Evangelist and Teacher}, 93; Sim, \textit{Matthew and Christian Judaism}, 49.
\textsuperscript{64} Carson, “Matthew,” 297.
\textsuperscript{65} Sim, \textit{Matthew and Christian Judaism}, 51.
\textsuperscript{66} John M.G. Barclay, \textit{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).
\textsuperscript{67} See Kilpatrick, \textit{Origins}, 130–34.
Instead, Kilpatrick suggests a Phoenician place of provenance, more specifically Tyre or Sidon. To argue his case, Kilpatrick makes a distinction between the ἡ θάλασσα of Mark 5.13, that describes the sea of Galilee, and τὰ υδάτα, 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 καταποντισθῇ 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.

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 κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ ἀπέθανον ἐν τοῖς υδάσιν) follows Mk. 5.13 (καὶ ὄρμησεν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ὡς δισχίλιοι, καὶ ἔπνιγοντο ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ). 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’ (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. However, Kilpatrick brings no evidence that such a distinction existed between the hinterland and the coast. 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).

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. 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.’ 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). 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.
Nepθαλίμ, ὁ δὸν θαλάσσης, πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν) and Matt. 19.1 (Καὶ ἐγένετο δὲ ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους, μετήρεν ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ ἤλθεν 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).  

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 καὶ, that distinguishes between Galilee, Judea, ‘and the area beyond Jordan’. 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 καὶ in both Matt. 4.15 and 19.1 is redactional, indicating Matthew’s current location. 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). 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. In favour of this reading, Davies-Allison point to Matt. 4.25, the only other Matthean...

---

text in which πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου is used. Here Matthew follows Mk. 3.7–8, yet keeps the
connective καὶ, clearly distinguishing between Galilee, Judea, ‘and [the area] beyond the
Jordan’: δόχοι πολλοί ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Δεκαπόλεως καὶ Ἰεροσολύμων 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). 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. 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. 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.

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. Indeed, Papias (Fragm. 3.16) affirms that
‘Matthew composed the sayings in the Hebrew tongue’ (Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν ἸΕβραῖοι διαλέκτῳ
tὰ λόγια συνετάξατο), which led certain scholars to postulate the existence of an
Aramaic/Hebrew Ur-Matthew. 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
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.’

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. 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. This is not surprising, since Matthew’s Gospel is the most Jewish of all. 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) and B. Witherington III (2006) suggested specific


88 Ehrman, *Jesus Before the Gospels*, 308 (n. 32).


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.’


locations in Galilee—Capernaum, Sephoris, or Tiberias. B.T. Viviano (1979) has advanced the hypothesis of Caesarea Maritima.

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); the testimony of the early church; the Aramaic/Hebrew language of composition (cf. Papias, *Fragm.* 3.16); the extensive use of Greek language in Jewish Palestine; 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); the emphasis on the conflicts with the Pharisees (23.1–36), that were disturbing the Matthean community; and the bilingual character of the text forms when the OT is cited.

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.
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.
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. Meier\(^{105}\) and J. Fitzmyer\(^{106}\) 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.’


\(^{108}\) 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 ῥακά [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, \textit{Adv. haer.} 3.1.1–2; Eusebius, \textit{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 (\textit{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, Perea, and Idumaea’\(^{117}\) (cf. Josephus, \textit{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, \textit{J.W.} 7.43), could hardly be the place of provenance for Matthew’s Gospel.\(^{118}\) As Sim notices,

\begin{quote}
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.\(^{119}\)
\end{quote}

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

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{Davies-Allison,} \textit{Matthew,} 1:140.
\item \textbf{Meier,} “\textit{Antioch},” 20.
\item \textbf{Viviano,} “Where was Matthew Written,” 540 (n. 32).
\item \textbf{Meier,} “\textit{Antioch},” 18. As various scholars have shown, the Matthean community appears to be prosperous, not affected by a recent war. Kilpatrick (\textit{Origins,} 124), for instance, calls it a ‘well-to-do city church’, noticing the usage of στατήρ, τάλαντον, κρυσός, etc. See also, Hagner, \textit{Matthew 1–13,} lxxv.
\item \textbf{Sim,} \textit{Matthew and Christian Judaism,} 41.
\end{itemize}
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.
122 Carson-Moo, Introduction, 155.
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.' 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), 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. 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.’

(5) There are various reasons why the majority of scholars place the composition of Matthew’s Gospel in Syria. 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.
come from the East.\textsuperscript{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’.\textsuperscript{134} Also, Syria had the largest concentration of Jewish population outside Palestine, especially in Antioch (Josephus, \textit{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 \textit{Didache} and the letters of Ignatius.\textsuperscript{135}

For internal evidence, scholars often point to Matt. 4.24a: καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ἤ ἀκοῆ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀκοῆς ἐξ 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.\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{137} As Carter,\textsuperscript{138} Sim,\textsuperscript{139} and others have shown, it is likely that this ‘unparalleled’ redactional intervention ‘functions as a type of authorial signature, analogous to 13:52.’\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{133} Streeter, \textit{Four Gospels}, 500; Davies-Allison, \textit{Matthew}, 1:143.
\textsuperscript{134} Sim, \textit{Matthew and Christian Judaism}, 51.
\textsuperscript{135} Keener, \textit{Matthew}, 41.
\textsuperscript{136} See the discussion above, § 4.2.1 (2).
\textsuperscript{138} Warren Carter, \textit{Matthew and the Margins: A Socio-Political and Religious Reading} (JSNTSup 204; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 15.
\textsuperscript{139} For Sim (\textit{Matthew and Christian Judaism}, 51), it is ‘[a] very minor point in favour of this hypothesis’.
\textsuperscript{140} Cousland, \textit{Crowds in Matthew}, 53–57 (54–55).
\textsuperscript{141} Luz, \textit{Matthew 1–7}, 57.
argument of the ‘most commonly used language of the ordinary people’. 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, following B.M. Metzger: ‘Outside the gates of Antioch, Syriac was the language of the people’.

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 Brock and Fergus Millar 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. Moreover, Edessa was considered ‘a Hellenistic stronghold’ receiving a Greek name since 304 BCE. 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.

The implied use of Greek in Edessa led B.W. Bacon (1930) to suggest the location as an alternative to Antioch:

---

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 of Latin names continued to use the original name for some time, ‘but this does not seem to be the case with Edessa’.
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 Osrhoene.\[150\]

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.


\[153\] 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." 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.’ 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) and R.E. Osborne (1973). For, Kennard—following Kilpatrick and Brandon—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. This theory has been challenged by Meier, 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. As Sim shows, this is ‘an unnecessary complication of Streeter’s Antiochene hypothesis’.

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
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164 Sim, Matthew and Christian Judaism, 52; Meier, “Antioch,” 25.
either not very close or not very relevant. As Craig Keener notices, ‘Palestinian Jewish parallels seem far stronger’. 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 κώμη (‘village’) is used only three times in Matthew (Mark has seven). 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’. Not all scholars have found this argument convincing. For Stanton, ‘these statistics are no more than straws in the wind’. The second point concerns the rapid dissemination and the early popularity of the Gospel, both requiring a large and influential Christian centre: ‘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’. 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:
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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.
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.’\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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:

\begin{quote}
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.\textsuperscript{179}
\end{quote}

After ‘excluding’ from consideration the alternative influential churches, such as Rome, Ephesus, Alexandria, Caesarea and Jerusalem,\textsuperscript{180} Streeter infers that Antioch is ‘the only one left’\textsuperscript{181} or that ‘[of] the greater Churches all but Antioch are excluded.’\textsuperscript{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’),\textsuperscript{183} points again to Antioch (cf. Gal. 2.11–14), for this church ‘follows Peter and stands for the via media between the Judaistic

\begin{footnotes}
177 Streeter, Four Gospels, 500.
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179 Sim, Matthew and Christian Judaism, 53.
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182 Streeter, Four Gospels, 502.
183 Streeter, Four Gospels, 504.
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intolerance of those who called James master and the all but antinomian liberty claimed by some of the followers of Paul.  

(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’.  

(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.’  

(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); moreover, he ‘frequently speaks of “the Gospel” as if this were the name of a [single] book’ (Phld. 5.1–2; 8.2). There are no quotations/allusions to Mark, only parallels that are closer to Matthew. As for the other Gospels, the ‘possible allusions to Luke […] are very uncertain’. 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.
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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...
(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
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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’.
use of Greek language becomes a key criterion for Meier’s rejection of the competing views.\textsuperscript{207} He goes so far as to eliminate all other locations in Syria, save for Antioch, based on this criterion.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{209} but only by the lack of Greek pre-Christian and Christian literature.\textsuperscript{210}

With regard to the content of Matthew’s Gospel, Antioch had the largest Jewish population in Syria,\textsuperscript{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’.\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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),\textsuperscript{215} disputes that can be traced in the ‘various strata of tradition that we find in Matthew’s gospel’.\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{217} Moreover, the use of ‘M’ suggests an ambivalent view towards the mission to the gentiles
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(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.\textsuperscript{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’\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{220} Since Antioch was its place of dissemination, to pose the composition to an unknown or obscure location ‘seems a useless complication of theories’.\textsuperscript{221}

Moreover, Meier answers the main objection against the Antiochene provenance, showing that ‘Paul’s heritage in Antioch was not completely lost’,\textsuperscript{222} for ‘the practical results of Paul’s theology and Matthew’s theology are surprisingly similar’:\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{224}

Meier also addresses a major objection against Antioch, which is of particular interest to our study:

\textsuperscript{218} Meier, “Antioch,” 53–54.
\textsuperscript{219} Meier, “Antioch,” 23–24.
\textsuperscript{220} Meier, “Antioch,” 25.
\textsuperscript{221} Meier, “Antioch,” 25.
\textsuperscript{222} Meier, “Antioch,” 63.
\textsuperscript{224} Meier, “Antioch,” 62. Also, Davies-Allison, \textit{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, \textit{Antioch}. He reconstructs a credible history of early Antiochian Christianity that makes sense of the order, Paul—Matthew—Ignatius.’ Similarly, David A. deSilva, \textit{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 (1 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?\textsuperscript{225}

The answer to this question shall be the focus of the next chapter.

(2) Not all of Streeter’s arguments are equally cogent,\textsuperscript{226} as Davies-Allison (1988) have shown.\textsuperscript{227} They rejected three of Streeter’s arguments (7–9), yet considered the remaining six (1–6) to have ‘considerable cumulative force’.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{231}

\textsuperscript{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’.
\textsuperscript{227} Davies-Allison, Matthew, 1:143.
\textsuperscript{228} Davies-Allison, Matthew, 1:144.
\textsuperscript{230} Davies-Allison, Matthew, 1:145.
\textsuperscript{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.  

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.

(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’. After a careful examination, he finds strengths and weaknesses in most of them. (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’, 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, while ‘[Streeter’s] strongest argument is the Petrine connection,’ 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.’ Based on these two arguments, Sim concludes: ‘These two arguments alone, even without the support of the others

---

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 I-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, a connection that Streeter himself recognized. However, when Streeter published his study (1930), the Didache scholarship was still young. Back in those days, for instance, Jan Greyvenstein (1919) was the only scholar to suggest that the Didache was composed in Antioch. As for Streeter, we have seen, he suggested that the Didache ‘arose somewhere in Syria or Palestine […] not later than A.D. 100’. Today the situation is rather different. After over a hundred and thirty years of research, the Antiochene provenance of the Didache is widely accepted. 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. 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

---

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.
247 Streeter, Four Gospels, 507.
Matthew and the Didache originated ‘from the same Jewish-Christian milieu’, 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.’ 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.

