

THE NEW TESTAMENT AND THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS

The Reception of the
New Testament in the
Apostolic Fathers

ΑΥΤΟΥ ΥΑΠΟΤΟΥΣ
ΛΟΥΤΡΩΣΟΝ ΚΑΙ
ΕΚΤΗΣΑΝ ΤΑΙΣ
ΤΗΣ ΑΓΙΑΣ ΤΩΝ ΓΕ
ΓΡΑΜΜΕΝΩΝ
ΤΩΝ ΕΝ ΤΟΙΣ
ΛΕΓΙΟΜΑΡΤΥΡΩΝ
ΤΑΥΤΑΙΣ ΚΑΙ
ΧΟΜΑΙ ΤΑΙΣ ΧΑΙ
ΚΕΙΝΗ Η ΧΑΡΙΣ ΤΟΥ
ΚΥΙΟΥ ΜΕΤΧΙΩΝΑΙ
ΩΝ ΑΜΗΝ:

ΧΑΙΡΕΤΕ ΥΙΟΙ ΚΑΙ
ΠΑΤΕΡΕΣ ΟΝΟ
ΜΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΤΑΙΣ
ΣΑΝΤΟΙΣ ΗΜΑΣ ΕΝΙ
ΜΕΤΑΛΛΟΝ ΕΝΟΝ
ΚΑΙ ΤΙΛΟΥΣΙΩΝ Τ
ΤΩΝ ΝΕΙΣΥΜΑΣ ΤΙ
ΤΙΚΑΙ ΚΑΘΥΠΕΡ Κ
ΛΙΝ ΗΥΠΕΡΕΥΦΕ
ΝΟΜΕ ΕΠΙ ΤΟΙΣ Μ
ΚΑΡΙΟΙΣ ΚΑΙ ΕΝ Λ
ΧΟΙΣΥΜΩΝ ΤΙΝ
ΟΥΤΩ ΕΜΦΥΤΟΝ Τ
ΔΩΡΕΑΣ ΤΙΝ ΚΗ
ΧΑΡΙΝ ΕΙΛΗΦΧΤΑΙ
ΔΙΟΚΑΙ ΜΑΛΛΟΝ
ΧΑΙΡΩ ΕΜΑΥΤΩ
ΠΙΖΩΝ ΣΩΘΗΝΑ
ΟΤΙ ΑΛΛΗΘΩΣ ΚΑ
ΤΩ ΕΝ ΥΜΙΝ ΕΚΚ
ΧΥΜΕΝΟΝ ΑΠΟ ΤΟΥ
ΠΙΛΟΥΣΙΟΥ ΤΗΣ
ΠΗΣ ΚΥΤΙΝ ΔΕ ΦΥ
ΜΑΣ ΟΥΤΩ ΜΕ ΕΣ
ΠΑΝ ΧΕΝ ΕΠΙ ΥΜΩ
Η ΕΠΙ ΤΙΟΟΗ ΤΗ
ΜΩΝ ΤΙΣ ΕΠΙ ΜΕ

123

ΑΓΙΟ ΚΑΛΥ
✠
ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ

Edited by
ANDREW GREGORY AND
CHRISTOPHER TUCKETT

THE RECEPTION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT
IN THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS

This page intentionally left blank

The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers

Edited by

ANDREW F. GREGORY
CHRISTOPHER M. TUCKETT

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore
South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© Oxford University Press, 2005

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted
Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

First published 2005

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover
and you must impose the same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic fathers / edited
by Andrew Gregory, Christopher Tuckett.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references (p.) and indexes.

ISBN 0-19-926782-0 (alk. paper)

1. Bible. N.T.— Criticism, interpretation, etc. 2. Church history—Primitive and early church, ca. 30-600.

3. Apostolic Fathers. I. Gregory, Andrew F. II. Tuckett, C. M. (Christopher Mark)

BS23641.3.R43 2005

225'.09'015—dc22

2005018652

Typeset by SPI Publisher Services, Pondicherry, India

Printed in Great Britain

on acid-free paper by

Biddles Ltd., King's Lynn

ISBN 0-19-926782-0 978-0-19-926782-8

1 3 5 7 9 10 8 6 4 2

Preface

The essays and studies included in these two volumes are intended to update, to develop, and to widen the scope of the issues considered by members of 'A Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology' in their landmark and still valuable reference book, *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. That volume was published by the Clarendon Press in 1905, and it is to acknowledge the importance of that famous book that these companion volumes are published in its centenary year. The 1905 volume was very much a product of Oxford, albeit by a number of scholars who may have been on the fringes of university life (as John Muddiman explains, in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, p. 107); Kirsopp Lake is listed among the contributors as Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the University of Leiden, but he was curate of the University Church of St Mary the Virgin in Oxford until his appointment to that chair in 1904.

Oxford connections remain important in these centenary volumes. Both editors are members of the Oxford Theology Faculty, and these papers represent the first-fruits of an ongoing research project on the New Testament and the second century that is supported by the Theology Faculty. Yet there is also a strong international dimension to the research presented in these volumes, for the contributors are drawn from Belgium, Germany, Canada, the USA, and South Africa, as well as from Oxford and elsewhere in the United Kingdom. Many of the papers were presented and discussed at a conference held at Lincoln College, Oxford, in April 2004; others were written solely for publication. But this collection is by no means just another Conference Proceedings; all the contributions printed here have been through the process of peer review that is customary in academic publishing.

The chapters that appear in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* offer a comprehensive and rigorous discussion of the extent to which the writings later included in the New Testament were known, and cited (or alluded to), by the Apostolic Fathers, and they do so in the light of contemporary research on the textual traditions of both corpora. The chapters in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers* are also sensitive to these issues, but offer a representative sample of a range of issues that arise in the comparative study of these texts. They cannot be comprehensive, because they address wider questions than those addressed in the companion volume, but they advance contemporary discussion and understanding of each of the Apostolic Fathers and much of the New

Testament in the wider context of Christian origins and development in the first and second centuries.

Both editors are glad to thank various people for their help in producing these volumes. We are grateful to Hilary O'Shea, who brought the proposal before the Delegates of Oxford University Press, and to Lucy Qureshi, who saw the volumes through from their acceptance by the Press until their publication. Dorothy McCarthy, Enid Barker, Amanda Greenley, Samantha Griffiths and Jean van Altena each helped us to keep to a tight production schedule and gave valuable advice on many points of detail. Particular thanks are due to the anonymous reader who read a large typescript with great speed and equal care, and offered a number of helpful and incisive suggestions.

OUP provided financial support for our conference, as did the British Academy, the Zilkha Fund of Lincoln College, Oxford, and the Theology Faculty of Oxford University. We are glad to acknowledge the assistance of each. Adam Francisco provided indispensable help in running the conference website, which allowed delegates to read papers in advance, and was of great assistance throughout the planning and administration of the conference, as were Mel Parrott and her colleagues at Lincoln College.

Most importantly, both editors were overwhelmed by the support and interest shown by such a range of international experts in the study of the New Testament and early Christianity, and we are grateful to all who have allowed us to include their work in this publication. We hope that that these volumes will become a standard reference work for many years to come, and that they will provide a useful resource for future researchers in New Testament and Patristics.

AFG
CMT

Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| <i>List of Contributors</i> | ix |
| <i>Abbreviations</i> | xi |
| Introduction and Overview ANDREW F. GREGORY and CHRISTOPHER M. TUCKETT | 1 |
| PART I. The Text of the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers | 7 |
| 1. Textual Traditions Compared: The New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers BART D. EHRMAN | 9 |
| 2. Textual Traditions Examined: What the Text of the Apostolic Fathers tells us about the Text of the New Testament in the Second Century WILLIAM L. PETERSEN | 29 |
| 3. Absent Witnesses? The Critical Apparatus to the Greek New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers J. KEITH ELLIOTT | 47 |
| PART II. The Textual Transmission and Reception of the Writings that later formed the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers | 59 |
| 4. Reflections on Method: What constitutes the Use of the Writings that later formed the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers? ANDREW F. GREGORY and CHRISTOPHER M. TUCKETT | 61 |
| 5. The <i>Didache</i> and the Writings that later formed the New Testament CHRISTOPHER M. TUCKETT | 83 |
| 6. <i>1 Clement</i> and the Writings that later formed the New Testament ANDREW F. GREGORY | 129 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 7. The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch and the Writings that later formed the New Testament PAUL FOSTER | 159 |
| 8. Polycarp's <i>Letter to the Philippians</i> and the Writings that later formed the New Testament MICHAEL W. HOLMES | 187 |
| 9. The <i>Epistle of Barnabas</i> and the Writings that later formed the New Testament JAMES CARLETON-PAGET | 229 |
| 10. <i>2 Clement</i> and the Writings that later formed the New Testament ANDREW F. GREGORY and CHRISTOPHER M. TUCKETT | 251 |
| 11. The <i>Shepherd of Hermas</i> and the Writings that later formed the New Testament JOSEPH VERHEYDEN | 293 |
| <i>Bibliography</i> | 331 |
| <i>Index of Primary Sources</i> | 347 |
| <i>Index of Subjects</i> | 367 |
| <i>Index of Modern Authors</i> | 373 |

List of Contributors

James Carleton-Paget is a Lecturer in New Testament Studies at the University of Cambridge, and Fellow and Tutor of Peterhouse. He is the author of *The Epistle of Barnabas: Outlook and Background* (1994) and a number of articles on Jews and Christians in the first and second centuries.

Bart D. Ehrman is the James A. Gray Distinguished Professor of Religious Studies at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The author or editor of sixteen books, he has recently published a two-volume edition of the Apostolic Fathers for the Loeb Classical Library.

J. Keith Elliott is Professor of New Testament Textual Criticism at the University of Leeds. He is the editor of *The Apocryphal New Testament* (1993), and secretary of the British Committee of the International Greek New Testament Project.

Paul Foster is Lecturer in New Testament Language, Literature and Theology at the University of Edinburgh. He is a series editor of the Oxford Apostolic Fathers and the author of *Community Law and Mission in Matthew's Gospel* (2004). His other publications include articles about the synoptic problem, the Jewish background to early Christianity, Pauline theology, and the *Gospel of Peter*.

Andrew F. Gregory is a Research Fellow at Keble College, Oxford. He is a series editor of Oxford Early Christian Gospel Texts and the Oxford Apostolic Fathers, and the author of *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus* (2003). His other publications include articles on the importance of second-century Christian texts for the interpretation of the New Testament.

Michael W. Holmes is Professor of Biblical Studies and Early Christianity, and Chair of the Department of Biblical and Theological Studies, Bethel University. An editor of the SBL-sponsored monograph series *The New Testament in the Greek Fathers*, he is the author or editor of six books, including *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations* (3rd edn., 1999), and has also published more than twenty articles, essays, or chapters in books.

William L. Petersen is Professor of New Testament and Christian Origins at The Pennsylvania State University. He is the author of many books and articles, including *Tatian's Diatessaron* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), and conducts

research on the text of the New Testament in the earliest non-canonical documents.

Christopher M. Tuckett is Professor of New Testament at the University of Oxford and Fellow of Pembroke College. He is a series editor of Oxford Early Christian Gospel Texts and the Oxford Apostolic Fathers, and the author of many books and articles. These include *Q and the History of Early Christianity* (1996) and *Christology and the New Testament* (2001).

Joseph Verheyden is Professor of New Testament at the Catholic University of Leuven. He has published many articles, including contributions on synoptic studies, textual criticism of the New Testament, intertestamental and non-canonical literature, and the reception history of the New Testament. His books include *De vlucht van de christenen naar Pella: onderzoek van het getuigenis van Eusebius en Epiphanius* (1988), and, as editor, *The Unity of Luke–Acts* (1999).

Abbreviations

| | |
|---------------|--|
| AB | Anchor Bible |
| AGAJU | Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums |
| AKG | Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte |
| ANTF | Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung |
| <i>ATR</i> | <i>Anglican Theological Review</i> |
| <i>BBR</i> | <i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i> |
| <i>BDAG</i> | W. Bauer, F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich, <i>Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> , 3rd edn. (Chicago, 1999) |
| BDF | F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> (Chicago, 1961) |
| BETL | Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium |
| BHT | Beiträge zur historischen Theologie |
| BNTC | Black's New Testament Commentary |
| <i>BR</i> | <i>Biblical Research</i> |
| <i>BZ</i> | <i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i> |
| BZNW | Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft |
| CBET | Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology |
| <i>CBQ</i> | <i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i> |
| CBQMS | Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series |
| CCSA | Corpus Christianorum, Series Apocryphorum |
| CSCO | Corpus scriptorum Christianorum orientalium |
| CSEL | Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum |
| EB | Études bibliques |
| <i>ECM</i> | <i>Editio Critica Maior</i> |
| EKK | Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament |
| <i>ExpTim</i> | <i>Expository Times</i> |
| FRLANT | Forschungen zur Religion und Literature des Alten und Neuen Testaments |
| FzB | Forschung zur Bibel |
| GCS | Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte |
| GH | Griesbach hypothesis |
| GTA | Göttinger theologische Arbeiten |

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| <i>HNT</i> | <i>Handbuch zum Neuen Testament</i> |
| HTB | Histoire du texte biblique |
| <i>HTR</i> | <i>Harvard Theological Review</i> |
| ICC | International Critical Commentary |
| IGNTP | International Greek New Testament Project |
| IQP | International Q Project |
| <i>JBL</i> | <i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i> |
| <i>JECS</i> | <i>Journal of Early Christian Studies</i> |
| <i>JSNT</i> | <i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i> |
| JSNTSup | Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series |
| <i>JSOT</i> | <i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i> |
| <i>JTS</i> | <i>Journal of Theological Studies</i> |
| KAV | Kommentar zu den apostolischen Vätern |
| KT | Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen |
| LCL | Loeb Classical Library |
| LkR | Lucan redaction |
| MattR | Matthean redactional material |
| NA | B. Aland <i>et al.</i> , <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> , 27th edn. (Stuttgart, 1993) |
| <i>New Docs</i> | <i>New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity</i> , ed. G. H. Horsley and S. Llewelyn (North Ryde, NSW, 1981–) |
| NICNT | New International Commentary on the New Testament |
| <i>NovT</i> | <i>Novum Testamentum</i> |
| NovTSup | Novum Testamentum Supplements |
| <i>NTAF</i> | <i>The New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers</i> (Oxford, 1905) |
| <i>NTS</i> | <i>New Testament Studies</i> |
| NTT | Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift |
| NTTS | New Testament Tools and Studies |
| PTS | Patristische Texte und Studien |
| <i>RAC</i> | <i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum</i> , ed T. Kluser <i>et al.</i> (Stuttgart, 1950–) |
| SBL | Society of Biblical Literature |
| SBL SBS | Society of Biblical Literature Sources for Biblical Study |
| SC | Sources chrétiennes |
| SD | Studies and Documents |
| SHAW.P-H | Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse |

| | |
|-------------|--|
| 2ST | Two source theory |
| <i>SJT</i> | <i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i> |
| SNTSMS | Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series |
| <i>SQE</i> | <i>Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum</i> |
| SUC | Schriften des Urchristentums |
| <i>TDNT</i> | <i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> , ed. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, 10 vols. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1964–76) |
| <i>TLG</i> | <i>Thesaurus Linguae Graecae</i> |
| TU | Texte und Untersuchungen |
| UBS | United Bible Society |
| VC | <i>Vigiliae Christianae</i> |
| VCSup | Supplements to <i>Vigiliae Christianae</i> |
| WBC | World Biblical Commentary |
| WUNT | Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament |
| ZAC | <i>Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum</i> |
| ZNW | <i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i> |

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction and Overview

Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett

The first modern editor to refer to a collection of early Christian writings as the Apostolic Fathers appears to have been J. Cotelier, whose edition was published in 1672. The most recent is Bart D. Ehrman, a contributor to this collection, whose Greek–English edition in the Loeb Classical Library replaces the original and much-used Loeb volumes produced by Kirsopp Lake. Lists of those who are included in the conventional but largely arbitrary collection known as the ‘Apostolic Fathers’ do vary slightly (Ehrman takes a more inclusive approach than both Lake and the Oxford Committee),¹ but included in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* and in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers* are treatments of the central texts in this category, as found also in the 1905 volume, *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers: the Didache, 1 Clement, 2 Clement*, the letters of Ignatius, Polycarp’s *Letter to the Philippians*, the *Letter of Barnabas*, and the *Shepherd of Hermas*. Also included in the second of these 2005 volumes is the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, which the Oxford Committee did not consider.

The 1905 volume treated a relatively narrow set of issues: namely, the extent to which the documents of the New Testament were known, and cited (or alluded to), by the Apostolic Fathers. Such issues remain important, so they are the central concern of *The Reception of the New Testament and the*

¹ Lake included the *Letter to Diognetus*, in addition to those named above and discussed in the present volumes; Ehrman includes all these texts, as well as the fragments of Papias and Quadratus. This collection, he notes, is comparable to other similarly arbitrary collections of second- and third-century Christian writings: e.g., the apologists, the heresiologists, and the Nag Hammadi Library. Understood as a collection of writings based only on convention, the Apostolic Fathers, he continues, ‘is not an authoritative collection of books, but a convenient one, which, in conjunction with these other collections, can enlighten us concerning the character of early Christianity, its external appeal and inner dynamics, its rich and significant diversity, and its developing understandings of its own self-identity, social distinctiveness, theology, ethical norms, and liturgical practices.’ See, further, B. D. Ehrman, ‘General Introduction’, in *The Apostolic Fathers*, i, LCL 24 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003), 1–14, quotation on pp. 13–14.

Apostolic Fathers. Each Apostolic Father is treated in turn, as in the 1905 volume, but these studies are now prefaced by a careful discussion of methodological issues that must be addressed in seeking to determine what might constitute a reference in the Apostolic Fathers to one of the writings that later became the New Testament, and also a number of investigations of the text and transmission of both the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers. Thus contemporary scholars continue to ask questions that have remained important and relevant since the publication of the 1905 volume, but they do so in light of manuscript evidence that was not available a century ago (newly discovered papyri of the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers, as well as of other early Christian writings), and on the basis of a century's continuing work on these texts. Questions of canon and authority are rarely far from the surface, but difficulties in assessing the relative likelihood that individual Apostolic Fathers were drawing on proverbial expressions and free traditions or on contemporary versions or copies of texts that would emerge in the surviving manuscripts of the late second or early third century papyri such as P⁴⁻⁶⁴⁻⁶⁷, P⁷⁵, and P⁴⁵ make these questions difficult to answer. Some of these studies reach conclusions not dissimilar to those of the Oxford Committee (see, for example, Gregory on *1 Clement*), whereas others find more (for example, Verheyden on *Hermas*) or less (for example, Foster on Ignatius) evidence for the use of the New Testament in the Apostolic Father whom they discuss than did the authors of the corresponding discussion in 1905. Questions of method are of great consequence, and readers will note how individual contributors, most notably William Petersen, in his essay on the Apostolic Fathers as witnesses to the text of the New Testament in the second century, have chosen to assess the evidence in a way different from that proposed by the editors. Such questions remain controversial and controverted, and we hope to have provided both useful discussion of these methodological issues and also a major reference tool for those who wish to take further the discussion of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers.

The contributions contained in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers* are also sensitive to these difficulties. Many of its papers contribute to and advance the discussion of similar questions to those addressed in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (most obviously Andreas Lindemann's discussion of Pauline influences in *1 Clement* and Ignatius, the discussions of Helmut Koester and Arthur Bellinzoni of gospel traditions in the Apostolic Fathers and other second-century texts, and Boudewijn Dehandschutter's discussion of the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*), but they also range more widely.

One significant development since 1905 has been the renewed recognition that the interpretation of any text can be significantly enriched by considering

its 'effect' and its usage in subsequent history, i.e., its *Wirkungsgeschichte*, as well as its antecedents. Thus some papers note how distinctive emphases or ideas that are present in certain writings of the New Testament are taken up and developed by certain Apostolic Fathers, and the continuities or discontinuities in the trajectories that are traced cast new light on both the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers. It is not, of course, that all authors understand development to have taken place in the same way. Frances Young's treatment of the relative absence of terms relating to Wisdom in the Christology of the Apostolic Fathers raises questions about the way in which such language is understood by interpreters who confine themselves largely to the New Testament and the earlier Jewish tradition on which it draws, whereas Thomas Weinandy argues strongly for clearly discernible continuity from Pauline Christology through that of Ignatius and ultimately to that of the Chalcedonian definition.

Attention is also given to literary as well as theological issues: for example, in Michael Holmes's discussion of how the genre of a 'passion narrative' is developed as one moves away from accounts of the death of Jesus to accounts of the death of later martyrs such as Polycarp. Nor are issues of sociology neglected: Clayton Jefford offers an illuminating account of how an examination of two apparently related texts—the *Didache* and Matthew—may provide some sort of insight into the development of Christianity in one place, as does Peter Oakes in his discussion of the situations that may be reflected in the letters of Paul and of Polycarp to the Philippians. Also significant in this respect is Paul Hartog's discussion of similar concerns found in Polycarp's letter (written from Smyrna) and 1 John (probably associated with nearby Ephesus), not least in the light of what Hartog considers to be the almost certain literary dependence of the former on the latter.

The arrangement of chapters in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* is self-evident and straightforward, but something of the rich interplay between many of the texts considered can be seen in the range of ways in which *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers* might have been ordered. Were we to have given greater prominence to the place of the New Testament (or at least some of it) than to that of the Apostolic Fathers, we might have arranged chapters with more emphasis on how they fell (at least primarily) into what might be considered synoptic, Johannine, Pauline, or other trajectories defined by their apparent relationship to New Testament books. Were we to have given greater prominence to the place of the Apostolic Fathers (or at least some of them) than to that of the New Testament, we might have arranged chapters with more emphasis on how they relate (at least primarily) to the study of individual Apostolic Fathers.

Equally, decisions might have been made to arrange these essays primarily on thematic grounds, rather than on the basis of the ancient text or texts with which each is primarily concerned. Jonathan Draper's treatment of prophets and teachers in the *Didache* and the New Testament might have been presented alongside Alistair Stewart-Sykes's discussion of charismatic functionaries and household officers; and the discussions of Paul and Ignatius by David Reis, by Harry Maier, and by Allen Brent might stand alongside the essay by Andreas Lindemann, thus accentuating the interplay between the influence of the apostle and that of the Graeco-Roman world—and in particular the impact of the Second Sophistic—on how early Christians such as 'Clement' and Ignatius presented themselves in their writings.

Similarly, the discussions of Boudewijn Dehandschutter and Michael Holmes of gospel and other New Testament traditions in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* might have been juxtaposed with the discussions of Arthur Bellinzoni and Helmut Koester, not to mention those of John Kloppenborg and Charles Hill; but, as it is, these different essays emphasize the central place of early Christian reflection on the person of Jesus. Thus discussions of the development and reception of gospel tradition not only book-end the volume, but also appear prominently in the middle.

So fluid and unclear are many of the boundaries between these closely related texts and issues that no neat or definitive boundaries may be drawn. Thus the approach that we have chosen is intended both to reflect the complexity and diversity of these writings and also to be of practical assistance to other researchers who can see at a glance which contributions may be of most use to them.

Some of the Apostolic Fathers receive more attention than others (most notably Ignatius and the *Didache*), but none is neglected. Neither *1 Clement* (strictly speaking) nor *Barnabas* appears in the table of contents for *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, but the former features prominently in the discussions of Andreas Lindemann and Alistair Stewart-Sykes, and the latter is considered by David Wright. John Muddiman and Alistair Stewart-Sykes each discuss a range of texts (the former, *2 Clement* and the *Shepherd of Hermas*; the latter, the *Didache*, Ignatius, *1 Clement*, and the *Shepherd of Hermas*), and their essays on ecclesiology and church order, together with those of Carsten Claussen and David Wright on the sacraments, help to make valuable connections between individual Apostolic Fathers as well as between the Apostolic Fathers and the New Testament. Their contributions, together with the rest of the papers collected in this volume, serve as important reminders of the benefits to be gained from reading the New Testament in the wider context of other early Christian writings, and show why even later texts are an essential component of what is sometimes referred

to as 'New Testament background'. It was only thanks to later Christians, perhaps some of the Apostolic Fathers among them, that the writings that became the New Testament were preserved and transmitted, so—as both these volumes demonstrate—knowledge of their concerns is a useful tool in interpreting both the New Testament and the development of Christianity from the late first to the mid- or late second century. Most, if not all, of the Apostolic Fathers may well have written later than most of the authors whose writings were later included in the New Testament, but almost certainly all of them wrote before even an early form of the canon of the New Testament, such as that witnessed to by Irenaeus, had yet emerged. The extent to which they witness to the existence of earlier collections such as the fourfold Gospel or (perhaps more likely) a Pauline corpus are among the questions that these studies address.

This page intentionally left blank

Part I

The Text of the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers

This page intentionally left blank

Textual Traditions Compared: The New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers

Bart D. Ehrman

In this paper, rather than investigate the transmission of the New Testament *in* the Apostolic Fathers—the subject of the Oxford volume we are honouring in this centenary celebration—I would like to explore the transmission of the New Testament *and* the Apostolic Fathers. That is to say, I would like to engage in a kind of comparative analysis of the textual traditions of both corpora.

It might fairly be objected that this is an unfair comparison, since the Apostolic Fathers did not, in fact, constitute a corpus until modern times, starting in 1672, the year J. Cotelier produced his first edition of the collection of the writings of Barnabas, Clement, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp.¹ Even so, the transmission histories of these two bodies of writings are not completely incommensurate. For one thing, even though the canon we call the Apostolic Fathers is an *ad hoc* construction of relatively modern times, we must never forget that the New Testament canon is also a construction, not a self-vindicating or original collection; the New Testament too consists of different authors and different genres of books written at different times for different occasions, only later compiled into a recognized canon of writings. Moreover, it is not correct to think that the writings of the New Testament were always circulated together, as a corpus, whereas those of the Apostolic Fathers were circulated separately, as discrete documents of the early church.

¹ J. Cotelier, *SS. Patrum qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt: Barnabae, Clementis, Hermae, Ignatii, Polycarpi. Opera edita et inedita, vera et supposititia. Una cum Clementis, Ignatii, Polycarpi Actis atque Martyriis* (Antwerp, 1672). An earlier collection of several Apostolic Fathers, in an English translation, was made by Thomas Elborowe: *The Famous Epistles of Saint Polycarp and Saint Ignatius, Disciples to the Holy Evangelist and Apostle Saint John: With the Epistle of St Barnabas and Some Remarks upon their Lives and Deaths...* (London: William Grantham, 1668). The first to use the term 'Apostolic Father' (or a close approximation) in the title of a collection was William Wake, in his 1693 English edition *The Genuine Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers, S. Barnabas, S. Clement, S. Ignatius, S. Polycarp, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Martyrdoms of St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp* (London).

Few manuscripts of the New Testament contain the *entire* New Testament (Codex Sinaiticus is the only majuscule manuscript to do so), and some of the New Testament writings were preserved in manuscripts that contained non-canonical texts (e.g., P⁷², which contains 1 and 2 Peter, Jude, the *Nativity of Mary*, 3 *Corinthians*, Melito's *Paschal Homily*, an Ode of Solomon, etc.). Moreover, some of the Apostolic Fathers *were* circulated as a group: one need think only of Codex Hierosolymitanus, written in 1056 and discovered by Philotheos Bryennios in 1873, which includes the texts of 1 and 2 *Clement*, the *Epistle of Barnabas*, the *Didache*, and the long recension of Ignatius. Moreover, even some of our biblical manuscripts contain small collections of Apostolic Fathers: 1 and 2 *Clement*, for example, are found in Codex Alexandrinus, and the *Shepherd of Hermas* and *Barnabas* in Codex Sinaiticus.

These manuscripts should alert us to another problem in assuming that the textual traditions of these two corpora of writings should be handled differently; for there were writings of the Apostolic Fathers that at one time or another in one place or another were in fact considered to be texts of Scripture. The scribes of Codices Alexandrinus and Sinaiticus are cases in point; but reference can also be made to the early patristic discussions of some of these texts, where the issue at stake was sometimes precisely their canonical status.²

And so, given the constructed nature of both corpora, their permeable boundaries, and their not incomparable textual histories, it is perhaps an interesting exercise to compare their histories of transmission. These will differ, of course, for the different books within each corpus, as they were all copied in different ways and with different levels of frequency. One may contrast, for example, the 1,950 Greek manuscripts of the Fourth Gospel with the 304 manuscripts of Revelation. Within the Apostolic Fathers the overall numbers are far lower, as would be expected, but the contrasts between the most and the least frequently copied are at least as striking. The *Shepherd of Hermas*, for example, is relatively well attested in the early centuries. Its only nearly complete witness, it is true, is Codex Athous of the fifteenth century. But up to the sixth century, it is better attested even than some of the books of the New Testament, being partially found in the Codex Sinaiticus (the first quarter of the book), the Michigan papyrus of the third century (most of the Parables), the Bodmer papyrus 38 (the first three visions), and nearly twenty other fragmentary papyri, most of them from the third to the fifth centuries. One could argue on strictly material grounds that the *Shepherd* was more widely read than the Gospel of Mark in the early centuries of

² As, e.g., already in the Muratorian Canon, which I continue to take as a second-century text.

Christendom.³ But a striking comparison comes with other writings of the Apostolic Fathers, the most extreme case being the *Epistle to Diognetus*, attested in a solitary manuscript of the thirteenth or fourteenth century, which was discovered in 1436—evidently in a fishmonger's shop—and, much to our regret, destroyed by fire in 1870 during the Franco–German war.

Despite the wide-ranging contrasts in levels of attestation, it is possible to compare the transmission of the books later collected together as the Apostolic Fathers with the transmission of the books collectively called the New Testament. The claim of my paper is not, perhaps, startling, but it is worth making none the less: there appears to be no noticeable difference in the kinds of alteration one finds made by scribes in New Testament writings, on the one hand, and writings of the Apostolic Fathers, on the other. In this brief account I will make no attempt to be exhaustive, in either the kinds of variation I consider or in the numbers of examples I cite. I will attempt, instead, to provide a representative sampling. My assumption throughout is that my reader will be more familiar with the textual problems of the New Testament, and so I will use these simply as a kind of backdrop for the similar kinds of problems one sees in the texts of the Apostolic Fathers. For the purposes of our consideration I will follow the traditional, if problematic, division between types of variation that appear to be 'accidental' and those that appear to have been made 'intentionally'.

ACCIDENTAL VARIATION IN THE TWO CORPORA

The scribes who transmitted the Apostolic Fathers were prone to the same kinds of mistakes as those who transmitted the texts that were eventually to become part of the New Testament. One can see this easily throughout both corpora: for example, in the frequent problems of spelling and misspelling, and the exchanges of *YMIN* and *HMIN* or *YMON* and *HMON* throughout. Other problems of scribal mistake are equally in evidence. In the New Testament manuscripts, of course, one not infrequently has to contend with omissions that have occurred because of parablepsis occasioned by homoioteleuton. One thinks of Luke 14. 26, 27, both verses that end with the statement *ου δυναται ειναι μου μαθητης*. After copying the first occurrence of the phrase, scribes of several manuscripts inadvertently thought they had

³ For a similar comparison of the early remains of the *Gospel of Peter* (attested even less than the *Shepherd*) with those of the Gospel of Mark, see Bart D. Ehrman, *Lost Christianities: The Battles for Scripture and the Faiths We Never Knew* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 22–4.

copied the second occurrence, and continued by copying v. 28—leaving out v. 27 altogether. The same phenomenon occurs with somewhat more disastrous results in John 17. 15 in Codex Vaticanus, where, due to the same problem of parablepsis, rather than saying ‘I do not pray that you keep them from the world, but that you keep them from the evil one’, the text reads the more pithy but also more troubling ‘I do not pray that you keep them from the evil one!’

The same phenomenon occurs throughout the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. To take just a few instances, in *1 Clem.* 15. 5, the majority of all witnesses (all, in fact, except the Syriac) shorten the citation of Psalm 77: *δια τουτο αλαλα γενηθητω τα χειλη τα δολια τα λαλουντα κατα του δικαιου ανομιαν. Και παλιν εξολεθρευσαι κυριος παντα τα χειλη τα δολια*, by leaving out the entire clause, *τα λαλουντα . . . τα δολια*. Sometimes the error occurs in only one witness, as in Codex Hierosolymitanus in *1 Clem.* 32. 4, where the clause *και ημεις ουν, δια θεληματος αυτου* is omitted, because the previous clause also ended with *δια θεληματος αυτου*. The error sometimes plays a significant role in the interpretation of a key passage. An example from *1 Clement* comes in one of the most important early expressions of the notion of apostolic succession, in chapter 42: ‘The apostles were given the gospel for us by the Lord Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ was sent forth from God. Thus Christ came from God and the apostles from Christ.’ In our later manuscript of the passage, however, the passage is truncated: ‘The apostles were given the gospel for us by the Lord Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ came from God and the apostles from Christ.’

As might be expected, it is sometimes difficult to determine whether an omission has occurred because of homoioteleuton or if an addition was made to a text for another reason. An example comes in *1 Clem.* 49. 4, in a prayer to the Lord, which is recorded in most of our witnesses as: *τους εν θλιψει ημων σωσον, τους πεπτωκοτας εγειρον*. But in Codex Hierosolymitanus there is an additional clause, added between the other two: *τους ταπεινους ελεησον*. It is possible that this represents a pious addition to the prayer, as it is found in most of our witnesses; but Gebhardt, Lightfoot, Funk, and others may be correct to see it as an accidental omission, occasioned by the similar terminations of the imperatives *σωσον* and *ελεησον*.⁴

Throughout the manuscript tradition of the New Testament, it is often difficult to determine whether a change was made accidentally or intentionally—this is true even of significant changes that affect the meaning of a passage. I take the original text of Mark 1. 41 to read *οργισθεις* rather than *σπλαγνισθεις*—that when Jesus was asked by the leper for healing, he became

⁴ See the Bihlmeyer apparatus *ad loc.*: K. Bihlmeyer (ed.), *Die apostolischen Väter: Neubearbeitung der Funkschen Ausgabe*, 3rd edn. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1956).

angry, rather than compassionate. Not only is it the more difficult reading, but it is the reading that makes sense of the decision by both Matthew and Luke to eliminate the participle altogether in their retelling of the account, a decision hard to explain otherwise, given both evangelists' propensity for describing Jesus as compassionate (whenever Mark mentions Jesus' anger, both remove it from their accounts). But even as the less difficult reading, was *σπλαγνισθεις* created *intentionally*? It is hard to say. It could just as easily have been the case that when a scribe imagined Jesus before this poor leper, he, the scribe, naturally saw Jesus' compassion and recorded his emotion as such, without giving a second's thought to the matter.⁵

Similar phenomena occur in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, changes that may well have been intentional but could have involved an element of accident as well. As an example of a textual alteration that probably had elements of both, we might consider the complicated opening of Ignatius's letter to the Ephesians. Did Ignatius write: *Αποδεξαμενος εν θεω το πολυαγαπητον σου ονομα*, or did he write: *Αποδεξαμενος υμων εν θεω το πολυαγαπητον ονομα*? Both are problematic in a way, but the second reading coincides well with how Ignatius places the personal pronoun in his other letters,⁶ and the singular pronoun of the other reading, while arguably original as the more difficult reading, is possibly *too* difficult (given the collective audience being addressed) and out of character with Ignatius's introductions otherwise. It may be, then, that the best way to solve the conundrum is to assume that a careless scribe inadvertently left the *υμων* out of the clause, realized while writing the sentence that it lacked a personal pronoun, and added one at what seemed like the right place (even though it wasn't where Ignatius normally placed his pronouns), and even more sloppily supplied the wrong word.

There are variants with far greater significance for interpretation, of course, and some of them may have been created by careless or thoughtless scribes—as happens time and again with the New Testament texts as well. Take a particularly notorious and thorny instance, the text of *1 Clem.* 2. 4. In recalling the former glory of the Corinthians, which in his opinion had now become tarnished, the author reminds them that 'Day and night you struggled on behalf of the entire brotherhood, that the total number of his chosen ones might be saved, with mortal fear and self-awareness' (*μετα δεους και συνειδησεως*). Or *is* that what he wrote? In fact, the majority of our witnesses, including our earliest manuscript, Alexandrinus, along with the Latin, Syriac,

⁵ For a full study, see B. D. Ehrman, 'A Sinner in the Hands of an Angry Jesus', in Amy Donaldson and Tim Saylor (eds.), *Essays in the Text and Exegesis of the New Testament: In Honor of Gerald W. Hawthorne* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2004).

⁶ e.g., see *Magn.* 1. 1; *Trall.* 1. 1; *Rom.* 1. 1.

and Coptic, indicate instead that the Corinthians were saved ‘with mercy and self-awareness’ (μετ’ ελεους και συνειδησεως). Good arguments can be made for this latter reading, and these arguments have convinced a number of modern editors. ‘Mercy’ is a relatively common word in *1 Clement* (it occurs on nine occasions), whereas ‘mortal fear’, δεος (as opposed to ‘awe/reverence/fear’, φοβος) is otherwise unattested in the letter. Moreover, the fact that salvation is a matter of mercy seems more palatable than the notion that it involves mortal dread.

These arguments notwithstanding, an even better case can be made that Clement spoke of fear, rather than mercy, as the emotion accompanying the Corinthians’ salvation. For one thing, even though ‘mercy’ is a common term for Clement, in every other instance it is an attribute of *God*, not of humans. The problem with considering it a divine attribute in the present context is the second term, ‘self-awareness’ (or ‘conscience’), which can hardly be assigned to God. For this reason, some scholars have been quick to urge an emendation of the text. Zahn, for example, has proposed that it originally read ελεους και συναθλησεως; Lake, ελεους και συναισθησεως; and Drijepondt, ελεους και συναιδεσεως. This final suggestion makes for an interesting case in point. Drijepondt maintains that the text could not originally have read ‘mortal fear’, because δεους is otherwise a hapax legomenon within *1 Clement*; but his proposed emendation of the second term, as he readily admits, is also a hapax legomenon—not just for *1 Clement* but for all of Greek literature!⁷

It is easy to see how the change of the text could have been made accidentally, given the similar appearances of the variant terms *ΜΕΤΑΔΕΟΥΣ/ΜΕΤΕΛΕΟΥΣ*. Once that is recognized, it is a relatively simple matter to reconstruct the direction of the change, away from the infrequently attested ‘fear’ to the rather common ‘mercy.’ And since the issue involved is salvation, the change would have been all the easier to have made. But in the context the change does not work, in view of the second term, which can only make sense in reference to the self-conscious act of humans being saved. And so, as Lightfoot recognized, the most economic solution to the problem is to accept the text of our latest witness and to conclude that the author spoke of the number of the elect being ‘saved with mortal fear and self-awareness’.⁸

Among ‘accidental’ errors there remains the kind of scribal slip that leads to a nonsense or near-nonsense reading. Cases of these abound in the New Testament manuscript tradition, of course, and need not occupy us here. Of

⁷ H. F. L. Drijepondt, ‘1 Clement 2, 4 and 59, 3: Two Emendations,’ *Acta Classica*, 8 (1965), 102–5.

⁸ J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 5 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1889), 1. 2. 18.

greater interest is the question of whether *all* manuscripts of a given passage may have been subjected to corruption of this kind, leading to the need for conjectural emendation. It has long been debated among critics whether emendation should ever be allowed in the text of the New Testament. It has always struck me as peculiar that among those who deny its necessity have been those who are otherwise labelled as ‘radical eclecticists’—that is, those like George Kilpatrick and Keith Elliott who think that external evidence should have little or no bearing on textual decisions, which should be reached instead on the grounds purely of intrinsic and transcriptional probabilities.⁹ For critics like this, the manuscripts provide us with a repertoire of readings, but not with evidence of which readings are superior. Given this perspective, one might suspect that radical eclecticists would freely acknowledge that the original reading may in some instances have been lost (if it can sometimes be found in only one late medieval manuscript, why would it be absurd to assume that lacking that one manuscript we would be missing the original reading?). But instead, rightly or wrongly, such critics tend to agree with the majority of scholars, that since we have such an abundance of New Testament manuscripts, it appears manifestly evident that even in difficult cases the original text can be found *somewhere* in the surviving witnesses.

It is quite different with the texts of the Apostolic Fathers, where there are numerous occasions on which our sparse witnesses clearly embody an error that requires emendation. Nowhere is this more true than in our poorest attested text, the *Epistle to Diognetus*. Here I will cite just three instances. The sole surviving manuscript of the *Epistle to Diognetus* created a strange anacolouthon in 3. 2, which states *Ιουδαιοι τοιουνν, ει μεν απεχονται ταυτης της προειρημενης λατρειας, και εις θεον ενα των παντων . . . αξιουσι φρονειν. Ει δε τοις προειρημενοις . . .* There is obviously no apodosis for the opening protasis, as the sentence then leads into another protasis. Hilgenfeld resolved the matter easily enough, emending *και εις* to *καλως*, as the text is more commonly printed today.

A somewhat more interesting instance occurs in 5. 7, where the author lauds the Christians because they *τραπεζαν κοινην παρατιθενται, αλλ' ου κοινην*. But this scarcely makes sense. The emendation proposed by the eighteenth-century Prudentius of St Maur resolves the problem, however. Under the influence of a word just written, the scribe inadvertently changed an original *κοιτην* to *κοινην*. Once emended, the text makes perfect sense:

⁹ See, e.g., the essays of Kilpatrick, edited by Elliott: J. K. Elliott (ed.), *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays of G. D. Kilpatrick*, BETL 96 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990), esp. ‘Conjectural Emendation in the New Testament’, pp. 98–109.

Christians share a common table, but not a common bed; they eat communal meals, but they don't share sexual partners.

As a final instance from the *Epistle to Diognetus*, after demonstrating the Christians' superiority to others, especially as seen in their response to persecution and their growth (despite attempts at their suppression), the author notes that this is not due to the work of humans: *ταυτα δυναμις εστι θεου, ταυτα της παρουσιας αυτου δογματα*. But in what sense is the boldness of Christians in the face of persecution the 'teachings/dogmas' of Christ's parousia? A simple emendation, made already in the editio princeps of Stephanus, resolves the problem neatly. The author originally called these 'proofs' of Christ's parousia *δειγματα* rather than *δογματα*.

Even in our better-attested texts among the Apostolic Fathers there are places that appear to require emendation. Scholars have disputed the text of *1 Clem.* 59. 3, where the author begins his long prayer to 'the Creator of all' (v. 2). As the text stands, the shift into the prayer is altogether abrupt, as in one breath the author moves from speaking *about* God (in the third person) to speaking *to* God (second person): *απο αγνωσιας εις επιγνωσιν δοξης ονοματος αυτου, ελπίζειν επι το αρχεγονον πασης κτισεως ονομα σου...* Some editors (e.g., Bihlmeyer) have let the text stand; others, however, including Lightfoot, appear to be right in considering the transition too harsh, and so have emended the text by adding words of supplication, *Δος ημιν, Κυριε*, to the beginning of v. 3.

An intriguing case that may require emendation occurs in *2 Clem.* 9. 5, where all the surviving witnesses except a Syriac fragment attest *εις Χριστος, ο κυριος ο σωσας ημας*, 'the one Christ, the Lord who saved us'. This reading makes almost no sense in the broader context, as the clause is evidently meant to serve as the protasis of the sentence; so most scholars have accepted the reading *ει Χριστος, ο κυριος ο σωσας ημας*, 'if Christ, the one who saved us'. The difficulty with this reading, however, is that it does not readily explain the widely attested variant. So it may be better to follow a suggestion buried away in Lightfoot's discussion, which he does not himself adopt for reasons he never states, that the text be emended to read *ει ις χς, ο κυριος ο σωσας ημας*: 'If Jesus Christ (both words abbreviated as nomina sacra), the Lord who saved us....' The emendation can explain the existence of all other readings, it makes sense in the context, and it preserves the double name Jesus Christ throughout *2 Clement's* text.¹⁰

One of the most difficult passages to establish in the Apostolic Fathers also happens to be one of the most central. As I've already intimated, *1 Clement* is significant for being the first text to proffer a form of the notion of apostolic

¹⁰ *Apostolic Fathers*, 1. 2. 230.

succession in its opposition to the Corinthian upstarts who have usurped the position of the elders of the community. *1 Clem.* 44 begins by noting that the apostles ‘knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that strife would arise over the office of the bishop’ (44. 1). Since they anticipated this strife, they ‘appointed’ leaders of the churches, and then made provision for what would happen once these leaders died. But what was this provision? Did they give the office an *επινομην*, as indicated in Codex Alexandrinus (and the Latin)? If so, what could that mean? (The term usually refers to the spreading out of something, like a fire; could it mean the spreading out of a law, an injunction?) Did they give it an *επιδομην*, as in Codex Hierosolymitanus, a word attested in neither Liddell and Scott nor Lampe? As you might imagine, attempts to make sense of the passage by emending it have been rife. Lightfoot made a good case that it should read *επιμονην*, by which he meant something like ‘permanent character’—which makes good sense in the passage.¹¹ But possibly better is the emendation recommended to Lightfoot, but not taken, by F. J. A. Hort, who suggested as the entire phrase *επινομιδα εδωκαν*, which would be translated ‘they gave a codicil’.¹² The understanding, then, is that once they established the leaders of the various apostolic churches, the apostles added a legally binding requirement—namely, that if these should die, other approved men should take their place.

There are other interesting emendations that have been proposed that perhaps ought not to be accepted. A rather clever one occurs in the letter of Ignatius to the Ephesians, where the readers are called the ‘stones of the father’s temple, prepared for the building of God the Father’ (*λιθοι ναου πατρος, ητοιμασμενοι εις οικοδομην θεου πατρος*; 9. 1). Lightfoot, however, noted that ‘temple of the Father’ is a bit awkward, coming immediately before ‘God the Father’; he suggested instead that the passage was carrying an allusion to Paul’s letter to the Ephesians 2. 10. Noting that *πατρος* would have been abbreviated as a *nomen sacrum*, he then emended the text to read ‘stones of the temple that have been prepared in advance...’ (*λιθοι ναου προητοιμασμενοι εις οικοδομην θεου πατρος*).¹³ The difference is between *ΠΡΟΗΤΟΙΜΑΣΜΕΝΟΙ* and *ΠΡΉΗΤΟΙΜΑΣΜΕΝΟΙ*, easily confused. But, given the circumstance that the text makes good sense as it stands, perhaps the emendation is not necessary.

So too with one of the most famous emendations in the texts of the Apostolic Fathers, this one in *1 Clement’s* reference to women who were martyred as *Δαναιδες και Διρκαί* (*1 Clem.* 6. 2). The author’s meaning is unclear. Some scholars have suggested that he is referring to Christian women martyred under Nero, who was known for his creatively brutal excesses.¹⁴ If so, women executed

¹¹ Ibid. 132.

¹² Ibid. 133.

¹³ Ibid. 2. 2. 53.

¹⁴ See Suetonius, *Nero* 11. 11.

as Dircae may have been dragged to death in the arena, bound to the horns of a bull, like Dirce of Greek myth. The reference to the Danaids is more puzzling. Some scholars have seen it as an allusion to the legend that the daughters of Danaus were taken by men against their will—i.e., that the Christian women were publicly raped before being put to death. Others have thought that it refers to the punishment of Danaus's daughters in the afterlife, where they were compelled perpetually to fill leaking vessels—i.e., that the Christian women were subject to pointless and seemingly endless torments prior to their deaths. In either event, the text is so difficult that several emendations have been suggested to eliminate the reference to 'Danaids and Dircae' altogether, the most popular of which has been to indicate that these people were *διωχθεισαι γυναικες νεανιδες παιδισκαι*, that is, 'persecuted as women, maidens, and slave-girls'.¹⁵ With this change, the text certainly makes better sense to modern readers; but one cannot help but suspect that the difficulty in the passage results from our lack of knowledge of its historical context, rather than a scribal corruption.

INTENTIONAL CHANGES OF THE TEXTS

For both the corpora we are looking at, the writings of the New Testament and those of the Apostolic Fathers, it is perhaps more interesting to consider changes that appear to have been made intentionally in the text by thinking and, probably, well-meaning scribes. This is not to say that it is easy to differentiate accidental from intentional changes; but keeping these categories serves a useful heuristic purpose, and on the psychological level—quite apart from our inability to psychoanalyse any particular scribe—it continues to make sense: whoever appended the last twelve verses of Mark to the Gospel did not do so by a slip of the pen.

Some kinds of intentional changes appear to represent either the scribe's inability to choose between two attractive readings or a scribe's decision to print as full a text as possible. This may be what happened, for example, in the case of confluents. A familiar instance occurs in the final verse of Luke's Gospel, where the disciples of Jesus are said to have remained in Jerusalem 'blessing God' (24. 53). Or were they, as some witnesses indicate, 'praising God'? Later scribes opted to include both readings, so that the disciples were in the temple 'praising and blessing God'.

¹⁵ Emendation of Woodsworth; see Bihlmeyer's apparatus *ad loc.* Discussion in Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1. 2. 32–4.

We find the same kind of scribal corruption in the texts of the Apostolic Fathers. To choose just one example, in the *Epistle of Barnabas* 4. 9 we are told that ‘the entire time of our faith will be of no use to us if we do not stand in resistance’ (so Sinaiticus). Or is it ‘the entire time of our *life*’ (as in Hierosolymitanus)? The Latin version resolves the problem by conflating the two options: ‘the entire time of our life and of our faith will be of no use to us’

One of the more common intentional changes in the manuscript tradition of the New Testament involves harmonizations among passages. These sometimes occur in slight alterations of a passage, as in the addition of $\epsilon\gamma\omega$ to the quotation of Exod. 23. 20 in some manuscripts of Mark 1. 2; other times the changes carry real weight, as happens in the next verse of Mark, where some scribes change the clause ‘make straight his paths’ to conform to the text of Isa. 40. 3, ‘make straight the paths of our God’—a significant change in light of the circumstance that the words are being spoken of Jesus. Similar harmonizations to the text of the Septuagint occur throughout the Apostolic Fathers exactly where one would expect them, in books like *1 Clement* and *Barnabas*, where texts of the Old Testament are cited at length, and sometimes in ways dissimilar to the Greek texts of Scripture themselves. Thus, for example, in *Barn.* 4. 4 appeal is made to the vision of Daniel: ‘For also the prophet says, “Ten kingdoms will rule the earth” ’ (thus the Syriac and the Latin). Our sole Greek witness, however, conforms the citation to the Septuagint, to say that ‘Ten *kings* will rule the earth’. In this case, as in most instances with such readings, it is the least harmonized text that is easiest to explain as original, and the more harmonized as the corruption.

Or consider a more substantial change in *Barn.* 5. 13, ‘an assembly of evildoers has risen up against me’ ($\epsilon\pi\alpha\nu\epsilon\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\ \mu\omicron\iota$). Not unexpectedly, the most recent Greek witness conforms the text to its parallel in Scripture, Ps. 21. 17, LXX: $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\sigma\chi\omicron\nu\ \mu\epsilon$. Or the change of *Barn.* 11. 2, where the people of God are accused of doing ‘two wicked things: they have deserted me, the fountain of life, and dug for themselves a pit of death’. The final phrase $\beta\omicron\theta\rho\nu\ \theta\alpha\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$, while graphic, is not what is found in the Septuagint; and so it came to be changed to read $\lambda\alpha\kappa\kappa\omicron\nu\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\tau\rho\iota\mu\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu\varsigma$ (‘broken cisterns’) in the majority of our Greek witnesses.

The more common kind of harmonization among the earliest Christian writings, however, is not toward the Old Testament but toward other texts that also came to be considered part of Scripture. Examples are abundant, on virtually every page, for example, of the synoptic gospels. With the Apostolic Fathers we are in a different situation, since we do not have ‘synoptic texts’ being produced and copied—that is, texts covering, for instance, the same words and deeds of Jesus. What we have are occasional quotations of, and

allusions to, earlier Christian writings. In some such instances of intertextuality, the later scribes of the works that came to be called the Apostolic Fathers modified their texts in order to make these quotations and allusions more precise. This appears to be what has happened, for example, in *1 Clem.* 34. 8, in the quotation of the passage, complex on its own terms, of 1 Cor. 2. 9: ‘For he says, No eye has seen nor ear heard, nor has it entered into the human heart, what the Lord has prepared for those who await him’, *λεγει γαρ οφθαλμος ουκ ειδεν . . . οσα ητοιμασεν κυριος . . .*. Not even the 1 Corinthians text is invariant here; but all of our known witnesses begin the quotation with the relative pronoun: *α οφθαλμος ουκ ειδεν . . .*. So it is no surprise to see some scribes of *1 Clement*—in fact, the scribes of most of our surviving witnesses—changing the text accordingly.

So too in *1 Clem.* 47. 3, the author reminds the Corinthians that Paul had sent them a letter concerning ‘himself, Cephas, and Apollos’. In our later Greek manuscript of the letter, however, the sequence is changed to coincide with that found in 1 Cor. 1. 12 and 3. 22, ‘himself, Apollos, and Cephas’.

Other kinds of intentional changes in our early Christian texts have more to do with the historical, theological, and social contexts of the scribes who were reproducing them. And here too, the same motivations behind changes in the New Testament texts are evidenced in the textual tradition of the Apostolic Fathers. We can consider three kinds of changes: those resulting from liturgical concerns, those involving understandings of women, and those influenced by ongoing theological disputes.

It is probably fair to say that liturgical concerns were not a major factor in the transmission of the texts of the New Testament. But there are some passages that have been considered as susceptible to corruption in light of scribes’ liturgical practices. Perhaps the best known is Mark 9. 29, where Jesus explains to his disciples that their attempts at exorcism had failed because ‘this kind [of demon] can come out only by prayer’. Some scribes appended the appropriate addendum ‘and fasting’.

Some scholars have argued that the text of Luke 22. 19–20 should be resolved on liturgical grounds, arguing that the shorter version of the institution of the Lord’s Supper conforms more closely with established liturgical practice, because now, with the shorter text, there is only one cup of wine distributed with the bread, instead of two. What that view overlooks is that even with the shorter text there is a significant incongruity with the emerging Christian liturgy, in that the cup is given *prior* to the giving of the bread. If a scribe wanted to make the text reflect more adequately contemporary practice, surely he would have excised a reference to the *first* cup, rather

than the second.¹⁶ Still, this is an instance in which liturgical concerns have played a part in the discussion of the textual problem.

The Apostolic Fathers are affected by such concerns little more than are the texts that became the New Testament; that is to say, these concerns played *some* role, but not a major one. Probably the most striking instance occurs in the *Didache*, in the passage where this author too is discussing the celebration of the Eucharist, in this case reproducing the prayers that are to be said over the elements (notably in the same order as in the Lucan shorter text: cup, then bread!). After the prayer over the bread, and the injunction to allow the prophets to give thanks ‘as often as they wish’, comes an addition, with variations, in two of our witnesses to the text (Coptic and the *Apostolic Constitutions*): ‘But concerning the matter of the ointment (*μυρος*—sometimes understood as incense instead of ointment¹⁷), give thanks, saying “We give you thanks, O Father, for the ointment you have made known to us through Jesus your child. To you be the glory forever. Amen.”’ Even though the style of the prayer is similar to that found over the other two elements, it is widely conceded that this is a later addition to the text—added, naturally enough, to reflect current liturgical practice or to promote a liturgical practice thought to be important by the scribe who originally produced the addition to the text.

More significant for the textual history of the New Testament are changes that function to lower the status and role of women in the church. The best-known instance of this is, of course, the text of 1 Cor. 14. 34–5, which continues to generate debate between those who see the passage as Pauline and those who consider it to be an interpolation. Gordon Fee has made an argument on *textual* grounds for the interpolation theory, so that the issue falls squarely within the provenance of the surviving textual tradition of the book.¹⁸ Other textual alterations occur in the book of Acts, where the statement that Paul’s Thessalonian converts included ‘women of prominence’ came to be changed to ‘wives of prominent men’ (17. 4), where the high profile of women is occasionally compromised by the insertion of references to their children (1. 14) or to men of high profile (17. 12), and where the

¹⁶ For a full discussion of the problem, see B. D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 197–209.

¹⁷ See S. Gero, ‘So-called Ointment Prayer in the Coptic Version of the *Didache*: A Re-evaluation’, *HTR* 70 (1977), 67–84.

¹⁸ G. D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1987), 699–708.

names Priscilla and Aquila are sometimes reversed in the textual tradition to give the man his due priority.¹⁹

The same motivations appear to have been at work in some passages of the Apostolic Fathers. In one of the most memorable scenes of the *Shepherd*, for example, Hermas seems taken aback that the woman he longed for (his former owner) should be in heaven accusing him before God for lusting after her. In his exasperation he asks, ‘Have I sinned against you? In what way? When did I speak an inappropriate word to you? Have I not always thought of you as a goddess?’ (*Ου παντοτε σε ως θεαν ηγγισαμην*; 1. 7). The idea that this woman could be so far superior to the man—a goddess in contrast to a mere mortal—is evidently what led some scribes to change the text, so that in one fifteenth-century manuscript Hermas objects that he has always thought of her as a ‘daughter’ (*θυγατερα*). He has, in other words, treated her with the respect due to a child, not with the awe and reverence due to a divine being.

A change of an entirely different sort, yet still involving the status of women, occurs in an important passage of *1 Clement*. The reading in question is found at 21. 7, where, among his injunctions, the anonymous author urges women to manifest habits of purity, to reveal their innocent desire for meekness, and ‘to show forth the gentle character of their tongue through silence (*συγης*)’. This is a somewhat odd comment, since the only way to show *anything* about the character of one’s tongue is by using it to say something. What’s striking is that the textual authority that most editors have almost invariably preferred throughout *1 Clement*, Codex Alexandrinus, words the passage differently. Here women are urged to show forth the gentleness of their tongue through their voice (*φωνης*)—that is, by how they speak.

Lightfoot thinks that the reading of Alexandrinus represents a corruption, and there may be a good case to be made for his position.²⁰ I should point out that he himself doesn’t make a case; he finds *φωνης* (‘voice’) to be nonsensical here, and on the strength of the citation of the verse by Clement of Alexandria prefers the reading (‘silence’) that makes perfect sense to him. He notes that Hilgenfeld also prefers this reading and points to 1 Cor. 14. 34–5 and 1 Tim. 2. 11 as relevant parallels.

These are indeed relevant parallels, but possibly not for the reason that Lightfoot suspects. Both are passages that require women to be silent: one that, as already intimated, was *interpolated* into a Pauline letter and another that was *forged* in Paul’s name. The author of *1 Clement*, of course, knows full

¹⁹ For such examples, see B. Witherington, ‘The Anti-Feminist Tendencies of the “Western” Text in Acts’, *JBL* 103 (1984), 82–4.

²⁰ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1. 2. 77.

well that Paul did not enjoin silence upon women—whether within the church or outside. He was intimately familiar with 1 Corinthians, in which women pray and prophesy publicly; and Paul wrote the letter to the Romans to Clement's own church, where it was known and used—a letter in which Paul speaks about women missionaries, a woman deacon, and even a woman apostle (ch. 16). Later in the second century, of course, when Paul's own teachings were corrupted by other-minded scribes, women were no longer allowed to exercise roles of authority and were silenced. It was not enough for them to speak with a gentle voice; they were not to speak at all.

It is completely plausible that not only Paul's letter to Corinth but also Clement's letter to Corinth was corrupted in order to require complete silence of the women there. As I have pointed out, it was the other reading that struck the Victorian Lightfoot as more sensible: women should show what *gentle* tongues they have by never using them. Even modern scholars who accept this reading, though, including the most recent commentator in German, Lona, find it oxymoronic at best.²¹ And we should remember that our only reasonably early Greek manuscript has the other reading. I would assume that this is an instance in which modern ecclesiastical sensibility has got in the way of textual sense.

The final area of intentional alterations that I would like to consider involves doctrinal disputes in early Christianity and their effects on early Christian texts. This is an area that has assumed sustained attention among New Testament critics over the past decade, and I need not repeat all their findings here. Suffice it to say that it appears that scribes of the second and third centuries were cognizant of the theological controversies raging in their days, and occasionally modified their texts in order both to make them more useful in the proto-orthodox quest to establish its views as dominant and to circumvent the use of these texts by those who took alternative points of view.²² Did these debates affect the writings of the Apostolic Fathers as well? One would be surprised if it were otherwise, since in this early period, some of these texts were often considered scriptural.

Probably the best-known instance of an 'orthodox corruption' of the text is one that Lightfoot took some pride in discovering, Ignatius's *Letter to the Magnesians* 8. 2. Interestingly enough, the corruption appears in the Greek and Latin tradition that Lightfoot otherwise preferred. In these witnesses, Ignatius says: 'There is one God who manifested himself through Jesus Christ his Son, who is his eternal word, which did not come forth out of silence (*απο σιγης*).' Lightfoot notes, though, that the Armenian version of Ignatius

²¹ H. Lona, *Der erste Clemensbrief*, KAV 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 283.

²² See Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, and the bibliography given there.

reads differently: there Jesus Christ is said to be God's 'word which *did* come forth out of silence'.

Lightfoot argues that the Armenian text is original.²³ He probably presses his case for the external support too far when he says that it is the 'oldest extant form of the text'; elsewhere, when the Armenian does *not* support the reading that he happens to like, he slights it. Even so, in this case Lightfoot *can* plausibly argue that the Armenian reading makes good sense in its context, and that that it accords particularly well with how Ignatius speaks of the Incarnation elsewhere.

Most persuasive, though, is his argument that the text as given in the Armenian, that Christ was the 'Word which comes forth from Silence (*σινη*)', would have been changed by scribes concerned about its Gnostic overtones. For there were Gnostics who maintained that Silence, *σινη*, was one of the two primordial divine beings (along with Depth (*βυθος*)) and that the divine redeemer came forth from the pleroma to earth for salvation. For these Gnostics, Christ really was the word that came forth from 'Silence'. Ignatius himself, of course, is sometimes thought to have had something like Gnostic leanings; at least by the standards of later orthodoxy, some of his language was incautious at best. In any event, it would make good sense that his text was changed to avoid its misuse by Gnostics in support of their own doctrines.

One other place that appears to have been altered for theological reasons is Ignatius's famous credal statement in *Eph.* 7. 2. In the new Loeb edition²⁴ it is translated as follows: 'For there is one physician, both fleshly and spiritual, born and unborn, God come in the flesh, true life in death, from both Mary and God, first subject to suffering and then beyond suffering, Jesus Christ our Lord.' The textual problems are intriguing, but difficult to resolve. Taking them in the order of their occurrence in the passage, did Ignatius speak of 'God come in the flesh', *εν σαρκι γενομενος*, or of 'God in man', *εν ανθρωπω*? The latter phrase is found in only one Syriac fragment, so seems unlikely to be original, although it also occurs in Patristic sources from Athanasius onwards. Was it inspired by a need to insist that Jesus was the 'God-man'? It is worth noting that Lightfoot took the opposite line, arguing that this was in fact the original text, and that the alternative was created by scribes fearing the possible Apollinarian doctrine 'that the Logos took the place of the human *vous* in Christ'.²⁵

²³ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 2. 126.

²⁴ B. D. Ehrman (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers*, 2 vols., LCL 24 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003).

²⁵ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 2. 49.

Equally interesting is the final phrase of the confession, ‘Jesus Christ our Lord’, missing from the Greek text of the middle recension, but preserved in the Aramaic (Latin) and a fragment of the Syriac. On the one hand, the phrase seems needed to round out the confession; on the other hand, that may well have been the reason for a scribe wanting to add it. Moreover, this kind of piling on of titles of Jesus is common in the manuscript tradition of the writings of the New Testament. Was it added here, as in many cases in the canonical scriptures, in order to clarify the unity of the one Lord Jesus Christ?²⁶

As a final instance of a textual alteration possibly changed for theological reasons, we might turn to the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*. Here we’re told that when Polycarp refuses to renounce his faith, he is ordered to be burned at the stake. But through a divine miracle, the flames never touch the saint; they instead form a kind of envelope around him, as if he is bread baking in the oven; and the air is filled not with the reek of burning flesh but with the smell of sweet perfume. The pagan authorities are themselves incensed, and order the executioner to put an end to it all. He stabs Polycarp in the side, and there emerges a dove and such a quantity of blood that it extinguishes the fire.

Some scholars, including Lightfoot, doubt whether there was any dove. The bird does appear in all of the manuscripts of the *Martyrdom*. But the passage is quoted more or less accurately by Eusebius, who does not mention the dove—only the blood. Lightfoot maintains that Eusebius would not have been averse to mentioning such a supernatural occurrence had he known it, and that it is precisely the restraint of the account otherwise with respect to the supernatural that makes it look like an authentic report. With some reservations, then, he concludes that the dove was added by a later scribe, who wanted to magnify this great man of God by showing that his departing spirit was in the untainted form of the dove, like the Holy Spirit in the Gospel accounts of Jesus.²⁷

But one wonders why the author of the account himself could not have held some such view. The appeal to the supernatural in the account otherwise may seem restrained to a Victorian like Lightfoot—but why is the emergence of a dove any more supernatural than the voice of God coming from the clouds, or the flames that refuse to touch the saint’s body, or the effusion of his blood that douses the entire conflagration? Given the circumstance that the dove is attested in the surviving manuscripts, is there a reason why it may have been removed, not just from Polycarp’s side, but from the account?

²⁶ See Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, 161–3.

²⁷ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 390–3.

One option is to look at the possible theological implications of the account. The author of the *Martyrdom* is quite explicit that the death of Polycarp was in conformity with the Gospel (1. 1)—that is, that the account is modelled on Jesus' passion in the gospels. The parallels are numerous, striking, and frequently noted: Polycarp predicts his own death, he prays before his arrest, the officer in charge is called Herod, Polycarp rides into town on a donkey, he is opposed by the crowds who call for his death, etc. Could it be that a scribe removed the dove from the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* because it opened itself up to a heretical construal of the death of Jesus?

We know of Gnostic groups who believed that Jesus and the Christ were separate beings, that Jesus was a man and the Christ was a divine aeon, who came into Jesus at the moment of his baptism in the form of a dove. One group, the Marcosians, had a special interpretation of the dove; according to Irenaeus, they noted that the numerical value of the letters of p-e-r-i-s-t-e-r-a were 801, the same as the letters alpha and omega. For them, the alpha and omega—the divine being—came into Jesus at his baptism.²⁸ Moreover, these Gnostics typically argued that the divine being left Jesus prior to his death—hence his cry of dereliction on the cross, 'My God, my God, why have you left me behind?'²⁹

The death of Polycarp was portrayed to stand in conformity with the gospel accounts of the death of Jesus. Possibly its text was changed because it was thought to be too close to a Gnostic separationist understanding of Jesus' yielding up of his divine element. This strikes me as at least possible, given the fact that the account is found in all of our surviving manuscripts, Lightfoot's uneasiness over such an unbelievable detail notwithstanding.

CONCLUSION

By way of conclusion, I will simply summarize my findings and restate my thesis. Over the entire course of their transmission, the texts of the Apostolic Fathers were not copied with anything like the frequency of the books that made it into the New Testament—even though in the early centuries of the church some of them (such as the *Shepherd*) were at least as popular and widely copied as several books that became canonical (such as Mark). When these books *were* copied, however, they were subject to the same kinds of textual corruption that one finds attested among the manuscripts of the New Testament. They were accidentally altered on occasion, by careless, tired, or

²⁸ See Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, 142.

²⁹ Cf. *Gospel of Philip*, 68.

inept scribes, to probably about the same degree as were the writings of Scripture. And they were intentionally changed by scribes in light of their own historical, theological, and social contexts: on rare occasions they were changed because of regnant liturgical practices; they were changed to lower the status and role of women in the churches; and they were changed in light of theological controversies that raged in the worlds of the scribes who were copying their texts. In short, the factors that affected the transmission of the texts of the New Testament played a similar role in the transmission of the early proto-orthodox writings that came to be excluded from the canon of sacred Scripture.

This page intentionally left blank

Textual Traditions Examined: What the Text of the Apostolic Fathers tells us about the Text of the New Testament in the Second Century

William L. Petersen

A century ago ‘a small committee’ of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology published a slender, 144-page volume entitled *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*.¹ The charge given the committee was ‘to prepare a volume exhibiting those passages of early Christian writers which indicate, or have been thought to indicate, acquaintance with any of the books of the New Testament’.²

The committee limited itself to the so-called Apostolic Fathers, examining eight authors (and/or texts).³ The results were presented in exemplary fashion. Each passage in an Apostolic Father thought to have a possible parallel in the canonical New Testament was excised and printed in Greek, accompanied by the putative parallel(s).⁴ A brief analysis accompanied each passage; often, a concluding summary gave an overview of that author’s (or text’s) presumed knowledge of the New Testament. Let us begin by reviewing the results achieved a century ago.

¹ A Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology, *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), hereafter *NTAF*.

² *NTAF*, p. iii.

³ The authors/texts are: *The Epistle of Barnabas*, the *Didache* (divided into two subsections: the ‘Two Ways’ section and the ‘Ecclesiastical’ section), Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, and *2 Clement*.

⁴ The problems of dealing with patristic or apocryphal ‘parallels’ to the present text of the New Testament are well known; they need not be rehearsed here.

I. THE RESULTS OF THE 1905 INVESTIGATION

The 1905 researchers ranked the likelihood that a specific Father demonstrated knowledge of a given book in the New Testament by assigning each possible intersection a letter grade from 'A' to 'D'. 'A' designated 'books about which there can be no reasonable doubt' that the Father knew it; 'B' referred to books where there was 'a high degree of probability'. 'C' referred to a 'lower degree of probability'. And 'D' meant that the evidence was 'too uncertain to allow any reliance to be placed upon it'.⁵ A table on page 137 summarized the results. Out of a total of 216 possible intersections between a Father and a specific book,⁶ conclusions were possible in only eighty-five of the intersections, 39 per cent. Out of those eighty-five places where it was possible to assign a letter rank, we find forty-three Ds and twenty-two Cs. There are fourteen Bs (eight of them, however, come from a single source: Polycarp), and six As. Converted to percentages, Ds make up 51 per cent of the total, and Cs constitute 26 per cent; combined, they comprise 77 per cent of the total. Bs are 16 per cent (or, if one eliminates Polycarp, 7 per cent), while As comprise a slender 7 per cent of the total.⁷

The most remarkable aspect of the 1905 volume is the fact that now, a century later, the significance of the 'formal' results achieved by the committee (i.e., the letter rankings and determination of what Father appears to have known which New Testament books) pale into insignificance when compared with the notes the researchers offered on the passages they examined. It is puzzling why researchers in the last century have paid so little attention to this 'commentary' on the readings, for the observations made by the 1905 researchers were not only far ahead of their time, they have also been independently confirmed by later researchers. In order to understand why the remarks of the 1905 researchers have been ignored, we must first sample them. What follows is a *mélange* of quotations from the Oxford Committee's 1905 volume.

⁵ *NTAF*, p. iii.

⁶ These '216 possible intersections' exclude the committee's category of 'synoptic tradition', where possible knowledge was signified by a plus sign (+). I ignore this because (1) the category fails to stipulate a specific document, and (2) the plus sign begs the question of the quality of the knowledge by failing to assign a letter rank. For the other books, where letter rankings have been given, I have ignored the committee's use of square brackets and question marks, which merely qualify a given letter rank.

⁷ Recall that these percentages are calculated on the basis of the eighty-five intersections where a letter rank was assigned; if one were to base the percentages on all 216 possible intersections, then there would be 20 per cent Ds, 10 per cent Cs, 7 per cent Bs, and 3 per cent As, and 61 per cent with no evidence (rounding means these numbers total 101 per cent).

Concerning the *Epistle of Barnabas* (studied by J. V. Bartlet), we read: ‘On the whole, then, we have reason to expect that, if Barnabas alludes to any N. T. writings, it will be in a free and glossing way. . . .’⁸ A bit later we find this remark: ‘Though the passages [*Barn.* 13. 2–3 and *Rom.* 9. 7–13] both turn on the phrase common to them, they use it differently. . . . Barnabas often twists what he borrows, and his knowledge of Romans is otherwise probable.’⁹

On the *Didache* (examined by K. Lake), we find:

The resemblance of this passage [*Did.* 1. 4–6] to Matthew [5. 39–42] and Luke [6. 29–30] is obvious. It should however be observed that, if we take the five cases as arranged and numbered above in the *Didache*, Matthew has 1, 3, 2, 5, omitting 4, while Luke has 1, 3, 5, 4, omitting 2. Going outside the Canonical Gospels, Tatian’s *Diatessaron* (according to the reconstruction made by Zahn in his *Forschungen*, i. 17) had 1, 2, 3, 4, omitting 5, and Justin’s *Apology*, i. 16, cites only 1, 3, and 2 a line later. It is hard to draw any more definite conclusion from these facts, than that the resemblance to our Gospels may be explained in any one of the four ways mentioned in the preceding note. . . . in a passage in which so many possibilities are open, only the closest verbal resemblances would be sufficient to prove literary dependence.¹⁰

Remarking on his findings concerning *1 Clement*, the author (A. J. Carlyle) writes:

The quotations from the Old Testament seem for the most part to be made with great exactness, especially in the case of the citation of longer passages. . . . The quotations from the N. T. are clearly made in a different way. Even in the case of N. T. works which as it appears to us were certainly known and used by Clement, such as Romans and I Corinthians, the citations are loose and inexact.¹¹

Of Ignatius of Antioch, the scholar responsible (W. R. Inge) makes the remarkable¹² observation that ‘Ignatius *always* quotes from memory; that he is inexact even as compared with his contemporaries; and that he appears sometimes to have a vague recollection of a phrase when he is not thinking of, or wishing to remind his readers of, the original context’.¹³

⁸ *NTAF*, 3.

⁹ *NTAF*, 4 (reading 2).

¹⁰ *NTAF*, 35–6 (reading 26).

¹¹ *NTAF*, 37.

¹² Inge’s claim is remarkable for three reasons: (1) it is an assertion that cannot be made with any degree of certainty—yet Inge is dogmatic (‘Ignatius *always*. . .’); (2) Inge’s claim is completely unverifiable; and (3) it completely eliminates—without any evidence!—*all* other possible explanations (e.g., verbatim citation from an apocryphal source, accurate citation from catenae, citation from oral tradition, citation from a *deviating* gospel text, etc.).

Inge’s presumptuous—but pious—claim is out of step with the very cautious, nuanced, and critical approach of the other contributors; cf., e.g., the careful, analytical work of J. V. Bartlet, A. J. Carlyle, and P. V. M. Benecke on *2 Clement*.

¹³ *NTAF*, 64 (reading ‘g’); italics added.

Concerning Polycarp of Smyrna, the researcher (P. V. M. Benecke) notes: ‘Here again [at 12. 3] the language of Polycarp seems to be influenced by teaching like that of the Sermon on the Mount [Matt. 5. 44; Luke 6. 27], but the passage affords no evidence for the use of either of our Gospels in its present form.’¹⁴

As for *Shepherd*, J. Drummond writes: ‘The author of the Shepherd of Hermas nowhere supplies us with a direct quotation from the Old or New Testament, and we are therefore obliged to fall back upon allusions which always admit of some degree of doubt.’¹⁵

And finally, of 2 *Clement* (examined by J. V. Bartlet, A. J. Carlyle, and P. V. M. Benecke), we read: ‘Clement’s wording [at 2 *Clem.* 3. 2] is sufficiently different [from Matt. 10. 32 or Luke 12. 8] to suggest the direct use of another source altogether, whether oral or written.’¹⁶ On another passage they note: ‘[The passage in 2 *Clem.* 4. 2] may simply echo [Matt. 7. 21].... Or the quotation may have stood in this form in the same source from which iv. 5, v. 2–4 seem to come, the subject being akin. Or, again, it may come from oral tradition.’¹⁷

As this sampling makes clear, the 1905 researchers (with the exception of Inge, who stood on the threshold of a fabled ecclesiastical career) were well aware of the multiplicity of possible explanations for the evidence they found in the Apostolic Fathers; they were also acutely aware of their inability to reach definitive judgements on the basis of the evidence. All they could do was follow the *via negativa*: the source(s) used in about three-quarters of the passages in the Apostolic Fathers with a parallel in the New Testament (to quote Benecke, on Polycarp) ‘affords no evidence for the use of either of our Gospels in its present form’;¹⁸ that being the case, one had to consider (to quote Bartlet, Carlyle, and Benecke, on 2 *Clement*) ‘the direct use of another [viz. non-canonical] source altogether, whether oral or written.’¹⁹

These conclusions—based on the first systematic cataloguing and examination of the potential parallels between the Apostolic Fathers and the New Testament—are what make the 1905 volume such a milestone in learning. Although the Committee’s stated task had *not* been to render a judgement on the *text* of the New Testament parallels in the Apostolic Fathers, nevertheless, they had done so. Whether they realized from the outset that such judgements were a necessary, intermediate step on the way to their final goal, or whether the realization dawned on them only as the project progressed, is unknown. But, as the small sampling of quotations presented above makes clear, their

¹⁴ *NTAF*, 103 (reading 78).

¹⁷ *NTAF*, 131 (reading 24).

¹⁹ *NTAF*, 130 (reading 23).

¹⁵ *NTAF*, 105.

¹⁸ *NTAF*, 103 (reading 78).

¹⁶ *NTAF*, 130 (reading 23).

empirical, textual observations were devastating for the idea of a ‘standard’ or ‘established’ text of the New Testament in the first half of the second century. The disjunction between piety (both lay and academic) and these findings goes a long way towards explaining why the 1905 volume has received so little attention—even, one regrets to say, among textual critics.

If one searches for patterns in the readings catalogued and examined by the Oxford Committee, three broad conclusions emerge. First, it is clear that the vast majority of passages in the Apostolic Fathers for which one can find likely parallels in the New Testament have *deviations* from our present, critically reconstructed New Testament text. It must be emphasized that the vast majority of these deviations are *not* minor (e.g., differences in spelling or verb tense), but major (a completely new context, a substantial interpolation or omission, a conflation of two entirely separate ideas and/or passages). Second, harmonization is a surprisingly common phenomenon. Sometimes the harmonizations are (almost) entirely composed of material found in our modern editions of the New Testament; more often, however, they contain material which we today classify as extra-canonical. Third, the Apostolic Fathers often reproduce, without remark, material that we, today, call extra-canonical. Sometimes this extra-canonical material is introduced with a quotation formula—such as, ‘the Lord says’, or ‘the Gospel says’. The obvious inference is that the Father considered this extra-canonical source as authoritative as any other.

Much has happened in the century since the publication of the 1905 volume. Two World Wars have come and gone, the atom has been harnessed, flight has become a reality, and polio and smallpox have all but vanished. Yet, a century later, one finds modern scholars—operating independently—coming to the same conclusions, expressed in virtually the same terminology. One may open Helmut Köster’s *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern*, and read (concerning *Did.* 16. 3–8 and *Matt.* 24. 10–12): ‘doch wegen zu großer Verschiedenheiten in Wortlaut und Inhalt kaum direct literarisch etwas miteinander zu tun haben werden.’²⁰

If one turns from Köster’s Olympian survey to studies which focus on a single document, the results remain the same. For example, of *2 Clem.* 13. 4 (parr. Luke 6. 32; 6. 27; and *Matt.* 5. 46, 44), Karl Donfried writes: ‘Most likely 2 Clement had access to a non-canonical source and is quoting from this.’²¹

²⁰ H. Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern* TU 65 (V Reihe, Band 10) (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957), 179.

²¹ K. P. Donfried, *The Setting of Second Clement in Early Christianity*, NovTSup 38 (Leiden: Brill, 1974), 78.

While modern researchers may quibble over precisely *how* one should account for a given reading in a given Apostolic Father,²² one fact—already noted by the 1905 committee—remains constant: *in the overwhelming majority of cases, those passages in the Apostolic Fathers which offer recognizable parallels with our present-day New Testament display a text that is very different from what we now find in our modern critical editions of the New Testament.* Some might wonder if the disagreements would disappear if the basis for comparison were changed from our modern critically reconstructed text to the texts of the ‘great uncials’ of the mid-fourth century (Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus). They do not. Even if the basis for comparison is changed to the text of our oldest continuous-text manuscripts of New Testament documents (P⁶⁴⁺⁶⁷ and P⁶⁶ (both of which date from ‘ca. 200’²³)), the differences remain. One simply must admit that the passages found in the Apostolic Fathers are different from the texts found in our oldest New Testament papyri, from the texts of the ‘great uncials’, and from the text of our modern editions.

II. THEN AND NOW: THE DIFFERENCES OF A CENTURY

Despite the similarities between the results of the 1905 volume and those of more recent research (Köster, Donfried, Niederwimmer, etc.), there are also differences. These differences are significant, for they show *how* our discipline has changed, and *what* caused it to change. The *what* has been the discovery of new sources, and the *how* has been the creation of new models of the development of early Christian texts (including those that would later become canonical) based on the evidence found in these new sources. Let us consider each in turn.

The New Sources

Merely naming three sources discovered since 1905 will be sufficient to demonstrate their importance. First, in 1911, Alfred Schmidtke collected

²² Is it due to the Father’s faulty memory, or reliance on ‘oral tradition’, or the use of a proto-version of one of our canonical gospels, or reliance upon a pre-Justin harmony, or use of an apocryphal gospel, or the proclivity of the Father to freely adapt the text to his audience and the moment?

²³ So K. and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 2nd rev. edn. (trans. from the 2nd German edn. (1981); Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans; Leiden: Brill, 1989), 100.

and published the glosses now known as the ‘Zion Gospel Edition’.²⁴ Second, Egerton Papyrus 2 was discovered in 1934, and published in 1935.²⁵ Third, the Coptic version of the entire *Gospel of Thomas* was found in 1945.²⁶

New Models Developed from the New Sources

The discovery of these new sources was revolutionary, for in many cases one now had *multiple* second-century examples of the *same* logion or episode. This allowed comparisons to be made, and for the first time one could plot a *trajectory* of development for a given logion or pericope: one point on a map is a static location, but a series of linked points on a map is a plot, a trajectory, which shows change. The existence of multiple versions of the same pericope also meant that the ‘patterns and practices’ of authors and scribes of the period could be identified and described. This multiplication of reference points profoundly *changed how we view the transmission history of the books that later became part of the canon*. How much of a change? Consider two examples.

Exhibit 1

When the authors of the 1905 volume pondered the source of 2 *Clem.* 12. 2, the only known parallel was a fragment of Julius Cassianus (*fl.* 190?) quoted by Clement of Alexandria in *Strom.* 3. 13. 92. Clement explicitly noted that the text quoted by Cassianus was *not* found in ‘our four gospels’, but was (according to Clement) from the ‘[*Gospel*] according to the Egyptians’. Today, however, it can be paralleled with logion 22 of the *Gospel of Thomas*.²⁷

²⁴ A. Schmidtke, *Neue Fragmente und Untersuchungen zu den judenchristlichen Evangelien*, TU 37.1, 3 Reihe, Band 7 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1911). Bousset’s first notice in 1894 (in his *Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament*, TU 11.4 (Leipzig: Hinrichs), 132–5) of ten of the manuscripts attracted little attention, and did not list all thirty-nine of the MSS of the group. See W. L. Petersen, ‘Zion Gospel Edition’, in D. N. Freedman (ed.), *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), vi. 1097–8.

²⁵ H. I. Bell and T. C. Skeat (eds.), *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel and other early Christian papyri* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1935), 1–41.

²⁶ A. Guillaumont, H.-C. Puech, G. Quispel, W. Till, and Y. ‘Abd al Masih (eds.), *The Gospel of Thomas* (Leiden: Brill; New York: Harper & Row, 1959). The oldest of the Oxyrhynchus fragments of *Thomas* (*P Oxy.* 1) was known to the Oxford researchers, having been published in 1897; the other two fragments (*P Oxy.* 654 and 655) were published only in 1904, and were therefore presumably unknown to the Oxford Committee (all three Oxyrhynchus fragments were edited by Grenfell and Hunt).

²⁷ The texts are available in their original languages in either T. Baarda, ‘2 Clement 12 and the Sayings of Jesus’, in H. Helderma and S. J. Noorda (eds.), *Early Transmission of Words of Jesus* (Amsterdam: VU Boekhandel/Uitgeverij, 1983), 261–88; or Donfried, *Setting of Second Clement in Early Christianity*, 73–7. The English translations given in the table (with minor modifications) are those, respectively, of Baarda, Lightfoot/Harmer/Holmes, and Baarda.

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Clem. Al. <i>Strom.</i> 3. 13. 92 | 2 Clem. 12. 2 | <i>Gospel of Thomas</i> , 22 |
| | a For the Lord himself, when he was asked by someone | a |
| | b | b They said to him: 'If we are little ones, |
| | c when his kingdom was going to come, | c will we enter into the kingdom?' |
| When Salome inquired, when she would know the things about which she had asked, | d | d |
| the Lord said, | e said, | e Jesus said to them: |
| 'When you tread upon the garment of shame | f | f |
| and when the two become one, | g 'When the two shall be one, | g 'When you will make the two one, |
| | h | h and make the inside as the outside |
| | i And the outside like the inside, | i and the outside as the inside, |
| | j | j and the upper side like the underside |
| | k | k and [so,] that you will make the male with the female into a single one, |
| and when the male with the female | l and the male with the female, | l so that the male is not male |
| is neither male nor female.' | m neither male nor female.' | m and the female is not female...' |

Without the evidence of the *Gospel of Thomas*, the Oxford Committee remarked that 'it looks as if 2 Clement quotes from the same passage [in the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*, also quoted by Cassian]'. Indeed, J. V. Bartlet, one of the Oxford Committee responsible for 2 *Clement*, suggested that *all* of 2 *Clement's* extra-canonical citations 'may be' from the *Gospel*

according to the Egyptians, which might even be ‘the one [extra-canonical source] cited by 2 Clem. throughout’.²⁸

An analysis conducted today would come to a different conclusion. The three texts above show that, by the middle of the second century, the transmission history of a single logion (‘the two become one, male with female’ (elements *g*, *l*, and *m*)) was already bifurcated into two families.

‘Family 1’ consists of the Clement of Alexandria/Cassianus/*Gospel according to the Egyptians* version of the saying. In this family, the core of the logion (elements *g*, *l*, and *m*) survives in what appears to be an uninterpolated form. However, it has been conflated with another logion (elements *d*, *e*, and *f*), which elsewhere circulates separately.²⁹

‘Family 2’ consists of the version found in 2 Clement and Thomas (logion 22). The textual filiation of these two sources is evidenced by four similarities. (1) Both texts introduce the logion as a question about the ‘kingdom’ (element *c*). (2) Both texts fail to interpolate the second logion (‘tread upon the garment of shame’; elements *d*, *e*, and *f*), found in ‘family 1’. (3) In both texts, Jesus’ first words are the same (element *g*). (4) Both texts contain the same interpolation concerning the ‘outside as the inside’ (element *i*).

Note also that ‘family 2’ shows development *within* the family. First, we note that only ‘family 2’ displays the interpolation of element *i* (‘outside like the inside’). Once this interpolation has been introduced (by 2 Clement or his source), and it reaches Thomas, either Thomas or his source has amplified the interpolation by the addition of elements *h*, *j*, and *k*.