On the other hand, following the influential work of J.-P. Audet (1958), the Didache scholars have extensively used the Gospel of Matthew to argue for the Antiochene origin of the Didache. 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. 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); 2) the Didache is anonymous (Did. 1.1), so its spread and

---

251 Meier, “Antioch,” 83.
252 Slee, Church in Antioch, 55–57, 118–22.
253 Audet, Didachè, 166–86.
acceptance could be explained by the influential mission-oriented church that stood behind its
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

---

Doctrine des douze apôtres (Didaché)* (SC 248; Paris: Cerf, 1998), 97–98; Klaus Wengst, *Didaché (Apostelllehre),
Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Klemensbrief, Schrift an Diognet* (SUC 2; München: Kösel, 1984), 62. See the lengthier

\(^{257}\) 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.

372; Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and

America, 2007), 91–94.


\(^{262}\) Carson-Moo, *Introduction*, 152.
Matthew was completed.'\textsuperscript{263} Or, in the words of Luz, ‘Where the Gospel was composed cannot be answered conclusively; the information on the subject is too meager.’\textsuperscript{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’,\textsuperscript{265} including the Antiochene hypothesis. Still, Luz continues and states: ‘However, the arguments against Antioch are no more convincing’.\textsuperscript{266} In my view, all the arguments against Antioch are significantly weaker that the arguments in its favour. In conclusion, although this hypothesis is inconclusive, I agree with Davies-Allison that Antioch is ‘the best educated guess’\textsuperscript{267} or with Sim that ‘the extant evidence we possess makes Antioch by far the most probable place where Matthew composed his Gospel’\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{269} Moreover, it is an entirely reasonable hypothesis.

\textsuperscript{263} Davies-Allison, \textit{Matthew}, 1:139.
\textsuperscript{264} Luz, \textit{Matthew 1–7}, 56.
\textsuperscript{265} Luz, \textit{Matthew 1–7}, 56–57.
\textsuperscript{266} Luz, \textit{Matthew 1–7}, 57.
\textsuperscript{267} Davies-Allison, \textit{Matthew}, 1:146.
\textsuperscript{268} Sim, \textit{Matthew and Christian Judaism}, 62.
\textsuperscript{269} Sim, \textit{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, a solid argument against the Antiochene hypothesis concerns Matthew’s Last Supper tradition (Matt. 26.26–29). 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), as Luke—a contemporary of Matthew—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). Also, most of them limit their analysis to the similarities and the differences between the two accounts. Very few scholars, even of those who accept the Antiochene provenance, attempt to explain the connection between the Matthean form and

---

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.
3 Meier, “Antioch,” 25: ‘Paul’s form represents the form used in Antioch in the 40s.’
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.’
the Pauline-Lukan. 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. This is indisputable, as the following comparison shows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 Ἐσθήνετον δέ αὐτῶν λαβὼν ὁ Ἱησοῦς ἅρτον καὶ εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ὄψες τοὺς μαθητὰς ἔπειν, Λάβετε φάγετε, τοῦτο ἐστίν τὸ σῶμά μου. 27 καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, Πίετε ἕξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. 28 τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστίν τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυμονοῦντος εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. 29 λέγο δὲ ὦμιν, οὐ μὴ πιέ αὐτῷ ἅρτοι ἐκ τούτου τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἁμέλου ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω μεθ᾽ ὦμον καίνον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου.</td>
<td>22 Καὶ ἐσθήνετον αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἅρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔπειν, Λάβετε, τοῦτο ἐστίν τὸ σῶμά μου. 23 καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπειν ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. 24 καὶ ἔπειν αὐτοῖς. Τοῦτο ἐστίν τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυμονοῦντος ύπέρ πολλῶν. 25 ἁμέν ἅρτοι ὦμιν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πιέ ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἁμέλου ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καίνον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.’

And yet there are six ‘substantive differences’ in Matthew. Hagner summarizes the differences as follows:

---


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 μεθ’ 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 πάτες, “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 τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, “the kingdom of God,” at the very end of the pericope (Mark 14:25) to τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρός 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 ἐπιν 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’. 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.
¹⁹ In the next section, I will attempt to argue that this church is Antioch. See below (n. 22).
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: 1) the highly predominant Markan source; 2) certain ritualistic snippets of a community yet unknown.

Other arguments for the ritual character of the Matthean or pre-Matthean form concern the ‘familiar liturgical sequence [of the verbs]’ or the ‘eucharistic language’, the internal structure of the tradition (Matt. 26.26–28a), and the individualization of Jesus’ words and actions. 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. 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.

---

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), in which the alteration of the pronoun ‘they’ (with reference to Jesus’ disciples) is more pronounced than in Matthew. 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 ὡμίν, οὐ μὴ πιὸ ἄπτετρον ἐκ τοῦτον τὸν γεννήματος τῆς ἁμείλου ἐως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πῖνο μεθ’ ὡμίν καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρός 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. However, Luz, following Klaus Berger, may be correct to assume that ‘we must probably designate it [i.e., the Matthean tradition] form-critically as a cult etiology’. Moreover, there is the addition of the Matthean μεθ’ ὡμίν (‘with you’) in Matt. 26.29 (cf. 1.23; 18.20; 28.20), which scholars such as Luz and J.T. Pennington relate to the ‘ecclesiological’ Matt. 18.20, thus implying a continuous fellowship of the meal, until the full consummation of the βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρός μου. 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 ἄπτετρον ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπό τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς ἁμείλου τοῦ πατρός μου.

---

29 See above (§ 3.2.2.1).
30 Andreas Lindemann, Der Erste Korintherbrief (HNT 9/1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 253–54.
33 Luz, Matthew 21–28, 364. Also, Davies-Allison, Matthew, 3:465; Osborne, Matthew, 966.
34 Luz, Matthew 21–28, 382–83.
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.\(^\text{37}\)

I would point to the fact that, even if the points above were valid,\(^\text{38}\) 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.\(^\text{39}\) In conclusion, I suggest that Matthew renders a tradition that is ritualistically superior to Mark (cf. Mk. 14.22–25),\(^\text{40}\) 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.\(^\text{41}\)

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 least\(^\text{42}\) three possible answers:

---

\(^\text{37}\) Kodell, *Eucharist*, 102 (emphasis original).

\(^\text{38}\) Pennington (“The Lord’s Supper,” 60), for instance, admits the risk of reading too much into the μεθ’ ὑμῶν addition.

\(^\text{39}\) 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 σημεῖον ἐξ τῆς ἔμην 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.


\(^\text{41}\) Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 188.

\(^\text{42}\) 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; \(Phild\). 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.


\(^{45}\) 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 οὐσαρήσαν 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 Antiochen 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.’


\(^{56}\) 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 ὡς θέλοισιν (Did. 10.7).64 Similarly, since the

---

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.
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. Garrow, 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

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, δε, ο Ἰησοῦς, and μαθηταί;70 in v. 27, λέγων; in v. 28, γάρ; in v. 29, δε, ἂπ’ ἀρτι (cf. 23.39), μεθ’ ὑμῶν (cf. 1.23; 18.20; 28.20), and [τῇ βασιλείᾳ 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 ἁφεσιν 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, ἁφεσις (‘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 ἁφεσιν 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 ἁφεσιν 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

---

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).
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 Epheuser Briefe (SHVL 39; Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1946), 85–86.
To strengthen the case for the credal or ritual origin of εἰς ἁφεσίν 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. 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). Consequently, I suggest the phrase εἰς ἁφεσίν ἁμαρτιῶν is ‘standard’, ritual, and pre-Matthean. Moreover, most of the NT appearances of εἰς ἁφεσίν ἁμαρτιῶν 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; 24.47; Acts 5.31; 10.43; 13.38; 26.18; Col. 1.14; cf. Eph. 1.7).


79 Marshall, Last Supper and Lord’s Supper, 100. Marshall (indirectly) assumes that Matthew knew about the subsequent addition of εἰς ἁφεσίν 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 ἁφεσίν 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.


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), not just from the ‘primitive traditions’ (rituals and creeds) of early Christianity. While all the speeches in Acts show clear marks of Lukan redaction, 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).

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). If we accept the traditional view that Peter was the source of Mark’s Gospel (Papias, Fragm. 3.16), 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’, 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), giving the impression

---

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.
that there is a certain connection between the two.\textsuperscript{94} In my view, if the phrase εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτίαν 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.\textsuperscript{95}

So, if the supposition that εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτίαν 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 ἁμαρτίαν could be connected to Antioch: Paul (Eph. 1.7; Col. 1.14; cf. Acts 13.38; 26.18),\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{97} Carson,\textsuperscript{98} and

\textsuperscript{94} In Acts 10.42–43, there is the explicit connection between the phrase εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτίαν (v. 43) and the apostolic preaching (v. 42). See I. Howard Marshall, \textit{Acts: An Introduction and Commentary} (TNTC 5; Nottingham: InterVarsity Press, 1980), 205.

\textsuperscript{95} Cf. Stanton, \textit{Jesus of Nazareth}, 70–84.

\textsuperscript{96} I consider the letters to Ephesians and Colossians to be Pauline. See (for instance) the detailed defence of Harold W. Hoehner et al., \textit{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,” \textit{ExT} 79 (1968): 296–302, who argues for the Lukan redaction of Ephesians. If Martin is correct, then εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτίαν, 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.

\textsuperscript{97} Senior, \textit{Passion in Matthew}, 64–71.

\textsuperscript{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. 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.

If the above scholars are correct, and all the differences are redactional (Matthean), then the Antiochene origin of the tradition results straightforwardly. However, as I have shown above, in my view, the arguments for a ritual influence are stronger than those for the redactional intervention. 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, just as the rituals were influenced in the same way (cf. Matt. 28.19; Did. 7.1), 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).
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 [τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρός μου (Matt. 26.29; cf. Mk. 14.24: τῇ βασιλείᾳ 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 τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρός αὐτῶν) and in 25.34 (οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρός μου, κληρονομίσατε τὴν ἕτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου),108 but are these associations enough to justify Matthew’s alteration of a phrase that is similar (τῇ βασιλείᾳ 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–

---

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.’
6, which is the older prayer, could be pre-Antiochene. 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). 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). 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.

(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. So, given the high status of Peter, both in the church of Antioch and also in his Gospel (cf. Matt. 16.17–19), I suggest Matthew omits the Petrine ἐἰς 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).


116 So, Audet, Didachè, 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

---

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.’
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. Still, there is the broad consensus that Peter was a very influential figure in Antioch, at the time of Matthew’s Gospel composition.

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. Yet, I suggest that this tradition (at least in part) came from Peter. This is why Matthew follows Mk. 14.22–25 so closely and also adds the Antiochene/Petrine phrase εἰς ἁμαρτίαν (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), 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) 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). Yet, in spite of

---


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.’


133 I call Luke’s tradition ‘pre-Petrine’ because, in Antioch, it chronologically predates the ritual use of the (assumed) tradition of Peter.


his (relatively) high view of Peter, Luke does not follow any of the supposedly Petrine forms, like Mark or Matthew.

As we have seen from the works of R. Glover, J. Fitzmyer, and R. Riesner, 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). 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.’ 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, which most probably ‘received’ the same tradition as the Corinthians (1 Cor. 11.23; cf. 1 Cor. 4.17). Also, as Meier and others assume, Theophilus’ community (Lk. 1.1–4; Acts 1.1–2) could have been part of Paul’s network. 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.

---

136 Talbert, Reading Acts, xxix.
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).
142 Riesner, Paul’s Early Period, 318–21.
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?’

A lot could have happened in the church of Antioch within three decades (ca. 40–70 CE), and, to paraphrase Stanton, many of the details still elude us. 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.’

---

147 As was mentioned above, I tentatively date the composition of Matthew’s Gospel between 66–70 CE.
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.
The Didache (also called The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles) is among the oldest Christian writings left outside the NT canon. Moreover, according to J. Quasten it is ‘the most important document of the subapostolic period.’ The popularity this writing enjoyed in the first Christian centuries (cf. Eusebius, Hist. eccl. 3.25.4–6; Athanasius, Ep. fest. 39.7), followed by a somewhat inexplicable disappearance, 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’. 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...
lost for fifteen centuries, finally returned to scholarly investigation, following the publication of its editio princeps, in 1883.

Adolf von Harnack’s enthusiastic assertion made in 1884, ‘the Didache has finally brought us light’, with reference to the importance of the Didache for the better understanding of the NT and of nascent Christianity, was paradoxically followed by an immediate and interminable series of academic disputes: ‘opposite hypothesis, challenges, controversies, rejections, and denials of authenticity’. In fact, no other Christian writing was so intensely disputed, in such a short amount of time. However, despite the numerous controversies and challenges, that touched every section and every subject of the text, 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.

As with most topics of the Didache, the place(s) of provenance or composition remains even today a matter of academic dispute. This chapter, therefore, seeks to address this issue and propose several pieces of evidence that favour Syrian Antioch as the place of composition

---


7 Philotheos Bryennios, Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροσολυμιτικοῦ χειρογράφου νῦν προέδευσεν μετὰ προλεγομένων καὶ σημειώσεων ἐν οἷς καὶ τῆς Συνόψεως τῆς Π. Α., τῆς ἐκδικεώς τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου, σύγκροτος καὶ μέρους 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.


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’. This means that its sources (the ‘older material’) may have originated ‘in various places, at various times’, as the vast majority of scholars concede. 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.’

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. This, of course, situates

---


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 Literatur 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. 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. 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. 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’. 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., Egypt and Syria), the safest academic position is the one

---

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.


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.’ 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.

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. 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; even more, it allows for the postulation of an Antiochene place of origin.

---

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, 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). 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. As for Vokes and Telfer, they prefer a much later date, toward the end of the second century or the beginning of the third. 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.

It is the monumental study of J.-P. Audet (1958) that became truly influential on locating the Didache in the area of Antioch. Audet came to this conclusion after comparing the text of the Didache with certain Matthean parallels. Moreover, he identified three stages of composition that covered a few decades, thus offering the compelling hypothesis of ‘an evolved text’. Audet’s view has become dominant nowadays, due to the influence of

---

33 Vokes, Riddle of the Didache, esp. 86–87, 216; Telfer, “Didache and Antioch,” 133.
35 Audet, Didachè, 206–10.
37 Audet, Didachè, esp. 121–86.
scholars such as Clayton Jefford, Jonathan Draper, Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser, Michelle Slee, Allan Garrow, and Nancy Pardee. Their compelling arguments, adduced in favour of an Antiochene place of provenance, have made Egypt almost a forgotten hypothesis nowadays; 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. The Jewish features of the Didache (Did. 1.1–6.3),

---

42 Van de Sandt-Flusser, Didache, 48–52.
43 Slee, Church in Antioch, 55–76.
44 Garrow, Matthew’s Dependence, 1–8 and passim.
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.
together with its persistent interest in Gentiles joining the church (Did. 1.1a; 1.1b–6.3), could suggest the city of Antioch as a possible place of origin.

(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), there is the ‘universalizing direction’ of the Didache, as noticed by Stephen Finlan. 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. This ‘denationalization’ and ‘internationalization’ of the language could well have originated in a cosmopolitan and missionary church, such as Antioch.

(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. This is consistent with the trajectory of Jewish

---

48 The manuscript discovered by Bryennios in 1873 has two titles. The longer title is: Διδαχὴ κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τῶν ἔθνων (‘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.


Christianity in Antioch (cf. Gal. 2.11–14; Matt. 5.17–20; Ignatius, Phil. 6.1).\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{57} Furthermore, virtually all scholars admit a close connection between the Didache and the Gospel of Matthew,\textsuperscript{58} although there is no consensus regarding the sort of connection: oral tradition,\textsuperscript{59} use of common sources\textsuperscript{60} or literary dependence.\textsuperscript{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

---


\textsuperscript{57} See above (§ 4.3).


\textsuperscript{59} Milavec, Didache, 695–739.


\textsuperscript{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.\(^\text{62}\)

Indisputably, the Didache shares numerous points of contact with Matthew (\textit{Did.} 1.3b–d and Matt. 5.44, 46–47; \textit{Did.} 1.4b–e and Matt. 5.39; \textit{Did.} 1.5a–d and Matt. 5.25–26, 42; \textit{Did.} 8.2 and Matt. 6.9–13; \textit{Did.} 9.5b and Matt. 7.6; \textit{Did.} 11.7 and Matt. 12.31; \textit{Did.} 13.1–2 and Matt. 10.10; \textit{Did.} 16.3–8 and Matt. 24.10–30).\(^\text{63}\) 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;\(^\text{64}\) but there are some notable exceptions (see e.g., \textit{Did.} 15.3–4; 16.3–8).\(^\text{65}\) Accordingly, in recent scholarship, special attention has been given to the Didache’s use of Q,\(^\text{66}\) to the use of ‘M’ (the community traditions that are peculiar to Matthew),\(^\text{67}\) but also to the \textit{εὐαγγέλιον} passages (8.2; 11.3; 15.3–4), as the latter suggest direct knowledge of both pre-Matthean traditions (8.2; 11.3)\(^\text{68}\) and Matthean texts (15.3, 4): \textit{ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγέλιῳ τοῦ κυρίου ἠμῶν} (‘as you have it in the gospel of our Lord’).\(^\text{69}\) 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.

---


\(^\text{65}\) See the persuasive argument of Balabansky, \textit{Eschatology in the Making}, 191–97.


\(^\text{67}\) 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.’

In my opinion, it is precisely this ‘complex relationship between Matthew and the Didache’\textsuperscript{70} that determined scholars to conclude that behind the two writings there stands a single community.\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{70} Draper, “Missing Pieces,” 534.
\textsuperscript{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.’
\textsuperscript{73} Draper: “‘Irrevocable Parting of the Ways’,” 217–41 (239–41); “Missing Pieces,” 535.
\textsuperscript{74} Cf. Milavec, \textit{Didache}, 698–719.
\textsuperscript{75} So, Draper, “Missing Pieces,” 534.
\textsuperscript{76} Jefford, “Social Locators,” 263; Pardee, “Visualizing the Christian Community at Antioch,” 70.
\textsuperscript{77} Draper, “Missing Pieces,” 534–35.
So, while various aspects of this debate remain unresolved, 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.

(5) A similar, although lesser connection, was established with the letter of James, based on criteria similar to Matthew. Of course, this attempt assumes an Antiochene provenance for the letter of James.

(6) Did. 6.2–3 reflects on the ‘apostolic decree’ of Acts 15.23–29, 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. 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.
account\textsuperscript{84} (since it was shown that Luke was from Antioch),\textsuperscript{85} and also for Did. 6.2–3.\textsuperscript{86} Since there is no ‘compelling evidence’ that the redactor/compiler of the Didache (henceforth ‘the Didachist’)	extsuperscript{87} knew the book of Acts,\textsuperscript{88} there remains the unique explanation of a common source that leads back to Antioch.\textsuperscript{89}

(7) In Did. 12.4 there is the use of the ‘uncommon’ Χριστιανός.\textsuperscript{90} The term is identified by the author of Acts as first used to designate ‘the disciples’ at Antioch (Acts 11.26).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{93} In sum, every time Χριστιανός appears in the earliest Christian writings, there is an Antiochene connection.

---


\textsuperscript{85} See above (§ 3.2.3.1).

\textsuperscript{86} Audet, Didachè, 354.


\textsuperscript{88} Tuckett, “Didache and NT Writings,” 89–90: ‘There is thus no compelling evidence to show that Didache knew or used Acts.’


\textsuperscript{90} Pardee, “Visualizing the Christian Community at Antioch,” 69.


\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{93} Pardee, “Visualizing the Christian Community at Antioch,” 69. Cf. BDAG, ‘Χριστιανός,’ 1090.
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

\(^{96}\) Niederwimmer, Didache, 53–54; van de Sandt-Flusser, Didache, 51–52.
\(^{100}\) For a similar view, see Jefford, “Locating the Didache,” 40.
\(^{101}\) O’Loughlin, Didache, 25.
Kurt Niederwimmer argues,\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{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 \textit{Didache} ‘appears to have only local situations in view’ and ‘preserves the archaic traditions of a particular locality’.\textsuperscript{104} However, if the \textit{Didache} is a composite text, as Audet and others have definitely shown,\textsuperscript{105} these ‘archaic traditions’ have most likely been composed in various places, at various times.\textsuperscript{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’ (\textit{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 (\textit{Did.} 7.2–3).\textsuperscript{107} This approach, based upon the individuality of each pre-Didachic tradition, will be resumed below,\textsuperscript{108} when I will examine the eucharistic traditions of \textit{Did.} 9–10.

\textsuperscript{102} Niederwimmer, \textit{Didache}, 3.
\textsuperscript{103} Schöllgen, “\textit{Didache} as a Church Order, 63 [Ger.: “Die \textit{Didache} als Kirchenordnung: Zur Frage des Abfassungszweckes und seinen Konsequenzen für die Interpretation,” \textit{JAC} 29 (1986): 5–26].
\textsuperscript{104} Niederwimmer, \textit{Didache}, 3.
\textsuperscript{105} Audet, \textit{Didachè}, 104–86; Garrow, \textit{Matthew’s Dependence}, 10–12.
\textsuperscript{106} Claussen, “Eucharist in John and the \textit{Didache},” 138: ‘different sections may stem not just from different times but also from a variety of localities.’
\textsuperscript{107} There are, however, scholars who locate the composition of the \textit{Didache} in Syria, based on the same passage (\textit{Did.} 7.2–3). See (for instance) Niederwimmer, \textit{Didache}, 53; van de Sandt-Flusser, \textit{Didache}, 51. Indeed, the baptistery discovered at the house-church in Dura-Europos, in which only sprinkling or pouring could have taken place, supports this reading. See Ramsay MacMullen, \textit{The Second Church: Popular Christianity, A.D. 200–400} (WGRWS; Atlanta: SBL, 2009).
\textsuperscript{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, than 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.

¹¹⁰ Jefford, “Did Ignatius Know the Didache,” 351.
¹¹¹ See the discussion in chapter 8 (§ 8.1.1).
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. I 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.


\(^{119}\) 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. Such words and phrases ‘betray familiarity with apostolic ideas’ more than with the LXX, as the comparison with the Epistle of Barnabas reveals:

Of the Didache 91\frac{1}{2} per cent, of the vocabulary is New Testament; of Barnabas, 91\frac{1}{2} 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.