A century ago, Bartlet presumed 2 Clement’s use of the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*—the same source used by Cassianus. Today, however, our conclusions would be very different. We would observe that we are in

²⁸ NTAf, 136. Despite these statements, Bartlet also offers a very prescient observation about the sources of the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*: ‘[The character of the source quoted in 2 Clem. 5. 2–4] corresponds more nearly to what we know of the Oxyrhynchus *Sayings of Jesus*, than to [the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*] as usually conceived. But it is quite likely that the Egyptian Gospel embodied much matter from earlier Gospels, including the Oxyrhynchus ‘*Sayings Gospel*.’ Today we can say that Bartlet was very close to the mark—although we would probably contend that none of the three versions available to us today represents the original form of the logion; it is generally agreed that 2 Clement’s version of the saying is the oldest preserved (so Köster, Donfried, Lindemann, etc.), but it is clear that all three descend from a still older tradition.

²⁹ These first three elements (*d*, *e*, and *f*) are obviously related to Thomas logion 37: ‘His disciples said, “When will you appear to us, and when will we see you?” Jesus said, “When you strip without being ashamed, and you take your clothes and put them under your feet like little children and trample them, then [you] will see the son of the living one and you will not be afraid.”’

possession of three versions of the same logion (elements *g*, *l*, and *m*), all dated to the first half of the second century. However, none appears to give us the most ancient version of the saying. Each source has tampered with the words of Jesus in its own distinctive way. In ‘family 1’, the original logion (elements *g*, *l*, and *m*) has been conflated with a separate logion (elements *d*, *e*, and *f*). In ‘family 2’ we note that *2 Clement* has interpolated element *i* into the logion; once element *i* is in place, it provides *Thomas* with a point of departure for further, related interpolations (elements *h*, *j*, and *k*).

In 1905, the researchers had only two versions of this saying at their disposal. Today, thanks to the discovery of *Thomas*, we have three points of reference, and a more accurate insight into how texts were handled in the early second century. Our analysis is, therefore, more profound and analytical.

Exhibit 2

In *2 Clem.* 4. 5a, there is a saying of Jesus which the Oxford Committee categorized as coming from the ‘apocryphal gospels’, without stipulating a specific gospel.³⁰ Schmidtke’s 1911 publication of the glosses of the ‘Zion Gospel Edition’³¹ provided the first parallel for this logion. In Greek gospel MS 1424 (ninth or tenth century), a marginal gloss at Matt. 7. 5 attributes the logion to ‘the Jewish [gospel]’ (τὸ Ἰουδαϊκόν).

| | | |
|-------------------------------|----------|---|
| <i>2 Clem.</i> 4. 5a | | ‘Zion Gospel’ gloss in MS 1424, at Matt. 7. 5 |
| | <i>a</i> | The Jewish gospel here reads the following: |
| If you were | <i>b</i> | If you were |
| with me assembled | <i>c</i> | |
| in my bosom and | <i>d</i> | in my bosom and |
| would not do my commandments, | <i>e</i> | would not do the will of my Father in heaven, |
| I would expel you. | <i>f</i> | I will cast you |
| | <i>g</i> | out of my bosom. |

³⁰ The speculation of J. V. Bartlet *et al.* (see *supra*, at n. 28) would, if accepted, apply here in addition to *2 Clem.* 12. 2.

³¹ See *supra*, n. 24.

Not only does the gloss identify the source of the logion (Schmidtko concluded that the 'Jewish Gospel' was one of the Judaic-Christian gospels; Vielhauer and Strecker have suggested that it was the *Gospel of the Nazaraeans*, which is dated to 'the first half of the second century'³²); it also appears to preserve a more ancient and 'Semitic' form of the logion than does *2 Clement*. In support of that claim, note the following: (1) the interpolation of 'with me assembled' in *2 Clement* (element *c*) seems a later addition to the text, for it presupposes a congregational setting; (2) the repetition and inversion of 'in/out of my bosom' in the gloss ('*in my bosom*' (element *d*) and '*out of my bosom*' (element *g*)) appear to be a Semitism; (3) *2 Clement's* 'my commandments' (element *e*) reflects a higher, Jesus-centred Christology, while 'the will of my Father in heaven' reflects a more modest (and, therefore, presumably more ancient) Judaic-Christian Christology.

In 1905, the logion found at *2 Clem.* 4. 5a was a singularity, and the Oxford Committee could only say that it appeared to come from an apocryphal gospel. Although they did not say so, one could infer that, since the oldest manuscript of *2 Clement* is Codex Alexandrinus (MS A, fifth century), the logion could have originated no earlier than the fourth century. Now, however, a century later, we have a second version of the logion, in a source that attributes it to a second-century document (*τὸ Ἰουδαϊκόν*); it is of the utmost significance that this 'Jewish gospel' is a direct chronological contemporary of *2 Clement*. This proves that the logion is very ancient. The new parallel also permits us to observe that *2 Clement's* version of the logion seems to be a more developed version of the saying found in *τὸ Ἰουδαϊκόν*.

III. THE STATE OF THE QUESTION IN 2005

As the foregoing has made clear, the discoveries of the last century permit us greater insight into how Christian texts were handled in the second century. It is to the eternal credit of the 1905 Oxford Committee that—although the new discoveries and the new models of the development of early Christian texts permit us to refine our analyses beyond what was possible in 1905—the core of the committee's remarks and commentary remain valid a century later.³³

³² P. Vielhauer and G. Strecker, 'IV. Jewish Christian Gospels, 1: The Gospel of the Nazaraeans', in W. Schneemelcher (ed.), *New Testament Apocrypha*, 2nd English edn. (Cambridge/Louisville, Ky.: James Clarke/Westminster Press, 1991), i. 159.

³³ The reason for their timelessness is the fact that they are based on empirical observation, not ideological, theological cant (e.g., Dean Inge's bold—but baseless—claim (*supra*, n. 12)).

Whether one works with the findings of the 1905 volume (presented in section I above), or whether one relies on more recent analyses (Köster *et al.*), the empirical evidence confronts one with two models for describing the texts of this period (100–150 CE) which eventually became the New Testament.³⁴ We consider each in turn.

Model 1

In the first half of the second century—that is, in the age of the Apostolic Fathers—and even later, into the time of Tatian and Clement of Alexandria (near the end of the second century), there was neither a fixed canon nor a fixed text for any of the New Testament documents. Rather, ‘clusters’ of sayings/episodes/parts of (what later became our canonical) gospels and epistles circulated, initially (for the gospels, at least) probably without a title, and then, later, with a title. But the *contents* of the ‘cluster’ bearing the title ‘Mark’ or ‘Romans’ was still very much in flux and subject to change. Additions were still being made,³⁵ as were deletions; the sequence of the text was still being modified.³⁶ In short, what the Alands have written is true:

Denn im 2. Jahrhundert ist der Text des Neuen Testament noch nicht endgültig festgelegt. Noch bis 150, wo wir bei Justin zum ersten Mal Zitate aus den Evangelien einigermassen fassen können (vorher herrscht völlige Willkür in der Zitation), warden diese ‘freischwebend’ zitiert, erst um 180 (bei Irenäus) setzt eine Verfestigung ein.³⁷

All attempts to establish use of this or that ‘canonical’ book by the Apostolic Fathers (as the 1905 Oxford volume sought to do) are, therefore—if one

³⁴ The subsequent remarks are subject to the following limitations: (1) I am addressing only the period 100–150 CE; (2) I am relying on the best critical editions of the Fathers available to us today (if new discoveries change the text of the Fathers, my conclusions may change); (3) I recognize and am aware of all of the problems in the field of patristic and apocryphal studies, including what constitutes a citation, an allusion, or an echo, and the vagaries of the transmission history of each Father’s own text; and, finally, (4) our still circumscribed (although better than in 1905) knowledge of the range of sources available to a writer in the first half of the second century.

³⁵ Two of the most obvious and generally accepted examples are the various ‘endings’ of the Gospel of Mark (what follows Mark 16. 8), and the *pericope adulterae* in John (7. 53–8. 11).

³⁶ It is important to realize that the liberties that the ‘evangelists’ took with each others’ ‘gospels’ is decisive evidence for this endless ‘tinkering’ and cavalier attitude towards the text: consider the liberties which each evangelist takes with the ‘Anointing at Bethany’ (Matt. 26. 6–13; Mark 14. 3–9; Luke 7. 36–50; John 12. 1–8), including where each gospel places the episode within the life of Jesus. Other examples abound: the crucifixion accounts and their date, the discovery of the empty tomb, the episode of the rich young man, the parable of the lost sheep, etc., etc.

³⁷ K. and B. Aland, *Der Text des Neuen Testaments*, 1st edn. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1982), 64. The same sentence stands in the 2nd German edn. (1989), and in the English translation thereof (pp. 54–5).

accepts the Alands' analysis—doomed from the outset; for how, in any meaningful way, can one speak of an Apostolic Father's use of (e.g.) 'Matthew', if the text of Matthew were *freischwebend*, and not yet 'fixed'? While one might be able to speak of the use of 'traditions' which later coalesced, and eventually became part of the fixed text that *today* bears the title 'The Gospel according to Matthew' (that is, *our* Matthew, of the 'great uncials' and of our modern, critically reconstructed text³⁸), one cannot speak with any degree of certainty about the form of *our* 'Matthew' in the first half of the second century.³⁹

Subscribing to this model has certain consequences. It means that scholars must be very circumspect about attributing *anything* to the first-century church, for there is a *complete* lack of *any* empirical evidence from the first century. And what evidence we have from the second century—in the Apostolic Fathers, for example—hardly inspires confidence. The problems are not confined to the liberties taken with the texts (as evidenced in our exhibits, or as evident in any synopsis), but also extend to the matter of the boundary between what would later be called canonical and extra-canonical texts,⁴⁰ and the citation of extra-canonical material as 'gospel' or *logia Iesou* during the age of the Apostolic Fathers.⁴¹ The issue, then, is not just one of the *texts* being unsettled, but also one of which *documents* (or, more properly, clusters of material) and which *traditions* were authoritative, and which were not.

³⁸ Elsewhere, I have argued—as have many others, both past and present—that our modern, critically reconstructed editions of the New Testament do not give us the text of the early (or even late) second-century gospels and epistles; rather, what our modern editions reconstruct is the text of the great uncials (c. 350) and the text of the third century (i.e., from 185 (the time of Irenaeus) and later): see W. L. Petersen, 'The Genesis of the Gospels', in A. Denaux (ed.), *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis*, BETL 161 (Leuven: Peeters and University of Leuven Press, 2002), 33–65; also *idem*, 'What Text Can New Testament Textual Criticism Ultimately Reach?', in B. Aland and J. Delobel (eds.), *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis and Church History: A Discussion of Methods*, CBET 7 (Kampen: Kok-Pharos, 1994), 136–51, esp. 151.

³⁹ It is the awareness of this problem that led Niederwimmer to caution that even though 'the . . . quotation [at *Did.* 9. 5] . . . is found word for word in Matt 7. 6 . . . it is not certain that the Didachist is quoting Matthew's Gospel'. (K. Niederwimmer, *The Didache: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1998), 53). Already in 1905, the Oxford Committee had identified this problem, and had already discerned the implications: 'The verbal resemblance [between *Did.* 9. 5 and Matt. 7. 6] is exact, but the passage in Matthew contains no reference to the Eucharist, and the proverbial character of the saying reduces the weight which must be attached to verbal similarity' (*N.T.A.F.* 27 (reading 10)).

⁴⁰ There are numerous examples of what we today consider extra-canonical material penetrating the manuscript tradition of the canonical gospels, e.g.: (1) the 'light' in the Jordan at Jesus' baptism in *Vetus Latina MSS a* and *g*¹; (2) the interpolation of the actual words spoken by the Jews at Luke 23. 48 in *Vetus Latina MS g*¹; (3) the variant reading 'bodiless demon' at Luke 24. 37.

⁴¹ An example of a 'gospel' citation that is unknown to us today is found at Clem. Al. *Strom.* 5. 10 (this is, of course, not a new problem when dealing with Holy Writ: the 'prophets' whose words—as quoted in Matt. 2. 23—were 'fulfilled' remain unknown to us even today).

Clearly, the standards of the Apostolic age were not those of the Quinisextine Council.⁴²

If one does not like the consequences of this first model, then there is always the alternative: model 2.

Model 2

In the age of the Apostolic Fathers, the text of the New Testament was fixed in the form known to us today. ‘Mark’ in 110 or 130 CE would be immediately recognizable as the critically reconstructed Gospel of Mark found in our modern editions, save for some minor, largely irrelevant, textual ‘noise’ (and (presumably) the lack of the ‘Long Ending’ (Mark 16. 9–20)). All of the ‘deviations’ from this established text in the Apostolic Fathers would be—as suggested by many Victorian (and even contemporary) scholars⁴³—due to citation from memory or adapting the text to the purposes of the moment (e.g., preaching, evangelizing, teaching, disputing).

The present author finds this model profoundly flawed, for four reasons.

First, we know that many of the ‘deviating’ readings found in the Apostolic Fathers *have parallels in other Fathers or documents*, where the same reading

⁴² But even when the Quinisextine Council in 692 promulgated the twenty-seven-book canon for the whole church, it still did not specify the *textual form* of those books. Hence, the *contents* of Matthew or John might (and did) vary considerably from area to area (examples would include the inclusion or omission of the ‘Sailor’s Signs’ at Matt. 18. 2–3 and the inclusion or omission of the *pericope adulterae* from the Gospel of John). See also *infra*, n. 50.

⁴³ Cf. the remarks on the biblical quotations in the *Epistle of Barnabas* in M. Staniforth (ed.), *Early Christian Writings* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968): ‘The ordinary reader may find himself puzzled by the seeming inaccuracy of many of Barnabas’s profuse quotations from Scripture. There are three factors, any of which—either by itself or in combination with others—may account for this. In the first place, it must not be forgotten that Barnabas is using the only Bible that was familiar to the Greek-speaking world, the Greek (LXX, or Septuagint) translation of the original Hebrew books. Secondly, his standards of exactitude are not high; he often quotes from a not very reliable memory, and is content to give the general sense of a text instead of its exact words. And finally, it must be confessed that he has regrettably few scruples about altering or adding to a Scriptural text to strengthen his argument’ (p. 191). Apparently, it never occurred to Staniforth—or was an idea beyond the pale—that the author of *Barnabas* simply had a *different* text from ours, one which he quoted accurately!

Consider also the remarks about Justin’s biblical quotations in A. Roberts and J. Donaldson (eds.), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, American edn. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1985), i: ‘Justin quotes from memory, so that there are some slight discrepancies between the words of Jesus as here cited, and the same sayings as recorded in our Gospels’ (167 n. 3); ‘This and the following quotation taken promiscuously from Matt. xxiii. and Luke xi’ (203 n. 6).

M. Mees’s study of Clement of Alexandria makes use of the ‘adaptation to the moment’ theory; more recently, J. Verheyden (‘Assessing Gospel Quotations in Justin Martyr’, in A. Denaux (ed.), *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel*, BETL 161 (Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 361–77) has argued that Justin had literary and/or stylistic reasons for some of his modifications.

turns up in almost—and, in many instances, *precisely*—the same ‘deviating’ form. This is incontrovertible proof that faulty memories are *not* the source of these ‘deviating’ readings; nor can ‘spontaneous’ adaptations to the moment explain them. Rather, we are dealing with *a tradition*—almost certainly *written* (because of the verbatim similarity)—that was known to multiple authors in close chronological proximity to each other.⁴⁴

Second, while the claim that all of the Fathers had gone potty may appeal to some—and the present author must admit that he is certainly sympathetic to the charge—it is an untenable claim, for it requires that one maintain as ‘true’ two mutually exclusive, contradictory beliefs. To hold this position, one must, on the one hand, maintain that the value of the text was recognized by the Fathers; it was, therefore, carefully established, preserved, and transmitted with scrupulous accuracy. But this option also forces one to maintain at the same time (and on the other hand) that *all* of the early Church Fathers treated this ‘carefully established, preserved, and [scrupulously] transmitted’ text with a cavalier attitude, tinkering with it to suit the purposes of the moment, and that—although they might have memorized the whole of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in their pagan youth—they were now incapable of citing from memory the simplest ‘words of God’—a God for whom they were willing to die—without messing things up.

If the absurd logic of this—both at an abstract level, as well as a practical level—does not render the ‘faulty memory’ argument untenable, then consider the facts. This position simply does not comport with what we know of memories and texts in antiquity. Recall that in Xenophon’s *Symposium* (3. 5), Niceratus becomes the butt of the joke when he states: ‘My father was anxious to see me develop into a good man, and as a means to this end he compelled me to memorize all of Homer; and so even now I can repeat the whole *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* by heart.’⁴⁵ The humour comes not from contemplating such an onerous task, but rather from the vulgarity of it: Antisthenes deflates Niceratus’ boast by observing, ‘Has it escaped you that every rhapsodist knows these poems, as well?’ It is Socrates who then intervenes, and rescues Niceratus: the rhapsodists, he notes, ‘obviously don’t understand the hidden meanings in them’, which Niceratus does, thanks to his extensive study with well-paid professors.

⁴⁴ E.g., in our second exhibit above, MS 1424 dates from ninth/tenth century, but the gloss cannot be dismissed as medieval, for (1) it is ascribed to ‘the Jewish gospel’, commonly understood to be one of the Judaic-Christian gospels (most likely the *Gospel of the Nazaraeans* (so Vielhauer and Strecker)), which would (2) place it in the first half of the second century, which is (3) precisely the time when *2 Clement* was composed—and *2 Clement* is the only other known source to offer what is essentially the same logion!

⁴⁵ E. C. Marchant and O. J. Todd (eds.), *Xenophon*, iv, LCL (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Heinemann, 1923), 558–9.

It is certainly true that our Apostolic Fathers were not handsome, athletic young Athenian aristocrats, blessed with the best education the world could offer. But two things remain true: in antiquity, if you had a text as short as the Epistle of James or even the Gospel of Matthew, memorizing it would not have been a problem. Second, if you held that text in any esteem, and learned the text's 'hidden meanings',⁴⁶ then it follows that your memorization of the text had to be quite accurate, or the point you sought to interpret would 'disappear' into the cobwebs of your faulty memory. Text and interpretation went hand in hand.⁴⁷ Just as an acrostic helped maintain textual integrity, so a hermeneutic system dependent upon extracting 'hidden meanings' from a text helped to maintain textual integrity.

But this is *not* what we are told by advocates of the 'memory lapse' theory. In their eyes, the text is there, somewhere, in all its immaculate glory, *but it is almost never cited accurately by any of these Apostolic Fathers*. And this in an age when memorization was common, and hermeneutics derived not from the latest post-modernist fad, but from the 'hidden' meanings found within a text.

Third, adherents of this model argue that the Fathers' deviating citations are the result, if not of faulty memory, of their adapting the text to the moment: when teaching, or preaching, or disputing, or evangelizing, they would alter this meticulously preserved text to suit their purposes. Again, just on the face of it, this can be dismissed for the same reasons as the 'memory lapse' explanation. It is impossible to imagine that ecclesiastical leaders—who are aware of the importance of the text, are conscious of the necessity of its correct preservation and transmission, and who are ever-vigilant against textual corruptions—would (themselves!) at the same time take such liberties with this same text. As we all know, habits of accuracy permeate one's life. One does not work tirelessly, preserving a text with the utmost accuracy, only to cite it carelessly when writing theological treatises which are held in such high esteem that they are the *only* works from the earliest Christians to have come down to us.

Fourth, and finally, this option requires one to violate common sense and ignore parallels in other religions. We know that texts evolve, and when the issue is theology, the need to adapt and change the text to prevent 'misuse' or 'misinterpretation' is overwhelming.⁴⁸ So is the need to keep in step with

⁴⁶ Cf. esp. Mark 4. 10–12, 33–4; also Gal. 4. 23–31.

⁴⁷ See J. Delobel, 'Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Siamese Twins?', in B. Aland and J. Delobel (eds.), *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis and Church History: A Discussion of Methods*, CBET 7 (Kampen: Kok-Pharos, 1994), 98–117.

⁴⁸ The examples are infinite, and extend from the antique (in a synopsis, cf. Mark 10. 17–18 with Matt. 19. 16–17, or Mark 11. 13 with Matt. 21. 19; in each case, the theological reasons for the differences are obvious) to the modern (the Roman Catholic *New Jerusalem Bible* (1990) translates τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου as 'wine' at Mark 14. 25 (parr.); unlike Baptists or Methodists, Catholics use wine in the Eucharist).

changing times and the latest theological fashions.⁴⁹ Yet we are asked to presume that in the period when the text was the *least* established, the *least* protected by canonical status, and the *most* subject to pressures from various constituencies (e.g., Gnostics, Montanists, Judaic Christians, Pauline Christians, Petrine Christians, etc.) vying for dominance within Christianity, the text was preserved in virginal purity, magically insulated from all of these tawdry motives. To assent to this thesis not only defies common sense, but mocks logic and our experience with the texts of other religious traditions.⁵⁰ It also defies the empirical textual evidence of the Apostolic Fathers and the manuscript tradition of the New Testament.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

One hundred years after the Oxford Committee produced its report, we are right to marvel at its perspicacity, its thoroughness, and its brevity. However, the question it asked—for which books of the New Testament is there evidence in the Apostolic Fathers?—is not the way we would now pose the question. Today we would ask a much more fundamental and ‘preliminary’ question: namely, what textual parallels are there for the recognizable passages⁵¹ in the Apostolic Fathers, and what do these parallels tell us about the *textual complexion* of the documents—whatever they may have been—that were known to the Apostolic Fathers?

The answers to this question were first set out in the 1905 volume, but have been largely ignored because of their devastating effect on dearly held myths about the genesis of the New Testament. Nevertheless, the last century of research has only confirmed the Oxford Committee’s findings, as reproduced in the first section of this paper. The text of the documents which would later

⁴⁹ The examples are legion: the pacifist early church (cf. Adolf von Harnack, *Militia Christi: The Christian Religion and the Military in the First Three Centuries* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), or C. J. Cadoux, *The Early Christian Attitude to War: A Contribution to the History of Early Christian Ethics* (London: Headley Brothers, 1919)) versus the militant post-Constantinian church, which in 380 became the state religion of the Roman Empire; the ‘divinely ordained’ inferiority of blacks (cf. S. R. Haynes, *Noah’s Curse: The Biblical Justification of American Slavery* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001)) versus their new-found equality with whites in the post-World War II period; etc.

⁵⁰ Cf., e.g., the problem concerning the relationship of the text of the Septuagint to the ‘Old Greek’, to the Masoretic text, to the text of Aquila, to the text of Symmachus, to the text of Theodotion, to the text of Qumran, etc. (cf. E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1992), or S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (repr., Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1989), 233–4, 312–13, *et passim*).

⁵¹ And ‘unrecognizable’ quotations from unknown ‘gospels’ or ‘words of Jesus’.

be included in the New Testament was neither stable nor established. Indeed, the texts were still evolving, both in terms of scope and variants. Additionally, no canon is evident, as is shown both by the citation of what are today considered extra-canonical *logia Iesou* as ‘gospel’, and by the status accorded documents (such as the unknown ‘gospel’ expressly cited at *2 Clem.* 8. 5 (‘For the Lord says in the gospel’)) which are unknown to us today. Most important, however, is the recognition—implicit in the findings of the 1905 volume—that the fixing of the canon actually meant little, for simply placing a name, such as ‘Matthew’, on a list fixes neither the content of that document, nor its text.⁵²

⁵² An example is Athanasius’ canonical list of 367 CE (in his *39th Festal Epistle*): it lists the Gospel of John, but the text of John known to Athanasius probably lacked the *pericope adulterae* (John 7. 53–8. 11), for the oldest Greek MS with this passage is Codex Bezae (D), which dates from c. 400 CE (so D. C. Parker, *Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript and its Text* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 280–1). Such tinkering with the text was not always by interpolation, for c. 430 Augustine (*De adulterinis coniugiis* 7. 6 (ed. Zycha, CSEL 41, 387–8)) reports that pious men in his diocese *excised* this same passage from their copies of John, lest their wives use it to justify their adulteries and escape punishment.

Absent Witnesses? The Critical Apparatus to the Greek New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers

J. Keith Elliott

Table II of *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*¹ shows that outside the synoptic gospels there are Aa-rated citations in the Apostolic Fathers from 1 Corinthians, Hebrews, and 1 Peter, and Ab-rated citations from Romans, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, and 1 Peter. An 'A' rating employed there indicates that there is 'no reasonable doubt' that the Father knew the particular New Testament book; an 'a' or 'b' refers to the relative closeness of a quotation in the Apostolic Fathers to the biblical text. We might expect our modern critical editions to show the evidence of some of these Apostolic Fathers for variants at these points. This is not the case, however. Souter's *Text and Canon*² may have been influential, especially in its conclusion that the results of the Oxford Committee's findings in their *New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* have 'hardly any bearing on the choice between variants in a passage of the New Testament'.

Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (= NA²⁷), our best hand edition, has in its list of patristic sources used in the apparatus (pp. 33–5*, 74*–6*) the following Apostolic Fathers: 2 *Clement*, Polycarp of Smyrna, and the *Didache*. The United Bible Societies' *Greek New Testament* (= UBS), the most widely distributed Greek Testament, says that 2 *Clement*, Polycarp, and the *Didache* are mentioned in the critical apparatus of this edition (pp. 30* ff.), but states on p. 35* that other Apostolic Fathers 'offer no witness of significance for the critical apparatus of this edition'.

Therefore in both hand editions, the writings of Ignatius, the *Epistle of Barnabas*, 1 *Clement*, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, the *Epistle to Diognetus*, and

¹ A Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology, *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), 138.

² A. Souter, *Text and Canon of the New Testament*, 4th edn. (London: Duckworth, 1935), 76.

Papias (all of which are normally to be found in modern collected editions of the Apostolic Fathers) are ignored.

But where are the references to the Fathers that are allegedly included? I can find only the *Didache* in NA in the critical apparatus to Matt. 6. 9–13 (the Paternoster). Others more eagle-eyed than I may find other references. But where are Polycarp and 2 *Clement* in NA and UBS? Where is the *Didache* in UBS?

In the *Oxford Bible Commentary*³ I discussed the likelihood that, among other references, *Did.* 9. 5 seems to know Matt. 7. 5, and that *Did.* 1. 3b–2. 1 refers to sayings known elsewhere in Matt. 5. 39–47, although I concluded by writing that in many such cases it may well be that parallels are not due to direct literary dependence but to oral tradition or even to a harmonized version of the canonical gospels.

I would certainly expect to see *Did.* 8. 2 quoted in the apparatus to Matthew's version of the Paternoster, as it indeed is in NA²⁷, especially as the *Didache* introduces the prayer with the words *ως κελευσεν ο Κυριος εν τω ευαγγελιω αυτου*⁴ (compared with *διδαχη* at *Did.* 1. 3; 2. 1), perhaps implying at least here that the author is consciously quoting from a source. NA shows in its apparatus for Matt. 6. 9 the unique reading by the *Didache*, *τω ουρανω* (as against *τοις ουρανοις cett.* of the text); for Matt. 6. 12 the unique reading *την οφειλην*, as against *τα οφειληματα*, and *αφιμεν* with $\aleph^1 f^{13}$ Maj against *αφιομεν* or *αφηκαμεν*; and for Matt. 6. 13 the longer ending, again with its sub-singular features: om. *η βασιλεια και* with k sa, and om. *αμην* with g¹ k sy^p.⁵

The present discussion concerns our expectations about what is needed from, and what is reasonably practicable to find within, the pages of a critical hand edition of the Greek New Testament.

In many ways a minimalist approach is inevitable: here a restricted amount of evidence is presented with a selection of (usually early) continuous text Greek manuscript witnesses consistently cited, together with a few random extra Greek manuscripts at certain key text-critical variants; a selection of early versions—predominantly Latin, Syriac, and Coptic—plus a few other

³ J. K. Elliott, 'Extra-Canonical Early Christian Literature', in John Barton and John Muddiman (eds.), *The Oxford Bible Commentary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 1306–30, esp. 1308–9.

⁴ All citations from the Apostolic Fathers are taken from the Loeb text in B. D. Ehrman (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers* (Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard University Press, 2003).

⁵ See also J. Delobel, 'The Lord's Prayer in the Textual Tradition: A Critique of Recent Theories and their View on Marcion's Role', in J.-M. Sevrin (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity*, BETL 86 (Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1989), 293–309. Also see J. Jeremias, 'The Lord's Prayer', most recently repr. in *idem, Jesus and the Message of the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 39–62.

versions; as well as patristic evidence in Greek and, normally, in Latin too, up to a given cut-off date, often the end of the fifth century.

Even the *Editio Critica Maior* (= *ECM*),⁶ with its commendably clear and full apparatus, has shown in the fascicules already published that only a certain, controlled number of witnesses appears in its apparatus. No Latin Fathers are cited. Only the earliest Greek Fathers are included (in this case up to the seventh–eighth century), but these are helpfully listed (in fascicule IV, 2 pp. B14–B20 (section 3.1) and with addenda on pp. B50, B98), with the reference to the context of the quotation in a printed edition. (That is a feature found in IGNTP Luke⁷ and in the *Vetus Latina* volumes.) However, in the Catholic Epistles no citations from the Apostolic Fathers appear, despite 1 Peter being in table II of the 1905 Oxford Committee’s book as Aa because Polycarp’s *Philippians* seems to have known this letter. We note that in at least one place (no. 21 below) Polycarp could properly and usefully appear in an apparatus to 1 Pet. 2. 12.

But even if we say that a minimalist approach is all one may reasonably expect of a hand edition, there could still be scope within NA and UBS for a different range of witnesses in their respective apparatuses. What we now suggest is that certain anomalies are weeded out from those editions. That would create space for added and arguably more relevant evidence—including some more evidence from second-century Fathers. For instance, NA²⁶, surprisingly, allows a reading from the apocryphal Fayyum fragment at Mark 14. 48. Admittedly, this has disappeared from the following edition, but NA²⁷ does have Papyrus Egerton 2 (a fragment of an apocryphal gospel) in its apparatus to John 5. 39! There may be a case for including the evidence of second-century apocryphal witnesses in an apparatus—and that case is made below—but the inclusion of such evidence in NA needs justifying in its editorial introduction.

Also, NA, following the papyri listed in the official register,⁸ allows into its apparatus certain papyri whose very character raises the question of whether they ought ever to have been allocated a Gregory(–Aland) number in the first place. I am thinking here of P³¹, a single sheet, blank on the reverse, that contains only Rom. 12. 3–8. This was probably a text used as an amulet. Again, a place for such evidence may well be justified (see below), but in a limited apparatus, where space is at a premium, the inclusion of a manuscript

⁶ B. Aland *et al.* (eds.), *Novum Testamentum Graecum* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997–).

⁷ The American and British Committees of the IGNTP, *The New Testament in Greek*, iii: *The Gospel of Luke*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984, 1987).

⁸ K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*, ANTF 1, 2nd edn. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994).

that was probably never part of a copy of the continuous text of a New Testament book is questionable. P¹², P¹³, and P¹⁸ are opisthographs (their reverse sides contain other matter). Whether they were ever from a continuous text is debatable. In any case, P¹² now contains only *one* verse of Hebrews. P² and P⁷ also contain fewer than five verses, and even what they contain is so fragmentary that the original contexts are unknown: they may well be extracts from a homiletic work, and need never have been written as continuous texts. P⁵⁰ and P⁷⁸ were talismans. The status of these and other papyri that are in the *Liste* is dubious. They have been used by the editors of NA and UBS, because the editors give undue significance to New Testament writings on papyrus, as if the very writing material was itself so important. And what is the status of those papyri that carry *hermeneiai*⁹ (e.g., P⁴⁴, a lectionary, P⁷⁶, and P⁹³, which seems to have been written, rather unprofessionally, for private use)? P⁹⁹ is merely a haphazard collection of unconnected verses from the Pauline letters and could have been a school exercise, as, apparently, was P¹⁰. Should P⁹⁹ be classified with a Gregory number alongside its fellow Chester Beatty manuscripts like P⁴⁵, P⁴⁶, P⁴⁷? P¹¹ contains only occasional notes. The following seem to have been intended as commentaries: P⁵⁵, P⁵⁹, P⁶⁰, P⁶³, P⁸⁰. P⁴³ and P⁶³ are mere selections of text. P⁴² is said by the Alands¹⁰ to have been a collection of songs. P⁷ is merely a patristic fragment. P²⁵ is probably a fragment of a harmony. More important in the present context is the question of why such witnesses should clutter the apparatus of our printed editions when the space saved by omitting such dubious sources could have been used to increase the exposure of v.ll. in the Apostolic Fathers. Our criticisms are not restricted only to papyri. Some of the same points may be made about other majuscules. For example, 0212 is a portion of a harmony, possibly the *Diatessaron*,¹¹ and 0250 is not a continuous-text manuscript.

There may be a case (made below) for allowing such *recherché* witnesses a place in an especially constructed apparatus, but in the minimal apparatus inevitably expected in a hand edition, we ought to view the inclusion of such evidence as on a different level from witnesses in ‘proper’ continuous-text manuscripts.

⁹ See B. M. Metzger, ‘Greek Manuscripts of John’s Gospel with “Hermeneiai”’, in T. Baarda *et al.* (eds.), *Text and Testimony: Essays on New Testament and Apocryphal Literature in Honour of A. F. J. Klijn* (Kampen: Kok, 1988), 162–9.

¹⁰ K. and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 2nd edn. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans; Leiden: Brill, 1989), 85.

¹¹ See D. C. Parker, D. G. K. Taylor, and M. S. Goodacre, ‘The Dura Europos Gospel Harmony’, in D. G. K. Taylor (ed.), *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts*, Texts and Studies, iii. 1 (Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 1999), 109–28; repr. in *SBL Text Critical Studies*, 1 (Atlanta: SBL, 1999).

An even more serious point about unnecessary overcrowding may be made with reference to the bizarre conjectures to be found frequently in the apparatus of NA. These are for the most part references to conjectural emendations to the New Testament text by nineteenth-century European scholars (such as Baljon, Schmiedel, Westcott, Hort, and Lachmann), although some older names appear (Beza,¹² Erasmus, Grotius), as well as the long-forgotten Von Wyss (2 Thess. 3. 10), Wendt (John 3. 5), Pearce (Jude 18), and Piscator (3 John 2). I have a list of some 243 conjectures culled from ninety-four authors in the apparatus of NA²⁵. That number was reduced to 136 in NA²⁷, although nine others were added.¹³ This evidence should be eliminated entirely. It has no place in the critical edition of a Greek New Testament. (We of course leave to one side the question as to whether *all* deliberate changes made by scribes to a manuscript they were copying were in effect also conjectures, whatever the origin of these.¹⁴) The conjectures are of historical interest, but the place to refer to such guesses (for that is often what these conjectures are) with reference to the attempted resolution of an often problematic text is in a learned commentary.¹⁵ At Phil. 1. 25 NA²⁵ a conjecture by Ewald has been altered to the now less helpful ‘comm’ (= commentaries). (Cf. also the addition of evidence from unnamed commentaries at Luke 1. 46; Col. 2. 15, 4. 13; and see Rev. 7. 16 (*‘et al.’*). Who can benefit from such information?) The whole seems to be a random and arbitrary collection. Even the accuracy of some information seems questionable.¹⁶

Enough has perhaps been said to show the inconsistencies of the hand editions. This is not the place to launch a full-scale critique of these editions.¹⁷

¹² For a recent discussion of Beza’s emendations, see J. Krans, ‘Theodorus Beza and New Testament Textual Emendation’, in W. Weren and D.-A. Koch (eds.), *Recent Developments in Textual Criticism: New Testament, Other Early Christian and Jewish Literature*, Studies in Theology and Religion, 8 (Assen: Royal van Gorcum, 2003), 109–28.

¹³ NA²⁷ Introduction p. 54* is less than helpful in referring as an example to a conjecture to Eph. 4. 21 which did not survive from NA²⁶. NA²⁷ has no such conjecture!

¹⁴ v.l. ‘Gergesenes’ at Matt. 8. 28, Mark 5. 1, Luke 8. 26, seems to have had its origin with Origen. See T. Baarda, ‘Gadarenes, Gerasenes and Gergesenes and the “Diatessaron” Tradition’, in E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox (eds.), *Neotestamentica et Semitica* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969), 181–97, esp. 185 ff.

¹⁵ For advocacy against conjectural emendation, see G. D. Kilpatrick, ‘Conjectural Emendation in the New Testament’, in E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee (eds.), *New Testament Textual Criticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), 349–60; and in favour of paying due attention to such matters, J. Strugnell, ‘A Plea for Conjectural Emendation in the New Testament: With a Coda on 1 Cor. 4:6’, *CBQ* 36 (1974), 543–58.

¹⁶ T. Baarda, ‘1 Thess 2: 14–16: Rodrigues in “Nestle-Aland”’, *NTT* 39 (1984–5), 186–93, relates how he spent a great deal of time trying to make sense of the reference to a conjecture by a Rodrigues given at 1 Thess. 2. 14–16, locating its author and original context, only to conclude that the apparatus in NA is wrong!

¹⁷ See my contribution to the Greeven Festschrift: ‘The Purpose and Construction of a Critical Apparatus to a Greek New Testament’, in W. Schrage (ed.), *Studien zur Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments*, BZNW 47 (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1986), 125–43.

We referred earlier to the minimalist approach to apparatus building—that is, when one concentrates mainly on recording the readings of a number of continuous-text manuscripts, consistently cited, backed up by relevant versional and patristic witnesses. There is an opposite point of view: namely, that absolutely everything potentially relevant for establishing the New Testament text should be exhibited, so as to assist the plotting of its influence on subsequent writings. Scribes of a New Testament book may themselves have been influenced by such writings. S. R. Pickering has proposed collecting as broad a conspectus of evidence as possible, including New Testament citations found in amulets, magical texts, talismans, private letters, and even school exercises—in other words, using some of those materials discussed above in relation to the selection of papyri in the official *Liste* of New Testament manuscripts. In a paper delivered at the Birmingham Conference on Textual Criticism in 1997 and since published,¹⁸ he set out his proposals. In this paper he lists some twenty-one of these neglected witnesses whose apparent knowledge and use of the Fourth Gospel could qualify for inclusion in the apparatus to John's Gospel.

Stanley Porter¹⁹ is also in favour of broadening the number of witnesses displayed in an apparatus. He takes a 'maximalist' view of what could be contained in an apparatus. For instance, he shows that P Vind G 29831, which is an amulet taken perhaps from a rejected page of a miniature codex, contains John 1. 5–6, and argues that this should be known to New Testament textual critics. He suggests that such witnesses should be printed, albeit in a second, separated apparatus, because such evidence may be of significance in reaching text-critical decisions.

It is not only the breadth of the materials cited in the apparatus but the depth of their presentation that is important. In his desire for an ideal apparatus, Tjitze Baarda laid out in an extensive article²⁰ his proposals for presenting a broad range of evidence that should be displayed exhaustively and *in extenso*. Basing his article on a friendly but none the less highly critical review of the apparatus at Luke 23. 48 as given in the IGNTP apparatus to Luke, Baarda advocates that an apparatus comprise four parts: the continuous Greek manuscripts, including evidence already collected and made available in earlier printed critical editions; patristic evidence, with full references to

¹⁸ S. R. Pickering, 'The Significance of Non-continuous New Testament Materials in Papyri', in Taylor (ed.), *Studies*, 121–41.

¹⁹ S. E. Porter, 'Why So Many Holes in the Papyrological Evidence for the Greek New Testament?', in S. McKendrick and O. O'Sullivan (eds.), *The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text* (London: The British Library; New Castle: Oak Knoll Press, 2003), 167–86.

²⁰ T. Baarda, 'What Kind of Apparatus for the New Testament do we Need? The Case of Luke 23:48', in B. Aland and J. Delobel (eds.), *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis and Church History: A Discussion of Methods*, CBET 7 (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994), 37–97.

modern editions which allow the context for the citation to be located; emendations (!); and early versions, to be quoted verbatim. Among the versions he would wish to have included is evidence from the varying forms of the *Diatessaron*. In the patristic evidence he suggests including *inter alia* the apocryphal texts of the *Acta Pilati*, the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, and the *Gospel of Peter*.

The suggestions by Pickering, Porter, and Baarda all encourage the widest possible inclusion of second-century patristic evidence, as well as apocryphal texts. Among the latter would figure the *Gospel of Thomas*, many of whose logia parallel canonical gospel sayings. Such evidence could then be included in a printed edition of a Greek New Testament—not in the belief that these were copied from the manuscripts of books that were to be included in the canonical New Testament, but in the recognition that the form of a saying known to and recorded in, say, the *Gospel of Thomas* may or could have later influenced a copyist of the canonical gospel text.

As far as the patristic evidence is concerned, we already have some scholarly work on Justin's citations²¹ to hand. Evidence from Irenaeus and others is to be found in our hand editions. The inclusion of such evidence always needs to be read with the usual cautions about utilizing patristic evidence, eloquently summarized by Gordon Fee in more than one place.²² Graham Stanton, in a recent article on Irenaeus and Justin,²³ hesitates about Justin's awareness of the written gospels ('A close reading of all the evidence confirms the high regard in which Justin held both the sayings of Jesus and the "memoirs of the apostles"'), but is of the opinion that Irenaeus' forceful defence of the fourfold gospel tradition would have made him hesitant to encourage the continuing of a vigorous oral tradition, so that in this case his quotations are likely to have come from the written gospels. As far as the Apostolic Fathers are concerned, we may well agree that they, like Justin and most other early writers, are unlikely to have had access to the 'published' documents. That was a reason why Justin in particular was not quoted extensively in the IGNTP Luke.²⁴ The same hesitations can apply to the Apostolic Fathers.

²¹ A. J. Bellinzoni, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr*, NovTSup 17 (Leiden: Brill, 1967).

²² Most recently in the second Metzger Festschrift: G. D. Fee, 'The Use of the Greek Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism', in B. D. Ehrman and M. W. Holmes (eds.), *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Questionis*, SD 46 (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1995), 191–207.

²³ G. N. Stanton, 'Jesus Traditions and Gospels in Justin Martyr and Irenaeus', in J.-M. Auwers and H. J. de Jonge (eds.), *The Biblical Canons*, BETL 163 (Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 2003), 353–70, on p. 366.

²⁴ W. L. Peterson's review (*JBL* 107 (1988), 758–62) criticized our decision not to quote Justin fully.

The 1905 book seems to reinforce that conclusion. The situation has of course moved on from there. Recently Jonathan Draper and Christopher Tuckett have addressed the issue in relation to the *Didache*, although they reach differing conclusions. Draper, in his reprinted article in the collection he edited, 'The Jesus Tradition in the *Didache*',²⁵ stresses the independence of Jesus' sayings found in the *Didache* from their biblical counterparts. Elsewhere Köster had reached similar conclusions, stating that parallels between the *Didache* and the gospels that were to become canonical were not due to any direct influence of the synoptic gospels on the Didachist.²⁶ Tuckett's article takes a different stance.²⁷ After a careful analysis of the parallels, Tuckett concludes that, however the gospels were available to the Didachist, 'the result has been that these parallels can be best explained if the *Didache* presupposes the finished gospels of Matthew and Luke', and that 'the evidence of the *Didache* seems to show that the text is primarily a witness to the post-redactional history of the synoptic tradition.'²⁸

There are many allusions in the Apostolic Fathers to New Testament passages, and some of the Aa and Ab references selected by the Oxford Committee in 1905 show that the Apostolic Fathers were familiar with a written New Testament book, the strongest examples of course being *1 Clement's* knowledge of 1 Corinthians. But those are of no use to textual criticism or to the assembling of an apparatus, as they are not precise citations. Such loose (or different) versions of a passage paralleled in the New Testament also include *Barn.* 12. 11 (cf. Mark 12. 37 and synoptic parallels); *Did.* 16. 5 (cf. Matt. 24. 13; Mark 13. 13); *Did.* 16. 3–5 echoes Matt. 24. 10–12; *1 Clem.* 35. 5–6 (cf. Rom. 1. 29–32); *1 Clem.* 33. 1 (cf. Rom. 6. 1); *1 Clem.* 47. 3 (cf. 1 Cor. 1. 11–13); Polycarp, *Phil.* 1. 3 (cf. 1 Pet. 1. 8); etc. These may do no more than indicate an awareness of, and even familiarity with, some of the texts that were later included in the New Testament canon.

I now list the places where the evidence of the Apostolic Fathers in the apparatus could be considered. I suggest that a 'maximalist' apparatus should include the support of the Apostolic Fathers for the following variant readings:

²⁵ In J. A. Draper (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research*, AGAJU 37 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 72–91.

²⁶ H. Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern*, TU 65 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957).

²⁷ C. M. Tuckett, 'Synoptic Tradition in the *Didache*', in J.-M. Sevrin (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity*, BETL 86 (Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1989), 197–230; repr. in Draper (ed.), *Didache in Modern Research*, 92–128.

²⁸ Cf. B. Dehandschutter, 'The Text of the *Didache*: Some Comments on the Edition of Klaus Wengst', in C. N. Jefford (ed.), *The Didache in Context*, NovTSup 77 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 37–46. On p. 46 he concludes that there is nothing in the *Didache* that excludes the knowledge of a written gospel by the community in which the *Didache* was composed.

1. Ign. *Polycarp* 2. 1–2 could support v.l. *οφεις* read by \aleph^* at Matt. 10. 16 against *οι οφεις*.
2. *Barn.*²⁹ 4. 14, where anarthrous *κλητοι* and *εκκλητοι* may support v. ll. at Matt. 22. 14 *οι bis*.
3. *Barn.* 5. 12 where there is a division in the manuscript tradition between *απολειται* and *σκορπισθησεται*. The latter could appear in the apparatus to Matt. 26. 31 in support of v.l. *διασκορπισθησεται*.
4. *Barn.* 12. 10 *ο Κυριος*, and thus could be used in support of v.l. *+ο (Κυριος)* at Mark 12. 36; Matt. 22. 44; Luke 20. 42. Also in this verse *υποποδιον* is found in *Barn.* following the LXX and in agreement with the Matthean and Lucan parallels, but at Mark there is a v.l. *υποκατω*, so *Barnabas* could appear in an apparatus to Mark 12. 36 supporting *υποποδιον*. Likewise, a ‘maximalist’ apparatus could add *Barn.* in favour of *καθου* (v.l. *καθισον*) in Mark 12. 36.
5. *Did.* 1. 2 *θεον* supports v.l. *σου*¹ at Luke 10. 27 (*ομ. σου B* H*).
6. *Did.* 1. 3 supports v.l. *υμιν* at Luke 6. 28 (after *καταρωμενους*).
7. Possibly *Did.* 7.1 *βαπτισατε* could be added to support the aorist participle *βαπτισαντες* of B D at Matt. 28. 19 v.l. *βαπτιζοντες (= txt)*. Even if, with Draper³⁰ we argue that the trinitarian baptismal formula came with a later redaction of Matthew, that is irrelevant to our purposes in constructing an apparatus to show places where scribes may have been influenced to alter the Biblical text they were copying.
8. *Did.* 8. 2; cf. Matt. 6. 7. Could the *Didache* be cited in support of v.l. by B (*ωσπερ οι υποκριται*)?
9. Add *Did.* 8. 1–2a in support of *προσευχεσθε* at Matt. 6. 5 (v.l. *-χη*).
10. An important difference between the *Didache*’s description of the Eucharist and the New Testament account is that the *Didache* expressly has the cup first in ch. 9. As such, it could be brought in as support for the Western non-interpolation at Luke 22. 19b–20.
11. *Did.* 11. 7 seems to be close to Matt. 12. 31 rather than to the parallels in Mark 3. 28–9 and Luke 12. 10. If so, we may consider adding the *Didache* to support v.l. *τοις ανθρωποις* and v.l. *υμιν* in Matthew.
12. *Did.* 13. 1 supports *της τροφης* in Matt. 10. 10 against v.l. *του μισθου* (from Luke 10. 7).

²⁹ And we remember that this writing was included alongside NT ‘canonical’ books in Codex Sinaiticus.

³⁰ Draper, ‘Jesus Tradition in the *Didache*’, 78.

13. At *Did.* 16. 8 the quotation parallel to Matt. 24. 30 carries the unique v.l. *επανω* (for *επι*) and *Κυριον* (for *υιον του ανθρωπου*). Again, a ‘maximalist’ apparatus could carry these singular readings by the *Didache* (as indeed NA²⁷ is prepared to do in the v.l. to Matthew’s version of the Paternoster; see above).
14. If one could be sure that *1 Clem.* 1. 3 was a citation from Titus 2. 5, the use of *οικουργειν* in the former would support the manuscripts that read *οικουργους* in Titus (against v.l. *οικουρους*).³¹
15. *1 Clem.* 35. 6 could support v.l. *δε* at Rom. 1. 32.³²
16. *1 Clem.* 36. 2–5 may support v.l. *ων* by P⁴⁶ *inter alia* at Heb. 1. 4,³³ despite other differences between the two versions of the quotation (e.g., *μειζων εστιν* in *1 Clement* and *κρειττων εστιν* in Hebrews). Also *1 Clem.* 36. 3 could be considered to support v.l. *πνευματα* at Heb. 1. 7 (against v.l. *πνευμα*). (*1 Clement* is closer to Hebrews in citing Ps. 103 (104) with *πυρος φλογα* than to the LXX, which reads *πυρ φλεγος* or v.l. *πυρος φλεγα*.)
17. A more sure candidate for inclusion is *1 Clem.* 13; cf. Matt. 5. 7; Luke 6. 31, 36–8. *1 Clem.* 13. 2 could be shown to support the reading *ω* at Luke 6. 38 against v.l. *τω*, and, at a stretch, to support *μετρηθησεται* of Matt. 7. 2 (against v.l. *αντιμετρηθησεται*).
18. *2 Clement* is said to be in NA. As stated above, I have as yet failed to find references to this Apostolic Father in the apparatus. Where it could and should appear is at *2 Clem.* 2. 4, which could be added to agree with (a) the shorter version of Matt. 9. 13: i.e., without *εις μετανοιαν*, and (b) Luke 5. 32, *αμαρτωλους* against v.l. *ασεβεις* (cf. *Barn.* 9. 5).
19. Pol. *Phil.* 10. 2 reads *irreprehensibilem*, which may not support *καλην* at 1 Pet. 2. 12.
20. Pol., *Phil.* 11. 2 *iudicabunt* supports v.l. *κρινουσιν* (accented as a future tense) at 1 Cor. 6. 2.

Quotations which do not betray any variant, either in the Apostolic Fathers or in the New Testament, would not figure in an apparatus to the Greek text of a

³¹ A. J. Carlyle, in a (rare) signed dissentient note in *NTAF*, states that the correspondence between the two passages here is due to the fact that the authors of *Clement* and of *Titus* are both using ‘some manual of directions for the moral life’.

³² *Re 1 Clem.* 35. 5–6, even the 1905 Oxford Committee concluded that *1 Clement* may have been dependent on Paul’s writing here.

³³ The unique combination of quotations in Heb. 1 and *1 Clem.* 36 makes this parallel rank as Aa in the conclusions of the Oxford Committee: see *NTAF*, 44–5.

critical edition of the New Testament: e.g., Ign. *Eph.* 18. 1 = 1 Cor. 1. 20, 23; *Barn.* 6. 6 = John's citation of Ps. 22. 19 (John 19. 24); *Did.* 9. 5 = Matt. 7. 6 (where the *Didache* is clearly quoting something *εἰρηκεν ὁ Κύριος*; cf. 16. 7, *ὡς ἐρρεθη*, and 1. 6, *εἰρηται*); 2 *Clem.* 16. 4 = 1 Pet. 4. 8 = Prov. 10. 12, LXX; 2 *Clem.* 11. 7 = 1 Cor. 2. 9; 2 *Clem.* 6. 1 = Luke 16. 13; 1 *Clem.* 24. 1 = 1 Cor. 15. 20, 23; *Did.* 3. 7 = Matt. 5. 5. Such passages are obviously of value, however, in discussing sources, the influence of shared traditions and the like, but these cannot be used for our present purposes.

For those citations from the New Testament where the evidence of the Apostolic Fathers supports a variant found in New Testament manuscripts, we urge that even a hand edition of a Greek New Testament make space in its apparatus to reveal the most significant and convincing testimony from the Apostolic Fathers. Patristic witnesses have conventionally figured in such apparatuses in the past. Revived interest in the Apostolic Fathers, stimulated by the commemoration of the 1905 Oxford publication, should encourage the expectation that the second-century Fathers be better represented in critical editions of the New Testament text.

APPENDIX: THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS IN RECENT PUBLICATIONS

The Apostolic Fathers appear in three significant publications.

Aland's *Synopsis*³⁴ includes many additional patristic and other witnesses in its edition. These are not added to the apparatus, but are listed after a pericope to show parallels (printed in full) that appear in patristic texts (including the Apostolic Fathers and apocryphal sources). As far as the Apostolic Fathers are concerned, we note that 1 *Clement*, 2 *Clement*, the *Didache*, the *Shepherd*, Ignatius, Polycarp, the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, Papias, and the *Epistle of Barnabas* figure extensively. Many of the references to the Apostolic Fathers discussed or listed above are found here.

Greeven's *Synopsis*³⁵ adopts a similar practice, although it includes quotations from only 1 *Clement*, 2 *Clement*, and the *Didache*.

³⁴ K. Aland, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, 15th rev. edn. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2001).

³⁵ A. Huck, *Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien*, rev. H. Greeven (Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1981).

Crossan³⁶ likewise includes sayings parallels in English between the canonical gospels and *1 Clement*, *2 Clement*, Ignatius, the *Epistle of Barnabas*, Polycarp, and the *Didache*.

The three clearly show links and parallels to the biblical text, and these enable the astute reader to amplify the apparatus to the gospel texts in the ways suggested above. Obviously that can be done only for the gospels in these publications, but it does allow us to have a visual display of places where the Apostolic Fathers and the New Testament texts are paralleled.

³⁶ J. D. Crossan, *Sayings Parallels: A Workshop for the Jesus Tradition* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986).

Part II

The Textual Transmission and Reception of the Writings that later formed the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers

This page intentionally left blank

Reflections on Method: What constitutes the Use of the Writings that later formed the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers?

Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett

INTRODUCTION

When the members of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology published their account of the use of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers, they expressed the hope that ‘their labours will not be wholly without fruit in this important field of Biblical study’. In this respect, their hopes have been met, and the work has served as a useful tool for 100 years. Readers may not always agree with the judgements that its authors have made, but the volume has given subsequent generations of scholars and students convenient and easy access to the primary texts in order that they may assess them for themselves.¹

Yet scholarship moves on, and one very significant difference between the content of the 1905 volume *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* and that of at least some subsequent discussions of the same topic has been apparent for some time. This striking difference concerns the amount of space that is devoted to the explicit discussion of methodological questions. The authors of the 1905 volume accept that ‘their judgements may not command universal assent’, but their readers are assured ‘at least that these judgements have been carefully formed, sometimes after considerable hesitation, by men who are not without practice in this kind of investigation.’² Readers are further assured that these men have discussed their judgements with each other; but we are given no account of what criteria were employed

¹ Primary responsibility for this essay rests with Andrew Gregory, who wrote the first and final drafts. Readers not averse to source-critical investigations may wish to identify instances of redactional seams or of changes in vocabulary and style that may suggest the presence of some of the particular contributions of Christopher Tuckett.

² A Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology, *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), p. iii.

in the course of their deliberations. In one way, this reticence of the authors to provide their readers with any account of the criteria that they employed may seem rather quaint, indicative perhaps of the optimism and confidence of a bygone age. They are not so bold as to claim unassailability or objectivity³ in their conclusions; but their very awareness of the potential provisionality of their conclusions leaves exposed their decision not to devote more space in print to the methodological discussions that took place at committee meetings behind closed doors. This omission begs the fundamental question: how best are we to judge whether or not the author of one text quotes or alludes to another?

This question, we should note, is not the same as the question of whether one author knows the work of another. Not only is it impossible to demonstrate knowledge of a text unless it is used, but also the inability of subsequent scholarship to demonstrate the use of one text in another does not mean that non-use, let alone ignorance, has been proved. Therefore, the following surveys are focused clearly and explicitly on the question of whether it is possible to demonstrate or to render probable the use of any of the writings subsequently canonized in the New Testament in the collection of writings subsequently labelled the 'Apostolic Fathers'. No inferences should be drawn from any failure to demonstrate such use, not least because of the difficulties often involved in assessing whether or not such dependence is to be considered likely.

One particular difficulty requires some comment at the outset. Any discussion of the possible dependence of one writing on another implies some degree of confidence that we have at least sufficient access to the form in which those texts were originally written to make meaningful judgements about possible literary relationships between them. This means confidence that we have access to the early forms in which texts such as those that we refer to as Matthew, Luke, or Romans may have been known to the Apostolic Fathers, and also confidence that the texts of the Apostolic Fathers themselves have not been corrupted during their transmission in such a way as to bring possible references to the New Testament into conformity with the forms in which those now canonical texts were known to the copyists of the Apostolic Fathers.⁴ These are matters on which different scholars will reach different judgements. Few if any

³ Cf. the bold claim of E. R. Goodenough, 'Foreword' in A. E. Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941), p. vii: 'No method in literary study is more objective or more fruitful than the comparison of one work with another to determine the question of literary indebtedness—which one shows acquaintance with the other, use of it, and dependence upon it.'

⁴ For a comparison of the textual transmission of texts contained in both collections, see Ch. 1 above.

would claim that the forms in which writings later considered canonical were available at the beginning of the second century were identical to the forms in which those texts begin to emerge in papyri from the end of the second century or the beginning of the third; but opinions vary as to the degree of continuity that may be posited between the earliest versions of these texts and the earliest surviving manuscripts.⁵ Scholars who emphasize (or at least tacitly assume) continuity may be more ready to speak of the literary dependence of the Apostolic Fathers on early versions of texts that may be referred to, albeit with suitable caution and caveats, as Matthew, Luke, or Romans. Scholars who emphasize discontinuity and argue that we must take specific account of significant development in the textual traditions of the writings later included in the New Testament, especially the gospels, in the course of the second century may be less ready to speak of dependence on a text known to us today as Matthew, Luke, or Romans.⁶ Thus they may prefer instead to speak of 'recognizable potential parallels', but to leave open the question of whether such parallels imply dependence on a text later included in the New Testament.

This is a controverted area, in which new manuscript discoveries may yet shed new light, for it is often difficult to see how best to adjudicate between these positions on the basis of the evidence that is available at present. In the meantime, as Arthur Bellinzoni observes, 'we can . . . never be confident that we are comparing the texts that demand comparison. . . . We must resign ourselves instead to comparing later witnesses to such texts with all of the hazards that such comparisons involve.'⁷

IDENTIFYING THE USE OF ONE TEXT IN ANOTHER: QUOTATIONS AND ALLUSIONS

Studies of quotations from, and allusions to, earlier authorities abound in the study of the New Testament, whether discussions of the use of the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament or of Jesus tradition in the letters of Paul and

⁵ For a variety of views, see the essays collected in C.-B. Amphoux and J. K. Elliott (eds.), *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity*, HTB 6 (Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2003); W. L. Petersen (ed.), *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century*, Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity, 3 (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989). For further discussion of these issues, with particular reference to their application to 2 *Clement*, see the comments of William L. Petersen, in Ch. 2 above, esp. pp. 40–5; also *idem*, 'The Genesis of the Gospels', in A. Denaux (ed.), *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis*, BETL 161 (Leuven: Peeters and Leuven University Press, 2002), 33–65.

⁶ See Petersen, above, p. 45.

⁷ A. J. Bellinzoni, Ch. 3 in companion volume.

elsewhere. Yet there has been, perhaps surprisingly, little rigorous attention paid to the methodological issues that are raised in the attempt to determine what constitutes the use of one text in another, or to give precise definitions of what is taken to constitute either a 'quotation' or an 'allusion', or indeed an 'echo', 'reminiscence', or 'citation'.⁸ Stanley Porter in particular has drawn attention to the lack of terminological clarity in such debates, so we shall follow his suggestion that contributors to this debate define their own terminology precisely, even if it may not match completely the ways in which others might use the same terms.⁹ In the discussion that follows, we use 'reference' as an umbrella term to refer to any apparent use of one text in another, and the terms 'quotation' and 'allusion' as more specific terms that relate more to the manner in which, and the degree of certainty with which, the presence of such a reference may be established. Thus we suggest that 'quotation' be used to refer to instances in one text showing a significant degree of verbal identity with the source cited; allusion will be used to refer to instances containing less verbal identity. 'Quotations' will often (but not always) be accompanied by some kind of formal marker, whereas this is less likely to be the case (but not altogether to be excluded) in the case of 'allusions'. Of course, even these 'definitions' are loose and imprecise, not least because the boundary between either a 'quotation' or an 'allusion' and a 'paraphrase' (by which we mean a freer rendering or amplification of a passage) may be porous and blurred. But such imprecision and lack of firm distinctions may be the necessary consequences of problems in discussing and identifying apparent references that admit of no easy or precise delineation of their nature. Quotation may slide into allusion, and vice versa, and either into paraphrase, and this flexibility in the way in which an author may refer to an earlier source makes it impossible to offer precise definitions if they are to

⁸ For discussion and bibliography, see C. D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 31–61; S. E. Porter, 'The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology', in C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders (eds.), *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*, JSNTSup 148 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 79–96; R. J. Bauckham, 'The Study of Gospel Traditions outside the Canonical Gospels: Problems and Prospects', in D. Wenham (ed.), *The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels*, Gospel Perspectives, 5 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 383–98 (Bauckham offers both a general methodological discussion and also a discussion of the relationship between Ignatius and Matthew as a specific case-study); M. J. Gilmour, *The Significance of Parallels between 2 Peter and Other Early Christian Literature* (Atlanta: SBL, 2002), 47–80. For another catalogue of criteria for literary dependence, intended to demonstrate the dependence of the *Acts of Andrew* on Homer, see D. R. MacDonald, *Christianizing Homer* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 302–16. Bellinzoni offers a slightly different approach to these issues from the one that is presented here: see Ch. 3 in companion volume.

⁹ Porter, 'Use of the Old Testament', 80–8, 94–5.

reflect the actual practice of ancient authors in so far as that practice is accessible to modern readers. We shall seek to further define these terms in the course of the discussion, but the nature of the ancient evidence and our access to that evidence are such that absolute precision is not possible. Fortunately, the precise distinction between a quotation and an allusion is not in itself of primary importance for the current discussion. This is because either quotations or allusions, if established, may each be sufficient to indicate the use of the New Testament, directly or indirectly, in the Apostolic Fathers.

Porter also asks that those who engage in such debates should make clear the goal of their investigations.¹⁰ His comments are directed specifically to those engaged in the study of the Old Testament in the New Testament, but they are broadly applicable to this investigation of the use of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers. There is one significant difference, however. Whereas most investigations of Paul's use of the Jewish Scriptures may assume that most or all of those books were known to him, we may make no such assumption about whether each of the Apostolic Fathers was familiar with any of the writings later canonized as part of the New Testament.¹¹ Rather, it is precisely the question of which books can be shown to have been used in the Apostolic Fathers that the following essays seek to address. Therefore, few if any prior assumptions should be made as to whether any Apostolic Father is or is not likely to have known and used any given writing.

¹⁰ Ibid. 94.

¹¹ Cf. the different approach of M. B. Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, JSNTSup 59 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991). Thompson considers the question of possible allusions to the Jesus tradition in the Apostolic Fathers as a control with which to compare Paul's possible use of dominical tradition. With the exception of *2 Clement*, which he dates late, Thompson argues that the Apostolic Fathers show less evidence of the use of Jesus tradition than might be expected from authors who (he argues) were clearly much more familiar with such traditions than their letters allow us to demonstrate (ibid. 44–8 (*1 Clem.*); 50 (*Barn.*); 52 (*Did.*); 55 (Ign.); 57 (*Pol. Phil.*); 59–60 (*2 Clem.*)). The analogy is an interesting one, but the use to which it is put appears problematic on methodological grounds, especially in the light of the current discussion. To argue that certain authors were familiar with the Jesus tradition (or indeed with the writings of the New Testament and/or their sources) even if they do not make much use of such tradition and/or texts is to introduce a hypothesis, not to offer criteria by which to evaluate the extent to which the Apostolic Fathers may have drawn on either the Jesus tradition or on the New Testament. Thompson's purpose in introducing this hypothesis is to provide an example of texts which are bound to have been written by authors who were familiar with the Jesus tradition in order to argue that Paul was also likely to have been familiar with Jesus tradition, even if he too used it in such a way that it is not obvious to many of his readers today. Of course, both hypotheses may be correct. But to assume the knowledge either of Jesus tradition or of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers is to prejudge precisely the question that the following studies set out to address. Should these studies find evidence for the use of Jesus tradition in the Apostolic Fathers that is not directly dependent on the finished gospels, this might well strengthen Thompson's reading of Paul. But it may not simply be assumed that such knowledge, if thought to be evident in or to lie behind the Apostolic Fathers, was also available to Paul some 50 or more years previously.

Circularity of argument will be avoided only if the answer to this question is reached primarily or exclusively on the internal evidence of their texts, rather than on the basis of hypotheses about which other texts may or must have been available to these authors.¹²

Finding References in the Absence of Formal Markers

On a stricter and perhaps simpler definition of a quotation than that which we have offered above, only one criterion might be considered sufficient to establish with certainty that the author of one text at least purports to quote from elsewhere: when the former includes some form of introductory formula, followed by an exact or an approximate quotation of a form of words belonging to the source so introduced.

The strength of such a definition is that it admits only clear examples of explicit quotation, thereby allowing the reader who applies the criterion to establish a secure, albeit small, sample of assured results. The presence of an introductory formula as well as the form of words that it precedes excludes the possibility that an author happens to use a form of words simply by coincidence, even if a modern scholar can identify an earlier text to which the ancient author might have had access and which contains the same (or a very similar) form of words. Modern readers familiar with *Hamlet* know that it is a play that is 'full of quotations'. But we also know that not everyone who advises a friend that she or he should 'to thine own self be true', or 'should neither a borrower nor lender be', can be said in any meaningful sense to quote Shakespeare. The speaker may use words that we can attribute to Shakespeare, but they are such common currency that we can consider them at best to be quotations of no more than a proverbial expression.

But there are also weaknesses to such an approach. An introductory formula, when present, leaves no doubt that an author wants the reader to be aware of his or her source, often because that source is considered in some sense authoritative. But introductory formulae may be used to introduce different kinds of material, only some of which may be sufficiently close to the authority to whom the author using the formula refers to qualify as an exact or approximate 'quotation', rather than as, say, an allusion or a paraphrase. Thus, although the presence of an introductory formula may indicate the author's intention, the material which follows may not be sufficient to be considered clear evidence of quotation to the audience were it not for the presence of the introductory formula. Nor need the absence of such a formula

¹² Cf. Bellinzoni, Ch. 3 in companion volume, p. 50, where he proposes what he describes as 'the criterion of *accessibility*'.

exclude the possibility that an earlier text is being cited. A writer may employ expressions in the precise form in which they were first written or spoken by others and do so deliberately, hoping that others will pick up on the reference, yet not draw attention to them by means of an introductory formula. Indeed, she or he may do so in the expectation that the hearer will know that the advice ‘to thine own self be true’ or ‘neither a borrower nor a lender be’ is in fact a ‘quotation’ from, or reference to, Shakespeare. Therefore caution must be exercised in making too much of introductory formulae. Their presence may alert the reader to give attention to the source of the words that follow, but their absence need not preclude the presence of a reference to an earlier text.

Further, at least three additional problems indicate other weaknesses in any approach that relies too heavily or exclusively on the presence of an introductory formula. First, an author may consciously set out to quote an earlier written authority and yet do so in such a loose or tendentious manner that it is difficult for a reader or hearer to ascertain whether or not the ‘quotation’ is intentional, quite apart from whether a potential source is extant. Modern academics are trained to quote and acknowledge their sources with scrupulous accuracy, but this was not the practice of the ancient world. Ancient writers appear to have used even authoritative sources with a great deal of freedom, and often to have referred to them from memory, so it would be unrealistic to demand too high a degree of identity between a potential quotation or allusion and its source before allowing that appropriation of that source had taken place.¹³ Second, the fact that so much early Christian literature is no longer extant means that an early Christian text may contain

¹³ So C. M. Tuckett, ‘Synoptic Tradition in the Didache’, in J.-M. Sevrin (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity* (Leuven: Peeters and Leuven University Press, 1989), 197–230, on pp. 198–9; W.-D. Köhler, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus*, WUNT 2.24 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 535–6; Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 61–3. See also Stanley, *Paul*, 350–60, for a substantial discussion of the freedom with which ancient writers made quotations or ‘interpretive renderings’, even of their archetypal texts. J. Whittaker, ‘The Value of Indirect Tradition in the Establishment of Greek Philosophical Texts, or the Act of Misquotation’ in John N. Grant (ed.), *Editing Greek and Latin Texts* (New York: AMS Press, 1989), 95, makes the same point, with particular reference to the transmission of Platonic texts. He argues that variations in indirectly transmitted portions of texts—i.e., ‘small fragments of texts transmitted indirectly in the form of quotations’—are more likely to represent a parallel tradition of commentary on ancient authoritative texts than the corruption of those texts before the close of antiquity. He is also reluctant to assign what modern scholars consider loose quotation to inattention or lapses of memory on the part of their ancient counterparts: ‘Instead we must acknowledge that there is about the ancient manner of quotation something of the technique of theme and variation, as though one thought it constricting and impersonal, as well as boring, to repeat potentially the same familiar words.’ For further discussion of Whittaker’s arguments, see C. E. Hill, *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 68–9.

quotations, even very accurate quotations, the presence of which may not be discernible to the modern reader if no introductory formula is present. For example, we know that Hermas is told to repeat quotations to Maximus that are drawn from the *Book of Eldad and Modad*.¹⁴ Yet the text of this book is no longer extant, so we do not know if it is also quoted elsewhere in the *Shepherd*, or indeed in other early Christian writings.¹⁵ Third, even when texts are extant, we can never be sure that the form (or forms) in which any text is known to modern scholarship is the same form as that in which it was known to ancient writers. Thus, for example, Matthew or Luke may quote Mark exactly according to the text that was known to them, but that text might differ from any of the manuscripts of Mark which are available to us today. Taken together, these difficulties leave no doubt of the need for criteria by which to assess possible references that may be quotations even in instances where no introductory formula is present.

IDENTIFYING THE PRESENCE OF NEW TESTAMENT REFERENCES IN THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS

If the presence of an introductory formula is to be considered determinative in identifying either quotations or allusions to the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers, then the results will be meagre. Some texts appear to include frequent references to the Old Testament, sometimes with the introductory formula 'it is written', but there are few examples of such explicitly acknowledged quotation from the writings of the New Testament to be found in the Apostolic Fathers. Ignatius, Polycarp, and the author of *1 Clement* each appeals explicitly to Paul (not, we should note, to a named letter), but no other individuals whose names are associated with the New Testament are appealed to as authorities whose teaching and/or writings may be used to resolve contemporary issues or debates.¹⁶ The author of *1 Clement* appeals to words that he ascribes to Jesus, but it seems more likely that he draws on oral tradition than on a written source. Similarly, the Didachist and the author of *2 Clement* each appeal to 'the gospel', but it is unclear if either refers to a written

¹⁴ *Vis.* II. 3.

¹⁵ K. Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers*, i (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1912), 51, notes that some have suggested that the saying quoted at *1 Clem.* 23. 4 and at *2 Clem.* 11. 2 may be a quotation from this text.

¹⁶ A. Lindemann, 'Paul in the Writings of the Apostolic Fathers', in W. S. Babcock (ed.), *Paul and the Legacies of Paul* (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990), 25–45, on p. 28.

source.¹⁷ There is ongoing debate as to whether the *Didache* refers to Matthew or perhaps to his source, and the interpretation of this text is made difficult by continuing uncertainty both as to its own date and the date when the term ‘gospel’ was used of a written narrative text concerning Jesus in addition to, or instead of, the oral proclamation of salvation.¹⁸ Similar factors affect the interpretation of the reference to ‘gospel’ in 2 *Clement*, although that discussion is further complicated because the source referred to as ‘gospel’ appears to have contained at least some material with no parallel in the synoptic tradition.

Since the presence of introductory formulae is so limited in the Apostolic Fathers (and by no means unproblematic even where it is present), other criteria must be used to assess not only whether a writer is referring to an earlier text or other source, but also whether and how that text or other source may be identified. These criteria may differ both according to the nature of the text from which quotations or allusions may have been drawn and according to the nature of the text in which quotations or allusions may be present. Each individual scholar whose survey of the possible use of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers is included in this volume offers his own assessment of the particular features which affect the manner in which and the extent to which the text that he considers quotes or alludes to the New Testament. But all face similar underlying issues in attempting to determine whether or not material parallel to parts of the New Testament may reflect either direct literary dependence on, or indirect knowledge of, those texts. Therefore what follows is an attempt to consider some of the issues that must be addressed in investigating possible quotations from and allusions to the different types of writings found in the New Testament. Perhaps the greatest difficulties are present in seeking to identify what may be quotations from the synoptic gospels. Not only are there issues arising from the likelihood that these texts drew on sources which may have circulated independently both before and after the composition of the gospels, but also the simple fact of there being three similar versions of the impact of Jesus’ life and teaching complicates the question of determining which, if any, may be the source of a quotation or allusion in the Apostolic Fathers. These particular difficulties throw up a number of issues; so this is where we shall begin our survey of the different types of literature contained in the New Testament and any specific issues raised by each.

¹⁷ *Did.* 8. 2; 11. 3; 15. 3; 4; 2 *Clem.* 8. 5.

¹⁸ For a recent discussion of these issues, see J. A. Kelhoffer, ‘“How Soon a Book” Revisited: *EYANGELION* as a Reference to “Gospel” Materials in the First Half of the Second Century’, *ZNW* 95 (2004), 1–34.

Identifying the Use of the Synoptic Tradition

Two very different approaches to the question of the possible use of the synoptic tradition¹⁹ in the Apostolic Fathers may be seen in the contrasting studies of Édouard Massaux²⁰ and Helmut Köster.²¹ Whereas Massaux found the use of Matthew in all of the Apostolic Fathers whom he studied (and the use of Luke in *2 Clement*, the *Didache*, and perhaps in Ignatius), Köster found in favour of the preponderance of oral tradition independent of and often earlier than the written gospels. He concluded that Ignatius drew on Matthew once, and that Polycarp, in his postulated second letter, drew on both Matthew and Luke. Each of the *Didache* and *2 Clement* includes sayings of Jesus taken from a sayings-harmony that depends on the synoptic gospels, argued Köster, so neither used Matthew or Luke directly or treated them as authoritative. Not surprisingly, such different results were obtained from the adoption of different methodological approaches. Neiryneck describes Massaux as having been guided by a ‘principle of simplicity’, for ‘a source which is “unknown” does not attract him’.²² Massaux’s own initial account of his methodology is quite brief. He notes that he will speak often of ‘literary contact’, and states that he will use the term

in a rather strict sense of the word, requiring, when speaking of contact, sufficiently striking verbal concurrence that puts the discussion in a context that already points towards the gospel of Mt. These literary contacts do not exhaust the literary influence of the gospel; one can expect, without a properly so-called literary contact, the use of typically Matthean vocabulary, themes and ideas.²³

Thus Massaux seeks passages that are similar to Matthew, and he evaluates their relationship to Matthew by asking if they are closer to *Matthew* than to other New Testament writings. This, in effect, is what Neiryneck has described as Massaux’s principle of simplicity: material that looks like Matthew probably depends on Matthew, and little or no consideration is given to the possibility that it depends on postulated sources such as M or Q, or on the shared vocabulary of a common community (for it could be a specifically Christian or even a Graeco-Roman commonplace), or even on coincidence.

¹⁹ Much of this section draws on A. Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus*, WUNT 2.169 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), where an earlier version of some of the material presented here may be found on pp. 7–13.

²⁰ E. Massaux, *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Irenaeus* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1990; French original 1950).

²¹ H. Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern*, TU 65 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957).

²² Neiryneck, ‘Preface to the Reprint’, in Massaux, *Influence*, p. xix.

²³ Massaux, *Influence*, pp. xxi–xxii.

Massaux assumes the knowledge and use of Matthew in at least some of the Apostolic Fathers, and sets out to determine its extent, whereas Köster sets out to determine whether the use of the synoptic gospels may be established at all.

Köster's approach is by far the more subtle and penetrating of the two. He takes proper account of the possibility that Jesus tradition may stem not from the synoptics but from their sources, written or oral; so he formulates a criterion to assess whether or not parallels to the synoptic tradition may be shown, rather than assumed, to depend on the synoptic gospels. This criterion is that literary dependence on the finished form of a text is to be identified only where the later text makes use of an element from the earlier text that can be identified as the redactional work of the earlier author or editor.²⁴ Köster does not refer to Massaux in his monograph,²⁵ but his methodology differs from Massaux's in its attempt to deal with the difficulty that the presence of similar or even verbally identical material in two texts is not itself sufficient proof of literary dependence, for two texts might each draw independently on a common source. Yet, if Massaux may be accused of finding dependence on Matthew too readily, Köster's weakness may be that his criterion makes it virtually impossible to demonstrate any dependence on a synoptic gospel except in passages where the redactional activity of an evangelist may be readily identified. The importance of Köster's criterion must be noted, but it is important to emphasize the limitations placed upon it by the nature of the evidence to which it must be applied.

Wolf-Dietrich Köhler provides a further important contribution to the debate on how the possible use of a synoptic gospel may be assessed.²⁶ Köhler's account of earlier research on the reception of Matthew notes the difference between the approaches of Köster and Massaux,²⁷ and he acknowledges that the methodology of the former is more satisfactory than that of the latter.²⁸ Köhler notes the importance of Köster's concern for introductory formulae, although he concludes that such formulae can neither prove nor disprove the appropriation of Matthew.²⁹ He also agrees with Köster's emphasis on redactional elements as proof for the use of a particular synoptic

²⁴ In discussion of the question of whether written gospels or older traditions lie behind passages quoted under the authority of 'the Lord' rather than that of an explicit appeal to a written source, Köster has: 'so hängt die Frage der Benutzung davon ab, ob sich in den angeführten Stücken Redaktionsarbeit eines Evangelisten findet' (*Synoptische Überlieferung*, 3). For another presentation of his argument, see H. Koester, 'Written Gospels or Oral Tradition', *JBL* 113 (1994), 293–7.

²⁵ But see Koester, 'Written Gospels or Oral Tradition', for a direct critique of Massaux.

²⁶ Köhler, *Rezeption*.

²⁷ *Ibid.* 2–4.

²⁸ *Ibid.* 5.

²⁹ *Ibid.* 4, 520.

gospel,³⁰ but notes also the limitations of his approach. Thus Köhler makes the important point that it is not appropriate to argue that written gospels have not been used just because it may not be possible to demonstrate their use,³¹ and he sets out to address the problem of how possible literary dependence might be ascertained even in instances where neither an introductory formula nor any redactional material is present.

Köhler's discussion is in two parts. In the first, he considers the nature of the evidence, and describes three issues that should be addressed in seeking to determine whether and how Matthew was used; in the second, he offers criteria by which potential references to Matthew may be assessed. Köhler begins his description of the issues to be addressed by noting, first, that the appropriation of Matthew (whether quotation or allusion) may or may not be indicated as such;³² and second, that expressions or details of content that are distinctive of, or particular to, Matthew may be present in other texts, whether or not there is any clear reference to a specific pericope or verse in Matthew.³³ Third, he is also clear that the purpose for which Matthew may have been appropriated is important.³⁴ Having outlined the issues, Köhler then addresses the question of how each is to be approached.³⁵ In the case of a text which contains both an introductory formula and material parallel with Matthew, both the wording of the parallel and the form of the introductory formula should be considered. The less clearly the introductory formula points to Matthew, the stronger must be the correspondence of the apparent reference itself to Matthew in order to make dependence probable. In the case of a text which does not contain an introductory formula, but which does contain material parallel to Matthew, other criteria must be employed. Köhler argues that three factors should determine the degree of certainty with which the use of Matthew may be maintained: the extent and type of parallels with Matthew in the instance in question; the existence of further parallels with Matthew in the same text, and the extent and type of such other parallels with Matthew; and the extent and type of divergences from Matthew. For Köhler, such divergences may be more important than the parallels. If they are not to be explained either by the purpose for which the later author has drawn on Matthew, or as free quotation dependent on memory, then, argues Köhler, they should be taken to derive not from the author of the document who includes the reference but from a post-Matthean source on which he has drawn—for example, a liturgical or kerygmatic formula, a catechism, or another gospel tradition.

³⁰ Köhler, *Rezeption*, 4.

³¹ *Ibid.* 5.

³² *Ibid.* 8.

³³ *Ibid.* 8–10.

³⁴ *Ibid.* 11–12.

³⁵ For what follows, see *ibid.* 12–13.

Köhler then summarizes and clarifies the manner in which these factors should be applied as follows.³⁶ First, dependence on Matthew is probable when (a) the wording of a particular passage clearly accords with Matthew, and at the same time, (b) the proximity to other parallels is less than that to Matthew, and (c) the wording of the passage, including its divergences from Matthew, can be explained on the basis that it has Matthew as its source. Second, dependence on Matthew is quite possible ('gut möglich') when, with (b) and (c) above, the wording corresponds only slightly with Matthew; or, with (a) and (c) above, the proximity to other parallels is just as extensive as it is to Matthew. Third, dependence on Matthew is theoretically possible, but in no way to be assumed either when, with factors (a) and (c), the proximity to other parallels is greater than to Matthew; or when, with factors (a) and (b), the wording of the passage in question cannot well be explained by the assumption that it has Matthew as its source.

Köhler then addresses the very important question of the Matthean *Sondergut*, noting that such material continued to be transmitted independently of, and alongside, Matthew. Clearly this observation precludes a straightforward and unqualified application of his criteria to possible instances of dependence on Matthew,³⁷ and Köhler allows that expressions which appear to modern readers to be distinctive of Matthew may originate in Matthew's sources rather than in his own redactional activity.³⁸ Yet Köhler appears to limit the extent to which such considerations might affect the outcome of his investigation of the reception of Matthew. This may be seen in two ways. First, Köhler appears to limit the theoretical possibility of the use of Matthean *Sondergut* independently of its inclusion in Matthew when he suggests that the reception of Matthean *Sondergut* in a document to be dated at some distance in space and time from the place and time in which Matthew was composed makes very likely ('sehr wahrscheinlich') the reception of Matthew rather than of the *Sondergut*.³⁹ Even in a document dated and located in close

³⁶ For what follows, see *ibid.* 13–14.

³⁷ *Ibid.* 14.

³⁸ *Ibid.* 14–15.

³⁹ Of course, questions might legitimately be asked as to whether this double criterion applies to any of the Apostolic Fathers. Each is likely to have been written no later than the mid-second century, and most probably earlier, so all were written within a relatively short space of time. Assuming that Matthew was written somewhere in the eastern Mediterranean, then texts such as *1 Clement* and the *Shepherd*, each of which may be located securely in Rome, were written some distance away; but the probability of regular and speedy communication between different churches suggests that even such relatively long distances need not have precluded the rapid exchange of the type of tradition found in the Matthean *Sondergut*. For a helpful discussion of the exchange of information between early Christians, see M. B. Thompson, 'The Holy Internet: Communication between Churches in the First Christian Generation', in R. J. Bauckham (ed.), *The Gospels for all Christians* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998), 49–70. On the links between the communities reflected in *1 Clement* and *Hermas* and Christians elsewhere in the Empire, see A. Gregory, 'Disturbing Trajectories: *1 Clement*, the *Shepherd of Hermas* and the Development of

proximity to Matthew, the reception of the *Sondergut* makes the reception of Matthew quite likely ('gut möglich').⁴⁰ Thus Köhler's methodology tends to favour the use of Matthew rather than that of Matthean *Sondergut*. Second, Köhler appears to assume, rather than to argue, that liturgical, kerygmatic, catechetical, and extra-canonical gospel sources are all more likely to presuppose Matthew than vice versa.⁴¹ Köhler tends to assume that texts whose combination of similarities with and divergences from Matthew suggest an indirect relationship between them are more likely to draw on, rather than to have been used by, the evangelist. This possibility cannot be excluded, of course, but Köhler's approach to this possibility means that it is scarcely surprising that he concludes that the use of pre-Synoptic oral tradition rather than Matthew is never probable in the period before Justin.⁴² If sufficient consideration is not given to the possibility of other written texts or oral traditions besides the completed Synoptic Gospels, then there is a risk of reaching potentially maximalist results by an uncritical application of a methodology akin to what Neiryneck called Massaux's principle of simplicity. Köhler's approach is methodologically much more sophisticated than that of Massaux, but his overall results are quite similar.

Yet there remains the problem that it is often difficult to know what was the range of sources that was available to an ancient writer. Thus Schoedel notes what he considers to be 'the... basic problem involved in taking any of the written Gospels as the point of departure. For such an approach already tends to narrow the range of possibilities and to hide the significance of the materials that cannot be explained in terms of dependence on Matthew or any written Gospel.'⁴³ Therefore he suggests that Köhler's approach is unlikely to allow sufficient weight to the possibility that a second-century writer may have drawn on sources other than our written gospels, and he offers as an example the question of whether Ignatius may have drawn on Matthew's special tradition as well as on Matthew.

Schoedel's criticism raises again the differences between Köhler and Köster as to what may be considered evidence of the appropriation of a synoptic gospel. Köhler indicates how his criteria may be applied in practice when he

Early Roman Christianity', in P. Oakes (ed.), *Rome in the Bible and the Early Church* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2002), 142–66.

⁴⁰ Köhler, *Rezeption*, 14.

⁴¹ *Ibid.* 13.

⁴² *Ibid.* 525.

⁴³ W. R. Schoedel, 'Review of Édouard Massaux, *Influence de l'Évangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée*; and Wolf-Dietrich Köhler, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1987', *CBQ* 51 (1989), 562–4, on pp. 563–4.

sets out the nature and extent of evidence for the use of Matthew that will be required to decide the degree of probability with which a possible echo of Matthew may be considered as dependent on Matthew or on a parallel source. This seems reasonable, but it remains unclear whether any parallel other than one that contains material identified as the result of Matthean redaction—Köster’s criterion—is in fact sufficient to indicate literary dependence on a synoptic gospel. Köhler’s methodology is intended to avoid an uncritical identification of Matthean-like material as evidence of the appropriation of Matthew, but only Köster’s criterion actually offers assured results. Further, it is not the case, *contra* Köhler,⁴⁴ that his approach to Matthew may simply be applied *mutatis mutandis* to the investigation of Luke.⁴⁵ Luke’s own preface indicates clearly his claim to have used written sources and oral traditions, and modern scholarship has postulated a number of sources that may lie behind his narrative. Of course, it is not possible to prove either that such sources existed or that they remained in use in the second century, but the possibility that they did means that it may not be reasonable simply to assume that even a close parallel to Luke is evidence of dependence on Luke. Thus there may be methodological reasons why it is more difficult to demonstrate the use of Luke than of Matthew.

Therefore Köhler’s caution about what Köster’s method cannot achieve, given the evidence available, must be taken seriously, but so too must the difficulties in his own approach. Some of the chapters that follow will note parallels to the synoptic tradition that meet the level of evidence required by Köhler, but which do not meet Köster’s criterion of the presence of redactional work by an evangelist. It is important that such parallels are discussed, and some readers will wish to accept many or all of these parallels as probable evidence for the appropriation of one or other of the synoptic gospels. Others will be more cautious, and will emphasize the importance of Köster’s criterion. Their use of such a rigorous criterion may be thought to weight their research towards a minimalist conclusion, and this should be acknowledged. But it seems equally true that a less rigorous criterion may weight research towards a maximalist conclusion. Given that we know so little about the early transmission of the gospels in general, and given that so much of early Christian literature has been lost, it may be the case that a small sample of quite secure evidence may be of more value than a larger sample of less secure evidence. Köster’s ‘exemplary’⁴⁶ approach provides a methodologically

⁴⁴ Köhler, *Rezeption*, 16.

⁴⁵ But see T. Nagel, *Die Rezeption des Johannesevangeliums im 2. Jahrhundert*, *Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte* 2 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2000), for the adoption of Köhler’s criteria in his account of the reception of John.

⁴⁶ Tuckett, ‘Synoptic Tradition’, 199.

rigorous criterion, the greatest strength of which is that it excludes any tendency to parallelomania. Yet it is not without its limitations.

One needs to remind oneself, for example, of the very obvious fact that the evangelists were not the only writers of their day, and hence they were not complete innovators in relation to vocabulary. The fact that one synoptic evangelist uses words by adding them redactionally at one place does not mean that any occurrence of the same words in another text is due to (direct or indirect) dependence on the synoptic gospel in question. Words could be used (possibly added) by two authors working independently of each other.

Further, one needs to note that any dependence established by this criterion may not show *direct* dependence or use of the earlier text by the later author or editor. The presence of redactional elements need not show that the first text was sitting on the 'desk' of the later author and was being read or copied directly. All it can show is that the first text had already developed to the point of being redacted by its author at some stage prior to that text being 'referred to' in the subsequent tradition history of the text. But that may simply alert us to the problems in determining the nature of any 'dependence' in a discussion like this.

More significant methodologically may be the problems inherent in seeking to determine precisely what is due to the redactional activity of an author, especially the synoptic evangelists. In discussing possible relationships between the synoptic tradition and the Apostolic Fathers, many would regard it as important to seek to determine redactional elements in the synoptics *prior* to any discussion of possible parallels in the writings of a particular Apostolic Father. Even with this presupposition, there are important methodological problems.

For many, the identification of redactional elements in the synoptics is heavily dependent on which solution is presupposed for the synoptic problem. For advocates of the Two Source Theory (2ST), differences between Matthew/Luke and Mark in parallel passages are routinely explained as due to MattR/LkR; hence too, small extra elements in Matthew/Luke which are not in Mark are often ascribed to MattR/LkR.⁴⁷ Clearly, a different solution to the synoptic problem might produce different results about what could or should be identified as redactional. For example, on the Griesbach hypothesis (GH), Luke's text would have to be compared with the version of Matthew, not Mark, and any differences which were to be regarded as LkR would have

⁴⁷ Within the presuppositions of the 2ST, there is of course also the obvious possible complication of cases where Q may have overlapped with Mark, and hence parallels between Matthew and Luke against Mark might be explained as due to common dependence on Q rather than on (independent) redaction.

to be differences from the text of Matthew. So-called double tradition material⁴⁸ would also look potentially very different in relation to the present discussion on the 2ST and on the GH, respectively. For the 2ST, this material may contain a number of places where Luke has preserved Q more accurately, and where Matthew's different version may then be MattR. For the GH, the bulk of any differences will be explained as due to LkR.⁴⁹ Any identification of MattR elements will be much harder, as no pre-Matthean source is postulated as accessible to us outside Matthew. (In the 2ST, the Q source is, at least indirectly, accessible via Luke.)

In all such discussions, there is, however, a further factor which must always be borne in mind as a possibility, and it is one which could be of crucial significance in the present context. This concerns the possibility that, in cases where Matthew/Luke differ from Mark (on the 2ST),⁵⁰ the differences are due not so much to the creative activity of the later evangelists but to the use of other, independent, parallel traditions to which the later evangelists had access. In relation to the study of the synoptic gospels themselves, this has always been an important issue, and recent work on the ongoing existence of oral tradition (beyond the time of the writing of the gospels) has given added impetus to the debate.⁵¹ And indeed, the evidence of the Apostolic Fathers may be of vital importance in this discussion, illustrating perhaps precisely this ongoing lively oral tradition existing alongside any possible written texts.⁵²

But then in terms of methodology, it could be a key issue to decide whether one can use the evidence of the Apostolic Fathers themselves as part of the debate about whether differences between synoptic parallels are to be

⁴⁸ By 'double tradition material', we mean material where there seems to be a literary relationship between Matthew and Luke which is not explicable by dependence on Mark. Such material is normally ascribed to Q on the 2ST. On the GH, this is presumably (mostly) to be explained by Luke's direct dependence on Matthew.

⁴⁹ Although some advocates of the GH allow the possibility that, in the so-called double tradition, Luke may at times have had access to independent traditions: on this see below.

⁵⁰ We formulate the above on the assumption of the 2ST; but the same issue arises on any source hypothesis, and advocates of other hypotheses can easily change the parameters of the discussion to fit their own theories.

⁵¹ E.g., most recently J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003). Cf. too debates about *Thomas* and the possibility that the vexed question of the relationship between *Thomas* and the synoptics could take account of the existence of oral tradition ongoing after the time of the writing of the synoptic gospels themselves, i.e. what Risto Uro has called 'secondary orality': see his 'Thomas and Oral Gospel Tradition', in R. Uro (ed.), *Thomas at the Crossroads* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998), 8–32.

⁵² The theory which, in general terms (in relation to the Apostolic Fathers), Helmut Köster has done so much to promote. Dunn (*Jesus Remembered*, 196) explicitly notes Köster's contribution here, and laments the lack of influence which this has had on the broader discussion of the development of the synoptic tradition more generally.

explained by a model of creative redaction or by one of independent traditions used by the evangelists. In other words, is the assumption mentioned earlier, assumed as almost axiomatic by some, that one should examine the synoptic evidence on its own and only compare the evidence of the Apostolic Father(s) secondarily, really justified?

To take a concrete example, we may consider in general terms the parallels between Matt. 24, Mark 13, and *Did.* 16. It is often noted that *Did.* 16 parallels with a number of features of Matt. 24 which are not in Mark 13. If we start with the synoptic evidence alone, we might well argue that these elements are due to MattR, Matthew having redacted Mark with no other evidence of an independent source being available to him. The parallels with *Did.* 16 then imply that the *Didache* presupposes MattR, and hence Matthew's finished gospel. But it would be equally possible to argue that confining attention to Matthew and Mark alone initially is too restrictive: with a broader look at *all* the evidence from early Christian texts available—i.e. Matthew, Mark, and *Didache*—then perhaps the evidence of *Did.* 16 *itself* could and/or should be brought into the picture as part of a case that the extra elements in Matt. 24 which are not from Mark 13 come from an independent tradition available to Matthew and the Didachist. Either way of arguing is defensible; both are in some way slightly circular; neither is inherently or clearly incorrect. And in part, such ambiguity may explain some of the different theories (e.g., about the relation of *Did.* 16 to Matthew) which are currently proposed.

Identifying the Use of John and Acts

Some of the difficulties encountered in seeking to establish the presence of quotations from, or allusions to, the synoptic gospels apply also to the discussion of quotations from, or allusions to, John⁵³ and Acts.⁵⁴ Each text is a narrative that purports to report events and discourses in the life of Jesus or that of some of his early followers. Therefore the possibility may not be excluded altogether that such events and discussions may have circulated in oral traditions quite independent of these written texts, or on sources which may have been used both by the authors of either text and also by others.⁵⁵

⁵³ Studies of the reception of John include Hill, *Johannine Corpus*; Nagel, *Rezeption*; F.-M. Braun, *Jean le Théologien et son Évangile dans l'Église ancienne* (Paris: Gabalda, 1959); J. N. Sanders, *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943); W. von Loewenich, *Das Johannes-Verständnis im zweiten Jahrhundert* (Giessen: A. Töpelman, 1932).

⁵⁴ On the reception of Acts, see Gregory, *Rezeption*.

⁵⁵ On the possible use of sources in John, see G. van Belle, *The Signs Source in the Fourth Gospel: A Historical Survey and Critical Evaluation of the Semeia Hypothesis*, BETL 116 (Leuven:

Those who see the creative hand of their authors throughout these texts and who give little credence to the possible historicity of their accounts may argue that they reflect the redactional activity of their authors virtually from start to finish, so that any later parallels to these writings are very likely to depend on them. But others, whether they argue for the historical value of these texts as faithful descriptions, or as accounts that incorporate and reshape earlier sources and/or traditions, regardless of the historical value of such material, may take a different line. For example, if there was an apostolic decree sent out from Jerusalem, then perhaps we ought to expect that decree to have been known to many churches, quite apart from whether or not they were familiar with Acts.

John and Acts are both narratives to which it is extremely difficult to apply Köster's criterion without first making other far-reaching decisions. As it happens, they are also texts for which there is very little evidence in the Apostolic Fathers.

Identifying the Use of the Letters and the Apocalypse

Letters present slightly different issues. Their nature as occasional documents means that they were written in response to particular circumstances at particular times. They are likely to have been written over a relatively short period of time, and not to have gone through a period of oral development, although the possibility of multiple recensions may not be excluded altogether.⁵⁶ They may refer to events that have happened—for example, the difficult situations addressed in Paul's letters to Corinth—and it is possible that memories of such events may have been preserved and transmitted independently of Paul's letters. But it seems unlikely that any such accounts would resemble the phraseology or particular content and form of Paul's two letters, for their text depends as much on Paul's situation and his understanding of the situation in Corinth as on the details of the situation itself, such as these may have been known to others. Therefore, there is a strong sense in which letters are largely redactional, in that they reflect mainly the compositional activity of their authors. Of course, they may contain traditional material—for example, credal statements and hymns—as well as quotations from those to whom they are addressed, and it is possible that such materials

Leuven University Press, 1994). On the use of sources in Acts, see J. Dupont, *The Sources of Acts* (London: DLT, 1964).

⁵⁶ E.g., there might be difficulty in determining the origin of material that is found in both Colossians and Ephesians.

may have been transmitted quite independently of their inclusion in Pauline or other letters.

A further distinction which should be drawn, particularly with reference to Paul, concerns the question of whether later authors who might appear to appeal to Paul in some way actually make direct use of his letters, or whether they appeal either to a particular image (*Paulusbild*) of the apostle, or to his theological ideas. Appeals to an image of the apostle or to his ideas need not reflect direct literary dependence on his letters; nor need the demonstrable use of one letter in a given text mean that its author also had direct access to other letters. These are distinctions drawn by Andreas Lindemann, whose work remains the standard discussion of this subject.⁵⁷ Lindemann argues that quotations may be identified securely only when they are explicitly designated as such by an introductory formula (he cites the reference to Paul in *1 Clem.* 47. 1 as an example).⁵⁸ But he also allows that the presence of a quotation may be considered probable when a later text includes a form of words which is clearly reminiscent of Paul in terms of grammar, wording, and content, provided that they cannot be attributed to a common tradition (e.g., Ign. *Eph.* 18. 1 // *1 Cor.* 1. 18, 20).⁵⁹ He argues further that quotations may be present even if their wording only loosely resembles that of Paul, provided that the text in which they are found shows other indications of an acquaintance with the Pauline letters or with Pauline theology.⁶⁰ Questions might be asked as to whether this tends to tip the scales in favour of dependence where the evidence is not sufficient to make the case, at least in the given instance then under discussion; but this is a relatively minor concern. Nothing significant hangs on any such instance of possible dependence, for such questionable examples are not in themselves used to determine whether or not a text draws on one or more of Paul's letters. Lindemann also allows that the presence of characteristic Pauline *topoi* or terminology may indicate the presence of allusions to Paul, provided that they appear to function as foreign bodies (*Fremdkörper*) in their host texts and could not have been derived from non-Pauline tradition.⁶¹ His criteria are balanced and consistent, and they may be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to all the letters contained in the New Testament.

⁵⁷ A. Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, BHT 58 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979). See also his essays, 'Paul in the Writings of the Apostolic Fathers', and 'Der Apostel Paulus im 2. Jahrhundert', in J.-M. Sevrin (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity*, BETL 86 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 39–67. Another important recent study of the early use of Paul is D. Rensberger, 'As the Apostle Teaches: The Development of the Use of Paul's Letters in Second-Century Christianity' (Ph.D. dissertation, Yale, 1981).

⁵⁸ Lindemann, *Paulus*, 17.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.* 17–18.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.* 18.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

Similar considerations are likely to apply also to the Apocalypse, the early use of which is the subject of a doctoral dissertation by Charles Helms.⁶² The one Apostolic Father whom he considers is Papias,⁶³ and he notes three different categories of patristic exegesis from Papias to Eusebius: chiliastic (or anti-chiliastic), eschatological, and christocentric. Interestingly, he does not include any explicit methodological discussion of how the use of the Apocalypse is to be identified, presumably because there appears to be no doubt that it is being used in the exegetical debates that he discusses. R. H. Charles is similarly silent on methodological issues, but offers a number of parallels on the basis of which he notes that there are ‘most probable but no absolutely certain traces’ of the Apocalypse in the Apostolic Fathers.⁶⁴

CONCLUSION

When the contributors to the *New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* wished to grade the probability with which allusions to, or quotations from, the New Testament might be found in the Apostolic Fathers, they did so by means of four classes, distinguished by the letters A, B, C, and D. Class A referred to those books about which there could be no reasonable doubt; Class D to those in regard to which the evidence appeared too uncertain to allow any case for dependence to be made. Classes B and C indicated a high and a low degree of probability, respectively. Such classification allows for a certain degree of slippage, particularly between classes B and C, and this is something about which the editors are candid.⁶⁵ This has remained the dominant approach in subsequent studies. Other attempts might be made to seek more clearly distinguishable boundaries between ‘reasonably certain’, ‘highly probable’, ‘probable’, and ‘unlikely’, but the judgements involved are not such as are readily susceptible to more precise categorization, or even to statistical analysis.⁶⁶ This may lead to a degree of open-endedness and untidiness in any

⁶² C. R. Helms, ‘The Apocalypse in the Early Church: Christ, Eschaton and Millenium’ (D.Phil. dissertation, Oxford University, 1991). See also D. Kyrtatas, ‘The Transformations of the Text: The Reception of John’s Revelation’, in A. Cameron (ed.), *History as Text: The Writing of Ancient History* (London: George Duckworth & Co., 1989), 146–62.

⁶³ Helms, ‘Apocalypse’, 27–37; cf. Kyrtatas, ‘Transformations’, 150–1.

⁶⁴ R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St John*, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1920), i. p. xcvi.

⁶⁵ *NTAF*, ‘Preface’, p. v.

⁶⁶ Cf. the attempt to do so in K. Berding, *Polycarp and Paul: An Analysis of their Literary and Theological Relationship in Light of Polycarp’s Use of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Literature*, VCSup 62 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 203–6.

results that may be obtained; but this is hardly surprising when we have only such partial access to the life of the emerging church as it may be seen through the texts that survive from the second century. The surveys that follow do not claim to be the last word on this subject, but they can claim to provide reliable and comprehensive accounts of such quotations from, or allusions to, the New Testament as may be found in each of the Apostolic Fathers.

The *Didache* and the Writings that later formed the New Testament

Christopher M. Tuckett

Ever since its discovery in 1873, the *Didache* has been a source of intense scholarly debate about a number of issues, including its date, the use of the ‘Two Ways’ tradition, early Christian liturgical—especially eucharistic—practice, and the nature of developing ecclesiastical hierarchy in the early church. Among these issues of debate has always been the question of the relationship of the *Didache* to the writings of (what became) the New Testament.¹

The text of the *Didache* shows a number of striking parallels with some parts of other NT texts, and the vast majority of these parallels involve material appearing in the synoptic gospels. Parallels between the *Didache* and other parts of the NT are generally thought to be rather slight. Such parallels as exist are discussed below. But interest in this general topic (of the relationship between the *Didache* and the NT) has always focused primarily on the parallels that exist between the *Didache* and the synoptic gospels.² However, before discussing the parallels in detail, some preliminary observations and comments are in order.

First is the issue of the unity of the text known as ‘the *Didache*’. This text is available to us in its entirety in only one eleventh-century Greek MS (henceforth denoted H), published in 1883 by P. Bryennios. Some sections of the text are available in other versions (Coptic, Ethiopic, Georgian), and a small section of the Greek text is available in a fourth-century parchment fragment

¹ For many, this question is closely related to that of the date of the *Didache*. However, the dating question should perhaps be left on one side when considering the possible relationship with the books of the NT. Any theory that the *Didache* depends on, or presupposes, some of the NT books would clearly imply a later, rather than an earlier, date for the composition of the text. But it is doubtful if the question of the date can be determined prior to, and/or independently of, the issue of the relationship of the *Didache* to the books of the NT. (It also goes without saying that talk about the books of ‘the NT’ is almost certainly anachronistic when discussing the *Didache*. On this, see below.)

² Cf. K. Niederwimmer, *The Didache: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1998), 48: ‘The only texts that deserve serious consideration are from the synoptic tradition.’

from Oxyrhynchus (*P Oxy.* 1782; henceforth P).³ Also the text appears to have been used directly by the author of Book VII of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. It is almost universally agreed that the present text (i.e. the H text) is, in some sense at least, 'composite'. *Did.* 1–6 incorporates an earlier (probably Jewish) Two Ways tradition attested in *Barn.* 18–20, the *Doctrina Apostolorum*, and elsewhere;⁴ within this section, the material in *Did.* 1. 3b–2. 1 is probably a secondary Christianizing addition. *Did.* 9–10 also clearly reflects and uses earlier liturgical prayers and traditions which have almost certainly not been invented *de novo* by the Didachist. Other seams within the H text have been suggested: for example, chapters 8 and 15 may be secondary additions to an earlier *Vorlage*.⁵ Other possible seams have led to more complex theories about the growth of the text into its present form (i.e., as it appears in H).⁶ The precise delineation of the development of the tradition that has culminated in the text now represented in H is debated. Nevertheless, it is clear that any theories about the relationship to NT documents in one part of the *Didache* will not necessarily apply to the *Didache* as a whole.⁷ Each part of the text must therefore be examined separately and, to a certain extent, independently.

On the other hand, we must bear in mind, and accept, the limitations of our evidence. Despite many theories about the composite nature of the H text, the fact remains that we have no direct evidence of the existence of an earlier version of the text of 'the *Didache*' which had any form other than that of H. Strong arguments can be adduced for the claim that *Did.* 1. 3b–2. 1 represents a secondary expansion of the Two Ways tradition found in the rest of the *Did.* 1–6.⁸ However, this does not mean that the section is a later addition to the text of the *Didache* itself. It could have been incorporated by the editor or author of the *Didache* who used the Two Ways tradition as a

³ For full discussion of the textual witnesses, see *ibid.* 19–29.

⁴ See most recently H. van de Sandt and D. Flusser, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Assen and New York: Royal Van Gorcum; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 55–190.

⁵ Cf. W. Rordorf and A. Tuilier, *La Doctrine des douze apôtres*, SC 248 (Paris: Cerf, 1978), 36, 63; J. A. Draper, 'The Jesus Tradition in the *Didache*', in J. A. Draper (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research*, AGAJU 37 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 72–91, on p. 76.

⁶ Cf. most recently A. J. P. Garrow, *The Gospel of Matthew's Dependence on the Didache*, JSNTSup 254 (London and New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2004), who argues for a multi-stage growth in the text.

⁷ Cf. H. Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern*, TU 65 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957), who argues that most of the *Didache* is independent of the synoptic gospels but that the section 1. 3b–2. 1 presupposes our gospels and represents a later addition. C. N. Jefford, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, VCSup 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1989), argues that *Did.* 1–6, 16, and Matthew depend on common source material, but that *Did.* 7–15 depends on the finished gospels (cf. pp. 91, 143).

⁸ Parallels to this section are lacking in *Barn.* 18–20 and the *Doctrina Apostolorum*.

source and expanded it with this small section.⁹ Sources of the text of the *Didache* are not necessarily to be identified with earlier versions of the text itself. Hence in what follows I presume that ‘the *Didache*’ is the text substantially represented in H. This text may well represent the end-point of a complex tradition history in relation to some of its constituent parts. But we do not have evidence of the existence of a (single) text of ‘the’ *Didache* different from that of H.¹⁰

The above remarks do not of course apply to the detailed wording of the H text. H is an eleventh-century Greek MS, and no one would pretend to claim that the wording of the text can have been handed down in pristine purity over a period of almost a thousand years. For a (very small) section of the text, we do have the witness of the P text from Oxyrhynchus, and this shows a number of differences from the Greek text of H.¹¹ Of particular importance for the present discussion are a couple of places where the *Didache*’s text seems to be clearly parallel to material appearing in Matthew/Luke; in both instances the H readings are closer to the gospel texts than the P readings.¹² Thus it is possible that the text of H has, in the course of transmission, been assimilated to the (more familiar) NT wording in parallel passages. Possible close parallels between the detailed wording of H and that of the NT might have been less close at the stage of the ‘original’ composition of the *Didache*.¹³

A further point should, however, also be borne in mind. For the most part, the *Didache* does not ‘quote’ anything from the synoptic tradition or other traditions reflected in the NT.¹⁴ There are a few instances where the *Didache* may indicate its intention to something (or someone): cf. *Did.* 1. 6; 8. 2; 9. 5;

⁹ Cf. W. Rordorf, ‘Le problème de la transmission textuelle de Didachè 1,3b–2,1’, in F. Pasko (ed.), *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, TU 125 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1981), 499–513, who argues for close links between this section and the rest of the *Didache*—hence *contra*, e.g., K. Wengst, *Didache (Apostellehre), Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Clemensbrief, Schrift an Diognet*, SUC 2 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1984), who is so convinced that the section is a later addition to the text of the ‘original’ *Didache* that he assigns it to a footnote in his edition of the text (p. 66).

¹⁰ Such a comment is intended to apply only to the broad contents of the text (e.g., the issue of the status of 1. 3b–2. 1 within the text). On the issue of the detailed wording, see the next paragraph.

¹¹ For full details, see Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 22.

¹² The H text of *Did.* 1. 3 has *ἐὰν ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς οὐχὶ καὶ τὰ ἔθνη τὸ αὐτὸ ποιούσιν; ὑμεῖς δὲ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς*, P reads *φιλεῖτε* for the second *ἀγαπᾶτε* (the papyrus is not extant for the first) and *τοῦτο* for *τὸ αὐτό*. In each case, the H reading is the same as Matt. 5. 44.

¹³ Cf. Draper, ‘Jesus Tradition’, 75; Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 42. For some, then, differences between the detailed wording of the *Didache* and the NT are all the more significant. Cf. too A. Milavec, ‘Synoptic Tradition in the *Didache* Revisited’, *J ECS* 11 (2003), 443–80, esp. 452–3. On this see also the next paragraph here.

¹⁴ For discussion of what constitutes a ‘quotation’, and what might be better described as an ‘allusion’ or ‘reference’, see Ch. 4 above, pp. 63–8.

16. 7.¹⁵ Elsewhere there are references to a *εὐαγγέλιον* (8. 2; 11. 3; 15. 3, 4), which may be to a written source (but may not: see below). However, the remaining links between the *Didache* and (parallels in) the NT are at the level of allusion only. It is thus inappropriate to assess the *Didache's* use of synoptic (or other NT) tradition as if it were a case of explicit quotation and to expect verbatim agreement between the 'quoted' version and the source used. The *Didache's* use of synoptic (and other NT) tradition seems to be one of free allusion.¹⁶ Hence disagreements between the *Didache* and the gospels in the context and application of common material, and to a certain extent in the wording, need not imply that the *Didache* cannot have known our gospels.¹⁷

One must remember too that, at the time of the writing of the *Didache*,¹⁸ the texts of the NT were not necessarily 'canonical', if indeed they were in existence at all.¹⁹ In one sense, therefore, one would not expect quotations of texts which had not yet become 'scriptural' to be regarded as so sacrosanct

¹⁵ Two of these are probably citations of Jewish Scripture: 1. 6 is probably intended as a citation of Sir. 12. 2 (see Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 84–6); 16. 7 cites Zech. 14. 5. For 8. 2 and the quotation of the Lord's Prayer, see below. *Did.* 9. 5 quotes what 'The Lord said', followed by a version of the saying which also appears in Matt. 7. 6: on this see below too.

¹⁶ J. S. Kloppenborg, 'The Use of the Synoptics or Q in *Did.* 1.3b–2.1' in H. van de Sandt (ed.), *The Didache and Matthew: Two Documents from the same Jewish-Christian Milieu?* (Assen: Van Gorcum; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 105–29, claims that this 'begs the question, since... one does not know a priori whether the Didachist's technique of usage is "allusive" or not'. Still it remains the case that the *Didache* does not for the most part 'cite' anything; it simply echoes or alludes to material which we identify as gospel traditions. (It may be, of course, that the *Didache* is carefully citing an earlier source at all these points very accurately; but that would simply shift the discussion to the issue of the relationship of the source at each point to the traditions of the NT.) For a reader without any knowledge of the NT gospels at all, there is nothing on the surface of the text of the *Didache* to indicate that the material presented in, say, 1. 3–5 has any parallels elsewhere or has been 'cited' from (an)other source(s).

¹⁷ This applies especially to the work of R. Glover, 'The *Didache's* Quotations and the Synoptic Gospels', *NTS* 5 (1958), 12–29, who frequently argues that the *Didache* cannot be dependent on our gospels because the same material is used in such widely differing contexts and ways. (Glover even speaks of the *Didache's* 'quotations' in the title of his article.) For a similar argument, see Draper, 'Jesus Tradition', 75; also Milavec, 'Synoptic Tradition', 456–60. Cf. Wengst, *Didache*, 30: 'Nach diesem Argumentationsmuster mußte man etwa Paulus die Benutzung des AT absprechen' (and see also below).

On the other hand, I have never argued that the *Didache's* possible use of gospel traditions is part of a policy of 'deliberate' non-quotation (as claimed by I. H. Henderson, 'Style-Switching in the *Didache*: Fingerprint or Argument?', in C. Jefford (ed.), *The Didache in Context: Essays on its Text, History and Transmission* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 177–209, on pp. 181–5; he discusses my work under the rubric of 'The Maxim of *Deliberate* Non-Quotation' (my emphasis): the reference to anything 'deliberate' is Henderson's, not mine.

¹⁸ The date is disputed, but few today would date the text much later than the middle of the second century CE.

¹⁹ Certainly if the *Didache* is to be dated very early, as some would argue, then it may have been written before some or all of the NT documents themselves were produced.

that no change were possible.²⁰ On the other hand, if the NT texts were in existence at the time of the *Didache* and were gaining status on the way to becoming authoritative and/or ‘canonical’, then freedom in applying such texts to new situations is precisely what one would expect: their very status as (quasi-) ‘scriptural’ texts would invite just such a process of reapplication. Certainly at almost every period of later Christian history, Christian writers fastened on the words of the NT books and applied them to new situations. Similarly, from the start of the Christian movement, Christians adopted at times the words of Jewish Scripture (the ‘Old Testament’) and applied them to their own circumstances, which differed significantly from their ‘original’ contexts. And in this Christians did no more and no less than many Jews at the time.²¹ Indeed, texts from Qumran also show that Jews could at times claim the freedom to be able to change the wording of their (‘scriptural’) texts to fit their own new interpretations and applications of these texts. One cannot, therefore, place much weight (if any) on differences between the *Didache* and parallels in the NT, whether at the level of wording or that of application and interpretation, as showing too much in the context of the present discussion. If the *Didache* did presuppose the gospel/NT texts, then an element of difference between the two, in wording and/or application, would not be at all unexpected.

In assessing whether the parallels between the *Didache* and materials in NT books reflect some ‘knowledge’ or ‘use’ of the NT books by the Didachist, the best criterion remains whether material which owes its origin to the redactional activity of the NT writer in question reappears in the *Didache*. If it does, then the latter must presuppose the finished work of that author.²² It will be argued here that such a situation does seem to be implied by the *Didache*, at least in relation to the gospel of Matthew. However, one should not assume

²⁰ *Contra*, e.g., W. Rordorf, ‘Does the Didache contain Jesus Tradition Independently of the Synoptic Gospels?’, in H. Wansbrough (ed.), *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*, JSNTSup 64 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 394–423, on p. 411, who argues that one cannot think of the *Didache* being dependent on the gospels via, say, a later harmony, since ‘a harmony of the Gospels presupposes that the basic text has canonical authority. But with a canonical text it is impossible to chop and change as the *Didache* does.’ As Milavec, ‘Synoptic Tradition’, 466, points out, such a view of the status of the gospels may well be anachronistic for the period of the first 200 years of the Christian church. In any case, one sees Matthew and Luke doing precisely such a process of chopping and changing Mark, as do many later writers using the gospel materials. Cf. generally W.-D. Köhler, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus*, WUNT 2.24 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 536, who speaks of the ‘größtmögliche Freiheit gegenüber dem “Text” bei enger Bindung an den Herrn—das war in der Zeit vor Irenäus der Weg, den schriftlichen überlieferten Evangelienstoff auf sich and seine Gegenwart zu beziehen’.

²¹ Cf. the Qumran *Pesharim*, where the texts are applied to the situation of the present unashamedly and with scant regard for their ‘original’ application or meaning.

²² See Ch. 4 above, p. 71, with further references.

that any 'dependence' which is established on the basis of such a criterion is necessarily direct: the later document may be several stages removed from the earlier one.²³ In the case of the synoptic tradition generally, one must reckon with a period of oral tradition existing alongside the written texts.²⁴ But equally, too, the written texts themselves may well have generated their own oral tradition as the texts were read (almost certainly aloud), heard (rather than read silently), and passed on verbally and orally.²⁵ It may well be that, if the *Didache* is 'dependent' on the gospel of Matthew, then that dependence is at best very indirect, perhaps several stages removed, and mediated through a process of oral transmission, retelling, and remembering. Once again, one should not think in terms of too close or direct a relationship as being the only one possible to conceive. The *Didache* is clearly not the result of an attempt by a scribe to *copy* the text of Matthew or any of the other gospels. In relation to the gospels or gospel traditions, the Didachist is not trying to do the same thing as any of the evangelists: he or she is not trying to produce an account of the life of Jesus; nor is he or she even necessarily concerned to present the teaching reproduced here as the teaching of Jesus himself.²⁶ We should not, therefore, judge the parallels between the *Didache* and other texts such as the gospels solely on the basis of a comparison with the way in which, say, the later synoptic evangelists used the earlier one(s).²⁷ On any showing, the Didachist has done something different with the materials available to him or her than what Matthew or Luke did with Mark and/or Q.

With these preliminary comments in mind, we may turn to the texts and the parallels with similar materials in the NT. I consider, first, parallels with NT texts other than the synoptic gospels before turning to the more substantial set of parallels with the synoptics.

²³ Milavec, 'Synoptic Tradition', in arguing for the independence of the *Didache* from the synoptics generally assumes that the only alternative to his own theory (of complete independence) is that of the *Didache* being directly and immediately dependent, with the Didachist having the text of Matthew open in front of him or her and being read directly.

²⁴ It is the great merit of Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, to have emphasized this and taken it seriously in discussing the history of the synoptic tradition in the second century.

²⁵ Cf. J. P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, I (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 131. The phrase 'secondary orality' has become popular in recent years in discussions of the *Gospel of Thomas* and its relationship to the canonical gospels to refer to this secondary, oral use of written texts: see R. Uro, 'Thomas and the Oral Gospel Tradition', in R. Uro (ed.), *Thomas at the Crossroads: Essays on the Gospel of Thomas* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998), 8–32, on p. 10, with further references. Exactly the same phenomenon is relevant to discussion of the *Didache*.

²⁶ The first 'title' of the work states that it is the 'teaching of the twelve apostles'. The second 'title' states that it is the 'teaching of the Lord [= Jesus?] through the twelve apostles...'. The relationship between the two titles, and their relative age, is disputed, though majority opinion is probably that, of the two, the first is more likely to be more original.

²⁷ Cf. V. Balabanski, *Eschatology in the Making: Mark, Matthew and the Didache*, SNTSMS 97 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 197.

THE *DIDACHE* AND THE NEW TESTAMENT APART FROM
THE SYNOPTICS

Parallels between the *Didache* and NT texts apart from the synoptics are generally thought to be too slight to have any significance at all in discussing the possible knowledge of, and use of, NT books by the Didachist. In any such discussion one must of course beware the danger of ‘parallelomania’, seeing any kind of verbal agreement as significant. One must, as always, remember that the NT books themselves were not hermetically sealed entities totally cut off from their surrounding context in the first century: hence the odd verbal agreement between two texts may be coincidental, or due to common traditions, rather than to any direct literary dependence. Further, the NT books and/or their traditions were not necessarily sealed off from each other. It is widely agreed, for example, that writers such as Paul and the author of 1 Peter may themselves have been in touch with Jesus traditions.²⁸ Hence any parallels between the *Didache* and NT epistles in material where there are gospel parallels as well may be due to common use of Jesus traditions rather than any link between the *Didache* and the NT epistles themselves (cf. below). With these factors in mind, I turn to a discussion of the relevant texts.

The *Didache* and Acts

Parallels between *Didache* and Acts are almost non-existent.²⁹ Some parallels have been noted,³⁰ but most are extremely weak. Perhaps the closest example might be the parallel between *Did.* 4. 8 and Acts 4. 32 (cf. also Acts 2. 44):

Did. 4. 8

συγκοινωνήσεις δὲ πάντα τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου
καὶ οὐκ ἔρείς ἴδια εἶναι

Acts 4. 32

καὶ οὐδὲ εἰς τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ
ἔλεγεν ἴδιον εἶναι ἀλλ’ ἦν αὐτοῖς ἅπαντα
κοινά.

²⁸ Clearly Paul knew some Jesus traditions (cf. 1 Cor. 7. 10; 9. 14; 11. 23–5); 1 Peter has a number of places with material that is parallel to the gospels. In the case of Paul, assuming conventional datings for the writings in question, such contact cannot have been between Paul himself and the written gospels since the latter had (almost certainly) not been written at the time Paul wrote. The case of 1 Peter is more debatable (and debated).

²⁹ A. Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus*, WUNT 2.169 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 310 and n. 1, dismisses any links between Acts and *Didache*, along with possible links between Acts and a number of other early texts (e.g., *Barnabas*, *Ignatius*, *2 Clement*), as ‘so tenuous that they hardly need further mention’.

³⁰ See C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, i, ICC, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994), 35–6; É. Massaux, *Influence de l’Evangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée*, BETL 75 (Leuven: Peeters, 1986), 642.

This is the one example cited by Lake in his discussion in the *NTAF* volume.³¹ The verbal similarity is close (though the two texts are certainly not verbally identical). However, it is very doubtful whether the life-style presupposed in the two texts is the same: the *Didache* gives no indication elsewhere of a communal life-style like that of the early Jerusalem church as reflected in Acts 2–5. The ethos of caring for the needy amongst one’s friends and neighbours is widespread in the OT and in Jewish tradition, and indeed in non-Jewish literature as well.³² This verse of the *Didache* is part of the Two Ways tradition, attested in *Barnabas* and with widespread roots in Jewish tradition, and this particular exhortation has a close parallel in *Barn.* 19. 8, probably from the Two Ways source shared by the *Didache* and *Barnabas*. Given the background in Jewish tradition, strongly affirming the obligation to care for the needy in the community, it seems quite unnecessary and unjustified to posit any direct relationship with Christian literature such as Acts at this point to explain the wording of *Did.* 4. 8.³³

Other possible parallels between *Didache* and Acts are even more tenuous, involving perhaps at most common vocabulary of an odd word to two.³⁴ There is thus no compelling evidence to show that *Didache* knew or used Acts.

The *Didache* and Non-Pauline Letters

The only real candidate for inclusion in this discussion is the parallel between *Did.* 1. 4a and 1 Pet. 2. 11.

Did. 1. 4a

1 Pet. 2. 11

ἀπέχου τῶν σαρκικῶν καὶ σωματικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν

The situation here is complicated by the presence of textual variants in the text of the *Didache*, and also by the widely held view that the phrase is a later gloss in *Didache*.

H reads the text as above. The P reading is ἀπόσχου τῶν σαρκε[ι]κῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν. The text of the *Apostolic Constitutions* here reads ἀπέχου τῶν σαρκικῶν καὶ κοσμικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν. Lake has suggested that perhaps the

³¹ K. Lake, ‘The Didache’, in *NTAF*, 24–36, on p. 25; cf. too Massaux, *Influence*, 642.

³² See Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 108 f., who also cites the Greek proverb ‘Friends have all things in common’ (attributed to Pythagoras, according to Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 8. 10).

³³ So too Lake, ‘The Didache’, 25: ‘The resemblance... is not sufficiently close to prove literary dependence.’

³⁴ Massaux, *Influence*, 642, refers to ‘baptising in the name of the Lord’ in *Did.* 9. 5 cf. e.g. Acts 19. 5, but this is far too general. Massaux also compares the use of κυριακή, in *Did.* 14. 1 with Acts 20. 7, but the ‘parallel’ is remote at best (with no verbal agreement beyond this word), also the phrase ‘break bread’ in *Did.* 14. 1, which also occurs in Acts 2. 46; 20. 7, 11 (and 1 Cor. 10. 16), but this is scarcely distinctive enough to show anything in this context.

Didache reading had only *σωματικῶν* with *ἐπιθυμῶν* (comparing 4 Macc. 1. 32), with *σαρκικῶν* then added later under the influence of 1 Pet. 2.³⁵ The subsequent discovery and publication of *P Oxy.* 1782 renders such a theory more doubtful, since *σαρκικῶν* seems to be the one adjective common to all three textual witnesses, and hence perhaps most likely to have been present in the original. Some secondary expansion or change of the text has clearly occurred. Niederwimmer suggests that the shorter P reading was more original and was glossed later (by *καὶ σωματικῶν* in H, and by *καὶ κοσμικῶν* in *Apostolic Constitutions*).³⁶ Hence the earliest reading may provide a parallel with 1 Pet. 2. 11. Many have also argued that the phrase is a secondary addition within (what may itself be a secondary addition to the rest of *Didache*) *Did.* 1. 3–2. 1.³⁷ Nevertheless, the phrase is clearly present in all the MS tradition (such as it is) of the text that is available to us, and hence must presumably be considered as part of the text of ‘the’ *Didache*.

How one should assess the parallel between the *Didache* and 1 Peter is not clear. The idea involved is very general, and other clear parallels in *Didache* to 1 Peter are lacking.³⁸ Lake’s conclusion, giving this parallel a ‘d’ rating, seems entirely justified: the coincidence of wording may just as easily be due to dependence on a common early Christian tradition.

There is thus no clear evidence that *Didache* knew 1 Peter. Further allusions to other NT books are almost totally lacking.

The *Didache* and Pauline Letters

Parallels between the *Didache* and Paul are also not numerous, and many have deduced that the *Didache* shows no knowledge of the Pauline letters.³⁹ Among possible parallels to be mentioned, the following may be considered:

³⁵ Lake, ‘The *Didache*’, 34.

³⁶ Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 76–7. B. Layton, ‘The Sources, Date and Transmission of *Didache* 1.3b–2.1’, *HTR* 61 (1968), 343–83, on pp. 375–8, has a much more complex theory, with the *ApConst* reading taken as more original, abbreviated in P and changed by mistake in H.

³⁷ See Layton, ‘Sources’; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 76. But contrast Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 78, who takes it as ‘pivotal’ to the wider context, being a general statement which is then applied more specifically in what follows. Nevertheless, Garrow still takes the statement as independently formulated prior to its inclusion here.

³⁸ One might refer to the possible parallel between the *ποιία γὰρ χάρις* . . . of *Did.* 1. 3 and 1 Pet. 2. 20: *τοῦτο γὰρ χάρις* . . . *ποιῶν γὰρ κλέος* . . . But 1 Peter itself is here close to, and may reflect, the language of the Jesus tradition in Luke 6, and *Did.* 1. 3 is also close to Luke 6 in language. The primary NT parallel to *Did.* 1. 3 is thus probably the Jesus tradition represented in Luke 6, and any parallels between *Didache* and 1 Peter here are probably via this link.

³⁹ Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 48: ‘There is no echo of the corpus Paulinum in the *Didache*.’ Cf. also A. Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, BHT 58 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979), 174–7; T. Aono, *Die Entwicklung des paulinischen Gerichtsgedanken bei den apostolischen Vätern* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1979), 163–4.

Did. 5. 2

οὐ κολλώμενοι ἀγαθῶ

Rom. 12. 9

κολλώμενοι τῷ ἀγαθῶ,

Despite the verbal agreement in talking about ‘cleaving to the good’, the parallel is scarcely sufficient to show any dependence. The contexts are quite different (*Did.* 5 is a list of vices, whereas Rom. 12 is part of positive Christian paraneisis).⁴⁰ Lake calls it an ‘ethical commonplace’,⁴¹ and Niederwimmer also refers to similar language in *T. Asher* 3. 1.⁴² There is therefore scarcely sufficient evidence here to warrant a theory of knowledge of Romans by the *Didache*.

Did. 10. 6

εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχεσθω· εἴ τις οὐκ ἐστι, μετανοεῖτω, μαρὰν ἄθα, ἀμήν

1 Cor. 16. 22

εἴ τις οὐ φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον, ἦτω ἀνάθεμα. Μαρὰνα θα.

The common use of the Aramaic word *Maranatha* in both texts is striking. Both may however reflect common usage in early Christian liturgical practice. (In *Did.* 10 the context is clearly that of ‘liturgical’ celebration of a Eucharist of some form.) The very use of Aramaic suggests that both authors are citing earlier traditions. Again, there is nothing to suggest a link between *Didache* and Paul’s actual letters.

Did. 1. 3

Εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμῖν καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑμῶν

Rom. 12. 14

εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας [ὑμᾶς], εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε.

Did. 13. 1

πᾶς δὲ προφήτης ἀληθινὸς θέλων καθῆσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἄξιός ἐστι τῆς τροφῆς αὐτοῦ

1 Tim. 5. 18

ἄξιος ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ.

These two examples may be considered together. Both show some parallel between the *Didache* and words found in Paul’s letters.⁴³ However, in each case Paul (or ‘Paul’) is probably alluding to Jesus tradition: for Rom. 12. 14, cf. Matt. 5. 44 // Luke 6. 27 f.; for 1 Tim. 5. 18, cf. Matt. 10. 10 // Luke 10. 7. In each case the text of the *Didache* may be closer to that of the gospel parallels than to Paul/‘Paul’. Hence any similarity between the *Didache* and the Pauline texts is probably via the link of Jesus traditions. As such, these *Didache* texts will be considered below in more detail in relation to parallels between the

⁴⁰ A closer substantive parallel to *Did.* 5 in Romans would surely be the vice list at the end of Rom. 1!

⁴¹ Lake, ‘The *Didache*’, 25.

⁴² ἀλλά τῇ ἀγαθοτήτι μόνῃ κολλήθητε: Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 117 n. 20.

⁴³ Whether 1 Timothy is a genuine Pauline letter or not is immaterial here.

Didache and the synoptic tradition. They probably tell us nothing about links between the *Didache* and the Pauline letters.⁴⁴

The analysis above thus confirms the widely held view that there is little if any evidence to support any theory that *Didache* knew or used the Pauline corpus of letters.

The *Didache* and John

Evaluations of possible contacts between the *Didache* and John's gospel have varied quite widely over the course of scholarship since the publication of the *Didache*. Some have pointed to a number of potentially striking agreements in the use of significant words and phrases, especially in the language of the prayers in *Did.* 9–10 and passages in John sometimes associated with the Eucharist and/or Last Supper (John 6, 15, 17).⁴⁵ Others have been rather more negative in their evaluations, seeing at most perhaps one or two similar words, but no suggestion of any direct link between the *Didache* and John. Thus Lake saw only three possible parallels (*Did.* 9. 2, 3; 10. 3), which he classified as 'unclassified'.⁴⁶ Niederwimmer denies that any link between the two texts can be established.⁴⁷

Of the possible links between the *Didache* and John, perhaps the most striking are the following:⁴⁸

Did. 9. 2 speaks of the 'holy vine of David your servant'; cf. John 15. 1, although there, Jesus himself is the vine. The common use of 'vine' language may simply reflect common use of Jewish imagery and/or a culture in which grapes are grown.

⁴⁴ Some have tried to see echoes of Paul in other parts of the *Didache*: e.g., A. von Harnack, *Die Apostellehre und die jüdischen beiden Wege* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1896), 11, saw in the command not to test a prophet (*Did.* 11. 7) an implied critique of Paul (cf. 1 Cor. 12. 10; 14. 29), but this seems extremely tenuous: cf. Aono, *Entwicklung*, 203. Other possible verbal parallels might include the reference to *εἰδολοθύτων* in *Did.* 6. 3; cf. 1 Cor. 8, or the command to a wandering Christian who wishes to settle in the community, 'let him work and eat'; cf. 1 Thess. 4. 11; 2 Thess. 3. (See Harnack, *Apostellehre*, 10 f.) Again the parallels are extremely tenuous, and insufficient to establish any theory of possible knowledge of Paul's letters with any degree of probability.

⁴⁵ Cf. A. von Harnack, *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel nebst Untersuchungen zur ältesten Geschichte der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1884), 79–81; J. Betz, 'The Eucharist in the *Didache*', in J. A. Draper (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 244–75, on p. 255; also E. R. Goodenough, 'John a Primitive Gospel', *JBL* 64 (1945), 174–5; C. F. D. Moule, 'A Note on *Didache* IX. 4', *JTS* 6 (1955), 240–3. See too C. Claussen, Ch. 8 in companion volume.

⁴⁶ Lake, 'The *Didache*', 31.

⁴⁷ Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 48.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.* See also Lake, 'The *Didache*', 31.

Did. 9. 2, 3; 10. 2 also uses the verb *γνωρίζειν* (e.g., 9. 2: ‘which you have made known to us through Jesus . . .’); cf. John 17. 26 (also 17. 3), though in John it is God’s name and/or his very self whom Jesus makes known.

Did. 9. 4 speaks of the broken bread becoming one (*ἐγένετο ἓν*); cf. John 17. 11, 21, 22, and Jesus’ prayer for the unity of his church.

The address of God as ‘holy Father’ in *Did.* 10. 2 is the same as Jesus’ address to God in John 17. 21, though this may simply reflect common liturgical practice.

The prayer to deliver the church from all evil in *Did.* 10. 5 is similar to John 17. 15 (though also close in language to the Matthean version of the Lord’s Prayer, Matt. 6. 13).

Did. 10. 3 thanks God for the gift of ‘eternal life’ through Jesus, a theme which is very prominent throughout John.

Finally, *Did.* 9. 3, 4 refers to the bread over which thanks is given as the *κλάσμα*, a strange word (much debated in discussions of *Did.* 9), but one which also appears in the gospels’ accounts of the feeding stories referring to the crumbs that are left when the crowds have eaten. (See John 6. 13, but the word is also in the synoptics: cf. Mark 6. 43 and parallels.)

However, in all this it is hard to find any distinctively Johannine ideas appearing in the *Didache*.⁴⁹ Thus there is no hint in the *Didache* of the idea that Jesus himself is the vine, or that he is himself the bread of life. The address to God as ‘holy Father’ is never developed christologically into the characteristically Johannine idea of Jesus as God’s Son. Although Jesus is the medium of the activity of God’s ‘making known’, the typically Johannine focus on Jesus as the active agent of the process of revealing, and on God himself as the object of the revealing activity, are absent in the *Didache*. And in the prayer for the unity of the church, the characteristically Johannine basis for this—the unity of the Father and the Son—is not found in the *Didache*.

Both the *Didache* and John may have roots in the same liturgical tradition.⁵⁰ At the very least, the *Didache* and John share negatively a use of eucharistic language and ideas that do not seem to ground the founding of the meal in an act of institution by Jesus at the Last Supper. But any suggestion that the *Didache* might have known John’s gospel itself almost certainly goes beyond the evidence of the texts themselves.

⁴⁹ Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 48 n. 40: ‘Precisely those things that are specifically Johannine are absent from the *Didache*.’

⁵⁰ See Claussen, Ch. 8 in companion volume; also Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 48.

THE *DIDACHE* AND SYNOPTIC TRADITION

As already noted, it is the parallels between the *Didache* and the synoptic gospels that have provoked the most interest and debate since the discovery of the full text of the *Didache*. Widely different positions have been taken by different scholars in the past. Some have argued that the *Didache* is independent of the synoptic gospels, perhaps being dependent on independent oral tradition, on other collections of the sayings of Jesus, or on one or more of the sources used by the evangelists; others have argued that the *Didache* is dependent on the finished gospels, or at least the gospel of Matthew, and that the parallels with the synoptic tradition are to be explained in this way.⁵¹

In the light of the widely held theory that *Did.* 1. 3b–2. 1 represents a separate section within the *Didache*, I consider first the parallels between the *Didache* and the synoptic gospels which occur outside this section.

⁵¹ For those arguing for independence, some have argued for dependence on oral tradition: see P. Audet, *La Didachè: Instructions des apôtres* (Paris: Gabalda, 1958); Rordorf, 'Problème', and *idem*, 'Jesus Tradition'. For possible dependence on Q, see Glover, 'Didache's Quotations'; Draper, 'Jesus Tradition'. For dependence on other collections of sayings of Jesus, see Lake, 'The Didache'; A. Tuilier, 'La *Didachè* et le problème synoptique', in Jefford (ed.), *Didache in Context*, 110–30; Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung* (with the exception of *Did.* 1. 3–2. 1); J. S. Kloppenborg, 'Didache 16.6–8 and Special Matthean Tradition', *ZNW* 70 (1979), 54–67 (at least for *Did.* 16). More generally, a theory of independence is defended by Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 48–51; Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 35–48; Milavec, 'Synoptic Tradition'. For the theory that the *Didache* is independent of Matthew, but that Matthew is dependent on the *Didache*, see Garrow, *Matthew's Dependence*.

Those who have argued for dependence (in some form) of the *Didache* on Matthew include B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels* (London: Macmillan, 1924), 507–11 (except for possibly one saying (*Did.* 16.1) which might be dependent on Q); F. E. Vokes, *The Riddle of the Didache* (London: SPCK, 1938); Massaux, *Influence*, 604–41; B. C. Butler, 'The Literary Relations of Didache, ch. XVI', *JTS* 11 (1960), 265–83; *idem*, 'The "Two Ways" in the Didache', *JTS* 12 (1961), 27–38; Layton, 'Sources'; J. M. Court, 'The Didache and St. Matthew's Gospel', *SJT* 34 (1981), 109–20; Wengst, *Didache*, 19–31; Köhler, *Rezeption*, 19–56 (with the possible exception of *Did.* 16); Aono, *Entwicklung*, 164–89 (perhaps via oral tradition and/or memory); C. M. Tuckett, 'Synoptic Tradition in the Didache', in J.-M. Sevrin (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity*, BETL 86 (Leuven: Peeters and Leuven University Press, 1989), 197–230 (repr. in Draper (ed.), *Didache in Modern Research*, 92–128; all references to the earlier edition); O. Knoch, 'Kenntnis und Verwendung des Matthäus-Evangeliums bei den Apostolischen Vätern', in L. Schenke (ed.), *Studien zum Matthäusevangelium: Festschrift für Wilhelm Pesch* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk), 159–77, on pp. 164–7; Balabanski, *Eschatology*, 180–205; A. Lindemann, 'Die Endzeitrede in Didache 16 und die Jesus-Apokalypse in Matthäus 24–25', in W. L. Petersen, J. S. Vos, and H. J. De Jonge (eds.), *Sayings of Jesus: Canonical and non-Canonical: Essays in Honour of Tjitze Baarda*, NovTSup 89 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 155–74.

For what follows, see also my essay 'Synoptic Tradition', of which the present discussion represents a slightly updated and abbreviated version. Constraints of space have precluded more detailed bibliographical details being included here. Some of these may be found in the earlier essay.

Did. 1. 1

ὁδοὶ δύο εἰσί, μία τῆς ζωῆς
καὶ μία τοῦ θανάτου,
διαφορὰ δὲ πολλὴ μεταξὺ
τῶν δύο ὁδῶν

Matt 7. 13–14

Εἰσελθατε διὰ τῆς στενῆς
πύλης· ὅτι πλατεία ἡ πύλη
καὶ εὐρύχωρος ἡ ὁδὸς ἣ
ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ἀπώλειαν
καὶ πολλοὶ εἰσὶν οἱ
εἰσερχόμενοι δι' αὐτῆς.¹⁴ Τί
στενὴ ἡ πύλη καὶ
τεθλιμμένη ἡ ὁδὸς ἣ
ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ζωὴν καὶ
ὀλίγοι εἰσὶν οἱ εὐρίσκοντες
αὐτήν.

Luke 13. 24

Ἀγωνίζεσθε εἰσελθεῖν διὰ
τῆς στενῆς θύρας, ὅτι
πολλοί, λέγω ὑμῖν,
ζητήσουσιν εἰσελθεῖν καὶ
οὐκ ἰσχύσουσιν.

Although some relationship between *Did.* 1. 1 and Matt. 7. 13–14 has sometimes been postulated in the past,⁵² such a theory seems unlikely and certainly unnecessary. The wording of the *Didache* here is close to that of *Barn.* 18. 1 and also the *Doctrina Apostolorum*, and hence almost certainly reflects dependence on a Two Ways source widely believed to underlie all three texts (cf. n. 4 above). The motif of the Two Ways was widespread in both Jewish and non-Jewish literature of the time.⁵³ Any verbal agreements between *Did.* 1. 1 and Matt. 7. 13 f. are thus probably due to both reflecting this widespread motif, rather than to any more direct relationship between the two texts.⁵⁴

Did. 1. 2

πρῶτων ἀγαπήσεις τὸν
θεόν

Matt. 22. 36–9

ποία ἐντολὴ μεγάλη ἐν τῷ
νόμῳ;
³⁷ ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ,

Ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν
θεόν σου

Mark 12. 28–31

Ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη
πάντων;
²⁹ ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι
Πρώτη ἐστίν, Ἄκουε,
Ἰσραήλ, κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν
κύριος εἷς ἐστίν,

³⁰ καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν
θεόν σου

⁵² Jefford, *Sayings*, 25, with references to other literature.

⁵³ See Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 60–3.

⁵⁴ Some discussions of synoptic tradition in the *Didache* (e.g., by Glover, Köster, Draper, Aono) do not mention the parallel. Jefford, *Sayings*, 25, ascribes the Matthean version to a special M source which has been combined in Matthew with Q (the Lucan parallel in Luke 13. 24 makes no mention of two 'ways'). But this seems both speculative and unnecessary (cf. too Rordorf, 'Jesus Tradition', 397, who calls Jefford's arguments here 'richly hypothetical'); rather than a special 'source', one need only posit use of the very widespread Two Ways motif, probably by Matthew himself.

| | | |
|-------------------|--|---|
| τὸν ποιήσαντά σε· | ἐν ὄλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ὄλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὄλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου· | ἐξ ὄλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὄλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὄλης τῆς διανοίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὄλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου. |
| δεύτερον | ³⁸ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μεγάλη καὶ πρώτη ἐντολή. | |
| τὸν πλησίον | ³⁹ δευτέρα δὲ ὁμοία αὐτῇ, Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον | ³¹ δευτέρα αὕτη, Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον |
| σου ὡς σεαυτόν. | σου ὡς σεαυτόν. | σου ὡς σεαυτόν. |

The commands to love God and one's neighbour are well known separately in non-Christian Judaism, and at times together, notably in the *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs*.⁵⁵ However, the use of the *πρώτον . . . δεύτερον* is not easy to parallel in non-Christian sources, and may reflect Christian influence.⁵⁶ The 'first . . . second' formulation appears in both Matthew and Mark in their accounts of the giving of the double love command, but does not appear in Luke's version (10. 25–8). This rather tells against Glover's thesis that the *Didache* tends to follow Matthew only when Matthew is not following Mark, and hence that the *Didache* is dependent on Q rather than on Matthew.⁵⁷ There may well have been a Q version of the pericope, as there are a number of agreements between the accounts in Matt. 22. 34–40 and Luke 10. 25–8.⁵⁸ But it is doubtful if the *πρώτη . . . δευτέρα* formulation was present in Q: it is

⁵⁵ Cf. *T. Iss.* 5. 2; 7. 6; *T. Dan* 5. 3. See Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 157 f.

⁵⁶ Cf. Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 172.

⁵⁷ See Glover, 'Didache's Quotations', 13. Glover sees a reflection of Luke's version of the pericope in the reference to the way of 'life' in *Did.* 1. 1, but this seems rather fanciful. This also tells against part of Garrow's overall argument for the dependence of Matthew on the *Didache*. An important part of his argument is the claim that almost all the redactional layers he identifies in the *Didache* have links with Matthean material: hence, if the *Didache* were dependent on Matthew, a whole series of different editors must have used Matthew in the same way and, moreover, homed in primarily on Matthew's special material (see Garrow, *Matthew's Dependence*, esp. 159, 246). This, he claims, is too coincidental to be credible. Part of the argument rests on the credibility of an extremely complex theory of a multi-stage development of the *Didache* itself, and the complexity itself makes the theory somewhat uncertain. But in any case, the parallels with Matthew are *not* confined to Matthew's special material, as here. Cf. too below on *Did.* 1. 2; 2. 2; 6. 1, 2; 8. 2; 11. 2–4; 11. 7; 13. 1; 16. 4–5; also most of 1. 3–2. 1.

⁵⁸ Cf. R. H. Fuller, 'The Double Love Commandment of Love: A Test Case for the Criteria of Authenticity', in *idem* (ed.), *Essays on the Love Commandment* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978),

absent from Luke 10, and hence there are no Matthew–Luke agreements in this respect to establish any theory that the Q version numbered the two commands in this way. The presence of the numbering in Matthew cannot therefore be explained as due to Q.

The *Didache* here is marginally closer to Matthew’s version than to Mark’s, in that the two love commands are rather more clearly in Matthew labelled as *πρώτη . . . δευτέρα*. (In Mark the parallelism is slightly more confused by the inclusion of the Shema before the command to love God in the ‘command’ that is said to be *πρώτη πάντων*.) But whether this shows that the *Didache* is dependent on, or presupposes, Matthew is not so clear. It is likely that the ‘first . . . second’ formulation in Matthew derives from Mark’s account.⁵⁹ At least in part, the *Didache* is clearly still dependent on the Two Ways source that it evidently shares with *Barnabas* (cf. the common reference to God as ‘the one who made you’ here and in *Barn.* 19. 2). But has the Two Ways command to love God been expanded with material taken from Matthew as such? Some dismiss the suggestion out of hand, on the basis that the differences are too great.⁶⁰ Köster simply states that the possibility that the linking and numbering of the two commands had already occurred prior to the evangelists is ‘very probable’.⁶¹ All one can probably say at this stage is that the *Didache* shows the closest similarity with Matthew’s version of all the synoptic versions.

| <i>Did.</i> 1. 2b | Matt. 7. 12 | Luke 6. 31 |
|---|--|---|
| <i>πάντα δὲ ὅσα ἐὰν θελήσῃς μὴ γινέσθαι σοι, καὶ σὺ ἄλλω μὴ ποίει</i> | <i>πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς</i> | <i>καὶ καθὼς θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως.</i> |

41–56; also C. M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1996), 416–17, with further references. However, the pericope is excluded from Q by the recent edition of the International Q Project (IQP): see J. M. Robinson, P. Hoffman, and J. S. Kloppenborg, *The Critical Edition of Q* (Minneapolis: Fortress; Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 200–5.

⁵⁹ Jefford, *Sayings*, 33–5, suggests that Matthew might have had yet another version of the story from his M tradition, along with that of Mark and Q. He appeals to A. J. Hultgren, ‘The Double Commandment of Love in Mt 22: 34–40: Its Sources and Compositions’, *CBQ* 36 (1974), 373–8, on p. 376; but Hultgren produces no concrete evidence beyond general claims that Jewish teachers often summarized the Law, and that great teachers often repeat themselves.

⁶⁰ Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 64.

⁶¹ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 172. This is of course very likely, but it does not determine where the *Didache* got it from!

The *Didache* appends to its version of the double love command a version of the golden rule, a form of which also appears in Matt. 7. 12 and Luke 6. 31. Again, it is not clear whether one could claim that the version of the *Didache* derives from one or other of the synoptic versions. The golden rule itself was very widespread, though it is usually presented in negative form, referring to what one would *not* want others to do to oneself. The positive form of the rule, as it appears in Matthew and Luke, is somewhat unusual.⁶² If it could be established that the reference to the ‘two ways’ in 1. 1 were related to Matt. 7. 13–14, it *might* then be significant that the golden rule in Matthew occurs in a very closely related context: i.e., just before the reference to the ‘two ways’.⁶³ However, I argued above that any link between *Did.* 1. 1 and Matt. 7. 13–14 was tenuous at best, hence one probably cannot build too much on the slight coincidence in contexts here. The evidence provided by this parallel is thus probably inconclusive.

| <i>Did.</i> 2. 2–3 | Matt. 19. 18 f. | Mark 10. 19 | Luke 19. 20 |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|
| οὐ φονεύσεις, | οὐ φονεύσεις, | μὴ φονεύσης, | μὴ φονεύσης, |
| οὐ μοιχεύσεις, | οὐ μοιχεύσεις, | μὴ μοιχεύσης, | μὴ μοιχεύσης, |
| οὐ παιδοφθορήσεις, | | | |
| οὐ πορνεύσεις, | | | |
| οὐ κλέψεις, | οὐ κλέψεις, | μὴ κλέψης, | μὴ κλέψης, |
| οὐ μαγεύσεις, | | | |
| οὐ φαρμακεύσεις, | | | |
| οὐ φονεύσεις | | | |
| τέκνον ἐν φθορᾷ | | | |
| οὐδὲ γεννηθὲν | | | |
| ἀποκτενεῖς | | | |
| οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὰ | | | |
| τοῦ πλησίον, | | | |
| ³ οὐκ ἐπιορκήσεις, | | | |
| οὐ | οὐ | μὴ | μὴ |
| ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, | ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, | ψευδομαρτυρήσης, | ψευδομαρτυρήσης, |
| | | μὴ ἀποστερήσης, | μὴ ἀποστερήσης, |
| οὐ κακολογήσεις | | | |
| οὐ μνησικακήσεις | | | |

⁶² Cf. Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 66.

⁶³ Cf. Jefford, *Sayings*, 36, who argues that Matthew may have known the same ‘set of elements from which the Didachist derived *Did.* 1.2’ and hence juxtaposed the two traditions in Matt. 7.

Exod. 20, LXX: ¹³οὐ μοιχεύσεις ¹⁴οὐ κλέψεις ¹⁵οὐ φονεύσεις ¹⁶οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις κατὰ τοῦ πλησίον σου μαρτυρίαν ψευδῆ
 Deut. 5, LXX: ¹⁷οὐ μοιχεύσεις ¹⁸οὐ φονεύσεις ¹⁹οὐ κλέψεις ²⁰οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις κατὰ τοῦ πλησίον σου μαρτυρίαν ψευδῆ

In 2. 2 the *Didachist* begins an exposition of the Way of Life with an expansion of the second half of the Decalogue. The ordering and wording of the elements from the Decalogue which are included in the *Didache* here bear some relationship to the list which appears in Matthew's account of Jesus' enumeration of these commands to the rich young man in Matt. 19, though it is not clear whether Matthew's version is sufficiently different from the other synoptic versions for this to be significant in the present discussion. All three synoptics have the same order of the four commands mentioned, and this differs from that of the LXX versions of the Decalogue in both Exod. 20 and Deut. 5 by having 'murder' before 'adultery'. However, the MT versions of both Exod. 20 and Deut. 5 agree with the synoptic versions in having the ban on 'murder' first.⁶⁴ Hence it is not certain whether the *Didache* is here to be seen as dependent on the NT versions or simply on the MT version of the OT itself (or perhaps on a Greek version of the OT which was closer to the ordering of the MT than our LXX versions).

For what it is worth, *Did.* 2. 2–3 is also closer to Matthew in using οὐ + future, rather than μή + aorist subjunctive (as in Mark and Luke). However, the LXX versions also use the οὐ + future construction, so one cannot say that the version of the *Didache* could *only* have derived from that of Matthew. In any case, the difference in wording is scarcely very significant, with little if any change in meaning. The *Didache* also has no equivalent to the μὴ ἀποστερήσης element which appears in Mark and Luke (but whether one can place any weight on an argument from silence in a context where there is anything but verbatim agreement between the different versions is very doubtful).

The *Didache* is clearly closest to Matthew; and further, Matthew's version is presumably due to MattR of Mark here. But presumably Matthew's own redaction might have been due to his aligning the account in Mark more closely with the LXX, and hence the possibility cannot be ruled out that the *Didache's* version is due to 'dependence' on the LXX itself rather than on Matthew's gospel.

Did. 3. 7

ἴσθι δὲ πρᾶύς ἐπεὶ οἱ πρᾶεῖς
 κληρονομήσουσι τὴν γῆν.

Ps. 37 (LXX 36). 11: οἱ δὲ πρᾶεῖς κληρονομήσουσιν γῆν

Matt. 5. 5

μακάριοι οἱ πρᾶεῖς, ὅτι αὐτοὶ
 κληρονομήσουσιν τὴν γῆν.

⁶⁴ So too does Exod. 20, LXX A, but this may be due to assimilation to the text of the NT, a feature which characterizes the A version of the LXX.

It is very uncertain whether one should see any significance in the apparent agreement (at one level) between *Did.* 3. 7 and Matt. 5. 5 in extolling the virtues of being ‘meek’. The beatitude in Matthew is widely regarded as being heavily dependent on the wording of Ps. 37 (LXX 36). 11, and hence any agreement with the *Didache* here may be due to common dependence on the psalm verse. The beatitude in Matthew (along with the other ‘extra’ beatitudes, i.e., those not in Luke) may well be due to MattR. But the immediate context in the *Didache* shows no other influence from Christian sources such as Matthew, and moreover does not reflect the beatitude form. Hence it is highly unlikely that the Didachist derived this part of his exhortation here from Matthew’s gospel.⁶⁵

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <i>Did.</i> 6. 1 | Matt. 24. 4 | Mark 13. 5 |
| ὄρα, μή τις σε πλανήσῃ ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς ὁδοῦ τῆς διδαχῆς | Βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ | Βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ |

The agreement in wording here between the *Didache* and Matthew/Mark in the warning not to be led astray is perhaps striking, though the contexts are quite different (ethical paranesis in the *Didache*, eschatological warnings in Matthew/Mark). Further, there is nothing to indicate that the evangelists’ redactional work has affected the wording, certainly not Matthew’s.⁶⁶

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <i>Did.</i> 6. 2 | Matt. 5. 48 | Luke 6. 36 |
| εἰ μὲν γὰρ δύνασαι βαστάσαι ὄλον τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου, τέλειος ἔσῃ. | Ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειός ἐστιν. | Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες καθὼς [καὶ] ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν. |

A potentially more significant parallel might be provided by *Did.* 6. 2 and Matt. 5. 48. There is widespread agreement that in Matt. 5. 48 // Luke 6. 36, Luke’s reference to being ‘merciful’ is more original, and that Matthew’s ‘perfect’ is due to MattR.⁶⁷ Further, this verse in Matthew clearly ties in very closely with a prominent theme in Matthew’s gospel as a whole: namely, the

⁶⁵ So most who bother to discuss the parallel at all: cf. Jefford, *Sayings*, 73–80. Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 240, regards it as significant that the next exhortation in the *Didache* mentions being ‘merciful’, which would be parallel to Matt. 5. 7, and he uses this as part of his evidence to show that Matthew might be dependent on the *Didache*. However, the agreement here seems too slight to bear the weight that Garrow suggests.

⁶⁶ At the very least, one could say that this example might tell again against Glover’s claim that parallels between the *Didache* and Matthew are confined to those parts of Matthew which are not derived from Mark. It would also be relevant to Garrow’s general claim: cf. above.

⁶⁷ So, e.g., the IQP’s *Critical Edition of Q*, 72.

importance of obeying the ethical demands laid upon one with absolute seriousness.⁶⁸ The Didachist's similar interest in the notion of being 'perfect' might then relate to what appears to be a significant element of MattR. One may also note the presence of the same word *τέλειος* in *Did.* 1. 4. The evidence could then be interpreted as due to two redactors independently developing the idea of ethical 'perfection'; or it could indicate the Didachist's dependence on a significant element of MattR, thus showing the dependence of the *Didache* on Matthew (whether direct or indirect).

We may also note the language here of the 'yoke' (of the Lord). This is not dissimilar to the reference of the Matthean Jesus to 'his' 'yoke' in Matt. 11. 28, a verse which many have thought again to resonate with significant Matthean themes, and hence could be due to MattR.⁶⁹

In sum, the evidence of this small verse would seem to indicate a close link between the *Didache* and Matthew's gospel in particular.

Did. 7. 1

περὶ δὲ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, οὕτω βαπτίσατε,
ταῦτα πάντα προειπόντες, βαπτίσατε
εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ
τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐν ὕδατι ζῶντι

Matt. 28. 19

πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα
τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς
εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ
τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος,

Further evidence of a close connection between the *Didache* and Matthew is implied by the next parallel to be considered, the instruction about baptism in *Did.* 7. 1 and the explicit instruction to baptize in the threefold name (of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit). The command to baptize in the threefold name is peculiar to Matthew among the synoptics.⁷⁰ On the other hand, a text such as this almost certainly reflects the ongoing liturgical life of the community, both Matthew's and the Didachist's. Matt. 28. 19 itself presumably reflects the baptismal practice of the Matthean community/communities.⁷¹ Hence one

⁶⁸ Cf. Matt. 5. 20; 6. 33; 7. 21–7; 16. 28; 21. 28–32; 21. 43; 22. 11–14; 23. 3; 25. 31–46, etc.

⁶⁹ Cf., e.g., the parallels between Matt. 11. 28–30 and Sir. 51, which many have seen as developing an implicit equation between Jesus and the figure of Wisdom, which may be a significant part of Matthew's Christology: see J. D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 2nd edn. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1996), 197–206.

⁷⁰ Assuming, that is, that the command is a genuine part of the text of Matthew. There is a very small amount of (mostly patristic) evidence suggesting that the words were not present in the text of Matthew (as read by Eusebius), but the evidence is very weak and generally discounted. See W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, *The Gospel According to St Matthew*, iii (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1997), 684.

⁷¹ There is of course debate about whether we should think of a single community, or a number of communities, behind Matthew, or whether Matthew was writing for a broader audience or readership than just his own community.

cannot necessarily ascribe the verse to MattR. Presumably, then, the presence of the same instruction in the *Didache* implies the same. It would thus be hard to deduce any direct literary relationship between the two texts on the basis of such a liturgical text as this which they have in common (though presumably the common text indicates that the communities behind the two texts were relatively ‘close’, at least in relation to liturgical practice).

Did. 8. 1

αἱ δὲ νηστεῖαι ὑμῶν μὴ ἔστωσαν μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, νηστεύσουσι γὰρ δευτέρα σαββάτων καὶ πέμπτη· ὑμεῖς δὲ νηστεύσατε τετράδα καὶ παρασκευήν

Matt. 6. 16

Ὅταν δὲ νηστεύητε, μὴ γίνεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταὶ σκυθρωποί, ἀφανίζουσιν γὰρ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν ὅπως φανῶσιν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις νηστεύοντες· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀπέχουσιν τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν.

The teaching about fasting in *Did.* 8 is, at one level, not close to teaching about fasting that occurs in Matt. 6. Both texts talk about ‘fasting’ and about the need to be different from the ‘hypocrites’. However, the way in which one is to distinguish oneself from those implicitly attacked is quite different: in Matthew it is via a totally different attitude and manner of fasting, in secret as opposed to publicly; in the *Didache* it is simply a matter of fasting on different days of the week. For some, this is an indication that the two texts are not directly related to each other at all.⁷² On the other hand, the close proximity of this text to the teaching about prayer, and the giving of the Lord’s Prayer in both contexts (cf. the next parallel: it is adjacent in both the *Didache* and in Matthew) is noteworthy. Further, the talk of one’s opponents as ‘hypocrites’ is very characteristic of Matthew and, one suspects, owes quite a lot to MattR. This is of course not to say that every other reference in Christian literature to ‘hypocrites’ must be dependent on Matthew.⁷³ Nevertheless, the agreement in language is striking. Moreover, the change in application of the language from Matthew might simply be due to Matthew becoming an ‘authoritative’ text, which, by virtue of being such, lent itself more readily to being reapplied to new situations. Thus the parallel between the *Didache* and Matthew might be more readily explained if Matthew’s teaching was known in the community of the Didachist and has been reapplied here to a new situation.

⁷² Cf. Draper, ‘Jesus Tradition’, 85; Rordorf, ‘Jesus Tradition’, 422; Milavec, ‘Synoptic Tradition’, 457.

⁷³ Assuming Marcan priority, the occurrence in Mark 7. 6 is manifestly not.

Did. 8. 2

μηδὲ προσεύχεσθε ὡς οἱ

ὑποκριταί

ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκέλευσεν ὁ

κύριος

ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ αὐτοῦ,

οὕτω προσεύχεσθε

πάτηρ ἡμῶν

ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ,

ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου

ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου

γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου,

ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς,

τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν

ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν

σήμερον,

καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὴν ὀφειλήν

ἡμῶν,

ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίμεν τοῖς

ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν,

καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς

εἰς πειρασμόν,

ἀλλὰ ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ

πονηροῦ,

ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ δύναμις καὶ

ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας

Matt. 6. 5, 9–13

⁵ Καὶ ὅταν προσεύχησθε,
οὐκ

ἔσεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταί

⁹ Οὕτως οὖν προσεύχεσθε
ὑμεῖς·

πάτερ ἡμῶν

ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς,

ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου

¹⁰ ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου

γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου,

ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς·

¹¹ τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν

ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν

σήμερον·

¹² καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ

ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν,

ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν

τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν·

¹³ καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς

εἰς πειρασμόν,

ἀλλὰ ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ

πονηροῦ.

Luke 11. 2–4

² Ὅταν προσεύχησθε
λέγετε,

Πάτερ,

ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου·

ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου·

³ τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν

ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ

καθ' ἡμέραν·

⁴ καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰς

ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν,

καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίμεν

παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν·

καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς

εἰς πειρασμόν

The next part of the teaching in the *Didache* is the giving of the Lord's Prayer. It is well known that the version of the prayer given here is extremely close to that of Matthew, and is certainly far closer to the Matthean version than to the Lucan version.⁷⁴ Further, the *Didache* shares with Matthew in the same context a warning not to pray like the 'hypocrites' (cf. Matt. 6. 5). At one level, there is clearly a strong case for arguing that the *Didache* is closely related to Matthew's gospel.

How close, of course, is another matter. As with the command about baptism, the specific prayer here was presumably one that was prayed—

⁷⁴ Cf. the address to God as 'Our Father who art in heaven', rather than as just 'Father', the inclusion of the 'Thy will be done...' petition, as well as the 'deliver us from evil' clause.

regularly—by Christians in the communities of both Matthew and the *Didache*. Hence any version of the prayer that is presented in either text is likely to have been influenced by the form in which the prayer was actually prayed in the community/ies to which each writer belonged. One does not need to resort to dependence on, and/or knowledge of, a written gospel text such as the gospel of Matthew to explain the text of the *Didache* here.

Some have referred to differences between the versions of the prayer in the *Didache* and in Matthew, arguing that these show that the *Didache* cannot have copied from Matthew.⁷⁵ For example, the *Didache* has a doxology at the end of the prayer (though so also do some MSS of Matthew); in addition, there are some fairly small differences between the two texts: for example, in the opening phrase, the *Didache* refers to our Father in ‘heaven’ (singular), whereas Matthew has ‘in the heavens’ (plural); the *Didache* speaks of forgiving our ‘debt’ (singular), whereas Matthew has ‘debts’ (plural); the *Didache* speaks of ‘we forgiving’ others’ debts in a present tense, whereas Matthew has a perfect tense. On the other hand, no one has ever pretended that the *Didache* was, or was trying to be, a perfect scribal copy of the text of Matthew! In fact, the differences are for the most part extremely small, and can be explained perfectly adequately while still positing a close relationship between the two versions of the prayer.⁷⁶

This is also the first time that the *Didache* mentions a *εὐαγγέλιον*. Three other occurrences of the word appear elsewhere in the text (11. 3; 15. 3, 4). The precise force of this is much debated. It is well known that the word *εὐαγγέλιον* underwent a significant semantic shift at some stage during the course of the first two Christian centuries, from meaning the Christian proclamation, or message, to referring to a written book or text. Where the usages in the *Didache* are to be placed in this semantic development is much disputed. However, as Kelhoffer has argued forcefully, one should not confuse issues here: whether the *Didache* here refers to a book or not, and whether the *Didache* is dependent specifically on Matthew’s gospel, are two logically separable problems.⁷⁷ The evidence here is probably not clear one way or the other. It is said here that ‘the Lord’ ‘commanded’ in his ‘gospel’. If the ‘Lord’ is Jesus, then one could translate *εὐαγγέλιον* as something like ‘preaching’: ‘as the Lord commanded during the course of his preaching and

⁷⁵ Cf. Audet, *Didachè*, 173; Glover, ‘Didache’s Quotations’, 19; Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 205–7; Draper, ‘Jesus Tradition’, 86; Milavec, ‘Synoptic Tradition’, 452 f.

⁷⁶ See esp. J. A. Kelhoffer, ‘“How Soon a Book” Revisited: *ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ* as a Reference to “Gospel” Materials in the First Half of the Second Century’, *ZNW* 95 (2004), 1–34, on pp. 17–22.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, *passim*.

teaching'. There is no clear signal indicating that the *εὐαγγέλιον* here is something written which is to be read.⁷⁸ On the other hand, as we shall see, the other references to a *εὐαγγέλιον* in the *Didache* seem to point more clearly to a written text. It is likely (though of course by no means absolutely necessary) that the four references to a 'gospel' use the word in the same way. Hence it may be that, here too, the reference is to the version of the prayer as written in a text, and the most obvious text likely to be in mind is the gospel of Matthew.⁷⁹

Overall, it seems hard to resist the notion that there is some relationship between the *Didache* and Matthew here. Clearly the *Didache* is no slavish copy of the text of Matthew; and liturgical influence has almost certainly been at work in shaping the text of the *Didache*. Hence the *Didache* is probably 'dependent' primarily on the version of the Lord's Prayer as this was prayed (daily) in the community. But equally, the version of the prayer, and possibly too the reference here to a 'gospel', may indicate that that community had been significantly informed by the text of the gospel of Matthew.

Did. 9. 5

καὶ γὰρ περὶ τούτου εἶρηκεν ὁ κύριος
μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἄγιον τοῖς κυσίν

Matt. 7. 6

Μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἄγιον τοῖς κυσίν

Did. 9. 5 is another instance where the Didachist signals explicitly his or her intention to quote—here what 'the Lord said'. The verbal agreement with Matt. 7. 6 is notable. On the other hand, there is nothing really to indicate that the verse in Matthew is due to MattR. Further, the saying looks very much like a stock proverb.⁸⁰ Hence there is nothing to require that Matthew's gospel be the source for the *Didache*'s wording and 'citation' here. Certainly a theory of dependence on Matthew would fit the evidence here, but one cannot say more.

Did. 11. 2–4

ἐὰν δὲ αὐτὸς ὁ διδάσκων στραφεῖς διδάσκη
ἄλλην διδαχὴν εἰς τὸ καταλύσαι, μὴ αὐτοῦ
ἀκούσητε· εἷς δὲ τὸ προσθεῖναι
δικαιοσύνην

Matt. 10. 40–1

Ὁ δεχόμενος ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ δέχεται, καὶ ὁ ἐμὲ
δεχόμενος δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.

⁷⁸ For the view that *εὐαγγέλιον* in the *Didache* here means the preached message, see Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 10; also his *Ancient Christian Gospels* (London: SCM Press; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990), 16–17. But see now Kelhoffer's response.

⁷⁹ Cf. Köhler, *Rezeption*, 26–7, and see below on 15. 3–4. See too Garrow, *Matthew's Dependence*, ch. 8, arguing that the four occurrences are all clear references to the gospel of Matthew, though he argues that this is a relatively late redactional layer in the growth of the *Didache* as a whole, and hence that these passages do not imply that the rest of the *Didache* presupposes the text of Matthew.

⁸⁰ R. Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1968), 103.

καὶ γνώσιν κυρίου, δέξασθε αὐτὸν ὡς
κύριον.

³ Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν,
κατὰ τὸ δόγμα τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὕτω
ποιήσατε.

⁴ πᾶς δὲ ἀπόστολος ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ὑμᾶς
δεχθήτω ὡς κύριος.

⁴¹ ὁ δεχόμενος προφήτην εἰς ὄνομα
προφήτου μισθὸν προφήτου λήμψεται,
καὶ ὁ δεχόμενος δίκαιον εἰς ὄνομα δικαίου
μισθὸν δικαίου λήμψεται.

The parallel noted here between *Did.* 11. 2–4 and Matt. 10. 40–1 is at best a parallel in ideas: the verbal agreement between the two passages is slight. On the other hand, this is another of the passages in the *Didache* which refers to a *εὐαγγέλιον*. The reference here is to a ‘δόγμα of the gospel’. If *εὐαγγέλιον* here means ‘preaching’ (or some such), the reference to a *δόγμα* in it seems a little odd, and it perhaps makes more sense to see *εὐαγγέλιον* here as a reference to a written text.⁸¹ If so, then the likeliest candidate is again the gospel of Matthew, with perhaps the text in Matt. 10. 40–1 in mind and (relatively loosely) alluded to here. Certainly Matthew consistently uses the verb *δέχομαι* in the context of a saying like this, and it is Matthew who applies the saying to Christian followers of Jesus in their preaching/‘missionary’ activity.⁸² The lack of close verbal agreement here makes any theory of possible dependence a little uncertain. Nevertheless, the evidence would certainly be adequately explained by such a theory (though with a rider that any ‘dependence’ here, if it exists, is then clearly shown to be not one of careful copying by the later writer, and the ‘use’ made of Matthew is one of more allusive reference than exact citation).

| <i>Did.</i> 11. 7 | Matt. 12. 31–2 | Mark 3. 28–9 | Luke 12. 10 |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|
| πᾶσα γὰρ ἁμαρτία | ³¹ πᾶσα ἁμαρτία καὶ | ²⁸ πάντα ἀφεθήσεται | |
| ἀφεθήσεται, | βλασφημία | τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν | |
| αὕτη δὲ ἡ | ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς | ἀνθρώπων τὰ | |
| ἁμαρτία | ἀνθρώποις, ἡ δὲ τοῦ | ἁμαρτήματα καὶ αἱ | |
| οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται. | πνεύματος | βλασφημίαι ὅσα ἐὰν | |
| | βλασφημία | βλασφημήσωσιν | |
| | οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται. | | |

⁸¹ Hence *contra*, e.g., Lake, ‘The Didache’, 30 f.; Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 10; for the view taken above, see Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 132; Kelhoffer, ‘ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ’, 23–4.

⁸² Contrast e.g. Mark 9. 37 which applies the saying to the ‘receiving’ of a little child. See Kelhoffer, “How Soon a Book”.

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>³²καὶ ὃς ἐὰν εἴπη λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· ὃς δ' ἂν εἴπη κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἀγίου,</p> | <p>²⁹ὃς δ' ἂν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀλλὰ ἔνοχός ἐστὶν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος.</p> | <p>πάσ ὃς ἔρει λόγον εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· τῷ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα βλασφημήσαντι</p> |
| <p>οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.</p> | | <p>οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται.</p> |

The saying about the unforgivable sin here may provide further evidence for some form of dependence by the *Didache* on Matthew. The evidence is very slight in extent, and the synoptic evidence is somewhat complicated. On the 'standard' Two Source theory, the passage constitutes a 'Mark–Q overlap'. However, in so far as it is possible to determine the Q wording, *Didache* here appears to show agreement with Matthew's redaction of Mark, rather than with the Q version.⁸³ Thus *Did.* 11 agrees with Matthew's redaction of Mark 3. 28 in the clause *πάσα ἁμαρτία . . . ἀφεθήσεται*. Mark has a different construction; and the Q version, if Luke is anything like a reliable guide, seems to have spoken of someone 'speaking against' other people/the Son of Man/the Holy Spirit, and of this there is nothing in the *Didache's* version. The second part of the saying in the *Didache* has been modelled very precisely on the first half. *ἁμαρτία* in the second half has no precise parallel in any Synoptic version, although *οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται* agrees with Matthew again (Matt. 12. 31b, 32b, also Luke 12. 10b). Köster admits that the *Didache* is closer to Matthew than to the other synoptic versions here, but denies direct dependence in view of the lack of any significant features.⁸⁴ However, it remains the case that such links as exist seem to be with features that are redactional in Matthew. Once again, this may provide a further pointer in support of a theory of dependence of the

⁸³ *Contra* Glover, 'Didache's Quotations', 20. Glover argues that the *Didache* here rejects words common to Matthew and Mark alone, but not in Luke, and also has some words in Matthew but not in Mark. But then, appealing to Streeter, he claims that Matthew here has conflated carefully his two sources so that every word in Matthew comes from one or other of Mark or Q; hence the non-Marcian words in Matthew must be from Q and omitted by Luke. This simply excludes a priori any possibility of Matthew actively redacting the Marcan (and Q) version(s).

⁸⁴ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 216 f. Cf. too Rordorf and Tuilier, *Doctrine*, 53, 88.

Didache on Matthew, though once again with the rider that any parallels are more by way of allusions than strict citations.

Did. 13. 1

Matt. 10. 10

Luke 10. 7

πᾶς δὲ προφήτης ἀληθινὸς
θέλων καθῆσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς

ἄξιός ἐστι
τῆς τροφῆς αὐτοῦ.

ἄξιος γὰρ ὁ ἐργάτης
τῆς τροφῆς αὐτοῦ.

ἄξιος γὰρ ὁ ἐργάτης
τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ.

1 Cor. 9. 14: οὕτως καὶ ὁ κύριος διέταξεν τοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καταγγέλλουσιν ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ζῆν.

1 Tim. 5. 18: Ἄξιος ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ.

The same may also be implied by the saying about the workman. The saying is clearly close to the Q saying found in Matt. 10. 10 // Luke 10. 7, and is closer to Matthew in talking about the workman being worthy of his ‘food’ rather than his ‘hire’. Certainty is not possible, but it seems likely that Luke’s version is more original, and that Matthew’s *τροφῆς* is MattR.⁸⁵ The parallels in Paul and deuterio-Paul must be noted, but it is unlikely that they are directly relevant in this context: the passage in 1 Cor. 9 is clearly an allusion (though in very general terms) to the gospel tradition; and the passage in 1 Tim. 5 may well be dependent in turn on 1 Cor. 9 and/or the gospel passage(s). Most probably the *Didache* is to be seen here as primarily parallel to the gospel passages; and of the two, it is closer to Matthew’s version, which in turn may well be redactional: hence once again the *Didache* appears to show knowledge of Matthew’s redactional work, and hence probably presupposes Matthew’s finished gospel.