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’. Nevertheless, the Didachist undoubtedly knows certain writings from the LXX (cf. Did. 14.3; 16.7). 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). So, the bulk of his vocabulary comes from all these sources. 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.
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’: ὁμοὶ δὲ παρὰ πλείστοις τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν γινωσκομένας.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’ (Διδαχὴ καλομένη τῶν ἀποστόλων). In line with Eusebius, Athanasius rejects the apostolic paternity of the writing (καλομένη), while he also recognizes its popularity and admits its spiritual benefit: ως οτι ἐστιν και ἑτερα βιβλια τοιτων ἐξωθεν, ου κανονιζομενα μεν τετυπωμένα δε παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἀναγινώσκεσθαι τοῖς ἄρτι προσερχομένοις και 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

128 Niederwimmer, Didache, 4.
Both Eusebius and Athanasius admit that the *Didache* has no apostolic paternity, as is presupposed by its title.\footnote{According to A. Adam and K. Niederwimmer, in the days of Eusebius and Athanasius (fourth century CE), the title of this writing was διδαχὴ/διδαχὴ τῶν ἀποστόλων. See Alfred Adam, “Erwägungen zur Herkunft der Didächè,” ZKG 68 (1957): 1–47; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 56.} 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.\footnote{B.H. Streeter, J.P. Meier, and others use the same argument for the Antiochene origin of Matthew’s Gospel. See § 4.3 (2).} If its anonymous compiler (the Didachist) was not an influential leader, his community must have been.\footnote{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.} 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),\footnote{E.g., F.X. Funk (ed.), *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum* (vols. 1–2; Paderborn: Ferdinand Schoeningh, 1905), 1:xv–xlvii, 386–423.} whose full (redacted) insertion (cf. *Ap. Const.* 7.1.2–32.4) reaffirms the authority of the *Didache* in the area.\footnote{Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 17, 28–29.}

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.\footnote{Cf. Adam, “Erwägungen zur Herkunft,” esp. 37–42. Adam suggests Pella as a possible place of composition.} However, taken together, these arguments create a coherent picture that makes Antioch the most probable candidate.
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*. 9–


\(^{137}\) Claussen, “Eucharist in John and the *Didache*,” 141–42: ‘Although εὐχαριστία appears in the New Testament altogether fifteen times, mainly in the Pauline and deuter-Pauline literature, it is never used as a terminus technicus for the Eucharist of the eucharistic elements.’
10.7). At present, most scholars would recognize the technicality of the term, especially because of its use in Did. 9.1 and 9.5. 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.

To further the argument, I suggest that ‘Eucharist’ became a technical term in the church of Antioch. 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. 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 ἐπέει… 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.

(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).’
142 Schaff, Oldest Church Manual, 58.
Wine—Bread'. 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. According to McGowan, all these references indicate a certain cup–bread sequence. Moreover, they indicate the presence of a cup–bread pattern especially in Syria, but also in other regions. 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.

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’. Actually, McGowan himself admits ‘That the reason for the reversal at 10:16 is [more likely] incidental or rhetorical’. Therefore, it is highly improbable that the Corinthians celebrated a cup–bread Eucharist, as McGowan presupposes, especially if Paul taught them the 1 Cor. 11.23–25 tradition when the church was founded (1 Cor. 11.23a).

As for the quotation from Papias (Irenaeus, Adv. haer. 5.33.3–4), McGowan also admits that: ‘If a eucharistic allusion can be identified only with caution, it is with still further

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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{a}d ff\textsuperscript{2} i\textsuperscript{3}), 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\textsuperscript{c}), the Sinaitic Syriac (syr\textsuperscript{s}), and the Peshitta Syriac (syr\textsuperscript{p}).\textsuperscript{157} The variations of the Syriac copies are set forth below in parallel columns, as presented by B.M. Metzger:\textsuperscript{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...”

\textsuperscript{154} McGowan, “‘First Regarding the Cup’,” 554.
\textsuperscript{155} There is no evidence of such patterns in the church of Papias. See Monte A. Shanks, Papia... Testament (Eugene: Pickwick, 2013).
\textsuperscript{156} McGowan, “‘First Regarding the Cup’,” 551–52.
\textsuperscript{158} Metzger, Textual Commentary, 148.
The syr⊂ 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. Similar variations also appear in syr³, which places both v. 19 and v. 20a before v. 17. As for the syr⁶, 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’. These variations were mostly produced by scribes ‘not isolated from the

---
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implications of these disputes’. So, following Westcott and Hort’s famous ‘Western non-interpolations’, 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.

However, when he mentions the Syriac manuscripts, Ehrman admits that these versions could have been altered to ‘[reverse] the sequence of cup and bread’.

Not many scholars today would hold to the views of Westcott-Hort or Ehrman, one of the recent exponents of the ‘short reading’ theory. 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. 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.

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]
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162 Ehrman, “The Cup, the Bread, and the Salvific Effect,” 177.
164 Ehrman, “The Cup, the Bread, and the Salvific Effect,” 176.
167 Billings, Do This in Remembrance of Me, esp. 61–81.
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

prayers behind the traditions of Did. 9–10. Under the influence of Louis Finkelstein, to consider these prayers a Christianized Birkat Ha-Mazon became almost a consensus. More recently, however, this view has repeatedly been challenged. 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. However, there is still the recognition that behind the two eucharistic prayers one may identify Jewish patterns of prayers for the meal.

Furthermore, ‘[t]here is general recognition of similar cup–first patterns in Jewish meal practices’. 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). There is, of course, the issue of anachronism, as the Mishnaic literature is later than the first century CE. However, the cup–bread polemics from the second to the fourth centuries CE show the lasting persistence of the inverse pattern. 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.

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. Tuiller. 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).
177 Milavec, Didache, 421.
179 McGowan, “Inordinate Cup,” 287.
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.\(^\text{183}\) 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.\(^\text{184}\) 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.\(^\text{185}\)

(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).\(^\text{186}\) First of all, it would be quite unusual for a liturgical tradition, in its original form, to reflect the geography of a different area.\(^\text{187}\) Then, it\(^\text{183}\) E.g., C.H. Kraeling, “The Jewish Community at Antioch,” *JBL* 51 (1932): 130–60.
\(^\text{187}\) 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 διεσκορισμένον καὶ συναχθὲν ἐγένετο εἷς 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. As for the ancient city of Antioch, it was surrounded by hills and mountains.

Secondly, Richard Bauckham has recently introduced the discipline of mental or cognitive mapping to the study of the Gospel’s origins. 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), while for the Roman citizens the centre would be Rome, the ‘Caput Mundi’.
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188 *Pace* O’Loughlin, *Didache*, 24, who suggests that the source of the metaphor is the prophetic language of the OT (e.g., Ez 36.4; Nah. 3.18).
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

A large majority of scholars, including A. Vööbus, K. Niederwimmer, K. Wengst, and J. Schwiebert 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, such as Ap. Const. 7.25–26 (7.25.3), Serapion, Euch. 13.13, P. Dêr Balizeh II/v. 3–4, 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.

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.

(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 ύμῶν), 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

198 Wengst, Didache, 78, 97–98.
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 Κόδ. 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, 65–66; Robert E. Aldridge, “The Lost Ending of the Didache,” VC 53/1 (1999): 3 (n. 6).
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). Not for this reason alone, it is unlikely that the saying is borrowed from the Gospel. 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matt. 7.6–8</th>
<th>GThom. 92–94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἄγιον τοῖς κυσίν μηδὲ βάλτη τοὺς μαργαρίτας ὑμῶν ἐμπρόσθεν τῶν χοίρων, μὴ ποτε καταπατήσασθε αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς ποσίν αὐτῶν καὶ στραφέτες ἐρέσασθαι ὑμᾶς.</td>
<td>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. 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 [. . .].’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Αἴτετε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν, ζητεῖτε καὶ εὑρήσετε, κρούετε καὶ ἐναοικήσεται ὑμῖν.</td>
<td>92 Jesus [said], ‘One who seeks will find, and for [one who knocks] it will be opened.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει καὶ ὁ ζητῶν εὑρίσκει καὶ τῷ κρούοντι ἀνοικήσεται.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

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
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in only two sections of Matthew: Matt. 5–7 (‘The Sermon on the Mount’) and Matt. 24–25 (‘The Apocalyptic Discourse’). 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). 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), 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. Bringing the argument further, Tuilier identifies the pre-Matthean collection of logia with the hypothetical Q.

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. However, there are several problems with this hypothesis. As numerous scholars have shown, the quotations from the Didache are most probably rendered from memory. 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.
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.
and Matt. 7.6 is entirely reasonable. Again, the point of intersection for Matthew and the Didache, the place of origin for this common source, could be Antioch.

(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. As Cullman notices, the Isaianic ‘paidological’ quotations and allusions, attributed to Jesus himself, 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. 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):

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), it suggests a very early date for the Christianized eucharistic prayers of Did. 9.1–10.7. Also, it should be noted that outside the eucharistic
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218 See H.W. Wolff, Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum (TVG 233; Gießen: Brunnen-Verlag, 1984), 57.
219 Cullmann, Christology, 69–79.
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 παὶς-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 [Δαυείδ τοῦ παιδός σου], which you made known to us through Jesus your servant [διὰ Ησοῦ 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 παὶς-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.
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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).\textsuperscript{231} Furthermore, Peppard connects the fresco to the eucharistic prayers of \textit{Did.} 9–10, especially \textit{Did.} 9.2 (‘the holy vine of David, your child, which you made known to us through Jesus, your child’)\textsuperscript{232} and \textit{Did.} 10.6 (‘May grace come and this world pass away. Hosanna to the God [or house, or Son] of David!’).\textsuperscript{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’\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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, \textit{Eph.} 17.1).\textsuperscript{236} It should be noted that both motifs appear in the eucharistic prayers of the \textit{Didache} (9.2–3; 10.5–6). Moreover, an anointing with oil also appears in these prayers, in some manuscript variants of \textit{Did.} 10.[8], most notably in the \textit{Vorlage} of the Syrian \textit{Ap. Const.} (7.22.2).\textsuperscript{237}

\textsuperscript{231} Peppard, \textit{World’s Oldest Church}, 49.
\textsuperscript{232} Peppard translates τὸ διδαχτὸν σου as ‘your child’, not ‘your servant’.
\textsuperscript{233} For a discussion concerning the original wording of \textit{Did.} 10.6, see Martin Dibelius, “Die Mahl-Gebete der Didache,” in Heinz Kraft, Günther Bornkamm (eds.) \textit{Botschaft und Geschichte}, vol. 2: \textit{Zum Urchristentum und zur hellenistischen Religionsgeschichte} (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1956), 116 (n. 10); Niederwimmer, “Textprobleme,” 126–27.
\textsuperscript{235} Peppard, \textit{World’s Oldest Church}, 63.
\textsuperscript{236} Peppard, \textit{World’s Oldest Church}, esp. 84–85.
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.\textsuperscript{238} Even if the connection to Dura-Europos is considered unconvincing, there is still the connection to Ignatius of Antioch (\textit{Eph. 17.1}). Similar to the prayers of \textit{Did. 9–10}, the teachings of Ignatius concerning the Eucharist connect Jesus to David repeatedly (e.g., \textit{Eph. 20.2}; \textit{Trall. 8.1–9.1}; \textit{Rom. 7.3}), in what appears to be language derived either from ‘liturgical formulae’ or ‘short creed-like statements’ (see \textit{Eph. 18.2, 20.2}; \textit{Trall. 9.1}; \textit{Rom. 7.3}; \textit{Smyrn. 1.1}).\textsuperscript{239} Consequently, this could be another indicator that the prayers of \textit{Did. 9–10} originated in the region of Syria.

\textit{(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.\textsuperscript{240} Teicher connected these prayers so closely with the prayers in the \textit{Didache}, that he actually used \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{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.\textsuperscript{241}

Given the ‘rather fluid pattern’ of ancient Jewish meal prayers,\textsuperscript{242} Teicher’s textual reconstruction is mostly unconvincing.\textsuperscript{243} Still, it can be used to indicate a certain knowledge

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{238} E.g., Leonhard Goppelt, \textit{Theology of the New Testament}, vol. 2: \textit{The Variety and Unity of the Apostolic Witness to Christ} (trans., John Alsup; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1982), 220.
  \item \textsuperscript{239} E.g., J.H. Srawley, \textit{The Epistles of St. Ignatius} (London: SPCK, 1900), 17, 29. See below (§ 8.2.1).
  \item \textsuperscript{241} Teicher, “Ancient Eucharistic Prayers,” 103, 105.
  \item \textsuperscript{242} E.g., Claussen, “Eucharist in John and the \textit{Didache},” 148 (n. 16). See the earlier discussion, § 6.2.1 (2).
  \item \textsuperscript{243} Cf. J. Neusner, \textit{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.’
\end{itemize}
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lk. 11.2b–4</th>
<th>Matt. 6.9b–13[b]</th>
<th><em>Did.</em> 8.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Πάτερ,</td>
<td>Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς,</td>
<td>Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγαθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου,</td>
<td>ἀγαθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου,</td>
<td>ἀγαθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἐλθέτω ἢ βασιλεία σου.</td>
<td>Ἐλθέτω ἢ βασιλεία σου, γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καί ἐπὶ γῆς.</td>
<td>Ἐλθέτω ἢ βασιλεία σου, γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸν ἀρτὸν ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν τῷ καθ’ ἡμέραν</td>
<td>τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δός ἡμῖν σήμερον.</td>
<td>τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸ ἐπιούσιον δός ἡμῖν σήμερον.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἄφης ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἁμαρτοῦμεν παντὶ ὁφείλοντι ἡμῖν,</td>
<td>καὶ ἄφης ἡμῖν τὰ ὁφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἁμαρτοῦμεν τοῖς ὁφειλέταις ἡμῶν,</td>
<td>καὶ ἄφης ἡμῖν τὴν ὁφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἁμαρτοῦμεν τοῖς ὁφειλέταις ἡμῶν,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν.(^{247})</td>
<td>καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.</td>
<td>καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


\(^{247}\) 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.’
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.’ 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.

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.

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.

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).
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’, 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’. Also, he opines that ‘the Didache was familiar with the pre-Matthean Lord’s Prayer, which Matthew also took over from his church tradition’. 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 πατρός; οὐρανός – γῆ; πονηρός. These peculiarities, that indicate a redactional intervention from the author himself, appear also in the Didache. 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’. 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. Moreover, it should be noted that both Matthew and the Didache insert their prayers in a similar context, unlike Lk. 11.1–2a. In Matthew, the Lord’s prayer is framed by

---

254 Niederwimmer (Didache, 136) concurs with this view: ‘a common liturgical tradition’.
256 Betz, Sermon on the Mount, 371 (n. 328).
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.
the instructions ‘not to pray’, nor ‘to fast like the hypocrites’ (Matt. 6.5, 16).\textsuperscript{262} Similarly, in the Didache, ‘the Lord instructs in his gospel’ not ‘to fast’, nor ‘to pray like the hypocrites’ (Did. 8.1–2).\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{264} Draper,\textsuperscript{265} Clabeaux\textsuperscript{266} 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did. 8.2</th>
<th>Did. 9.1–4</th>
<th>Did. 10.1–5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>οὐτί προσεύχεσθε…</td>
<td>οὕτως εὑχαριστήσατε…</td>
<td>οὕτως εὑχαριστήσατε…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ἀγαθόθεν τὸ ὄνομά σου, ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου, γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημα σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς.</td>
<td>Εὐχαριστοῦμεν σοι, πάτερ ἡμῶν, ύπὲρ τῆς ἀγίας ἀμπελοῦ Δαυείδ τοῦ παιδός σου.</td>
<td>Εὐχαριστοῦμεν σοι, πάτερ ἄγιε, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἄγιου ὀνόματος σου, οὗ κατεσκήνωσας ἐν ταῖς καρδίας ἡμῶν, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς γνώσεως καὶ πίστεως καὶ ἀθανασίας, ἢς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Θεοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸ ἐπούσικον δός ἡμῖν σήμερον, καὶ ἀφες ἡμῖν τὴν ὀρείλην ἡμῶν; ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίμεν τοῖς οἰκολέταις ἡμῶν, καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, περὶ δὲ τοῦ ἄρτου [κλάσματος] Εὐχαριστοῦμεν σοι, πάτερ ἡμῶν, ύπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ γνώσεως, ἢς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Θεοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου.</td>
<td>σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.</td>
<td>σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.</td>
<td>σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.</td>
<td>σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{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.’


\textsuperscript{264} Niederwimmer, Didache, 136–38.


\textsuperscript{266} Clabeaux, “Ritual Meal,” 215–16.
Considering the similarities of language and motifs, Draper is entitled to consider that the three prayers were produced by the same community. 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. 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), which was very common among the Jewish doxologies of the time, 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’. 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.’ 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

---

268 See the discussion in Clabeaux, “Ritual Meal,” 218.
271 Niederwimmer, Didache, 138.
ancient Jewish prayers were inconceivable without such concluding doxologies (m. Ber. 1.4). 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), although ‘a fixed form for the doxology appears for the first time here in the Didache’. 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.

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.’ 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), 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 η δύναμις και η 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. 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.
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*).

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 κυρίον], 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 ἔσῃ]. 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*). 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

---

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). 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). His observation is of great relevance, since it shows that the phrase κλάσατε ἄρτον became consecrated in a particular Christian community, hence its hendiadys construction. 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), and Ignatius of Antioch (e.g., Eph. 20.2: συνέρχεσθε … ἐνά ἄρτον κλάντες). 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. Moreover, the affixing of εὐχαριστέω and [ἄρτον] κλάω appears in some of the references listed above, especially in Lk. 22.19 (καὶ λαβὼν
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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.


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, 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’. This, of course, includes his knowledge of the two eucharistic prayers of Did. 9–10. In my own estimation, a particular knowledge of Did. 9–10 is unprovable, since there are no explicit citations, nor clear references. All that scholars can infer, based on circumstantial evidence, is a certain indirect knowledge.

Similar to Did. 9.2 (τῆς ἀγίας ἀμπέλου Δαυείῳ τοῦ παιδός σου, ἢς 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’, 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, ἡ ἐκλασις του αρτου seems to be the formal reference to celebration of the Lord’s Supper, as in 1 Cor 10:16: τον αρτον ἑκλάμεν, “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).


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 κοινωνίᾳ ἔστε, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ἐν τοῖς θνητοῖς), Did. 10.2–3 (καὶ ἀθανασίας ἦς ἐγνώρισας ἦμιν διὰ Ἡσυχοῦ τοῦ παιδῶς σου… ἦμιν δὲ ἐχαρίσω πνευματικὴν τροφῆν καὶ ποτὸν καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ τοῦ παιδῶς σου) and Ignatius, Eph. 20.2 (ἐνα ἅρπον κλόντες, ὡς ἐστίν φάρμακον ἄθανασίας). As Jefford notices, ἀθανασία is rarely used within early Christianity, and even rarer in the context of the shared meal of thanksgiving. Actually, one can limit the connection of ἀθανασία to food and drink to Ignatius and the Didache. 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. So, in a sense, Did. 4.8 is reaffirming Paul’s view of 1 Cor. 11.17–34. 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. 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’, 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. In sum, ‘In the absence of any similar usage […] elsewhere in early Christian literature’, the technical language that connects ἀθανασία and the eucharistic

300 Jefford, “Did Ignatius Know the Didache,” 345.
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.\textsuperscript{303}

Then, I have already mentioned, there is the use of the ‘breaking of the bread’, both in Did. 14.1 (συναχθέντες κλάσατε ἅρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσατε) and Ignatius, Eph. 20.2 (ἐν χάριτι ἐξ ὀνόματος συνέρχεσθε ἐν μιᾷ πίστει [...] ἐνα ἅρτον κλόντες),\textsuperscript{304} which reflects a preference for this terminology, at least in the church of Antioch (cf. 1 Cor. 11.24; Lk. 22.19).\textsuperscript{305} The terminology can be connected only indirectly to Did. 9.3–4 (περὶ δὲ τοῦ κλάσματος [...] ὀσπερ ἣν τοῦτο τὸ κλάσμα διεσκορπίσμενον ἐπάνω τῶν ὅρεων καὶ συναχθὲν ἐγένετο ἐν); 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 κυριακὴ (cf. Rev. 1.10).\textsuperscript{306} The technical term κυριακὴ appears also in Ignatius, Magn. 9.1, in which ‘the Lord’s day’ replaces the Sabbath: μηκέτι σαββατιζόντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ κυριακὴν ζῶντες (cf. Did. 8.1).\textsuperscript{307} Moreover, as scholars have observed, κυριακὴ 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 κυριακὴ is used are located in the region of Syria: Did. 14.1; Ignatius, Magn. 9.1; GPet. 9.35, 13.50.\textsuperscript{308}


\textsuperscript{304} Jefford, “Did Ignatius Know the Didache,” 347.

\textsuperscript{305} See § 6.2.1 (11).


\textsuperscript{307} Schoedel, \textit{Ignatius of Antioch}, 123 (n. 3).

Moreover, according to Jefford, ‘it is logical to assume’ that the technical κυριακή was derived from the phrase κυριακὸν δεῖπνον (1 Cor. 11.20). If this assumption is correct, 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; 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’. 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’. This indirectly denotes that Ignatius knew the eucharistic prayers of Did. 9–10.

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

---

311 For the technical use of κυριακὸν δείπνον 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. 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.

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, 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, was composed elsewhere, as a reworking of an archaic Jewish meal prayer. Still, it was adopted by the church of Antioch and used there as a eucharistic prayer, at the time when the prayer of Did.

---

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

---

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, Scrierile Părinților apostolici (PSB 1; Bucharest: EIBMBOR, 1979), 17.
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did. 9.1–5</th>
<th>Did. 10.1–7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας, ὦτως εὐχαριστήσατε.</td>
<td>1 Μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπληρωθῆσαι, ὦτως εὐχαριστήσατε.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 πρῶτον περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου. Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας ἁμαρτίας Ἁμαρτίαν σου τοῦ παιδός σου, ἥς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἱσραήλ τοῦ παιδός σου. οὐ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.</td>
<td>2 Εὐχαριστοῦμεν σοι, πάτερ ἄγιο, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁγίου ἄνω τῆς καρδιάς ἡμῶν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Περὶ τοῦ κλάσματος. Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ γνώσεως, ἥς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἱσραήλ τοῦ παιδός σου. οὐ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.</td>
<td>4 Ἡθελῶν ἂν τὸ κλάσμα διεσκορπισμένον ἐπάνω τῶν ὀρέων καὶ συνανθέθη ἐγκύκλιον ἐν, οὕτως συνανθέθησαν οὐ καταγελαν. ἔνας πονηρὸς πάνος ἡμῶν διὰ τῶν πατρών σου. δοξάσας διήκονεν καὶ δοξάσας διήκονεν. 5 ημῶν διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας και τῆς πίστεως καὶ ἄνθρωπος σου τοῦ πατρὸς σου, καὶ σύνεδρον ἐκκλησίας σου. οὐ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Μηδεὶς δὲ φαγέτω μηδὲ πίετω ἀπὸ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὑμῶν, ἄλλ’ οἱ βαπτισθέντες εἰς ὔμοια κυρίου. καὶ γὰρ περὶ τοῦτον εἰρήκεν ὁ κύριος. Μή δοτε τὸ άρείον τὸς κοσμοῦ.</td>
<td>6 ἦλθετον χάρις καὶ παρελθεῖτο ὁ κόσμος ὦτος. Ὁσπάννα τὸ θεὸν Δαυίδ. εἰ τῆς ἁγίας ἐστιν, ἐρχόμενος εἰ τις οὐκ ἔστι, μετανοεῖτο. μαραν ἀνήμ. ἔμ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Τοῖς δὲ προφήταις ἐπιτρέπετε εὐχαριστεῖν ὅσα θέλουσιν.</td>
<td>8 πρὸ πάντων εὐχαριστοῦμεν σοι, ὅτι δυνάτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, οὗτος εὐχαριστήσατε), while Did. 10.1–6 is to be used ‘after’ (10.1: Μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆσαι, οὗτος 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,

---


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, J. Betz, J.W. Riggs, K. Niederwimmer, and E. Mazza, 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). 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.