Did. 15. 3–4: Ἐλέγχετε δὲ ἀλλήλους μὴ ἐν ὀργῇ, ἀλλ’ ἐν εἰρήνῃ ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ· καὶ παντὶ ἀστοχοῦντι κατὰ τοῦ ἐτέρου μηδεὶς λαλεῖτω μηδὲ παρ’ ὑμῶν ἀκουέτω ἕως οὗ μετανοήσῃ. ⁴τὰς δὲ εὐχὰς ὑμῶν καὶ τὰς ἐλεημοσύνας καὶ πάσας τὰς πράξεις οὕτω ποιήσατε, ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

No gospel parallel texts have been given alongside the above passage, if only because any ‘parallels’ in the gospels are not verbally close. This is, however, the last of the passages in the *Didache* which refer to a *εὐαγγέλιον*. Of all four references, these two are thought by many to be the most likely to refer to a written text rather than to (oral) preaching. Certainly the reference to *Did.* 15. 3, which speaks of ‘finding’ in ‘the’ gospel (used absolutely, i.e., not the ‘gospel of the Lord’) seems to suggest that ‘the gospel’ is a relatively fixed entity which can be consulted independently. As such, it seems to fit a referent as a book

⁸⁵ This is the judgement of the IQP: cf. Robinson, Hoffman, and Kloppenborg, *Critical Edition*, 170; Tuckett, ‘Synoptic Tradition’, 210, for further references.

much better than being a reference to the general ‘preaching’ (of Jesus, or the church).⁸⁶

If the references here are to a written gospel, once again Matthew seems to be the likeliest candidate. The (general) reference to ‘prayers and alms[giving]’ links closely with the teaching which appears in Matthew 6 concerning prayers and almsgiving (much of which may have already been picked up earlier in *Did.* 8). Further, the instruction not to speak with an unrepentant brother is clearly close in general terms (but by no means a precise verbal ‘citation’) of the teaching appearing in Matt. 18. 15–17.⁸⁷ As before, the nature of any possible ‘dependence’ should be noted: the ‘allusion’ is quite unspecific, referring the hearer or reader in general terms to the teaching on these broad topics to be found elsewhere. At least, then, this part of the *Didache* seems to know of a written text known as a ‘gospel’, and probably (but not absolutely certainly) knew the gospel of Matthew in this connection.

Didache 16

Did. 16. 1

γρηγορεῖτε ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς
ὑμῶν· οἱ λύχνοι ὑμῶν μὴ
σβεσθήτωσαν, καὶ αἱ ὀσφύες
ὑμῶν μὴ ἐκλυέσθωσαν, ἀλλὰ
γίνεσθε ἕτοιμοι.

οὐ γὰρ οἶδατε τὴν ὥραν,
ἐν ἣ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν ἔρχεται.

Matt. 24. 42

γρηγορεῖτε ὄν,

Matt 25. 13

Γρηγορεῖτε ὄν, ὅτι οὐκ
οἶδατε τὴν ἡμέραν οὐδὲ τὴν
ὥραν.

ὅτι οὐκ οἶδατε ποία ἡμέρα ὁ
κύριος ὑμῶν ἔρχεται.

Mark 13. 35

γρηγορεῖτε ὄν.

Luke 12. 35

Ἔστωσαν ὑμῶν αἱ ὀσφύες
περιεζωσμέναι καὶ οἱ
λύχνοι καιόμενοι·

Mark 13. 35

οὐκ οἶδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ
κύριος τῆς οἰκίας ἔρχεται

The final chapter of the *Didache* presents an extraordinarily complex set of parallels, with a range of passages from the synoptic gospels, and it is not at all

⁸⁶ This is conceded even by Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, esp. 11; see too Wengst, *Didache*, 26; Rordorf and Tuilier, *Doctrine*, 88; Draper, ‘Jesus Tradition’, 76; Knoch, ‘Kenntnis’, 164; Köhler, *Rezeption*, 27; Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence*, 131–2. (Both the latter ascribe the sections to a later redactional layer, and hence firmly resist any idea of generalizing from these passages to any theory involving the rest of the material in the *Didache*.) Garrow is also critical (probably rightly) of Köster’s attempt to interpret *εὐαγγέλιον* differently in different passages of the *Didache*.

⁸⁷ Cf. Kelhoffer, ‘ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ’, 27, and others.

certain how these parallels are to be interpreted. The general exhortation to 'watch' in *Did.* 16. 1 illustrates the complexity well. The introductory call to 'watch' is parallel to Matt. 24. 42 (MattR of Mark 13. 33, but the phrase also occurs in Mark 13. 35). The saying about the lamps and loins is close to (but not identical with) Luke 12. 35; and the saying about being 'ready for you do not know...' is close to the ending of the parable of the thief in the night in Matt. 24. 44 // Luke 12. 40 and the similar saying in Matt. 24. 42 // Mark 13. 35.

It is certainly not possible to be dogmatic about the relationships implied here. One must bear in mind again the fact that this is not an explicit quotation, but a piece of exhortation perhaps using traditional language. Thus it is not unexpected that the uses of individual words may have shifted slightly from their synoptic contexts.⁸⁸ There is nothing here that is so clearly MattR that it could only have derived from Matthew's gospel.⁸⁹

More difficult to assess is the possible parallel between *Did.* 16. 1a and Luke 12. 35. Some have seen this as clear evidence of the *Didache's* dependence on Luke.⁹⁰ Others have disagreed, arguing variously that Luke 12. 35 may be Q material, so that the *Didache* here is dependent on Q rather than Luke,⁹¹ that the language and imagery is stereotypical (cf. 1 Pet. 1. 13; Eph. 6. 14),⁹² that the verbal agreement between the *Didache* and Luke is not close enough to imply direct dependence,⁹³ or that the *Didache* nowhere else shows knowledge of Luke's gospel and hence is unlikely to do so here.⁹⁴ Others again have been agnostic.⁹⁵

It must be said that none of the arguments against dependence on Luke is fully convincing. The argument appealing to lack of Lucan parallels elsewhere is somewhat circular and unpersuasive. If nothing else, it appears to prejudice the discussion of other possible parallels between the *Didache* and Luke (see, e.g., below on *Did.* 1. 4). With regard to the allegedly stereotyped

⁸⁸ Cf., e.g., Balabanski, *Eschatology*, 198, who refers to the significant shift in meaning in the command to 'watch', from referring to watching for the imminent end to being careful about ongoing daily life.

⁸⁹ Of the possible Matthean parallels, that involving the final phrase here in the *Didache* is perhaps the most significant, though the verbal agreement between the *Didache* and Matthew is not exact (cf. *Didache's* 'our Lord' versus Matthew's 'your Lord'; cf. Mark's 'lord of the house'), and one cannot build too much on this.

⁹⁰ Butler, 'Literary Relations', 265–8, appeals to the parallels between *Did.* 16. 1a, 1b, and Luke 12. 35, 40, and argues that the link in Luke is due to LkR.

⁹¹ Glover, 'Didache's Quotations', 21–2; Draper, 'Jesus Tradition', 87; also Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 511 (for this one saying).

⁹² Draper, 'Jesus Tradition', *ibid.*; Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 175–6; Wengst, *Didache*, 99.

⁹³ Audet, *Didachè*, 181; Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, *ibid.*

⁹⁴ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*; Rordorf and Tuilier, *Doctrine*, 89–90.

⁹⁵ Gregory, *Reception*, 119–20.

language and imagery, each of the images ('loins girded' and 'lamps') can be paralleled separately, but the conjunction of the two is not so easy to find. Whether Luke 12. 35 belonged to Q is more debatable. More recent study has suggested that, whilst Luke 12. 36–8 may (in part at least) derive from Q, v. 35 is more likely to be LkR.⁹⁶ This might then suggest that the *Didache* is dependent on LkR material, and hence presupposes Luke's finished gospel. Nevertheless, the lack of precise verbal agreement between the *Didache* and Luke here must make this suggestion by no means certain.

Did. 16. 3–8

³ ἐν γὰρ ταῖς ἐσχάταις
ἡμέραις πληθυνθήσονται οἱ
ψευδοπροφήται καὶ οἱ
φθορεῖς, καὶ στραφήσονται
τὰ πρόβατα εἰς λύκους, καὶ ἡ
ἀγάπη στραφήσεται εἰς
μῖσος.

Matthew

24. 10–12

καὶ τότε
σκανδαλισθήσονται πολλοὶ
καὶ ἀλλήλους
παραδώσουσιν καὶ
μισήσουσιν ἀλλήλους·
¹¹ καὶ πολλοὶ
ψευδοπροφήται
ἐγερθήσονται καὶ
πλανήσουσιν πολλούς·

¹² καὶ διὰ τὸ πληθυνθῆναι
τὴν ἀνομίαν ψυγήσεται ἡ
ἀγάπη τῶν πολλῶν.

7. 15

Προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν
ψευδοπροφητῶν, οἳ τινες
ψευδοπροφητῶν, οἳ τινες
ἔρχονται πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν
ἐνδύμασιν προβάτων,
ἕσωθεν
δέ εἰσιν λύκοι ἄρπαγες.

Mark

⁴ αὐξανούσης γὰρ τῆς

ἀνομίας
μισήσουσιν ἀλλήλους καὶ
διώξουσι καὶ παραδώσουσι,
καὶ τότε φανήσεται ὁ

24. 24

ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ
ψευδόχριστοι καὶ
ψευδοπροφήται καὶ
δώσουσιν

13. 22

ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ
ψευδόχριστοι καὶ
ψευδοπροφήται καὶ
δώσουσιν

⁹⁶ See C. M. Tuckett, *The Revival of the Griesbach Hypothesis*, SNTSMS 44 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 181, with further references.

κοσμοπλανῆς ὡς υἱὸς θεοῦ
καὶ ποιήσει σημεῖα καὶ
τέρατα, καὶ ἡ γῆ
παραδοθήσεται εἰς χεῖρας
αὐτοῦ, καὶ ποιήσει ἀθέμιτα,

ἃ οὐδέποτε γέγονεν ἐξ
αιῶνος.

⁵ τότε ἤξει ἡ κτίσις τῶν
ἀνθρώπων εἰς τὴν πύρωσιν
τῆς δοκιμασίας, καὶ
σκανδαλισθήσονται πολλοὶ
καὶ ἀπολοῦνται,

οἱ δὲ ὑπομείναντες ἐν τῇ
πίστει αὐτῶν σωθήσονται
ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ καταθέματος,

⁶ καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὰ
σημεῖα τῆς ἀληθείας· πρῶτον
σημεῖον ἐκπετάσεως ἐν
οὐρανῷ εἶτα σημεῖον φωνῆς
σάλπιγγος, καὶ τὸ τρίτον
ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν.

⁷ οὐ πάντων δέ, ἀλλ ὡς
ἐρρέθη· ἤξει ὁ κύριος καὶ
πάντες οἱ ἄγιοι μετ' αὐτοῦ.

⁸ τότε ὄψεται ὁ κόσμος τὸν
κύριον ἐρχόμενον ἐπάνω τῶν
νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

σημεῖα μεγάλα καὶ
τέρατα ὥστε
πλανῆσαι, εἰ δυνατόν,
καὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς·

²¹ οἷα οὐ γέγονεν
ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κόσμου

24. 13

ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος
οὗτος σωθήσεται.

24. 30

καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὸ
σημεῖον τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ
ἀνθρώπου

³¹ καὶ ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς
ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ μετὰ
σάλπιγγος μεγάλης,

24. 30

καὶ ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ
ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ
τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης
πολλῆς·

σημεῖα καὶ
τέρατα πρὸς τὸ
ἀποπλανᾶν, εἰ δυνατόν,
τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς.

¹⁹ οἷα οὐ γέγονεν τοιαύτη
ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως

13. 13

ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος
οὗτος σωθήσεται.

13. 26

καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν
τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν
νεφέλαις
μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ
δόξης.

Dan. 7. 13, LXX: ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὄραματι τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦρχετο καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν παρῆν καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες παρῆσαν αὐτῷ

The cluster of parallels between *Did.* 16 and passages from the synoptic gospels (predominantly Matthew) is extremely complex. There are few, if any, direct parallels between longer phrases in the *Didache* and in any of the gospels. Rather, it is a case of similar language and (possibly significant) words in common between the texts. In relation to Matthew, the parallels occur in various places in Matt. 24, but also Matt. 7.

Many who have argued against any dependence of the *Didache* on Matthew's gospel have appealed to a peculiar pattern in the parallels here. It is said that *Did.* 16 shows links only with material peculiar to

Matt. 24 in the synoptic tradition: the *Didache* does not have any links with material from Matt. 24 which Matthew has derived from Mark. Hence, it is argued, the *Didache* is more likely to be dependent on the source(s) which lie behind Matt. 24 and which were available to Matthew alone, since if the *Didache* were dependent on Matthew, one would expect some of Matthew's Marcan material to be reflected as well.⁹⁷ Such an argument is not wholly convincing, however, especially if one considers the whole of *Did.* 16. 3–8.⁹⁸

Didache 16. 4

In *Did.* 16. 4, there is a reference to the *κοσμοπλανής* who will perform 'signs and wonders' (*σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα*) and iniquities *ἃ οὐδέποτε γέγονεν ἐξ αἰῶνος*. The language is similar to that of Matt. 24. 24 // Mark 13. 22, referring to the coming of false messiahs and false prophets who will perform *σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα*, and in Matt. 24. 21 // Mark 13. 19 the coming tribulation is said to be such as has never been (*οὐ γέγονεν*) since the creation of the world. It can be argued that these verbal 'parallels' (or echoes) are not very significant. Both the *Didache* and the synoptics could be reflecting standard eschatological motifs and using OT language.⁹⁹ However, it is clear that the verbal links between *Did.* 16 and Matt. 24 are not confined to material peculiar to Matthew.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁷ See, e.g., Glover, 'Didache's Quotations', 22–5; Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 184 f.; Audet, *Didachè*, 182; Rordorf and Tuilier, *Doctrine*, 90; Kloppenborg, 'Didache 16. 6–8'; Draper, 'Jesus Tradition', 90; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 212; Milavec, 'Synoptic Tradition', 477. This, in general terms, is also the phenomenon to which Garrow appeals in relation to the rest of the *Didache* (see above); however, he here argues, interestingly, that *Did.* 16 might itself be the source of Mark 13 (as well as of Matthew): see Garrow, *Matthew's Dependence*, 191–6. But this raises a host of other issues (e.g., about the relationship between the *Didache* and Mark elsewhere and about whether other Matthew–*Didache* agreements in Marcan material are also mediated through Mark's possible use of the *Didache*), which Garrow does not discuss.

⁹⁸ Kloppenborg, 'Didache 16. 6–8', to whom many later authors refer approvingly, considered only *Did.* 16. 6–8. That there are many parallels between *Did.* 16 and elements peculiar to Matthew in Matt. 24 is undeniable: see below.

⁹⁹ Cf. Deut. 13. 2; Dan. 12. 1 *θ'*: see Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 182. Glover, 'Didache's Quotations', 24, refers to the differences between the *Didache* and the gospels; cf. too Rordorf, 'Jesus Tradition', 415: in the *Didache* it is the (single) 'world deceiver' who performs the signs and wonders, whereas in the gospels it is the (many) false prophets. But this may confuse quotations and allusions: clearly on any showing the *Didache* is not quoting any of the gospels: it might, though, be using language (ultimately) deriving from the gospels to build its own eschatological discourse.

¹⁰⁰ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 184–5, recognizes this, but argues that the parallels here might be with Mark's source, not Mark's gospel. Whether this is actually the case or not is

Didache 16. 5

A similar instance may occur in *Did.* 16. 5: οἱ δὲ ὑπομείναντες . . . σωθήσονται; cf. Matt. 24. 13 // Mark 13. 13 (cf. also Matt. 10. 22): ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος . . . σωθήσεται. Again it can be argued that the parallel is not by itself very significant.¹⁰¹ The language is not unusual in such an eschatological context (cf. Dan. 12. 12; 4 *Ezra* 6. 25), though the verbal agreement between these texts and the *Didache* is not as close as that between the *Didache* and Matthew/Mark.¹⁰² Whether the verse in Mark is part of Mark's *Vorlage* is debatable. But whatever its origins, the parallel here provides another instance of the *Didache* showing verbal links with material which Matthew shares with Mark.

Didache 16. 8

Potentially one of the most significant parallels in this passage occurs in *Did.* 16. 8 with the reference to the Lord coming on the clouds of heaven. With its clear allusion to Dan. 7. 13, the *Didache* is very close here to the wording of Matt. 24. 30, which in turn is (probably) MattR of Mark 13. 26. The *Didache* shares with Mark and Matthew the use of ὄψεται/ὄψονται, and the inversion of the order of the 'coming' and the 'clouds' as compared with Dan. 7. Further, the *Didache* agrees with Matthew's redaction in having the person come 'on' the clouds (ἐπάνω: cf. Matt. ἐπί, Mark ἐν), and adding τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. A priori there is a strong case for seeing the *Didache* here reflecting MattR of Mark, and hence presupposing Matthew's finished gospel.

Others have interpreted the evidence differently. For example, Glover argues that the agreement is due to 'joint borrowing from Dan. vii. 13',¹⁰³

dubious (cf. Tuckett, 'Synoptic Tradition', 202, for more detailed discussion and for the case that, if anything, at least v. 22 in Mark might be MkR). But whatever the ultimate origin of the verses in Mark, the fact remains that the *Didache* here shows agreement with material common to Matthew and Mark. Köster's point might have relevance if one were positing possible dependence of the *Didache* on Mark. But this is unlikely, and the issue is more probably whether the *Didache* might be dependent on Matthew.

¹⁰¹ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 183, again ascribes it to Mark's *Vorlage*, and argues that, since Matthew's wording is dependent on Mark here, this cannot prove the dependence of the *Didache* on Matthew. On its own, this is quite true; but it does add a further example which tells against any claims that all the parallels between *Did.* 16 and Matt. 24 are confined to material peculiar to Matthew.

¹⁰² Pace Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 183, who claims that the passage in 4 *Ezra* is 'fast wörtlich gleich Mk 13,13b par'. Dan. 12. 12 has ὁ ὑπομένων, but no exact parallel to σωθήσεται. 4 *Ezra* 6. 25 has 'omnis qui derelictus fuerit . . . saluabitur', but 'derelictus' is perhaps rather weaker in meaning than the active endurance implied by ὑπομένω.

¹⁰³ Glover, 'Didache's Quotations', 24.

but he provides no explanation for the ways (noted above) in which the three texts agree in differing from Dan. 7. Köster claims that Matthew's 'on the clouds' might have been in Mark's *Vorlage*,¹⁰⁴ but there appears to be no evidence for this. Kloppenborg appeals to some of the differences between the *Didache* and Matthew: e.g., the absence of any reference in Matt. 24. 29 to the 'signs' of heaven mentioned in the *Didache*, and the absence in the *Didache* of the words *μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς*, claiming that 'there is no reason for the author's avoidance of this phrase'.¹⁰⁵ However, any argument from silence is precarious, bearing in mind that the *Didache* here is clearly not attempting to reproduce the full text of Matthew, but is developing its own eschatological discourse; further, any argument based on what is not present at the very end of the text of *Did.* 16 as we have it (i.e., in H) is even more dangerous, since it is widely agreed that the text in H is incomplete and that some text has been lost at the end.¹⁰⁶ Kloppenborg claims that 'Did 16,8 agrees with Mt 24,30 at those points where Matthew disagrees with Mark';¹⁰⁷ but this ignores the features common to the *Didache*, Matthew, and Mark noted above. Kloppenborg's conclusion is that 'Did 16,8 represents an independent tradition under whose influence Matthew altered his Markan source, namely by substituting *ἐπί* for *ἐν* and adding *τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*'.¹⁰⁸ However, both these alterations serve to align the text more closely with the text of Dan. 7. 13, LXX. A tendency by Matthew to conform OT allusions to the LXX version is well documented.¹⁰⁹ Thus 'tradition under whose influence Matthew altered his Markan source' may simply be the LXX version of Dan. 7. Any theory of a special Matthean tradition here is probably unnecessary: rather, the *Didache* aligns itself with Matthew's redaction of Mark.¹¹⁰

The parallels considered so far indicate that *Did.* 16 has links not only with Matthew's special material, but also with material common to Matthew and Mark, and in the last instance considered, presupposes Matthew's redaction of Mark. I consider now the links between *Did.* 16 and material peculiar to Matthew.

¹⁰⁴ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 188.

¹⁰⁵ Kloppenborg, 'Didache 16. 6–8', 63.

¹⁰⁶ Audet, *Didachè*, 73–4; Rordorf and Tuilier, *Doctrine*, 107, 199; Wengst, *Didache*, 20.

¹⁰⁷ Kloppenborg, 'Didache 16. 6–8', 63.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁹ Cf. K. Stendahl, *The School of St Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968), 147 ff.; G. Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 21 ff.

¹¹⁰ For further discussion of other possible explanations, see Tuckett, 'Synoptic Tradition', 204–5.

Didache 16. 3–5

The existence of verbal echoes and possible allusions between *Did.* 16 and material peculiar to Matt. 24 is widely recognized. In *Did.* 16. 3–5 there is a cluster of such echoes, mostly of Matt. 24. 10–12, but also of other passages in Matthew, though in no case could one say there is anything like a ‘citation’. ‘False prophets being multiplied’ in *Did.* 16. 3 uses similar vocabulary to Matt. 24. 11–12 (‘false prophets’ in Matt. 24. 11, being ‘multiplied’ in Matt. 24. 12); ‘sheep becoming wolves’ in *Did.* 16. 3 uses imagery similar to that of Matt. 7. 15; ‘love turning to hate’ reflects Matt. 24. 10, 12 (‘love’ in v. 10, ‘hate’ in v. 12); an increase in ἀνομία (*Did.* 16. 4) is similar to Matt. 24. 12 (ἀνομία multiplying); and σκανδαλισθήσονται πολλοί in *Did.* 16. 5 reflects the identical words in Matt. 24. 10. In fact, all the parallels to *Did.* 16. 3–5 in Matthew include the three references in Matthew to ‘false prophets’ (Matt. 7. 15; 24. 10–12; 24. 24). This might be readily explained if the Didachist were attempting to cull from Matthew language and ideas associated with false prophets. This might then go some way to explaining what might appear at first sight to be a rather random set of parallels in Matthew.¹¹¹

Within Matthean scholarship, there is widespread agreement that, e.g., Matt. 24. 10–12 may be due to MattR.¹¹² However, from the side of Didachean scholarship, others have disagreed. Some have pointed to the fact that the common words are used in very different ways in the *Didache* and Matthew as evidence of the independence of the two writings.¹¹³ However, such an argument does tend to assume that the *Didache* is ‘quoting’ synoptic tradition, whereas there is at best here only allusion and use of common language.

In a significant part of his argument, Köster also claims that, while the parallels between the *Didache* and Matthew here undoubtedly exist, the level of verbal agreement is insufficient to show dependence, and hence both depend on common tradition; further, *Did.* 16 itself might provide part of

¹¹¹ Cf. the way in which it is almost impossible to set out the parallels in a neat synopsis: the parallels in Matthew to the words of the *Didache* appear in a bewilderingly complex ‘pattern’.

¹¹² See, e.g., J. Lambrecht, ‘The Parousia Discourse: Composition and Content in Mt. XXIV–XXV’, in M. Didier (ed.), *L’Evangile de Matthieu* (Gembloux: Duculot, 1972), 320; R. H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on his Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1982), 479; U. Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 18–25)*, (EKK i/3 (Zürich: Benziger; and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1997), 409; Balabanski, *Eschatology*, 185. One can point to a number of words and phrases here that seem to be highly characteristic of Matthew: e.g., καὶ τότε, σκανδαλίζομαι, πλανῶ, ψευδοπροφήτης, ἀνομία, etc.

¹¹³ Glover, ‘Didache’s Quotations’, 23; Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 178, 180–1.

the evidence that Matt. 24. 10–12 is a piece of pre-Matthean tradition.¹¹⁴ However, such an argument is in danger of becoming somewhat circular in the present context: since the issue here of whether Matt. 24. 10–12 is MattR or pre-Matthean bears directly on the issue of the *Didache's* possible dependence on Matthew, it is dangerous to use the evidence of the *Didache* itself to provide an answer to the first issue (effectively assuming the *Didache's* independence) and then use this 'result' to decide the second issue of the *Didache's* independence.¹¹⁵

Overall it is certainly possible to argue that Matt. 24. 10–12 owes much to Matthew's redactional activity. If this is the case, then the parallels with *Did.* 16 may indicate that the *Didache* here presupposes Matthew's finished work.

Didache 16. 6

Parallels between *Did.* 16. 6 and Matt. 24. 30a, 31, are also widely recognized (e.g., the common use of *φανήσεται, σημεῖον, ἐν οὐρανῷ, σάλπιγξ*). Again, many would ascribe this material to MattR in Matthew,¹¹⁶ though the limited extent of the evidence makes certainty impossible. In defending the *Didache's* possible independence, reference has again been made to the differences between the two texts here.¹¹⁷ But again we should note that, whatever the *Didache* is doing, it is not attempting to reproduce the text of Matthew. Others too have pointed to the fact that *Did.* 16. 6 has links only with material peculiar to Matthew.¹¹⁸ This is certainly true for *Did.* 16. 6, but in 16. 8, as we have seen, the situation is rather different. Each of the motifs here may be using stock apocalyptic images (e.g., the trumpet); but the collocation of all these motifs in both *Did.* 16 and Matt. 24 is still striking.

¹¹⁴ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 181, 184. Cf. too Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, iii. 327, for a similar appeal to the *Didache* to make deductions about possible sources of Matthew. See too Rordorf, 'Jesus Tradition', 417–18, for a defence (against my earlier essay) of Köster's argument.

¹¹⁵ See further, Balabanski, *Eschatology*, 184–5, on the fundamental difference between my earlier argument and that of, e.g., Rordorf: Rordorf and others are primarily 'source critics'; in dealing with Matt. 24. 10–12, the assumption is implicitly made that these verses must derive from another source (since they clearly do not derive from Mark 13). The possibility of redactional creation is almost excluded a priori.

¹¹⁶ Cf. Lambrecht, 'Parousia Discourse', 324; Gundry, *Matthew*, 488.

¹¹⁷ Glover, 'Didache's Quotations', 24–5; Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 184–5.

¹¹⁸ Glover, 'Didache's Quotations', 24–5; Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 184–5; also Klopberg, 'Didache 16. 6–8', 64–5.

Conclusion

The conclusion of this section is that there is nothing peculiar in the pattern of verbal parallels in *Did.* 16 and Matt. 24. The *Didache* here shows verbal parallels with material peculiar to Matthew, with material common to Matthew and Mark, and with Matthew's redaction of Mark. There is little convincing evidence to show that Matthew had access to any extensive source other than Mark for this chapter. One must again recall that the *Didache* is clearly not attempting to reproduce the text of Matthew, but is developing its own argument and rhetorically structured chapter to conclude the work.¹¹⁹ The pattern of parallels may be most easily explained if the *Didache* here presupposes Matthew's finished gospel.

Didache 1. 3–2. 1

The final section to be examined here is *Did.* 1. 3–2. 1. This is an extraordinarily complex passage. As already noted, it may be a secondary expansion to the Two Ways source probably underlying the rest of *Did.* 1–6 (though that does not necessarily mean that it represents a later addition to the *Didache* itself: see above). The passage contains a number of clear echoes of parts of the Sermon on the Mount in Matt. 5 with parallels in Luke. In turn, this material in the gospels is extremely complex: the parallels are mostly Q material, and there is no unanimity about what is the more original form of the tradition at any point.

Recent studies of the *Didache* have also differed in their assessments of the parallels here. Contrary to his general conclusions about the rest of the *Didache*, Köster argues here that the text does presuppose the finished gospels of Matthew and Luke, and this has been supported by the detailed study of Layton.¹²⁰ Others have argued that the *Didache* here represents an independent line of the tradition.¹²¹ The evidence often appears to be indeterminate and does not point clearly one way or the other. Nevertheless, there

¹¹⁹ Garrow, *Matthew's Dependence*, ch. 13, makes much of the rhetorical structure of the chapter in the *Didache*, and seeks to show that vestiges of this appear also in Matthew and Mark. Balabanski, *Eschatology*, 192–5, argues that the broad structure of *Did.* 16 is determined by the discourse in Matt. 24 (in debate primarily with Köhler). Lindemann, 'Entzitrede', 157, speaks of *Did.* 16 as 'eine Art "Kommentierung" der Aussagen in Mt 24'.

¹²⁰ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 217 ff.; Layton, 'Sources'; for others supporting dependence here, cf. Butler, 'Two Ways'; Massaux, *Influence*, 608–13.

¹²¹ Rordorf, 'Problème'; Köhler, *Rezeption*, 46; also Audet, *Didachè*, 166–86; Glover, 'Didache's Quotations', *passim*; Milavec, 'Synoptic Tradition', 461–5. Draper, 'Jesus Tradition', argues that the *Didache* depends on Q.

may be a few instances indicating possible dependence of the *Didache* on the NT gospels. I consider each parallel briefly in turn.

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <i>Did.</i> 1. 3 | Matt. 5. 44 <i>ἀγαπάτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν</i> | Luke 6. 27–8 <i>ἀγαπάτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς, εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς, προσεύχεσθε περὶ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς.</i> |
| <i>εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμῶν καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑμῶν, νηστεύετε δὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς</i> | <i>καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς,</i> | |

Rom. 12. 14: *εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας [ὑμᾶς], εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε.*

The evidence is probably ambiguous for the present purposes. The ‘love of enemies’ saying in the *Didache* is perhaps closer to Luke 6. 27–8 than to Matt. 5. 44: the *Didache* has an exact parallel to the ‘bless those who curse you’ clause of Luke 6. 28a, which has no parallel in (at least the ‘best’ MSS of) Matthew.¹²² Although there is no explicit parallel to the command to ‘love one’s enemies’, the rhetorical question which follows in the next section (‘if you love those who love you...’) seems to presuppose a command here to ‘love’ those who are not well disposed to one. Moreover, the *Didache* has a clause at the end of the next section (‘love those who hate you’) which is parallel to both halves of Luke 6. 27 (‘love your enemies and do good to *those who hate you*’). Thus the whole of the longer, fourfold command to love one’s enemies (as in Luke) seems to be presupposed by the *Didache* here.

It is not certain, however, whether Luke’s fourfold form of the saying, or Matthew’s twofold one, is more original and which might be redactional. But even if one were to decide that Matthew’s twofold form is the more original,¹²³ the presence of a (rough) parallel to Luke 6. 28a in Rom. 12. 14

¹²² The clause is present, however, in some, predominantly ‘Western’ MSS of Matthew. One must bear in mind that, if the *Didache* did know Matthew’s gospel, it probably was not precisely the text of NA²⁷! But Glover’s claim that the *Didache* agrees with Luke only when it ‘is covering ground common to both Luke and Matthew’ (‘*Didache*’s Quotations’, 14), which he uses to posit some relationship between the *Didache* and Q, is clearly true only in the most general terms here.

¹²³ So Robinson *et al.*, *Critical Edition*, 56.

may suggest that Luke added a traditional exhortation here, rather than creating the clause himself. The one part of Luke 6. 27–8 which is widely accepted as LkR is *καλῶς ποεῖτε* (which links with the references to ‘doing good’ later: see below); but it is just this phrase which does not have a parallel in *Did.* 1. 3.

One small feature here which may be more significant is the use of the verb *διώκω* in *Did.* 1. 3, which agrees with Matt. 5. 44 against Luke 6. 28. Many would argue that the word in Matthew may be redactional.¹²⁴ Luke uses the word not infrequently (three times in the gospel, nine times in Acts), so there is no obvious reason why he would change it. But the word is a Matthean favourite (cf. its use in the beatitude in Matt. 5. 10, which in turn is widely regarded as a redactional creation). Hence, it may be MattR here too, in which case the *Didache* shows an agreement with redactional wording of Matthew. On the other hand, the word is a common one, so cannot carry too much weight here. But equally, the idea of ‘persecution’ is not one that dominates this, or any, part of the *Didache*, hence it may be due to influence from a source. This small agreement, then, may indicate that the *Didache* presupposes Matthew’s finished gospel here.

Did. 1. 3b

ποία γὰρ χάρις, ἐὰν ἀγαπάτε
τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς;

οὐχὶ καὶ τὰ ἔθνη
τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν;

ὑμεῖς δὲ ἀγαπάτε τοὺς
μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς, καὶ οὐχ
ἔξετε ἐχθρόν.

Matt. 5. 46–7

ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς
ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τίνα
μισθὸν ἔχετε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ
τελώναι τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν;

⁴⁷ καὶ ἐὰν ἀσπάσησθε τοὺς
ἀδελφοὺς ὑμῶν μόνον, τί
περισσὸν ποιεῖτε;
οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ ἔθνηκοὶ
τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν;

Luke 6. 32–5

καὶ εἰ ἀγαπάτε τοὺς
ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν
χάρις ἐστίν; καὶ γὰρ οἱ
ἁμαρτωλοὶ τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας
αὐτοὺς ἀγαπῶσιν.

³³ καὶ [γὰρ] ἐὰν ἀγαθοποιήτε
τοὺς ἀγαθοποιούντας ὑμᾶς,
ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν;
καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ
τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν.

...

³⁵ πλὴν ἀγαπάτε τοὺς
ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν καὶ
ἀγαθοποιεῖτε καὶ δανίζετε
μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες· καὶ
ἔσται ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς,
καὶ ἔσεσθε υἱοὶ ὑψίστου,

¹²⁴ Further, more detailed arguments, with references, in Tuckett, ‘Synoptic Tradition’, 219. The most recent IQP *Critical Edition* prints this as the text of Q, though this reverses the earlier decision of the IQP: see Kloppenborg, ‘Use’, 120.

The *Didache* here is once again close to the Lucan version without being identical with it. On the other hand, it agrees with Matthew in mentioning Gentiles as the ‘opposing group’ from whom the readers are to distinguish themselves.

There is also a problem with the text of the *Didache* here. As noted earlier, part of the text here is also witnessed in P as well as H, and the P reading here has the verb *φιλέω* instead of the second *ἀγαπάω*.¹²⁵ The H reading aligns more closely with the wording in the NT gospels and may represent a later scribal assimilation to the text of the gospels. Hence, some have argued that the P reading is more original and attests to the independence of the *Didache* from the gospels here.¹²⁶ However, it is not certain how much weight this evidence will bear. That a process of assimilation may have taken place is undeniable. However, the two verbs *ἀγαπάω* and *φιλέω* are all but synonymous, so no great change in meaning is implied by the different verbs. Further, as has been said many times in this essay, one must remember that the *Didache* is not intended as a scribal copy of the text of Matthew but an independent composition where the text of Matthew and Luke may (possibly) be at most echoed and/or alluded to, but not ‘quoted’. Hence, even if the P reading were to be accepted here,¹²⁷ it probably does not affect the issue very significantly. Similarly, the difference between H’s *τὸ αὐτό* (= Matthew/Luke) and P’s *τούτο* seems too slight to bear much weight. Even with the P readings (making the *Didache*’s text differ from Matthew/Luke at this point), there is a whole range of other agreements between the *Didache* and the synoptics to suggest a common link between the two.

The reference to ‘Gentiles’ here is probably indecisive for the present purposes.¹²⁸ It is widely agreed that Luke’s reference here to ‘sinners’ is almost certainly LkR, seeking to avoid the slightly derogatory reference to Gentiles. Hence Matthew’s version is probably the more original, and thus the *Didache* here shows no link with any clearly redactional elements in Matthew.

More significant may be the introductory question *ποία γὰρ χάρις*; which agrees closely with Luke’s form of the rhetorical questions here *ποία ὑμῖν*

¹²⁵ The use of *φιλέω* is also attested by the *Apostolic Constitutions* at this point.

¹²⁶ Cf. Audet, *Didachè*, 54; Draper, ‘Jesus Tradition’, 82; Köhler, *Rezeption*, 44. A possible parallel in Ign. *Pol.* 2. 1 (which also uses *φιλέω*) has also been adduced to support the theory of a form of the saying existing independently of the Synoptic versions.

¹²⁷ Though one must beware of adopting a (potentially dangerous) criterion appealing simply to the earliest MS as *ipso facto* the ‘best’. The P text does have some clear errors and/or secondary readings.

¹²⁸ The slightly different wording used here (the *Didache* has *ἔθνη*, Matthew *ἔθνηκοί*) is probably immaterial (*pace* Glover, ‘Didache’s Quotations’, 14): as before, the *Didache* is not a scribal copy of Matthew.

χάρις ἐστίν; Luke's version here may well owe a lot to LkR. In a programmatic essay, van Unnik has shown how Luke adapted his tradition in order to address the morality determined by a Hellenistic reciprocity ethic:¹²⁹ an ethic of doing good to others in order to receive reciprocal favours in return was widespread in the ancient Hellenistic world. Further, talk about 'doing good' and χάρις had a firm place in such talk. Thus Luke's language here may well be redactional, directly addressing this ethos and criticizing it sharply. Further Luke's language here, especially his use of ποία, is probably significant, pointing to the nature of the reward that the Christian can expect: it is *not* a this-worldly reward, but a divine one.

The *Didache* here shares some of the same language, but not the framework of thought. For the *Didache* the rather lame conclusion is not that one will have a 'heavenly', rather than a this-worldly, reward ('you will be sons of the Most High'), but that 'you will not have an enemy'. However, this is precisely the reciprocity ethic which Luke's language was designed to oppose: love others and they will love you back. Thus the formulation of the rhetorical question, which makes excellent sense in the Lucan context, becomes confused when repeated verbatim in the slightly different context of the *Didache*. The *Didache* thus seems secondary here, taking over—but failing to understand fully—the wording from Luke. Given that the wording in Luke may be redactional, the *Didache* here may betray the fact that it is presupposing the finished text of Luke.¹³⁰

Did. 1. 4

ἐάν τις σοι δῶ ῥάπισμα εἰς
τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα,
στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν
ἄλλην,

καὶ ἔση τέλειος·

ἐὰν ἀγγαρεύσῃ σέ τις μίλιον
ἔν, ὕπαγε μετ' αὐτοῦ δύο.

Matt. 5

³⁹ ἀλλ' ὅστις σε ῥαπίζει εἰς
τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα [σου],
στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν
ἄλλην.

⁴⁸ Ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι
ὡς ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ
οὐράνιος
τέλειός ἐστιν.

⁴¹ καὶ ὅστις σε ἀγγαρεύσει
μίλιον ἔν, ὕπαγε μετ' αὐτοῦ
δύο.

Luke 6

²⁹ τῷ τύπτοντί σε ἐπὶ τὴν
σιαγόνα
πάρεχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην,

³⁶ Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες
καθὼς [καὶ] ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν
οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν.

¹²⁹ W. C. van Unnik, 'Die Motivierung der Feindesliebe in Lukas VI 32–35', *NovT* 8 (1966), 288–300.

¹³⁰ For a similar conclusion, though with slightly different argument, see Kloppenborg, 'Use', 123 (with some caution).

The evidence here is probably indecisive. *Did.* 1. 4 agrees very closely with the Matthean form of the saying about ‘turning the other cheek’, specifying explicitly the ‘right’ cheek, using δὴ ῥάπισμα (cf. Matthew’s ῥαπίζει as opposed to Luke’s τύπτοντι) and στρέψον (Luke πάρεχε). However, it is not clear if any of these elements are MattR. The saying about going the extra mile here is paralleled in Matt. 5. 41, with no parallel at all in Luke; but again there is no clear evidence that this is a redactional creation by Matthew. Nevertheless it is still with the Matthean version that the *Didache* shows the closest affinity.

It is possible that the phrase ‘and you will be perfect’ here in *Did.* 1. 4 may be more significant. The wording is similar to the exhortation in Matt. 5. 48, which closes the series of antitheses in Matt. 5 and where the talk about being ‘perfect’ is widely regarded as MattR of Luke’s more original exhortation to be ‘merciful’ in Luke 6. 36. A similar exhortation to be ‘perfect’ occurs in *Did.* 6. 2. Hence it could be argued that both Matthew and the *Didache* have a common interest in the idea of promoting ‘perfection’, in which case any parallel in vocabulary here could be regarded as coincidental. However, it could also be argued that, given the number of other indicators elsewhere in the text of the *Didache* of closeness to Matthew, any interest in the idea of ‘perfection’ may come precisely from Matthew’s interest in this (see earlier on *Did.* 6. 2). Hence the parallel here may be more significant as another pointer to the possibility that the *Didache* presupposes Matthew’s finished gospel.

| <i>Did.</i> 1. 4–5 | Matt. 5. 40, 42 | Luke 6. 29–30 |
|---|---|---|
| ἐὰν ἄρῃ τις τὸ ἱμάτιόν σου, δὸς αὐτῷ και τὸν χιτῶνα. ἐὰν λάβῃ τις ἀπὸ σοῦ τὸ σόν, μὴ ἀπαίτει· οὐδὲ γὰρ δύνασαι. | και τῷ θέλοντί σοι κριθῆναι και τὸν χιτῶνά σου λαβεῖν, ἄφες αὐτῷ και τὸ ἱμάτιον. | και ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵροντός σου τὸ ἱμάτιον και τὸν χιτῶνα μὴ κωλύσης. |
| παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου και μὴ ἀπαίτει. | τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δός, και τὸν θέλοντα ἀπὸ σοῦ δανίσασθαι μὴ ἀποστραφῆς. | παντὶ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου, και ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵροντος τὰ σὰ μὴ ἀπαίτει. |

The *Didache* here reveals close affinities with the Lucan version. The differences between Matthew and Luke here are quite considerable. It is well known that Matthew’s version (at least in the first part) seems to presuppose a legal situation where someone is being sued for their property; Luke’s version presupposes a situation of a robbery. But which is more original in this respect, and which redactional, is not easy to determine.

In the second saying, the exhortation to ‘give to everyone who asks’ is common to Matthew and Luke. But the *Didache* here seems to agree with

Luke in continuing to envisage a robbery situation, whereas Matthew talks about someone wanting to ‘borrow’. Matthew’s version here may well be more original (it is echoed later in Luke 6. 34–5, which may well be a reminiscence of the Q version in the earlier context¹³¹). Luke appears to have continued the ‘robbery’ idea from v. 29, somewhat artificially, and saved the reference to ‘borrowing’ for later; but he starts to introduce the idea of not asking for anything in return (μη ἀπαίτει) here, an idea which ties in closely with Luke’s critique of the reciprocity ethic already noted earlier.

The resulting Lucan version is somewhat uneven. For the Lucan text exhorts someone who has just been robbed not to demand their property back. But in such a context, simply asking for one’s property back is unlikely to have any effect at all. It may be that it is just this incongruity which is reflected in the *Didache*’s little clause οὐδὲ γὰρ δύνασαι which is appended at this point. The clause has caused immense perplexity.¹³² But it may simply represent the Didachist’s own comment on the preceding exhortation, which he recognizes as somewhat incongruous. If this is so, then it may suggest that the *Didache* is again presupposing Luke’s wording here, and that this represents Luke’s editorial activity in relating the saying to a situation of a robbery: hence the *Didache* is presupposing Luke’s finished gospel.¹³³

Did. 1. 5

Matt. 5. 26

Luke 12. 59

καὶ οὐκ ἐξελεύσεται ἐκεῖθεν, οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν, ἕως
μέχρις οὗ ἀποδώ τὸν
ἔσχατον κοδράντην.

οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν, ἕως
ἂν ἀποδώς τὸν ἔσχατον
κοδράντην.

οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν, ἕως
καὶ τὸ ἔσχατον λεπτόν
ἀποδώς.

The final parallel to be noted here again shows a striking agreement between the *Didache* and the synoptics, though using similar words in a very different context. If anything, the *Didache* here is closer to the wording of Matthew (cf. the use of κοδράντης, Luke λεπτόν), though it is hard to say with any certainty if this is MattR in Matthew. The evidence here is thus probably indecisive. However, it may be significant that the saying occurs relatively close to the other sayings paralleled here on love of enemies and non-retaliation only in Matthew. In Luke the sayings are widely separated (Luke 6 and Luke 12), and Luke’s order is often thought to reflect the order of Q, at least in general terms, most closely. The placing of the sayings in Matt. 5 relatively close together may therefore be due to MattR, and the *Didache* may then reflect this, thus once again showing a link with Matthew’s redaction and hence presupposing Matthew’s finished gospel.

¹³¹ See Tuckett, ‘Synoptic Tradition’, 228, with further references.

¹³² See Layton, ‘Sources’, 346 ff., for a discussion of older views, together with his own proposed emendation of the text.

¹³³ See too Kloppenborg, ‘Use’, 126–7.

CONCLUSIONS

This essay has attempted to analyse the parallels that exist between materials in the *Didache* and other books of the New Testament. In relation to the NT books apart from the synoptic gospels, the evidence is mostly negative: there is no compelling evidence to suggest that the *Didache* knew any of these books.

In relation to the synoptic gospels, the situation is rather different. The *Didache* clearly has a number of places where a form of wording that is strikingly similar to that of the synoptics is offered, even though it rarely if ever appears to quote the gospels as such. However, the few references to the 'gospel' may indicate that the author knew of one or more written texts, and also referred to it or them as a 'gospel'. Moreover, the likeliest candidate to have been in mind here is the gospel of Matthew. Apart from *Did.* 1. 3–2. 1, almost all the echoes of the synoptic tradition which appear in the *Didache* can be explained as deriving from Matthew. (The one exception might be the possible parallel which exists between *Did.* 16. 1 and Luke 12. 35.) In virtually every instance where there are synoptic parallels, the version in the *Didache* is closest to the Matthean version. Moreover, in some instances the *Didache* appears to reflect elements of Matthew's redactional activity, and hence to presuppose Matthew's finished gospel rather than just Matthew's traditions.

The parallels concerned also cover the range of material in Matthew in relation to Matthew's possible sources. Thus some parallels are with material peculiar to Matthew, some with Q material, some with Marcan material. The slightly lower proportion of Marcan material (whether from Matthew or not) may simply reflect the fact that the *Didache* is clearly interested in material giving (Jesus') *teaching*, and, for whatever reason, Mark's gospel is relatively speaking less rich in this respect than the Q material. However, it is certainly not the case that the parallels with Matthew in the *Didache* are confined (or even largely confined) to Q material (implying that the *Didache* might be dependent on Q) or to Matthew's special material (implying an ability by the editor(s) of the *Didache* to home in only on this material in a way that seems inherently implausible).

In the case of *Did.* 1. 3–2. 1, more parallels with Luke's gospel were found, along with some evidence suggesting that the *Didache* might reflect elements of LkR, and hence of Luke's finished gospel, as well. Given the peculiar nature of this section of the *Didache*, it may be that any theories about relationships to the synoptics in this section do not apply to the rest of the text. On the other hand, the general picture that emerges from the analysis here is fairly

consistent across the whole of the present (i.e., H) text of the *Didache*: parallels with Matthew predominate and at times relate to elements of MattR. In theory, it is of course possible that the *Didache* derived some of its language in part from Matthew's traditions rather than from Matthew's gospel itself; but it is probably a more economic solution to say that, if some parts of the *Didache* derive (ultimately) from the finished gospel of Matthew, then other parallels with Matthew are to be explained in the same way.

However, to reiterate what has been said many times in the course of this discussion, the *Didache* is clearly not attempting to produce a scribal copy of the text of any of the gospels. Whoever compiled the *Didache* was aiming at a new literary production. Any 'agreements' between the *Didache* and the gospels are thus almost all at the level of allusions only, not quotations, and they should be judged as such. Further, if (as has been argued here) the agreements are to be explained as due to a measure of 'dependence' of the *Didache* on the Gospel of Matthew (and perhaps of Luke), it must also be remembered that this 'dependence' is not necessarily a direct dependence. Certainly, the Didachist is not using Matthew (if at all) in the same way as, say, Matthew used Mark. Certainly he or she did not have Matthew's gospel open in front of him or her as he or she wrote. Any 'dependence' here is likely to be somewhat indirect, perhaps mediated through a process of oral tradition and/or memory. Yet, if the arguments of this essay have any validity, they show that the *Didache* is primarily a witness to the post-redactional history of the synoptic tradition. It is certainly none the worse for that! But it may not then be a witness to pre-redactional stages of the Jesus tradition.

This page intentionally left blank

1 Clement and the Writings that later formed the New Testament

Andrew F. Gregory

INTRODUCTION

Writing in 1973,¹ Donald Hagner could observe that there was as yet no full-scale monograph on the subject of the use of the New Testament in *1 Clement*, although there were available a number of works which discussed *1 Clement* in the context of the use of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers.² Thus Hagner refers to a number of studies of the early use of some or all of the writings which were later canonized as the New Testament, singling out *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* as the standard work on its subject-matter.³ Other works have since appeared which consider *1 Clement* in the context of more wide-ranging studies of the reception of particular texts or bodies of texts than those with which Hagner was able to engage,⁴ and the present survey takes into account their discussions. There are a number of

¹ D. A. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*, NovTSup 34 (Leiden: Brill, 1973).

² Ibid. 14.

³ Ibid. 14 n. 14, 278 n. 2. Older studies that remain significant include A. E. Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941); H. Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern*, TU 65 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957); and E. Massaux, *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Irenaeus* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1990), published originally as *Influence de l'Évangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée*, BETL 75 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986 [1950]).

⁴ A. Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum: Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion*, BHT 58 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979); W.-D. Köhler, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus*, WUNT 2.24 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987); T. Nagel, *Die Rezeption des Johannesevangeliums im 2. Jahrhundert*, Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte 2 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2000); A. Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus*, WUNT 2.169 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); C. E. Hill, *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004). In commentaries on *1 Clement*, see also the summaries in A. Lindemann, *Die Clemensbriefe*, HNT 17 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 18–20, with a

points on which this leads to conclusions closer to those of the Oxford Committee than to the sometimes more maximalist judgements of Hagner, but the latter's work remains the standard discussion of this topic.⁵ Hence, his criticisms of less comprehensive treatments than his own notwithstanding, Hagner's work is but one of a number of advances in scholarship made in the course of the last 100 years that justifies the present undertaking and its attempt to meet the need for a succinct survey of the current state of scholarship on this question. As the following account will indicate, the judgements of the Oxford Committee, as presented by A. J. Carlyle in 1905, have tended to stand the test of time. More recent discussions do not reach conclusions that are radically different from the committee's, although the presentation of the methodological basis on which they are reached is significantly more transparent than that of *The New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*.

Carlyle's survey of potential quotations begins with Paul's letter to the Romans, his first letter to the Corinthians, and also the letter to the Hebrews. Each of these texts is classified as 'A', which means that he considered its use to be beyond any reasonable doubt.⁶ His survey ends with the synoptic gospels, the possible use of which is considered too uncertain even to admit classification according to the alphabetical scheme adopted by the committee responsible for the *New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. In between he finds a low degree of probability for the use of Acts and of Titus (class C), and the possibility (class D) that 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 Timothy, 1 Peter, 1 John, and the Apocalypse were used, although (as per the definition of class D) 'the evidence appeared too uncertain to allow any reliance to be placed upon it.'⁷ The Fourth Gospel is passed over in silence.

particular focus on the relationship of 1 Clement with Hebrews; and H. E. Lona, *Der erste Clemensbrief*, KAV 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 48–58.

⁵ Further, its importance is by no means limited to the specific question of 1 Clement's use of the writings recognized subsequently as the Old and New Testaments. Hagner's monograph contains an extended methodological discussion of how scholars should evaluate what he refers to as 'variant [i.e. inexact] quotations' (in which he argues that these are usually best explained as *memoriter* quotations from known texts rather than as accurate quotations from unknown texts or oral traditions; see Hagner, *Use*, 80–108, on the use of the OT; 287–312, on the use of the NT), and also a helpful survey of how the pattern of 1 Clement's apparent use of the writings later canonized as the NT compares with that of the use of the same writings in other Apostolic Fathers (ibid. 272–87).

⁶ For the following summary, see *NTAF*, 137–8, tables I and II. It is unfortunate that Ephesians, classified as D in table I, has been omitted from table II. Each classification (a description of which is explained in the introduction to the *NTAF*, pp. iii–iv, and is summarized in Gregory and Tuckett, p. 81 above) should be read in the light of the qualifications presented in Carlyle's discussion. See *NTAF*, 37–62.

⁷ *NTAF*, p. iii.

In the discussion that follows, I shall consider potential quotations from the New Testament according to the canonical order of these texts. Thus I shall begin with the Gospels and Acts, then move to Pauline letters, and finish with other letters and the Apocalypse.

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

Carlyle notes four possible instances of the use of synoptic tradition, none of which may be attributed securely to any one of the synoptic gospels. More recent studies add little to his discussion, although they are less likely to specify that his source or sources was some form of written or unwritten ‘Catechesis’.

The first example is *1 Clem.* 13. This passage opens with an appeal to its hearers to be humble, to do what is written in Scripture, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus which he spoke when teaching about gentleness and patience. It is these words that are quoted at *1 Clem.* 13. 2.⁸ As Carlyle observes, ‘the phenomena of the passage are very complex’;⁹ Most, but not all, of the passage has parallels of differing degrees of similarity to sayings known also from synoptic double tradition found in the Sermon on the Mount and the Sermon on the Plain, but similar material is found also in other (later) patristic texts.¹⁰ Thus the material may depend on Matthew and Luke (and perhaps also on Mark), either directly or indirectly, or on some of the sources and/or traditions on which the evangelists drew. The passage consists of seven maxims, stylistically arranged, as set out below. Each maxim is labelled both numerically (with Carlyle) and alphabetically (with Hagner) for ease of reference.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------|--|
| <i>1 Clem.</i> 13. 2 | Matt. 5. 7; 6. 14; 7. 1–2, 12 | Mark 4. 24; 11. 25 | Luke 6. 31, 36–8 |
| 1a: Ἐλεᾶτε, ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε | 5. 7: μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθήσονται. | | 6. 36: Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες καθὼς [καὶ] ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν. |

⁸ *NTAF*, 58–61; Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 12–16; Massaux, *Influence*, 7–12; Hagner, *Use*, 135–51; Köhler, *Rezeption*, 67–71; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 53–4; Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 214–16; Gregory, *Rezeption*, 125–8.

⁹ *NTAF*, 59.

¹⁰ *Clem. Al. Strom.* 2. 18. 91; *Pol. Phil.* 2. 3; *Didascalía Apostolorum*, 2. 21, 42 (preserved in Greek in the *Apostolic Constitutions*); Ps. Macarius, *Hom.* 37. 3. Each is printed in *NTAF*, 59, but it is unclear whether any of them casts any light on the source of *1 Clement*. Polycarp may be an independent witness to Clement’s source, but this seems less likely for the later texts; certainly at least Clement of Alexandria was familiar with *1 Clement*. See Carlyle’s careful discussion in *NTAF*, 60–1; cf. Hagner, *Use*, 140–6.

2b: ἀφίετε, ἵνα
ἀφεθῆ ὑμῖν

6. 14: Ἐὰν γὰρ
ἀφῆτε τοῖς
ἀνθρώποις τὰ
παραπτώματα
αὐτῶν, ἀφήσει καὶ
ὑμῖν ὁ πατὴρ
ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος.

11. 25b: ἀφίετε εἴ
τι ἔχετε κατὰ
τινος, ἵνα καὶ ὁ
πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν
τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἀφῆ
ὑμῖν τὰ
παραπτώματα
ὑμῶν.

6. 37c: ἀπολύετε,
καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε

3c: ὡς ποιεῖτε,
οὕτως ποιηθήσεται
ὑμῖν

7. 12: Πάντα οὖν
ὅσα ἐὰν θέλητε ἵνα
ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ
ἄνθρωποι, οὕτως
καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε
αὐτοῖς

6.31: καὶ καθὼς
θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν
ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι
ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς
ὁμοίως.

4d: ὡς δίδετε,
οὕτως δοθήσεται
ὑμῖν

6. 38a: δίδετε, καὶ
δοθήσεται ὑμῖν

5e: ὡς κρίνετε,
οὕτως κριθήσεσθε

7. 1: Μὴ κρίνετε,
ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε
7.2 ἐν ᾧ γὰρ
κρίματι

6. 37a: Καὶ μὴ
κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ
κριθῆτε

οὕτως κριθήσεσθε

κρίνετε
κριθήσεσθε,

6. 35c: ὅτι αὐτὸς
χρηστός ἐστιν ἐπὶ
τοὺς ἀχαρίστους
καὶ πονηροὺς.

6f: ὡς
χρηστεύεσθε,
οὕτως
χρηστευθήσεται
ὑμῖν

7g: ᾧ μέτρω
μετρεῖτε, ἐν αὐτῷ
μετρηθήσεται
ὑμῖν.

καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρω
μετρεῖτε
μετρηθήσεται
ὑμῖν.

4. 24: ἐν ᾧ μέτρω
μετρεῖτε
μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν
καὶ προστεθήσεται
ὑμῖν.

6. 38c: ᾧ γὰρ
μέτρω μετρεῖτε
ἀντιμετρηθήσεται
ὑμῖν.

As Carlyle observes,¹¹ maxim 1 ‘has no phrase directly corresponding to it in any of our four Gospels, but might be founded on Matt. 5. 7’. Maxim 2 ‘has no proper parallel in St Matthew, but is near Luke ἀπολύετε etc.’. Maxim 3 ‘has no proper parallel in our Gospels, but may be compared with Matt. 7. 12 and Luke 6. 31’. Maxim 4 ‘has no parallel in Matthew, but is very near Luke 6. 38’.

¹¹ For what follows, see *NTAF*, 59–61.

Maxim 5 'is parallel to Matt. 7. 1 and Luke 6. 37', but shows differences from each. Maxim 6 'has no parallel in either Gospel'. Finally, maxim 7 'is parallel to Matt 7. 1 and Luke 6. 38', but shows differences from each.

Hagner's summary of the evidence is based on a more detailed description than that given by Carlyle, but his analysis is broadly the same: 'three sayings (g, e, d) are paralleled closely enough to suggest literary dependence as a possibility; for two other sayings (b, a) such a suggestion seems less plausible; for the remaining two (c, f) no convincing parallels exist, and the second, at least, may be designated as extra-canonical.'¹² Hence it comes as no surprise that his conclusions are similar to those recorded in 1905, although his judgement that there is no convincing parallel to maxim c (Carlyle's '3') further accentuates the differences between these maxims and their synoptic parallels than does Carlyle's summary. Thus the Oxford Committee concludes that these sayings are *probably* (my italics) drawn from 'some written or unwritten form of "Catechesis" as to our Lord's teaching, current in the Roman Church, perhaps a local form which may go back to a time before our Gospels existed',¹³ whereas Hagner finds it '*highly probable* (my italics) that Clement here employs an extra-canonical tradition which was known also to his Corinthian readers'.¹⁴ Further, argues Hagner, this tradition was more likely to have been oral than written on account of its readily memorable form, the use of the verb *μυμνήσκω* in its introductory formula, the probable importance of oral tradition in the early church, and the differences between the forms of this tradition as they are found here at *1 Clement* and also in *Pol. Phil. 2. 3*.

Hagner offers a helpful survey of previous scholarship, which indicates clearly that his evaluation and that of Carlyle *et al.* stand clearly in the majority tradition of finding evidence here of a pre- rather than a post-synoptic collection of sayings ascribed to Jesus. Other more recent studies concur with this conclusion.¹⁵ The fact that it is very difficult to establish the presence of either MattR or LkR in double tradition means that we are scarcely able to use this criterion, but the presence of differences from the forms of those sayings that are paralleled in Matthew and Luke, the presence of one or two saying(s) that are not, the demonstrable unity of the present collection, and parallels elsewhere in early Christian literature strongly suggest that Clement refers here to a collection of sayings that is independent of and

¹² Hagner, *Use*, 140.

¹³ *NTAF*, 61.

¹⁴ Hagner, *Use*, 151.

¹⁵ Köhler, *Rezeption*, 71; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 54; Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 215; Gregory, *Rezeption*, 128.

earlier than the broadly similar sayings of Jesus that are preserved also in Matthew and/or Luke.¹⁶

The second substantial parallel to synoptic tradition in *1 Clement* occurs at 46. 8.¹⁷ It consists of an extended saying¹⁸ ascribed to Jesus, in which he warns of the consequences for those who offend or cause to stumble his elect (or little ones). The saying is straightforward when read in its context in *1 Clement*, but appears much more complicated when it is analysed in terms of its relationship to parallels in the synoptic tradition as preserved in the synoptic gospels. It may be set out as follows:

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| <p>1 Clem. 46. 7–8¹⁹ 7: Μνήσθητε τῶν λόγων Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. 8: εἶπεν γάρ,</p> | <p>Matt 26. 24; 18. 6</p> | <p>Mark 14. 21; 9. 42</p> | <p>Luke 22. 22; 17. 2</p> |
| <p>a: οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ</p> | <p>26. 24: ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάγει καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ, οὐαὶ δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι' οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται·</p> | <p>14. 21: ὅτι ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάγει καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ, οὐαὶ δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι' οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται.</p> | <p>22. 22: ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς μὲν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατὰ τὸ ὠρισμένον πορεύεται, πλὴν οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι' οὗ παραδίδοται.</p> |
| <p>καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἶ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη</p> | <p>καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἶ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκείνος.</p> | <p>καλὸν αὐτῷ εἶ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκείνος.</p> | |

¹⁶ Pace H. B. Green, 'Matthew, Clement and Luke: Their Sequence and Relationship', *JTS* 40 (1989), 1–25, who argues that Matthew was the source of the Jesus tradition found in *1 Clem.* 13. 2 and 46. 8, and that Luke was familiar with both Matthew and *1 Clement*. Green also argues (*ibid.* 15–16) that the author of *1 Clement* also used Mark.

¹⁷ *NTAF*, 61–2; Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 16–19; Massaux, *Influence*, 21–4; Hagner, *Use*, 152–64; Köhler, *Rezeption*, 62–4; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 137; Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 497–8.

¹⁸ It might be described as two sayings that have been conflated, but this would be to prejudge questions about the most primitive context of the twofold warnings that Clement presents as one saying, and also about the relationship between the synoptic tradition found here and in the synoptic gospels.

¹⁹ The text presented here follows that of B. D. Ehrman (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers*, i (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003). The early versions and Clement of Alexandria, who quotes *1 Clement*, all read ἐκλεκτῶν μου διαστρέψαι against the two Greek manuscripts, A and H, both of which read μικρῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι. The latter, the easier reading, may be explained as a harmonization of *1 Clement* to Luke. For discussion of the textual variants in this passage of *1 Clement*, see Hagner, *Use*, 154–5.

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| b: ἡ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι | 18. 6: ὁς δ' ἄν σκανδαλίση ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ, | 9. 42: Καὶ ὁς ἄν σκανδαλίση ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων [εἰς ἐμέ], | |
| c: κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτῷ | συμφέρει αὐτῷ ἵνα κρεμασθῇ μύλος ὄνικος | καλόν ἐστιν αὐτῷ μᾶλλον εἰ περὶκείται μύλος ὄνικος | 17. 2: λυσιτελεῖ αὐτῷ εἰ λίθος μυλικὸς περὶκείται |
| περιτεθῆναι μύλον | περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ | περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ | περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ |
| καὶ καταπονισθῆναι εἰς | καὶ καταποντισθῆ ἐν τῷ πελάγει | καὶ βέβληται εἰς | καὶ ἔρριπται εἰς |
| τὴν θάλασσαν d: ἡ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου διαστρέψαι | τῆς θαλάσσης | τὴν θάλασσαν. | τὴν θάλασσαν ἢ ἵνα σκανδαλίση τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ἕνα. |

The first part of the saying (indicated as ‘a’ in the tabulation) appears to be parallel to what are two very different sayings in the synoptic tradition. The first synoptic parallel, present in Matthew and in Mark, refers specifically to Judas, ‘that man . . . for whom it would be better that he had not been born’. But whereas Matthew and Mark refer to him as ‘that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed’,²⁰ Clement here refers to ‘that man who causes one of my [i.e., Jesus] elect to stumble’. Thus the second part of the saying (b) is parallel to the Matthean and Marcan forms of another saying of Jesus, where he offers a general warning to his disciples of the consequences of causing his elect (or little ones) to stumble. The third part (c) is loosely parallel to the same saying as it is found in all three synoptics, though with little verbal identity; and the fourth (d) is parallel in content if not vocabulary to the final clause of the Lucan version of this saying.

As the Oxford Committee observes, it is not impossible that Clement, quoting from memory, has conflated two very different sayings that he quotes from one or other of the gospels. ‘But it is just as probable that we have here, as in Clem. xiii, a quotation from some form of catechetical instruction in our Lord’s doctrine.’²¹

²⁰ Luke has a similar form of words at 22. 22b.

²¹ NTAf, 62.

Subsequent scholarship has been divided on this question, as documented in Hagner's survey of the discussion.²² Unlike the case of the sayings cited at *1 Clem.* 13, where apparently independent external parallels support the likelihood of independence of the synoptic gospels, there are no similar parallels to witness to the source of the current citation, although some parallels that appear to draw on the synoptic gospels do indicate that there was a tendency to give Jesus' words to Judas a wider application, and that this warning was commonly combined with others.²³ Nevertheless, the majority of scholars have tended to find Clement's source in an extra-canonical tradition, probably oral. Édouard Massaux argues for Clement's literary dependence on Matthew, but his argument rests almost entirely on their shared use of *καταποντίζω*, which he describes as 'a rare and characteristic term, peculiar to Mt. in the entire New Testament'.²⁴ Yet this shared terminology is hardly compelling; the word is also used by contemporary authors such as Plutarch and Josephus,²⁵ and its presence here need imply only that *1 Clement* and Matthew drew on a shared tradition. Massaux also notes that *1 Clement* and Matthew both have the verb *ἦν* after *κάλον*, whereas Mark does not. If it were possible to take this as evidence of Clement's use of MattR, then the case for literary dependence would be strengthened greatly, but this is unlikely. Assuming that Matthew's addition to Mark is a stylistic improvement,²⁶ there is no reason why Clement might not have also made such an improvement if he knew the Marcan version of the saying.

Hagner²⁷ offers three reasons that, he argues, make it more likely that Clement is dependent on an extra-canonical source than on the synoptic gospels. These are, first, that, had Clement known the synoptic context of these sayings, he would have had to remove them (particularly the first, addressed to Judas) from those contexts, which seems unlikely. Second, that each part of Clement's sayings differs from the synoptic gospels. Third, that the internal parallelism of Clement's sayings suggests that the combination has an identity of its own quite apart from the synoptic gospels. This third argument is particularly convincing, and may be presented even more strongly if Clement's quotation is referred to as one extended warning rather than as two warnings that have been combined. There is no reason to describe it as two warnings unless it is read in the light of its parallels in the synoptic gospels.²⁸

²² Hagner, *Use*, 159–61.

²³ Hagner, *Use*, 156–9, esp. 159. But see below, p. 137 and n. 29.

²⁴ Massaux, *Influence*, book I, 23.

²⁵ See BDAG, *ad loc.*

²⁶ See W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St Matthew*, iii, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1997), 463.

²⁷ For what follows see Hagner, *Use*, 162–3.

²⁸ Cf. above n. 18.

Further, he observes, the probability that *1 Clem.* 13 draws on oral tradition strengthens the likelihood that this passage does the same. The Corinthian Christians are again invited to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, which are again presented in a form which lends itself to easy memorization.

Such conclusions might be further supported if it were possible to demonstrate that Clement shows no evidence of any redactional touches of the evangelists in their accounts of Jesus' words concerning Judas. Arguments from silence must of course be treated with great circumspection. Nevertheless, Hagner's suggestion as to how Clement would have had to modify Matthew if that gospel were his source is highly suggestive, for it appears to amount to the observation that Clement would have had to remove everything that might be considered to be the result of either Matthean or Marcan redactional activity (assuming that Mark first connected these words with Judas, or at least that his connection of these words with Judas is the earliest stage to which we may trace the tradition). Thus, if such speculation may be allowed (and I emphasize that this is speculative, for the following suggestion depends on the possibility of getting behind the Marcan passion narrative to a stage at which some of its contents were not yet joined together in the tradition), then perhaps it may be possible, albeit with great caution, to raise the question of whether *1 Clement* testifies to a stage when a minatory saying of Jesus had not yet been given a narrative setting as a reference to Judas, but was rather a free-floating logion. This possibility would then be strengthened if Hermas' warning at *Vis.* 4. 2. 6 (spoken by the personified Church) were taken as evidence of a similar free-floating warning, irrespective of the fact that the words there are not attributed to Jesus.²⁹

The third example comes at *1 Clem.* 24. 5. Here Clement makes the statement that 'the sower went out' (ἐξῆλλθεν ὁ σπείρων) in the context of a discussion of the resurrection of the body.³⁰ He appears to draw on 1 Corinthians 15 as the wider context of his discussion, and uses these words to refer to the way in which God the sower brings human lives into

²⁹ It would gain further support if it were in fact possible to demonstrate that any of the parallels which Hagner considers to depend on the synoptic gospels rather than on *1 Clement* could be shown to be independent of the former, but I see no way to demonstrate that this might be the case. (Nor, *pace* Hagner, do I see any methodologically rigorous way in which to demonstrate that it is not. Thus such parallels may provide little evidence for or against this possibility.) On the development of traditions concerning Judas, and for bibliography, see W. Klassen, 'Judas Iscariot', in D. N. Freedman (ed.), *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), iii. 1091–6.

³⁰ *NTAF*, 62; Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 20–1; Massaux, *Influence*, 28–9; Hagner, *Use*, 164–5; Köhler, *Rezeption*, 61–2; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 87–8; Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 301–2; Gregory, *Rezeption*, 129.

existence.³¹ The words are parallel to the phraseology of Jesus' parable of the sower, found in all three synoptic gospels, but they do not carry the same meaning as the phrase carries in that context. Therefore it is unclear whether Clement echoes that parable at all, either consciously or unconsciously. If he does, then it seems impossible to decide whether he draws on a form of the parable that is independent of any of the synoptic gospels or, if not, then on which gospel (if any) he depends. Nevertheless, it is of interest to note the way in which Clement appears to conflate traditions associated with Jesus and with Paul.

Carlyle offers no comment on the origin of this expression. His brevity is admirable, for it seems that there is little that may be said with any degree of confidence.

The fourth example, *1 Clem.* 15. 2,³² is one of a number of instances where Clement includes a citation from the Jewish Scriptures that is cited also in the synoptic gospels.

| <i>1 Clem.</i> 15. 2 | Matt. 15. 7–8 | Mark 7. 6 | Isa. 29. 13 |
|---|---|---|--|
| | ἡ ὑποκριταί, καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν περὶ ὑμῶν Ἡσαΐας | ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν Ἡσαΐας περὶ ὑμῶν | Καὶ εἶπεν |
| Λέγει γάρ που, | λέγων, | τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, ὡς γέγραπται [ὅτι] | κύριος Ἐγγίζει μοι |
| Οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χειλεσίν με τιμᾶ, | ⁸ Ο λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χειλεσίν με τιμᾶ, | Οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χειλεσίν με τιμᾶ, | ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χειλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσίν με, |
| ἢ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἄπεστιν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. | ἢ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. | ἢ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. | ἢ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. |

The Oxford Committee observed only that the citation is probably from Isaiah, 'but the form of the quotation in Clement is the same as that in the Gospels'.³³ Yet this is not strictly correct. As Hagner observes (with H. B. Swete, *contra* W. Sanday),³⁴ Clement's use of ἄπεστιν against ἀπέχει (which is

³¹ *Contra* Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 302 n. 5, Hagner (*Use*, 164) may be correct when he suggests that 'what Clement presents is not the Parable of the Sower, but rather a homily on 1 Cor. 15. 36 ff., employing the imagery of the Parable of the Sower'—which need not be to claim (as Hagner goes on to do) that Clement used the parable itself.

³² *NTAF*, 62; Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 21–2; Massaux, *Influence*, 19–21; Hagner, *Use*, 171–4; Köhler, *Rezeption*, 64–6; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 58; Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 224–5; Gregory, *Rezeption*, 125–8.

³³ *NTAF*, 62. They also note a parallel at *2 Clem.* 3. 4.

³⁴ Hagner, *Use*, 174.

found in Isaiah, Matthew, and Mark) calls into question his dependence on the synoptics. He is close to them, but not identical. Variations between the form of this verse as found in different manuscripts of the LXX and as cited here complicate discussion, so the similarities between *1 Clement* and the gospels might be accounted for either by the dependence of the former on the latter or by their independent use of some form of testimony collection.³⁵ The fact that Clement appears more likely elsewhere to draw on extra-canonical rather than canonical forms of the synoptic tradition is not good enough reason to deny that he might have been influenced by either Matthew or Mark in this instance; but nor is there sufficient evidence to mount a convincing case that he was. As Hagner observes, 'There can be no certainty here as to the source of Clement's citation.'³⁶

Other instances of parallels between *1 Clement* and the synoptics have also been adduced,³⁷ and there are a number of points where Clement includes citations from the Jewish Scriptures that are included also in the synoptic gospels.³⁸ Yet none adds any clearer evidence than that already considered above to indicate that Clement drew on the synoptic gospels rather than on pre-canonical forms of the synoptic tradition. Therefore, while it is not possible to demonstrate that Clement did not know or use any of the synoptics, there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that he did.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN

Carlyle offers no instances where *1 Clement* appears to draw on John. Nor does Charles Hill.³⁹ J. N. Sanders⁴⁰ and Titus Nagel⁴¹ also pass over *1 Clement* in silence, and Lindemann makes no reference to the Fourth Gospel in his succinct account of possible references to the New Testament in *1 Clement* in

³⁵ Hagner, *Use*, 37 n. 1, 53–4, 106, 172–4; B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic* (London: SCM, 1961), 164–6.

³⁶ Hagner, *Use*, 174.

³⁷ See Massaux, *Influence*, i, 12–29. Massaux finds further evidence for dependence on Matthew as follows: *1 Clem.* 7. 4 // Matt. 26. 28; *1 Clem.* 27. 5 // Matt. 5. 18; 24. 35; *1 Clem.* 30. 3 // Matt. 7. 21. On pp. 24–32 he considers further passages, but concludes that their evidence for literary dependence on Matthew is doubtful or to be dismissed. See also Hagner, *Use*, 165–71.

³⁸ Hagner, *Use*, 171–8.

³⁹ Hill, *Johannine Corpus*.

⁴⁰ J. N. Sanders, *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943).

⁴¹ Nagel, *Rezeption*.

the introduction to his commentary.⁴² Braun finds a number of affinities between them, but he refrains from claiming direct literary dependence of *1 Clement* on John, and suggests that the majority of their doctrinal and literary contacts might be explained ‘par la diffusion d’une liturgie primitive d’esprit johannique’.⁴³ Lona concurs: *1 Clement* and John show similar motifs, but there are no exact parallels, and a literary relationship is unlikely.⁴⁴ Hagner appears to take a stronger line in favour of literary dependence of *1 Clement* on John. He notes a range of potential parallels that are insufficient to suggest literary dependence, but considers that such dependence is possible at *1 Clem.* 49. 1 and 43. 6.⁴⁵ He suggests that some of the similarities ‘are impressive and deserve consideration as possibilities’, but acknowledges that in no instance is there significant agreement in wording. Thus he acknowledges that ‘the evidence indicates only the possibility of Clement’s knowledge of, and dependence upon, the Gospel of John’.⁴⁶

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

Carlyle notes three possible citations of Acts.⁴⁷ Two of these, which he rates only as ‘d’, may be dismissed at once. As Carlyle notes, the observation that it is preferable to give rather than to receive, found in similar forms at *1 Clem.* 2. 1 and on the lips of Paul at Acts 20. 35, may depend either on an otherwise unrecorded saying of Jesus, or on Clement’s use of an early Christian commonplace. Thus there is no good reason to posit the dependence of *1 Clement* on Acts in this instance. Similarly, the common use of the metaphor of transference from darkness to light (*1 Clem.* 59. 2 // Acts 26. 18; cf. Col. 1. 13; 1 Pet. 2. 9) is too widespread in early Christian literature to provide any evidence for literary dependence.

Carlyle rates as ‘c’ his other example, *1 Clem.* 18. 1⁴⁸ // Acts 13. 22, so it is on the basis of this parallel alone that he considers it possible that the author of *1 Clement* has used Acts, although he concedes that the agreements between the two texts in their quotation of Ps. 88(89). 21 and 1 Sam. 13. 14 might be

⁴² Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 18–20.

⁴³ F.-M. Braun, *Jean le Théologien et son Évangile dans l’église ancienne* (Paris: Gabalda, 1959), 173–80, esp. 179, where this quotation may be found. The principal passages that he discusses are *1 Clem.* 21. 6; 42. 1–2; 43. 6; 45. 2; 49. 1; 51. 3; 52. 1; 59. 2–3.

⁴⁴ Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 51–2.

⁴⁵ Hagner, *Use*, 263–8.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.* 268.

⁴⁷ *NTAF*, 48–50.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 66; Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 57, 236–7.

explained on the hypothesis of independent use of a testimony book. The parallel is as follows.

1 Clem. 18. 1

Τί δὲ εἶπωμεν ἐπὶ τῷ μεμαρτυρημένῳ
 Δαυίδ;
 πρὸς ὃν εἶπεν ὁ θεός,
 εἶδρον ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου,
 Δαυὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί,
 ἐν ἐλέει αἰωνίῳ ἔχρισα αὐτόν.

Acts 13. 22

καὶ μεταστήσας αὐτόν, ἤγειρεν τὸν
 Δαυὶδ αὐτοῖς εἰς βασιλέα,
 ᾧ καὶ εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας,
 εἶδρον Δαυὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, ἄνδρα
 κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου,
 ὃς ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου.

Ps. 88(89). 21

εἶδρον Δαυὶδ τὸν δοῦλόν μου,
 ἐν ἐλέει ἀγίῳ ἔχρισα αὐτόν

1 Sam. 13. 14

Καὶ ζητήσῃ Κύριος ἐαυτῷ ἄνθρωπον
 κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ.

As Carlyle observes, *1 Clement* and Acts both (1) combine phrases from the psalm and from 1 Samuel; (2) insert the words τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, which are not in either passage quoted; and (3) agree in reading ἄνδρα against δοῦλόν in Ps. 88. 21) and ἄνθρωπον (1 Sam. 13. 14). He also notes that the quotations in *1 Clement* and Acts end differently. He observes that the evidence is complicated, but inclines towards the conclusion that Clement set out to quote Ps. 88. 21, but was possibly influenced in doing so by ‘a recollection of the passage as it is quoted in Acts 13.’⁴⁹ Thus he appears to imply that although Clement knew the verse in the form in which it was quoted in Acts, it is possible that he took it not from Acts but from a source known also to Luke. His caution is commendable.

Hagner finds the agreement between *1 Clem.* 18. 1 and Acts 13. 22 to be sufficiently conspicuous to assert the probability of Clement’s knowledge of Acts,⁵⁰ but C. K. Barrett observes that the differences between the parallels suggest that they are independent.⁵¹ Martin Albl, who argues that Luke is unlikely to have created so complex a conflated quotation as is found in Acts 13. 22, points to the differences between the endings of the two quotations. He argues that both the absence in *1 Clement* of the final phrase of Acts 13. 22 and the continuing use of Ps. 88(89) past what appears in Acts suggest that both texts are independent witnesses to an earlier tradition which had already combined 1 Sam. 13. 14 and Ps. 88(89). 21, perhaps as part of a scriptural historical review that culminated in the selection of David, the ideal

⁴⁹ NTAf, 49.

⁵⁰ Hagner, *Use*, 263. See also the other parallels which he lists: *ibid.* 256–63. These include common subject-matter and shared citations from the Jewish Scriptures, but it is hard to see why they suggest literary dependence rather than origin in a similar milieu.

⁵¹ C. K. Barrett, *The Acts of the Apostles*, i, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994), 35. He notes that other parallels that have been cited include *1 Clem.* 2. 2; 6. 3; 12. 2; 14.1.

‘messianic’ king.⁵² This substantiates Carlyle’s observation that a possible collection of Davidic or Messianic passages ‘might explain the phenomena presented by the passages in Clement and in the Acts without requiring any direct dependence of the one upon the other.’⁵³

Morton Smith (followed, in part, by Hagner) has argued that the report of Peter’s trial and martyrdom at *1 Clem.* 5. 4⁵⁴ is best accounted for as an exegesis of Acts 3–5 (esp. 5. 4) and 12 (esp. 12. 3 ff.),⁵⁵ but this seems unlikely.⁵⁶ Thus Barrett’s conclusion, not altogether unlike that of Carlyle, can hardly be bettered: ‘That Acts was known to Clement is not impossible, but is by no means proved.’⁵⁷

THE PAULINE EPISTLES AND THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

As Andreas Lindemann has argued, to speak of ‘Paul in the writings of the apostolic fathers’ is to speak of Paul as he was understood in the early church rather than as he is now often understood in the contemporary academy. ‘This Paul was the author of the letter to the Ephesians as well as of the letter to the Romans; and he was writer not only of a letter to Philemon but also of letters to Timothy and to Titus.’⁵⁸ In the section that follows, I shall therefore consider those letters considered deutero-Pauline as well as the seven that are now often thought to have been written by Paul. Hebrews is then treated by itself. This is because we do not know what opinion Clement held about its

⁵² M. C. Albl, ‘*And Scripture Cannot be Broken*’: *The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections*, NovTSup 96 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 196–8.

⁵³ NTAf, 49–50.

⁵⁴ Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 37–8; Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 57 n. 6, 159 n. 2.

⁵⁵ M. Smith, ‘The Report about Peter in *1 Clement* v.4’, *NTS* 7 (1960/1), 86–8.

⁵⁶ For a critique, see Gregory, *Reception*, 312–13.

⁵⁷ Barrett, *Acts*, 35.

⁵⁸ A. Lindemann, ‘Paul in the Writings of the Apostolic Fathers’, in W. S. Babcock (ed.), *Paul and the Legacies of Paul* (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990), 25–45, on p. 25. On the specific question of Paul’s discernible influence on the theology of *1 Clement*, see *idem*, ‘Paul’s influence on “Clement” and Ignatius’, ch. 1 in companion volume. See also *idem*, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*; *idem*, ‘Der Apostel Paulus Im 2. Jahrhundert’, in J.-M. Sevrin (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity*, BETL 86 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 39–67. Other important surveys of the reception of Paul include Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*; D. K. Rensberger, ‘As the Apostle Teaches: The Development of the Use of Paul’s Letters in Second-Century Christianity’ (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale, 1981).

authorship. Internal evidence suggests that the author of Hebrews will have been known to those whom he addressed (13. 19), and some form of connection with Rome, or at least Italy, is strongly implied (13. 24). Pantaeus and Clement of Alexandria both attributed the letter to Paul,⁵⁹ and it is included in P⁴⁶, our earliest manuscript of the Pauline corpus. But the absence of any earlier evidence means that we must remain agnostic about the views of Clement of Rome.⁶⁰

Carlyle's conclusions regarding Clement's knowledge of the letters of Paul were careful and modest: Clement can be shown to have used both Romans and 1 Corinthians, and there is some slight evidence that he may also have used 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 Timothy, and Titus. Hagner's conclusions are much more maximalist. Despite the careful qualifications in his detailed and nuanced discussion of a wide range of often extremely tenuous parallels to Paul's letters, he concludes that the evidence suggests that Clement appears to have known all the Pauline epistles except 1 and 2 Thessalonians and Philemon. He concedes that only for Romans and 1 Corinthians is there enough evidence to provide certain knowledge, but considers the use of Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, 1 Timothy, and Titus to be probable. Clement's use of 2 Corinthians, Colossians, and 2 Timothy is possible, and even his knowledge of 1 and 2 Thessalonians and Philemon is not to be ruled out, for their brevity and particular content make them less susceptible to quotation than the other Pauline letters. 'Clement thus provides us with indications that the greater part, if not the whole, of the Pauline corpus was probably known to him and was present to his mind as he wrote in c.95 AD.'⁶¹ Lindemann's conclusions are closer to those of Carlyle: Clement may be said with confidence to have used Romans and 1 Corinthians, but the evidence for his use of other Pauline letters is much more ambiguous.⁶² Lona concurs: 'Mit Sicherheit läßt sich . . . nur die Kenntnis des ersten Briefes an die Korinther und des Römerbriefes nachweisen.'⁶³

⁵⁹ Eusebius, *EH* 6. 14. 1–3; cf. 6. 13. 1–3.

⁶⁰ For a survey of ancient views on the authorship of Hebrews, see H. W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 1–2. He notes that Pauline authorship was not widely accepted in the West until the fifth century.

⁶¹ Hagner, *Use*, 237.

⁶² Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 177–99, esp. 178, 194; *idem*, 'Paul in the Writings', 32; *idem*, Ch. 1 in companion volume.

⁶³ Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 49.

1 Corinthians

That Clement knew something about Paul—what Lindemann has referred to as the ‘Paulusbild’—is beyond doubt, for Clement refers by name to both Peter and to Paul at 5. 5–7.⁶⁴ But our concern here is solely with the not unrelated question of what may be shown about Clement’s knowledge and use of Paul’s letters. Whereas Carlyle began with Romans, the current survey begins with 1 Corinthians. This is because we have the strongest possible evidence for Clement’s knowledge of that letter at *1 Clem.* 47. 1–4.⁶⁵ Not only does Clement tell the Corinthians to take up a letter from Paul, but so too he refers to sufficient of its contents to make it all but certain that the letter to which he draws their attention is 1 Corinthians. Such clear testimony to 1 Corinthians means that this conclusion is secure, even without any significant verbatim parallels at this point.⁶⁶

The evidence may be set out as follows:

1 Clem. 47. 1–4

1 Cor. 1. 12

Ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ
μακαρίου Παύλου ἀποστόλου.

Τί πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ
εὐαγγελίου ἔγραψεν;

ἐπ’ ἀληθείας πνευματικῶς ἐπέστειλεν
ὑμῖν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ τε καὶ Κηφᾶ τε καὶ
Ἀπολλῶ,

διὰ τὸ καὶ τότε προσκλίσεις ὑμᾶς
πεποιήσθαι. ἀλλ’ ἢ πρόσκλις ἐκείνη
ἤττονα ἀμαρτίαν ὑμῖν προσήνεγκεν,
προσεκλίθητε γὰρ ἀποστόλοις
μεμαρτυρημένοις καὶ ἀνδρὶ
δεδοκιμασμένῳ παρ’ αὐτοῖς.

Ἐγὼ μὲν εἶμι Παύλου, Ἐγὼ δὲ
Ἀπολλῶ, Ἐγὼ δὲ Κηφᾶ, Ἐγὼ δὲ
Χριστοῦ.