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 (μηδὲς δὲ φαγέτω μηδὲ πιέτω ἀπὸ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὑμῶν, ἀλλ’ οἱ βαπτισθέντες εἰς ὅνομα κυρίου);
3) Did. 10.1: the ‘filling’ agape meal (Μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλήσθησα, οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε);
4) Did. 10.2–3a, 4–5: a thanksgiving after the agape meal (τροφήν τε καὶ ποτὸν ἔδωκας τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν);

12 J. Betz, “The Eucharist in the Didache,” in Draper, Didache in Modern Research, 244–75.
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 (ἡμῖν δὲ ἔχαρισω πνευματικὴν τροφὴν καὶ ποτὸν… εἴ τις ἁγιὸς ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω. εἴ τις οὐκ ἐστιν, μετανοεῖτο).\(^{18}\)

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 ἁγιὸς ἐστιν) and have ‘repented’ of their unholy deeds (εἴ τις οὐκ ἐστι, μετανοεῖτο). 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 ύμῶν) may be pure […] Let no one […] join you until they are reconciled, that your sacrifice (ἡ θυσία ύμῶν) may not be defiled’.\(^{25}\)

---

\(^{18}\) Garrow, Matthew’s Dependence, 21.

\(^{19}\) Garrow, Matthew’s Dependence, 14–15.


\(^{21}\) Niederwimmer, Didache, 143.

\(^{22}\) Virtually all scholars agree that Did. 10.7 comes from the hand of the final editor, the Didachist.


In Did. 9.5, the sacrificial language is implicit (τὸ ἅγιον); in 14.1–2, the language is explicit (ἡ θυσία). 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, the natural reading of 10.6 points to an invitation to the eucharistic meal (εἰ τις ἅγιος ἔστιν, ἐρχέσθω).

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 ἐμπληθῆσαι, 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’. Moreover, Did. 10.3 appears to render a transition from the regular to the eucharistic food: τροφῆν τε καὶ ποτὸν ἔδωκας τοῖς ἁγνῶποις εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν, ἵνα σοι εὐχαριστήσωσιν, ἵνα μὲ 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’. 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).

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,

---

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.
30 Niederwimmer, Didache, 158.
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*.

Even Klaus Wengst, who argued that *Did.* 9–10 depicts ‘nothing but a full-course meal’, admits that ‘originally’ *Did.* 10.6 might have been ‘a fragment of a Lord’s Supper liturgy’. 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.

In conclusion, for most scholars it obvious that *Did.* 10.6 originally renders a restrictive invitation to the Eucharist: εἰ τις ἁγιός ἔστιν, ἐρχέσθω. 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*), recent scholarship inclines to the former, in most cases. 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 […] μηδὲς δὲ φαγέτω μηδὲ πιέτω ἀπὸ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὑμῶν, ἀλλ’ οἱ… Moreover, it should be noted that the technical

---

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).
36 For several other examples, see Draper, “Ritual Process,” 141–42.
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 ἄνθρωποις 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 kλάσμα, 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

---

⁴² Garrow, Matthew’s Dependence, 20.
⁴³ Betz, “Eucharist in the Didache,” 249.
(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’, was convincingly refuted by A. McGowan, 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.

(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. 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. 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. 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: εἰ τις ἁγιός ἔστιν, ἔργεσθο. However, a similar restriction ends the prayer of Did. 9, as has been already noted:

46 Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 118 (n. 5).
50 Cf. Niederwimmer, Didache, 140–43.
μηδεὶς δὲ φαγέτω μηδὲ πιέτω ἀπὸ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὑμῶν, ἀλλὰ οἱ βαπτισθέντες εἰς ὄνομα κυρίου. καὶ γὰρ περὶ τούτου εἴρηκεν ὁ κύριος: Μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἄγιον τοῖς κωσί. Niederwimmer, for instance, who strongly argues that Did. 9.1–4 introduces the ‘nonsacramental meal of the community’ (agape), finds the ‘rubrical comment’ of 9.5 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 ἐμπλήσθησαι, οὖτως εὐχαριστήσατε) with a post communionem rubric (Μετὰ δὲ τὴν μετάληψιν, οὖτως 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: εἰ τις ἄγιος, 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.’ However, this conclusion, correlated with the conclusion of the previous sub-chapter, creates precisely the ‘incompatibilities’ noted by Garrow, 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, 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), A.D. Nock (1929), J. Jeremias (1935), R.H. Connolly (1937), M. Dibelius (1938), A. Arnold (1939), G. Dix (1945), R. Bultmann (1948), P. Vielhauer (1965), and S. Gero. 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.
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.
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).\(^92\)


\(^70\) 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.’


\(^76\) Van de Sandt, “Baptism and Holiness,” 140.

\(^77\) Schwiebert, *Knowledge*, 4–12, 98–110.


\(^83\) Lietzmann, *Mass and Lord’s Supper*, esp. 188–94. But see the discussion below, § 7.1.3 (1).


\(^85\) Anton Greiff, *Das älteste Pascharituale der Kirche, Did 1–10, und das Johannesevangelium* (Johanneische Studien 1; Paderborn: Schoeningh, 1929), 109–11 and passim.


\(^92\) 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 (ἐὰν τις ἀγαθός ἐστίν, 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.
ἐλθέω χάρις καὶ παρελθέω ὁ κόσμος οὗτος and the archaic μαρανθάν ὁθά 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 εἰ τις ἄγιος ἐστίν, ἐρχόμεθα. εἰ τις οὐκ ἐστι, 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 ἄγιος (“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 εἰ τις ἄγιος ἐστιν, ἐρχόμεθα, 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


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.\textsuperscript{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. \textit{Did.} 9.5).\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{108} Dibelius,\textsuperscript{109} Audet,\textsuperscript{110} Wengst,\textsuperscript{111} and Niederwimmer,\textsuperscript{112} J. Schwiebert has convincingly shown that \textit{Did.} 10.6 comprises strong indications of a ritual dialogue (‘antiphonal’), including a ‘congregational’ response:\textsuperscript{113}

\begin{quote}
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.\textsuperscript{114}
\end{quote}

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:

\begin{quote}
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.\textsuperscript{115}
\end{quote}

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{106} Van de Sandt-Flusser, \textit{Didache}, 302. The same solution was introduced earlier by Vööbus, \textit{Liturgical Traditions}, 73–74, 102.
\item\textsuperscript{107} Van de Sandt-Flusser, \textit{Didache}, 302.
\item\textsuperscript{108} Van de Sandt-Flusser, \textit{Didache}, 302.
\item\textsuperscript{109} Lietzmann, \textit{Mass and Lord’s Supper}, 193.
\item\textsuperscript{110} Dibelius, “Mahl-Gebete,” 125.
\item\textsuperscript{111} Audet, \textit{Didachè}, 411–12.
\item\textsuperscript{112} Wengst, \textit{Didache}, 46.
\item\textsuperscript{113} Niederwimmer, \textit{Didache}, 161–62.
\end{itemize}
Furthermore, as several scholars have pointed out, the Didachist is remarkably conservative when he cites earlier Christian traditions.\textsuperscript{116} As I will argue later, this is particularly true with respect to the eucharistic traditions/prayers of Did. 9–10.\textsuperscript{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 εἰ τὶς ἔγινός ἐστιν, ἔρχεσθω (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 ἐμπλήσθησαι, οὗτος 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’.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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’.\textsuperscript{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”’.\textsuperscript{121} Since Draper has changed his position on the meaning of 10.6,\textsuperscript{122} I will only mention this unlikely reading without further elaboration.

\textsuperscript{117} See below (§ 7.1.4).  
\textsuperscript{118} Van de Sandt-Flusser, Didache, 302.  
\textsuperscript{119} See Garrow, Matthew’s Dependence, 16 (n. 14).  
\textsuperscript{120} Garrow, Matthew’s Dependence, 16.  
\textsuperscript{121} Garrow, Matthew’s Dependence, 22.  
\textsuperscript{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 (ἐἴ τις ἀγιός 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.\(^\text{123}\) 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.\(^\text{124}\)

(4) For D.-A. Koch, the invitation of *Did.* 10:6c (ἐἴ τις ἀγιός 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).\(^\text{125}\) 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.\(^\text{126}\)

In order to defend this view, Koch argues that the ‘liturgical exclamations occur only in 10:6 and […] have no parallel in chapter 9.’\(^\text{127}\) 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.


\(^{125}\) Koch, “Eucharistic Meal,” 200, 214.

\(^{126}\) Koch, “Eucharistic Meal,” 211.

\(^{127}\) Koch, “Eucharistic Meal,” 205.
Such a distinction leads Koch to affirm ‘the unique character of 10:6c within the liturgy of Did. 9 and 10’.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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’ (τοις δὲ προφήταις ἐπιτρέπετε εὐχαριστεῖν). The language of contrast (the adversative particle δὲ) and of ‘permission’ (ἐπιτρέπω) indicates an exceptional case.\textsuperscript{132} Moreover, 10.6 was part of the original prayer, or at least predates the final stage of composition,\textsuperscript{133} while 10.7 comes from the later hand of the Didachist.\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{128} Koch, “Eucharistic Meal,” 206.  
\textsuperscript{129} Koch, “Eucharistic Meal,” 206.  
\textsuperscript{130} Mazza, “Didache 9–10,” 277–83.  
\textsuperscript{132} Cf. Milavec, Didache, 428–35.  
\textsuperscript{133} Cf. Van de Sandt-Flusser, Didache, 325–29.  
\textsuperscript{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. Moreover, the ἄμην that ends the exclamations of Did. 10.6 seems to terminate the congregational participation, rather than introduce it. It is precisely in this post-ἄμην context that the Didachist will later insert the contrasting exception regarding ‘the prophets’ (10.7).

### 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. 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 εἰ τίς ἁγιὸς ἔστιν, ἐρχέσθω invitation remains hidden. In the words of van de Sandt, ‘[it] is an invitation to come but without saying where’. 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.

---

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. 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. 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.

Audet’s theory of two Eucharists has found no supporters. As Vööbus emphatically notes, Audet’s proposal has ‘not one shred of evidence in its support’. 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’.

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: 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
already having happened'. 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.

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.

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’. In time, however, the prayers of Did. 9.2–10.5 became redundant, as the eucharistic theology developed. Yet, rather than to discard the outdated prayers, ‘they were transformed and revalued from original eucharistic prayers to mere agape prayers’. So, it is only Did. 10.6 that introduces the Eucharist proper.

Betz’s reconstruction has been criticized by J.W. Riggs. Overall, I concur with Garrow, who considers that Riggs’ critique, mainly his three editorial stages alternative, ‘[require] an even more unlikely turn of events’. However, I still think that Riggs is correct to suggest that Did. 10.2–5 is the older tradition, predating Did. 9.2–4. To state it again, this

---

147 Betz, “Eucharist in the Didache,” 249.
150 Betz, “Eucharist in the Didache,” 274.
152 Betz, “Eucharist in the Didache,” 251–53 (251); Garrow, Matthew’s Dependence, 23.
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.\textsuperscript{157} Therefore, I consider that Betz should have kept a clearer distinction between \textit{Did.} 9.2–4 and \textit{Did.} 10.2–5, given their parallel composition.\textsuperscript{158} In my opinion, it was the eucharistic prayer of \textit{Did.} 10.1–6 that was ‘downgraded’ or ‘revalued’,\textsuperscript{159} thus becoming a thanksgiving prayer ‘after’ the Eucharist (10.1), after the more explicit eucharistic prayer originated within the same community (\textit{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.\textsuperscript{160}

(3) As was previously stated, this chapter follows closely Garrow’s approach to ‘the five incompatible actions of \textit{Did.} 9.1–10.6’.\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{162} Furthermore, in order to solve the problem of the incompatibilities (especially \textit{Did.} 9.2–5 and 10.6), he advances the ‘previously unconsidered solution […] that they represent two separate accounts of the same liturgical event’.\textsuperscript{163} Garrow calls this approach ‘the parallel liturgy theory’, as the two eucharistic prayers circulated in the form of ‘separate first-century Christian liturgies’.\textsuperscript{164}

\textit{Did.} 9 and 10 belonged to two separate layers of tradition which, when joined together in the \textit{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 \textit{Apostolic Constitutions} VII where, however, those aspects of \textit{Did.} 9 and 10 that make such a running together impractical have been modified.\textsuperscript{165}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{157} E.g., van de Sandt-Flusser, \textit{Didache}, 313; Mazza, \textit{Origins}, 17; J.D. Crossan, \textit{The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant} (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 361–64.
  \item \textsuperscript{158} See Garrow, \textit{Matthew’s Dependence}, 26–27.
  \item \textsuperscript{159} Betz, “Eucharist in the Didache,” 251; Garrow, \textit{Matthew’s Dependence}, 23.
  \item \textsuperscript{160} Betz, “Eucharist in the Didache,” 251.
  \item \textsuperscript{161} Garrow, \textit{Matthew’s Dependence}, 21.
  \item \textsuperscript{162} Garrow, \textit{Matthew’s Dependence}, 26–27.
  \item \textsuperscript{163} Garrow, \textit{Matthew’s Dependence}, 25.
  \item \textsuperscript{164} Garrow, \textit{Matthew’s Dependence}, 28.
  \item \textsuperscript{165} Garrow, \textit{Matthew’s Dependence}, 28.
\end{itemize}
As Garrow himself admits, this thesis is ‘open to criticism’. 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)’. 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’. 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. And this community was Antioch, as I have argued.

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. Second, I suggest that Garrow uses the term ‘liturgy’ anachronistically. If these prayers were primitive, belonging to earliest Christianity, as Garrow himself admits (‘separate first-century Christian liturgies’), 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’. He is also
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166 Garrow, Matthew’s Dependence, 28.
167 Garrow, Matthew’s Dependence, 28.
168 Garrow, Matthew’s Dependence, 28.
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 (ἐἰ τις ἁγιὸς ἐστιν, ἔρχεσθω) 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).

---

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 (ἐἰ τις ἁγιός ἐστιν, ἔρχεσθω), 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.
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*).\(^\text{180}\)

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);\(^\text{181}\) 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).\(^\text{182}\) 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).\(^\text{183}\) 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).\(^\text{184}\) 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’.

---


\(^{181}\) 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.


\(^{184}\) 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

---

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, οὐτος εὐχαριστήσατε) and 10.6c (εἰ τις ἡγιάς ἔστιν, ἔρχεσθω) 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).
about Ignatius and his church comes from the seven letters 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). 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).  

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). 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.

---


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. 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), and reached Smyrna sometime in August (where there was a providential delay). Ignatius gained the support of the local Christians and Polycarp, their bishop. 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. He also wrote to the church of Rome at this time. The next step was Troas where the stay was apparently shorter and abruptly terminated. There Ignatius learned that “peace” had been restored to the Christians in Antioch. And there he wrote letters to the Philadelphians, the Smyrnaeans, and Polycarp. 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.

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’). According to Eusebius (Hist. eccl. 3.22.1), he was the second (or the third) bishop of Antioch, succeeding Evodius (cf. 3.36). 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):

---

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.
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 (Dia. 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

---

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).
25 Lightfoot, Apostolic Fathers II.1, 2-69.
the reign of Trajan (98–117 CE). Unlike these scholars, Andreas Lindemann (2005), after evaluating the state of modern scholarship, 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.  

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.’ 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)—and Timothy Barnes (2008), who suggests the 140s CE, during the reign of Antoninus Pius (138–161 CE). Later dates (ca. 165–175 CE) have been suggested by Robert Joly (1979), Reinhard Hübner (1997), Markus Vinzent (1999), and Thomas Lechner (1999).

---


30 Foster, “Epistles of Ignatius (1),” 492.


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 Pastoral epistles 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.\(^\text{37}\)

First of all, I tend to date these NT writings much earlier than Foster does.\(^\text{38}\) 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)\(^\text{39}\) and four Pauline epistles: 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, 1 Timothy, and 2 Timothy.\(^\text{40}\) As I will show later, he may also have used some oral traditions underlying John’s Gospel.\(^\text{41}\) 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 \textit{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’.\(^\text{42}\) Then, there was the sudden (‘unexpected’)
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). 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). So, Ignatius’ use of this limited NT ‘canon’, 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. Also, as C. Jefford suggested, it is highly probable that Ignatius knew the Didache in its final form.

Furthermore, Brent persuasively argues that Ignatius should be interpreted within the intellectual background of the second sophistic movement. 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’. However, the second sophistic can be traced back at least to Dio Chrysostom, who lived under Trajan (ca. 40–115 CE). Barnes, as I mentioned, dates Ignatius’ writings even later, in the 140s CE. His main argument comes from Pol. 3.2, 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).
52 Pol. 3.2: τὸν ἵστερ καιρὸν προσδόκα, τὸν ἠχονον, τὸν ἄρατον, τὸν δι’ ἡμᾶς ὁρατόν, τὸν ἀνήλωσις, τὸν ἅπαν τρόπον δι’ ἡμᾶς ὑπομείνατι. (’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. Other passages, especially Smyrn. 2.1–3.3 could ‘reflect a repudiation of the teachings of Marcion’ (see Phld. 8.2). However, as Sebastian Moll and T.J. Lang have shown, Barnes’ argument for direct influence could be reversed. As for the repudiation of the teachings of Marcion, the theory is highly unlikely. Therefore, following Lang, I concur with Moll’s assessment: ‘the appearance of such men as Ptolemy and Marcion remains the terminus ante not post quem’.

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.

(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), given the complete disappearance of the first generation of Christians, 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). 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). 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.
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’.
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').

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). 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’.

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).

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 ὑποπτεύσαντες με ὡς πρεσβύτα τοὺς μερισμοὺς τινων λέγων 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 ἔγνω; 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 λέγων τάδε). 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): ‘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). 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.
‘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 γάρ σάρξ 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).’


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.’
(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 Philippians (Cambridge: CUP, 1936), 85–88; Hammond Bammler, “Ignatian Problems,” 79; Brent, Ignatius of Antioch, 20–22.


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.


ending, in the lack of an official edict. And there is no evidence that such an edict was issued in Antioch.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{in lícitá factió}.\textsuperscript{87}

Moreover, before he has heard about the restoration of peace,\textsuperscript{88} Ignatius asks the Magnesians (\textit{Magn.} 14.1) to pray εἰς τὸ ἀξιωθῆναι τὴν ἑν Συρία ἐκκλήσιάν (‘that the church of Syria may be judged worthy [of being refreshed]’), a rather negative evaluation.\textsuperscript{89} After he has heard about the restoration of peace (\textit{Smyrn.} 11.2; cf. \textit{Pol.} 7.1–2), he asks the church of Smyrna to send ‘a godly ambassador’ (θεοπρεσβύτην) to visit the church of Antioch and συγχαρήναι αὐτοῖς […] ἀπέλαβον τὸ ἱδιὸν μέγεθος καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη αὐτοῖς τὸ ἱδιὸν 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 ἱδιὸν σωματεῖον (\textit{Smyrn.} 11.2) could describe the reunion of a church that was previously divided.\textsuperscript{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, \textit{Cor.} 15.1; 44.2; 63.4; Hermas, \textit{Man.} 27[II].3; \textit{Vis.} 14[III.6].3; 17[III.9].2; 20[III.12].3; \textit{Sim.} 73[VIII.7].2; \textit{Barn.} 19.12; \textit{Did.} 4.3).\textsuperscript{91}

In conclusion, it is likely that, prior to his arrest, Ignatius ‘lost control of the church in Antioch’, as scholars assume (cf. \textit{Magn.} 4.1).\textsuperscript{92} Hence the numerous statements of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{86} See Brent, \textit{Ignatius of Antioch}, 14–19.
\item \textsuperscript{87} Schlatter, “Restoration of Peace,” 467.
\item \textsuperscript{88} See the epistolary chronology in LaVerdiere, \textit{Eucharist}, 149–150; Schoedel, \textit{Ignatius of Antioch}, 11.
\item \textsuperscript{89} Schoedel, \textit{Ignatius of Antioch}, 132.
\item \textsuperscript{90} Schlatter, “Restoration of Peace,” 467; Brent, \textit{Ignatius of Antioch}, 21.
\item \textsuperscript{91} Brent, \textit{Ignatius of Antioch}, 21; Harrison, \textit{Polycarp’s Two Epistles}, 84 (n. 3).
\end{itemize}
unworthiness, when he refers to his Antiochene membership (Eph. 21.2; Magn. 14.1; Trall. 13.1; Rom. 9.2; Smyrn. 11.1). 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):

\[\text{Μνημονεύετε ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ ὑμῶν τῆς ἐν Συρίᾳ ἐκκλησίας, ἣτις [ἀντὶ ἐμοῦ] ποιεῖται αὐτῷ θεὸς 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').

A prayer request like this could point to the existence of a concurrent bishop, that Ignatius had not approved (cf. Smyrn. 6.1). 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.

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). 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). 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). As T.A. Robinson shows, Ignatius’ status of τὸν ἐπίσκοπον Συρίας was unchallenged in the churches of Asia Minor. 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 ἐκτρομα (Rom. 9.2; cf. 1 Cor. 15.8–9; Philo, Leg. alleg. 1.76), ‘used more broadly of moral and spiritual failings’.
95 Schoedel, Ignatius of Antioch, 240.
96 Schlatter, “Restoration of Peace,” 469.
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.’
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). 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); 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. 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.
104 Two letters are sent to the same church: to Smyrna and to Polycarp, its bishop.
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, 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), 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). To these, Meeks-Wilken add the use of certain ‘apostolic creeds’ and ‘liturgical traditions’, 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 ἑνὶ σῶματι τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτοῦ).  

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, P.J. Donahue, Ulrich Luz, and others have argued for the existence of several, ‘independent’ churches in Antioch, that ‘rarely met together’. 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). 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.