As Lindemann observes, this passage is of especial interest.⁶⁷ It shows that Clement considered it to be self-evident that he should make use of Paul’s letter in support of his own argument; that he assumed that the letter Paul sent some forty years before is still available in the Corinthian church; and

⁶⁴ Cf. Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 72–82.

⁶⁵ NTAF, 40–1; Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 98–99; Massaux, *Influence*, 40; Hagner, *Use*, 196–7; Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum* 178, 190–2; *idem*, *Clemensbriefe*, 138–9; Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 505–9.

⁶⁶ This is a striking reminder of the methodological point that a lack of literary parallels between texts is not evidence that the author of the later writing was unfamiliar with the earlier text.

⁶⁷ Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 190–1; *idem*, Ch. 1 in companion volume; ‘Paul in the Writings’, 30–1.

that he saw no reason to comment on the fact that a copy of the letter already existed in Rome.

This in turn strengthens the likelihood that other parallels to 1 Corinthians may be considered evidence for Clement's use of that letter. These include two other passages which Carlyle classified as 'a': 1 *Clem.* 37. 5–38. 1 (to which may be added, with Lindemann, 1 *Clem.* 38. 2) and 1 *Clem.* 49. 5. Each will be considered in turn.

1 *Clem.* 37. 5–38. 2⁶⁸

Λάβωμεν τὸ σῶμα ἡμῶν.

ἡ κεφαλὴ δίχα τῶν ποδῶν
οὐδέν ἐστίν
οὕτως οὐδὲ οἱ πόδες δίχα
τῆς κεφαλῆς.

Τὰ δὲ ἐλάχιστα μέλη τοῦ
σώματος ἡμῶν ἀναγκαῖα
καὶ εὐχρηστα εἰσιν ὅλων
τῶ σώματι.

ἀλλὰ πάντα συνπνεῖ καὶ
ὑποταγῇ μιᾷ χρήται

εἰς τὸ σώζεσθαι ὅλον τὸ
σῶμα. Σωζέσθω οὖν
ἡμῶν ὅλον τὸ σῶμα ἐν
Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ
ὑποταστέσθω ἕκαστος
τῷ πλησίον αὐτοῦ,
καθὼς ἐτέθη ἐν τῷ
χαρίσματι αὐτοῦ.

ὁ ἰσχυρὸς τημελείτω τὸν
ἀσθενῆ, ὁ δὲ ἀσθενῆς
ἐντροπέσθω τὸν
ἰσχυρόν . . .

1 Cor. 12. 12, 14

¹²Καθάπερ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα
ἐν ἐστίν καὶ μέλη
πολλὰ ἔχει, πάντα δὲ τὰ
μέλη τοῦ σώματος πολλὰ
ὄντα ἐν ἐστίν σῶμα,
οὕτως καὶ ὁ Χριστός . . .
¹⁴καὶ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα οὐκ
ἐστίν ἐν μέλος ἀλλὰ
πολλὰ . . .

cf. 1 Cor. 8. 7–13; Rom.
15. 1

1 Cor. 12. 20–8

²⁰νῦν δὲ πολλὰ μὲν μέλη, ἐν
δὲ σῶμα.
²¹οὐ δύναται δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς
εἰπεῖν τῇ χειρὶ, Χρεῖαν σου
οὐκ ἔχω, ἢ πάλιν ἡ κεφαλὴ
τοῖς ποσί, Χρεῖαν ὑμῶν οὐκ
ἔχω.

²²ἀλλὰ πολλῶ μάλλον τὰ
δοκοῦντα μέλη τοῦ σώματος
ἀσθενέστερα ὑπάρχειν
ἀναγκαῖα ἐστίν . . .

²⁴ἀλλὰ ὁ θεὸς συνεκέρασεν τὸ
σῶμα τῷ ὑστερουμένῳ
περισσοτέραν δούς τιμῆν,
²⁵ἵνα μὴ ᾖ σχίσμα ἐν τῷ
σώματι

ἀλλὰ τὸ αὐτὸ ὑπὲρ
ἀλλήλων μεριμνῶσιν
τὰ μέλη.

²⁸καὶ οὓς μὲν ἔθετο ὁ θεὸς
ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ . . .

⁶⁸ NTAF, 40; Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 96–7; Hagner, *Use*, 197–200; Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 189; *idem*, *Clemensbriefe*, 116–17; Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 413–19.

Paul's metaphor of the body is found in 1 Corinthians, Romans, and Ephesians. But the detailed correlation between *1 Clement* and 1 Corinthians makes it very likely that in this instance Clement draws on the metaphor as it is developed in Paul's letter to the Corinthians. As Lindemann observes, there is 'eine erhebliche Wahrscheinlichkeit' that we find here evidence of direct literary dependence on 1 Corinthians.⁶⁹

1 Clem. 49. 57⁰

ἀγάπη κολλᾷ ἡμᾶς τῷ θεῷ,
 ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν,
 ἀγάπη πάντα ἀνέχεται,
 πάντα μακροθυμεῖ.
 οὐδὲν βάνανσον ἐν ἀγάπῃ,
 οὐδὲν ὑπερήφανον.
 ἀγάπη σχίσμα οὐκ ἕξει,
 ἀγάπη οὐ στασιάζει,
 ἀγάπη πάντα ποιεῖ ἐν ὁμοιοῖα.

1 Cor. 13. 4–7

⁴ ἡ ἀγάπη μακροθυμεῖ,
 χρηστεύεται ἡ ἀγάπη, οὐ ζηλοῖ,
 [ἡ ἀγάπη] οὐ περπερεύεται, οὐ
 φυσιοῦται,
⁵ οὐκ ἀσχημονεῖ,
 οὐ ζητεῖ τὰ ἑαυτῆς,
 οὐ παροξύνεται,
 οὐ λογίζεται τὸ κακόν,
⁶ οὐ χαίρει ἐπὶ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ,
 συγχαίρει δὲ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ.
⁷ πάντα στέγει, πάντα πιστεύει,
 πάντα ἐλπίζει, πάντα ὑπομένει.

The parallels between these passages are extremely suggestive, although perhaps not in themselves sufficient to demonstrate literary dependence. If Clement has used Paul, he echoes rather than quotes him, taking Paul's hymn to love but adapting it to his own preferred vocabulary (*σχίσμα*, *στασιάζω*, *ὁμόνοια*) for dealing with the situation in Corinth.⁷¹ The lack of direct parallels or quotations notwithstanding, it does seem likely that here Clement refers to Paul's letter,⁷² and that his hearers in Corinth would have been expected to recognize the allusion.

Also worthy of particular attention is *1 Clem.* 24. 1,⁷³ which Carlyle rated as 'b', but described as 'almost certainly a reminiscence'⁷⁴:

⁶⁹ Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 188–9.

⁷⁰ NTAF, 41; Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 100; Hagner, *Use*, 200; Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 192; *idem*, *Clemensbriefe*, 143–5; Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 526–8.

⁷¹ Hagner, *Use*, 200.

⁷² Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 192; *idem*, *Clemensbriefe*, 143.

⁷³ NTAF, 41; Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 91; Massaux, *Influence*, 41–2; Hagner, *Use*, 201; Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 183–4; *idem*, *Clemensbriefe*, 86; Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 298.

⁷⁴ NTAF, 41.

1 Clem. 24. 1

Κατανοήσωμεν, ἀγαπητοί,
 πῶς ὁ δεσπότης
 ἐπιδείκνυται διηλεκτῶς ἡμῖν
 τὴν μέλλουσαν ἀνάστασιν
 ἔσεσθαι, ἧς τὴν ἀπαρχὴν
 ἐποιήσατο τὸν κύριον
 Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν
 ἀναστήσας.

1 Cor. 15. 20

Νυνὶ δὲ Χριστὸς
 ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν
 ἀπαρχὴ τῶν
 κεκοιμημένων.

1 Cor. 15. 23

ἔκαστος δὲ ἐν
 τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι.
 ἀπαρχὴ Χριστός,
 ἔπειτα οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ
 ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ,

Closely related is the following parallel between the same chapters, where the image of the seed and the point that it makes, if not the vocabulary used, are similar:

1 Clem. 24. 4–5⁷⁵

Λάβωμεν τοὺς καρπούς, ὁ σπόρος πῶς
 καὶ τίνα τρόπον γίνεται; ἐξῆλθεν ὁ
 σπείρων καὶ ἔλαβεν εἰς τὴν γῆν
 ἕκαστον τῶν σπερμάτων, ἅτινα
 πεσόντα εἰς τὴν γῆν ξηρὰ καὶ γυμνὰ
 διαλύεται . . .

1 Cor. 15. 36–7

ἄφρων, σὺ ὁ σπείρεις, οὐ
 ζωοποιεῖται ἐὰν μὴ ἀποθάνῃ.³⁷
 καὶ ὁ σπείρεις, οὐ τὸ σῶμα τὸ
 γενησόμενον σπείρεις ἀλλὰ γυμνὸν
 κόκκον εἰ τύχοι σίτου ἢ τινος τῶν
 λοιπῶν.

Clement's use of ἀπαρχή to refer to the resurrection of Jesus as the first fruits of the general resurrection suggests that Clement draws on Pauline teaching about the resurrection contained in 1 Corinthians 15. Clement's emphasis on the future resurrection of the dead (τὴν μέλλουσαν ἀνάστασιν ἔσεσθαι; cf. 1 Cor. 15. 12, 51–5) and his use of the image of the seeds of corn (1 Clem. 24. 4; cf. 1 Cor. 15. 36–7) give further support to the strong likelihood that Clement here depends on 1 Corinthians. Lindemann suggests that the parallels are so clear that one is compelled to conclude that Clement had the text of 1 Corinthians directly before him as he wrote.⁷⁶

Other parallels between 1 Clement and 1 Corinthians might also be adduced. Carlyle and the Oxford Committee consider three others: 1 Clem. 48. 5 // 1 Cor. 12. 8–9 (the juxtaposition of faith, knowledge, and wisdom); 1 Clem. 5. 1–5 // 1 Cor. 9. 24; cf. Phil. 3. 14 (the metaphor of an athlete's prize); and

⁷⁵ NTAF, 41–2; Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 92; Massaux, *Influence*, 28–9; Hagner, *Use*, 201; Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 183–4; *idem*, *Clemensbriefe*, 86–7; Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 301–2.

⁷⁶ Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 183: 'Kap. 24 weist so deutliche Parallelen zu 1 Kor 15 auf, daß man zu der Annahme gezwungen ist, der Vf habe beim Schreiben diesen Text direkt vor sich gehabt.' Cf. *idem*, *Clemensbriefe*, 86: 'Die Verwendung des ἀπαρχή in diesem Zusammenhang erinnert an 1 Kor 15. 20, 23; diesen Text hat der Vf zweifellos gekannt . . . aber man braucht nicht mit einer unmittelbar gewolten Anspielung zu rechnen.'

1 Clem. 34. 8 // *1 Cor.* 2. 9; cf. *Isa.* 64. 4 (the common use of a quotation, the source of which is unclear⁷⁷). To these may be added similar epistolary conventions (*1 Clem.*, sal.; cf. *1 Cor.* 1. 1–3; *1 Clem.* 65. 2; cf. *1 Cor.* 16. 23; *Rom.* 11. 36); and the use of the imperative and indicative in ethical exhortation (*1 Clem.* 30. 1 // *1 Cor.* 5. 27; cf. *Gal.* 5. 25, etc.); although such features are found in other Pauline letters besides *1 Corinthians*.⁷⁸ None of these possible references is compelling in itself, and each may be explained on grounds other than of direct literary dependence, but the fact that Clement clearly used *1 Corinthians* means that the possibility that each parallel arises from direct literary dependence (or at least an intimate acquaintance with the letter, such that Clement draws on its language and content quite unconsciously) should not be underestimated.

Romans

Provided that one does not posit a developmental model that sees Clement's community as somehow disconnected from those whom Paul addressed at Rome in his letter to the Christians of that city, then there is an a priori possibility that Clement would have been familiar with this text. It was written earlier than his own letter, and it was addressed to the predecessors of those on whose behalf he now claims to speak. Hagner may be correct when he suggests that the original manuscript may have been available to Clement,⁷⁹ although to state that this is probable may be to claim too much.

Carlyle found⁸⁰ that there was one passage (*1 Clem.* 35. 5–6 // *Rom.* 1. 29–32, 'a') where it was 'practically certain' that Clement drew on Romans; another (*1 Clem.* 33. 1 // *Rom.* 6. 1, 'b') where it was 'most probable' that he wrote 'under the impression of . . . Romans'; and another (*1 Clem.* 32. 2 // *Rom.* 9. 5, 'c') in which 'It seems probable that the sentence in Clement was suggested by that in Romans'. Hagner suggests that there is perhaps not as much allusion to Romans as one might expect,⁸¹ but this apparent discrepancy may arise from unrealistic expectations. Given that Clement appears to have wanted to accentuate what he perceived to be parallels between the contemporary situation in Corinth and the unrest that Paul had addressed a generation or so before, it is perhaps only to be expected that it would be *1 Corinthians* rather than Romans on which he would rely the most.

⁷⁷ The same source appears again at *2 Clem.* 11. 7. See my discussion in Ch. 10 below, on pp. 284–5.

⁷⁸ For further examples, see esp. Hagner, *Use*, 195–209.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.* 214.

⁸⁰ For what follows, see *NTAF*, 37–9.

⁸¹ Hagner, *Use*, 214.

The principal evidence may be set out as follows:

1 Clem. 35. 5–6⁸²

ἀπορρίψαντες ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν
 πᾶσαν ἀδικίαν
 καὶ ἀνομίαν,
 πλεονεξίαν,
 ἔρεις,
 κακοηθείας τε καὶ δόλους,
 ψιθυρισμούς τε καὶ καταλαλιάς,
 θεοστυγίαν,
 ὑπερηφανίαν τε καὶ ἀλαζονείαν,
 κενοδοξίαν
 τε καὶ ἀφιλοξενίαν.

⁶ ταῦτα γὰρ οἱ πράσσοντες
 στυγητοὶ τῷ θεῷ ὑπάρχουσιν.
 Οὐ μόνον δὲ οἱ πράσσοντες αὐτά, ἀλλὰ
 καὶ οἱ συνευδοκοῦντες αὐτοῖς.

Rom. 1. 29–32

²⁹ πεπληρωμένους
 πάσῃ ἀδικίᾳ
 πονηρίᾳ
 πλεονεξίᾳ κακίᾳ,
 μέστους φθόνου φόνου
 ἔριδος
 δόλου κακοηθείας,
 ψιθυριστῶν ³⁰ καταλάλους
 θεοστυγεῖς ὑβριστῶν
 ὑπερηφάνους, ἀλαζόνων,
 ἐφευρετὰς κακῶν, γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς,
³¹ ἀσυνέτους ἀσυνθέτους
 ἀστόργους ἀνελεήμονας·
³² οἷτινες τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ
 ἐπιγνόντες
 ὅτι οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες
 ἄξιοι θανάτου εἰσίν,
 οὐ μόνον αὐτὰ ποιούσιν ἀλλὰ καὶ
 συνευδοκοῦσιν τοῖς πράσσουσιν.

The parallels are striking, but not necessarily decisive. The fact that so many of the same vices are listed need not be important, since it is possible that each author might have drawn independently on existing tradition.⁸³ A similar argument might apply to the comment which follows each list of vices, but it is probably easier to explain this sentence and the passage as a whole on the basis that Clement has drawn on Paul's letter to the Romans. Hagner goes too far when he concludes that literary dependence is the 'only satisfactory conclusion which can be drawn',⁸⁴ but it certainly seems the most likely explanation. As Lindemann observes, differences between the uses to which the authors put these vice lists in their respective arguments notwithstanding, there remains 'eine erhebliche Wahrscheinlichkeit dafür, daß 1 Clem 35,5f tatsächlich in unmittelbarem literarischem Zusammenhang mit Röm 1, 29–32 steht'.⁸⁵

⁸² NTAf, 37–8; Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 95–6; Massaux, *Influence*, 42; Hagner, *Use*, 214–16; Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 188–89; *idem*, *Clemensbriefe*, 109; Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 383–7.

⁸³ Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 188.

⁸⁴ Hagner, *Use*, 216.

⁸⁵ Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 188–9.

1 Clem. 32. 4–33. 1⁸⁶

Καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν, διὰ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ κληθέντες, οὐ δι' ἑαυτῶν δικαιοῦμεθα, οὐδὲ διὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας σοφίας ἢ συνέσεως ἢ εὐσεβείας ἢ ἔργων ὧν κατειργασάμεθα ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδίας, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς πίστεως, δι' ἧς πάντας τοὺς ἀπ' αἰῶνος ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεὸς ἐδικαίωσεν. ᾧ ἔστω ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

33. 1: τί οὖν ποιήσωμεν, ἀδελφοί; ἀργήσωμεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγαθοποιίας καὶ ἐγκαταλίπωμεν τὴν ἀγάπην; μηθαμῶς τοῦτο εἶσαι ὁ δεσπότης ἐφ' ἡμῖν γε γεννηθῆναι, ἀλλὰ σπεύσωμεν μετὰ ἐκτενείας καὶ προθυμίας πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐπιτελεῖν.

As Carlyle observes, the thought but not the vocabulary of these passages is closely related. Each is placed in the context of justification by faith; each argues that justification is not an excuse for sin, but an impetus for appropriate ethical living. It seems difficult not to conclude that at this point Clement is very probably dependent on Romans.

1 Clem. 32. 2⁸⁷

ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς
τὸ κατὰ σάρκα

Rom. 5. 21–6. 2a

5. 21: ἵνα ὥσπερ ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ, οὕτως καὶ ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαιοσύνης εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

6. 1: Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; ἐπιμένωμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσῃ;

6. 2: μὴ γένοιτο.

Rom. 9. 5

ὧν οἱ πατέρες
καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς
τὸ κατὰ σάρκα,
ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς
τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν.

This passage may reflect dependence on Romans, but it is difficult to be certain. As the Oxford Committee observes, the phrase 'κατὰ σάρκα' is 'not a very obvious one'.⁸⁸ It is part of an idiom in Clement (ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα) that corresponds almost exactly with Paul's ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, but appears to disrupt the sense of the former; 1 Clement would read more smoothly were the reference to Jesus not there, for it falls between references

⁸⁶ NTAf, 38; Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 92–3; Hagner, *Use*, 216–17; Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 186–7; *idem*, *Clemensbriefe*, 103; Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 351–2.

⁸⁷ NTAf, 38–9; Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 92; Massaux, *Influence*, 49; Hagner, *Use*, 216; Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 185; *idem*, *Clemensbriefe*, 99; Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 343–5.

⁸⁸ NTAf, 39.

to the origin of priests and Levites, and of the kings, rulers, and leaders in the line of Judah. Thus, suggests Lindemann, albeit with suitable caution, it might be considered a gloss that was added to *1 Clement*.⁸⁹ This is an attractive suggestion and a plausible example of where knowledge of Paul's letters may have influenced the text of *1 Clement* after it was originally written.⁹⁰

The other possible parallels that Carlyle notes are *1 Clem.* 36. 2; 51. 5 // Rom. 1. 21; cf. Eph. 4. 18; *1 Clem.* 38. 1; 46. 7 // Rom. 12. 4; cf. 1 Cor. 6. 15; 12. 12; Eph. 4. 4, 25; 5. 30; *1 Clem.* 50. 6–7 // Rom. 4. 7–9; cf. Ps. 31(32). 1–2. Among further possible references that Hagner considers are: *1 Clem.* 30. 6 // Rom. 2. 29b; *1 Clem.* 31. 1 // Rom. 6. 1; *1 Clem.* 34. 2 // Rom. 11. 36; cf. 1 Cor. 8. 6; *1 Clem.* 37. 5 // Rom. 12. 4, etc.; *1 Clem.* 47. 7 // Rom. 2. 24; cf. Isa. 52. 5.⁹¹ None of these parallels is decisive evidence of dependence on Romans, but the fact that Clement's use of that letter has already been established securely from other references means that the cumulative force of these parallels should not be underestimated.

The Other Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Letters

Carlyle notes the possibility (class D) that 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and 1 Timothy were used, but the textual evidence is very slight indeed.⁹² The evidence of the use of Titus is rated slightly higher, with one parallel classified as 'c', but here Carlyle notes that his own judgement, unlike that of the rest of the committee, is that the parallel *1 Clem.* 1. 3 // Titus 2. 4–5 is more likely to reflect independent use of a common source than dependence of one upon the other.⁹³ A full account of possible references to these texts is offered by Hagner,⁹⁴ but the evidence is very sparse.

⁸⁹ Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 185.

⁹⁰ For other intentional changes in *1 Clement*, see Ehrman, Ch. 1 above, at pp. 20, 22–3.

⁹¹ For further references and discussion, see Hagner, *Use*, 217–20.

⁹² He notes the following parallels, some of which are unclassified, but considers none sufficiently certain to allow any reliance to be placed upon it (*NTAF*, 51–5): *1 Clem.* 36. 2 // 2 Cor. 3. 18; *1 Clem.* 5. 5–6 // 2 Cor. 11. 23–7; *1 Clem.* 2. 1 // Gal. 3. 1; cf. Deut. 28. 66; *1 Clem.* 5. 2 // Gal. 2. 9; *1 Clem.* 36. 2 // Eph. 4. 18; *1 Clem.* 46. 6 // Eph. 4. 4–6; *1 Clem.* 59. 3 // Eph. 1. 18; *1 Clem.* 3. 4; 21. 1 // Phil. 1. 27; *1 Clem.* 47. 1–2 // Phil. 4. 15; *1 Clem.* 59. 2 // Col. 1. 12–13; cf. Col. 1. 9; Acts 26. 18; 1 Pet. 2. 9; *1 Clem.* 2. 4 // Col. 2. 1; *1 Clem.* 61. 2 // 1 Tim. 1. 17; *1 Clem.* 29. 1 // 1 Tim. 2. 8. For a critique of a recent claim that the author of *1 Clement* used Ephesians, see J. Muddiman, 'The Church in Ephesians, 2 *Clement* and *Hermas*', Ch. 6 in companion volume, at p. 108.

⁹³ *NTAF*, 51. A further possible parallel with Titus is rated d: *1 Clem.* 2. 7; 24. 4 // Titus 3. 1; cf. 2 Tim. 2. 21; 3. 17; 2 Cor. 9. 8.

⁹⁴ Hagner, *Use*, 220–37. Cf. Lona, who notes parallels in vocabulary and content between *1 Clement* and the Pastorals, but attributes them to a common background (*Erste Clemensbrief*, 50–1).

Hebrews

Hebrews is the third text that Carlyle finds Clement to have used without any reasonable doubt. He offers one passage in which such dependence is secure, and notes others where it is possible. The principal passage is *1 Clem.* 36. 1–5,⁹⁵ which has occasioned much debate. Carlyle suggests that there is ‘practically no doubt that in this passage we have a reminiscence of the first chapter of Hebrews.’⁹⁶ Yet the pattern of striking parallels and possible allusions, but only limited verbal identity, means that it is difficult to exclude altogether the possibility that Clement and the author of the letter to the Hebrews might each have drawn on a common source or tradition. It may be best to conclude, as Paul Ellingworth demonstrates, that it is possible to affirm both the independence of Clement’s thought from that of Hebrews at a number of critical points and also their independent indebtedness to a common tradition at others, yet not to question the general consensus of the literary dependence of *1 Clement* on Hebrews.⁹⁷

The evidence may be set out as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| <i>1 Clem.</i> 36. 2–5 | Heb. 1 | LXX Psalms 103(104), 2 and 109(110). |
| ὄς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ, | ³ ὄς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτῆρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ρήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, καθαρισμόν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, | |
| τοσοῦτω μείζων ἐστὶν ἀγγέλων, ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον ὄνομα κεκληρονόμηκεν. | ⁴ τοσοῦτω κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον παρ’ αὐτοὺς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα. | Ps. 103(104). 4 |
| ³ Γέγραπται γὰρ οὕτως, | ⁷ καὶ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους λέγει, | |

⁹⁵ NTAF, 44–6; Massaux, *Influence*, 53; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 112; Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 52–5, 391–8, esp. 396–8; other studies include P. Ellingworth, ‘Hebrews and 1 Clement: Literary Dependence or Common Tradition?’, *BZ* 23 (1979), 262–9.

⁹⁶ NTAF, 46.

⁹⁷ Ellingworth, ‘Hebrews and 1 Clement’, 269. Lona (*Erste Clemensbrief*) denies literary dependence. For a brief but telling critique of his position, see M. Hengel, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ* (London: SCM, 2000), 285 n. 511.

ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους
αὐτοῦ πνεύματα

καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς
αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα.

⁴ Ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ
οὕτως εἶπεν ὁ δεσπότης,
Υἱός μου εἰ σύ,
ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά
σε,

αἵτησαι παρ' ἐμου, καὶ
δώσω σοι ἔθνη τὴν
κληρονομίαν σου καὶ τὴν
κατάσχεσίν σου τὰ
πέρατα τῆς γῆς.

⁵ Καὶ πάλιν λέγει πρὸς
αὐτόν,
κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου,
ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς
σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν
σου.

ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους
αὐτοῦ πνεύματα

καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς
αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα,

⁵ Τίνι γὰρ εἶπέν ποτε
τῶν ἀγγέλων,
Υἱός μου εἰ σύ,
ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά
σε,

καὶ πάλιν,
Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς
πατέρα,
καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς
υἱόν.

¹³ πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν
ἀγγέλων εἶρηκέν ποτε,
κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου,
ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς
σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν
σου.

ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους
αὐτοῦ πνεύματα

καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς
αὐτοῦ πῦρ φλέγον

Ps. 2. 7–8
κύριος εἶπεν πρὸς με
Υἱός μου εἰ σύ,
ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά
σε,

αἵτησαι παρ' ἐμου, καὶ
δώσω σοι ἔθνη τὴν
κληρονομίαν σου καὶ τὴν
κατάσχεσίν σου τὰ
πέρατα τῆς γῆς

Ps. 109(110). 1

Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ
μου,
κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου,
ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς
σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν
σου.

Further allusions to Hebrews have also been detected at 36. 1–2 (cf. Heb. 9. 8, 10. 20) and elsewhere in the letter. Hagner discusses several more,⁹⁸ but those noted by the Oxford Committee are as follows: *1 Clem.* 17. 1 // Heb. 11. 37, 39; *1 Clem.* 17. 5 // Heb. 3. 2; cf. Num. 12. 7; *1 Clem.* 19. 2 // Heb. 12. 1; *1 Clem.* 21. 9 // Heb. 4. 12; *1 Clem.* 27. 1 // Heb. 10. 23, 11. 1; *1 Clem.* 27. 2 // Heb. 6. 18; *1 Clem.* 36. 1, 61. 3, 64 // Heb. 2. 18, 3. 1; *1 Clem.* 43. 1 // Heb. 3. 5; *1 Clem.* 56. 4 // Heb. 12. 6; cf. Prov. 3. 12.⁹⁹ None is convincing in itself, but they may have a certain cumulative value, and the very strong likelihood that *1 Clem.* 36. 2–5 depends on Hebrews strengthens the possibility that other parallels also reflect literary dependence. But, as Lindemann observes, even if Clement did use Hebrews 1, this need not mean that he was familiar with the rest of the letter, or that it had a special place at Rome, for he may have known this passage through an intermediary source.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁸ Hagner, *Use*, 182–95.

⁹⁹ NTAJ, 46–8.

¹⁰⁰ Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 122, 18–20.

OTHER LETTERS AND THE APOCALYPSE

Carlyle and the Oxford Committee found no evidence for classifying higher than 'd' any potential allusions to either non-Pauline letters¹⁰¹ or the Apocalypse.¹⁰² Hagner provides an extensive discussion of a range of parallels,¹⁰³ but none is sufficient to demonstrate that *1 Clement* may have depended on any of these texts.

CONCLUSION: *1 CLEMENT* AND THE WRITINGS THAT LATER FORMED THE NEW TESTAMENT

It seems certain on the basis of the internal evidence of his letter that the author of *1 Clement* used 1 Corinthians, and very likely indeed that he used Romans and Hebrews. He appears also to have drawn on Jesus traditions, but not in the form preserved in the synoptic gospels. Beyond this, no firm conclusions may be drawn on the basis of evidence from the text of *1 Clement*.

Yet to draw this conclusion is not to imply that the question as to which of the writings later included in the New Testament may have been available to the author of *1 Clement*, writing in Rome towards the end of the first century

¹⁰¹ The potential parallels that he notes, some of which are unclassified, are (*NTAF*, 55–8): *1 Clem.* 29. 1 // 1 Tim. 2. 8; *1 Clem.* 7. 2, 4 // 1 Pet. 1. 18–19; *1 Clem.* 30. 1–2 // 1 Pet. 2. 1; 5. 5; cf. Jas. 4. 6; Prov. 3. 34; *1 Clem.* 49. 5 // 1 Pet. 4. 3; cf. Jas. 5. 20; Prov. 10. 12; *1 Clem.* 49. 2 // 1 Pet. 2. 9; cf. Col. 1. 12–13; *1 Clem.* sal. // 1 Pet. 1. 1–2; *1 Clem.* 2. 2 // 1 Pet. 4. 19; *1 Clem.* 2. 4 // 1 Pet. 2. 17; 5. 9; *1 Clem.* 49. 5; 50. 3 // 1 John 4. 18. The most striking are those with 1 Peter. John H. Elliott (*1 Peter: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 37B (New York: Doubleday, 2000) supplies a full list of parallels, on the basis of which he claims that '1 Clement is in all probability the first writing attesting the existence and influence of 1 Peter'. But, as Elliott concedes, this claim rests only on 'numerous lexical and thematic affinities' (*1 Peter*, 138–40; quotation on p. 138). Many of these, it may be noted, are no more than single words. For an effective rebuttal of Elliott's claims, see E. Norelli, 'Au sujet de la première réception de 1 Pierre: Trois exemples', in J. Schlosser (ed.), *The Catholic Epistles and the Tradition*, BETL 176 (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 327–66, on pp. 328–34.

¹⁰² The only parallel noted is *1 Clem.* 34. 3 // Rev. 22. 12; cf. Isa. 40. 10; 62. 11; Prov. 24. 12. The committee remarks on the 'noticeable' combination of phrases from Isaiah and Proverbs found in both *1 Clement* and Revelation, but observes that this 'may perhaps be accounted for by the hypothesis that it may have been made in some earlier apocalyptic work', and refers to *Barn.* 21. 3 (*NTAF*, 58).

¹⁰³ Hagner, *Use*, 238–71. As was the case in his summary of the evidence for Paul's letters, his final summary here (p. 271) appears to claim rather more than might be expected on the basis of his careful, detailed and patient discussions. Cf. Lona (*Erste Clemensbrief*, 56–7), who notes parallels with 1 Peter and with James, but attributes them to a common background.

or the beginning of the second,¹⁰⁴ is now closed. The internal evidence of *1 Clement* is an indispensable guide to the minimum number of such texts that its author may be shown to have used, but other avenues may also be explored. It would be foolish to preclude the possibility that new understandings of external evidence that is already extant, or even the discovery of new manuscripts, may offer good reason to believe that it is probable that this author may have *known* other texts even if that knowledge leaves no trace of their *use* in his letter. His extant literary *œuvre*, we should remember, consists of no more than a single occasional letter. Such possibilities may be illustrated by reference to recent discussion about the origins of Mark, of a collection of synoptic gospels, and of the Pauline corpus.

Were it possible to demonstrate that Mark was written in Rome, as early traditions claim,¹⁰⁵ then this would strongly suggest that Mark's gospel was known to the author of *1 Clement*. It would be almost impossible to believe that the gospel had dropped out of use in the city by the time that Clement wrote, and that a representative of the Roman church—even a church with such a history of fragmentation as appears to have been the case both before and after, and therefore probably during, the time at which the letter was written¹⁰⁶—would be unfamiliar with this work. Therefore, such evidence, were it to be found persuasive, might indicate the probability that this author was familiar with Mark. It would remain the case that it is not possible to demonstrate the author's use of Mark from a close reading of his text, but this external evidence would be very suggestive, and an inability to find clear textual evidence of quotations from or allusions to Mark is hardly an anomaly in early Christian literature from the period before Irenaeus.¹⁰⁷ Unfortunately, there is little agreement on the question of where Mark was written,¹⁰⁸ and no clear signs that a consensus in favour of Rome will emerge.

¹⁰⁴ I have raised questions about its traditional date elsewhere. See A. Gregory, 'Disturbing Trajectories: *1 Clement*, the *Shepherd of Hermas* and the Development of Early Roman Christianity', in P. Oakes (ed.), *Rome in the Bible and the Early Church* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2002), 142–66, on pp. 144–9. Note also the important study by L. L. Welborn, 'On the Date of *1 Clement*', *BR* 24 (1984), 34–54; repr. as 'The Preface to *1 Clement*: The Rhetorical Situation and the Traditional Date', in C. Breytenbach and L. L. Welborn (eds.), *Encounters with Hellenism: Studies on the First Letter of Clement*, AGAJU 53 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 197–216.

¹⁰⁵ On the second-century evidence, see C. C. Black, *Mark: Images of an Apostolic Interpreter* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1994), 77–191.

¹⁰⁶ See P. Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 359–65.

¹⁰⁷ Exceptions might be made for other evangelists (canonical or otherwise), but otherwise the earliest clear allusion to Mark in a later author may be Justin Martyr's reference in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, 106, to James and John as the Sons of Thunder. This term, which Justin appears to ascribe to Peter's *Memoirs* (*ἀπομνημονευματα*) is extant in surviving gospel tradition only at Mark 3. 17.

¹⁰⁸ For cautious and balanced assessments of the evidence, see the discussions of Raymond Brown in R. E. Brown and J. P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic*

Just as obscure is the question of when the synoptic gospels were first collected together, with or without the presence of John.¹⁰⁹ Martin Hengel's conjecture that the author of *1 Clement* may have had access to all three synoptics in a book-cupboard in Rome may not be excluded from consideration,¹¹⁰ but there is little evidence to support it. Even if Justin Martyr, writing in Rome perhaps fifty years later, knew all three synoptic gospels, great problems remain in establishing if this is likely to have been the case at the time of *1 Clement*.

Such difficulties in drawing trajectories back from the middle to the beginning of the second century or to the end of the first are no less apparent in continuing debates about the formation of the Pauline corpus.¹¹¹ Our earliest manuscript evidence for a Pauline corpus is P⁴⁶, but it is difficult to know when such collections became established, or when individual letters ceased to circulate on their own. The probability that such a collection existed before Marcion seems increasingly to be accepted,¹¹² and there seems no doubt that one was in place by no later than mid-second century.¹¹³ The suggestion that either Paul himself or one of his close followers initiated such a collection may favour a date in the late first century,¹¹⁴ perhaps before the composition of *1 Clement*.¹¹⁵ If it were possible to argue that Paul's letters

Christianity (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983), 191–201; J. R. Donahue, 'The Quest for the Community of Mark's Gospel', in F. Van Segbroeck *et al.* (eds.), *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neiryneck*, BETL 100 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), ii, 817–38; C. C. Black, 'Was Mark a Roman Gospel?', *ExpTim* 105 (1994–5), 36–40. Donahue subsequently advocated a Roman origin: *idem*, 'Windows and Mirrors: The Setting of Mark's Gospel', *CBQ* 57 (1995), 1–26. Another recent advocate of a new variant of this hypothesis is Brian J. Incigneri (*The Gospel to the Romans: The Setting and Rhetoric of Mark's Gospel*, Biblical Interpretation Series, 65 (Leiden: Brill, 2003)), who claims that it was written in the autumn of 71 after Titus had returned there from Jerusalem. For a Syrian provenance, and a critique of the Rome hypothesis, see J. Marcus, 'The Jewish War and the Sitz im Leben of Mark', *JBL* 111 (1992), 441–2; *idem*, *Mark 1–8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 27 (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 30–7.

¹⁰⁹ For recent discussion and further bibliography, G. N. Stanton, 'The Fourfold Gospel', *NTS* 43 (1997) 317–46, on 341–6; repr. (with minor revisions) in *idem*, *Jesus and Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Hengel, *Four Gospels*.

¹¹⁰ Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 116–30, esp. 128–30.

¹¹¹ For a recent survey and further bibliography, S. E. Porter, 'When and How was the Pauline Canon Compiled? An Assessment of Theories', in *idem* (ed.), *The Pauline Canon*, Pauline Studies, 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 95–127.

¹¹² J. J. Clabeaux, *A Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul: A Reassessment of the Text of the Pauline Canon Attested by Marcion*, CBQMS 21 (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989), 1–6; U. Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der Marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe*, ANTF 25 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995), 310–11.

¹¹³ Porter, 'When and How', 96–7, with supporting bibliography.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.* 109–13, 122–7.

¹¹⁵ As Zahn (*Geschichte des neutestamentliche Kanons*, i, 835) had argued, but on the basis of a theory of a gradual collection of Paul's letters. See Porter, 'When and How', 99–100, to which I owe this reference.

came to be transmitted mainly in a collection, rather than as individual writings, this might suggest that knowledge and use of even one letter in a later text could mean that its author had access to them all; but this argument is difficult to apply at an early date, when different churches may not yet have obtained such collections.¹¹⁶ Thus the author of *1 Clement* may have known each of the letters that he appears to cite quite apart from such a collection: Romans, because it was written to the city where he lived; Hebrews, because of its association with Rome (although there is an element of circularity in this case), and 1 Corinthians because—as *1 Clement* shows—there were ongoing relationships between the churches in the imperial capital and in one of its major colonies. If so, questions might be asked as to whether Rome was likely to have had a copy of Paul's other correspondence with Corinth; but there is no need to assume—or to deny, though the hypothesis is unnecessary—that there was yet a larger collection of Pauline letters in its possession.¹¹⁷

As each of these three examples shows, internal evidence is not the only criterion on which to decide which of the writings later included in the New Testament may have been known to, and used by, the author of a text such as *1 Clement*. Yet the difficulties in assessing these wider questions and the meagre data available are themselves powerful reminders of the value of minimal but assured results such as those that can be achieved on the basis of methodologically rigorous close readings of particular texts such as are exemplified in the main part of this discussion of *1 Clement*. Both approaches have their place. Wider discussions notwithstanding, it seems certain on the basis of the internal evidence of his letter that the author of *1 Clement* used 1 Corinthians, and very likely indeed that he used Romans and Hebrews. He appears also to have drawn on Jesus traditions, but not in the form preserved in the synoptic gospels. Thus there are no substantial amendments to be made to the conclusions presented by Carlyle and the other members of the Oxford Committee in 1905.

¹¹⁶ Pace Porter, 'When and How', 96.

¹¹⁷ As C. F. D. Moule observes (*The Birth of the New Testament*, 3rd edn. (London: A. & C. Black, 1966), 260, a reference that I owe to Porter, 'When and How', 109): *1 Clement* shows some knowledge of Pauline letters, yet, 'even so, evidence for the knowledge of one or two Pauline Epistles is not evidence for the existence of a collection, a *corpus*'.

This page intentionally left blank

The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch and the Writings that later formed the New Testament

Paul Foster

INTRODUCTION

Discussion concerning the use of the various writings that now comprise the New Testament by Ignatius of Antioch has been overburdened with both theological and historical freight. Theologically, both the advocacy of a monarchical episcopacy¹ and many of the heightened christological claims made by Ignatius have impinged on decisions concerning the date and authenticity of these epistles. Historically, much has been made of Ignatius' location in Antioch,² and apparent links with Paul or the writer of the first gospel.³ An issue that spans both theological and historical questions is the development of the NT canon, and the use by Ignatius of certain writings that were to become part of that grouping in order to establish some notion of a 'proto-canon' among 'orthodox' or 'proto-orthodox' Christians.⁴

¹ Lietzmann drew the conclusion that 'In Ignatius we already find that the monarchical episcopate is an accomplished fact and is applicable to both Syria and Western Asia Minor' (H. Lietzmann, *A History of the Early Church*, trans. B. L. Woolf (London: Lutterworth, 1961), i. 248. See also F. A. Sullivan, *From Apostles to Bishops: The Development of the Episcopacy in the Early Church* (New York/Mahwah, NJ: Newman Press, 2001), 103–25.

² For the argument of a discernible trajectory at Antioch from Peter to Matthew and on to Ignatius, see J. P. Meier, 'Part One: Antioch', in R. E. Brown and J. P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983), 11–86.

³ See W. R. Schoedel, 'Ignatius and the Reception of Matthew in Antioch', in D. L. Balch (ed.), *Social History of the Matthean Community* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 129–77.

⁴ The terms 'orthodox' and 'proto-orthodox' are placed in inverted commas to acknowledge that in the first half of the second century they are anachronistic and are an artificial attempt to portray the theological positions of later Nicene and Chalcedonian formulations of Christianity as ancient truths from which schismatics and heretics deviated. Bauer's corrective to this line of thinking still needs to be heard (W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*, BHT 10 (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1934; 2nd edn. 1964; Eng. trans. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1971;

This study seeks to distance itself from such theological and historical questions and to investigate the literary relationship between the seven epistles of Ignatius contained in the so-called middle recension and the body of writings that only later became known as the NT. Obviously, in broad terms the historical question is not irrelevant. The later one dates the Ignatian epistles, the more likely it becomes that the author knew the gospels, epistles, and other writings of the NT, although knowledge alone does not equate to use. Moreover, if the Ignatian epistles pre-date certain writings in the NT, then dependence on those writings is excluded.⁵ Since, however, there is no uniform consensus concerning the date of either the NT documents or the Ignatian epistles, it is necessary to compare each of the parallels under consideration on a case-by-case basis, and then to see if a literary relationship can be established. Furthermore, it will need to be established whether a direction of dependence can be established. This will perhaps be easiest for material that is paralleled in the genuine Pauline epistles, since an extremely strong case can be made for the latter's priority. The other epistles contained in the NT are much harder to date, and thus complicate the issue of the direction of dependence. The synoptic gospel material throws up the added complication of having to determine which account may be the basis of the parallel, or even the possibility that the tradition is drawn from a pre-gospel source.

THE SCOPE OF THIS STUDY

When W. R. Inge undertook a similar task to this present study 100 years ago, he discussed 104 examples that showed varying degrees of affinity between the epistles of Ignatius and the text of the NT documents.⁶ The decision taken

(London: SCM, 1972)). Orthodoxy was not necessarily the original form of Christianity, from which heresy always deviated subsequently. Often two competing theological understandings developed together, with one finally supplanting the other, and with the successful form being deemed 'orthodox'.

⁵ Of course, even these apparently self-evident statements need to be qualified. First, it is possible that a tradition that is earlier than both the Ignatian epistles and a later NT writing was independently incorporated by both. Thus, if a parallel were to exist between 2 Peter and Ignatius (which, incidentally, does not appear to be the case), and since many scholars date the writing of 2 Peter later than the composition of the Ignatian letters, it might be the case that an independent tradition stood behind both documents, rather than implying that 2 Peter was dependent on Ignatius. In this hypothetical case the epistle of Jude could be potentially the source of a parallel. Second, one needs to take seriously the possibility of textual interpolations in the Ignatian corpus. None of our manuscript evidence for the middle recension is particularly early; hence later scribes could have introduced the scriptural citations or, perhaps more likely, made what appear to be partial allusions conform more explicitly to texts that were later canonized by their faith communities.

⁶ W. R. Inge, 'Ignatius', *NTAF*, 61–83.

here to deal with far fewer readings is not due to the limitation of space, but rather reflects the fact that most of the parallels in 'class d' leave one bemused and pondering at what point the parallel actually occurs, and perhaps only modern scholars armed with critical tools such as a concordance and lexicon are able to find what was never seen by original or subsequent readers, nor ever intended by the author! Similarly, many of the parallels that form 'c-type' readings are very slight allusions to the NT text in question. There may exist either a couple of shared words, although not in the same syntactical order, or a conceptual similarity, but using differing terms. Perhaps such strictures may at first appear too harsh. If, however, the objective of this study is to be accomplished—namely, identifying which NT documents Ignatius made use of in his correspondence and which parts of the NT he quotes—then a harder line is necessary than that employed by Inge. In effect, this removes the nebulous category of 'allusion' altogether, but perhaps this is no bad thing, since one person's allusion often appears to be another's authorial creativity.⁷

It also needs to be noted that Ignatius does not maintain high levels of accuracy when he appears to be quoting earlier literary sources. This is neither an indictment of Ignatius, nor a suggestion that certain NT writings had not necessarily become fixed in form. Rather, this caveat is intended as a reminder of the historical circumstances surrounding the composition of the Ignatian epistles. It is highly unlikely that Ignatius had access to the texts he cited while being taken to Rome. One can then only be impressed at the number of scriptural quotations he makes, and draw from this the conclusion that many of the texts he cites had been deemed authoritative enough to be committed to memory. Although Inge does not comment on the circumstances surrounding the composition of the letters, he does comment on the memorization of Paul's first letter to the Corinthians by Ignatius.

Ignatius must have known this epistle almost by heart. Although there are no *quotations* (in the strict sense, with mention of the source), echoes of its language and thought pervade the whole of his writings in such a manner as to leave no doubt that he was acquainted with the First Epistle to the Corinthians.⁸

Thus, Ignatius should not be deemed deficient when it comes to the levels of accuracy of citation; nor should this be seen as providing insight into the 'status' of the NT writings for Ignatius. Rather, inaccuracy of references is due to the pragmatic factors surrounding the composition of his epistles.

⁷ Cf. the debate between C. M. Tuckett, 'Paul, Scripture and Ethics: Some Reflections', *NTS* 46 (2000), 403–24, and R. B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

⁸ Inge, 'Ignatius', *NTAF* 67.

In this study parallels will be treated broadly in the same order as was set out by the contributors to the original volume. This means that the books of the NT are arranged into three classes A to C, indicating descending order of probability.⁹ Within each of those classes the books are arranged in canonical order, except that, as in the original study, ‘the Gospels are reserved for a section by themselves after the other writings’.¹⁰ This was an eminently sensible decision, since the problems surrounding the gospels are different from those concerning other NT documents. This is due to the fact that it may not be possible to determine which gospel is being utilized in a triple or double tradition passage, or in fact if an underlying oral or written source is being incorporated. These problems could in theory arise with the epistles, such as the parallel material between Jude and 2 Peter, or if a no longer extant source lies behind the epistles to the Colossians and the Ephesians.¹¹

ANALYSIS OF THE PARALLELS

In citing passages from the documents that were to form part of the NT, Ignatius does not use introductory formulae as markers of quotations. This is in contrast to one citation from the OT that is prefaced with *γέγραπται γάρ*.¹²

Ign. *Eph.* 5. 3

γέγραπται γάρ: Ὑπερηφάνοις ὁ Θεὸς
ἀντιτάσσεται

Prov. 3. 34, LXX

Κύριος ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται

One should, however, be cautious about concluding too much from this single example, such as Ignatius having different attitudes to the OT as Scripture in comparison with the writings that were later canonized as the NT. First, apart from the obvious deviation in word order, it needs to be noted that Prov. 3. 34 is quoted in the extant Christian sources prior to Ignatius on

⁹ As discussed earlier, class D seems to be of little value for determining which parts of the NT were used by the various Apostolic Fathers.

¹⁰ *NTAF*, p. iv.

¹¹ The theory of a common source lying behind Ephesians and Colossians was first suggested by H. J. Holtzmann, *Kritik der Epheser- und Kolosserbriefe auf Grund einer Analyse ihres Verwandtschaftsverhältnisses* (Leipzig: Englemann, 1872). More recently, J. Muddiman, *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, BNTC (London and New York: Continuum, 2001) has argued that Ephesians is an expansion and redirection to Ephesus of Paul’s letter to Laodiceans, which was similar to the (largely) genuine Colossians. Muddiman offers a reconstruction of Laodiceans in Appendix B (pp. 302–5) of his commentary. If his theory is correct, it would also problematize the discussion of the citation of Ephesians and Colossians by later writers, since such writers might still have had access to the no longer extant epistle to the Laodiceans.

¹² See Inge, ‘Ignatius’, example 1, *NTAF*, 63 and example 76, *NTAF*, 76.

at least three occasions. The references are Jas. 4. 6; 1 Pet. 5. 5; 1 Clem. 30. 2. Inge correctly notes that, 'In all alike *Θεός* or *ὁ Θεός* takes the place of the *Κύριος* of the LXX; but Ignatius alone puts *ὑπερφάνοις* first in the sentence.'¹³ He does not explicitly state any conclusion from these data. One may, however, advance the idea that not only is it impossible to determine the specific source for the reference that Ignatius makes, but the fact that all three quotations of Prov. 3. 34 use *Θεός* or *ὁ Θεός* instead of *Κύριος* may well suggest that this proverbial saying had wide currency, at least among early Christians, without direct dependence on any literary text. Thus the *γέγραπται γάρ* may well denote a gnomic saying with wide circulation, rather than communicating anything about the authority of the OT.

Ignatius does refer to one figure and his literary corpus explicitly in his correspondence. In *Eph.* 12. 2 he exhorts the Ephesians to whom he writes to be imitators of Paul, and then he makes the following descriptive statement about the apostle's references to the Ephesians in his epistles: *Παύλου συμμύσται . . . ὅς ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ μνημονεύει ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*. The majority of commentators, if they have discussed the issue at all, have taken the statement that Paul remembers the Ephesians in every letter as mere 'hyperbole'.¹⁴ Schoedel states that 'the whole passage is highly idealized and tends to make sweeping claims on the basis of a few instances'.¹⁵ Similarly, Lightfoot mentions the various hermeneutical devices that have been attempted to remove the apparent difficulty, including the alteration by the person responsible for the longer recension, *ὅς πάντοτε ἐν ταῖς δεήσεσιν αὐτοῦ μνημονεύει ὑμῶν*. Yet Lightfoot himself uses the term 'hyperbole' to describe Ignatius' claim.¹⁶ The tension arises because Paul does not in fact mention the Ephesians 'in every letter', but refers to them in only four of the epistles that form the Pauline corpus.¹⁷ These are 1 Corinthians,¹⁸ Ephesians,¹⁹

¹³ *Ibid.*, example 76, *NTAF*, 76.

¹⁴ W. R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985) 73 n. 7.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* 73.

¹⁶ J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers: Part 2, Ignatius and Polycarp* (London: Macmillan, 1889–90; repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1989), 65–6.

¹⁷ Lightfoot sees references to the Ephesians contained also in Rom. 16. 5: *ἀσπάσασθε Ἐπαῖνετον τὸν ἀγαπητὸν μου, ὅς ἐστιν ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀσίας εἰς Χριστόν* and 2 Cor. 1. 8: *Ὁὐ γὰρ θέλομεν ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὑπὲρ τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν τῆς γενομένης ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ*. These references to 'Asia' are obviously not explicitly mentioning the Ephesians, although, as Rev. 1–3 makes clear, Ephesus was undoubtedly considered part of the Roman province of Asia by Christian writers.

¹⁸ In 1 Corinthians Ephesus is mentioned twice towards the end of the epistle: at 15. 32, where Paul mentions fighting with wild beasts; and at 16. 8, as a disclosure of the plan to remain in Ephesus until Pentecost.

¹⁹ In Ephesians, Ephesus is mentioned in the majority of manuscripts in the opening verse, *τοῖς ἀγίοις τοῖς οὐσιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*; significantly, however, the words *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* are omitted in the

1 Timothy,²⁰ and 2 Timothy.²¹ What has not been considered is that Ignatius might be correct in reporting the facts as he knows them: that is, that all of the Pauline epistles of which he had first-hand knowledge did in fact explicitly name the Ephesians or the city of Ephesus. This does not necessarily imply that he was referring to all four epistles mentioned above, but perhaps a subset of those epistles constituted his personal acquaintance with the writings of Paul. To test this hypothesis, it is necessary to look at the parallels that exist between the Ignatian epistles and the Pauline corpus.

Epistles and Acts

Category A: No Reasonable Doubt Concerning Knowledge of the Document

1 Corinthians

Texts of Type b: A High Level of Correspondence, But not Exact Quotation

Ign. *Eph.* 16. 1

μη̄ πλανᾶσθε ἀδελφοί μου. οἱ οἰκοφθόροι βασιλείαν θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν·

1 Cor. 6. 9–10

Ἡ οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι ἄδικοι θεοῦ βασιλείαν οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν; μη̄ πλανᾶσθε· οὔτε πόρνοι οὔτε εἰδωλολάτραι οὔτε μοιχοὶ οὔτε μαλακοὶ οὔτε ἀρσενοκοῖται¹⁰ οὔτε κλέπται οὔτε πλεονέκται, οὐ μέθυσοι, οὐ λοῖδοροι, οὐχ ἄρπαγες βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομήσουσιν.

Here it can be seen that Ignatius' form has six words in common with 1 Cor. 6. 9a. The syntactical arrangement differs; the addressees implied by Paul's second person plural verb form *οἶδατε* explicitly become *ἀδελφοί μου* in Ign. *Eph.* 16. 1; and the negatively depicted group in 1 Corinthians, *ἄδικοι*, are labelled by Ignatius as *οἱ οἰκοφθόροι*, with the latter term being a more specific reference to those who corrupt families or households. It may be the case that this last change was introduced to address a specific problem.²² The

three earliest MSS which are extant for Eph 1. 1: P⁴⁶, S^{*}, B, although later scribes inserted the reference to Ephesus into both S² and B². Moreover, the *subscriptio* which is included after 6. 24 in many MSS, including the original hand of both S and B describes the epistle as being *πρὸς Ἐφέσιους*.

²⁰ 1 Tim. 1. 3, Timothy being urged to remain in Ephesus.

²¹ 2 Tim. 1. 18; 4. 12; and some forms of the *subscriptio* that occurs after 4. 22.

²² It is not clear whether the 'corrupters of homes' who first did 'these things in the flesh' denote acts of adultery (see the discussion in Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 79, esp. n. 2), or whether Lightfoot (*Apostolic Fathers*, ii. 71) and Bauer (*BDAG*, 3rd edn.: *οἰκοφθόρος*, p. 700) are correct that the term *οἰκοφθόροι* refers to temple-destroyers.

nature of the parallel in Ign. *Eph.* 16. 1 can be described as a text with close thematic and verbal points of correspondence with 1 Cor. 6. 9–10, but not an exact quotation.

Ign. *Eph.* 18. 1

... σταυροῦ, ὃ ἐστὶ σκάνδαλον τοῖς ἀπιστοῦσιν, ἡμῖν δὲ σωτηρία καὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος. ποῦ σοφός; ποῦ συζητητῆς; ποῦ καύχησις τῶν λεγομένων συνετῶν;

1 Cor. 1. 18, 20

ὁ λόγος γὰρ ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῖς μὲν ἀπολλυμένοις μωρία ἐστίν, τοῖς δὲ σφζομένοις ἡμῖν δύναμις θεοῦ ἐστὶν ...
 20 ποῦ σοφός; ποῦ γραμματεὺς; ποῦ συζητητῆς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου;

The complicating issue here, as Inge points out, is that 1 Cor. 1. 20 is itself a quotation from the OT, of Isa. 33. 18. In this case, however, the reference to the cross in Ign. *Eph.* 18. 1, along with its contrasting significance for ‘unbelievers’ and the ‘us’ group, shows that the wider context depicted in 1 Cor. 1. 18 was in the mind of Ignatius. Thus the source of the second half of Ign. *Eph.* 18. 1 is almost certainly the material in 1 Cor. 1 and not that in Isaiah. Moreover, the term *σκάνδαλον* also occurs in the same context in Paul’s letter to the Corinthians, *Ἰουδαίοις μὲν σκάνδαλον* (1 Cor. 1. 23).²³ Hence, once again, there is an inexact quotation of material from 1 Corinthians, probably reflecting the fact that while being transported in Roman custody Ignatius did not have access to a copy of 1 Corinthians. None the less, he knew its contents well enough to paraphrase the epistle at certain points, at times with quite a high correspondence with its actual vocabulary.²⁴

Ign. *Magn.* 10. 22⁵

ὑπέρθεσθε ὄν τὴν κακὴν ζύμην τὴν παλαιωθεῖσαν καὶ ἐνοξίσασαν καὶ μεταβάλεσθε εἰς νέαν ζύμην, ὅς ἐστιν

Ἰησοῦς Χριστός.

1 Cor. 5. 7–8

ἐκκαθάρατε τὴν παλαιὰν ζύμην, ἵνα ἦτε νέον φύραμα, καθὼς ἐστε ἄζυμοι· καὶ γὰρ τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστός ...⁸ μηδὲ ἐν

ζύμῃ κακίας καὶ πονηρίας

It is also important to note that in 1 Cor. 5. 8 Paul adjusts the metaphor slightly as his train of thought progresses, and describes the leaven as ἐν ζύμῃ κακίας καὶ πονηρίας, which with regard to the first adjective gives a verbal

²³ As Schoedel observes, ‘The decisive elements in 18.1... are directly based on 1 Cor 1:19, 20, 23 (with an echo perhaps of Rom 3:27, “where is the boasting?”)’ (*Ignatius of Antioch*, 84).

²⁴ Lightfoot’s conclusion is essentially the same. Commenting on the second half of Ign. *Eph.* 1. 18, he states: ‘An inexact quotation from I Cor. I. 20 ποῦ σοφός; ποῦ γραμματεὺς; ποῦ συζητητῆς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου; which words themselves are a free paraphrase of Isaiah xxxiii. 18’ (*Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 2. 74).

²⁵ Inge cites this text as ‘Magn. x. 3’ (*Ignatius*, *NTAF*, 65), but it is actually 10. 2, as given above.

match to Ignatius' phrase τὴν κακὴν ζύμην. Schoedel correctly sees both vv. 7 and 8 as forming the parallel behind Ign. *Magn.* 10. 2 (*contra* Inge); however, Schoedel's reference to Gal. 5. 9, μικρὰ ζύμη ὄλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοί, is dubious.²⁶ Rather, the use of the leaven metaphor in Gal. 5. 9 is due to Paul applying similar language in another context and not a reflection of Ignatius drawing this language from two separate Pauline epistles.²⁷ This example furnishes further evidence of the pattern identified in the previous quotations. Ignatius presents a loose citation of a passage from 1 Corinthians with strong conceptual and terminological points of contact. There is little doubt that 1 Cor. 5. 7–8 is the source of the image, and the inexact type of quotation is what we would expect from a person using memory to recall passages from source material.

Ign. *Rom.* 5. 1

ἀλλ' οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο δεδικαίωμαι

1 Cor. 4. 4

ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ δεδικαίωμαι

A very close parallel exists here, although spanning only five words.²⁸ Although only two of the words agree exactly, two more are modified only slightly due to the substitution of *παρά* for *ἐν*. This has resulted in the case change of the demonstrative from the dative to the accusative, and since *παρά* commences with a consonant, the longer form of the negative is no longer required. There can be little doubt that Ignatius is drawing, from memory, on the wording of 1 Corinthians.²⁹

Texts of Type c: A Slight Level of Correspondence, Some Verbal Similarity

Ign. *Rom.* 9.2

Ἐγὼ γὰρ αἰσχύνομαι ἐξ αὐτῶν λέγεσθαι
οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀξίός εἰμι, ὡν ἔσχατος αὐτῶν
καὶ ἔκτρωμα, ἀλλ' ἠλέημαι τις εἶναι, ἐὰν
Θεοῦ ἐπιτύχω

1 Cor. 15. 8–10a

ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων ὡσπερὶ τῷ
ἐκτρώματι ὡφθη κάμοι.
⁹Ἐγὼ γὰρ εἰμι ὁ ἐλάχιστος
τῶν ἀποστόλων ὃς οὐκ εἰμὶ ἰκανὸς
καλεῖσθαι ἀπόστολος, διότι ἐδίωξα τὴν
ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ.¹⁰ χάριτι δὲ θεοῦ εἰμι ὁ
εἰμι

²⁶ In fairness it must be said that Schoedel does not state that Gal. 5. 9 is a parallel or source for the imagery employed by Ignatius, but he does list it alongside 1 Cor. 5. 7–8 without any qualification (Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 126).

²⁷ Lightfoot implies that Gal. 5. 9 has no direct impact on Ignatius' thought at this juncture. He simply notes, 'On the metaphor [leaven] generally see note *Galatians* 5.9' (*Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 2. 133).

²⁸ *Ibid.* 2. 2. 214.

²⁹ As Schoedel notes, 'Ignatius speaks of his justification in terms that are directly dependent on 1 Cor 4:4 (echoed again in *Tr.* 5:2)' (*Ignatius of Antioch*, 179).

This is the only example of a type-c text that will be discussed as a separate example. The reason for dealing with it explicitly is that Inge classified it as a type-b reading.³⁰ It is apparent that this parallel shows far less agreement between the two readings in terms of similarity in wording than previous examples. The verbal correspondence between the two texts occurs with the terms ἔσχατος and ἔκτρομα agreeing apart from required case changes. There also appears to be a conceptual parallel between the clauses ἀλλ' ἠλέημαι τις εἶναι and χάριτι δὲ θεοῦ εἶμι ὃ εἶμι, although only the verb εἶμι in different forms is shared. Ignatius' intention may be, as Schoedel suggests, to present himself 'in imitation of Paul (1 Cor 15:8–9) [when] he calls himself "last" of them (*Eph.* 21.2; *Tr.* 13.1; *Sm.* 11.1) and a "miscarriage" (a term which he takes in a purely negative sense).³¹ While the first shared term, ἔσχατος, may suggest some sort of dependence, it should also be noted that it is a favourite of Ignatius, and not only here, but also in the three references listed by Schoedel, occurs in conjunction with words from the ἀξιός semantic group.³² The term ἔκτρομα, by contrast, is not as common in the NT, but has wider usage in the LXX,³³ other Greek writers,³⁴ and even in the writings of Eusebius of Caesarea.³⁵ Despite the term being in common currency, in this instance it is more likely that Ignatius is drawing on Paul's self-deprecating description, although this 'borrowing' from 1 Corinthians is much less than the previous examples listed above.

One could add further examples of type-c texts, where the correspondence is light but, none the less, dependence is not improbable.³⁶ While these texts lend weight to a cumulative case for Ignatius' use of 1 Corinthians (citing that epistle from memory while *en route* to Rome), the first four examples of type-b texts are probably strong enough to establish with a high degree of probability that Ignatius knew and consciously quoted phrases and concepts from that writing.

³⁰ Inge, 'Ignatius', *NTAF*, 65.

³¹ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 189.

³² Lightfoot notes the repeated use of such constructions by Ignatius (*Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 2. 89).

³³ LXX, Num. 12. 12; Job 3. 16; Eccl. 6. 3.

³⁴ Arist. *Gen. an.* 4, 5, 4 (773b, 18); *P Teb* iii. 800, 30 (142 BC); Philo, *Leg.* 1, 76.

³⁵ Euseb. *HE* 5. 1. 45.

³⁶ The examples listed by Inge for 1 Corinthians are: Ign. *Eph.* 15. 3 // 1 Cor. 3. 16; Ign. *Trall.* 2. 3 // 1 Cor. 4. 1; Ign. *Trall.* 5. 1 // 1 Cor. 3. 1–2; Ign. *Trall.* 12. 3 // 1 Cor. 9. 27; Ign. *Rom.* 4. 3 // 1 Cor. 7. 22; Ign. *Rom.* 6. 1 // 1 Cor. 9. 15; Ign. *Phld.* 4.1 // 1 Cor. 10. 16–17; Ign. *Phld.* 7. 1 // 1 Cor. 2. 10; Ign. *Smyrn.* inscript. // 1 Cor. 1. 7.

Category B: a High Degree of Probability of Knowledge of the Document

Ephesians

The level of correspondence between passages in Ignatius' seven letters and the Pauline epistle to the Ephesians does not match the level of verbal parallels with 1 Corinthians. None the less, the repeated references to imagery and short verbal phrases that occur in the epistle to the Ephesians support the likelihood that Ignatius was intentionally, although perhaps from memory, drawing upon the contents of this epistle. Thus, as Inge suggests, 'Though the correspondences between Ignatius and this Epistle are not nearly so numerous as in the case of 1 Corinthians, it may be considered almost certain that they are not accidental.'³⁷ In fact, the first example given below, although not having long stretches of exactly corresponding material, has such a concatenation of images and terminology drawn from Eph. 1. 3–14 that any theory other than dependence of the text upon Ephesians would appear to be less likely.

Texts of Type b: A High Level of Correspondence, But not Exact Quotation

Ign. Eph. inscript.

τῇ εὐλογημένη ἐν μεγέθει, Θεοῦ πατρὸς
πληρώματι, τῇ προωρισμένη πρὸ αἰώνων
εἶναι διὰ παντὸς εἰς δόξαν παράμονον
ἄτρεπτον, ἡνωμένη καὶ ἐκκελεγεμένη ἐν
πάθει ἀληθινῶ ἐν θελήματι τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, τῇ
ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ οὐσῇ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, πλείστα ἐν
Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ καὶ ἐν ἀμώμῳ χαρὰ
χαίρειν.

Eph. 1. 3–14

Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ . . . ὁ
εὐλογήσας ἡμᾶς ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ . . .⁴
καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς . . . πρὸ καταβολῆς
κόσμου εἶναι ἡμᾶς . . . ἀμώμους . . .⁵
προορίσας . . . κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ
θελήματος . . .⁷ διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ
. . .¹⁰ τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν
. . .¹¹ προορισθέντες . . . κατὰ τὴν βουλήν
τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ . . . εἰς¹⁴ ἔπαινον τῆς
δόξης αὐτοῦ.

The opening makarisms in the two passages share a number of similarities. Throughout there are a number of terms in common (with required changes for case or tense). Terms which are shared or modified from Ephesians include *εὐλογητός*, *θεός*, *πατήρ*, *ἐξελέξατο*, *πρό*, *καταβολῆς*, *ἀμώμους*, *προορίσας*, *θελήματος*, *πληρώματος*. While each of these terms occurs with different frequencies in wider Hellenistic literature, their occurrence in such close proximity in both passages makes literary dependence almost certain. As Lightfoot comments with respect to the opening to the Ignatian epistle, 'This opening contains several obvious reminiscences of Ephes. I. 3 sq. . . the acquaintance of Ignatius with that epistle [Ephesians] appears from other passages beside this exordium.'³⁸ This passage may also contain parallels to

³⁷ Inge, 'Ignatius', *NTAF*, 69.

³⁸ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 2. 23.

other material in Eph. 1 such as ἐν μεγέθει // τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος (1. 19) and πληρώματι // τὸ πλήρωμα (1. 23).³⁹

Ign. *Pol.* 5. 1b

ἀγαπᾶν τὰς συμβίους, ὡς ὁ Κύριος τὴν
ἐκκλησίαν

Eph. 5. 25

ἀγαπάτε τὰς γυναῖκας, καθὼς καὶ ὁ
Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν

Not only does this parallel show affinities in terminology between the two passages, but as the wider context in each epistle makes clear, both are addressed to husbands (or ‘brothers’ in the church), and both occur in the context of a wider household code. The deviations made by Ignatius from the Pauline form are not of great significance in counting against dependence. First, Ignatius does not repeat the verb ἀγαπάω; second, he changes τὰς γυναῖκας to the synonymous τὰς συμβίους; third, he reduces the double conjunction καθὼς καὶ to the simpler form ὡς; and fourth, he changes the christological title from Χριστός to Κύριος. Again, all these alterations should be attributed to the process of citing Eph. 5. 25 from memory. Lightfoot, unnecessarily, reduces the length of the quotation to the five words ὡς ὁ Κύριος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.⁴⁰ The preceding three words should also be included, however, since the same verb introduces the object of both clauses, which in turn consist of the accusative plural definite article with the chief deviation being in the use of different terms to denote the spouses of the husbands.⁴¹

Further parallels of a c-type text could be given for the epistles of Ignatius and the Pauline letter to the Ephesians. These would include Ign. *Eph.* 20. 1 // Eph. 2. 15 and 4. 24; Ign. *Smyrn.* 1. 1 // Eph. 2. 16; Ign. *Pol.* 1. 2 // Eph. 4. 2.⁴² The case for Ignatius’ knowledge of Ephesians is compelling, and in many ways perhaps could have been placed in category A. The reason for this reluctance to do so is based not so much on any uncertainty about the use of Ephesians by Ignatius, but more on a desire to mark the qualitative distinction between the knowledge of Ephesians and the overwhelming use of 1 Corinthians demonstrated by Ignatius. To place Ephesians and 1 Corinthians in the same category might give rise to the misleading assumption that they are used to the same degree by Ignatius. Perhaps it would be better to designate 1 Corinthians as A* and Ephesians as A, for there can be little doubt that both were well known to Ignatius, and that he could cite large portions of each letter from memory.

³⁹ See Schoedel for a helpful table illustrating the similarities with Eph. 1. 3–23. He comments: ‘The address to the Ephesian church contains a series of these reminiscent of the opening of Ephesians in the NT (1:3–23)’ (*Ignatius of Antioch*, 37).

⁴⁰ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 2. 348.

⁴¹ Lightfoot incorrectly gives the parallel as Eph. 5. 29 instead of 5. 25 (*Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 2. 348).

⁴² See Inge, ‘Ignatius’, *NTAF*, 68, for a synoptic display of these parallels.

Inge places the other Pauline epistles⁴³ in either category C or D. Of those he lists in category C he gives four examples of possible allusions to Romans (three of text type c, one of d);⁴⁴ three for 2 Corinthians (all type d);⁴⁵ five for Galatians (one c, four d);⁴⁶ four for Philippians (two c, two d);⁴⁷ four for 1 Timothy, although the first text is alluded to in three places, so this is perhaps better enumerated as six allusions (in which case there are four of type c, two of type d);⁴⁸ five examples for 2 Timothy, although again the first text is alluded to in two Ignatian passages (in which case three of type c, three of type d);⁴⁹ and two for Titus (one of c, one of d).⁵⁰ The remaining Pauline epistles are placed in category D, all with d-type texts.⁵¹ It should be noted that Inge is hesitant about classifying the allusions to the two epistles to Timothy as low as category C. He states: ‘The reminiscences of 2 Timothy, as of 1 Timothy, are tolerably clear. Both Epistles are nearly in Class B.’⁵² Moreover, in regard to the three passages (Ign. *Eph.* 14. 1, 20. 1; *Magn.* 8. 1) that are seen as having resemblance to 1 Tim. 1. 3–5, Inge notes,

If these three passages are compared with the opening sentences of 1 Timothy, it will be seen that the resemblance is very close, and that it lies in words and expressions which are not commonplaces. (See, however, Hermas, *Vis.* iii. 8. 3–5, for a list of virtues beginning with and ending with ἀγάπη.) It is also clear that, if literary dependence be admitted, it is on the side of Ignatius.⁵³

Looking at the type-c parallels in Inge’s list for both 1 and 2 Timothy, it appears that he was being over cautious in not classing these letters as

⁴³ Here the term ‘Pauline epistle’ does not prejudice the question of authorship. Rather, it is used to refer to the body of thirteen epistles traditionally attributed to Paul (Rom., 1 and 2 Cor., Gal., Eph., Phil., Col., 1 and 2 Thess., 1 and 2 Tim., Titus, Philem.) but not to the epistle to the Hebrews.

⁴⁴ Type c: Ign. *Eph.* 8. 2 // Rom. 8. 5, 8; Ign. *Eph.* 19. 3 // Rom. 6. 4; Ign. *Smyrn.* 1. 1 // Rom. 1. 3, 4. Type d: Ign. *Eph.* inscript. // Rom. 15. 29.

⁴⁵ Type d: Ign. *Eph.* 15. 3 // 2 Cor. 6. 16; Ign. *Trall.* 9. 2 // 2 Cor. 4. 14; Ign. *Phld.* 6. 3 // 2 Cor. 1. 12; 11. 9; 12. 16.

⁴⁶ Type c: Ign. *Phld.* 1. 1 // Gal. 1. 1. Type d: Ign. *Eph.* 16. 1 // Gal. 5. 21; Ign. *Eph.* 18. 1 // Gal. 5. 11; Ign. *Trall.* 10. 1 // Gal. 2. 21; Ign. *Rom.* 7. 2 // Gal. 6. 14.

⁴⁷ Type c: Ign. *Smyrn.* 4. 2 // Phil. 4. 13; Ign. *Smyrn.* 11. 3 // Phil. 3. 15. Type d: Ign. *Rom.* 2 and 4 // Phil. 2. 17; Ign. *Phld.* 1. 1, 8. 2 // Phil. 2. 3, 5.

⁴⁸ Type c: Ign. *Eph.* 14. 1; 20. 1; Ign. *Magn.* 8. 1 // 1 Tim. 1. 3–5; Ign. *Pol.* 4. 3 // 1 Tim. 6. 2. Type d: Ign. *Rom.* 9. 2 // 1 Tim. 1. 13; Ign. *Smyrn.* 4. 2 // 1 Tim. 1. 12.

⁴⁹ Type c: Ign. *Eph.* 2.1; Ign. *Smyrn.* 10. 2 // 2 Tim. 1. 16; Ign. *Pol.* 6. 2 // 2 Tim. 2. 3. Type d: Ign. *Eph.* 17. 1 // 2 Tim. 3. 6; Ign. *Trall.* 7. 2 // 2 Tim. 1. 3; Ign. *Rom.* 2. 2 // 2 Tim. 4. 6.

⁵⁰ Type c: Ign. *Magn.* 8. 1 // Titus 1. 14; 3. 9. Type d: Ign. *Pol.* 6. 1 // Titus 1. 7.

⁵¹ For Colossians there are seven very questionable allusions; two for 1 Thessalonians; one for 2 Thessalonians; and, one for Philemon. See Inge, ‘Ignatius’, *NTAF*, 74.

⁵² *Ibid.* 73.

⁵³ *Ibid.* 72.

category B, for they are closer to Ignatius' use of Ephesians than to the faint allusions listed for the other epistles in categories C and D.

Ign. *Eph.* 14. 1; 20. 1; Ign. *Magn.* 8. 1

a. ἀρχὴ μὲν πίστις, τέλος δὲ ἀγάπη.

b. προσδηλώσω ὑμῖν ἧς ἡρξάμην
οἰκονομίας...

c. μὴ πλανᾶσθη ταῖς ἑτεροδοξίαις μηδὲ
μυθεύνασιν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἀνωφέλεσιν
οὐδὲν εἰ γὰρ μέχρι νῦν κατὰ Ἰουδαϊσμὸν
ζῶμεν, ὁμολογοῦμεν χάραν μὴ εἰληφέναι.

1 Tim. 1. 3–5

Καθὼς παρεκάλεσά σε προσμεῖναι ἐν
Ἐφέσῳ πορευόμενος εἰς Μακεδονίαν, ἵνα
παραγγείλης τισὶν μὴ ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν
μηδὲ προσέχειν μύθοις καὶ γενεαλογίαις
ἀπεράντοις, αἵτινες ἐκζητήσεις
παρέχουσιν μᾶλλον ἢ οἰκονομίαν
θεοῦ τὴν ἐν πίστει.

Ἐπὶ δὲ τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας ἐστὶν ἀγάπη
ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας καὶ συνειδήσεως
ἀγαθῆς καὶ πίστεως ἀνυποκρίτου,

The combination of numerous verbal similarities and lines of thought makes verbal dependence highly likely. In relation to Ign. *Eph.* 14. 1 Schoedel notes, 'A verbal parallel to part of the statement is provided in 1 Tim 1:5, "the end of our instruction is love"'.⁵⁴ Also discussing the term *ἑτεροδοξίαι* that occurs in Ign. *Magn.* 8. 1 he states, 'Such false views are characterized by Ignatius in language reminiscent of the Pastoral Epistles: they are "fables" that are "useless" (cf. 1 Tim 1:4; 4:7; Tit 1:14)'.⁵⁵ Similar levels of correspondence could be noted for Inge's other type-c parallels from 1 and 2 Timothy. Hence it appears that these two epistles should be classed as Category B texts, demonstrating a high likelihood of literary dependence. The question remains as to the direction of that dependence. This is not as easily resolved as may at first appear to be the case. The dating of the Pastorals is notoriously difficult.⁵⁶ Arguments about the more primitive and complex forms of parallels are often easily reversed,⁵⁷ and discussions about theological developments fail to

⁵⁴ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 76.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.* 118.

⁵⁶ The dating of the Pastorals is of course related to the question of authorship. For those who think that they are genuine epistles of the apostle Paul, dates in the 60s are usually suggested. Alternatively, for those who see them as products of a 'Pauline school', a date around the end of the first century or the beginning of the second is quite a common suggestion. For an early date see G. W. Knight III, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1992), 53–4; and L. T. Johnson, *The Writings of the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1986), 381–407. For a later date see H. Köster, *Introduction to the New Testament*, ii: *History and Literature of Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1982), 297–308; R. E. Brown, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 638–80.

⁵⁷ This point has been demonstrated by E. P. Sanders in relation to the synoptic gospels (*The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969)).

recognize the pluriform and non-linear evolution of Christianity.⁵⁸ The issue cannot be treated in detail here; suffice it to note that the latest period suggested for the composition of the Pastorals, the early second century, overlaps with the traditional date of the martyrdom of Ignatius in the reign of Trajan. The dating of the Ignatian correspondence may not be as secure as is often supposed, and may itself come from a later period.⁵⁹ Perhaps all that can be concluded is that the balance of probability is in favour of Ignatius knowing 1 and 2 Timothy, rather than vice versa.⁶⁰

Conclusion Concerning Ignatius' Use of the Pauline Epistles

The foregoing investigation has demonstrated that a reasonably secure determination of which epistles from the Pauline corpus were used by Ignatius identifies only four epistles with relative certainty. The methodology allows for the fact that deviations from the exact wording of the NT epistles are to be expected, due to the circumstances of composition and reliance on memory. Here the findings do not differ vastly from those of Inge, apart from the exclusion of many of the dubious parallels for epistles put in the C and D categories. The four epistles for which a strong case for Ignatius' usage can be supported are, in declining order of likelihood, 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, 1 Timothy, and 2 Timothy. Interestingly this result also gains support from Ignatius' own comment in *Ign. Eph.* 16. 2 that Paul *ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ μνημονεύει ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*. It is not necessary to agree with Lightfoot or Schoedel and dismiss this comment as hyperbole.⁶¹ Rather, it appears to be an accurate comment in so far as Ignatius knew the Pauline corpus.

⁵⁸ For a detailed discussion of these issues see J. D. G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament*, 2nd edn. (London: SCM, 1990).

⁵⁹ R. M. Hübner, 'Thesen zur Echtheit und Datierung der sieben Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochien', *ZAC* 1 (1997), 44–72. For further bibliography on the debate, see A. Brent, 'The Significance of the Ignatius–Polycarp Relations for the New Testament', ch. 16 in companion volume.

⁶⁰ One would be intrigued to know the basis for Inge's unsupported declaration, 'It is also clear that, if literary dependence be admitted, it is on the side of Ignatius' (Inge, 'Ignatius', *NTAF*, 72).

⁶¹ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch* 73 n. 7, and Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 2. 65–6.

The Use of the Gospel Tradition by Ignatius

Since there is no strong basis for assuming that Ignatius made use of the non-Pauline epistles contained in the NT,⁶² or Acts,⁶³ or Revelation,⁶⁴ the focus can now move on to his use of the gospel tradition. The gospels present methodological problems that are not encountered to the same degree in the epistolary literature. These unique problems are due to the parallel material within the gospels and the possibility of pre-gospel sources being the basis for the quotations in the correspondence of Ignatius, and not the gospels themselves.⁶⁵

Matthew

Without doubt Matthew's gospel has attracted the greatest amount of scholarly investigation as a potential source in the writings of Ignatius. Although there have been numerous studies analysing the relationship between this first gospel and the writings of Ignatius, vastly different conclusions have been advanced. Such diversity often, in part, reflects different underlying methodological presuppositions. On the one hand, there are those such as Köster,⁶⁶ Smit Sibinga,⁶⁷ and Hagner⁶⁸ who feel that at no point can it be demonstrated that Ignatius is directly dependent upon Matthew. Bauckham argues that it is possible that Ignatius drew upon special M-material, rather than utilizing the canonical gospel.⁶⁹ Alternatively, Massaux⁷⁰ finds clear evidence of dependence. Köhler⁷¹

⁶² Inge discusses two d-type allusions each for both Hebrews and 1 Peter. Neither of these is compelling. (See Inge, 'Ignatius', *NTAF*, 75–6.)

⁶³ For Acts two weak parallels are discussed (type d). (See Inge, 'Ignatius', *NTAF*, 73). C. K. Barrett considers three texts from the Ignatian corpus, first the two examples in common with Inge: Ign. *Magn.* 5. 1 // Acts 1. 25; Ign. *Smyrn.* 3. 3 // Acts 10. 41; and additionally Ign. *Phld.* 2. 1 f. // Acts 10. 28, 29. He concludes that '[t]here is no convincing evidence of literary connection' (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, i, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994), 36).

⁶⁴ No possible parallels to Revelation are suggested by Inge.

⁶⁵ See the discussion at the end of section 2 and n. 12 for the potential for such problems to surface with the epistles. Here, however, these problems did not materialize.

⁶⁶ H. Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern*, TU 65 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957), 24–61.

⁶⁷ J. Smit Sibinga, 'Ignatius and Matthew', *NovT* 8 (1966), 263–83.

⁶⁸ D. A. Hagner, 'The Sayings of Jesus in the Apostolic Fathers and Justin Martyr', in D. Wenham (ed.), *The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels*, Gospel Perspectives, 5 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 233–68.

⁶⁹ R. Bauckham, 'The Study of Gospel Traditions Outside the Canonical Gospels: Problems and Prospects', in Wenham (ed.), *Jesus Tradition*, 369–403.

⁷⁰ É. Massaux, *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Saint Irenaeus* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1990), esp. 85–122.

⁷¹ W.-D. Köhler, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus*, WUNT 2.24 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987).

offers an intermediate position, but none the less comes down on the side of some knowledge of the first gospel by Ignatius. In her summarizing essay, Trevett⁷² notes that although as many as thirty-six allusions have been posited by various scholars, a list of eighteen forms the core of the discussion. Many of those eighteen examples, however, are at best extremely faint allusions. Consequently, only the more widely supported parallels that are seen as displaying Ignatius' dependence on Matthew will be considered here.

This difficulty of determining a writer's dependence on one of the gospel writers, as opposed to one of the other evangelists who has a parallel account, is usually resolved by looking for evidence of redactional material in the later document. This is the principle that guided Köster in his work. He states: 'so hängt die Frage der Benutzung davon ab, ob sich in den angeführten Stücken Redaktionsarbeit eines Evangelisten findet.'⁷³ This more rigorous approach unfortunately excludes a number of potential parallels, but to include them would only lead to a lack of precision and results that would be indeterminate. While Köster's criterion is undoubtedly an important one, at times he appears to apply it in such an unbending manner that even what appears to be distinctively Matthean redactional work is excluded from discussion because it might in fact originate in a pre-Matthean source, or have come to Ignatius through an intermediate source.⁷⁴ Potentially, one of the most significant parallels occurs between Ign. *Smyrn.* 1. 1 and Matt. 3. 15.

Ign. *Smyrn.* 1. 1

Matt. 3. 15

ἵνα πληρωθῇ πᾶσα δικαιοσύνη ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

οὕτως γὰρ πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι
πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην.

The significance of the parallel is not the result solely of the three shared words (although there are differences in the grammatical forms) but of the fact that the attempt by John to hinder Jesus coming for baptism is a Matthean redactional addition, as is the phrase *πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην*. It could be argued that at this point Matthew preserves the Q form more accurately, but a number of factors militate against this suggestion. First, the criterion of embarrassment serves to explain the introduction of this narrative aside, but it is much harder to explain why Luke would delete it if it stood in his Q account. Second, Matthew repeatedly introduces the word *δικαιοσύνη*⁷⁵ in Matthean single tradition as well as in other contexts.⁷⁶ This parallel appears to

⁷² C. Trevett, 'Approaching Matthew from the Second Century: The Under-Used Ignatian Correspondence', *JNT* 20 (1984), 59–67.

⁷³ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 3.

⁷⁴ See Köster's discussion of Ign. *Smyrn.* 1.1: *ibid.* 57–9.

⁷⁵ See the study on righteousness terminology in Matthew by B. Pryzybylski, *Righteousness in Matthew*, SNTSMS 41 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

⁷⁶ Markan or Q contexts: Matt. 3. 15; 5. 6, 10; 6. 1, 33; 21. 32. Matthean single tradition: Matt. 5. 20.

present an obvious case where a redactional word, *δικαιοσύνη*, that is favoured by the first evangelist, is taken up in the work of a later Christian writer, and hence demonstrates the dependence of the latter on the former.

Nevertheless, this conclusion is resisted by Köster. He does not doubt that the phrase *ἵνα πληρωθῇ πάντα δικαιοσύνη ὑπ' αὐτοῦ* in *Ign. Smyrn.* 1. 1 is dependent on the parallel in *Matt.* 3. 15, but he claims, rather, that this Matthean terminology came to Ignatius not directly through his own reading of the first gospel, but instead via a circuitous route. Thus, he argues that the tradition reached Ignatius in a form (probably oral) that, while reflecting its original Matthean context, had none the less been freed from that initial context. Thus for Köster the answer to his own question, 'Hat Ign. also Mt gelesen?'⁷⁷ is dealt with by first noting that Ignatius has an interest in traditions pertaining to the baptism of Jesus.⁷⁸ From this observation Köster draws the following conclusion that is worth quoting at length.

Ich möchte eher annehmen, daß Ign. den sich mit Mt. 3,15 berührenden Passus bereits innerhalb der von ihm Sm. 1,1 wiedergegebenen kerygmatischen Formal übernahm. Der fragliche Passus wäre dann schon vor Ign. aus Mt. in diese Formal eingedrungen. Auch Sm. 1,1 könnte also die direkte Abhängigkeit des Ign. von Mt. nicht erweisen, setzt aber die Existenz des Mt. Evangeliums indirekt voraus.⁷⁹

Such reasoning carries a number of implications for the whole endeavour of showing literary dependence between two authors. As Gregory notes, 'Köster's weakness may be that his criterion makes it virtually impossible to demonstrate any dependence on a Synoptic Gospel except in passages where the redactional activity of an evangelist may be readily identified.'⁸⁰ It may be added that even when redactional phrases are found to be in common, these can also be excluded, because it is possible to theorize other pathways by which such distinctive phraseology of the evangelist might have come to the later writer apart from that of direct literary dependence on one of the four canonical gospels. Specifically in relation to the parallel between *Ign. Smyrn.* 1. 1 and *Matt.* 3. 15, Trevett makes the following observation about Köster's conclusion: 'Ignatius's direct dependence on the Gospel had therefore been excluded, although its existence prior to Ignatius was attested indirectly.'⁸¹ While Köster's suggestion is certainly possible, its plausibility needs to be

⁷⁷ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 59.

⁷⁸ The only other instance cited by Köster is *Ign. Eph.* 18. 2 (ibid. 59). One may question whether two mentions of the incident of Jesus' baptism constitute 'an interest', in much the same vein as Köster himself would suggest that a couple of redactional phrases from the first gospel do not constitute dependence!

⁷⁹ Ibid. 59.

⁸⁰ See p. 71 above.

⁸¹ Trevett, 'Approaching Matthew', 61.

assessed. Is it more likely that Ignatius knew and used Matthew's gospel directly, or that a Matthean tradition came to Ignatius through a now unknown indirect avenue? In fairness, neither possibility should be excluded a priori, and perhaps the most helpful way to decide between these two options is to investigate whether there are any other places in his correspondence where Ignatius may have used Matthew's gospel, and thereby to establish a cumulative case for literary dependence.

Before leaving the discussion of this highly significant example, it is worth noting the argument of Smit Sibinga. Apart from the two texts that have been discussed so far, he also notes the passage in the *Gospel of the Ebionites* that aligns with references in Matt. 3. 15 and Ign. *Smyrn.* 1. 1: ἄφες, ὅτι οὕτως ἐστὶ πρέπον πληρωθῆναι πάντα (Epiphanius, *Panarion haer.* 30. 13. 7–8). From this parallel Smit Sibinga suggests that, 'At this point it is Matthew who parts from the common source, not Ignatius or his credal formula'.⁸² There are a number of moves here that are highly questionable. First, Smit Sibinga's discussion does not acknowledge that the 'text' of the *Gospel of the Ebionites* is itself a quotation of that document contained in the writings of Epiphanius. Second, he appears to take it for granted that the citation has been preserved accurately. Third, it is taken as axiomatic that *Ebionites* and Matthew share a common source, and the possibility that literary dependence exists between them is not considered. Fourth, the wider context of this text as presented in the *SQE*⁸³ appears to suggest that the passage from the *Panarion* is a composite of numerous gospel traditions concerning the baptism of Jesus. Fifth, his inference that 'the wording in Ignatius which uses the passive voice of πληροῦν is less likely to be secondary than that in Matthew, who employs the active voice', is not compelling. It is based on the notion that the common use of passive forms, but not identical forms, of πληροῦν places Ignatius and *Ebionites* in closer literary relationship than that between Ignatius and Matthew. Sixth, and finally, he does not give due weight to the fact that Ignatius and Matthew share the term δικαιοσύνη against *Ebionites*. The combination of these unresolved issues undermines the argument of a primitive credal affirmation that is better preserved by *Ebionites* and Ignatius than by Matthew, along with the consequent inference that Ignatius depends on this credal source. Köster's position is far stronger, for he at least acknowledges that the presence of Matthean redactional language in Ign. *Smyrn.* 1. 1 means that Matthew stands behind Ignatius, even if it be at several stages removed.

⁸² Smit Sibinga, 'Ignatius and Matthew', 277.

⁸³ K. Aland, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, 15th edn. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1985), 27.

Ign. *Trall.* 11. 1 and Ign. *Phld.* 3. 1

οἳτοι γὰρ οὐκ εἰσιν φυτεία πατρός.

ἀπέχεσθε τῶν κακῶν βοτανῶν, ἄστινας οὐ
γεωργεῖ Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, διὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι
αὐτοὺς φυτεῖαν πατρός.

Matt. 15. 13

ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· πᾶσα φυτεία ἣν οὐκ
ἐφύτευσεν ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος
ἐκριζωθήσεται.

These two passages from the Ignatian corpus appear to echo Matt. 15. 13, a saying without any parallel in the canonical gospel tradition. Here, then, is a second potential case where Matthew's redactional work may have been used by Ignatius, thus showing dependence on the first gospel, rather than upon the synoptic tradition in general. Inge presents this parallel without any explanation or qualification, as a type-b level of text agreement.⁸⁴ The similarity between Matt. 15. 13 and Ign. *Trall.* 11. 1 is limited to two shared words (*φυτεία* and *πατήρ*) and a negative clause. These are precisely the same formal correspondences that Ign. *Phld.* 3. 1 shares with Matt. 15. 13, although it is a very different gnomic saying from that contained in Ign. *Trall.* 11. 1. While Matt. 15. 13 is unique among the canonical accounts to the first gospel, and hence might be classed as Matthean redactional work, it is of a different type from Matt. 3. 15. There *πληρῶσαι* and *δικαιοσύνην* were favourite Matthean vocabulary, while *φυτεία* and *πατρός* are not distinctively characteristic of the first evangelist. Moreover, Matt. 3. 15, when incorporated into Ign. *Smyrn.* 1. 1, still carries the same narrative setting, the baptism of Jesus, whereas Matt. 15. 13 represents a free-floating saying or redactional creation, inserted into a Markan context which is not reflected in either Ign. *Trall.* 11. 1 or Ign. *Phld.* 3. 1. Instead, the three passages all speak of plants that do not belong to the Father. It is quite plausible that this metaphor could have circulated in the oral tradition among the early Christian movement down to the time of Ignatius. Here it appears that Köster's explanation is the most plausible: 'Vielleicht stammt auch die Metaphor Mt. 15, 13 aus dem gnostischen Raum. Doch das ist unsicher; die etwa zugrunde liegende mythologische Vorstellung tritt jedenfalls bei Mt. bei weitem nicht mehr so lebendig zu Tage wie bei Ign.'⁸⁵ It needs to be noted that this reasoning stands in opposition to Massaux and Köhler⁸⁶ who find in this example strong evidence of dependence upon the first gospel. The former states, 'Together with most commentators, I believe this text is a reflection of and exhibits a literary dependence on Mt. 15:13... Of the evangelists only Mt. recalls this saying of Christ.'⁸⁷ While the gospel saying is unique to Matthew, Massaux fails to persuade his readers that the two words constitute a strong case for

⁸⁴ Inge, 'Ignatius', *NTAF*, 76.

⁸⁶ Köhler, *Rezeption*, 80.

⁸⁵ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 38.

⁸⁷ Massaux, *Influence*, 88.

dependence, rather than the possibility that oral tradition, or perhaps even that non-canonical gospel sources, account for this parallel. Thus it appears best to conclude that the case for literary dependence cannot be established on the basis of this parallel, and that oral tradition or the phrase being part of early Christian homiletics is at least as likely an explanation for it surfacing in the writings of Ignatius.

Ign. *Pol.* 2. 2

φρόνιμος γίνου ὡς ὁ ὄφης ἐν πᾶσι καὶ
ἀκέραιος εἰς αἶμα ὡς ἡ περιστερά.

Matt. 10. 16b

γίνεσθε οὖν φρόνιμοι ὡς οἱ ὄφεις καὶ
ἀκέραιοι ὡς αἱ περιστεραί.

This is an example of an apparent extended and close verbal similarity between Ignatius and a saying which among the synoptic gospels occurs only in Matthew. However, this case is complicated by the existence of a parallel that both exists in the Greek fragments of the *Gospel of Thomas* and is more fully evidenced in the later Coptic text discovered at Nag Hammadi. It must be acknowledged that the Greek text of *P Oxy.* 655 is extremely fragmentary. Aland presents the parallel in *SQE* to Matt. 10.16 as: ὑμεῖς] δὲ γίν[εσθε φρόνι]μοι ὡ[ς οἱ ὄφεις καὶ ἀκέραιοι ὡς αἱ περιστε]ρα[ί]. The presence of the bracketing in the text reveals the extent of the lacunae.⁸⁸ Moreover, it is instructive to note that in their *editio princeps* Grenfell and Hunt did not identify Matt. 10. 16b as a parallel to lines 47–9 of *P Oxy.* 655.⁸⁹ Therefore, it is only the discovery of the later Coptic version of the *Gospel of Thomas* that facilitated the identification of this fragmentary portion of Ign. *Pol.* with Matt. 10. 16b. The Coptic text of saying 39c reads: **Ν̄ΤΩΤΝ ΔΕ ΦΩΠΕ ΜΦΡΟΝΙΜΟΣ Ν̄ΘΕ Ν̄ΝΖΟQ ΑΥΩ Ν̄ΑΚΕΡΑΙΟΣ Ν̄ΘΕ Ν̄Ν̄ΟΡΟΜΠΕ**. Hence the discovery of the fuller text enabled scholars to suggest the reconstruction of the Greek text that was no longer fully extant in *P Oxy.* 655. Saying 39 commences with material that parallels most closely Luke 11. 52 (= Q 11. 52; cf. Matt. 23. 13). Yet it is debated whether the *Gospel of Thomas* is combining free-floating pre-synoptic material,⁹⁰ or is dependent upon the canonical

⁸⁸ *SQE*, 141.

⁸⁹ B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part 4 (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1904). The discussion of *P Oxy.* 655 is on pp. 22–8, with the relevant plate for the section under discussion being plate 2 (column 2 being seen at the top of the page of the book, just below to the right of the heading). The reconstruction of the relevant lines is:

ΔΕ ΓΕΙ[
ΜΟΙΩ[
ΚΕΡΑΙ[

⁹⁰ Among those who argue independence from the synoptic gospels and hence a mid-first century date for composition are S. J. Patterson, *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus* (Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge Press, 1993), and H. Köster, 'Q and its Relatives', in J. E. Goehring, C. W. Hendrik, and J. T. Sanders (eds.), *Christian Origins and Christian Beginnings: In Honor of James M. Robinson* (Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge Press, 1993), 49–63.

gospels.⁹¹ If the former is the case, then it is possible that Ignatius shows an awareness of a pre-gospel source; if the latter is true then it is more likely that that he is dependent on canonical Matthew for the parallel. But because this issue is hotly debated, a conclusion about Ignatius' literary or oral source for Ign. *Pol.* 2.2 cannot be drawn that will command widespread assent.

Inge gives a fourth example of a parallel that he cites as text type b. Here

Ign. *Smyrn.* 6.1

Matt. 19. 12d

ὁ χωρῶν χωρεῖτω.

ὁ δυνάμενος χωρεῖν χωρεῖτω.

Ignatius shares three words with Matt. 19. 12d, two being exactly equivalent, the third being a participle rather than the infinitive form of Matthew.⁹² A common meaning is suggested by Inge in the two contexts. 'The meaning of the phrase is the same in the two passages; it stamps the doctrine just stated as a difficult and mysterious one.'⁹³ This, however, is not as significant as Inge implies. The gnomic phrase itself demands that it be used in relation to a statement that is hard to accept. For Ignatius this hard knowledge is the universal judgement or condemnation of those who 'do not believe on the blood of Christ' (Ign. *Smyrn.* 6. 1). By contrast, in Matt. 19. 3–12 it is used to sum up the harsh words of Jesus about divorce (19. 3–9), remaining in an unmarried state (19. 10–11), and becoming eunuchs for the kingdom (19. 12). Ignatius shows no awareness that the saying was used in relation to these issues when he applies his variant form to the topic of universal judgement. While Massaux thinks that literary dependence is likely, he does acknowledge the difference in contexts.

This proposition is, therefore, introduced by Ignatius in a very appropriate context and probably constitutes a literary reference to Mt. 19.12. It is hard to establish a definite literary contact, because the doctrine, which is difficult and mysterious to understand, is different in each of the two authors.⁹⁴

While still being positive about dependence, Köhler is a little more circumspect in his discussion. He concludes: 'Daß Ignatius die Kenntnis dieses Satzes dem Mt verdankt, ist durchaus möglich.'⁹⁵ Yet on balance it appears that

⁹¹ For the position that *Thomas* is a mid-second century document and shows a knowledge of the canonical gospel tradition, see K. Rudolph, *Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism*, trans. R. McL. Wilson (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1977), and C. M. Tuckett, 'Thomas and the Synoptics', *NovT* 30 (1988), 132–57.

⁹² Smit Sibinga's observation that 'the form of the phrase in Ignatius is that of the Western addition to Mark iv 9' ('Ignatius and Matthew', 279) is not of great relevance because of the use of a different verb, καὶ ὁ συνίῳν συνιέτω.

⁹³ Inge, 'Ignatius', *NTAF*, 77.

⁹⁴ Massaux, *Influence*, 94.

⁹⁵ Köhler, *Rezeption*, 87.

Köster's rejection of dependence is justified for this extremely short phrase which could have had an independent currency in the preaching of the early church. 'Die Übereinstimmung von Ign. und Mt. beruht wohl auf dem von beiden befolgten Brauch, etwas schwer Faßbares durch diese homiletische Phrase zu charakterisieren.'⁹⁶ Thus it seems that a good case cannot be mounted for Ignatius intending a citation of Matt. 19. 12d when he penned Ign. *Smyrn.* 6. 1.

Numerous other possible parallels have been suggested between Matthew's gospel and the epistles of Ignatius. In addition to the four type-b examples, Inge offers three of type c (Ign. *Eph.* 5. 2 // Matt. 18. 19–20; Ign. *Eph.* 6. 1 // Matt. 10. 40; Ign. *Pol.* 1. 2–3 // Matt. 8. 17) and four type-d texts (Ign. *Eph.* 17. 1 // Matt. 26. 7; Ign. *Magn.* 5. 2 // Matt. 22. 19; Ign. *Magn.* 9. 3 // Matt. 27. 52; Ign. *Rom.* 9. 3 // Matt. 10. 40–1);⁹⁷ however, with the possible exception of the first example of type c, these appear totally unconvincing. Trevett notes that as many as thirty-six parallels have been suggested, but that 'eighteen are cited with the greatest regularity.'⁹⁸ She continues by noting that, 'In the case of a number of the 36 passages, however, it is difficult to escape the impression that we are faced with, at best, "hints" at tradition of Matthaean type and "echoes" of the evangelist's ideas.'⁹⁹ While the maximalist position of Massaux is helpful in drawing attention to similarities in language and concepts between Ignatius and Matthew, it does little to establish a rigorous case for literary dependence.¹⁰⁰ Its main value is in providing evidence for those who wish to mount a cumulative case. By contrast, Köster's treatment is much more methodologically sophisticated, and his attempt to identify places where redactional material has been used by later authors is important for mounting the case for dependence. Unfortunately, in the one example (Ign. *Smyrn.* 1. 1 // Matt. 3. 15) where this seems highly plausible, Köster opts for a far less likely (but not impossible) explanation of indirect dependence.¹⁰¹ This choice makes his work appear somewhat arbitrary and agenda-driven, rather than allowing the evidence to be taken at face value. A more balanced conclusion would be that Ignatius provides only one certain example, where it can be demonstrated that he knew and cited what is almost certainly Matthaean redactional material. The most likely explanation is that he knew the version of the baptism story preserved in the first gospel, and probably

⁹⁶ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 35.

⁹⁷ Inge, 'Ignatius', *NTAF*, 77–9.

⁹⁸ Trevett, 'Approaching Matthew', 62.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁰ Massaux identifies fourteen likely parallels, two of which occur in the Sermon on the Mount: *Influence*, 85–96.

¹⁰¹ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 57–9.

knew this work directly and not by some circuitous route involving an unevicenced and no longer extant intermediary source. All other examples suggested show far fewer points of contact, but they are of value for building a cumulative case for Ignatius' use of Matthew's gospel.

Mark, Luke, and Other Synoptic Traditions

The case for Ignatius' knowledge of the gospels of Mark and Luke is extremely poor. Inge presents two type-d parallels for the former¹⁰² and three for the latter,¹⁰³ none of which is convincing. There are, however, two places where Ignatius presents traditional synoptic gospel material where the source cannot be determined conclusively. Both of these passages come from the so-called double tradition material shared by Matthew and Luke; hence Ignatius may be quoting the Q source directly rather than either of the gospels into which that material has been incorporated. If, however, Ignatius is drawing upon one of the canonical gospels, the balance of probability would be in favour of Matthew, simply because he appears to know the first gospel elsewhere in his writings, whereas this is not the case for Luke.

Ign. *Eph.* 11. 1

ἢ γὰρ τὴν μέλλουσαν ὄργην φοβηθῶμεν

Matt. 3. 7 and Luke 3. 7 (same wording)

γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, τίς ὑπέδειξεν ὑμῖν
φυγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς μελλούσης ὄργης;

Here the points of contact are weak, consisting of a three-word phrase, τὴν μέλλουσαν ὄργην // τῆς μελλούσης ὄργης. If Ignatius is dependent on the gospel tradition at this point, it is impossible to identify his source, since the wording of Matthew and Luke is the same. Moreover, since the double tradition agrees, there is a strong case that this represents the original Q wording, so it is equally feasible that he was drawing upon that document as his source.¹⁰⁴

Ign. *Eph.* 14. 2

φανερὸν τὸ δένδρον ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ αὐτοῦ

Matt. 12. 33b and Luke 6. 44a

ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ καρποῦ τὸ δένδρον γινώσκειται
ἕκαστον γὰρ δένδρον ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου καρποῦ
γινώσκειται

¹⁰² Ign. *Eph.* 16. 1 // Mark 9. 43; Ign. *Smyrn.* 10. 2 // Mark. 8. 38. Inge, 'Ignatius', *NTAF*, 79.

¹⁰³ Ign. *Smyrn.* 1. 2 // Luke 23. 7–12; Ign. *Smyrn.* 3. 2 // Luke 24. 39; Ign. *Smyrn.* 10. 2 // Luke 9. 26. Inge, 'Ignatius', *NTAF*, 79–80.

¹⁰⁴ This point is also recognized by Smit Sibinga: 'Matthew and Luke evidently reproduce their common source without changing anything. So it cannot be said whether Ignatius either knew one of the Gospels or their source' ('Ignatius and Matthew', 267).

Matthew and Luke are closer to one another than Ignatius is to either of them. They both share the verb *γινώσκω*, the preposition *ἐκ*, and the particle *γάρ*. Ign. *Eph.* 14. 2 has the definite article before *δένδρον* in common with Matthew, but places *καρποῦ* after the reference to ‘tree’, as does Luke, and also introduces *αὐτοῦ* which is loosely equivalent to Lucan *τοῦ ἰδίου*. This pattern of alternating similarities and deviations from Matthew and Luke suggests that Ignatius is dependent on a source shared with these two evangelists, most probably Q. Or if Inge is correct that ‘the words have the look of a current saying of Christ’,¹⁰⁵ then perhaps from oral tradition.

Gregory discusses the parallel between Ign. *Smyrn.* 3. 2–3 and Luke 24. 36–43 in some detail.¹⁰⁶ Both passages refer to the resurrection body of Jesus, but diverge greatly both in terms of shared vocabulary and specific details. Commenting on Ign. *Smyrn.* 3. 2–3, Lightfoot observed, ‘[t]he reference is plainly to the same incident which is related in Luke xxiv. 36 sq; . . . The words, however, in which it is told, are different.’¹⁰⁷ Gregory offers three possible explanations of this parallel: first, the proposal of Petersen, that Ignatius is a witness to the original reading in Luke 24. 36–43;¹⁰⁸ second, a variant of this proposal, that Ignatius is dependent on an alternative textual form, but not necessarily the original reading. Thus Gregory raises the possibility that in this case ‘Ignatius would be a witness to a version of *Luke* which had 24:37 in a “western” form and 24:39 (probably) in an “Alexandrian” form, although he was prepared to modify the text to suit the context for which he used it.’¹⁰⁹ Third, the hypothesis preferred by Gregory is the possibility that ‘Luke and Ignatius each drew independently on the same source or that each presents parallel but distinct tradition.’¹¹⁰ While it may be impossible to choose conclusively between the two alternatives in the final option, the discrepancies between the two accounts may perhaps be better accounted for by the freedom in retelling stories that circulated in the oral tradition, rather than being dependent on redactional creativity with an earlier written source. This problem notwithstanding, it appears that Gregory’s conclusion concerning the relationship between Ignatius and Luke is the most plausible explanation. He states, ‘there is no compelling reason to suggest that Ignatius drew on *Luke*, and there are strong, if not compelling, reasons to suggest that he may not have done.’¹¹¹

¹⁰⁵ Inge, ‘Ignatius’, *NTAF*, 80.

¹⁰⁶ A. Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus*, WUNT 2.169 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 69–75.

¹⁰⁷ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 2. 294.

¹⁰⁸ W. L. Petersen, ‘What Text Can New Testament Textual Criticism Ultimately Reach?’, in B. Aland and J. Delobel (eds.), *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis and Church History: A Discussion of Methods*, CBET 7 (Kampen: Kok-Pharos, 1994), 144–5, 149–51.

¹⁰⁹ Gregory, *Reception*, 72.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.* 73.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.* 74.

John's Gospel

Inge thought that the case for Ignatius' use of the Fourth Gospel was strong, and categorized John as class B literary dependence, 'the use of which, in the judgement of the editors, reaches a high degree of probability'.¹¹² His classification was based on seven parallels, two of text type b,¹¹³ one of c (although the passage from John was seen to be paralleled at two places in the epistle to the Magnesians)¹¹⁴ and four of type d.¹¹⁵ The four type d parallels have only the lightest, if any, connection and, thus, are not helpful in establishing literary dependence. The type c case, according to Inge, 'is much strengthened by the *double* reminiscence'.¹¹⁶ It may, however, be a misnomer to call this a double reminiscence, since Ign. *Magn.* 7. 1 parallels John 8. 28, and Ign. *Magn.* 8. 2 parallels John 8. 29 with no overlap. Both of these supposed parallels contain little in the way of shared vocabulary, and again do not present a strong case for literary dependence. The two remaining type b examples are worth considering in more detail, since there are definite points of verbal similarity, and some of the language has what may be described as 'a distinctively Johannine ring'.

Ign. *Rom.* 7. 2

Οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἐμοὶ πῦρ φιλόυλον, ὕδωρ δὲ ζῶν καὶ λαλοῦν ἐν ἐμοί, ἔσωθέν μοι λέγον· Δεῦρο πρὸς τὸν πατέρα.

John 4. 10b, 14

σὺ ἂν ἤτησας αὐτὸν καὶ ἔδωκεν ἅ σοι ὕδωρ ζῶν . . .¹⁴ ὕδωρ ὃ δώσω αὐτῷ γενήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ πηγή ὕδατος ἀλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

Inge concludes that 'on the whole direct literary dependence seems much the most probable hypothesis'.¹¹⁷ He adduces Lightfoot's comment that 'the whole passage is inspired by the Fourth Gospel',¹¹⁸ as support for his own conclusion.¹¹⁹ While the reference to 'living water' has a strikingly Johannine ring, as Schoedel points out, Ignatius' full reference to the 'living and speaking water' is also reminiscent of 'τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ λαλοῦν "the speaking water" of the *Odes of Solomon* (11. 6) which "came near my lips from the spring of life of the Lord in his abundance"'.¹²⁰ It therefore seems best to view Ign. *Rom.* 7. 2

¹¹² NTAῤ, p. iii.

¹¹³ Ign. *Rom.* 7. 2 // John 4. 10, 14; Ign. *Phld.* 7. 1 // John 3. 8.

¹¹⁴ Ign. *Magn.* 7. 1, 8. 2 // John 8. 28–9.

¹¹⁵ Ign. *Eph.* 5. 2 and Ign. *Rom.* 7.3 // John 6. 33; Ign. *Eph.* 6. 1 // John 13. 20; Ign. *Eph.* 17. 1 // John 12. 1–8; Ign. *Phld.* 9. 1 // John 10. 9.

¹¹⁶ Inge, 'Ignatius', NTAῤ, 82.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 2. 224.

¹¹⁹ Inge, 'Ignatius', NTAῤ, 81.

¹²⁰ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 185.

as a concatenation of imagery relating to water which Ignatius may have combined himself. Or perhaps this imagery had already been joined in the oral kerygma of early Christianity.

Ign. *Phld.* 7. 1

τὸ πνεῦμα οὐ πλανᾶται, ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ὄν.
οἶδεν γὰρ πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει
καὶ τὰ κρυπτὰ ἐλέγχει.

John 3. 8

τὸ πνεῦμα ὅπου θέλει πνεῖ καὶ τὴν φωνὴν
αὐτοῦ ἀκούεις, ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶδας πόθεν
ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει· οὕτως ἐστὶν πᾶς
ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος.

These parallel texts have greater verbal correspondence than the previous pair. The reference to τὸ πνεῦμα occurs in both, as does the verb οἶδα, and most striking is the shared extended phrase πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει. Yet, even Inge admits that the sense is so different that it gives pause to arguing for literary dependence, although in the end he dismisses this as being characteristic of Ignatius. 'The passage reads like an echo of the words in the Gospel, though the thought is quite different. This, however, is in Ignatius's manner.'¹²¹ The main difference is that whereas John states that there is no constraint on the Spirit's movement, Ignatius says that the Spirit is not deceived or wandering, because it originates from God; he then uses the phrase πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει to declare the Spirit's self-knowledge of movement. This is markedly different from John 3. 8. Hence Schoedel is correct that, 'Here we have the strongest possibility in Ignatius of a dependence on the Fourth Gospel. Yet in the absence of other positive evidence of such dependence the question must be left open.'¹²² It is not only the lack of corroborating parallels that makes the case for dependence on John's Gospel uncertain, but the way the phrase is used in a manner so different from the Johannine context. It is, then, quite possible that the phrase had become part of the oral language used to describe the Spirit, and that the original context was unknown to Ignatius. Thus, it is necessary to concur with Schoedel that Ignatius' use of the Fourth Gospel cannot be established with any degree of certainty.¹²³

¹²¹ Inge, 'Ignatius', *NTAF*, 82.

¹²² Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 206.

¹²³ In his recent study Charles Hill comes to strikingly different conclusions. See C. E. Hill, *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 421–43. He states categorically that 'Ignatius' knowledge of John can be taken as proved' (p. 442). First, it should be acknowledged that Hill is presenting an argument for 'knowledge of John' rather than use of John. The distinction may be fine, but it is significant, since Hill does not confine his argument to the textual evidence contained in the seven authentic epistles of Ignatius. Rather, his conclusion is based also on the locale and orthodox nature of the Johannine writings, as well as Ignatius' positive attitude towards the apostles. This study has intentionally not drawn upon such lines of argument. The disagreement surrounding the critical judgements that underpin those assessments would lessen the acceptance of the findings of this investigation.

CONCLUSIONS

Establishing literary dependence is difficult. Such problems may be exacerbated in the case of Ignatius in comparison with the other authors whose writings comprise the corpus known as the Apostolic Fathers. The composition of the seven letters that form the middle recension were not the products of measured literary reflection, but were produced while the writer was *en route* to his martyrdom (if the testimony of the epistles themselves is accepted as genuine). Such circumstances in all probability prevented Ignatius from consulting those texts which he might have had at his disposal in Antioch. Despite this, at a number of points he refers to passages from some of the documents that were later to constitute the New Testament. Among the Pauline corpus his knowledge of 1 Corinthians is assured, and he seems to be able to cite large portions of this text from memory. Here Inge's conclusion is correct, that 'Ignatius must have known this Epistle almost by heart'.¹²⁴ Among the other Pauline epistles a strong case can be made for Ignatius' use of Ephesians and 1 and 2 Timothy. These four epistles all make mention of Ephesus or the Ephesian church, and this corresponds remarkably well with Ignatius' own statement that in all his epistles (that Ignatius knew about) Paul makes mention of the Ephesians (Ign. *Eph.* 16. 2: [Παῦλος] ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ μνημονεύει ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ). No decisive case can be made for Ignatius' use of the other epistles of the New Testament.

In relation to the gospel material, on the basis of the parallel between Ign. *Smyrn.* 1. 1 and Matt. 3. 15 it is most likely that Ignatius knew Matthew's gospel, although Köster's counter-proposal that this material came to Ignatius indirectly is impossible to rule out.¹²⁵ The case for seeing the other cited examples as instances of Ignatius' dependence on Matthew is inconclusive when they are viewed in isolation. But perhaps the case may be strengthened somewhat if one concludes that Matt. 3. 15 has been cited in Ign. *Smyrn.* 1. 1. While it appears unlikely that Ignatius used either Mark's or Luke's gospel, the parallel between Ign. *Eph.* 14. 2 and the double tradition material contained in Matt. 12. 33b and Luke 6. 44a may well suggest that Ignatius used Q, or oral tradition that fed into that document. The case for Ignatius' use of the Fourth Gospel is more marginal. He may have cited John 3. 8 at Ign. *Phld.* 7. 1, but this is complicated by the way in which the sense in the Ignatian epistle differs from its original Johannine context.¹²⁶

¹²⁴ Inge, 'Ignatius', *NTAF*, 67.

¹²⁵ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 59.

¹²⁶ Inge, 'Ignatius', *NTAF*, 82.

While these findings may be meagre, it is hoped that as a result of the adoption of a fairly rigorous approach, the results will be widely accepted. To claim more would in many ways go beyond the evidence of Ignatius' own writings. Of course, Ignatius may have known more of the writings that were to form the New Testament than he used in his correspondence, but this must remain mere speculation and cannot be established with any degree of certainty. Moreover, some of the texts that have been dismissed as providing evidence of literary dependence may in fact have been in the back of Ignatius' mind, but the level of correspondence does not allow this to be verified. One must, therefore, be content with the conclusion that a strong case can be mounted for Ignatius' knowledge of four Pauline epistles and the Gospel of Matthew. An interesting 'canon' for those who wish to draw wider implications from these findings!

Polycarp's *Letter to the Philippians* and the Writings that later formed the New Testament

Michael W. Holmes

INTRODUCTION

'No method in literary study', wrote E. J. Goodspeed in 1941, 'is more objective or more fruitful than the comparison of one work with another to determine the question of literary indebtedness—which one shows acquaintance with the other, use of it, and dependence upon it.'¹ One may perhaps grant him his point in theory, but scarcely in practice;² one does not have to be post-modern to recognize that the presuppositions (conscious or otherwise) one brings to the investigation and the question(s) one seeks to answer both shape one's analysis and conclusions.

For the present discussion the shaping focal question is relatively straightforward: is there any demonstrable evidence that Polycarp, in his letter to the Philippians,³ has made use of any of the writings that later formed the New Testament? The simplicity of the question masks, of course, substantial methodological and procedural difficulties. These have been well articulated by Andrew Gregory, whose general approach and perspective have been adopted.⁴

¹ E. J. Goodspeed, in the foreword to Albert E. Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941), p. vii.

² For a striking example, see below the opening paragraph under the heading 'Johannine gospel tradition'.

³ I am persuaded that the letter is more likely a unified document than a collocation of two separate letters, and that it was sent to Philippi around the time of the death of Ignatius of Antioch, which occurred sometime during the second or third decades of the second century. (If the letter is a composite document, the earlier letter comprises the prescript, 1. 1, and 13–14, and the second letter, 1. 2–12. 3, would have been sent within a year of the first.)

⁴ Andrew Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century*, WUNT 2.169 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 5–20.

As a matter of convenience, I will proceed through the documents in canonical order,⁵ using the same four ratings categories as the 1905 Committee: A/a ('no reasonable doubt'), B/b ('high degree of probability'), C/c ('lower degree of probability'), and D/d (possibility only).

GOSPELS

Synoptic Tradition

The Oxford Committee categorized the few parallels to synoptic material in *Philippians* that it discussed as 'unclassified'.⁶ Other investigations, however, have been far more confident of Polycarp's dependence on written gospel sources.⁷

The Methodological Implications of Phil. 6. 1

In *Phil.* 6. 1 (NTAF #82) Polycarp quotes a saying—'we are all debtors with respect to sin'—which he has introduced with the phrase εἰδότες ὅτι. He uses the same formula three other times (in 1. 3; 4. 1, and 5. 1) to introduce citations whose sources we can probably identify (Eph. 2.5, 8–9; 1 Tim. 6. 10; and Gal. 6. 7 respectively), and which Polycarp seemingly considered to be authoritative. This pattern of usage suggests that the saying in 6. 1 is likewise from a source considered authoritative by Polycarp, at least, and perhaps also his audience.⁸

⁵ Since this represents a very different arrangement from the original 1905 study, I have whenever possible included below the original 'passage number' assigned to a particular text (in the form, 'NTAF #').

⁶ A Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology, *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), 101–3.

⁷ Cf., e.g., P. N. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936), 285–8; É. Massaux, *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Saint Irenaeus* (Louvain: Peeters; Macon, Ga.: Mercer, University Press, 1992 (French original 1950)), 11. 27–35; H. Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern*, TU 65 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957), 112–23; K. Berding, *Polycarp and Paul: An Analysis of their Literary and Theological Relationship in Light of Polycarp's Use of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Literature*, VCSup 62 (Leiden: Brill, 2002); Paul Hartog, *Polycarp and the New Testament: The Occasion, Rhetoric, Theme, and Unity of the Epistle to the Philippians and its Allusions to New Testament Literature*, WUNT 2.134 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002).

⁸ A. Lindemann (*Paulus im ältesten Christentum: Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion*, BHT 58 (Tübingen: Mohr

What is both interesting and methodologically consequential about this saying (the words of which 'rise above the ordinary level of Polycarp's own language'⁹) is that it 'does not occur elsewhere in early Christian sources';¹⁰ that is, 'there is . . . nothing to indicate the source from which the quotation (if such it be) is derived'.¹¹ This means that an a priori methodological bias in favour of known sources cannot be justified.¹² Such a bias is justified only if we have reason to believe that those were the only sources available to the writer in question. In the case of Polycarp, however, such an approach must be rejected, for two reasons: (1) the presence of this otherwise unknown saying in 6. 1 offers positive evidence that Polycarp almost certainly had available to him resources no longer extant; and (2) it assumes the answer to a question we seek to investigate: namely, whether Polycarp's use of documents that eventually came to be included in the New Testament can be demonstrated with any degree of certainty. Therefore, in the following discussions a decision in favour of a specific document as Polycarp's source will require positive evidence beyond mere similarity of wording, in order to rule out other option(s) that Polycarp is known to have had available to him.

The first two passages to be discussed are each found at *Phil.* 2. 3 (NTAF #75).

Siebeck, 1979), 225) thinks that Polycarp takes it for granted that the Philippians already know this saying.

⁹ J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, part 2: *S. Ignatius, S. Polycarp*, 2nd edn., 3 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1889), 2. 3. 324 (cf. NTAF, 104; W. R. Schoedel, *Polycarp, Martyrdom of Polycarp, Fragments of Papias* (Camden, NJ: Nelson, 1967), 22); Lindemann (*Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 225) notes that Polycarp does not appear to have composed the sentence *ad hoc*.

¹⁰ D. K. Rensberger, 'As the Apostle Teaches: The Development of the Use of Paul's Letters in Second-Century Christianity' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale, 1981), 114.

¹¹ NTAF, 104.

¹² *Contra* Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 29; cf. in a similar vein Massaux, *Influence*, 2. 32 ('since the text of Mt. was within reach . . . Why then turn to an oral tradition or to a parent document of the gospels, whose existence is hypothetical?'), and B. Dehandschutter, 'Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians: An Early Example of "Reception" ', in J.-M. Sevrin (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity: La réception des écrits néotestamentaires dans le christianisme primitif*, BETL 86 (Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1989), 288 ('Why suppose that Polycarp "assumes that a body of teaching, oral or written, similar to the Sermon on the Mount, was familiar to the Philippian church"? (citing NTAF, 102)).

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| <i>Phil.</i> 2. 3a ¹³ | <i>1 Clem.</i> 13. 2 ¹⁴ | Matt. 5. 7; 6. 14; 7. 1–2 | Luke 6. 37–8 |
| 1) μὴ κρίνετε ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε· | ε) ὡς κρίνετε οὕτως κριθήσεσθε· | 7. 1–2a: μὴ κρίνετε ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε· ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε . . . | 6. 37a: καὶ μὴ κρίνετε καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε |
| 2) ἀφίετε καὶ ἀφεθήσεται ὑμῖν· | β) ἀφίετε ἵνα ἀφεθῆ ὑμῖν· | 6. 14: εἰάν γὰρ ἀφῆτε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν ἀφήσει καὶ ὑμῖν ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος· | 6. 37c: ἀπολύετε καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε |
| 3) ἐλεᾶτε ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε· | α) ἐλεᾶτε ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε· | 5. 7: μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθήσονται· | |
| 4) ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρδίτε ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν· | γ) ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε ἐν αὐτῷ μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν· | 7.2b: καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν | 6. 38c: ᾧ γὰρ μέτρῳ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν |
| | ς) ὡς ποιεῖτε οὕτω ποιηθήσεται ὑμῖν· | <hr/> μετρηθήσεται <i>rell</i>] ἀντιμετρηθήσεται Θ 0233 f ¹³ al it vg ^{c1} Cyr | |
| | δ) ὡς δίδοτε οὕτως δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· | | |
| | φ) ὡς χρηστεύεσθε οὕτως χρηστευ- θήσεται ὑμῖν· | | |

¹³ The quotation formula that introduces the sayings in *Phil.* 2. 3, *μνημονεύοντες δὲ ᾧ ἐῖπεν ὁ κύριος διδάσκων*, is similar to those found in *1 Clem.* 13. 1–2 (*μνημονεύοντες τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, οὓς ἐλάλησεν διδάσκων . . . οὕτως γὰρ εῖπεν*), 46. 7–8 (*μνήσθητε τῶν λόγων Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, εῖπεν γὰρ*), and *Acts* 20. 35 (*δεῖ . . . μνημονεύειν τε τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ὅτι αὐτὸς εῖπεν*).

¹⁴ Five of the following seven statements (a, b, c?, e, g) are paralleled in the Matthean account of the Sermon on the Mount, and four (c?, d, e, g) in Luke, including one (d) not found in Matthew. But none of them agrees verbatim with any of the gospel parallels; the order does not follow either Matthew or Luke; and at least one statement (f) is essentially without parallel (cf. Massaux, *Influence*, 1. 9–10; D. A. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*, NovTSup 34 (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 137).

Here we must analyse not the relationship (if any) only between Polycarp and the gospels, but also between his text and *1 Clem.* 13, which, Gregory concludes, utilizes a collection of sayings that are independent of and earlier than the sayings of Jesus that are preserved also in Matthew and/or Luke.¹⁵

The relationship between *Phil.* 2. 3a and the other passages can be summarized as follows:

| Polycarp | <i>1 Clement</i> | Matthew | Luke |
|----------|------------------|------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | cf. e | = 7. 1 | cf. 6. 37a |
| 2 | ≈ b | cf. 6. 14 (and Mark 11. 25b) | |
| 3 | = a | cf. 5. 7 | — |
| 4 | ≈ g | cf. 7. 2b | = 6.a 38c |

The complexity of the evidence has resulted in numerous proposals to explain the interrelationships between these texts; at the risk of over-simplification, they may be arranged into four categories.

1. Direct dependence upon *1 Clement*: the similarities between the sayings and the introductory formulae, and Polycarp's undoubted knowledge of *1 Clement*, have led Lightfoot and others to argue that Polycarp was directly dependent upon that document.¹⁶
- 2a. Direct dependence upon *1 Clement*, corrected against written gospels: Köster suggests that Polycarp, who knew the gospels of Matthew and Luke, copied the quotation formula and 2. 3a from *1 Clem.* 13. 1–2, but corrected the wording of the sayings to agree with the text of the written gospels from which he drew his other gospel sayings (cf. 2. 3b; 7. 2; 12. 3).¹⁷
- 2b. Citation of *1 Clement* from memory, with the wording certainly affected by Matthew and possibly by Luke.¹⁸

¹⁵ A. Gregory, Ch. 6 above, p. 133.

¹⁶ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1. 2. 52, 2. 3. 325 ('it can hardly be doubted from his manner of introducing the quotation . . . that he had this passage of Clement in his mind and does not quote independently'); W. Bauer, *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Polykarpbriefe*, HNT; Die Apostolischen Väter, 2 (Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1920), 286.

¹⁷ Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (London: SCM; Philadelphia: Trinity, 1990), 19–20, summarizing *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 115–18. Similarly J. B. Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*, KAV 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 28, 44–5; cf. earlier Harrison (*Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 286–7), who explains Polycarp's omission of three of Clement's seven sayings (i.e., c, d, f) as due to their lack of any gospel equivalent (cf. Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 117). But this point is not persuasive (cf. Hagner, *Use*, 141 n. 1), since only one of the three omissions (f) lacks any gospel parallel; (d) is at least partially paralleled by Luke 6. 38a, and (c) is, according to Köster (*Synoptische Überlieferung*, 116) and Massaux (*Influence*, i. 9), paralleled by the golden rule (Matt. 7. 12, Luke 6. 31).

¹⁸ Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 12; similarly Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 56–7 ('Polycarp is aware of *1 Clement* . . . but corrects the form of the text toward the written gospels,' or under the influence of oral tradition).

- 3a. Use of a later finished stage of a primitive catechism whose point of departure was the Matthean form of the Sermon on the Mount, and which in an intermediate form was the source of *1 Clement*, which Polycarp also knew and which influenced his wording here.¹⁹
- 3b. Use of a written document, similar to Q, originally written in Aramaic, and known to Polycarp, Justin, and the authors of Matthew, Luke, *1 Clement*, and the *Didache*, among others.²⁰
4. Dependence upon oral tradition parallel to (and probably earlier than) the synoptic gospels, by both the author of *1 Clement* and Polycarp: so Hagner, for whom the differences in wording, order, and number of sayings rule out direct dependence of *Philippians* on either written gospels or *1 Clement*.²¹

Each of these proposals is possible; more could be proposed;²² none is without difficulties. For example, against (2a) stands the question of why, if Polycarp copied from *1 Clement*, he copied only partially (omitting c, d, f) and in such an odd order (e, b, a, g)²³—an objection which (2b) seems

¹⁹ Massaux, *Influence*, ii. 29–30; cf. p. 31: ‘In the whole of verse 3, Polycarp refers to Matthew’s Sermon on the Mount, being at the same time under the influence of a catechism which he knows represents the substance of the Sermon.’ Further, ‘the text of Polycarp is too removed from Mt. and Lk., especially from a stylistic viewpoint, to allow the conjecture of a direct reference to one or the other’ (p. 29). Cf. *NTAF*, 102.

²⁰ R. Glover, ‘Patristic Quotations and Gospel Sources’, *NTS* 31 (1985), 234–51; similarly R. Buckham (‘The Study of Gospel Traditions Outside the Canonical Gospels: Problems and Prospects’, in D. Wenham (ed.), *The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels*, Gospel Perspectives, 5 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 378), who does not, however, indicate whether the ‘blocks’ of tradition (i.e., a connected series of logia) which he posits were in written or oral form. W. Sanday (*The Gospels in the Second Century: An Examination of the Critical Part of a Work Entitled ‘Supernatural Religion’* (London: Macmillan, 1876, 86) thinks that at least two factors were at work: viz., memory and a written tradition different from the canonical gospels.

²¹ D. A. Hagner, ‘The Sayings of Jesus in the Apostolic Fathers and Justin Martyr’, in Wenham (ed.), *Jesus Tradition*, 236; *idem*, *Use*, 279, 141–3; cf. Gregory, Ch. 6 above, p. 133. See also L. E. Wright, *Alterations of the Words of Jesus as Quoted in the Literature of the Second Century*, Harvard Historical Monographs, 25 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952), 78; J. Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942), 143; W.-D. Köhler, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus*, WUNT 2.24 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 108. The modifications which Köster takes as evidence of correction according to the written text of Matthew and Luke could reflect ‘mutants of oral tradition that were either caused by, or taken up in, the written Gospels’ (Hagner, ‘Sayings’, 261 n. 8). E.g., the only evidence of Lucan redaction in Polycarp—the presence of *ἀντιμετρηθήσεται* in place of *μετρηθήσεται*—involves one of the less stable elements of the textual tradition, as compound and simplex verb forms are often subject to variation.

²² E.g., dependence on *1 Clement*, corrected on the basis of a memorized, orally transmitted form of the teachings of Jesus also preserved in the Matthean and Lucan ‘sermons’.

²³ Cf. the conclusion of the Oxford Committee (*NTAF*, 102): he ‘may have been influenced by Clement. Polycarp does not, however, quote Clement directly, as he omits some of Clement’s most characteristic phrases.’ H. Paulsen (*Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Brief des*

formulated to meet. But with respect to (2b), how might one decide between a *memoriter* citation of *1 Clement* affected by Matthew versus a *memoriter* citation of Matthew affected by *1 Clement*, particularly in an environment in which written and oral forms of the tradition both circulated, each affecting the form of the other?²⁴ Rather than multiply options or continue to list the difficulties of each, we should instead confront the primary difficulty we face in assessing any of these proposals: we simply lack evidence of the sort that would enable us to differentiate between them. Clearly both Polycarp and *1 Clement* partake of a similar stream of tradition, but it does not seem possible, in view of the current state of the evidence, to indicate the relationship or connections any more precisely.

The situation in 2. 3b, which combines a pair of synoptic beatitudes,²⁵ is only somewhat less complex than that of 2. 3a.

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <i>Phil.</i> 2. 3b | <i>Matt.</i> 5. 3, 10 | <i>Luke</i> 6. 20 |
| [μνημονεύοντες . . .] καὶ ὅτι μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ | 5. 3: μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν | μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί, |
| καὶ οἱ διωκόμενοι ἔνεκεν δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. | 5. 10: μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἔνεκεν δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. | ὅτι ὑμετέρα ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. |

The omission of ‘in spirit’ parallels the text of *Luke* 6. 20 (rather than *Matt.* 5. 10 and 5. 3), as does the substitution of ‘God’ for ‘heaven’ (but these details are precisely the sort of elements often subject to variation in transmission²⁶). ‘Those who are persecuted for the sake of righteousness’, on the other hand,

Polycarp von Smyrna, zweite, neubearbeitete Auflage der Auslegung von Walter Bauer, Die Apostolischen Väter, 2; HNT 18 (Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1985), 114), who otherwise follows Köster on this point, also demurs regarding the possibility of proving direct dependence.

²⁴ A point already raised by Köster (*Synoptische Überlieferung*) and now worked out in substantial detail by J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003), 205–54, who reminds us that ‘Jesus tradition did not cease to circulate in oral form simply because it had been written down . . . the written text was still fluid, still living tradition’ (249–50).

²⁵ That only these two beatitudes include the promise of the kingdom likely generated their linkage (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 326). Whether Polycarp linked them himself or received them already joined cannot be determined (the only other mention of the kingdom in Polycarp is in 5.3, in a quotation of *1 Cor.* 6. 9). The claim that he created the combination as a summary of all the Beatitudes (so Massaux, *Influence*, ii. 31) goes far beyond any evidence.

²⁶ Cf. Dehandschutter, ‘Polycarp’s Epistle’, 288 n. 57.

parallels only Matthew among the canonical gospels (though with a present tense in place of the perfect), and for that reason, many see here clear evidence of knowledge of that gospel.²⁷ But given that we are dealing with ‘Sermon’ material, which almost certainly circulated in oral form, and keeping the implications of 6. 1 in mind, it is difficult to be so certain: knowledge of Matthew and Luke is possible, but not demonstrable.

Phil. 6. 2a

Matt. 6. 12

Luke 11. 4

[μὴ ταχέως πιστεύοντες
κατὰ τινος, μὴ ἀπότομοι ἐν
κρίσει, εἰδότες ὅτι πάντες
ὀφειλέται ἐσμὲν ἁμαρτίας.]
εἰ οὖν δεόμεθα τοῦ κυρίου
ἵνα ἡμῖν ἀφῆ, ὀφείλομεν
καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφιέναι.

καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ
ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ
ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν τοῖς
ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν.

καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας
ἡμῶν, καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ
ἀφίομεν παντὶ ὀφείλοντι
ἡμῖν.

Three further passages ought to be discussed. The first is *Phil.* 6. 2 (NTAF #76). The language of 6. 2a clearly calls to mind the Lord’s Prayer. Over against the widely held opinion that the use of ‘such common liturgical material as this rules out any decision on literary dependence’,²⁸ Berding contends that Polycarp is dependent on ‘not just the Lord’s Prayer in general, but probably the Lord’s Prayer as recorded by Matthew’ (a ‘probable allusion’), on the basis that only in Matthew is the request for forgiveness (6. 12) juxtaposed with the condition that we should also forgive each other to receive forgiveness (6. 14–15).²⁹ But his point is not a strong one. First, whereas Matthew is the only gospel to juxtapose the two concepts, it is not the only one to include both, inasmuch as Mark 11. 25 parallels *Matt.* 6. 14 (and in many MSS of Mark (including A (C D) Θ (f1.¹³ 33) *Maj* lat), *Matt.* 6. 15 is paralleled as well). Second, even if one were to grant Berding’s point, it would link Polycarp only to the Sermon on the Mount, which, as Benecke points out, ‘would not necessarily imply a knowledge of our Matthew’.³⁰ In short, we lack any probative evidence that would justify identifying any one of our possible sources as the probable source.

The next parallel to synoptic tradition occurs at *Phil.* 7. 2 (NTAF #77).

²⁷ e.g., Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 326; Massaux, *Influence*, ii. 31; Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 118; Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 12; Köhler, *Rezeption*, 99–100.

²⁸ Hagner, ‘Sayings’, 240; cf. Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 120; NTAF, 102; Massaux, *Influence*, ii. 32 (who notices, but dismisses as too weak to be significant, the numerous Matthean parallels—5. 22; 6. 19; 7. 1–2—in the immediate context); also Köhler, *Rezeption*, 102–3.

²⁹ Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 84–5, whose general line of argument is similar to that of Dehandschutter, ‘Polycarp’s Epistle’, 288; cf. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 33; Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 287; Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 22.

³⁰ NTAF, 102.

Phil. 7. 2

δεήσασιν αὐτούμενοι
τὸν παντεπόπτῃν θεὸν
μὴ εἰσενεγκεῖν ἡμᾶς
εἰς πειρασμόν,

καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ κύριος·

Τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα
πρόθυμον,

ἢ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής.

Matt. 6. 13 = Luke 11.4

καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς
ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν . . .

Matt. 26. 41:

γρηγορεῖτε καὶ
προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ
εἰσέλθετε εἰς πειρασμόν·

τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα
πρόθυμον,

ἢ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής.

Mark 14. 38

γρηγορεῖτε καὶ
προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ
ἔλθετε εἰς πειρασμόν·

τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα
πρόθυμον,

ἢ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής.

ελθετε \aleph^* B f¹³ 2427 pc q]
εισελθετε *rell*

The request of God ‘not to lead us into temptation’ is nearly identical with phrases from the Lord’s Prayer (Matt. 6. 13a = Luke 11. 4b) and the Gethsemane episode (Matt. 26. 41a = Mark 14. 38a (most MSS)), while the reason given for making such a request (‘the spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak’) agrees verbatim with Matt. 26. 41b = Mark 14. 38b. Whether this indicates that Polycarp cited or is dependent upon the gospel of Matthew,³¹ or some other source, written or oral,³² continues to be debated. Those arguing for dependence on Matthew typically bring forward two points in support of this claim. One is that dependence on Matthew in *Phil.* 6. 2 increases the probability of dependence here in 7. 2. But as we have seen in the discussion of 6. 2, the probability of dependence upon Matthew there has been overstated, and is insufficient to justify a presumption in favour of Matthew here.

The other point brought forward is the observation that the two phrases in *Phil.* 7. 2 are found together in only one of the known possible sources: namely,

³¹ That Polycarp demonstrates dependence on or knowledge of Matthew is the conclusion of Massaux (*Influence*, ii. 31–2); Köster (*Synoptische Überlieferung*, 114–15), followed by Schoedel (*Polycarp*, 26) and Paulsen (*Die Briefe*, 121); Berding (*Polycarp and Paul*, 93–4; 198: ‘probable source’); Harrison (*Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 287); and Dehandschutter (‘Polycarp’s Epistle’, 288), followed by Hartog (*Polycarp*, 183). Köhler (*Rezeption*, 103) is less certain, placing it in his ‘quite possible’ (rather than ‘probable’) category.

³² The agnostic view of the Oxford Committee (‘But this quotation might well be due to oral tradition; or it might be from a document akin to our Gospels, though not necessarily those Gospels themselves’ (*NTAF*, 103)) anticipates the conclusions of Hagner (‘Despite the fact that the words preceding this saying are also attributed to Jesus in the Synoptics, Polycarp inserts the introductory formula *καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ κύριος* which suggests the possibility of an independent source for the saying, perhaps in oral tradition. On the other hand, the insertion may be of no special significance whatever’ (*Use*, 279); ‘The saying is again brief and pithy, however, and may thus derive equally well from oral tradition as from the written Gospels’ (‘Sayings’, 240)).

the Gospel of Matthew. But there is nothing about Polycarp's text that requires dependence on Matthew to explain it; as Berding observes, Polycarp 'merely makes explicit the connection which is implicit' in Mark as well as Matthew.³³

How one resolves the matter will be determined largely by the question one seeks to answer. If the goal is to assess which of the many possible sources available to Polycarp is the more likely source, then there is perhaps a slim basis for favouring the Gospel of Matthew.³⁴ If, however, one is seeking to determine whether or not Polycarp used a specific document, a different answer must be returned, in view of the absence of any necessary link between Polycarp and any of his possible sources, only some of which are known to us (cf. the discussion of *Phil.* 6. 1 above).

The final parallel to synoptic tradition that I shall discuss occurs at *Phil.* 12. 3 (*NTAF* 78).

Phil. 12. 3

pro omnibus sanctis orate.
orate etiam pro regibus et
potestatibus et principibus
atque pro persequentibus
et odientibus vos et pro
inimicis crucis, ut fructus
vester manifestus sit in
omnibus, ut sitis in illo
perfecti.

Matt. 5. 44, 48

ἀγαπάτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς
ὑμῶν, καὶ προσεύχεσθε
ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς.

⁴⁸ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι
ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ
οὐράνιος τέλειός ἐστιν.

καὶ . . . των \aleph B f¹ pc k sy^{s,c}.
sa?bo^{pt} Ir^{lat} Or Cyp]ευλογειτε
τους καταρωμενους υμας,
καλως ποιειτε τοις μισουσιν
υμας και προσευχεσθε υπερ
των επηρεαζοντων υμας
και (D) L (W) Θf¹³ Byz lat
sy^{(p)h} mae (Cl) (Eus)

Luke 6. 27

ἀγαπάτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς
ὑμῶν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς
μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς, εὐλογεῖτε
τοὺς
καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς,
προσεύχεσθε περὶ τῶν
ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς.

Köster lists this as another instance of Polycarp drawing upon written gospels in *Philippians*, Matthew being the primary source (due to the juxtaposition of language echoing both 5. 44 and 5. 48), with possible influence from Luke 6. 27.³⁵

³³ Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 93.

³⁴ But one must avoid assuming what one seeks to prove; cf. Dehandschutter (who claims that Polycarp 'is aware of the connection present in the Gospel itself' ('Polycarp's Epistle', 288)), or Massaux ('since the text of Mt. was within reach . . .' (*Influence*, ii. 32)).

³⁵ Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 20; Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 119–20 (followed by Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 37); cf. Köhler (*Rezeption*, 100–2), who thinks dependence on Matthew is 'probable'. Hartog (*Polycarp*, 184) repeats Koester's arguments, as does Berding, who none the

But it is unlikely that the details can be sorted out quite so confidently with regard to which gospel Polycarp echoes, or that we can even be sure he is dependent on a written gospel, for at least three reasons. First, the presence of significant variation in the textual tradition of Matt. 5. 44 means that we cannot be certain what Polycarp's text of Matthew (assuming he had one) was. Second, that *Phil.* 12. 3 is extant only in a Latin translation adds a further level of complication, inasmuch as the translator may have assimilated the text of *Philippians* to the text of the gospels as he knew them (as in fact happened at *Phil.* 2. 3b³⁶). Third, the many instances of subtly different forms of the basic command to 'pray for one's enemies' in early Christian writings³⁷ alert us to the possibility that the sayings in view here took on (or perhaps even continued to have) a life of their own even after being incorporated into written gospel texts, increasing the possibility that Polycarp may be echoing a source other than the known gospel texts (cf., again, *Phil.* 6. 1).

In short, we can do no more than follow the lead of the Oxford Committee and Massaux, and note the similarities without drawing any conclusions, due to the uncertainty of the evidence.³⁸

Conclusion: Evidence for the Use of the Synoptic Gospels in Philippians

Other instances of parallels between *Philippians* and the synoptics may be noted;³⁹ none, however, adds any clearer evidence than that examined above to indicate that Polycarp drew on any of the synoptic gospels as we now know them. It is possible that Polycarp made use of one or more of the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and/or Luke; but there is no evidence to demonstrate that he did, nor is it possible to demonstrate that he did not know or use any of these three writings.

Johannine Gospel Tradition

Opinion continues to be sharply divided as to whether *Philippians* offers any evidence that Polycarp knew the Fourth Gospel: whereas Hartog states that

less sees dependence here as no more than a 'possibility' (*Polycarp and Paul*, 123). Dehandschutter likewise follows Koester, but limits dependence to Matthew alone ('Polycarp's Epistle', 289).

³⁶ There the Latin reads *pauperes in spiritu* for *οἱ πτωχοί*, and *regnum caelorum* instead of *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*.

³⁷ See, e.g., *Did.* 1. 3; Justin Martyr, *1 Apol.* 15. 9, 14. 3; *idem*, *Dial.* 133. 6, 96. 3; Athenagoras, *Leg.* 11. 2; Theophilus, *Ad Autol.* 3. 14; *Ap Const.* 1. 2. 2; *P Oxy.* 1224.

³⁸ *NTAF*, 103; Massaux, *Influence*, ii. 33; cf. Gregory, *Reception*, 135.

³⁹ Parallels noted by the Oxford Committee or others but not discussed below (due to their very low level of probability) include 5. 2 // Mark 9. 35; Matt. 20. 28 (*NTAF* #73); 11. 2 // Matt. 18. 17 (*NTAF* #74); 1. 3 // Matt. 13. 17 (*NTAF* #79); 4. 3 // Luke 2. 37 (noted by Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 71, 199).

‘Polycarp does not appear to use the Gospel of John,’ Hill contends that the letter offers ‘reasonable assurance that Polycarp indeed knew and valued the Fourth Gospel’.⁴⁰ This sharp divergence of opinion is somewhat surprising in view of the small amount of evidence with which to work: the Oxford Committee mentioned only two passages, and rated only one, *Phil.* 5. 2 (NATF # 80), *giving it only a ‘c’ evaluation*.⁴¹

Phil. 5. 2

Καθὼς ὑπέσχετο ἡμῖν ἐγείραι ἡμᾶς ἐκ νεκρῶν

John 5. 21, 6. 44

5. 21: ὡς περ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ἐγείρει τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ ζῶσσοιεῖ, οὕτως καὶ ὁ υἱὸς οὗς θέλει ζῶσσοιεῖ.

6. 44: κἀγὼ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

‘No such promise is given in the synoptic Gospels,’ observes Benecke, ‘whereas it is put plainly in John’—‘three times in the space of fifteen verses’ (6. 40, 44, 54; cf. 5. 21, 6. 39), notes Hill, who contends that ‘Polycarp’s reference to such a promise on the part of Jesus may well reflect a knowledge of the Fourth Gospel’.⁴² This evidence, in conjunction with the indirect evidence Hill finds in *Phil.* 7. 1, offers, he claims, ‘reasonable assurance that Polycarp indeed knew and valued the Fourth Gospel’.⁴³

Upon examination, however, Hill’s case collapses. First, his effort to bolster his claim by drawing 7. 1 into the discussion is unpersuasive. His argument is that the sources of Polycarp’s allusions in 7. 1—1 John and perhaps 2 John—for their part probably allude in turn to the gospel of John, which opens the possibility that at least some of Polycarp’s words ‘are somewhat more likely to reflect knowledge of the Fourth Gospel’ than of the Johannine letters.⁴⁴ But an

⁴⁰ Hartog, *Polycarp*, 186; C. E. Hill, *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 420. T. Nagel, *Die Rezeption des Johannesevangeliums im 2. Jahrhundert*, *Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte*, 2 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2000), does not mention *Philippians* in his survey.

⁴¹ NATF, 104. The other passage mentioned is *Phil.* 12. 3 // John 15. 16 (NATF #81, nicely discussed by Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 123–4); also mentioned occasionally is *Phil.* 10. 1 // John 13. 34 (noted by Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, 418). The contact in the first instance amounts to only a single word, and the second instance is more likely dependent on (if anything) 1 Pet. 2. 17 or 3. 8 (cf. Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 102).

⁴² NATF, 104; Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, 420. Hill’s predecessors include E. Jacquier, *Le nouveau testament dans l’église chrétienne*, 2 vols. (Paris: Gabalda, 1911, 1913), i. 55, who sees here a possible allusion to John 6. 44, which R. M. Grant (‘Polycarp of Smyrna’, *ATR* 28 (1946), 137–48, at p. 142) takes as an indication that ‘Polycarp could have quoted from the gospel’ but chose not to. Cf. also J. A. Fischer, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, 6th edn. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970), 255 n. 65; H. Lohmann, *Drohung und Verheissung: Exegetische Untersuchungen zur Eschatologie bei den Apostolischen Vätern*, BZNW 55 (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1989), 186.

⁴³ Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, 420.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.* 419–20, on p. 420.

argument composed by compounding possibilities—e.g., ‘the phrase “of the devil”... *may* be dependent upon 1 John 3. 8... But both it and the final clause... *may* on the other hand be dependent upon... John 8. 44’—is simply not compelling.⁴⁵

Second, even if one were to grant, for the sake of argument, Hill's contention regarding 7. 1, the evidence would still be grossly insufficient to make his point, in view of the methodological consequences of Irenaeus's testimony (in *Haer.* 3. 3. 4) that Polycarp was acquainted with the apostle John. When person A is personally acquainted with person B, it takes a much higher standard of evidence to demonstrate that person A acquired an idea from person B's writings rather than from person B directly than it does when A does not know B. In short, the connection between John and Polycarp reported by Irenaeus requires that one demonstrate positive evidence of dependence not merely on Johannine teaching, but on the written gospel specifically—and that sort of evidence is lacking in this instance.

In short, given that there are in *Philippians* no more than a very few *possible* references to the Fourth Gospel, Benecke's conclusion—‘The reference seems certainly to be to a Johannine tradition, though it need not necessarily be to our Fourth Gospel’—remains a fair assessment of what can be said about the matter.⁴⁶ There is no evidence that Polycarp did not know the gospel of John, but neither is there evidence to demonstrate that he did.

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

The only passage that requires extended discussion in relation to Acts is *Phil.* 1. 2 (*NTAF* # 59).

Phil. 1. 2

[... Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν...]
ὃν ἤγγειρεν ὁ θεός,
λύσας τὰς ᾠδίννας τοῦ ᾄδου.

Acts 2. 24

[... Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον...]
ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἀνέστησεν
λύσας τὰς ᾠδίννας τοῦ θανάτου...
θανάτου p74^{vid} N A B C E 33 1739 Byz sy^h
cop^{sa} Eus Ath *rell*] αδοου D latt sy^p mae bo Ir^{lat}

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* 419, emphasis added. One may also observe how the nuanced language of possibility on pp. 418–20 (e.g., ‘seems’, ‘may’, ‘possible traces’) has become, in his concluding paragraph (p. 420), something rather more certain (‘there are indeed several “traces”’).

⁴⁶ *NTAF*, 104; Berding (*Polycarp and Paul*, 75), contrary to his usual tendency, is even more sceptical than Benecke.

Opinion continues to be divided as to whether Polycarp is here dependent on Acts. The key phrase is *λύσας τὰς ὀδίννας*, an apparent allusion to Ps. 18(17). 6 (or perhaps 116(114). 3), whose distinctive form, however, is not found in the Septuagint (which in both Pss. 17 and 114 mistranslates the Hebrew).⁴⁷ In Berding's estimation, the phrase 'seems clearly to have been dependent on Acts... The verbal similarities are obvious',⁴⁸ the replacement of *ἀνέστησεν* by the synonymous *ἤγειρεν* perhaps reflecting the influence of Acts 3. 15 and 4. 10. Gregory, however, while granting that 'it is certainly unlikely' that Luke and Polycarp would have independently adopted this unusual form, observes that 'the possibility that each drew on an earlier source (probably a testimony book) renders the argument that Polycarp drew on *Acts* unnecessary, although of course it remains possible'.⁴⁹

How one reconciles these differing perspectives depends a great deal upon how one approaches the question and/or the outcome one seeks. If the goal is to establish a 'critically assured' foundation of indisputable data, then one must side with Gregory: dependence on Acts cannot be demonstrated, though it is clearly possible—a 'd' rating, on the Committee's scale, in other words. If one is, by way of contrast, more concerned to assess which of the two possibilities is the more likely, then a different conclusion may be reached: in view of the conceptual and distinctive verbal similarities between Acts and Polycarp, 'it seems probable that Polycarp is dependent on Acts,' in the words of Benecke, who immediately adds, however, that both authors may have followed an earlier writer—hence the committee's 'c' rating.⁵⁰

As for other possible instances of the use of Acts in *Philippians*, Berding suggests that the language of Acts 10. 42 (*κριτῆς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν*) may be

⁴⁷ The question of whether Polycarp gives evidence of a 'Western' textual variant is complicated by the continuing uncertainty regarding the origin(s) and date of the 'Western' textual tradition of Acts: Polycarp is chronologically early enough that it is possible that he is a source of, rather than a witness to, a 'Western' variant. Indeed, Polycarp has even been credited with creating a 'pre-recensional' form of the text now found in Codex Bezae (C.-B. Amphoux, in his revision of L. Vaganay, *An Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*, 2nd edn. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 95, 98).

⁴⁸ Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 39 (cf. p. 199: an 'almost certain loose citation'); earlier, J. B. Bauer, *Polykarpbriefe*, 41; Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 8; Grant, 'Polycarp', 142–3; all echoing the arguments of T. Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909 (German original 1906–7)), ii. 186; also Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 288–290; Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 323. Less certainty (sometimes much less) is expressed by Hagner, 'Sayings', 240, 263 n. 38; Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 222; Massaux, *Influence*, ii. 34–5.

⁴⁹ Gregory, *Reception*, 314; earlier, C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, i, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994), 36, 143–4; E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 6, 7; similarly Dehandschutter, 'Polycarp's Epistle', 283 n. 39.

⁵⁰ NTAf, 98.

reflected in *Phil.* 2. 1 (NTAF #60), but even he acknowledges that the conventional phrase is (in Hartog's words) 'rather common kerygmatic fare' with parallels elsewhere.⁵¹ Other possible instances are even more ambiguous.⁵² In short, the use of Acts in *Philippians* cannot be demonstrated; at the same time, knowledge of Acts on the part of Polycarp cannot be excluded.⁵³

LETTERS ATTRIBUTED TO PAUL

In the case of the letters attributed to Paul,⁵⁴ we have a different set of circumstances than in the case of the other documents we have been examining. Not only does Polycarp mention Paul by name four times (at 3. 2, 9. 1, 11. 2, 3), he also knows that he wrote 'letters'⁵⁵ to the Philippian congrega-

⁵¹ Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 47 (cf. p. 199), mentioning 2 Tim. 4. 1; 1 Pet. 4. 5; 2 Clem. 1. 1 (cf. also Barn. 7. 2); Hartog, *Polycarp*, 185; similarly Barrett, *Acts*, i. 36; Haenchen, *Acts*, 5, 6 ('a very old kerygmatic formula'); Lightfoot, on the other hand, signals the reference typographically as a quotation (*Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 324–5).

⁵² These include *Phil.* 2. 3 // Acts 20. 35 (NTAF #61); *Phil.* 3. 2 // Acts 16. 12–40; *Phil.* 6. 3 // Acts 7. 52 (NTAF #62); *Phil.* 12.2 // Acts 26. 18 (NTAF #63). A more optimistic assessment of each instance is offered by Harrison (*Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 290–1).

⁵³ Similarly Gregory, *Reception*, 314.

⁵⁴ Surveys include Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*; *idem*, 'Paul in the Writings of the Apostolic Fathers', in W. S. Babcock (ed.), *Paul and the Legacies of Paul* (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990), 25–45; also *idem*, 'Der Apostel Paulus im 2. Jahrhundert', in Sevrin (ed.), *New Testament in Early Christianity*, 39–67; Rensberger, 'As the Apostle Teaches'; and Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*.

⁵⁵ The plural 'letters' is unexpected and awkward. In classical and later usage, as Lightfoot pointed out, the plural could refer to a single letter (J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, 6th edn. (London: Macmillan, 1881), 140–2, with numerous examples; additional examples in M. L. Stirewalt, Jun., *Studies in Ancient Greek Epistolography*, SBLSPS 27 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 77; see also Euseb. *HE* 6. 43. 3.). While granting that this is a linguistic possibility, Paulsen (*Die Briefe*, 116) rejects this solution, pointing out that in 13. 2 Polycarp clearly distinguishes the singular from the plural; see also BDAG, s.v. ἐπιστολή ('In all probability the plur. in our lit.—even Ac 9. 2; Pol. 3. 2—always means more than one letter, not a single one'). If this is a true plural, (a) it may be 'no more than an imprecision arising from familiarity with Pauline phraseology' (Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 15, with reference to 2 Cor. 10. 11); (b) he may simply have assumed that the Philippians possessed two or more letters (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 327); (c) he knows that the Philippians possessed two or more letters (Philip Sellew, 'Laodiceans and the Philippians Fragments Hypothesis', *HTR* 87 (1994), 17–28); (d) he may have read it out of *Phil.* 3. 1 (Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 14); or (e) 'What Polycarp means is that Paul's letters, no matter to which community they were originally written, can strengthen all Christians and every Christian community in the present. In this light, he can speak of all of the letters as "written to you," that is, to the Philippians of his own day' (Lindemann, 'Paul in the Writings', 41–2)—a statement which may reflect Polycarp's attitude towards apostolic literature, but which seriously overstates what may be deduced from the plural here. More options are catalogued by Schoedel (*Polycarp*, 14–15) and Berding (*Polycarp and Paul*, 62–3), to which may be added the view of Stephanus Le Moyné, *Varia Sacra*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Daniel à Gaesbeeck,

tion, and commends these documents as a proper object of study (3. 2).⁵⁶ This last point would imply that Polycarp assumed that the Philippians had available to them copies of the documents in question—as he himself apparently did.⁵⁷ We immediately wonder, of course: which ones? Unless we assume that Polycarp used in *Philippians* every Pauline letter he possessed (or that use of one implies possession of a corpus of letters)—assumptions we have no basis for making—we cannot answer that question.⁵⁸ Instead, we can only pursue the clues which *Philippians* offers as to which documents Polycarp used in the composition of that particular and circumstantial document, always remembering that absence of use does not mean lack of knowledge.

Romans

Benecke places Romans in the Committee's 'B' category, and Berding finds one 'almost certain' citation and two 'probable' allusions. Yet the actual evidence of use of Romans is rather thin.⁵⁹ The most likely instance, in *Phil.* 6. 2 (NTAF # 21), is not without its ambiguities.

Phil. 6. 2

πάντας δεῖ παραστήναι
τῷ βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ
καὶ ἕκαστον ὑπὲρ
ἑαυτοῦ λόγον δοῦναι.

Rom. 14. 10, 12

πάντες γὰρ
παραστησόμεθα τῷ
βήματι τοῦ θεοῦ . . . ἄρα
οὐδὲν ἕκαστος ἡμῶν περὶ
ἑαυτοῦ λόγον δώσει τῷ
θεῷ.

2 Cor. 5. 10

τοὺς γὰρ πάντας ἡμᾶς
φανερωθῆναι δεῖ
ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος
τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἵνα
κομίσηται ἕκαστος τὰ
διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς

1685), ii. 343, as reported by V. Koperski, 'The Early History of the Dissection of Philippians', *JTS* 44 (1993), 599–600, who suggested that a single letter to the Philippians might later have been divided into two segments, which were then mistaken for two separate letters. Paulsen (*Die Briefe*, 116) favours either (d) or (e); I lean towards either (a) or (b) or the two in combination; Berding (*Polycarp and Paul*, 63) thinks the problem is unresolvable.

⁵⁶ The verb ἐγκύπτειν occurs in early Christian literature only here and in *1 Clem.* 40. 1; 45. 2; 53. 1; 62. 3, where the objects of the verb are, respectively, 'divine knowledge', 'the scriptures', 'the oracles of God', and 'the oracles of the teaching of God'.

⁵⁷ On *Phil.* 3. 2 see further the discussion below under Philippians.

⁵⁸ As Lindemann ('Paul in the Writings', 25) reminds us, the Pauline corpus was not known to every Christian who happened to mention Paul or quote one or two of his letters.

⁵⁹ Two passages listed by the Oxford Committee under Romans, #22 and #24, are discussed under 2 Corinthians and 1 Timothy, respectively; for Rom. 12. 17, see NTAF #28; for Rom. 4. 16, see the discussion of *Phil.* 3. 3 under Gal. 4. 26 below. Additional passages mentioned as possibilities by Berding (*Polycarp and Paul*, 199) include 9. 2 (cf. Rom. 8. 17) and 10. 2–3 (cf. Rom. 2. 24).

θεου \aleph^* A B C* DFG
 1506.1739 *pc lat co* | *Χριστου*
 $\aleph^c C^2 \Psi$ 048 0209 33 1881 Byz
 sy
τω θεω \aleph A C D Ψ 0209 33
Byz lat sy co | *omit B FG 6*
 1739 1881 *pc Cyp*

ἃ ἔπραξεν εἴτε ἀγαθὸν
 εἴτε φαῦλον.

The wording of the second clause is verbally similar to Rom. 14. 12; the first clause has similarities to both Rom. 14. 10 and 2 Cor. 5. 10,⁶⁰ and opinions about its origin vary widely.⁶¹ In view of the differences between Polycarp's statement and either of the putative sources, and given the formulaic or traditional nature of some of the phrases,⁶² it is unwarranted to label this a 'citation';⁶³ it seems, rather, a classic case of allusion.⁶⁴ That both clauses of 6. 2 are paralleled in close context (separated only by a scriptural citation) in Romans, but that only one of them is paralleled in 2 Corinthians, is reason to think that the former is the more probable source. The existence of two, difficult-to-differentiate sources, however, suggests no more than a 'c' rating is in order here.

Berding labels two passages as 'probable reminiscences' of Romans, 3. 3 and 10. 1, to both of which, however, the Oxford Committee gives only a 'd' rating. In 3. 3 (*NTAF* #23), the conjunction of the double command to love God and neighbour and the idea of 'fulfilment' (*προαγούσης τῆς ἀγάπης τῆς εἰς θεὸν καὶ Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὸν πλησίον. ἐὰν γὰρ τις τοῦτων ἐντὸς ἡ, πεπλήρωκεν ἐντολὴν δικαιοσύνης*) suggests a link to Paul (Rom. 13. 8–10;

⁶⁰ Like 2 Cor. 5 is the use of the *δεῖ* + infinitive construction and the reference to Christ; like Rom. 14 is the use of 'stand' instead of 'appear' and a dative construction rather than a preposition + genitive for the phrase 'before the judgement seat'.

⁶¹ Lightfoot (*Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 333) thinks that in the first clause 'we have here a combination of both passages' (i.e., Rom. 14. 10 and 2 Cor. 5. 10), as does J. B. Bauer (*Polykarpbriefe*, 56). The Oxford Committee (*NTAF*, 91, 89) attributes it 'primarily' to Rom. 14, allowing only that Polycarp may have 'unconsciously been influenced by 2 Cor 5. 10 also'; cf. Lohmann (*Drohung und Verheissung*, 187). Rensberger (*As the Apostle Teaches*, 113) does not even mention 2 Cor. 5. 10. On the other hand, Lindemann ('Paul in the Writings', 43; *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 225–6; followed by Paulsen, *Die Briefe*, 119) is of the firm opinion that this is a 'quotation' of 2 Cor. 5. 10. Berding (*Polycarp and Paul*, 85–6) finds here 'probable influence' of the form of 2 Cor. 5. 10 on an 'almost certain loose citation' of Rom. 14. 10.

⁶² e.g., *παραστήναι* as a technical term (*BDAG*, s.v. *παρίστημι*, 1.e and 2.a. a), or *λόγον δοῦναι* as a standard accounting phrase (*BDAG*, s.v. *λόγος*, 2.a–b), which in this instance carries forward the metaphor of 'debtors' from 6. 1. For *λόγον δοῦναι τῷ θεῷ*, see *NewDocs* 3. 136.

⁶³ As do, e.g., Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 86, 199; Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 226.

⁶⁴ See on this point the important work of F. M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 119–39.

Gal. 5. 14) rather than to the Jesus tradition⁶⁵—though it is curious that whereas Rom. 13. 8–10 and Gal. 5. 14 (as also Jas. 2. 8) present only the second half of the ‘greatest commandment’, Polycarp presents both halves, and, with the juxtaposition of ‘God and Christ’, in a very distinctive form. In any case, if the source is Pauline, it is indeterminable: love as the fulfilment of the law is mentioned in both passages, and Polycarp’s language could be derived from either.⁶⁶ The only reason that either the Committee or Berding favour Romans slightly—that it has the ‘more fully developed passage’⁶⁷—is hardly firm grounds for a decision. The Committee’s ‘d’ rating is to be affirmed.

The other passage to which Berding draws attention is *Phil.* 10. 1 (*NTAF* #25), where, following Lightfoot (as does the Oxford Committee), Berding finds a double ‘probable reminiscence’ of Rom. 12. 10.⁶⁸

Phil. 10. 1

... fraternitatis amatores, diligentes
invicem, in veritate sociati,
mansuetudine Domini alterutri
praestolantes, nullum despicientes.

Rom. 12. 10

τῇ φιλαδελφία εἰς ἀλλήλους
φιλόστοργοι, τῇ τιμῇ ἀλλήλους
προηγούμενοι.

‘Probable’, however, seems much too confident. The passage survives only in Latin translation; so any reconstruction of the Greek is only a conjecture⁶⁹ and, in the case of the second phrase, one which rests on a particular interpretation of an ambiguous Latin verb.⁷⁰ Moreover, the phrases in question are only short snippets of traditional paraenetic elements, which have parallels elsewhere in the letter and in other Christian writings from the same general period.⁷¹ In short, there is nothing in the way of evidence to raise this

⁶⁵ So Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 66. Polycarp’s reference to ‘the commandment of righteousness’ (rather than the ‘law’) no doubt reflects his immediate concern with this topic.

⁶⁶ Berding (ibid. 199) admits as much (despite giving a ‘probable’ rating) when he describes the referent of 3. 3 as ‘Rom 13:8–10 and/or Gal 5:14’; methodologically, if it can be either passage, it counts as evidence for neither (the same problem encountered in dealing with double or triple tradition material in the gospels).

⁶⁷ *NTAF*, 90; Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 66.

⁶⁸ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 339; *NTAF*, 90; Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 102–3.

⁶⁹ In this regard it is worth noting that Zahn’s retroversion here differs from that of Lightfoot. ⁷⁰ I.e., *praestolantes*; cf. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 339; Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 102–3.

⁷¹ For ‘loving the brotherhood’, cf. *Phil.* 3. 3a; 1 Pet. 3. 8, 2. 17 (or perhaps Rom. 12. 10, especially if, as Lightfoot suggests (*Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 339; cf. Paulsen, *Die Briefe*, 122), one connects this phrase with the following one (i.e., ‘devoted to one another with brotherly affection’); Schoedel (*Polycarp*, 30), probably correctly, prefers to separate the two). For ‘cherishing one another’, cf. 4. 2; Rom. 12. 10 (John 13. 34; 15. 12, 17). For ‘giving way to one another in the gentleness of the Lord’, cf. *Phil.* 2. 3; Rom 12. 10; 2 Cor. 10. 1 (so Lightfoot (*Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 339) and Schoedel (*Polycarp*, 30); cf. Paulsen, *Die Briefe*, 122–3); Ignatius, *Phld.* 1. 2.

instance beyond the level of possibility. Once again, the Committee's 'd' rating is appropriate.

1 Corinthians

This is one of two documents whose use by Polycarp the Oxford Committee considered as 'beyond reasonable doubt'. The first passage to be discussed is *Phil.* 5. 3 (*NTAF* #1).

Phil. 5. 3

οὔτε πόρνοι οὔτε μαλακοὶ οὔτε
ἀρσενοκοῖται βασιλείαν θεοῦ
κληρονομήσουσιν, οὔτε οἱ
ποιοῦντες τὰ ἄτοπα.

1 Cor. 6. 9–10

ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι ἄδικοι θεοῦ
βασιλείαν οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν; μὴ
πλανᾶσθε· οὔτε πόρνοι οὔτε
εἰδωλόλατραι οὔτε μοιχοὶ οὔτε
μαλακοὶ οὔτε ἀρσενοκοῖται ¹⁰ οὔτε
κλέπται οὔτε πλεονέκται, οὐ
μέθυσοι, οὐ λοῖδοροι, οὐχ ἄρπαγες
βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομήσουσιν.

Though Benecke did not discern any 'fixed principle' guiding the omission of seven of Paul's ten terms,⁷² context suggests that Polycarp's main focus in 5. 3—a concern for the sexual purity of the young men—controls his selection of just three terms from Paul's list.⁷³ The resulting statement is verbally identical, and lists the selected items in the same order as Paul's declaration in 1 Corinthians, and the concluding generalized reference to οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ ἄτοπα, which functions in essentially the same way as the inclusive ἄδικοι in 6. 9a, suggests that Polycarp was consciously abbreviating.⁷⁴ There is widespread agreement that 1 Corinthians is Polycarp's source,⁷⁵ with slight hesitation arising only on the part of some who wonder if Paul himself may be relying on traditional materials.⁷⁶ The Oxford Committee's 'a' rating is not without its reasons.

The second passage of note is *Phil.* 11. 2 (*NTAF* #2).

Phil. 11. 2

aut nescimus, quia sancti mundum
iudicabunt, sicut Paulus docet?

1 Cor. 6. 2

ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι οἱ ἅγιοι τὸν
κόσμον κρινούσιν;

⁷² *NTAF*, 85.

⁷³ The only sexual category not mentioned is 'adulterers', probably because most if not all of the young men Polycarp addresses were, at least in his estimation, not yet likely to be married (similarly Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 225).

⁷⁴ Benecke, *NTAF*, 85; similarly Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 225.

⁷⁵ E.g., Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 331; Bauer, *Die Briefe*, 289 ('unverkennbar'); Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 176; Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 78–9.

⁷⁶ Cf. Rensberger, *As the Apostle Teaches*, 113; Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 225 (less hesitantly in 'Paul in the Writings', 43: 'of course').

The mention of Paul by name, suggests Benecke, ‘makes Polycarp’s use of 1 Corinthians practically certain’, though the fact that this passage survives only in the Latin version means, as Lindemann points out, that ‘it is not impossible’ that the reference to Paul ‘was inserted by the Latin translator’.⁷⁷ On the other hand, the introductory ‘or do we not know’ ‘seems to indicate Polycarp’s supposition that his readers are acquainted with the quoted sentence, just as he is’: in short, he assumes, apparently, that his readers also know 1 Corinthians.⁷⁸ The usual reservations engendered by the Latin translation might suggest a ‘b’ rating overall, though there is otherwise little to quarrel with regarding to the Committee’s ‘a’ ranking.

The third passage of interest is *Phil.* 3. 2–3 (*NTAF* #3).

Phil. 3. 2–3

τὴν δοθείσαν ὑμῖν πίστιν, . . .
 ἕπακολουθούσης τῆς ἐλπίδος,
 προαγούσης τῆς ἀγάπης τῆς εἰς
 θεὸν καὶ χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὸν
 πλησίον.

1 Cor. 13. 13

νυνὶ δὲ μένει πίστις, ἐλπίς, ἀγάπη,
 τὰ τρία ταῦτα· μείζων δὲ τούτων ἡ
 ἀγάπη.

The traditional triad of ‘faith, hope, and love’ occurs not infrequently in Pauline and other writings, in two sequences: faith/love/hope (1 Thess. 1. 3; 5. 8; Col. 1. 4–5), and faith/hope/love (Rom. 5. 1–5; 1 Cor. 13. 13; Gal. 5. 5–6; Heb. 10. 22–4; 1 Pet. 1. 21–2), as in *Phil.* 3. 2–3. There is some uncertainty, however, regarding the logical sequence of Polycarp’s triad: does *προαγούσης* indicate that love leads both other terms (i.e., love/faith/hope), that it leads just the preceding term, hope (i.e., faith/love/hope), or is it a paraphrastic rendering of *μείζων δὲ τούτων*?⁷⁹ If the third option is adopted,⁸⁰ then there is some basis for preferring, as does the Oxford Committee, 1 Cor. 13 as the most likely source, and for its ‘c’ rating here. Otherwise, the source is essentially indeterminate, and a ‘d’ rating would be appropriate.⁸¹

⁷⁷ *NTAF*, 85; Lindemann, ‘Paul in the Writings’, 42; *idem*, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 90, 228.

⁷⁸ Lindemann, ‘Paul in the Writings’, 42; *idem*, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 90.

⁷⁹ For the first option see Paulsen, *Die Briefe*, 117; for the second, Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, ii. 3. 327; for the third, Schoedel, *Polycarp and Paul*, 15.

⁸⁰ Polycarp’s reference to love specifically ‘for God and Christ and for our neighbour’ clearly echoes Jesus’ teaching about the ‘greatest commandment’—a slight reason, perhaps, to prefer the third option.

⁸¹ Benecke (*NTAF*, 85–6) lists five additional sets of weak parallels (## 4–8), all of which he places in the ‘d’ category (no more than a possibility). Surprisingly, Berding (*Polycarp and Paul*, 199–200) in his summary does not mention two of these (##4, 8), and rates the other three (## 5, 6, 7) as ‘probable’. In each instance, however, it is a matter of multiple potential sources for very short phrases; Benecke’s rating is much to be preferred.

Benecke's concluding observation bears repetition: 'In view of the fact that Polycarp's use of 1 Corinthians may be regarded as certain, the small amount of verifiable influence from 1 Corinthians is worth noting.'⁸²

2 Corinthians

Two passages call for discussion.⁸³ Unexpectedly, the Oxford Committee and Berding each rate higher the passage that the other rates lower. The first is *Phil.* 4. 1 (*NTAF* #22).

| | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| <i>Phil.</i> 4. 1 | Rom. 13. 12, 6. 13 | 2 Cor. 6. 7 |
| ὀπλισώμεθα τοῖς ὄπλοις τῆς δικαιοσύνης. | ἐνδυσώμεθα δὲ τὰ ὄπλα τοῦ φωτός. 6. 13: ὄπλα δικαιοσύνης. | διὰ τῶν ὄπλων τῆς δικαιοσύνης. |

With regard to the mention of 'weapons of righteousness' in *Phil.* 4. 1, it is widely agreed that a Pauline metaphor has 'certainly influenced' the passage.⁸⁴ But which one? The verb, a vivid military metaphor, occurs in early Christian literature only here and in 1 Pet. 4. 1, but Rom. 13. 12 certainly echoes the concept (cf. also Eph. 6. 13). The specific noun + genitive construction occurs in the three instances set out above, but again the concept is more widespread, in Christian writings (cf. Eph. 6. 13; Ign. *Pol.* 6.2) and secular authors (e.g., Pseudo-Crates, *Ep.* 16 (1–2 c.CE), where the Cynic's cloak and wallet are 'the weapons of the gods'). In short, the phrase is sufficiently common that Polycarp's rather generic formulation of it cannot be taken as evidence of knowledge of any particular document. The Oxford Committee rightly assigns a 'd' rating here.⁸⁵

The second passage is *Phil.* 2. 2 (*NTAF* #26).

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Phil.</i> 2. 2 | 2 Cor. 4. 14 |
| ὁ δὲ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐγερεῖ. | εἰδότες ὅτι ὁ ἐγείρας τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἡμᾶς σὺν Ἰησοῦ ἐγερεῖ. |

⁸² *NTAF*, 86.