As Robinson notices, this view has become dominant in modern scholarship. Nevertheless, I concur with Meier, Robinson, and others that emphasise the singularity of the ‘Great Church’ of Antioch, despite the existing factions (cf. Smyrn. 1.1–2; 8.2; Origen, Cels. 5.61–62). 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.’
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].’
116 Donahue, “Jewish Christianity,” 84, 88.
117 Donahue, “Jewish Christianity,” 92.
118 Robinson, Ignatius of Antioch, 77.
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. Most probably, most of these occurred during his episcopacy and ended soon after his arrest and departure (*Smyrn.* 11.2). 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). 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). In sum, Ignatius does not consider the separate assemblies a *status-quo*.

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.

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). And they were recent, transitory, abnormal, and consistently associated with the ‘great church’. In conclusion, the mono-episcopal hierarchy that Ignatius tried to impose was rejected by certain groups of the Antiochene church (sg.).

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.

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.’


*Magn.* 8.1: εἰ γὰρ μέχρι νῦν κατὰ Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ζῶμεν (‘For if we have lived according to Judaism until now…’).


Donahue, ‘Jewish Christianity,”’ 87–92.


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).


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 ἄρχοντιμον τῆς τύπου [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 μιμήματα 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.
137 See also the persuasive argument of Brent, Ignatius of Antioch, 79–94.
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’, 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).

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’. At this point, I will focus mainly on the latter. 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. 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), as in the council of presbyters of the church. And the ‘Prophets’, let us love them too (καὶ τοῖς προφήταις 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’.
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. However, since there are very few NT writings echoed by Ignatius, it is probably anachronistic to expect this canonical division. More likely, ‘Apostles’ could refer both to some of the writings of the apostles (such as 1 Corinthians) and to the oral traditions of the church, that were associated with the apostles. 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).

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 ἀργείοις), 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 ἀδικτὰ 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):

be fully convinced (πεπληροφορῆθαι) 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 βεβαιῶς ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), our hope, from which may none of you ever be turned aside (ἡς ἐκτραπῆναι μηδενὶ υμῶν γένοιτο).

The ‘archives’ of the apostles preserved and summarized the historical and theological truths about Jesus Christ, i.e., ‘the central elements of Christianity’. his divinity (Eph. 18.2); his

---

147 So, Lightfoot, Apostolic Fathers II.2, 260.
150 Cf. Smyrn. 7.2: προσέχειν δὲ τοῖς προφήτας, ἐξαμείτει δὲ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ (‘pay attention to the “Prophets”, and above all to the “Gospel”’).
151 Cf. Edwards, Catholicity and Heresy, 40.
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).\(^\text{153}\) 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).\(^\text{154}\) 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 μίᾳ 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 ὄν τις). For even though I have been bound in chains because of his Name, I have not yet been perfected (οὐκ ἀπέτρισμαι) 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.\(^\text{155}\) Note, for instance, Eph. 16.1–2:

---


\(^{155}\) Hoffman, “Apostolic Doctrine,” 78.
Do not be deceived, my brothers: ‘those who corrupt their households will not inherit the kingdom of God.’ 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. 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). Moreover, ‘the entire thinking of Ignatius [concerning his own martyrdom] is a dynamic prolongation of the eucharist’. 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 ἐνστὶν θεὸν ἐπιτυγχάνω). 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 καθάρως ἄρτος εὑρεθῶ 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. In the words of Raymond Johanny,

---

156 Cf. 1 Cor. 6.9.
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.  

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)—the lack of any explicit quotation of the eucharistic traditions is surprising (cf. Rom. 7.3).

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). 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 πολὺς ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτός γίνεσθαι), 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 (μιᾷ εὐχαριστίᾳ χρήσθαι). For there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup that brings the unity of his blood (μία γὰρ σάρξ τοῦ κυρίου ἤμων Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἕν ποτήριον εἰς ἔοις τοῦ ἁματος 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 (ἐπιθερεόδοξοντας) 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 ὑμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα

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.
Let no one do anything involving the church without the bishop. Let only that Eucharist be considered valid, that occurs under the bishop (ἐκείνης Βεβαίας εὐχαρίστια ἔγειρθο, ἢ ὡς ἐπίσκοπον οὖσα ἢ ὁ ὁ ἀν ἀοτῶς ἐπιτρέψῃ); 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; and perhaps the most debated meaning is in Eph. 13.1. Johanny, for instance, following A. Hamman and J. de Watteville, argues for the technical use of the term, while other scholars consider that εὐχαριστία should be translated ‘thanksgiving’. In my view, W. Schoedel is correct to argue for both, keeping the ambiguity of P.T. Camelot:

“thanksgiving” (εὐχαριστία) 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.

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’.

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), but also included certain eucharistic prayers.

This reading is confirmed by related texts, such as Eph. 5.2 and Smyrn. 7.1: Εὐχαριστίας καί...
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. 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). 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. Also, the phrase ή 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). Nonetheless, any certainty is impossible.

However, there is another possible scenario. Following Corwin, Jefford suggests that Ignatius’ opponents in Antioch were ‘highly influenced by Essene Judaism’. Moreover, it was this faction (the ‘party of the right’) that was responsible for Didache’s final stage of composition, a composition that ‘reflects some flavor of Essene Judaism’. 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.’).  
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).  
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).\textsuperscript{184} If Jefford’s hypothesis, which he considers ‘not definitive, [but] certainly suggestive’,\textsuperscript{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 ὠθεῖμαι, ὁ ἐστὶν σὰρξ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὸν ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυείδ); and for drink I desire his blood, which is (ὁ ἐστὶν) imperishable love.’

As Johanny notices, ‘Ignatius’ letters are full of short and highly compact phrases’ and ‘[his] style is rough’.\textsuperscript{186} In other words, his language sounds creedal enough to hinder clear distinctions between his own teachings and the allusions to prior tradition.\textsuperscript{187} Such is the case

\textsuperscript{184} Jefford, “Conflict at Antioch,” 263.
\textsuperscript{185} Jefford, “Conflict at Antioch,” 268.
\textsuperscript{186} Johanny, “Ignatius of Antioch,” 49.
\textsuperscript{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. On the one hand, the reference to σπέρματος Δαυείδ ('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). Similarly, the parallel use of δ ἐστιν ('which is') could also indicate a creedal formula: ‘bread of God, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ […] his blood, which is imperishable love.’ 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 ἁγάμη 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.

That this is the case is confirmed by Ignatius’ distinctive link of ‘blood’ and ‘love’ (cf. Trall. 8.1). 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). 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 (τὸ κατὰ

---
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σάρκα ἐκ γένους Δαυείδ), 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 (ἐνα ἄρτον κλώντες), which is the medicine of immortality (ὁς ἐστιν 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 ὁς ἐστιν (‘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

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, ἀντιδότος 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 creational 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 ἠμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), which suffered on behalf of our sins and which the Father raised in his kindness.’

It could be that the phrase τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν τῇ χρηστότητι ὁ πατὴρ ἔγερεν (‘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 ἐν τῷ 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 preceded\(^{201}\) 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


\(^{202}\) 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.’


\(^{204}\) 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.)

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 ὁ 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).

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, 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. 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. Among the four letters of Paul that were used by Ignatius, scholars
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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). 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’. Likewise, R.M. Grant, who identified forty-six ‘allusions’, concluded that Ignatius knew 1 Corinthians ‘practically by heart’. With regard to the Gospel of Matthew, 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). 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).

---


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).\textsuperscript{216} Despite these ‘points of contact’, most scholars would argue against a direct knowledge.\textsuperscript{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’,\textsuperscript{218} still stands.\textsuperscript{219}

So, following these observations, there is a high probability that Ignatius knew the eucharistic traditions of 1 Cor. 11.23–25\textsuperscript{220} 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.\textsuperscript{221} I find his view very unlikely, as there are no significant correspondences between the two passages.\textsuperscript{222} Furthermore, Johanny suggested that 1 Cor. 10.16 and 11.25 were behind Phld. 4.1.\textsuperscript{223} Unlike the view of LaVerdiere, Johanny’s could partially be defended by textual comparison:

\footnotesize{
\textsuperscript{218} Streeter, \textit{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.’
\textsuperscript{219} For a more recent argument for Ignatius’ knowledge of John’s Gospel, see Charles E. Hill, \textit{The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church} (New York: OUP, 2004), 421–43.
\textsuperscript{221} LaVerdiere, \textit{Eucharist}, 153.
\textsuperscript{222} As far as I am aware, no other scholar holds this view.
\textsuperscript{223} Johanny, “Ignatius of Antioch,” 54.
}
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). 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 ποιῇτε, τὴν σάρκα ὑμῶν ὡς ναὸν θεοῦ τηρεῖτε, τὴν ἐνωσιν ἁγαπᾶτε, 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. 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.’

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’. This assumption fits well with Ignatius’ high appreciation for the apostle Paul (Eph. 12.2); 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. 

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. 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. 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. Unfortunately, in both cases, all the answers we can get are hypothetical.

---

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 that 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

---

236 LaVerdiere, Eucharist, 151–52, 160.
238 Cf. LaVerdiere, Eucharist, 151–53, 158, 160.
241 LaVerdiere, Eucharist, 152.
John’s Gospel’. 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.’ 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’. 

In my view, all these scholars rightly suggest a non-literary source. 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’. 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). 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 […] ἐξαιρέτως δὲ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, ἐν φῶ τῷ πάθος ἡμῖν δεδήλωται καὶ ἢ ἀνάστασις τετελείωται (‘pay attention […] especially to the “Gospel”, in which the passion is clearly shown to us and the resurrection is perfected’).

In conclusion, it is possible that there is a Johannine ‘living tradition’ behind Phld. 4.1; but the evidence is slim. 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.

242 LaVerdiere, Eucharist, 151.
243 LaVerdiere, Eucharist, 160.
244 LaVerdiere, Eucharist, 160 (cf. 152).
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). 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) 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.’ Thus, McGowan challenges the acknowledged dominant view of the form critics, 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…

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. 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’.

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.

---

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.
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.

---

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

---


15 Corwin, *St. Ignatius*, 49.


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.

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.
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. 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. 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. 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. 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’. 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. It should be noted that all the variety that Dunn identified concerns primarily the practice of the Eucharist. However, if we consider that most of the NT texts examined by Dunn originated in Antioch (Matt. 26.26–29,

28 Dix, Shape of the Liturgy, 48–50.
30 McGowan, “‘First Regarding the Cup’,” 551–52.
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. 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. It is also consistent with the fact that, in Antioch, there were separate Eucharists held from the earliest period (Gal. 2.11–14).

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 ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτίαν (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.
36 Meier, “Antioch,” 40, 80.
Matt. 26.26–29 and the eucharistic prayer of Did. 10.1–6, a prayer that echoes the Jewish meal benediction (berakha). However, Did. 10.1–6 shows only an incipient distinction between the regular food and the ‘spiritual food and drink’ (πνευματικὴν τροφὴν καὶ ποτὸν). 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), 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.
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, 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’. 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.

(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), 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).
42 This scenario admits the possibility of multiple house-churches, but not ‘isolated’ or ‘independent’ from each other.
43 D. King calls the Didache ‘pericononical’, 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).
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’. 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

---

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.’

---

Church today is a broken body.\textsuperscript{47} In too many cases, diversity simply means ‘adversity’.\textsuperscript{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 Antiochens chose the way of ‘addition’ and ‘revaluation’. 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?\textsuperscript{49} These important questions require further reflection.

\textsuperscript{48} Lat. \textit{adversus, adversitas}: ‘against’; ‘opposition’.
\textsuperscript{49} Cf. B.F. Meyer (ed.), \textit{One Loaf, One Cup: Ecumenical Studies of 1 Cor. 11 and Other Eucharistic Texts} (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1993).
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