⁸³ *Re Phil.* 6. 2 (*NTAF* #27), where Berding finds 'probable' influence of 2 Cor. 5. 10, see the discussion of Rom. 14. 10 above; even the 'c' rating assigned by the Oxford Committee (*NTAF*, 91) for the possible parallel between 6. 2 and 2 Cor. 5. 10 seems unduly optimistic. The three additional passages given a 'd' rating (*Phil.* 5. 2 // 2 Cor. 8. 21 and others (*NTAF* #28); *Phil.* 11. 3 // 2 Cor. 3. 2 (*NTAF* #29); *Phil.* 3. 2 // 2 Cor. 10. 1 (*NTAF* #30)) need no discussion. Additional passages mentioned as possibilities by Berding (*Polycarp and Paul*, 200) include 9. 2 (cf. 2 Cor. 10. 1) and 10. 1 (cf. 2 Cor. 10. 1).

⁸⁴ So *NTAF*, 90; cf. Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 68–9.

⁸⁵ In contrast to Berding (*Polycarp and Paul*, 68–69), who finds here a 'probable' allusion to 2 Cor. 6. 7.

Lightfoot considered 2. 2 a ‘loose quotation’ of 2 Cor. 4. 14; the Oxford Committee, acknowledging that ‘the idea contained in’ these two passages ‘may have become a Christian commonplace’,⁸⁶ none the less found it ‘difficult to resist the conclusion that we have here a reminiscence of 2 Corinthians’—primarily on the strength of the phrase *καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐγερεῖ*—and assigned a ‘b’ rating.⁸⁷ But such a conclusion overlooks the extent to which this portion of 2.2 (a) merely repeats the language and thought of *Phil.* 2. 1 (likely derived from 1 Peter); (b) lacks any of the distinctive verbal features of 2 Cor. 4. 14;⁸⁸ and (c) has parallels with other texts (e.g. 1 Cor. 6. 14; Rom. 8. 11). This text does not demonstrate that Polycarp knew 2 Corinthians; an allusion to 2 Corinthians is, as Berding concludes, no more than a possibility.⁸⁹

Galatians

Two passages offer the primary evidence for Galatians in Philippians.⁹⁰ The first is *Phil.* 5. 1 (*NTAF* #31).

Phil. 5. 1

εἰδότες ὅν ὅτι θεὸς οὐ
μυκτηρίζεται.

Gal 6. 7

μη̄ πανάσθε θεὸς οὐ μυκτηρίζεται.

The introductory formula leaves little doubt that the proverbial⁹¹ statement is a quotation. Because (1) the wording matches Gal. 6. 7 exactly, and (2) the saying does not appear to be otherwise attested in antiquity,⁹² this instance is

⁸⁶ So also Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 227; cf. Grant, ‘Polycarp’, 143.

⁸⁷ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 325 (similarly Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 173; Massaux, *Influence*, ii. 35–6; Schoedel, *Polycarp and Paul*, 11); *NTAF*, 91.

⁸⁸ On this point see especially Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 49.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.* 51, 200.

⁹⁰ In regard to other possible connections, Berding’s alleged ‘probable’ allusion in *Phil.* 3. 3 to Gal. 5. 14 (*NTAF* #33) is in fact indeterminable (a point Berding (*Polycarp and Paul*, 199, 200) as much as admits when he describes the referent of 3. 3 as ‘Rom 13: 8–10 and/or Gal 5:14’; methodologically, if it can be either passage, it counts as evidence for neither). We may set aside the other two ‘d’ passages the Committee noticed (*Phil.* 5. 3 // Gal. 5. 17 (*NTAF* #34); *Phil.* 9. 2 // Gal. 2. 2 (*NTAF* #35)); for the latter, see the discussion of *Phil.* 2. 16 below. Additional passages mentioned as possibilities by Berding (*Polycarp and Paul*, 200) include *Phil.* 12. 2 (cf. Gal. 1. 1).

⁹¹ Note the very concise sentence structure, the anarthous *θεός* (cf. BDF §254), and the gnomic present. See E. Burton, *Galatians*, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921), 340–1, and H. D. Betz, *Galatians*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 306–7; so also Rensberger, ‘As the Apostle Teaches’, 114.

⁹² So Betz, *Galatians*, 306 n. 148; but cf. Prov. 1. 30; Ezek. 8. 17; and *1 Clem.* 39. 1 for conceptually similar material.

widely viewed as a virtually certain citation of Galatians by Polycarp.⁹³ But as Betz notes, 'the fact that it is not widely attested could be accidental', and in any case, 'the idea of God expressed in the "proverb" was common in antiquity'.⁹⁴ Moreover, as Benecke observes, 'the possibility cannot be excluded that the words may be a quotation in Galatians also' (note the introductory *μη̄ πλανᾶσθε*), and that Paul and Polycarp made independent use of a familiar saying. Thus the Oxford Committee assigned a 'b' rating, indicating high probability rather than certainty;⁹⁵ a 'c' rating would not seem unreasonable.

The second passage is *Phil.* 3. 3 (*NTAF* #32).

| <i>Phil.</i> 3. 3 | Gal. 4. 26 | Rom. 4. 16 |
|---|---|--|
| ... πίστω, ἥτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ πάντων ἡμῶν | ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἥτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ ἡμῶν. | ... πίστεως Ἀβραάμ, ὃς ἐστὶν πατὴρ πάντων ἡμῶν |
| | <hr style="width: 20%; margin: 0 auto;"/> <i>μητηρ</i> p ⁴⁶ S* B C DFG 33 1739 1881 <i>pc</i> <i>lat sy^p.hmg co Marcicon^T Ir^{arm} Or</i>] + <i>παντων</i> <i>S²A C³ 0261^{vid} Byz a b t sy^h Ir^{lat}</i> | |

The imagery of Jerusalem (or Zion) as 'our mother' is well established in Jewish writings (cf. Isa. 49. 14–21; 50. 1; 51. 18; 54. 1; 60. 4; Jer. 50 (LXX 27). 12; Hos. 4. 5); in second-century Christian writings we find faith as 'mother'.⁹⁶ Paul's allegory in Galatians 4 may represent the transition from the one image to the other. But is it the source of Polycarp's text? The form is similar, but the context is different, observes Berding, who then notes the thematic similarity with Rom. 4. 16, which is also very similar in form.⁹⁷ If the logic behind Polycarp's expression were known, it might reveal a material connection between Polycarp and Galatians, in addition to the formal similarities of

⁹³ e.g., Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 73; J. B. Bauer, *Polykarpbriefe*, 53; Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 224 (followed by Paulsen, *Die Briefe*, 118); Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 292–3; Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 330.

⁹⁴ Betz, *Galatians*, 307.

⁹⁵ *NTAF*, 92; similarly Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 176.

⁹⁶ e.g., *Martyrdom of Justin and Companions*, 4. 8, 'our true father is Christ, and faith in him our mother' (the phrase occurs in Recension B only; see Herbert Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 51); Hermas, *Vis.* 3. 8. 3–7 (16. 3–7), where 'Faith' is the 'mother' (directly or at some remove) of self-control, sincerity, innocence, reverence, knowledge, and love.

⁹⁷ Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 64; cf. J. C. Plumpe, *Mater Ecclesia* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1943), 19, who suggests that the reference in Rom. 4. 16 to the 'faith of Abraham ... the father of us all' generated by analogy Polycarp's phrase here in 3. 3.

wording.⁹⁸ Absent that information, the Oxford Committee's 'b' rating seems perhaps a bit generous; I would prefer a 'c' classification.

Ephesians

The first passage, to be discussed here is *Phil.* 12. 1 (*NTAF* #37).

| | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|
| <i>Phil.</i> 12. 1 | Eph. 4. 26 | Ps. 4. 5 (LXX) |
| Modo, ut his scripturis dictum est, irascimini et nolite peccare, et sol non occidat super iracundiam vestram. | ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε· ὁ ἥλιος μὴ ἐπιδυέτω ἐπὶ παροργισμῶ ὑμῶν. | ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε· |

In view of how the two statements in *Phil.* 12. 1 are essentially 'framed' by the two 'expressions of confidence' that open and close the section ('I am convinced that you are all well-trained...' and 'blessed is the one who remembers this, which I believe to be the case with you'), and given the introductory formula (*ut his scripturis dictum est*), there can be little question that we are dealing here with explicit quotations. The first agrees essentially verbatim with the LXX of Ps. 4. 5, which is quoted verbatim in Eph. 4. 26a; and the second is an essentially verbatim quotation of 4. 26b (which has Septuagintal antecedents; cf. Deut. 24. 13, 15; Jer. 15. 9).

For many scholars, the question of greater interest is not whether Polycarp here makes use of Ephesians but whether he refers to Ephesians as 'Scripture'.⁹⁹ The key issue for the moment, however, is whether Polycarp independently combined the two sayings found together in Eph. 4. 26, or whether

⁹⁸ Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 223; cf. Schoedel's suggestion (*Polycarp and Paul*, 15), that 'Abraham, the "father of us all," is originator of Christians through Sarah—that is, faith—who is, therefore, the mother of us all'.

⁹⁹ The latter question is basically unanswerable (similarly Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 228; Paulsen, *Die Briefe*, 125), in view of the state of the evidence: e.g., the references first to *sacris literis* and then to *scripturis*, which Schoedel (*Polycarp*, 35) renders as 'writings' and 'scriptures' respectively. Lightfoot (*Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 344, in agreement with Zahn) gives *γραφαῖς* as the retroversion of both *literis* and *scripturis*, but W. Bauer (*Die Briefe*, 296) wonders if the first reference might reflect the *ἱερά γράμματα* ('sacred writings') of 2 Tim. 3. 15. Do the different Latin terms accurately reflect differences in the underlying Greek text of Polycarp (and if so, what were they?), or do they reflect the translation technique of the Latin translator? Lacking answers to such basic questions, it is difficult if not impossible to decide whether Polycarp (simply to list the major options) (1) cited both sayings as 'scripture', thinking that both were from the LXX; (2) intended the introductory formula to apply only to the first quotation, the *et* separating rather than linking the two; (3a) cited both as 'scripture', thinking that the first was from Psalms and the second from Ephesians; (3b) cited both as 'scripture', and derived both from Ephesians. For discussion and a slightly different arrangement of the options, see Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 118–19.

their collocation here in *Philippians* testifies to Polycarp's use of Ephesians. One possibility—namely, 'that St. Paul and Polycarp are quoting a common proverb . . . seems to be excluded by *his scripturis*', notes Benecke. Further, the close verbal similarity between 12. 1 and Eph. 4. 26b, where the two sayings are already associated, strongly suggests (to quote Benecke again) that 'the collocation of the two passages in Polycarp is almost certainly due to Ephesians'.¹⁰⁰ For once, I would rate this example higher than the Oxford Committee: 'a' instead of 'b'.

The second passage is *Phil.* 1. 3 (*NTAF* #36).

Phil. 1. 3

εἰδότες ὅτι χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, ἀλλὰ θελήματι θεοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Eph. 2. 5, 8–9

⁵χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι . . . ⁸τῆ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι διὰ πίστεως· καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν, θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον· ⁹οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων

While granting that 'in 1. 3, there appears to be a quotation of Ephesians 2. 8–9', Lindemann notes that 'it is possible, however, that Polycarp is not citing the "Pauline" text directly but rather is making use of a tradition that we may suppose to have been of Pauline origin'.¹⁰¹ But in view of (1) the extent (quantity) and degree (quality) of verbal similarity between the two passages, (2) the remarkably similar structure of the two passages,¹⁰² and (3) the near certainty, on the basis of *Phil.* 12. 1, that Polycarp knows Ephesians, this instance is certainly worthy of at least the 'b' rating the Oxford Committee assigned it.¹⁰³

Philippians

In *Phil.* 3. 2 (*NTAF* #40) Polycarp reminds the Philippians that 'when [Paul] was absent he wrote you letters'. Regardless of how the problematic plural

¹⁰⁰ *NTAF*, 93. Berding (*Polycarp and Paul*, 119, following Bauer, *Polykarpbriefe*, 69–71), concludes that the first citation is primarily dependent on Ps. 4. 5a, rather than Ephesians; in view of the verbal identity between the two, it is unclear how one might demonstrate this.

¹⁰¹ Lindemann, 'Paul in the Writings', 43; fuller discussion in *Paulus in ältesten Christentum*, 222–3.

¹⁰² Eph. 2. 8–9, (a) saved by grace, (b) through faith, (c) not by works, (d) gift of God, (e) created in Christ Jesus, (f) for good works; *Philippians*, (a) saved by grace, (b) [believe, 1.3a], (c) not works, (d) will of God, (e) through Jesus Christ, (f) therefore serve God [2. 1].

¹⁰³ *NTAF*, 92–3; Berding (*Polycarp and Paul*, 44, 200) rates it as 'almost certain'. Passages not discussed include *Phil.* 11. 2 // Eph. 5. 5; Col. 3. 5 (*NTAF* #38; the 'c' rating overstates the case, inasmuch as the passage survives only in Latin, which makes distinguishing between nearly identical material in Ephesians and Colossians impossible) and *Phil.* 12. 3 // Eph. 6. 18 (*NTAF* #39, 'd'). Additional passages mentioned as possibilities by Berding (*Polycarp and Paul*, 200) include 2. 1 (cf. Eph. 6. 14) and 10. 2 (cf. Eph. 5. 21; 1 Pet. 5. 5).

‘letters’ is to be interpreted,¹⁰⁴ many see here virtual proof that Polycarp knew Paul’s letter to the Philippians.¹⁰⁵ Strictly speaking, however, all this reference reveals is that Polycarp knew of a letter (or letters) to the Philippians; it does not prove that he knew the letter itself.¹⁰⁶ Consequently, it is still necessary to examine the evidence for usage of the document.

Three passages will be discussed. The first is *Phil.* 9. 2 (NTAF #41).

Phil. 9. 2

ὅτι οὗτοι πάντες οὐκ εἰς
κενὸν ἔδραμον.

Phil. 2. 16

ὅτι οὐκ εἰς κενὸν ἔδραμον.

Gal. 2. 2

μὴ πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ
ἔδραμον.

The relative rarity of the phrase εἰς κενὸν τρεχεῖν (used here in the aorist, ἔδραμον) increases the probability that Polycarp is alluding to one of the other two texts.¹⁰⁷ While the language of both *Phil.* 2. 16 and *Gal.* 2. 2 is similar, their respective contexts are rather different, and it is the context of Philippians that Polycarp echoes more closely. Berding’s conclusion of a ‘probable’ connection (which I take to be roughly equivalent to a ‘c’ rating) is not unjustified.¹⁰⁸

The second passage is *Phil.* 2. 1 (NTAF #42; cf. #8).

Phil. 2. 1

ᾧ ὑπεράγει τὰ πάντα
ἐπουράνια καὶ ἐπίγεια, . . .
οὐδὲ τὸ αἷμα ἐκζητήσει ἀπὸ
τῶν ἀπειθούντων αὐτῷ.

Phil. 2. 10

ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ
πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ
ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων
καὶ καταχθονῶν.
3. 21: ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ τὰ
πάντα.

1 Cor. 15. 28

ὅταν δὲ ὑποταγῇ αὐτῷ τὰ
πάντα.

Benecke’s primary reason for issuing a ‘c’ rating—that the context of the passage ‘shows clearly’ that it refers to Christ¹⁰⁹—is, in fact, not so clear, as the antecedent of the pronoun ᾧ is grammatically and contextually ambiguous, and the verb employed in the following clause (λατρεύει) is elsewhere used

¹⁰⁴ See n. 55 above.

¹⁰⁵ E.g., Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 63 (‘almost certain’); Massaux, *Influence*, ii. 36 (knowledge of Philippians is ‘infinitely probable’); NTAF, 94 (‘highly probable’); Lightfoot, *Philippians*, 142.

¹⁰⁶ Similarly Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 229; ‘Paul in the Writings’, 44.

¹⁰⁷ A TLG search of centuries 1 BCE–2 CE for the sequences –κεν– and either –τρέχ– or –δραμ– within five words of each other, in either order, produced only four hits: the three cited above, and a quotation of *Phil.* 9 in the Martyrdom of Ignatius.

¹⁰⁸ Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 98–9; rating it somewhat higher are NTAF, 94 (‘b’); Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 177 (‘highly probable’); cf. Grant, ‘Polycarp’, 143 n. 68. Somewhat more sceptical (without, however, giving any reasons) are Lindemann (*Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 228) and Rensberger (*As the Apostle Teaches*, 114).

¹⁰⁹ NTAF, 94.

uniformly with God as object of service.¹¹⁰ Moreover, the parallel phrases are short, the language not uncommon, and the potential sources multiple: more than enough reasons to list this, as does Berding, as no more than a 'possible' allusion.¹¹¹

The third passage is *Phil.* 12. 3 (*NTAF* # 43).

Phil. 12. 3

Phil. 3. 18

ei pro inimicis crucis

τοὺς ἐχθροὺς τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

'The expression is sufficiently striking to make it probable that Polycarp is thinking of the passage in Philippians,' notes the Oxford Committee, which assigned a 'c' rating.¹¹² The phrase does not occur elsewhere in Greek Christian literature of the first and second centuries CE.¹¹³

Colossians

The evidence for use of Colossians is exceedingly tenuous. The Oxford Committee listed four possible instances, giving 'd' ratings in every case: in one the verbal connection involves a single word, and in the other three (which survive only in the Latin translation, always a problematic circumstance) there are multiple potential sources.¹¹⁴ Polycarp may have known Colossians, or not: *Philippians* offers no evidence in either direction.

1 Thessalonians

The evidence for use of 1 Thessalonians is even less than that for Colossians. In *Phil.* 11. 1, Polycarp's *abstinetes vos ab omni malo* has similarities with 1 Thess. 5. 22, ἀπὸ παντὸς εἴδους πονηροῦ ἀπέχεσθε. Absent the Greek text, however, and given the brevity of the phrase and the conventionality of the

¹¹⁰ See *BDAG*, s.v. λατρεύω.

¹¹¹ Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 48, 201 (though his discussion on p. 47 seems rather more optimistic than his conclusion).

¹¹² *NTAF*, 94; similarly Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 123; J. B. Bauer, *Polykarpbriefe*, 73; Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 37; Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 181; Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 346; Grant ('Polycarp', 143) is 'doubtless'.

¹¹³ A *TLG* search of centuries 1 BCE–2 CE produced, in addition to the two passages cited above, only three other instances, all in the pseudo-Ignatian correspondence.

¹¹⁴ The passages are *Phil.* 1. 2 // *Col.* 1. 5, 6 (*NTAF* #69); *Phil.* 10. 1 // *Col.* 1. 23, 1 *Cor.* 15. 58 (*NTAF* #70 = #6); *Phil.* 11. 2 // *Col.* 3. 5; *Eph.* 5. 5 (*NTAF* #71 = #38; cf. on Ephesians above); and *Phil.* 12. 2 // *Col.* 1. 12; *Acts* 2. 5 (*NTAF* #72 = #63). Passages not discussed, to which the

concept, a connection is not demonstrable.¹¹⁵ See further, however, the conclusion to the discussion of 2 Thessalonians below.

2 Thessalonians

Two passages require discussion here. The first is *Phil.* 11. 3. (NTAF #46).

Phil. 11. 3

ego autem nihil tale sensi in vobis vel
 audivi, in quibus laboravit beatus Paulus,
 qui estis in principio epistulae eius: de
 vobis etenim gloriatur in omnibus
 ecclesiis

2 Thess. 1. 4

ὥστε αὐτοὺς ἡμᾶς ἐν ὑμῶν
 ἐγκαυχασθαι ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις
 τοῦ θεοῦ.

Some degree of verbal similarity (assuming, of course, that the Latin is a fair approximation of the Greek) is evident—sufficient, perhaps, to justify a ‘c’ rating, though not the ‘b’ awarded by Benecke.¹¹⁶ For some, however, the circumstance that Polycarp addresses to the Philippian words originally addressed to the Thessalonians raises rather more doubt about whether he is really drawing on 2 Thessalonians here.¹¹⁷ A reference to 2 Thessalonians is certainly possible; given the uncertainties about the reliability of the Latin and about Polycarp’s state of mind with respect to what he thought he was doing, raising this to a level of probability seems unwarranted. I would rate this in the ‘d’ category.

The second passage is *Phil.* 11. 4 (NTAF #47).

Phil. 11. 4

et non sicut inimicos tales existimetis,
 sed sicut passibilia membra et errantia
 eos revokeate.

2 Thess. 3. 15

καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐχθρὸν ἡγεῖσθε, ἀλλὰ
 νοουθετεῖτε ὡς ἀδελφόν.

Committee gave a ‘d’ rating, include *Phil.* 1. 1 // *Phil.* 2. 17 (NTAF #44; see the discussion of 2 Thess. 1. 4 (NTAF #46) below) and *Phil.* 5. 2 // *Phil.* 1. 27; 1 *Clem.* 21. 1 (NTAF #45; in this case, Berding’s rating of this essentially indeterminable allusion—the connections with 1 Clement are as strong as those to *Phil.* 1. 27—as a ‘probable’ allusion to Philippian (*Polycarp and Paul*, 75–6, 77, 200) seems unduly enthusiastic). Additional passages mentioned as possibilities by Berding (ibid. 200–1) include: 1. 2 (Paul’s commendation of the Philippian church); 3. 2 (cf. *Phil.* 1. 27); 4. 3 (cf. *Phil.* 2. 17; 4. 18); 9. 1 (cf. *Phil.* 1. 29–30); 11. 3 (cf. *Phil.* 4. 15; 2 *Cor.* 3. 2).

¹¹⁵ Cf. Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 108.

¹¹⁶ NTAF 95; cf., e.g., Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 113, 201; J. B. Bauer, *Polykarpbriefe*, 66; Massaux, *Influence*, 40; Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 178–9; Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 343.

¹¹⁷ Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 90; Paulsen, *Die Briefe*, 124. For discussions of the various problems raised by this circumstance (along with proposed solutions), see Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 112–13; Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 33–4. For related problems associated with the preceding clause (*qui estis in principio epistulae eius*), see Michael W. Holmes, ‘A Note on the Text of Polycarp *Philippians* 11.3’, VC 51 (1997), 207–10.

Benecke observes that 'Polycarp's words sound as though he had purposely adapted the expression of 2 Thessalonians for his own object', and gives this parallel a 'c' rating—i.e., not a 'high degree' of probability, but still probable rather than merely possible.¹¹⁸ It seems a rather short phrase, however, to raise to the level of probability in the absence of additional evidence. The possible (my evaluation) or probable (Benecke's evaluation) evidence for Polycarp's use of 2 Thessalonians, such as it is, is not without implications for his knowledge of 1 Thessalonians; it would seem unlikely (not impossible, of course, but unlikely) that he knew the second letter without also knowing the first.

1 Timothy

Only one passage will be discussed in detail here: *Phil.* 4. 1 (*NTAF* #48).

Phil. 4. 1

ἀρχὴ δὲ πάντων χαλεπῶν
φιλαργυρία. εἰδότες οὖν ὅτι οὐδὲν
εἰσηνέγκαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ'
οὐδὲ ἐξενεγκεῖν τι ἔχομεν.

1 Tim. 6. 7, 10

οὐδὲν γὰρ εἰσηνέγκαμεν εἰς τὸν
κόσμον, ὅτι οὐδὲ ἐξενεγκεῖν τι
δυνάμεθα.

6. 10: ῥίζα γὰρ πάντων τῶν κακῶν
ἐστὶν ἡ φιλαργυρία.

The thoughts expressed by the two maxims Polycarp quotes¹¹⁹ at this point—'But the beginning of all troubles is the love of money', and 'we brought nothing into the world, nor can we take anything out'—are well known in Greek, Jewish, and Hellenistic-Jewish literature.¹²⁰ The first is similar to 1 Tim. 6. 10, and the second is virtually identical to 1 Tim. 6. 7. Indeed, so close are the similarities that a relationship between the two documents is widely assumed; the precise nature of this relationship, however, is much disputed.

¹¹⁸ *NTAF*, 95; cf. Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 114, 201; Rensberger, 'As the Apostle Teaches', 114 ('very probable'); Massaux, *Influence*, ii. 40; Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 179–80; Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 293; Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 343.

¹¹⁹ Note the introductory formula that precedes the second maxim.

¹²⁰ For examples consult M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972), 84–6; C. Spicq, *Saint Paul: Les Épîtres Pastorales*, 2 vols., EB, 4th edn. (Paris: Gabalda, 1969), i. 564–5; and I. H. Marshall, *The Pastoral Epistles*, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1999), 645–53.

Suggestions include (1) independent use of well-known and widely attested sayings;¹²¹ (2) identity of authorship;¹²² (3) shared use of the same or similar tradition(s);¹²³ (4) quotation of Polycarp by 1 Timothy;¹²⁴ and (5) quotation of 1 Timothy by Polycarp.¹²⁵ It is of course quite true that both maxims are commonplace, and if taken separately (as do Dibelius and Conzelmann), they need demonstrate nothing about a relationship. But (a) they do in fact occur together in *Philippians*, not separately, which is quite unusual,¹²⁶ and (b) the wording of the saying in 1 Tim. 6. 7 is virtually identical with 4. 1—and quite different from the idea anywhere else it occurs. These considerations leave options (3) and (5) as the more likely possibilities. While acknowledging the difficulty of disproving (3), none the less, (i) the use of ‘knowing that’ to introduce the saying also found in 1 Tim. 6. 7 (the same introductory phrase which in 1. 3 and 5. 1 introduces apparent citations), and (ii) the presence of ἀλλά in 4. 1 instead of the very difficult ὁτι of 1 Tim. 6. 7 strongly suggest (5), quotation of 1 Timothy by Polycarp, as the more probable explanation. Benecke’s ‘b’ rating is, if anything, too low.

¹²¹ Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 85, 86; W. Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, ed. Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 224; Paulsen, *Die Briefe*, 117.

¹²² H. von Campenhausen, ‘Polykarp von Smyrna und die Pastoralbriefe’, in SHAW.P-H Jahrgang 1951 (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag, 1951) 5–51; repr. in *idem*, *Aus der Frühzeit des Christentums: Studien zur Kirchengeschichte des ersten und zweiten Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1963), 197–252. Against this view see Rensberger (‘As the Apostle Teaches’, 120–2), who calls attention to, among other points, the differences in literary style and quality, in introductory formulae, in the offices and positions addressed, and in the instructions given to the various offices. Cf. also Schoedel (*Polycarp*, 5, 16).

¹²³ The author of 1 Timothy, if not actually Polycarp himself, ‘must at least have been intimately connected with Polycarp’ (H. von Campenhausen, *The Formation of the Christian Bible* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972), 181; cf. *idem*, ‘Polykarp von Smyrna’, 250–2); Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 86 n. 19; W. Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 224; Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 183 (‘The parallels that Harnack insists show that Polycarp used the Pastorals may as easily be allowed to show the latter’s use of Polycarp but are more properly, perhaps, to be understood in terms of their common use of paranesis’).

¹²⁴ W. Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 224; Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 182–3. The very difficult ὁτι in 1 Tim. 6. 7 (a difficulty evidenced by widespread textual variation; for discussion, see Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd edn. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft; New York: UBS, 1994), 576), for which *Phil.* 4. 1 smoothly reads ἀλλά, would appear to render this suggestion quite unlikely.

¹²⁵ Adolf von Harnack, *Die Briefsammlung des Apostels Paulus und die anderen vorkonstantinischen christlichen Briefsammlungen* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1926), 72 n. 4; D. Völter, *Polykarp und Ignatius und die ihnen zugeschriebenen Briefe*, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, 2.2 (Leiden: Brill, 1910), 36–7; Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 16; Rensberger, ‘As the Apostle Teaches’, 124–5; *NTAF*, 95–6; Lindemann, ‘Paul in the Writings’, 43 (cf. *idem*, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 223–4); Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 295.

¹²⁶ Philo expresses both ideas in *De specialibus legibus*, but one is in 1. 294–5 and the other in 4. 65; both occur in Pseudo-Phocylides, but some distance apart (42, 109–10).

There are four passages to which Benecke gives a 'c' rating, signalling a 'lesser degree of probability'; in each case, however, it appears that a 'd' rating might be more in order. Two of his cases—4. 3 // 1 Tim. 5. 5 (NTAF #49) and 5. 2 // 1 Tim. 3. 8 (NTAF #50), dealing respectively with widows and deacons—fall within the so-called *Haustafel* ('household code') sections of the two letters. In *Phil.* 4. 1–6. 2, Polycarp sets out what is more properly termed a *Gemeindetafel*, a 'congregational code'; similar codes are found in 1 Timothy, Titus, Ephesians, Colossians, and 1 Peter, and similar material is embedded in 1 *Clement* and the *Didache*.¹²⁷ A comparison of the similarities as well as the differences indicates that Polycarp partakes of a common milieu, but does not stand in a close literary relationship with any of these other examples.¹²⁸ In the case of *Phil.* 8. 1 // 1 Tim. 1. 1 (NTAF #51), Polycarp's statement is a pastiche of Pauline ideas and phraseology, but the individual short phrases—in this instance, the idea of Christ Jesus as the object of hope—cannot be linked to a single source text to the exclusion of others, and Berding is right to list it only as a possibility.¹²⁹ The fourth case, *Phil.* 12. 3 // 1 Tim. 2. 1–2 (NTAF #52), involves a phrase so short and generic ('pray also for kings') that probability of dependence upon a specific source is difficult to demonstrate.¹³⁰

2 Timothy

Two passages will be discussed here. The first is *Phil.* 9. 2 (NTAF #55).

Phil. 9. 2

οὐ γὰρ τὸν νῦν ἠγάπησαν αἰῶνα.

2 Tim. 4. 10

ἀγαπήσας τὸν νῦν αἰῶνα.

The way in which Polycarp 'reverses' the phrase to make his point—in contrast to Demas, who deserted Paul because he 'loved the present world', the subjects of Polycarp's statement (a whole roster of faithful heroes) did 'not love the present world'—gives it every appearance of a classic allusion. The circumstance that the idea of 'loving the present world' is surprisingly

¹²⁷ Cf. 1 Tim. 2. 1–6. 1; Titus 1. 5–9; 2. 1–10; Eph. 5. 21–6. 9; Col. 3. 18–4. 1; 1 Pet. 2. 18–3. 7; 1 *Clem.* 1. 3; 21. 6–8; *Did.* 4. 9–11.

¹²⁸ Berding (*Polycarp and Paul*, 69–70, 201), on the other hand, thinks that *Philippians* betrays a 'probable general dependence upon the *Haustafeln* of 1 Timothy'—a conclusion which reflects inadequate attention to the differences between the two documents.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.* 94.

¹³⁰ Passages not discussed, to which the committee gave a 'd' rating, include *Phil.* 11. 2 // 1 Tim. 3. 5 (NTAF #53) and *Phil.* 12. 3 // 1 Tim. 4. 15 (NTAF #54). Additional passages mentioned as possibilities by Berding (*Polycarp and Paul*, 74, 201) include *Phil.* 5. 2 // 1 Tim. 6. 17 (cf. 2 Tim. 4. 10; Titus 2. 12; cf. *ibid.* 74 n. 144) and 6. 1 // 1 Tim. 5. 19.

uncommon in Greek literature—it occurs in only these two instances among surviving texts of centuries 1 BCE–2 CE¹³¹—lends weight to the probability that Polycarp is here dependent on 2 Timothy. The ‘b’ rating assigned by the Oxford Committee is not unjustified.¹³²

The second passage is *Phil.* 5. 2 (*NTAF* #56; cf. #24).

Phil. 5. 2

καθὼς ὑπέσχετο ἡμῖν ἐγείραι ἡμᾶς
ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ὅτι, ἐὰν
πολιτευσώμεθα ἀξίως αὐτοῦ, καὶ
συμβασιλεύσομεν, εἴγῃ πιστεύομεν.

2 Tim. 2. 11–12

πιστὸς ὁ λόγος· εἰ γὰρ
συναπεθάνομεν καὶ συζήσομεν,¹² εἰ
ὑπομένομεν καὶ συμβασιλεύσομεν.

The Oxford Committee placed this instance in its ‘c’ category, while Berding rates it somewhat more positively.¹³³ The key verb (*συμβασιλεύειν*) occurs in early Christian literature only in 1 Cor. 4. 8; 2 Tim. 2. 12; and here. The last two texts also share conceptual affinities,¹³⁴ but as 2 Tim. 2. 12 is one of the ‘faithful sayings’ (*πιστὸς ὁ λόγος*)—in this case, a quotation of unknown origin, probably from a hymn¹³⁵—the similarities may well be due to common use of traditional material, rather than direct dependence.¹³⁶ No more than a ‘d’ rating seems warranted.

With regard to *Phil.* 11. 4 // 2 Tim. 2. 25 (*NTAF* #57), the other passage to which Benecke gives a ‘c’ rating, Berding (uncharacteristically) rates it less positively. Noting that the verbal connections ‘are fairly conventional’, he rightly places this instance in the ‘possibility’ category (the Oxford Committee’s ‘d’ category, where they place *Phil.* 12. 1 // 2 Tim. 1. 5 (*NTAF* #58)).¹³⁷

Titus and Philemon

There appears to be no plausible evidence for the use of either Titus or Philemon. This silence, of course, proves nothing as to whether Polycarp did or did not know these documents.

¹³¹ More precisely, Greek literature included in the *TLG* data base.

¹³² *NTAF*, 97; Berding (*Polycarp and Paul*, 100) essentially repeats Benecke’s arguments, yet rates it a bit more confidently (‘almost certain’).

¹³³ *NTAF*, 97; Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 76–7 (a ‘probable’ allusion).

¹³⁴ 2 Tim. 2. 12, ‘if we endure’ (*εἰ ὑπομένομεν*); *Phil.* 5. 2, ‘if we prove to be worthy citizens’ (*ἐὰν πολιτευσώμεθῃ ἀξίως*).

¹³⁵ Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 109.

¹³⁶ *NTAF*, 97; Campenhausen, ‘Polykarp von Smyrna’, 225.

¹³⁷ *NTAF*, 97–8; Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 113.

HEBREWS, THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES,
AND THE APOCALYPSE

Hebrews

The principal passage of relevance here is *Phil.* 6. 3 (NTAF #64).

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <i>Phil.</i> 6. 3 | Heb. 12. 28 | Ps. 2. 11 (LXX) |
| δουλεύσωμεν αὐτῷ μετὰ φόβου καὶ πάσης ἐνλαβείας. | λατρεύωμεν ἐν ἀρέστῳ τῷ θεῷ μετὰ ἐνλαβείας καὶ δέους. | δουλεύσατε τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε αὐτῷ ἐν τρόμῳ. |

Two words (δουλεύω, φόβος) link Philippians and Psalm 2 (cf. *Phil.* 2. 1), while only the term ἐνλαβείας (Septuagintal: Josh. 22. 24; Prov. 28. 14; Wisd. 17. 8) links it with Heb. 12;¹³⁸ moreover, the αὐτῷ in *Philippians* likely refers to Christ (the nearest and most natural antecedent), not θεῷ, as in Hebrews.¹³⁹ In short, Benecke's assignment of a 'c' rating seems a bit gratuitous, especially as he recognizes that 'the reference seems to be a general one to the tenour of the O.T. as well as the Gospel'. A link between Polycarp and Hebrews here is a possibility, but no more than that.¹⁴⁰

Another instance where Benecke assigns a 'c' rating involves *Phil.* 12. 2 // Heb. 4. 14; 6. 20; 7. 3 (NTAF #65). The linkage of 'high priest' and 'son of God' in 12. 2 'render it not improbable' that Polycarp depends on Hebrews: in 4. 14, Jesus is called both ἀρχιερέα and υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ; in 6. 20, ἀρχιερέυς; and just four verses later, in 7. 3, υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ and ἱερέυς.¹⁴¹ But Berding, noting that none of the 'pastiche of early Christian expressions' in 12. 2 'can be definitively connected with any particular text', classifies it as only a 'possible' allusion.¹⁴² The linkage of priesthood and sonship that is distinctive of Hebrews is not, however, exclusive to Hebrews: cf. *1 Clement* (a document very well known to Polycarp¹⁴³), where in 36. 1 Jesus is termed 'High Priest of our offerings' and shortly thereafter (in a direct continuation of the writer's line of thought) 'son' of God (36. 4—citing Heb. 1!). A connection is surely

¹³⁸ Nor do any of the textual variants in Heb. 12. 28 move the text any closer to that of *Philippians*.

¹³⁹ Cf. R. Bultmann, 'ἐνλαβής, etc.', *TDNT* ii (1964), 753; against W. Bauer, *Die Briefe*, 290; Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 22; Paulsen, *Die Briefe*, 119; J. B. Bauer, *Polykarpbriefe*, 56.

¹⁴⁰ So also Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 86–7, esp. n. 189.

¹⁴¹ *NTAF*, 99–100.

¹⁴² Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 120, 201.

¹⁴³ For comparative texts and lists of parallels, consult J. B. Bauer, *Polykarpbriefe*, 28–30; Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 202.

possible, but cannot, in view of the multiple possible sources, be deemed probable.¹⁴⁴

1 Peter

Three passages will be discussed here. The first is *Phil.* 1. 3 (NTAF # 9, 16).

Phil. 1. 3

[... Χριστόν ...] εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες
πιστεύετε

χαρᾶ ἀνεκκλήτῳ καὶ δεδοξασμένῳ
εἰς ἣν πολλοὶ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν εἰσελθεῖν.

1 Pet. 1. 8, 12

1. 8: [... Χριστοῦ ...] ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες
ἀγαπάτε, εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ ὀρώντες
πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιάσθε

χαρᾶ ἀνεκκλήτῳ καὶ δεδοξασμένῳ ...

1. 12: εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι

Benecke's opinion ('1 Peter is almost certainly presupposed by Polycarp here') and rating ('a') is widely echoed.¹⁴⁵ The circumstance that the combination of *χαρά*, *ἀνεκκλήτος*, and *δοξάζω* apparently occurs only in *Philippians* and 1 Peter in extant Greek literature of centuries 2 BCE–3 CE considerably increases the probability that Polycarp is here dependent on 1 Peter.¹⁴⁶

With regard to possible dependence on 1 Pet. 1. 12, Benecke (who awards only a 'd' rating) allows that 'Polycarp may possibly be influenced by I Peter here, as his words follow immediately the certain quotation (9), while the words in I Peter follow the words cited from that Epistle under (9) after a short interval'.¹⁴⁷ On the same basis Berding is more optimistic, rating this instance as a 'probable allusion';¹⁴⁸ even those who think the content of *Phil.* 1. 3 is reminiscent of Matt. 25. 21, 23 (cf. 13. 17 // Luke 10. 2) acknowledge that the form reflects 1 Peter.¹⁴⁹

The second is *Phil.* 8. 1 (NTAF # 10).

Phil. 8. 1–2

... ὃς ἀνήνεγκεν ἡμῶν τὰς
ἁμαρτίας τῷ ἰδίῳ σώματι
ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον, ὃς ἁμαρτίαν

1 Pet. 2. 21–4; 4. 16

²¹ ... εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ
ἐκλήθητε,

Cf. Isa. 53. 4a, 9b, 12b
[*Rahlf's*].

^{4a} οὗτος τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν
φέρει ...

¹⁴⁴ Rated in the 'd' category and not discussed is *Phil.* 9. 1 // Heb. 5. 13 (NTAF #66).

¹⁴⁵ NTAF, 86; similarly, e.g., Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 9; Massaux (*Influence*, ii. 42: 'The literary contact is definite: the idea is absolutely similar, the terms are practically identical; Polycarp simply omitted a few'), followed by Berding (*Polycarp and Paul*, 41); J. H. Elliott, *1 Peter*, AB 37B (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 342–3; Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 323.

¹⁴⁶ These results are based on searches of the TLG 'E' database.

¹⁴⁷ NTAF, 88.

¹⁴⁸ Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 41–2; cf. earlier Massaux, *Influence*, ii. 42 ('most probably').

¹⁴⁹ E.g., Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 9; J. B. Bauer, *Polykarpbriefe*, 41–2; Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 323.

οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ εὐρέθη
δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ.
ἀλλὰ δι' ἡμᾶς, ἵνα ζήσωμεν
ἐν αὐτῷ,

πάντα ὑπέμεινεν.

²μματαὶ οὖν γενόμεθα
τῆς ὑπομονῆς [αὐτοῦ],
καὶ ἐὰν πάσχομεν διὰ τὸ
ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, δοξάζωμεν
αὐτόν. τοῦτον γὰρ ἡμῖν τὸν
ὑπογραμμὸν ἔθηκε δι
ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ ἡμεῖς τοῦτο
ἐπιστεύσαμεν.

ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἔπαθεν
ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἡμῶν ὑπολιμ-
πάνων ὑπογραμμὸν ἵνα
ἐπακολουθήσητε τοῖς
ἴχνεσιν αὐτοῦ . . .

²²ὃς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ

ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ εὐρέθη
δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι
αὐτοῦ, . . .²⁴ ὃς τὰς
ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν
αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ
σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον,
ἵνα ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις
ἀπογενόμενοι τῇ
δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσωμεν . . .

4. 16: εἰ δὲ ὡς Χριστιανός
[πάσχει], μὴ ἀισχνέσθω,
ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ.

^{9b}ὅτι ἀνομίαν οὐκ
ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ εὐρέθη
δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ.
. . .

^{12b}καὶ αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας
πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν καὶ
διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας
αὐτῶν παρεδόθη.

Several phrases in 8. 1–2 are couched in language that closely echoes 1 Pet. 2. 21–4.¹⁵⁰ The phrase ‘who bore our sins in his own body upon the tree’ is very similar to 1 Pet. 2. 24a; Polycarp has ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον (preposition + article + accusative), a combination which occurs in the NT only at 2. 24a (cf. *Barn.* 8. 5), instead of the expression more commonly found in the NT: namely, ἐπὶ ξύλου (preposition + genitive, as in Acts 5. 30, 10. 39; Gal. 3. 13; cf. *Barn.* 5. 13). The following phrase (‘who committed no sin, nor was deceit found in his mouth’) is verbally identical to 1 Pet. 2. 22, which is in turn a quotation of Isa. 53. 9b. Polycarp’s dependence on 1 Peter (rather than Isaiah, or *1 Clem.* 16. 10, which cites the Isaiah passage without alteration) is confirmed by the presence in Polycarp’s text of two modifications of Isa. 53. 9b (LXX) found in the text of 1 Peter: the substitutions of ὃς for ὅτι and ἁμαρτίαν for ἀνομίαν.

In these two instances we have, therefore, positive evidence upon which to base a conclusion: ‘where 1 Peter is dependent on Isaiah . . . Polycarp seems clearly to be dependent on 1 Peter.’¹⁵¹ It appears virtually certain that here *Philippians* offers clear evidence of the use of 1 Peter.

A third phrase, ‘that we might live in him’, is similar to 1 John 4. 9 (ἵνα ζήσωμεν δι’ αὐτοῦ), but in light of the strong link to 1 Peter already evident in this section, an echo of 1 Pet. 2. 24 is much more probable. The response Polycarp envisions—that of ‘becoming an imitator’ (cf. *1 Clem.* 17. 1) of

¹⁵⁰ The passage in 1 Peter is itself likely a midrash on Isa. 53. 4–12; see J. R. Michaels, *1 Peter*, WBC 49 (Waco, Tex.: Word, 1988), 136–7, 144–52; and Elliott, *1 Peter*, 543–8.

¹⁵¹ *NTAE*, 87.

Christ's *ὑπομονή*¹⁵²—is expressed in language that continues to echo both the content ('following in his footsteps') and vocabulary (*ὑπογραμμός*) of 1 Pet. 2. 21.¹⁵³ Additional likely echoes may be noted: Polycarp writes, 'if we should suffer' (cf. 1 Pet. 3. 14) while following this path, that in turn should result in doxology ('let us glorify him'; cf. 1 Pet. 4. 16). In brief, the 'a' rating the Oxford Committee assigns to this passage is well justified.¹⁵⁴

The third passage is *Phil.* 10. 2 (NTAF #11).

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <i>Phil.</i> 10. 2 | <i>[Lightfoot's Greek retroversion]</i> | 1 Pet. 2. 12 |
| ... conversationem vestram irreprehensibilem habentes in gentibus, ut ex bonis operibus vestris et vos laudem accipiatis et dominus in vobis non blasphemetur. | ... τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἀνεπίλημπτον ἔχοντες ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ἵνα ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ὑμῶν καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔπαινον λάβητε καὶ ὁ κύριος μὴ βλασφημῆται ἐν ὑμῖν | τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἔχοντες καλήν, ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐποπτεύοντες δοξάσωσιν τὸν θεὸν ἐν ἡμέρα ἐπισκοπῆς. |

If the Latin translation may be trusted, this portion of 10. 2 echoes closely 1 Pet. 2. 12.¹⁵⁵ Moreover, in the LXX and Christian literature of the first two centuries CE, the conjunction of *ἀναστροφή* and *ἔθνη* apparently occurs only in 1 Peter, *Philippians*, and texts explicitly citing 1 Peter. At the same time, in *Philippians* a key point is strikingly different: whereas in 1 Peter the point of doing good deeds is to provoke outsiders to glorify God, in Polycarp the motivation is to win praise for the community and avoid becoming a cause of blasphemy against the Lord.

The Oxford Committee's 'a' rating reflects Benecke's opinion that here there 'seems to be a certain quotation from I Peter', an opinion widely

¹⁵² See also 9. 1; 12. 2; 13. 2; and for the verb, 1. 2; 8. 1; 9. 1.

¹⁵³ In the Greek Bible only at 2 Macc. 2. 28 (the earliest occurrence of the word) and 1 Pet. 2. 21; in the Apostolic Fathers also at *1 Clem.* 16. 17; 33. 8 (of Christ); 5. 7 (of Paul).

¹⁵⁴ NTAF, 87; cf. Elliott, *1 Peter*, 549: 'No precise hymnic or creedal parallel to the entire text of 1 Pet 2:21–24 (25) is extant. The parallels that have been cited involve only isolated formulas or debatable thematic affinities... rather than complete correspondences and similarly structured texts. The similarity between 1 Pet 2:21–25 and the later text of *Phil.* 8:1–2 is quite close, but the different structure and content of these similar texts argues against any common use of a fixed hymnic source and for the direct influence of 1 Peter upon Polycarp.' Cf. Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 94–7; Massaux, *Influence*, 43–4; Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 336.

¹⁵⁵ The italicized portions of this translation of 1 Pet. 2. 12 indicate the extent of verbal agreement: 'maintaining your good standard of conduct among the Gentiles, so that in case they malign you as wrongdoers they may, seeing [your] good deeds, glorify God on the day of visitation.' There is also the conceptual link between 1 Peter's 'malign you as wrongdoers' and Polycarp's reference to blasphemy. Cf. Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 106.

echoed.¹⁵⁶ If viewed in isolation, one might wish, especially as Polycarp's text is extant only in Latin (always of uncertain reliability with respect to details), to rank it as probable ('b') rather than nearly certain. But in the context of the first two passages examined above, this caution is probably not required; as the Committee observes, 'These three passages (9) (10) (11), taken together, strengthen each other, and justify the inclusion of all three in the first class.'¹⁵⁷

To summarize: on the basis of the three passages examined, it appears virtually certain that Polycarp made relatively extensive use of 1 Peter (an opinion already expressed by Eusebius).¹⁵⁸

In view of this finding there is no need, for the purposes of this essay, to examine additional passages, which will, therefore, merely be listed, grouped according to the categories in which the Oxford Committee placed them.

A 'b' rating is assigned to four parallels between *Philippians* and 1 Peter. These are *Phil.* 2. 1 // 1 Pet. 1. 13; 1. 21 (NTAF #12); *Phil.* 2. 2 // 1 Pet. 3. 9 (NTAF #13); *Phil.* 5. 3 // 1 Pet. 2. 11; cf. Gal. 5. 17 (NTAF #14); and *Phil.* 7. 2 // 1 Pet. 4. 7 (NTAF #15). Berding gives essentially the same rating to three of these instances; the other (NTAF #13) he classifies as an 'almost certain true citation'.¹⁵⁹

A 'd' rating has been assigned to five passages where a connection with 1 Peter is thought to be possible. One of these (*Phil.* 1. 3 // 1 Pet. 1. 12 (NTAF #16)) has been discussed above; the other four are *Phil.* 6. 1 // 1 Pet. 2. 25; Ezek. 34. 4 (NTAF #17); *Phil.* 6. 3 // 1 Pet. 3. 13; Titus 2. 14 (NTAF #18); *Phil.* 12. 2 // 1 Pet. 1. 21; Rom. 4. 24, and others (NTAF #19); and *Phil.* 5. 2; 6. 1 // 1 Pet. 3. 8; Eph. 4. 32 (NTAF #20).¹⁶⁰

1 and 2 John

Only one passage will be discussed here: *Phil.* 7. 1 (NTAF #67).

Phil. 7. 1

πᾶς γὰρ ὁς ἂν μὴ

1 John 4. 2–3; 3. 8

πάν πνεῦμα ὃ ὁμολογεῖ

2 John 7

ὅτι πολλοὶ πλάνοι

¹⁵⁶ NTAF, 87; Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 106 ('almost certainly a loose, compressed [sic] citation'); cf. J. B. Bauer, *Polykarpbriefe*, 64; Paulsen, *Die Briefe*, 123; Schoedel, *Polycarp and Paul*, 31; Massaux, *Influence*, 44 ('very probable'); Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 339.

¹⁵⁷ NTAF, 87.

¹⁵⁸ Euseb. *HE* 4. 14. 9 (Loeb 1. 338–9): 'Polycarp, in his above-mentioned letter to the Philippians, which is still extant, has made some quotations from the first Epistle of Peter.'

¹⁵⁹ Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 50–1, 202.

¹⁶⁰ Berding (ibid. 102–3, 202) does not include in his summary list any of these four passages; he does add one passage not mentioned by Benecke: *Phil.* 10. 1 // 1 Pet. 2. 17 or 3. 8.

ὁμολογῆ Ἰησοῦν
Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ
ἐληλυθέναι ἀντίχριστος
ἐστίν· καὶ ὃς ἂν μὴ
ὁμολογῆ τὸ μαρτύριον
τοῦ σταυροῦ ἐκ τοῦ
διαβόλου ἐστίν.

Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν
σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα ἐκ
τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν, καὶ πᾶν
πνεῦμα ὃ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ
τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ
οὐκ ἐστίν· καὶ τοῦτο
ἐστίν τὸ τοῦ
ἀντιχρίστου . . .
3. 8: ὁ ποιῶν τὴν
ἁμαρτίαν ἐκ τοῦ
διαβόλου ἐστίν.

ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸν
κόσμον, οἱ μὴ
ὁμολογοῦντες Ἰησοῦν
Χριστὸν ἐρχόμενον ἐν
σαρκὶ· οὗτός ἐστίν ὁ
πλάνος καὶ ὁ
ἀντίχριστος.

The epithet ‘an antichrist’ (which occurs in early Christian literature only in *Phil.* 7. 1; 1 John 2. 18, 22; 4. 3; and 2 John 7) is used generically (as in 1 John 2. 18c) rather than as a title (cf. 1 John 2. 18b). The phrase ‘For everyone who does not confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is antichrist’ is ‘the most important early parallel to the Johannine Epistles’, being ‘uniquely close’¹⁶¹ to 1 John 4. 2–3 and 2 John 7. Most take it for granted that Polycarp, if not actually citing, is at least directly dependent on 1 and/or 2 John,¹⁶² though there are those who demu.¹⁶³ In this instance, the character of the verbal similarities (quality) and the length of the alleged citation (quantity) render it very probable that Philippians is here dependent on 1 John (and not 2 John 7);¹⁶⁴ the ‘c’ rating of the Oxford Committee is surprisingly low. At the same time, the connection between John and Polycarp reported by Irenaeus

¹⁶¹ R. E. Brown, *The Epistles of John*, AB 30 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1982), 8.

¹⁶² So W. von Loewenich, *Das Johannes-Verständnis im zweiten Jahrhundert*, BZNW 13 (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1932), 23; Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 3. 334; Massaux, *Influence*, ii. 34 (‘A literary contact with these texts is beyond doubt: Polycarp cites them almost literally’); W. Bauer, *Die Briefe*, 291; Paulsen, *Die Briefe*, 120; Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 300, 173; Dehandschutter, ‘Polycarp’s Epistle’, 284. Brown (*Epistles of John*, 8, 492) is initially cautious (‘it is still very difficult to be certain’ that Polycarp ‘had the text of a Johannine Epistle before him’), but later writes that he ‘quoted’ 1 John 4. 2–3. That Polycarp uses the term ‘antichrist’ to establish internal boundaries rather than to attack outside threats (G. C. Jenks, *The Origins and Early Development of the Antichrist Myth*, BZNW 59 (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1991), 352) strengthens (but does not prove) the case for dependence on 1 John.

¹⁶³ Campenhausen (‘Polykarp von Smyrna’, 240) considers it only a piece of typical ecclesiastical anti-Gnostic polemic; F. X. Gokey (*The Terminology for the Devil and Evil Spirits in the Apostolic Fathers*, Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, 93 (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1961), 92) suggests that ‘the terms of John which are re-echoed in *Poly.* 7.1 may have been those of liturgical and common Christian usage’; cf. Fischer (*Apostolischen Väter*, 239; cf. pp. 257, 236), who raises the possibility of ‘early confessional formulas’ (‘frühe Glaubensformeln’).

¹⁶⁴ In addition to ἀντίχριστος, note ὁμολογέω, the phrase Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκί, the use of the perfect tense of ἐρχομαι, and the πᾶς + relative pronoun construction. The corresponding lack of similarity in detail with 2 John 7 (or, to put it differently, the difference between the two) makes dependence on that text unlikely (cf. Hartog, *Polycarp*, 189: ‘the use of 2 John 7 is possible but not necessary’).

(see above, under 'Johannine Gospel Tradition') raises the possibility of dependence on Johannine teaching rather than a Johannine writing; for this reason, one cannot advance it to an 'a' rating (i.e., 'no reasonable doubt').¹⁶⁵ A 'b' rating therefore seems appropriate in this instance.

The phrase 'is of the devil' matches verbatim 1 John 3. 8 (cf. 1 John 3. 10; John 8. 44). The phrase was likely a traditional early Christian epithet, whose use in isolation can only suggest (but not demonstrate) the possibility of a literary relationship.¹⁶⁶ Its occurrence in conjunction with the reference to 'antichrist', however, increases the odds that Polycarp here also utilized 1 John.¹⁶⁷ A 'c' rating appears appropriate.¹⁶⁸

OTHER DOCUMENTS

Hartog catalogs alleged claims of parallels to James, Jude, 3 John, and 2 Peter;¹⁶⁹ but these scarcely rise above the level of remote possibilities, and none requires discussion here. There is no indication of any use of the Apocalypse.

CONCLUSION

My conclusion is in two parts. The first is a summary of the results achieved above; the second addresses the question of whether *Philippians* offers evidence of the existence of a Pauline corpus or collection of letters.

¹⁶⁵ As does, e.g., Berding (*Polycarp and Paul*, 91, 202), who describes dependence as 'almost certain'.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. Campenhausen ('Polykarp von Smyrna', 240), who sees it as nothing more than 'a typical ecclesiastical slogan in the struggle against Gnosis in Asia Minor'; Jenks (*Antichrist Myth*, 352), who thinks it 'is drawn from the general Jewish-Christian tradition'; or Norbert Brox ('Häresie', *RAC* 13 (1986), 248–97, at p. 265), who characterizes it as an 'obligatory *topos*'.

¹⁶⁷ Dehandschutter ('Polycarp's Epistle', 284) puts the matter a bit more forcefully: he thinks the conjunction of texts here 'constitutes . . . a strong presumption'.

¹⁶⁸ Benecke lists one reference in the 'd' category: *Phil.* 1. 1 // 1 John 4. 8, 16 (*NTAF* #68). *Re* 1 John 4. 9, see on *Phil.* 8. 1, under 1 Peter (*NTAF* #10). Berding (*Polycarp and Paul*, 202) adds, as possible reminiscences in *Phil.* 7. 1, 1 John 3. 12 and 5. 6–9.

¹⁶⁹ Hartog, *Polycarp*, 190. The claims of Harrison (*Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 285–310) are perhaps the most egregious: he claims to find evidence of every book of the NT, except for 2 Peter and the Apocalypse.

Summary: *Philippians* and the Writings that later formed the New Testament

We may set out our findings using the same four categories as the Oxford Committee. If the present rating of a document differs from the Committee's, a symbol in parentheses follows the document's name: (+) indicates one level higher; (-) or (—) indicates, respectively, one or two levels lower; absence of a symbol signals that the rating is effectively the same.¹⁷⁰

A: 1 Corinthians, Ephesians (+), 1 Peter

B: 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, 1 John (+).

C: Romans (-), Galatians (-), Philippians (-).

D: Matthew, Mark, Luke, John (—), Acts (-), 2 Corinthians (-), Colossians, 2 Thessalonians (-), Hebrews (-), 2 John.

No evidence: 1 Thessalonians, Titus, Philemon, James, 2 Peter, 3 John, Jude, Apocalypse.

In general, there is an observable tendency of the present study to be somewhat more sceptical than the Oxford Committee. In large part, this may be a result of the more specific focus of the question being asked. On the whole, the Oxford Committee's work has stood the test of time well.

Polycarp and the Pauline Corpus

In view of Polycarp's virtually certain or highly probable use in *Philippians* of at least four documents (1 Corinthians, Ephesians, 1 and 2 Timothy), and probable use of three others (Romans, Galatians, and Philippians—the last of which he apparently knew about, quite apart from the question of whether he knew or used its contents) that comprise part of the Pauline corpus as we know it today, the question arises as to whether *Philippians* offers evidence of the existence of a Pauline corpus or collection of letters.¹⁷¹ Clearly, Polycarp knows something of the contents of, and apparently has access to, multiple letters: do they comprise a circumstantial accumulation of documents, or do they represent something more—a deliberate collection, or perhaps even a defined corpus?¹⁷² And with regard to any of these possibilities, do the letters

¹⁷⁰ E.g., the synoptic parallels that the committee left unclassified are here given a 'd' rating, but there is no meaningful difference between the two evaluations of these passages.

¹⁷¹ On this point cf. the brief discussions of Hartog, *Polycarp*, 232–5, and especially Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 187–9 (both with bibliography).

¹⁷² My intentional use here of three different terms ('circumstantial accumulation', 'deliberate collection', 'defined corpus') is an attempt to make explicit two aspects associated with the

used represent all or only part of that accumulation/collection/corpus? On the basis of the evidence of *Philippians* alone, these questions cannot be answered: on the one hand, the use of some letters may imply, but certainly does not prove, possession of others; while on the other hand, absence of use of a letter does not mean lack of knowledge of it.

Furthermore, to attempt to answer any of these questions on some other basis—e.g., a particular view of the formation of the Pauline corpus itself—amounts to little more than an attempt to explain the unknown by the uncertain, given our present state of knowledge regarding the latter subject.¹⁷³

In short, we do know that Polycarp used a number of documents that are now part of the Pauline corpus; we do not know, however, the answers to the further questions this knowledge raises.

formation of a group of documents that are often simply assumed or not discussed: (a) the degree of intentionality involved and (b) whether the collection is considered to be 'open' or 'closed' (or whether that question has even been asked). Each term may be thought of as representing a point on a graph with two axes, one indicating the degree of intentionality involved in the formation of a group of documents, and the other indicating the degree to which the group is considered to be open or closed to further additions.

¹⁷³ For a recent survey of the Pauline corpus in general (with extensive bibliography), see S. E. Porter, 'When and How was the Pauline Canon Compiled? An Assessment of Theories', in *idem* (ed.), *The Pauline Canon*, Pauline Studies 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 95–127; *idem* with E. R. Richards, 'The Codex and the Early Collection of Paul's Letters', *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 8 (1998), 151–66; and H. Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 58–66.

This page intentionally left blank

The *Epistle of Barnabas* and the Writings that later formed the New Testament

James Carleton-Paget

INTRODUCTION

The *Epistle of Barnabas* can be dated any time between the mid-90s CE and the 130s CE. Its attribution to Barnabas, the companion of Paul, is clearly false, and may in fact have been made after the letter was written in circumstances which are no longer reconstructable (to call it a pseudepigraph might, therefore, be wrong). Its provenance is probably Alexandrian, although certainty on this point is not attainable.

Like *1 Clement*, *Barnabas* is much concerned with direct citation of what Christians came to call the Old Testament, but which *Barnabas* simply refers to as ‘scripture’.¹ With a variety of introductory formulae, he cites from a broad swathe of OT books, with varying degrees of accuracy, and usually quoting from what appears to be a Greek *Vorlage*. How extensive his personal knowledge of the OT was is unclear, some attributing much of it to testimony books or school tradition.² Indeed, beginning with Windisch in 1920, and continuing like a crimson thread through mainly German scholarship on *Barnabas*, the epistle’s author has been seen as the uncreative tradent of sources.³ This has affected scholarship on the epistle in a variety of ways, not least attempts to assess its purpose and audience.

¹ ἡ γραφή is used six times to introduce the estimated ninety-nine citations in *Barnabas* (see 4. 7, 11a; 5. 4; 6. 12a; 13. 2; 16. 5). For other terms used to introduce scriptural citations see R. Hvalvik, *The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant: The Purpose of the Epistle of Barnabas and Jewish-Christian Competition in the Second Century*, WUNT 2.82 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 108–9.

² For the most recent discussion of this complex subject, see F. Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief*, KAV 8 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), 90–7.

³ In recent times the work of R. Kraft (‘The Epistle of Barnabas’, in *idem*, *The Apostolic Fathers*, iii: *Didache and Barnabas* (New York: Nelson, 1965); *idem*, ‘The Epistle of Barnabas: Its Quotations and Sources’ (unpub. Harvard diss., 1961)) and K. Wengst (‘Barnabasbrief’, in *idem*, *Schriften des Urchristentums: Didache, Barnabasbriefe, zweiter Klemensbrief, Schriften an Diognet*

In contradistinction to *Barnabas*'s use of the Old Testament, where *formulae citandi* followed by quotations allow us to assume some degree of knowledge of that body of literature on the part of the author, however mediated, the position with regard to the same author's knowledge of texts which came to be associated with the New Testament is an altogether more complicated business (as is the case with nearly all of the so-called Apostolic Fathers). Except in one disputed case, we lack any introductory formulae to what might appear to be quotations from the NT, and in the vast majority of cases which might be taken to betray knowledge of the NT, we are dealing with allusions. Moreover, even where we may feel that the author shows knowledge of some part of the NT, it will never be unambiguously clear whether he acquired such knowledge from an actual reading of the NT document in which the relevant related passage is found or from knowledge of a source.

I do not wish to rehearse many of the more general difficulties we have in spying knowledge of NT books in early non-canonical Christian texts. The co-editors' introductory essay to this volume,⁴ and Andrew Gregory's larger book on the use of Luke–Acts in the second century,⁵ give more than adequate expression to these problems, and some of them will emerge in discussions of specific passages. It has been the tendency of this recent discussion as it relates to *Barnabas* to arrive at negative conclusions.⁶ Self-evidently, one's conclusions on this matter will be determined by, amongst other things, the kinds of criteria one adopts in seeking clear evidence of the usage of NT texts. The editors have admitted as much in their introductory remarks, where, in discussing the issue of the use of the synoptics, they contrast the more stringent position of Köster with that of the much less stringent Massaux and the moderately stringent Köhler. Significant in this context will be the assumptions one has about questions relating to the distribution of source material which either helped to generate or was generated by material in the New Testament about none of which one can be certain. Given the conventional dating of the gospels, for instance, we can at least be certain about the fact that texts looking like our Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were doing the rounds by 120, but that, of course, is not to say anything about how widespread knowledge of them was. To assume that it was widespread is

(Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1984); *idem*, *Tradition und Theologie des Barnabasbriefes*, AKG 42 (Berlin, 1971)) has done much to promote this viewpoint.

⁴ Andrew Gregory and Christopher Tuckett, Ch. 4 above pp. 61–82.

⁵ A. Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus*, WUNT 2.169 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003).

⁶ For the most recent of such assessments see Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 97, written after no separate and detailed analysis of the question: 'Alle Versuche, im Barn die Verwendung neutestamentlicher Literatur nachzuweisen, dürfen als gescheitert gelten.'

already to answer a question that the present volume wishes to address. But, equally, we have to be careful about all too easily accepting that where material in an Apostolic Father or another early Christian source appears to reflect the words found in an individual gospel or epistle, an explanation deriving from dependence on oral tradition or independent gospel-like written traditions is the best one.⁷ Significance will also have to be attached to altogether more complex questions about the absorption and appropriation of sources in the early period of Christian history. To what extent is it the case that when Christians used a source in this period they felt the need to betray such usage by exact copying? In all of this we should note that the influence of books can be expressed in a variety of ways, not all of which should be seen to involve literal borrowing. And how important is the question of the knowledge of context in the use of a source, or the related question of right understanding (has our mooted quoter always got to understand the source he may be quoting in the manner in which it was used in his supposed source?). And in this same context we need also to note that a writer may use a source because he wishes to oppose it, not just because he wishes to endorse it.⁸ We may, of course, be inclined to think that a writer like the author of *Barnabas*, who is so keen on citing OT books, would adopt the same approach in citing NT material. But can we be certain about this, given the probably non-canonical status of the New Testament at the time he was writing? And if we discount this as an explanation, to what extent should our understanding of the purpose of the epistle play a role?⁹ All of these questions give voice to what the editors have already made plain in their prefatory remarks: namely, that certitude (and it is precisely this which we appear to be seeking) on the question of the use of the New Testament by the

⁷ For a sensible analysis of this issue and a helpful critique of Köster's position, see J. A. Kelhoffer, *Miracles and Mission: The Authentication of Missionaries and their Message in the Longer Ending of Mark*, WUNT 2.112 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 124 f.

⁸ Note that some of these points are made by C. E. Hill, *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 67–71. He attacks what he takes to be the over-literal approach of some scholars to the question of citation amongst early Christians. He draws attention to the work on citation by some classical scholars. One of these, John Whittaker, who has worked on the *Didaskalois* or *Epitome* of Plato's doctrines, written by Alcinous in the first or second century CE, notes that in this book 'many of the quotations were not only brief but also out of context . . . and . . . the vast majority of these borrowings diverged to a greater or lesser degree from the wording of their original'. Hill goes on to assert that such features are quite common in material from the epoch in which he was working, concluding that '[w]e have to reckon with the fact that, in the second century, literary customs of borrowing or citation demanded neither the exact reproduction of texts, nor the explicit acknowledgement of the author of the borrowed text' (p. 70).

⁹ E.g., Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, 315–16, in explaining Justin's failure in the *Dialogue* to present detailed arguments about NT texts, notes that this would not have been compatible with his aim in the *Dialogue*, where he wished to argue his case with Trypho on the basis of texts whose authority they both agreed upon (*Dial.* 120. 5).

Apostolic Fathers will never be arrived at, and all comments must remain provisional and tentative.

KNOWLEDGE OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS AND JOHN

Barnabas and the Synoptics

We shall begin with *Barn* 4. 14: *προσέχωμεν, μήποτε, ὡς γέγραπται, πολλοὶ κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ εὐρεθῶμεν.*

There are a number of things to note about this passage. First, it is introduced by a *formula citandi* (*γέγραπται*)¹⁰ which is normally reserved for citations from OT texts. But the closest text we have to this one comes not from the OT but from the NT, namely, Matt. 22. 14 (*πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσιν κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί*). If the author of *Barnabas* were in fact quoting from the NT, this would be the earliest example of a citation of the NT as scripture.¹¹ But, given the uniqueness of this occurrence (all other citations introduced by *formulae citandi* come from the OT, or very occasionally from apocryphal sources), a number of scholars have sought alternative explanations. So, for instance, some, citing passages from 4 Ezra which bears a reasonably close relationship to the citation at *Barn.* 4. 14 (4 Ezra 8. 3 and 9. 15¹²) have argued that the author of *Barnabas* may be quoting an unknown apocalypse which contained the citation in the form we find it in his epistle and Matthew. The use of a *formula citandi* would be entirely compatible with the use of such a formula at 4. 3, 16. 5, and 12. 1, where he appears to be quoting from apocryphal texts.¹³ Others have argued that the author may have mistaken the text concerned as coming from the OT. But

¹⁰ *γέγραπται* appears at 5. 2; 14. 6; 15. 1; and 16. 6. For *γραφῆ* see 4. 7, 11; 5. 4; 6. 12; 13. 2; 16. 5.

¹¹ P. F. Beatrice, 'Une citation de l'Évangile de Matthieu dans l'Épître de Barnabé', in J.-M. Sevrin (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity*, BETL 86 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 231–45. T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Erlangen: A. Deichert, 1888–92), 847 f., also made this assertion. For another positive judgement, see É. Massaux, *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Saint Irenaeus*, Book 1: *The First Ecclesiastical Writers*, ed. A. J. Bellinzoni (Macon, Ga: Mercer University Press, 1990), 65–6.

¹² 4 Ezra 8. 3 reads: 'Many are created but few are saved'; and 9. 15 reads: 'More are of the lost than of the redeemed.'

¹³ *Barn.* 4. 3 is directly attributed by the author to Enoch (*ὡς Ἐνώχ λέγει*), and is thought by some to be taken from *1 Enoch* 85–90, specifically 89. 61–4 and 90. 17 f. Certitude on this point cannot be arrived at, and H. Windisch, 'Der Barnabasbrief', in *Die Apostolischen Väter*, iii HNT. Ergänzungsband (Tübingen: Mohr, 1920), 219–413, on p. 318, posited the view that *Barnabas* was referring to an unknown source. For a full discussion, see Probstmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 197–8 n. 19. *Barn.* 12. 1 is unattributed, but seems certain to come from some apocryphal work; and 16. 5 is also unattributed and thought by some to come from *1 Enoch*.

that is simply based upon the assumption that he could not quote a text from the NT as scripture even if he was writing as late as the 130s.¹⁴ Here, however, it is worth noting Köster's observation that the term *εὐαγγέλιον* when referred to in *Barnabas* (cf. 5. 9; 8. 3) seems to bear no relationship to written texts.¹⁵ But the force of this observation depends upon when you think the gospels received their present titles. It is not, of course, out of the question that the quotation could have done the rounds independent of Matthew, a possibility that is suggested by the gnomic character of the sentiment, and by the appearance of a similar sentiment at Matt. 20. 16¹⁶ and in the passages from 4 Ezra already referred to, although here in slightly different contexts. But in spite of all of these arguments, it still remains the case that the closest existing text to *Barn.* 4. 14 in all known literature is Matt. 22. 14, and one senses that attempts to argue for independence from Matthew are partly motivated by a desire to avoid the implication of the *formula citandi* which introduces the relevant words: namely, that the author of *Barnabas* regarded Matthew as scriptural. We should also note Beatrice's attempts to argue for reliance on Matthew not only by reference to verbal similarities but also by reference to the apparently similar theological contexts of both passages.¹⁷ In both we see a mixture of anti-Jewish polemic (the covenant has now passed to Christians) with a concomitant warning against what one might call an over-realized eschatology and moral complacency on behalf of the new people of God. Of course, one could argue that precisely the similarity of context makes the very different ways in which these two writers have presented their cases more striking.

Certitude, then, cannot be arrived at, but Köhler's judgement that the possibilities of this going back to Matthew are 'gut möglich' is not unreasonable.¹⁸

The next passage, *Barn.* 5. 9 f., reads: *ὅτι οὐκ ἦλθεν καλέσαι δικαίους, ἀλλὰ ἁμαρταλούς.*

¹⁴ See Köhler, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus*, WUNT 2.24 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 113.

¹⁵ H. Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern*, TU 65 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957), 6, 126; *idem*, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 16.

¹⁶ The actual text of Matt. 20. 16 reads: *οὕτως ἔσονται οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι*. But some texts (C D W Q f) add words from Matt. 22. 14, indicating that the scribe concerned saw the connection between both verses and that the gnomic phrase may have been transmitted independently of the passage to which it is attached in Matthew. We should also note that the verse itself does not straightforwardly make sense of the pericope to which it is attached, for there only one person is chosen, not many. W. D. Davies and D. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Matthew*, iii (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1997), 206–7, argue that we should regard it as a conclusion to both parables, including the parable of the wedding feast. Even if this is true, it may still indicate that the phrase had an independent existence.

¹⁷ Beatrice, 'Une citation', 236.

¹⁸ Köhler, *Die Rezeption*, 113.

For some scholars the passage in *Barnabas* shows clear knowledge of Matthew's gospel, not only because the words cited are similar to what we read in Matt. 9. 13 (οὐ γὰρ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς), although we should note that the words are attributed to Jesus in Matthew and not reported of him, but also because of the order in which Jesus' ministry is described—*Barn.* 5. 8 f. speaks of Jesus' teaching and healing and then calling his disciples, which conforms to the order of events in Matt. 5–9. But the sentiment could be taken as general synoptic tradition, not least because the order ascribed to Matthew is equally witnessed in Mark 1–2, and the saying appears in more or less the same form in that gospel.¹⁹ Some have argued that the reference to proclaiming the gospel (κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον) in the previous part of the verse betrays an understanding of the gospel as the earthly teaching of Jesus, an understanding found only in Matthew. But the phrase itself is witnessed in Mark (1. 14; 13. 10; 14. 9), and in Matthew, of the four times the phrase appears, three appear with the term 'Gospel of the kingdom' (4. 23; 9. 35; 24. 14), not witnessed here.

But certainty cannot be arrived at on this point. If, as was implied in my discussion of *Barn.* 4. 14, it is the case that the author of *Barnabas* did know Matthew, then does it make sense to state that a series of Greek words which come very close to words found in Matthew go back to a tradition independent of that gospel? Answers to this question will, to a certain extent, depend upon whether one sees the author of *Barnabas* as a copier of tradition or a creative writer engaging with tradition.

It should be noted that some scholars have wanted to see *Barnabas'* interesting observation in an earlier part of the verse that Jesus chose (ἐξελέξατο) those who were lawless beyond all sin (ὄντας ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν ἀνομωτέρους) as deriving from a reading of Mark's gospel, in which the disciples are represented in a notably negative light. This seems unlikely.²⁰ Interestingly, Origen, in the midst of a defence of the apparently disreputable character of the disciples, quotes these words from *Barnabas* (c. *Cels.* 1. 63), assuming, it would seem, that Celsus has picked up his negative view of Jesus' followers from there, rather than from a gospel. It could have been the case that by the time *Barnabas* was written the sinfulness of the disciples was widely known and need not have been derived from a close reading of the gospels.

The next passage to be considered is *Barn.* 5. 12. Here *Barnabas* shares a citation of Zech. 13. 7 with Matt. 26. 31 and Mark 14. 27, with some variants

¹⁹ Köhler, *Die Rezeption*, 114.

²⁰ See Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 142–3; and our discussion of 1 Tim. 1. 12 f. below.

in common against the LXX reading. So, for instance, all three refer to a single shepherd (τὸν ποιμένα) rather than the ποιμένας of the LXX, and all three refer to τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποιμνῆς rather than to the unqualified πρόβατα of the LXX. It should be noted that Matthew and Mark share more variants from the LXX in common than either one does with *Barnabas*, and that *Barnabas* uses the passage differently from the synoptics (in *Barnabas* the consequences of Jesus' death for the Jews are in sight; in the synoptics the consequences for Jesus' disciples are to the fore). Moreover, in *Barnabas* God speaks these words; in the synoptics they are placed on the lips of Jesus. However, quite reasonably Köhler notes that in relation to the last two points we should not exclude the possibility of a reinterpretation of the passage on the part of the author of *Barnabas*, even if he betrays no clear knowledge of the synoptic context in which the passage appears.²¹

I turn next to *Barn.* 7. 3–5: ἀλλὰ καὶ σταυρωθεὶς ἐποτίζετο ὄξει καὶ χολῇ (cf. also 7. 5: ἐμέ . . . μέλλετε ποτίζω χολὴν μετὰ ὄξους).

While gall is mentioned by Matthew as something that Jesus was given to drink before his crucifixion (Matt. 27. 34—this appears as an addition to Mark 15. 23), and vinegar as something he was given during his crucifixion (Matt. 27. 48; Mark 15. 36), they do not, as they do in *Barnabas*, appear together in the gospel tradition. A number of possible explanations of this phenomenon are available. One lies in arguing that the author of *Barnabas* has extracted his information from a combination of material in the synoptics, in particular Matthew. Against this, Bartlet pointed out that it was easier to see the combination as emerging from Ps. 68. 22, where both χολή and ὄξος are mentioned together with ποτίζειν.²² The further possibility that the combination of vinegar and gall emerges from something other than knowledge of the synoptics might be supported by the *Gospel of Peter*, where at v. 16 we read: καὶ τις αὐτῶν εἶπεν ποτίσατε αὐτὸν μετὰ ὄξους. It is unlikely that the *Gospel of Peter* is dependent at this point on *Barnabas*, and possible that he gives voice to a known tradition, broadly based on Ps. 68. 22 (LXX) which was widely associated with the passion.²³ But again, certainty cannot be arrived at.

The next passage to be considered is *Barn.* 7. 9b:

ἐπειδὴ ὄψονται αὐτὸν τότε τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τὸν ποδῆρην ἔχοντα τὸν κόκκινον περὶ τὴν σάρκα καὶ ἐροῦσιν Οὐχ οὗτος ἐστίν, ὃν ποτε ἡμεῖς ἐσταυρώσαμεν ἐξουθενήσαντες καὶ κατακεντήσαντες καὶ ἐμπτύσαντες, ἀληθῶς οὗτος ἦν, ὁ τότε λέγων, ἑαυτὸν υἱὸν θεοῦ εἶναι.

²¹ Köhler, *Die Rezeption*, 116–17.

²² Ps. 68. 22 (LXX) reads: καὶ ἔδωκαν εἰς τὸ βρῶμά μου χολὴν καὶ εἰς τὴν δίψαν μου ἐπότισάν ὄξος.

²³ In this respect take note of Melito, *Peri Pascha* 79, 80, and 93; and Irenaeus, *Dem.* 82. Origen, *c. Cels.* 2. 37, quotes Celsus' Jew as criticizing Jesus for rushing greedily to drink 'vinegar

This comes from a section of *Barnabas* in which the author draws a parallel between the two appearances of Jesus, one in suffering at his passion and one in glory at his parousia, and the two goats on the Day of Atonement. In the passage under discussion *Barnabas* is referring to the Jesus who returns in triumph and who is recognized by those who executed him. The fact that *Barn.* 7. 9b emerges from a passage which betrays knowledge of extra-biblical sources to do with the Day of Atonement and develops a typological relationship not explicitly referred to in the gospels,²⁴ should make us somewhat suspicious of assuming that its author is drawing directly on this material. Certainly one can point to the presence of some shared words,²⁵ but the connections do not reflect a particular gospel's account of the passion; thus, in so far as one wants to posit any knowledge of the gospels, this probably results from knowledge of shared traditions connected with the passion, a point which receives support from the fact that Tertullian, in a passage which has close similarities to *Barn.* 7 but appears to be independent of it, shares some details with *Barnabas*.²⁶

There remain only two further passages to be considered. The first is *Barn.* 12. 10. There are no good grounds for thinking that the use of Ps. 109. 1 (LXX) at this point in *Barnabas* goes back to any of the synoptic gospels. We should first note that *Barnabas* does not share in common with Matthew and Mark their one variant from the LXX (both read ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν σου rather than the LXX's ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου, which is *Barnabas's* reading), but secondly we should note that the psalm was widely used in a christological context,²⁷ making it likely that *Barnabas's* use of it is the result of knowledge of a common Christian tradition rather than direct use of the gospels.

The final possible parallel with the synoptic tradition comes at *Barn.* 15. 9: ἐν ἧ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανοῦς.

and gall', claiming, interestingly, that he has taken this out of the gospel text (ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ... λέξεις). But in the same paragraph he goes on to mention Ps. 68. 22.

²⁴ Although we should note Matt. 22. 39, where a two-advent view of Christ might be hinted at. See J. Carleton Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas: Outlook and Background*, WUNT 2.64 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 136–40, where the relationship of the two goats typology is shown to have similarities to passages from *m. Yoma* 6; Justin, *Dial.* 40. 4 ff.; and Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 3. 7. 8. See also Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 310 f.

²⁵ For ἐμπτύσατε see Mark 14. 65 (// Matt. 26. 67). See also Mark 15. 19 and *Gospel of Peter* 3. 9. For κατακεντήσατε see John 19. 34 f. and Apoc. 1. 7. κόκκινων in the phrase τὸν ποδήρη τὸν κόκκινων is witnessed at Matt. 27. 28, but here the garment is referred to as a χλαμύδα.

²⁶ See Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 3. 7. 7, where the goat is referred to as 'consputus et convulsus et compunctus'.

²⁷ In the New Testament see Acts 2. 34 and Heb. 12. 10 f. On all of this see Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 145–6. He posits the origin of its use as lying in Christian circles opposed to a Davidic understanding of Jesus' messiahship.

On this verse Bartlet states that it seems extraordinary that the author of *Barnabas* should have used such ambiguous language if he had known ‘any of our synoptics’—unless it were Luke, before Acts had come into his hands.²⁸ Köhler disagrees, stating that the Greek need not imply what Bartlet thinks.²⁹ In fact, Bartlet prefaces his comments on *Barnabas* and the synoptics with a discussion of this verse stating that the difficulty he has outlined ‘must be borne in mind in estimating the final effect of the positive evidence adduced below’—that is, positive evidence in favour of knowledge of the synoptics. Independent of the fact that Bartlet misconstrues the potential importance of this passage, he also arrives at a possibly faulty conclusion in logic: that is, that knowledge of particular sources implies consistent agreement with them. In fact, it seems clear that in his understanding of the relationship of the resurrection and the ascension, *Barnabas* comes closest to Luke 24. 50 f., even if there are no verbal parallels to speak of.³⁰

Barnabas and John

The subject of *Barnabas*’s relationship to John has been much debated, but with no agreed-upon conclusion.³¹ Certainly there are very few places where we can speak of a direct literary relationship. I shall list the passages that have been discussed in this context below.

On a number of occasions *Barnabas* uses the phrase ‘live forever’ (ζῆν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα): 6. 3; 8. 5; 9. 2; 11. 10. The phrase occurs once in John (6. 51), here in connection with the eating of Christ’s flesh. The same phrase occurs in the influential Gen. 3. 22 and again in *Pss. Sol.* 14. 2 and Sir. 37. 26. Bartlet is probably right to suspect that Johannine influence is difficult to espy here, not only because the phrase occurs elsewhere, but also because in John the phrase is clearly connected with the bread of life, which remains unmentioned by *Barnabas* (the reference to eating and living forever in 11. 10 is connected with the trees of paradise).

Both *Barn.* 12. 7 and John 3. 14 refer to the story of Moses being commanded to make a poisonous serpent, and place it on a pole so that those Israelites who had been bitten might look at it and live (Num. 21. 7, 8). Both

²⁸ J. Bartlet ‘The Epistle of Barnabas’, *NTAF*, 1–23, on p. 17.

²⁹ Köhler, *Die Rezeption*, 121.

³⁰ On all of this, see Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 147–8.

³¹ See Carleton Paget, *Barnabas*, 225–30, for a recent discussion and a presentation of relevant secondary material. Interestingly, Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, who takes a maximalist position on the question of knowledge of John in the second century, does not consider *Barnabas* worthy of discussion.

see the snake as a type of the Christ who brings life through his death. But in John there is no citation of the relevant passage from Num. 21, and there is an attempt through the use of the ambiguous verb *ὑψωθῆναι* to point forward to both Jesus' death and exaltation. Absence of any reference to this distinctive Johannine verb or to any other features of the Johannine passage except the basic typology seem to point away from any idea of literary dependence.³²

In *Barn.* 5. 10–11 we read of Christ having come in the flesh (*ἦλθεν ἐν σαρκί*), a phrase which bears some relationship to what we read in 1 John 4. 2 and 2 John 7. Elsewhere he prefers to use the verb *φανερῶω* with *ἐν σαρκί* (see *Barn.* 5. 6, 9; 6. 7, 9, 14; 12. 10). *Φανερῶω* is an important verb for John, but is not ever used with *ἐνσαρκί*.³³ Again, proving a literary relationship with John on the basis of these few words seems very difficult.

Other similarities between the two works, of a non-literary kind, do not seem sufficiently strong to enable us to talk about any knowledge of John on the part of the author of *Barnabas*.

Conclusion on Usage of the Synoptics and John

What I have written above constitutes a brief discussion of passages which seem to have the best claim to giving evidence of knowledge of gospel material. A cluster of this material appears in *Barn.* 5–7 and is here mainly concerned with the passion. The difficulty in asserting knowledge of the gospels on the basis of this material lies in the fact that (i) some of it may be accounted for by reference to use of scriptural, i.e. OT, material;³⁴ and (ii) none of it gives much evidence of use of a specific gospel (one thinks in particular of the references to the manner in which Jesus has been treated by his enemies), let alone of redactional material. Moreover, it appears to have been developed in a different setting: namely, one connected with the creation of a complex, and sometimes confused, typology of the two goats on the Day of Atonement. Given all of this, it is probably safer to assume that in relation to his knowledge of passion material, the author of *Barnabas* may have had access to common passion traditions rather than to the gospels themselves.

³² Note should also be taken of the fact that John refers to eternal life in 3. 15, a theme close to the author of *Barnabas*'s heart, but one to which he does not allude at this point; and of the fact that Justin, *Dial.* 91, witnesses to a similar but probably independent development of the same complex of passages in Genesis and Numbers as we find in *Barnabas*, pointing to the possibly traditional character of this material. On this see O. Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-type, Provenance, Theological Profile*, NovTSup 56 (Leiden: Brill, 1987), 398.

³³ The best parallel to this expression occurs in 1 Tim. 3. 16, where we read: *ὅς ἐφανερῶθη ἐν σαρκί*.

³⁴ See Windisch, 'Der Barnabasbrief', 375.

A similar explanation may also be applicable to other places often cited as possible evidence of knowledge of the gospels. The closest we come to evidence of knowledge of the synoptics is *Barn.* 4. 14, which bears a close relationship to Matt. 22. 10. While it is difficult to demonstrate knowledge of Matthew here, it remains the case that Matt. 22. 14 is the closest text to what we have in *Barn.* 4. 14, and that in broad terms it reflects a similar context. But if we accept an origin in Matthew for this set of words, should we apply less stringent criteria when, for instance, considering the use of Matthew elsewhere in *Barnabas*?³⁵ Or can we overcome the implications of this question by assuming that the author of *Barnabas* has not taken the words directly from Matthew but rather from a source which itself made use of these words? Yet, if we are right to assume that *Barnabas* betrays knowledge of Matthew at this point, is it not strange that the author did not use him more frequently, given the fact that he and the first gospel could be seen to have anti-Jewish views in common? Direct knowledge of John also remains unproven. But the absence of any clear reference to material in any one of the canonical gospels may not be thought strange, given the strong concern of the author to prove the conjunction of Old Testament promise with the Christian faith;³⁶ and, in this regard, it is striking that dominical words are exclusively scriptural, that is, OT, words (cf. 6. 13; 7. 5, 11). As Köhler implies in his generally judicious assessment of the author of *Barnabas*'s knowledge of Matthew, it is very difficult to demonstrate that *Barnabas* did not know the gospels. After all, if we admit that the author aims to make his subject Old Testament promise and Christian fulfilment, then the need to cite from NT texts is, as noted, diminished.³⁷

KNOWLEDGE OF PAUL

For some there may be seen to be a convergence between the concerns of Paul and those of the author of *Barnabas*. Both, in broad terms, are concerned with the relationship between the new covenant in Christ and the old covenant with the Jews, and they take a keen interest in issues relating to the law and the history of Israel. Views on the nature of their relationship have ranged from seeing the author of *Barnabas* as a radical Paulinist to seeing him as an

³⁵ This was precisely the point I made when discussing *Barn.* 5. 9 f., but it could be applied equally to any of the synoptic material considered.

³⁶ See Windisch, 'Der Barnabasbrief', 375; and Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 157, citing Windisch.

³⁷ See Hill's comments on Justin referred to in n. 9 above.

opponent of aspects of Pauline theology.³⁸ Some of these views will be assessed in the analysis below of possible allusions to Paul.

There are six passages to consider, the first of which is *Barn.* 13. 7: *τί οὖν λέγει τῷ Ἀβραάμ, ὅτε μόνος πιστεύσας ἐτέθη εἰς δικαιοσύνην; Ἰδοῦ, τέθεικά σε, Ἀβραάμ, πατέρα ἐθνῶν τῶν πιστευόντων δι' ἀκροβυστίας τῷ θεῷ.*

In the first part of the verse *Barnabas* appears to be quoting from Gen. 15. 6 (LXX), here reminding us of Paul in Rom. 4. 3 (cf. also Gal. 3. 6), although *Barnabas* reads *ἐτέθη* for Paul's and the LXX's *ἐλογίσθη*. But it is the second part of the verse that seems to indicate clear knowledge of Paul, or at least a Pauline tradition. Here *Barnabas* appears to quote a form of Gen. 17. 4, 5, adding the words *τῶν πιστευόντων δι' ἀκροβυστίας*, words which appear in Rom. 4. 11 but are not presented there as part of an OT citation. As Bartlet comments, 'In our author's memory the O. T. passages have become conflated with comments in Rom. 4; for the phrase *τῶν πιστευόντων δι' ἀκροβυστίας* (by no means an obvious one), especially as qualifying *ἐθνῶν* in *Barnabas*, can hardly be explained otherwise.'³⁹ This is absolutely right, for in Gen. 17. 4 where Abraham is described as the father of the Gentiles, it is assumed that the Gentiles of whom he will be father will in fact be circumcised. But against the view that the author of *Barnabas* is taking his citation directly from Romans is the fact that he is using the passage in a quite different way from Paul. For the latter the key lies in developing the idea that belief, rather than circumcision, is central to Gentiles entering the messianic community, 'for Abraham believed and it was reckoned to him as righteousness'. But in *Barnabas* the passage is concerned to prove that the Christians, not the Jews, are the children of Abraham. In such an argument, which makes precisely the same point as *Barnabas's* development of the stories of Jacob and Esau (Gen. 25)⁴⁰ and Manasseh and Ephraim (Gen. 48) in the preceding section of the chapter, the issue of circumcision is referred to but not developed,⁴¹ and Paul's assertion, admittedly itself undeveloped, but nevertheless voiced, that Abraham is the ancestor of the circumcised (as well as the uncircumcised) who follow the example of Abraham's faith, is omitted.

³⁸ For a brief history of research, see Carleton Paget, *Barnabas*, 367 n. 33.

³⁹ Bartlet, 'Barnabas', *NTAF*, 3–4. Interestingly, this is the only passage in the whole of Bartlet's assessment of the author of *Barnabas's* knowledge of the NT that receives a B rating (no other passage receives anything better). Windisch, 'Der Barnabasbrief', 378, is similarly confident.

⁴⁰ Paul shows knowledge of this tradition at Rom. 9. 7–13, but the contexts in which it is used are quite different. In *Barnabas* it is used as a prophecy of the two peoples, in Paul as a justification of the principle of God's election. See Bartlet, 'Barnabas', *NTAF*, 4.

⁴¹ The point is neatly made by Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 463: 'Dabei ist zu beachten, dass der Scopus der Argumentation nicht die Frage der Beschneidung, sondern der Identifizierung des Gottesvolks ist.'

Whether such an observation is sufficient to exclude knowledge of Paul depends to some extent on whether one could conceive of the passage as evidencing *use* of Paul—that is, an appropriation of Paul for un-Pauline ends.⁴² What must be true is that at the very least knowledge of a tradition influenced by Paul is evidenced at this point.⁴³

The second passage comes at *Barn.* 4. 10. Here, in a section running from 4. 9b to 4. 13, *Barnabas* exhorts his readers to avoid behaviour that might allow the entry of the wicked one. In this context he issues a warning to those who live apart from the community ‘as if already made righteous (ὡς ἤδη δεδικαιωμένοι)’ (4. 10). While there is no reference in any extant Pauline literature to people who describe themselves as already justified, the use of *δικαίω* seems to betray at least some knowledge of Pauline language. It is interesting to note that where Paul appears to refer to people who entertain a realized eschatological view possibly similar to the views that *Barnabas* is opposing here (cf. 1 Cor. 4. 8), he too appeals, in an admittedly different context and with different wording, to the Christian community’s status as the temple of God (1 Cor. 3. 16–17), which is precisely what *Barnabas* does at 4. 11 f. Again, none of this proves direct knowledge of Paul, but it may indicate some knowledge of Pauline or Paulinizing traditions.⁴⁴

The third passage is *Barn.* 2. 6. The reference here to a new law of our Lord Jesus Christ without yoke of necessity (ὁ καινὸς νόμος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἄνευ ζυγοῦ ἀνάγκης ὄν), understood as a kind of replacement of something which has been abolished (*κατήργησεν*) could be conceived of as influenced by Paul. The reference to the law of our Lord Jesus Christ has its parallels in Paul’s reference to the law of Christ (Gal. 6. 2; 1 Cor. 9. 21); the verb *καταργέω* appears in a number of places in Pauline literature to refer the abolition of certain Jewish prescriptions (Rom. 3. 31; 2 Cor. 3. 7, 11, 13; Eph. 2. 15); and Paul also refers to the yoke of the law (Gal. 5. 1). But while the strength of such an argument lies in the cumulative character of the parallels,

⁴² Note my introductory comments about the appropriation of texts. See Carleton Paget, *Barnabas*, 374, for the tentative suggestion that at this point in *Barnabas* we might be able to discern evidence of an original source, possibly influenced by Paul, which the author of *Barnabas* has modified. Also note R. Werline, ‘The Transformation of Pauline Arguments in Justin Martyr’s *Dialogue with Trypho*’, *HTR* 92 (1999), 79–93, who shows how, by not dissimilar means, Justin in *Dial.* 11, 23, and 119, modifies Pauline arguments about the people so as to exclude Jews.

⁴³ In support of this view, see A. Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum: Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion* BHT 58 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979), 279.

⁴⁴ The view expressed by Wengst, *Tradition und Theologie*, that at this point *Barnabas* is straightforwardly opposing Paul on the basis of passages like Rom. 5. 1 and Titus 3. 7 is unfounded. If Paul had read *Barn.* 4. 9 f. he would have agreed with its sentiments. As 1 Cor. 4. 8 f. shows, he was opposed to over-realized eschatological positions.

its weakness lies in the fact that we find no verse in Paul which contains all the component parts of *Barn.* 2. 6. Moreover, it is possible to argue that the phrase may have emerged from a non-Pauline, possibly Jewish Christian, anti-cultic tradition.⁴⁵ But we should admit that it still remains the case that the closest parallel to this phrase lies in Paul's letters and nowhere else.

The fourth passage is *Barn.* 7. 7, where the description of the second goat as *ἐπικατάρατος* in *Barnabas's* development of the typology concerning the two goats on the Day of Atonement has reminded some of Gal. 3. 10 and 13, the only other place in either the New Testament or the writings of the Apostolic Fathers that we find the term used to describe Jesus. Interestingly, in Lev. 16, the passage upon which the author of *Barnabas* loosely bases his typological development, the goat is described in the LXX as *ἀπομπαῖος* (Lev. 16. 8 and 10). This and the fact that we meet the term elsewhere in early Christian literature only in Paul, might lead us to think that there is at least a faint Pauline reminiscence here, although we should note that (i) what we in fact know about earliest Christianity is by no means comprehensive; (ii) that the term *ἐπικατάρατος* in its original Pauline context comes from Deut. 27. 26 and so could have found its way into *Barnabas* via the OT rather than Paul; (iii) that in an apparently independent version of the two goats typology, Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* 3. 7. 7) uses the word 'maledictus' to describe the goat, which could be said to approximate to a translation of *ἐπικατάρατος*; and (iv) *Barnabas* betrays no knowledge of the original context in which the Pauline passage appears in Galatians.⁴⁶ We are dealing, after all, with a single word.

The next passage to be considered is *Barn.* 9. 6, which contains two possible allusions to Paul. The first occurs in the earlier part of the verse, in the reference to circumcision as a seal (*σφραγίς*). The strength in seeing this as possibly alluding to Paul is that he explicitly refers to circumcision in such a way (Rom. 4. 11, where Paul uses *σημεῖον* as well as *σφραγίς*), whereas in the OT, both the MT and the LXX, circumcision is referred to as a sign (LXX, *σημεῖον*) but never as a seal. Again, the case for a direct allusion is very doubtful, if only because there is no hint that the author of *Barnabas* knows anything of the wider context in which the term occurs in Romans. It may also be the case that evidence even of knowledge of a Pauline tradition is weak, for in some rabbinic sources we find circumcision referred to as seal, possibly implying that it was referred to in such a way in non-canonical, pre-Pauline sources.⁴⁷ The case for seeing *Barn.* 9. 6 as possibly anti-Pauline (in this view

⁴⁵ On this see Carleton Paget, *Barnabas*, 105–7.

⁴⁶ Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 303 n. 18, notes the appearance of the word in Paul, but makes plain his view that its appearance in *Barnabas* may imply some knowledge of Pauline tradition only in 365 n. 53.

⁴⁷ For these and other Christian references, see Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 364 n. 50.

the interlocutor who is the subject of ἐρείς is Paul, here arguing against *Barnabas* for some validity to circumcision in the pre-Christian period) is unconvincing.⁴⁸

The other possible reference to Paul in this verse lies in the use of the introductory words ἄρα οὖν, here introducing an argument against the idea that circumcision could be a seal of the covenant. According to Prostmeier, this linking particle phrase occurs only in Paul (cf. Rom. 5. 18; 7. 3–25; 8. 12; 9. 16, 18; 14. 12, 19; Gal. 6. 10; Eph. 2. 19; 1 Thess. 5. 6; 2 Thess. 2. 15) and some Apostolic Fathers (Ign. *Trall.* 10; 2 *Clem.* 8. 6; 14. 3) before the second century, and even in this century it is used sparingly. This leads Prostmeier to suggest not that the author of *Barnabas* had access to Paul's letters, but rather that he had picked up Pauline phrases and concepts, however indirectly.⁴⁹ Interestingly, he sees some of this knowledge reflected in the opening chapter of the epistle and in the manner in which he addresses his addressees elsewhere in the epistle.⁵⁰

The sixth and final parallel to letters today usually considered to be Pauline is *Barn.* 5. 9. We have already had reason to refer to this verse in relation to its assertion that Jesus did not come to call the righteous but sinners. In the same verse *Barnabas* refers to the apostles as those who ὄντας ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν ἀνομωτέρους. Lindemann,⁵¹ rejecting the view that we have here a reference to Matt. 9. 9–13, or any extension of Mark's negative view of the disciples, argues that the strong sentiments expressed here come closest to Paul's own self-description in such passages as 1 Cor. 15. 8 f.; Eph. 3. 8; 1 Tim. 1. 15 f. He claims that the passage could be taken as an oblique criticism of Paul. But this seems an unlikely interpretation, not least because the reference appears to be to the historical Jesus' calling of his disciples; and interestingly, Origen, who cites *Barn.* 5. 9 at *c. Cels.* 1. 63, sees it as a reference to the apostles, i.e. the followers of Jesus during his lifetime, mentioning Paul's sinful past quite separately.⁵²

⁴⁸ The argument fails, because (i) the language is not necessarily Pauline; and (ii) it is much easier to read the chapter as an attack upon the implementation of circumcision, not upon the technical point of whether circumcision once had some validity.

⁴⁹ Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 365 n. 53.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.* 145–61. E.g., Prostmeier makes quite a lot of the way in which the author of *Barnabas* addresses his readers as 'sons and daughters' (cf. 1. 1), something which manifests itself later in the epistle as children (τέκνα) of God. See *inter alia* 1 Thess. 2. 11; 1 Cor. 4. 14; 2 Cor. 6. 13. Such a form of address is witnessed elsewhere only in *Didache* (cf. 3. 1, 2, 4–6; 4. 1) and Ign. *Phil.* 2. 1.

⁵¹ Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 277.

⁵² Immediately after quoting *Barn.* 5. 9, Origen quotes Luke 5. 8 and follows this up with a quotation from 1 Tim. 1. 15, making it clear that the latter passage refers to Paul, not the apostles.

Deutero-Pauline letters

Two parallels with Ephesians may be considered. The first is *Barn.* 3. 6 and Eph. 1. 4–6. The connection between them seems very tenuous. Bartlet makes much of the use of the words *προβλέψας* (equivalent to Ephesians' *προορίσας*), and the reference in both passages to the beloved (*ἡγαπημένῳ*). But the contexts in which the passages are mentioned are quite different (a straightforwardly polemical one in *Barnabas* and an introductory one for Ephesians), and both the ideas and the christological title are sufficiently widespread for us to think that *Barnabas* could not only have picked these things up from the writer of Ephesians.⁵³

The second passage that might be compared with Ephesians is *Barn.* 6. 11 f., with which may be compared *Barn.* 16. 8–10. Bartlet argued strongly for the existence of some parallels between the language used at *Barn.* 6. 11 f. and that found in Eph. 2. 10, 21 f.; 3. 17; and 4. 22 f. He pointed in particular to the similarity in the ideas of re-creation in both (compare in particular *Barn.* 6. 11 and Eph. 4. 22 f.); to the fact that, as in *Barnabas*, the author of Ephesians uses *κατοικτήριον*⁵⁴ in close conjunction with *ναὸν ἅγιον* as well as *κατοικῆσαι τὸν χριστὸν . . . ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν*, an idea from which Bartlet claims, *Barnabas* begins (see Eph. 2. 21 f.). He also makes reference to apparently similar ideas of the mystical indwelling of Christ in believers and the church (see *Barn.* 16. 8–10). Again, it is very difficult to argue for actual knowledge of Ephesians by the author of *Barnabas*, even if some of the ideas are broadly similar.

Two parallels with the Pastoral Epistles may also be noted. The first is *Barn.* 5. 9 and 1 Tim. 1. 15, which I have discussed above. The second is *Barn.* 5. 6, with which may be compared 2 Tim. 1. 10. As Bartlet notes, there is a possible conjunction of two ideas here: the idea of the incarnation, expressed in terms of the verb *φανερώω*, although in the case of the passage in 2 Timothy without any reference to *ἐν σαρκί*,⁵⁵ and the idea of the abolition of death expressed in both passages with the verb *καταργέω*.⁵⁶ The phrase 'appearing in the flesh' seems almost formulaic in *Barnabas* (see 6. 7, 9, 14; 12. 10), and in Hebrews we meet up with the idea of the abolition of death (Heb. 1. 14: see the discussion below).⁵⁷

⁵³ See Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 184–5.

⁵⁴ The word *κατοικτήριον* occurs only in Ephesians in the NT (Eph. 2. 21), and only in *Barnabas* in the Apostolic Fathers.

⁵⁵ We do find this expression in 1 Tim. 3. 16.

⁵⁶ We should note that the connection is made more clearly in *Barnabas*.

⁵⁷ Some have argued for the view that *Barnabas* reflects a Paulinism in a similar state of flux to what we find in the Pastoral Epistles. In particular, reference is made to a tendency to use

Conclusion

It is difficult to prove that the author of *Barnabas* had a direct knowledge of any of the letters of Paul. But there is, I think, sufficient evidence to show that he was in contact with traditions which were at least conversant with aspects of Paul's theology. Whether he sought to modify those traditions to suit his own somewhat different perspective is not easy to prove. The best case for such a view can be found in chapter 13 of his epistle, where Barnabas appears to modify part of Rom. 4 to support the un-Pauline position of an exclusively Gentile identity for the church. It is certainly clear that the author of *Barnabas* was not a conscious opponent of Paul, as some have sought to argue.

THE REST OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Hebrews

The case of the relationship between *Barnabas* and Hebrews is a complex one. As will be demonstrated below, it is very difficult to see any clear evidence of even an allusion to Hebrews. Yet, in terms of theological atmosphere and general tendencies, there is a greater proximity than perhaps is the case with any other NT book.

Four passages may be considered, the first of which is *Barn.* 5. 6, to which may be compared Heb. 2. 14. Here both authors refer to the abolition of death, although stated in slightly different ways. In *Barnabas* the reference is straightforwardly to the abolition of death (*καταργήση τὸν θάνατον*) by Christ's own death; in Hebrews, where the same verb is used (*καταργέω*), the reference is to the destruction of the one who has the power of death (*τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου*). Not only do these differences of expression point away from any straightforward idea of literary dependence, but a similar confluence of ideas is found at 2 Tim. 1. 10, possibly indicating a widespread connection between the verb *καταργέω* and death.

words such as *δικαιοσύνη* in a non-Pauline way to mean something like honesty or moral uprightness (cf. 1 Tim. 6. 11; 2 Tim. 2. 22; 3. 16; cf. with *Barn.* 1. 4, 6; 4. 12; 5. 1); the replacement of the Pauline soteriological concepts of *δικαιώω* with *σωζέειν* (1 Tim. 1. 15; 2. 4, 15; 4. 16; 2 Tim. 1. 9; 2. 10; 3. 15; cf. *Barn.* 1. 3; 2. 10; 4. 1); and the definition of *πίστις* in terms of faithfulness (1 Tim. 1. 5, 19; 5. 8; cf. *Barn.* 1. 4, 5); and the use of traditional baptismal and atonement vocabulary (Titus 3. 5; cf. *Barn.* 6. 11, 14). For this argument, see K. Wengst, *Didache, Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Klemensbrief, Schrift an Diognet*, SUC 2 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1984), 118.

Another parallel has been noted between *Barn.* 6. 17–19 and Heb. 2. 5–9, but it is not obvious why Bartlet should include this comparison in his analysis. There appear to be only similarities of ideas and no verbal similarities between the two passages—in each case the writer appears to see eschatological salvation in terms of sovereignty over the natural world and makes it clear that such salvation has not yet arrived. Bartlet’s case is bound up with what he sees as a consistent coming together of ideas both here and elsewhere in *Barnabas* and Hebrews (on this see below).

The third passage is *Barn.* 7. 4, which may be compared with Heb. 9. 12 f., 19, and 10. 4. The literary relationship here concerns the single word *τράγος*, used instead of Lev. 16 (LXX)’s *χίμαρος*, a word that is the standard translation of the goat used as a sin offering on the Day of Atonement. Prostmeier, however, notes that *τράγος* is used in Aquila, Symmachus, and the Aldina in the translation of Lev. 16. 8, possibly indicating that there were texts available to the authors of both *Barnabas* and Hebrews that used *τράγος*. The same scholar also notes that the same word appears as a translation for goat in a number of the prophetic writings which were known to the author of *Barnabas*.⁵⁸

The final parallel is between *Barn.* 5. 1 and Heb. 12. 24 (cf. 13. 12). The similarity between these two verses lies in the reference to the blood of sprinkling (*Barnabas*: ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ ῥαντίσματος αὐτοῦ; in Hebrews, αἵματι ῥαντισμοῦ). The primary association in Hebrews appears to be with the Day of Atonement, which is also implied in *Barnabas* (see ch. 7). The phrase may have been generally known, as implied by its appearance in 1 Pet. 1. 2. In *Barnabas* there is an attempt explicitly to associate it with the forgiveness of sins, something which is present only implicitly in Hebrews (cf. *Barn.* 8. 1).

There appear to be no other examples of allusions to Hebrews in *Barnabas*. But let us now examine in more detail the view that *Barnabas* and Hebrews betray so much similarity in terms of their ideas that cumulatively we can speak of a literary relationship.⁵⁹

First, we should note the importance that both writers ascribe to the sacrificial death of Christ and the fact that both develop this idea with reference to a typology of the Day of Atonement. Moreover, although appearing in a much more developed form in *Barnabas*, an interest in the sacrifice of the red heifer (compare *Barn.* 8 and the reference to σποδὸς δαμάλεως at Heb. 9. 13) is apparent in both, possibly associating its sacrifice with the Day of Atonement. Both authors see Jesus’ death as abolishing the power of death or

⁵⁸ Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 296.

⁵⁹ For a brief history of scholarship on this matter, see Carleton Paget, *Barnabas*, 214–15.

death itself (see above), and connect it very clearly with the forgiveness of the believer's sin. While there is no explicit reference to Jesus as High Priest,⁶⁰ a title which is very important for the writer of Hebrews, there is at least a hint of knowledge of such a designation at *Barn.* 7. 9. Finally, in relation to this topic, we should note the strongly anti-cultic posture of both texts, in which, amongst other things, there appears to be a strong sense of the inadequacy of sacrifice even in the period before Christ.⁶¹ Such observations should be tempered by what might be seen as strange omissions on the part of the author of *Barnabas*. Particular note might be taken of the absence of any reference to the superiority of Jesus' death in terms of an atonement for sin at a deeper level (Jesus as atoner for the sins of conscience referred to at Heb. 9. 9, 14; 10. 2, 22; 13. 18); the related failure to refer to the once-and-for-allness of Jesus' sacrifice (Heb. 5. 6; 6. 20; 7. 3, 17, 21 f., 24 f., 28; 13. 8); and the fact that *Barnabas* refers to the temple as ναός rather than Hebrews' σκηνή.

A related area of comparison appears in the considerable interest both authors take in the idea of the covenant, an interest which might be seen as distinctive by virtue of the explicit use which both authors make of the term διαθήκη.⁶² Both link the formation of the covenant with Jesus' death (see *Barn.* 5. 7 and 7. 5) and are keen to emphasize the idea of Christians as inheritors of the covenant. Hebrews explicitly links the covenant of the Christians with Jer. 31 (Heb. 8. 8 f. and 10. 16), and there may be a hint at such an association at *Barn.* 14. 5 and 4. 8.⁶³ At *Barn.* 14. 4 we read that Moses received the covenant when he was a servant (θεράπων), whereas Jesus received it when he was Lord. While not explicitly connected with the covenant, Hebrews also makes use of a comparison between Moses as God's servant (θεράπων) and Jesus as God's son, in order similarly to play up the superiority of Jesus (3. 5–6). Once again these comparisons appear approximate (*Barnabas* nowhere makes use of the comparative motif; and one could see his attempt to connect Jesus' death with the covenant as much less explicit than that in Hebrews—note, for instance, the lack of reference to the covenant in *Barn.* 7 and 8).

⁶⁰ The term is clearly important for the writer of *1 Clement*, who is the other Apostolic Father strongly linked with Hebrews. For a recent discussion, see H. Lona, *Der erste Clemensbrief*, KAV 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 52–5.

⁶¹ See, e.g., the description of sacrifice at *Barn.* 2. 6 as ἀνθρωποποίησης and at Heb. 9. 10 as χειροποίησης.

⁶² In spite of the fact that the idea of covenant may be thought to be central to the NT, explicit reference to the concept is quite rare. In fact, Hebrews contains over half of the references. The term is similarly rare in the works of the Apostolic Fathers, occurring fourteen times in *Barnabas* and a mere two times elsewhere (both OT citations in *1 Clement*).

⁶³ In this context we might note the reference at *Barn.* 4. 8 to the covenant being sealed upon the hearts of Christians.

Both writers take an interest in the elusive concept of rest (*κατάπαυσις*) (see Heb. 3. 18 and 4. 6 f.; and *Barn.* 15. 3 f.). The fact that both mention this quite rare concept, even if with different eschatological emphases, is striking. But we should be cautious about positing any kind of literary relationship on the basis of this: we should note that in *Barn.* 6. 8 f., where we have a detailed exegesis of what it means to enter into the land of milk and honey, there is no mention of rest, a point that becomes interesting when we see how the term for rest takes the place of the term for land in Heb. 3–4 (see esp. Heb. 3. 18).⁶⁴

What might we deduce from the above? First, that there is no straightforward confluence of ideas between *Barnabas* and Hebrews. Rather, what we find is a series of potentially distinctive concerns and interests. Whether these can be said to show, as Bartlet wished to assert, that *Barnabas* was influenced by Hebrews is not certain. Discerning influence is a very difficult thing, and one might have expected more possible allusions if *Barnabas* had read Hebrews. More likely, perhaps, is a the possibility, altogether vaguer, that both texts arose out of similar milieu.⁶⁵

1 Peter

In *Barn.* 5. 1 and 1 Pet. 1. 2 the similarity lies in the reference to the sprinkling of Jesus' blood (*ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*; compare with *Barnabas* ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ ῥαντίσματος αὐτοῦ). But, as we have seen above, a reference to the sprinkling of blood is found in Heb. 12. 24, so we may in fact be in the presence of a Christian tradition to which the author of *Barnabas* had access.

In *Barn.* 4. 11 f. and 1 Pet. 4. 11 f. we note the coming together of the concepts of the fear of God and discriminating judgement. But little can be concluded from this, not least because we have a conjunction of similar ideas in 2 Cor. 5. 10.

As regards *Barn.* 6. 2–4 and 1 Pet. 1. 17, the similarity here lies simply in the citation of Isa. 28. 16. But it appears in a strikingly different form in *Barnabas*.⁶⁶

⁶⁴ See Carleton Paget, *Barnabas*, 221: 'If B. had read Heb. it seems to be stretching the limits of the imagination to argue that he would not even have hinted at a *κατάπαυσις* to describe the entry.'

⁶⁵ Precisely the explanation of Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 55, for the relationship between Hebrews and *1 Clement*, a text which ironically contains a much closer literary parallel to Hebrews (cf. *1 Clem.* 36. 2–5 and Heb. 1. 3–5, 7, 8, and 13) and more shared vocabulary, but is ideologically much less close than *Barnabas*.

⁶⁶ The two passages are adequately discussed by Bartlet, 'Barnabas', *NTAF*, 15.

Apocalypse

In *Barn.* 6. 13 and Apoc. 21. 5 the reference to the last things being like the first, a sentiment which may have its roots in Isa. 43. 19, is a sufficiently well-known trope to be explained by reference to traditions in common.

Bartlet notes that many of the parallels between *Barn.* 7. 9 and Apoc. 1. 7, 13 can be explained by reference to common Christian traditions, in particular those which applied Zech. 12. 10 to aspects of the passion. Bartlet, however, argues that 'the substantival use of *ποδήρη* found in the N.T. only in Apoc. 1. 13, might suggest that Barnabas' language was unconsciously influenced by this passage also'.⁶⁷ Certainly both passages associate the garment with the exalted Christ, but in quite different contexts and to make very different points.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

In the preceding paragraphs, I have not been able to *demonstrate* that the author of *Barnabas* knew an individual New Testament book. He comes closest to quoting Matthew (*Barn.* 4. 14) and seems to show knowledge of what one might loosely call synoptic passion traditions, although these could have been made known to him through an already existing typological development of the two goats on the Day of Atonement. He seems to show knowledge of a text influenced by a quotation from Paul in Romans. Beyond that, it is difficult to prove any real knowledge of the apostle's work, although I did suggest that there may be evidence of a modification of a Paulinizing tradition in *Barn.* 13. Even where we are able to point to considerable convergence of theme and, up to a point, thought, such as with the Epistle to the Hebrews, there is no evidence of allusions to that text. In one sense my minimalist conclusion is the result of my insistence on *demonstration* of knowledge of the NT. It is equally very difficult to *demonstrate* that the author of *Barnabas* did not know the texts discussed but has cited them and used them in a variety of ways. Moreover, in a text which appears to associate 'perfect knowledge' with a Christian appropriation of Old Testament promises and the one covenant of God (see esp. 1. 5; 47 f.; 13 and 14), extensive reference to Old Testament texts, by no means always in a literal form, and lack of reference to so-called New Testament texts, appears understandable, an observation which should keep us from deducing anything of significance about the status of the latter texts at the time *Barnabas* was being written.

⁶⁷ Bartlet, 'Barnabas', *NTAF*, 16. For a lengthy discussion of the meaning of the term and its appearances in the OT, see Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 310–13.

This page intentionally left blank

2 *Clement* and the Writings that later formed the New Testament

Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett

INTRODUCTION

The so-called *Second Letter of Clement to the Corinthians* is usually described as a homily (apparently based primarily on Isa. 54. 1; see 2 *Clem.* 2. 1–3), for the implied author states that someone is reading the text aloud (19. 1) and clearly suggests that those whom the reader addresses are gathered in the context of worship (17. 3).¹ There is no epistolary framework, and the association of the title with *1 Clement* comes about from its transmission with that letter, although the fact that they circulated together does suggest that there was some perception of a link between these texts at least by the fifth century, when both were included in the Codex Alexandrinus. There they follow Revelation, but are apparently considered part of the New Testament.² It has been suggested that 2 *Clement* was known to Eusebius (*EH* 3. 38. 4), but the fact that it is not a letter makes this identification uncertain. The only secure conclusions that may be reached are that its author, date, and place of composition are unknown, although there is critical consensus that it should be placed somewhere around the first half or the middle of the second century. One argument often used in support of putting it towards the middle rather than the beginning of the second century is its apparent use of a range of the writings later included in the New Testament, including the synoptic gospels to which the letter may refer as ‘scripture’ (2. 4; cf. 8. 5; 14. 2).³ It seems likely that the author recognized certain Christian authorities alongside

¹ But see A. Stewart-Sykes, *From Prophecy to Preaching: A Search for the Origins of the Christian Homily*, VCSup 59 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 174–87, who argues that ‘it is not a typical homily, but is wedded much more closely to catechesis’ (p. 174).

² For a description of the table of contents included in this codex, see J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 5 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1890), 1. 1., 117.

³ See below, p. 255.

the Jewish Scriptures (14. 2, where he refers to τὰ βιβλία καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι), but it is unclear whether or not those authorities (οἱ ἀπόστολοι) are written texts.⁴ And even if so, their identity is unclear; it is possible that the texts that he associated with the apostles may have included some writings that were not among those later included in the New Testament. Thus *2 Clement* is of particular interest on account of what appears to be its author's use of a variety of forms of Jesus tradition—post-synoptic and otherwise—and also because of a significant number of passages in which he includes material with parallels in writings later recognized as canonical, though there is no clear evidence of his direct use of any of these other texts.

The remainder of this chapter is in two parts. The first—and more substantial—part considers the nature of the relationship between Jesus tradition in *2 Clement* and the canonical gospels; the second, the question of the relationship between *2 Clement* and the rest of the writings later included in the New Testament.⁵

2 CLEMENT AND THE GOSPELS

2 Clement is one of the most interesting texts in the context of the present discussion about possible knowledge of the texts which later became canonized as part of the New Testament, particularly in relation to the gospels. We may consider very briefly, first, the question of possible links between *2 Clement* and the gospel of John before going on to the more complex question of possible links between *2 Clement* and the synoptic gospels.

⁴ See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1. 2. 245–6; Helmut Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern*, TU 65 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957), 67–9; K. P. Donfried, *The Setting of Second Clement in Early Christianity*, NovTSup 38 (Leiden: Brill, 1974), 93–6.

⁵ Three scholars were responsible for the discussion of *2 Clement* in *NTAF*: J. V. Bartlet, A. J. Carlyle, and P. V. M. Benecke. In this chapter, Christopher Tuckett has written on the gospels and Andrew Gregory on the rest of the New Testament. While each author takes full responsibility for the opinions presented in the section that he has written, we are glad to acknowledge the assistance of Professor William L. Petersen, with whom we have had extensive discussions about *2 Clement* and early Christian traditions. Professor Petersen would disagree with many of the conclusions that we reach (see above, Ch. 2), but has been generous in sharing with us his own assessment of many of the parallels that we discuss.

2 Clement and John

Only a very small number of possible examples suggest any link between 2 *Clement* and the gospel of John.⁶ Two will be discussed here briefly.

At 2 *Clem.* 9. 5, the author refers to ‘Christ, the Lord who saved us, though he was originally spirit, became flesh (ἐγένετο σάρξ) and so called us’. In one way this is clearly reminiscent of the language of John 1. 14.⁷ But whether this shows a literary link, or simply reflects common Christian terminology, is not so clear.

2 *Clem.* 4. 5, in a citation of what ‘the Lord said’, has ‘if you be gathered together with me in my bosom...’. Some have seen in the reference to followers of Jesus being ‘in my bosom’ an allusion to John 13. 23 (the beloved disciple being in the ‘bosom’ of Jesus).⁸ The full citation will be discussed in more detail later. Here, however, we may note that this part of the saying is paralleled in a Jewish-Christian gospel, and hence any allusion to John is likely to be at most indirect. In fact, the language may be closer to that of Isa. 40. 11.⁹ Certainly John does not provide a precedent for talk about being ‘gathered’ into Jesus’ bosom. Thus it seems unlikely that there is an allusion to John’s gospel here.

Other alleged parallels with John are extremely remote.¹⁰ It therefore seems very unlikely that 2 *Clement* shows any knowledge of the gospel of John at all.

⁶ Possible echoes of John are not even mentioned by Bartlet, *NTAF*, 124–36, and only rarely in passing in Donfried, *Setting*, in his chapter on ‘quotations from authoritative sources’ (pp. 49–97, which also includes a section on allusions). Some allusions are suggested by R. Warns, *Untersuchungen zum 2. Clemens-Brief* (dissertation, Marburg, 1985), 245–8.

⁷ Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 246–57, argues that 2 *Clement* does not know John, but that the language comes from opponents, assumed to be Valentinian Gnostics, with whom the author is engaged. This depends, however, on a specific theory about the ‘opponents’ addressed in 2 *Clement*, and this is somewhat uncertain: see A. Lindemann, *Die Clemensbriefe*, HNT 17 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 192. The echo of John may have been recognized by the scribe of the Constantinople MS of 2 *Clement* who has λόγος for πνεῦμα just before this, thus strengthening the echo of John 1: see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 1. 230; Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 246.

⁸ Cf. Donfried, *Setting*, 66; T. Aono, *Die Entwicklung des paulinischen Gerichtsgedanken bei den apostolischen Vätern* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1979), 135.

⁹ LXX (in some MSS) τῷ βραχίονι αὐτοῦ συνάξει ἄρνας καὶ ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ αὐτοῦ βαστάσει: see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1. 2. 218.

¹⁰ Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 258 ff., refers to 2 *Clem.* 9. 6 and John 3. 5; he also sees a possible echo of John 1. 1 ff. in 2 *Clem.* 14. 2 (the reference to pre-existence, but with a quite different reference). Both seem far too distant as parallels to bear any weight in the present argument. Cf. too Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 242, on 14. 2. There is also a reference to an ‘advocate’ (παράκλητος) in 2 *Clem.* 6. 9, but again it is not clear how far this is to be seen as derived from the Johannine NT tradition: cf. Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 265 f.

2 *Clement* and Synoptic Tradition

By contrast with the situation in relation to John, *2 Clement* displays a number of interesting parallels with materials also appearing in the synoptic gospels. In a number of instances, ‘Clement’¹¹ gives what appear to be explicit citations, or at least provides explicit introductory formulae introducing material which often (but not always) has parallels with material in the synoptic gospels. For the most part, these are presented as things that ‘the Lord’ ‘says/said’. I consider first the texts where the author cites with an explicit introductory formula, or where the words of the text seem very close to the synoptic tradition. I then consider texts where *2 Clement* and the synoptic gospels both cite the same Old Testament text. Finally, I consider briefly some possible instances of common terminology and possible allusions to the synoptic tradition.

Gospel ‘Citations’

2 Clem. 2. 4

καὶ ἑτέρα δὲ γραφή λέγει,
ὅτι οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι
δικαίους, ἀλλὰ
ἁμαρτωλοὺς.

Mark 2. 17 = Matt. 9. 13

οὐκ [γὰρ] ἦλθον καλέσαι
δικαίους ἀλλὰ
ἁμαρτωλοὺς.

Luke 5. 32

οὐκ ἐλήλυθα καλέσαι
δικαίους ἀλλὰ
ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν.

Barn. 5. 9: οὐκ ἦλθεν καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς.

Justin, *1 Apol.* 15. 8: οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν.
[1 Tim. 1. 15: Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἁμαρτωλοὺς σῶσαι.]

The saying in *2 Clem.* 2. 4 is clearly all but identical with that in Matt. 9. 13 // Mark 2. 17.¹² The parallel in Luke has the (typically Lucan) reference to ‘repentance’ at the end, which is lacking in *2 Clement*. Hence there is no real question of any dependence, direct or indirect, of *2 Clement* on Luke here.¹³

The saying, or something very similar, occurs in a number of places in early Christian sources: e.g., in *Barn.* 5. 9 (in a form identical to that in *2 Clement* and Mathew/Mark) and in Justin, *1 Apol.* 15. 8 (in a form very close to that

¹¹ The text known as *2 Clement* is universally accepted as not being by the same author as *1 Clement*. It derives its modern name on the basis of its link in the MSS which attest it with *1 Clement*. I refer to the author then as ‘Clement’, using inverted commas.

¹² Matthew and Mark here are in turn all but identical. The only difference between the two is that Matthew has an extra γὰρ at the start of the saying: but such an inconsequential detail can scarcely have any significance in the present discussion.

¹³ Cf. A. Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus*, WUNT 2.169 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 146.

of Luke).¹⁴ This may show that the saying circulated independently; and indeed it may be that the saying in the story of Mark 2 // Matt. 9 represents an independent saying that has been incorporated secondarily into the story of Jesus eating with tax collectors and sinners.¹⁵ Thus some have argued that the saying was a floating tradition, and that its occurrence in *2 Clement* is due to 'Clement's' use of this common tradition, not necessarily of the synoptic gospels themselves.¹⁶ On the other hand, the presence of the saying as independent of its synoptic context in *Barnabas* and Justin may represent a post-synoptic development of the tradition.

We should also note that 'Clement' here states that the saying comes from 'another' *γραφή* (having just cited a verse from the Old Testament, viz. Isa. 54. 1). This at the very least suggests that 'Clement' is taking his quotation here from a written source, and hence not from some free-floating oral tradition. Further, it would seem that the source has almost the status of 'scripture' for 'Clement', *γραφή* being the word that Christians came to use to refer to Scripture.¹⁷ One cannot be certain of the last point, but the language certainly suggests that, rather than quoting a free-floating saying of Jesus from some unattached oral tradition, 'Clement' is rather quoting the saying as coming from a larger *written text*. It is of course theoretically possible that this text was a gospel text otherwise unknown to us.¹⁸ But a more economical solution would be to say that *2 Clement* here presupposes the gospel of Matthew.¹⁹ Thus, whilst certainty is not possible, some dependence on Matthew (direct or indirect) seems to be the most likely explanation of the evidence here.²⁰

¹⁴ For the texts, see above. 1 Tim. 1. 15 is also often cited in this context, though the vocabulary is by no means as close as in the other texts. E.g., 1 Timothy speaks of 'saving', rather than 'calling' sinners; and the verse lacks the antithetical structure evident in the others, which sets the claim about calling/saving sinners over against the negative assertion that Jesus did not come to call/save the 'righteous'. As we shall see, 1 Tim. 1. 15 might be closer to the words of *2 Clem.* 2. 7 (discussed below). Here though, it should probably be left out of account.

¹⁵ Cf. Donfried, *Setting*, 57, referring to R. Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1968), 18.

¹⁶ So, e.g., Donfried, *Setting*, 59 f.

¹⁷ It is used this way elsewhere in *2 Clement* at 6. 1; 14. 1, 2.

¹⁸ Cf. Bartlet, *NTAF*, 133; Donfried, *Setting* 59 f., who speaks of a 'Gemeindetradition', and who argues that *γραφή* may refer to 'words of Jesus transmitted orally'. The evidence for such a claim seems lacking.

¹⁹ Theoretically it could be Mark; but there is no other evidence in *2 Clement* presupposing knowledge or use of Mark, and Matthew's gospel generally was by far the most popular in the early church. Hence it is surely more likely that, if any synoptic gospel is presupposed here, it is Matthew rather than Mark. Cf. Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 71. See too Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 278, for the lack of any reference to Mark in *2 Clement*. Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 205, also refers to the use of *ἔλεος* at 3. 1, which might be a reminiscence of the quotation of Hos. 6. 6 earlier in the same verse in Matthew (cf. too Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 286).

²⁰ Cf. W.-D. Köhler, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus*, WUNT 2.24 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 136, qualifying É. Massaux, *Influence de*

2 Clem. 2. 7

οὕτως καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠθελῆσεν σώσαι τὰ
ἀπολλύμενα, καὶ ἔσωσεν πολλούς, ἐλθὼν
καὶ καλέσας ἡμᾶς ἤδη ἀπολλυμένους

Luke 19. 10

ἦλθεν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ζητῆσαι
καὶ σώσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός.

[Matt. 18. 11: ἦλθεν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (ζητῆσαι καὶ) σώσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός.]

[1 Tim. 1. 15: Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἁμαρτωλοὺς σώσαι.]

This ‘parallel’ between 2 *Clement* and the synoptic gospels is rather unlike some of the others considered. First, it is not signalled by ‘Clement’ as a quotation as such (as many of the other parallels are): it is simply presented as a (quasi-summary) statement, apparently by the author himself, about the intention and significance of Jesus’ ministry. Second, the parallel with the synoptic tradition is at best a fairly loose one. The closest parallel is to be found in Luke 19. 10, which also refers to the aim of Jesus’ life and work as being to ‘save’ the ‘lost’.²¹ However, there is no reference in 2 *Clement* to Jesus as ‘Son of Man’, or to his ‘coming’ (at least in this part of the saying). Again, the ‘parallel’ with 1 Tim. 1. 15 is sometimes mentioned in this context, but the agreement in wording is even less close than Luke 19. 10 (really only ‘save’ is common to the two texts: the object of the ‘saving’ is ‘sinners’ in 1 Timothy, rather than the ‘lost’).

It is possible that 2 *Clement* here has drawn on the saying in Luke 19. 10 (and also, in doing so, adapted it slightly). But one cannot really say more with any degree of confidence. The saying is too general, and the sentiments too widespread, for one to be able to pin down any precise parallel exactly.²²

l’Evangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée, BETL 75 (Leuven: Peeters, 1986), 139, who takes this as an example where dependence on Matthew is ‘certain’: Köhler, takes it as ‘gut möglich’. Cf. too Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 71. Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 287, takes this as a clear example of 2 *Clement* citing Matthew’s gospel itself as scripture; but that may be too precise.

²¹ There is also a parallel in Matt. 18. 11, though this is generally regarded as a later interpolation into the text of Matthew, based on the verse in Luke 19. 10. The MSS which contain the verse in Matt. 18 vary slightly, with the majority omitting *ζητῆσαι καὶ*, though a few include these words. The shorter version of Matt. 18. 11 is then in fact slightly closer to 2 *Clement* here (in omitting any reference to ‘seeking’). But one probably should not build too much on this.

²² Cf. too Bartlet, *NTAF*, 132; Köhler, *Rezeption*, 141 (at least in relation to Matt. 18. 11); Gregory, *Rezeption*, 146 f. Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 109, proposes a possible recollection of the Lucan verse by memory. Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 206, says that ‘die Nähe zu der Tradition, die auch in Lk 19,10, 1 Tim 1,15 begegnet, ist deutlich’, but is no more specific. However, Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 304 f., sees here a clear use of either Luke 19. 10 or Matt. 18. 11.

2 Clem. 3. 2

Matt. 10. 32

Luke 12. 8

λέγει δὲ καὶ αὐτός·

τὸν ὁμολογήσαντά με
ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων,Πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ὁμολογήσει
ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν
ἀνθρώπων,πᾶς ὃς ἂν ὁμολογήσῃ ἐν
ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν
ἀνθρώπων,

ὁμολογήσω αὐτὸν

ὁμολογήσω ἀγὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ

καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
ὁμολογήσει ἐν αὐτῷ

ἐνώπιον τοῦ πατρός μου.

ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρός μου
τοῦ ἐν [τοις] οὐρανοῖς·ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων
τοῦ θεοῦ·

Rev. 3. 5: καὶ ὁμολογήσω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐνώπιον τοῦ πατρός μου καὶ ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ.

2 Clem. 3. 2 refers explicitly to a saying of Jesus. The closest parallel is undoubtedly the Q saying in Matt. 10. 32 // Luke 12. 8.²³ There is no verbatim agreement down to the last preposition or detail: e.g., 2 Clement does not have a *πᾶς* construction, it uses *ἐνώπιον* rather than *ἔμπροσθεν*, and it has the object of the ‘confessing’ as an accusative rather than *ἐν* + dative. These details are, however, relatively trivial, involving little if any difference in substance and hence are scarcely significant in the present discussion.

Much more relevant is the fact that 2 Clement here agrees closely in substance with Matthew against Luke in (a) making Jesus’ statement about his confessing as a first person claim (rather than a third person reference to the ‘Son of Man’ as in Luke), and (b) having the ‘audience’ before whom Jesus will confess those who confess him as ‘my father’ (Matthew also has ‘in heaven’), rather than Luke’s ‘the angels of God’. The version in 2 Clement is thus significantly closer to Matthew’s version than to Luke’s. Further, and probably of most significance in the present context, both these differences between Matthew and Luke are almost universally taken by commentators on the synoptic tradition and/or Q to be due to MattR. Thus Matthew’s first person form of the saying is almost universally taken to be a secondary change by Matthew of an original ‘Son of Man’ saying in Q;²⁴ and Matthew’s

²³ The ‘parallel’ often cited here from Rev. 3. 5 is somewhat more remote: there is nothing in this verse implying the reciprocal relationship whereby Jesus will ‘confess’ precisely the one who ‘confesses’ him. In Rev. 3, the one who will be confessed by Jesus is the one who ‘conquers’. Hence, *pace* e.g. Gregory, *Reception*, 144 f., who takes the common use of *ἐνώπιον* in Revelation and 2 Clement as evidence that there was a version of the saying circulating independently of the synoptics (cf. too Donfried, *Setting*, 61); but such a common synonym for such an inconsequential word in the saying can only bear this weight in the argument with great difficulty.

²⁴ This is the reading adopted (with some reservations) in the IQP reconstruction of Q: see J. M. Robinson, P. Hoffmann, and J. S. Kloppenborg, *The Critical Edition of Q* (Minneapolis: Fortress; Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 304. The main dissenting voice today is that of Paul Hoffmann: see, e.g., his ‘Der Menschensohn in Lukas 12.8’, *NTS* 44 (1998), 357–79; for a response,

reference to God as ‘my father’ represents a feature which is characteristic and distinctive to Matthew in the synoptic tradition.²⁵ The version in *2 Clement* thus agrees with Matthew at just those points where Matthew has redacted the tradition. It is thus most probable that *2 Clement* presupposes the development of the tradition after it has gone through Matthew’s editorial hand, and hence presupposes Matthew’s finished gospel.²⁶ Whether *2 Clement* has derived the saying directly from Matthew is not certain; and indeed the slight differences from Matthew might suggest otherwise (or at least a somewhat loose ‘citation’, perhaps from memory).²⁷ However, the evidence here would suggest that, in its tradition history, the saying has passed through Matthew’s gospel by the time it reaches the author of *2 Clement*.

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 2 Clem. 4. 2 | Matt. 7. 21 | Luke 6. 46 |
| λέγει γάρ οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι Κύριε, κύριε, σωθήσεται, ἀλλ’ ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην. | Οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι, Κύριε κύριε, εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἀλλ’ ὁ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. | Τί δέ με καλεῖτε, Κύριε κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε ἃ λέγω; |

A very similar situation may arise in *2 Clem.* 4. 2. This is another explicit ‘citation’ of what ‘the Lord’ (= Jesus) ‘says’. The citation is clearly close in substance to Matt. 7. 21 // Luke 6. 46. Further, once again, *2 Clement* is much closer to the version in Matthew than to that in Luke (cf. the common

see C. M. Tuckett, ‘Q 12,8 once again—“Son of Man” or “I”?’ in J. M. Asgeirsson, K. de Troyer, and M. V. Meyer (eds.), *From Quest to Q: Festschrift for J. M. Robinson*, BETL 146 (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 171–88, with further references. For others supporting this, see e.g. Bultmann, *History*, 112; S. Schulz, *Q—Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zurich: TVZ, 1971), 68; W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988–97), ii. 216.

²⁵ For Luke’s ‘angels’ as preserving the Q version, see Robinson *et al.*, *Critical Edition*. Also Schulz, *Q*; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*.

²⁶ Cf. Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 72; Massaux, *Influence*, 142 f.; Köhler, *Rezeption*, 131 f.; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 207. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1. 2. 216, describes the text in *2 Clement* here as ‘a free quotation of Matt. x. 32’.

²⁷ Donfried, *Setting*, 61, argues on the basis of ‘substantial differences’ between *2 Clement* and the synoptic versions for dependence on an independent source. (cf. too Bartlet, *NTAF*, 130). But this seems unnecessary. The differences are scarcely ‘substantial’, and in all important respects of substance, *2 Clement* seems to agree closely with Matthew. Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 333 f., takes it as coming from the (one) apocryphal gospel which he posits as used by ‘Clement’ for a number of his citations, and argues that it follows on closely from the saying cited in 5. 2–4, though this gospel in turn presupposes the gospels of Matthew and Luke. But, as Warns himself is certain that ‘Clement’ has used the synoptic gospels themselves (directly), it may be easiest to see this as an example of ‘Clement’s’ use of Matthew, rather than of another gospel text using Matthew.

structure to the saying *οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι . . . ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶν*). Moreover, as in the previous example, Luke's version here is also widely assumed to preserve the Q version more accurately, with Matthew's version being due to MattR. Certainly, at most of the points where Matthew differs from Luke here, Matthew's version seems to be characteristically Matthean (cf. the reference to 'kingdom of heaven' and 'my father in heaven').²⁸

It is true that the version in *2 Clement* lacks the features that might most obviously be identified as MattR ('kingdom of heaven' and 'my father in heaven'). Thus some have argued that the version in *2 Clement* may represent an earlier form of the saying, which Matthew then redacted.²⁹ This is of course possible. However, it seems unnecessary, since (a) there is little reason (apart from the version in *2 Clement* itself) to postulate an earlier form of the saying in Matthew other than the (probable) Q version as now represented in Luke 6. 46, and (b) the differences between *2 Clement* and Matthew, especially at the points where Matthew seems peculiarly Matthean, can be explained as due to the preferred vocabulary of the author of *2 Clement*.³⁰ Thus the use of *σῶζειν* in the saying (parallel to Matthew's 'enter the kingdom of heaven') takes up the use of the verb in 4. 1, and in turn this vocabulary of 'save'/'salvation' is prominent throughout this section of *2 Clement*.³¹ Further, 'righteousness' is a favourite word of this author.³²

Thus, although one cannot point to verbatim agreement with clearly identifiable elements of Matthean redaction, the fact remains that the version in *2 Clement* does agree with Matthew in what is (probably) Matthew's restructuring of the saying from Q 6. 46; and the further points where *2 Clement* differs from Matthew (and in so doing avoids the more obviously Matthean terminology) can be adequately explained by the linguistic preferences of 'Clement' himself. Once again, the most economical explanation of the evidence would be that *2 Clement* presupposes the development of the

²⁸ Cf. Robinson *et al.*, *Critical Edition*, 94; also Bultmann, *History*, 116; U. Luz, *Matthew 1–7* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 440; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, i. 711 f.; J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel of Luke (I–IX)*, AB 28 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981), 643 f.

²⁹ So, e.g., Donfried, *Setting*, 63; Gregory, *Reception*, 141, mentioning the possibility of a 'Q^{Mt}' source used by Matthew alone.

³⁰ See Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 81.

³¹ Köster (*ibid.*) points out that *σῶζειν* occurs often in *2 Clem.* 1–3 (at 1. 4, 7; 2. 5, 7; 3. 3); cf. too *σωτηρία* at 1. 1, 7. Cf. too Bartlet, *NTAF*, 131.

³² Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 82, compares 11. 7; 19. 3. Köhler, *Rezeption*, 134, following Massaux, *Influence*, 144, points out that it is thoroughly appropriate for a follower of Matthew to equate 'righteousness' with 'the will of the father in heaven!' But see too Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 298 f. Warns also refers to the reference in 3. 5 (in the prelude to this citation) to 'doing what he says' as evidence that the author knew the Lucan form of the saying as well (even though Warns takes the citation in 4. 2 itself as coming from the apocryphal gospel which he argues was used by 'Clement').

tradition after it has reached Matthew. As before, it may well be that 2 *Clement* does not 'cite' Matthew's gospel directly. Nevertheless, it does appear clearly to presuppose Matthew's finished gospel as part of its tradition and on which it is (directly or indirectly) dependent.

2 *Clem.* 4. 5

Matt. 7. 23

Luke 13. 27

εἶπεν ὁ κύριος·

ἐὰν ᾗτε μετ' ἐμοῦ

συνηγμένοι ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ

μου καὶ μὴ ποιήτε τὰς

ἐντολάς μου, ἀποβαλῶ

ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐρῶ ὑμῖν·

ὑπάγετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, οὐκ

οἶδα ὑμᾶς, πόθεν ἐστέ,

ἐργάται ἀνομίας

καὶ τότε ὁμολογήσω

αὐτοῖς ὅτι Οὐδέποτε

ἔγνων ὑμᾶς· ἀποχωρεῖτε

ἀπ' ἐμοῦ οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι

τὴν ἀνομίαν.

καὶ ἐρεῖ λέγων ὑμῖν, Οὐκ

οἶδα [ὑμᾶς] πόθεν ἐστέ·

ἀπόστητε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, πάντες

ἐργάται ἀδικίας.

Ps. 6. 9 (LXX): ἀπόστητε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ πάντες οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν.

Justin, *1 Apol.* 16. 11: καὶ τότε ἐρῶ αὐτοῖς· Ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ἐργάται τῆς ἀνομίας.

'Jewish' Gospel (gloss at Matt. 7. 5 in MS 1424): ἐὰν ᾗτε ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ μου καὶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς μὴ ποιήτε. ἐκ τοῦ κόλπου μου ἀπορρίψω ὑμᾶς.

The second citation (of what 'the Lord' 'said') in 2 *Clem.* 4 is considerably more complex.³³ For many modern interpreters, the saying divides into two halves: the second half clearly bears a close relationship to Matt. 7. 23 // Luke 13. 27; the first half has no clear parallel with any synoptic saying. However, it should be noted that such a division of 2 *Clem.* 4. 5 into two halves has no real basis in the text of 2 *Clement* itself: the two halves run straight on without any obvious break.³⁴

In the second half of the saying here, there are clear parallels with Matthew and Luke. As well as the problems of dealing with a section of Q tradition present in both Matthew and Luke, the situation here is rendered more complicated by the fact that the Q verse appears to be a (deliberate?) echo of the words of Ps. 6. 9 (LXX); it is then not clear whether the synoptic version closer in wording to Ps. 6. 9 is more original, or whether one evangelist has secondarily aligned the wording to be closer to the OT text. Further, there are

³³ It is not clear if this is to be regarded as a saying independent of 4. 2 or a continuation of the earlier citation: cf., e.g., Aono, *Entwicklung*, 131: 4. 3–4 may be the author's interpretation and application of the saying in 4. 2, and 4. 5 may just continue the latter. Similarly Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 325.

³⁴ Cf. Köhler, *Rezeption*, 144: 'Festzuhalten ist, daß der Verfasser des II Clem beide Zitathälften als Einheit zitiert.'

textual variants in the text of the gospels making for an even more complex situation.

As the texts stand in the versions given above, it would seem that the text of *2 Clement* is closer to the Lucan version. Thus both agree (against Matthew) in the use of ἐρῶ/ἐρεῖ (Matthew, ὁμολογήσω),³⁵ οὐκ οὔδα ὑμᾶς³⁶ (Matthew, Οὐδέποτε ἔγνων ὑμᾶς), πῶθεν ἐστέ (no parallel in Matthew), and in ἐργάται (Matthew, οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι).³⁷ The *2 Clement* version is possibly closer to Matthew only in the final use of ἀνομία, where Luke uses ἀδικία, though even here there is no certainty, as the D text of Luke here has ἀνομίαν.³⁸ Since this reading of Luke was also known to Marcion, it is clearly an early reading. Thus the saying in *2 Clem.* 4. 5b could be seen as parallel to (one version of the text of) Luke alone.

Köster and Bellinzoni have sought to use the evidence from Justin (*1 Apol.* 16. 11; cf. too *Dial.* 76. 5) to argue that Justin here (as elsewhere) is using a version of the tradition which harmonized the texts of Matthew and Luke, and that the similar version in *2 Clement* here shows that this harmony pre-dates its use by Justin.³⁹ It is not so clear, however, that this backs up such a theory. Justin's text at this point seems to be close to the text of Matthew,⁴⁰ and in the text here, the only common features with Luke are the common use of ἐρῶ (also in *Dial.* 76. 5) and the use of the noun ἐργάται rather than the participle ἐργαζόμενοι.⁴¹ As Donfried says, 'it is difficult to see any significant relationship between *2 Clement* and Justin'.⁴²

³⁵ Though a reading of ἐρῶ in Matthew here may be implied by some old Latin MSS (a c g h) and sy^c: see Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 87.

³⁶ ὑμᾶς is present in some MSS of Luke at this point (D Θ pm), but missing from others.

³⁷ The last point is scarcely significant, given that the two versions are all but synonymous in this respect. But in any case, ἐργάται may be the reading implied by some old Latin MSS (a c h q): see Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 87.

³⁸ Also 1424 Marcion. (I owe this observation to Professor W. L. Petersen who has provided many insights into the discussion of this essay in private conversations.) But in any case, the use of ἀνομία serves to align the saying more closely to the wording of Ps. 6. 9, LXX. Thus it could be that any change from a Lucan version which used ἀδικία could be due to a secondary assimilation to the text of Ps. 6, without any reference to Matthew at all.

³⁹ See Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 92; H. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International; London: SCM, 1990), 356; A. J. Bellinzoni, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr*, NovTSup 17 (Leiden: Brill, 1967), 25.

⁴⁰ For the fuller context of the text in Justin, see Donfried, *Setting*, 64 f. The case for Justin using a harmonized text is based on parallels with both Matthew and Luke: but the main parallels to Luke come elsewhere (e.g., at 16. 11a, where Justin refers to 'eating and drinking', as in Luke 13. 26 and not in Matt. 7. 22). Here Justin agrees with Matthew in using ἀποχωρεῖτε (Luke, ἀπόστητε; *2 Clement*, ὑπάγετε).

⁴¹ It is doubtful, however, whether the latter can bear much weight in the present context: cf. n. 37 above.

⁴² Donfried, *Setting*, 67. Donfried's comment is probably justified in relation to this parallel considered in isolation. However, the case for the use of a common harmony is strengthened if one accepts the theory that the saying at 4. 5 is a continuation of the saying at 4. 2. For, as we saw

Whether one can identify elements that are MattR and/or LkR in the parallels here is not certain. It is difficult to say which way redaction has gone in the allusion to Ps. 6. 9. (Has one evangelist made an original Q reading that was identical with the wording of Ps. 6 less close?⁴³ Or has one evangelist assimilated the text to the wording of Ps. 6? Or has Matthew's well-known interest in ἀνομία influenced the wording?) Perhaps more convincing is the suggestion that the phrase *πόθεν ἐστέ* in Luke 13. 27 is due to LkR, assimilating to the context implied by 13. 25.⁴⁴ If so, then this might imply that the version of the saying in 2 *Clem.* 4. 5 presupposes the redactional activity of Luke, and hence the existence of Luke's finished gospel.⁴⁵

However, the form in which the saying might have been known to 'Clement' has to take account of the first half of the saying as well. Here there is a well-known close parallel to the version in 2 *Clement* in the marginal gloss to Matt. 7. 5 found in MS 1424, said to be from 'the Jewish gospel' (το Ἰουδαϊκόν). The identity of this 'Jewish (gospel)' is much debated. Vielhauer has argued that it is the *Gospel of the Nazaraeans*,⁴⁶ though this can never be certain. According to Koester, this gospel 'was essentially an expanded edition of the Gospel of Matthew'.⁴⁷ However, as Koester also points out, the text mentioned in the marginal gloss echoes Matthean language (especially in the reference to doing 'the will of my father in heaven'), and it is at just this point that the text of 2 *Clement* is not parallel (it has 'my commandments').⁴⁸ Thus Koester claims that the source of 2 *Clement* cannot be the *Gospel of the Nazaraeans* itself; rather, the version in the Jewish-Christian gospel may be later, having assimilated to the text of Matthew, and 2 *Clement* may be witness to an earlier form of the tradition.

Yet it could as easily be argued that the version in 2 *Clement* is later, at least judged in form-critical terms: the object of the 'doing'/'not doing' is here no longer God's commands, but those of Jesus himself ('my' commandments). Hence the version in 2 *Clement* represents a version that is significantly 'higher' christologically. Whilst it is clearly dangerous to posit too neat a developmental scheme in relation to Christology within early Christianity, it may still be that the version of this saying here in 2 *Clement*

in discussing 4. 2, 2 *Clement* there is close to Matt. 7. 21; and Justin, 1 *Apol.* 16. 9 (just before 16. 11 with its parallel to 2 *Clem.* 4. 5) has a saying which agrees almost verbatim with Matt. 7. 21.

⁴³ Cf. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 356.

⁴⁴ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 83–4; Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 356. So too the IQP version here: see Robinson *et al.*, *Critical Edition*, 412.

⁴⁵ Cf. too Massaux, *Influence*, 150; Aono, *Entwicklung*, 134.

⁴⁶ See P. Vielhauer, 'Jewish Christian Gospels', in E. Hennecke (ed.), *New Testament Apocrypha*, i (ET: London: SCM, 1963), 136.

⁴⁷ Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 357; Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 92 f.

⁴⁸ Koester, *ibid.*

represents a later development than the version preserved in the marginal gloss in MS 1424.

Nevertheless, whatever one decides about this, it would seem that ‘Clement’ here has access to, and uses, a form of a saying of Jesus that has no parallel in any synoptic gospel, but which was clearly known more widely. Further, there is no evidence that ‘Clement’ thought that the whole of his ‘citation’ at 4. 5 was anything other than a single citation (see above). It is thus most likely that ‘Clement’ is here drawing on a source for a saying of Jesus that is not one of the synoptic gospels, even though it overlaps with (at least) Luke in the second half. The analysis above may show that this source presupposed, and used, the tradition as it had been developed by Luke himself; i.e., it presupposes the finished gospel of Luke. But the tradition appears to have developed still further after that, perhaps reaching a stage of a further written ‘gospel’ (a ‘Jewish’ ‘gospel’), which may then have been the form in which the tradition was accessed by ‘Clement’. The evidence of this is that, at this point at least, *2 Clement* may well be presupposing the finished gospel of Luke; but the form in which the tradition is accessed may not have been Luke’s gospel itself.⁴⁹

2 Clem. 5. 2–4

λέγει γὰρ ὁ κύριος
ἔσεσθε ὡς ἄρνια ἐν μέσῳ
λύκων.
ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος
αὐτῷ λέγει·
ἐὰν οὖν διασπαράξωσιν οἱ
λύκοι τὰ ἄρνια;
εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ Πέτρῳ·
μὴ φοβείσθωσιν τὰ ἄρνια
τοὺς λύκους μετὰ τὸ
ἀποθανεῖν αὐτά·
καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ φοβείσθε
τοὺς ἀποκτενόντας ὑμᾶς
καὶ μηδὲν ὑμῖν
δυναμένους ποιεῖν,

Matt. 10

¹⁶ Ἴδου ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω
ὑμᾶς ὡς πρόβατα ἐν μέσῳ
λύκων·

²⁸ καὶ μὴ φοβείσθε ἀπὸ
τῶν ἀποκτενόντων τὸ
σῶμα, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν μὴ
δυναμένων ἀποκτείνειν·

Luke

10. 3: Ἴδου ἀποστέλλω
ὑμᾶς ὡς ἄρνας ἐν μέσῳ
λύκων.

12. 4–5: Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν τοῖς
φίλοις μου, μὴ φοβηθῆτε
ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτενόντων τὸ
σῶμα καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μὴ
ἔχόντων περισσώτερόν τι
ποιῆσαι.
ὑποδείξω δὲ ὑμῖν τίνα

⁴⁹ Similarly Köhler, *Rezeption*, 144; cf. too Massaux, *Influence*, 150; Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 325–8; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 210 f. Similarly too (though with more scepticism about whether Luke’s gospel is presupposed, Donfried, *Setting*, 66 f.; Gregory, *Rezeption*, 141 f. Among older studies, Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1. 2. 218, ascribes the saying to the *Gospel of the Egyptians* (apparently on the basis that the latter is cited later [presumably Lightfoot had 12. 2 in mind]); Bartlet, *NIAF*, 135, lists it as one of the examples of *2 Clement* using an (unspecified) apocryphal gospel.

ἀλλὰ φοβεῖσθε τὸν μετὰ τὸ
ἀποθανεῖν ὑμᾶς ἔχοντα
ἐξουσίαν ψυχῆς καὶ
σώματος τοῦ βαλεῖν εἰς
γέενναν πυρός.

φοβεῖσθε δὲ μᾶλλον τὸν
δυνάμενον καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ
σῶμα ἀπολέσαι ἐν γέεννῃ.

φοβηθήτε· φοβήθητε τὸν
μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτείνειν ἔχοντα
ἐξουσίαν ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν
γέενναν.
ναὶ λέγω ὑμῖν, τοῦτον
φοβήθητε.

Justin, *1 Apol.* 19. 7: μὴ φοβεῖσθε τοὺς ἀναιροῦντας ὑμᾶς καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μὴ
δυναμένους τι ποιῆσαι, φοβήθητε δὲ τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν δυνάμενον καὶ
ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα εἰς γέενναν ἐμβαλεῖν.

Ps. Clem. *Hom.* 17. 5. 2: μὴ φοβηθήτε ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀποκτένοντος τὸ σῶμα, τῇ δὲ
ψυχῇ μὴ δυναμένου ποιῆσαι, φοβήθητε δὲ τὸν δυνάμενον καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα εἰς
τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός βαλεῖν.

The quotation in *2 Clem.* 5. 2–4 is extremely complex. There are parallels to what is said here in two synoptic contexts: the saying about lambs in the midst of wolves occurs in the mission discourse in Matt. 10. 16 // Luke 10. 3; and the saying about not being afraid of those who kill the body is found in Matt. 10. 28 // Luke 12. 4–5. However, the section between these in *2 Clement*, with the dialogue between Jesus and Peter, has no parallel in the canonical gospels. Thus a number of scholars have suggested that ‘Clement’ is here dependent on an apocryphal gospel, now lost, a theory strengthened for some by similar versions of the saying about not fearing in Justin and in the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*.⁵⁰

A further development has taken place in recent years, with a claim that the lost gospel on which *2 Clement* may depend here can be identified as the *Gospel of Peter*. This has been suggested by D. Lührmann, arguing that a small papyrus fragment from Oxyrhynchus, *P Oxy.* 4009, represents a fragment of the *Gospel of Peter* which overlaps with the saying in *2 Clem.* 5.⁵¹ The fragment appears to have a version of the saying ‘be wise as serpents and innocent as doves’ (only the last half is extant): this has a synoptic parallel in Matt. 10. 16b, which is adjacent to the saying about sheep and wolves in Matt. 10. 16a and which is parallel to *2 Clem.* 5. The fragment then appears to reflect

⁵⁰ Cf. Massaux, *Influence*, 151 (‘une source apocryphe’); Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 98, suggests the *Gospel of the Nazaraeans* (because of possible other links with this gospel elsewhere in *2 Clement*); Donfried, *Setting*, 70 (‘a non-canonical source’); Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 330–5; Köhler, *Rezeption*, 146; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 213; Gregory, *Reception*, 144.

⁵¹ See D. Lührmann and E. Schlarb, *Fragmente apokryph gewordener Evangelien* (Marburg: N. G. Elwert, 2000), 73, 78–9; D. Lührmann, *Die apokryph gewordenen Evangelien*, *NovTSup* 112 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 73–86 (taking up his earlier ‘POxy4009: Ein neues Fragment des Petrus-evangeliums?’, *NovT* 35 (1993), 390–410). For the first edition of the fragment (with also a tentative identification as a fragment of the *Gospel of Peter*), see P. J. Parsons and D. Lührmann, ‘4009: Gospel of Peter?’, in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, lx (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1994), 1–5.

a dialogue between someone (presumably Jesus) and a person who refers to him or herself in the first person ('he says to me'). What follows is very fragmentary, but can be reconstructed to be close to the saying in *2 Clem.* 5 about not fearing death or its consequences. The other main fragment of the *Gospel of Peter* does, at one point, have Peter refer to himself in the first person. Lührmann therefore suggests that the fragment offers a version of the same saying as is reflected in *2 Clem.* 5; also the equivalence of the 'me' in the fragment and 'Peter' in *2 Clement* suggests that the source of the saying is the *Gospel of Peter*.

The theory is brilliantly developed by Lührmann, though one has to say that it must remain tentative and speculative. For example, the *Gospel of Peter* is not the only text in ancient literature where Peter is referred to in the first person.⁵² In any case, the parallels between the fragment and *2 Clem.* 5 are not as compelling as they might appear at first sight. The opening saying in the two texts reflects *different* parts of Matt. 10. 16. Further, the alleged parallel between the fragment and *2 Clement* in the saying about not fearing death depends in part on the parallel being assumed: since the text of *P Oxy.* 4009 is so fragmentary, the reconstruction is heavily based on the text of *2 Clement*, and hence the theory that the two texts agree closely is somewhat circular.

However, whatever one may decide about the possibility of a reference to the *Gospel of Peter* here, it seems clear that the tradition used by *2 Clement* in this saying reflects a post-synoptic development. Thus Köster has pointed out that the version in *2 Clement* seems to presuppose elements from both Matthew and Luke, and also to reflect a harmonized version of these two gospels.⁵³ Further, some of these elements may well be redactional in Matthew and/or Luke. Thus, in the second part of the saying, where *2 Clement* is parallel to Matt. 10. 28 // Luke 12. 4–5, *2 Clement* has no reference to 'killing the soul', but simply refers to others 'not being able to do anything to you'. The vocabulary agrees closely with that of Luke over against Matthew, and the Lucan wording here has been widely taken to be LkR, Luke avoiding the language of 'killing the soul'.⁵⁴ The version in *2 Clement* also agrees with Luke in speaking about fearing the one 'who has authority' (ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν; Matthew, δυνάμενον) to 'throw' (βαλεῖν; Luke, ἐμβαλεῖν; Matthew, ἀπολέσαι) you into hell 'after killing [you]' (μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν ὑμᾶς; Luke, μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτεῖναι; no equivalent in Matthew). Yet *2 Clement* agrees with Matthew in the language of 'not being able' to do anything more (Luke, not

⁵² See T. J. Kraus and T. Nicklas, *Das Petrus-evangelium und die Petrusapokalypse*, GCS (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004), 59–63, esp. p. 63.

⁵³ See Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 95–6. Cf. too Bellinzoni, *Sayings*, 110 f., who argues on the basis of the version in Justin that Justin and *2 Clement* are dependent on the same harmonized version. Cf. too Aono, *Entwicklung*, 136–8.

⁵⁴ Cf. Robinson et al., *Critical Edition*, 296; see, e.g., Aono, *Entwicklung*, 136; Schulz, Q, 158; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, ii. 206.

‘having’ more they can do), and in referring to ‘body and soul’ being cast into/destroyed in hell.

Further, if the source used by ‘Clement’ here is indeed the *Gospel of Peter*, then the different first parts of the extracts in *2 Clement* and *P Oxy.* 4009, which are parallel to Matt. 10. 16a and Matt. 10. 16b respectively, may suggest that the two sayings were already combined in the tradition. But whilst the saying about being ‘innocent as doves’ on its own may well be proverbial and traditional,⁵⁵ it is hard to see the combination of this *with* the warning about being like lambs in the midst of wolves as not reflecting Matthew’s editorial work. Thus, once again the tradition as used by *2 Clement* may well reflect the editorial activity of the synoptic evangelists, and hence presuppose the finished gospels of Matthew and Luke.

The saying in *2 Clement* here may well reflect a non-canonical, ‘apocryphal’ gospel source. It *may* be that the *P Oxy.* 4009 fragment allows us to identify that source as the *Gospel of Peter*. However, whatever the immediate source of the saying in *2 Clement*, it seems clear that it reflects developments of the tradition which post-date the synoptic gospels. It may well be that *2 Clement* here uses a form of a saying which has built on, and harmonized, the versions of the saying about not fearing found in Matthew and Luke. Thus it may well be that *2 Clement* is not directly dependent on the canonical gospels themselves; but it almost certainly presupposes their finished forms, and uses a version of the saying which has been built up from these canonical versions, perhaps in some harmony.⁵⁶

2 Clem. 6. 1

λέγει δὲ ὁ κύριος·
Οὐδεὶς οἰκέτης δύναται
δυσὶ κυρίοις δουλεύειν.

ἐὰν ἡμεῖς θέλωμεν καὶ
θεῶ δουλεύειν καὶ
μαμωνᾷ, ἀσύμφορον ἡμῖν
ἐστίν.

Matt. 6. 24

Οὐδεὶς δύναται δυσὶ
κυρίοις δουλεύειν ἢ γὰρ
τὸν ἕνα μισήσει καὶ τὸν
ἕτερον ἀγαπήσει, ἢ ἐνὸς
ἀνθέξεται καὶ τοῦ ἑτέρου
καταφρονήσει. οὐ δύνασθε
θεῶ δουλεύειν καὶ
μαμωνᾷ.

Luke 16. 13

Οὐδεὶς οἰκέτης δύναται
δυσὶ κυρίοις δουλεύειν ἢ
γὰρ τὸν ἕνα μισήσει καὶ
τὸν ἕτερον ἀγαπήσει, ἢ
ἐνὸς ἀνθέξεται καὶ τοῦ
ἑτέρου καταφρονήσει. οὐ
δύνασθε θεῶ δουλεύειν καὶ
μαμωνᾷ.

Gospel of Thomas, 47: ‘And it is not possible to serve two masters; either he will honour the one and insult the other.’

⁵⁵ It appears in *Gospel of Thomas*, 39, without any connection to an equivalent of the other half of Matt. 10. 16. But whether this represents a pre-synoptic form of the saying as an isolated one, or a post-synoptic development where the saying has become detached from its Matthean context, is not clear.

⁵⁶ This may also be the significance here of the similar version of the saying in Justin. Cf. n. 53 above.

The saying in 2 *Clem.* 6. 1 can probably tell us little in the present context. Clearly, it is related in some way or other to the tradition in Matt. 6. 24 // Luke 16. 13, and in the first part of the saying, there is almost verbatim agreement between the versions. 2 *Clement* is slightly closer to the Lucan version in having *οἰκέτης*, which Matthew omits; but whether one can build very much on this is uncertain.⁵⁷

The second part of the saying in 2 *Clement* is by no means as close verbally to the synoptic versions. There is the contrast between ‘serving God’ and ‘(serving) mammon’, but the structure of the sayings is different. Hence, at most there seems to be a common tradition underlying the versions here, but we cannot go further. In any case, it is not clear that in this part ‘Clement’ thinks that he is actually quoting as such. The use of the first person plural *ἡμεῖς θέλωμεν* may suggest rather that this is ‘Clement’s’ own gloss on, or interpretation of, the saying, rather than a continuation of the quotation of the saying of ‘the Lord’.⁵⁸

The presence of a possibly independent saying circulating in the tradition is confirmed for some by the presence of a similar saying in the *Gospel of Thomas*, 47 (also apparently without the equivalent of *οἰκέτης*).⁵⁹ However, the whole issue of the relationship between *Thomas* and the synoptics is still very much an open one, and one cannot build too much on the parallel in *Thomas* here.

| 2 <i>Clem.</i> 6. 2 | Matt. 16. 26 | Mark 8. 36 | Luke 9. 25 |
|--|--|---|---|
| τί γὰρ τὸ ὄφελος, | τί γὰρ ὠφεληθήσεται ἄνθρωπος | τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖ ἄνθρωπον | τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος |
| ἐάν τις τὸν κόσμον ὄλον κερδήσῃ, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν ζημιωθῆ; | ἐάν τὸν κόσμον ὄλον κερδήσῃ τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ζημιωθῆ; | κερδήσαι τὸν κόσμον ὄλον καὶ ζημιωθῆναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ; | κερδήσας τὸν κόσμον ὄλον ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἀπολέσας ἢ ζημιωθεῖς; |

⁵⁷ The word is omitted in the IQP reconstruction of Q, implying that it is redactional in Luke: hence the version in 2 *Clement* might appear to presuppose Luke’s redaction, and thus Luke’s finished gospel. But certainty is not possible. Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 353 ff., argues that it comes from his proposed apocryphal gospel, where it was linked with the citation in 8. 5; but the saying could just as easily have come from Luke more directly.

⁵⁸ Cf. Köhler, *Rezeption*, 142. In the English translation of the LCL editions of the text of 2 *Clement* by both Lake and Ehrman, the inverted commas end at the end of the first half, and hence the second half, are taken as ‘Clement’s’ own comment; similarly Lindemann, *Clemens-briefe*, 211.

⁵⁹ But whether one can rely on a version in translation (here Coptic) for such relatively small points of detail is very uncertain.

⁶⁰ For Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 350, this shows that the Lucan form of the saying is older. (Hence apparently changing his mind: in Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 75, he takes the *οἰκέτης* in Luke as a secondary addition to Q.)

Clem. Al. *Strom.* 6. 112. 3: τί γὰρ ὄφελος, ἐὰν τὸν κόσμον κερδήσῃς, φησί, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν ἀπολέσῃς;

Justin, *1 Apol.* 15. 12: τί γὰρ ὠφελείται ἄνθρωπος ἂν τὸν κόσμον ὄλον κερδήσῃ, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσῃ;

It is not clear whether this is intended to be a continuation of a 'quotation' of what 'the Lord said' (cf. 6. 1).⁶¹ Clearly, though, what is said here is close to the saying in the synoptics at Mark 8. 36 and pars. Further, the version in 2 *Clement* is closer to the version in Matthew, in having the ἐάν + subjunctive construction, unlike Mark and Luke. Thus 2 *Clement* agrees with Matthew precisely where Matthew has redacted Mark. 2 *Clement* thus shows agreement with Matthew's redactional activity, and hence appears to be based (directly or indirectly) on Matthew's finished gospel.⁶²

There are parallels to the saying also in Clement of Alexandria and Justin Martyr (see above), and the two versions in which the saying is quoted there are close (cf. especially the common use of the verb ἀπόλλυμι at the end of the saying). Further, the opening of the saying in Clement of Alexandria is similar to the opening in 2 *Clement* (in the use of τί γὰρ ὄφελος). It is thus possible that Clement of Alexandria and 2 *Clement* attest to a common version of the saying. But the comparison with the synoptic evidence suggests that any such version represents a development of the tradition which post-dates and presupposes Matthew's gospel.

2 *Clem.* 8. 5

Luke 16. 10–12

λέγει γὰρ ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ
εὐαγγελίῳ·
εἰ τὸ μικρὸν οὐκ
ἐτηρήσατε, τὸ μέγα τίς
ὑμῖν δώσει; λέγω γὰρ
ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ πιστὸς ἐν
ἐλαχίστῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ
πιστὸς ἐστιν.

¹⁰ ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ
καὶ ἐν πολλῷ πιστὸς
ἐστιν, καὶ ὁ ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ
ἄδικος καὶ ἐν πολλῷ
ἄδικός ἐστιν.

¹¹ εἰ οὖν ἐν τῷ ἀδίκῳ
μαμωνᾷ πιστοὶ οὐκ
ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ἀληθινὸν τίς
ὑμῖν πιστεύσει;

¹² καὶ εἰ ἐν τῷ ἄλλοτρίῳ

⁶¹ E.g., both Lake and Ehrman, in the English translation in their LCL editions, open the inverted commas again; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 211, does not.

⁶² Cf. too Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 73 f.; Massaux, *Influence*, 145; Köhler, *Rezeption*, 135, observes (against Massaux) that dependence on Matthew is not certain, but is still 'die wahrscheinlichste Annahme'. Even Donfried, *Setting*, 83, concedes that dependence on Matthew is 'possible' (though he also claims that 'one cannot with certainty assert [such] dependence'). Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 394 ff., takes it as part of his proposed apocryphal gospel.

πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ
ὑμέτερον τίς ὑμῖν δώσει;

Irenaeus, *AH* 2. 34. 2: et ideo dominus dicebat ingratis existentibus in eum: si in modico fideles non fuistis, quod magnum est, quis dabit vobis?

Hilary, *Epistula seu libellus*, 1: si in modico fideles non fuistis, quod maius est, quis dabit vobis?

This saying in *2 Clement* is of interest as it is the only one which is said to be 'in the gospel' (ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ). The word 'gospel' is of course notoriously ambiguous, especially in Christian usage around this period. However, the most obvious interpretation of the word here is that it refers to a written text containing words attributed to Jesus.⁶³ The identification of that text is, however, not explicitly specified.

The second half of the saying is close in wording to Luke 16. 10a. The verse has no parallel in the other synoptic gospels, and hence cannot easily be identified as a Lucan redactional creation. Indeed, its content suggests that it is some kind of proverbial saying. The context in Luke is a series of sayings appended to the parable of the dishonest steward, and it may well be that Luke has added here a number of sayings of disparate origin. But it is really impossible to say whether *2 Clement* has derived the saying from Luke, from an earlier tradition also available to Luke, or from a tradition which was originally based on Luke and subsequently developed.⁶⁴ Certainly there are no clear indicators of LkR elements which might help to settle the issue.

The first part of the saying as recorded in *2 Clement* has no clear parallel in the synoptic tradition (its sentiments are not far removed from Luke 16. 11–12, but there is no clear verbal agreement). The presence of a very similar saying in Irenaeus and Hilary⁶⁵ may suggest that a saying in this form circulated in Christian circles around this time.⁶⁶ But the nature of the

⁶³ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 11, referring also to the present tense λέγει, as well as the absence of an αὐτοῦ with εὐαγγέλιον. For Köster, the present tense is more readily interpreted as referring to words of Jesus (now) recorded in a written text and reproduced, rather than to words of Jesus spoken in the past. Cf. too Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 224. Against Köster's appeal to the present tense λέγει, Donfried, *Setting*, 81, has pointed out that εἶπεν (not λέγει) is used to introduce citations at 4. 5; 9, 11; 17. 4 (though these do not have ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ).

⁶⁴ Koester himself seems to have changed his mind slightly: in Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 101, he seems to incline to the last possibility; whereas in Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 354 f., he appears to incline more to the view that *2 Clement* is accessing a pre-Lucan tradition.

⁶⁵ The difference between their *fideles non fuistis* and *2 Clement's* οὐκ ἐτηρήσατε could be explained by 'Clement's' preference for the verb τηρεῖν: cf. Donfried, *Setting*, 73 (though cf. Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 356 f., who argues that 'Clement' cites accurately).

⁶⁶ Bartlet, *NTAF*, 133; Donfried, *Setting*, 73; Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 355; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 224; Gregory, *Reception*, 137. Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 354 ff., takes it as

evidence is such that it is really impossible to say with any certainty whether this form of the saying represents a post-Lucan development of the tradition, or a point on a trajectory which bypasses Luke's gospel and reaches back to the pre-Lucan tradition.

2 *Clem.* 9. 11

Matt. 12. 50

Mark 3. 35

Luke 8. 21

καὶ γὰρ εἶπεν ὁ
κύριος·

ἀδελφοί μου οὗτοι
εἰσιν οἱ ποιοῦντες
τὸ θέλημα τοῦ
πατρὸς μου

ὅσους γὰρ ἂν
ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα
τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ
ἐν οὐρανοῖς αὐτός
μου ἀδελφός καὶ
ἀδελφή καὶ μήτηρ
ἐστίν.

ὅς [γὰρ] ἂν ποιήσῃ
τὸ θέλημα τοῦ
θεοῦ, οὗτος
ἀδελφός μου καὶ
ἀδελφή καὶ μήτηρ
ἐστίν.

ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς
εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς,
Μήτηρ μου καὶ
ἀδελφοί μου οὗτοι
εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον
τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούοντες
καὶ ποιοῦντες.

Gospel of the Ebionites (as in *Epiph. Pan.* 30. 14. 5): οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ ἀδελφοί μου καὶ ἡ μήτηρ καὶ ἀδελφαί, οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα τοῦ πατρὸς μου

Clem. Al. Ecl. proph. 20. 3: ἀδελφοί μου γάρ, φησὶν ὁ κύριος, καὶ συγκληρονόμοι οἱ ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου

Gospel of Thomas, 99: 'Those here who do the will of my father are my brothers and my mother.'

It is widely agreed that 2 *Clement* here reflects a harmonized version of the saying that appears in the (now) canonical gospels, agreeing in part with both Matthew's and Luke's adaptation of the saying in Mark 3. 35. Thus 2 *Clement* agrees with Luke in the ἀδελφοί μου οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ ποιοῦντες construction (against Mark's/Matthew's ὅσους . . . ἂν ποιήσῃ); and it agrees with Matthew's reference (in typical Matthean vocabulary) to the will 'of my father' (Matthew also has 'in heaven'). It seems very unlikely that Matthew and Luke here are doing anything other than redacting Mark's version. Thus the version in 2 *Clement* presupposes the redactional activity of both Matthew and Luke, and hence presupposes their finished gospels.

On the other hand, we may also note the presence of a similar harmonized version of the saying in the *Gospel of the Ebionites*, and in *Clement of Alexandria* (see above).⁶⁷ Hence it may well be that 2 *Clement* is dependent here on a separate source that had already harmonized the different versions of the saying in the synoptics into its form here.⁶⁸ But this source seems to be

part of his postulated apocryphal gospel used by 2 *Clement* (and linked to the citation in 6. 1). Even Massaux, *Influence*, 153, takes it as 'vraisemblable' that 2 *Clement* is here dependent on 'une source apocryphe' rather than Luke's gospel.

⁶⁷ The version in the *Gospel of Thomas*, 99, is extant only in Coptic and it is scarcely appropriate to compare finer points of detail concerning the construction in Greek in this context.

⁶⁸ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 79; Donfried, *Setting*, 73; Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 367 ff.; also Bartlet, *NTAF*, 134; Gregory, *Reception*, 148.

part of a post-synoptic development which presupposes the finished gospels of Matthew and Luke.

| 2 Clem. 13. 4 | Matt. 5 | Luke 6 |
|--|--|--|
| ... λέγει ὁ θεός· οὐ χάρις ὑμῖν, εἰ ἀγαπάτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ἀλλὰ χάρις ὑμῖν, | ⁴⁶ ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ τελώναι τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν; | ³² καὶ εἰ ἀγαπάτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν; |
| εἰ ἀγαπάτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς καὶ τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς· | ⁴⁴ ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀγαπάτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς, | ²⁷ Ἀλλὰ ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἀκούουσιν, ἀγαπάτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς, ²⁸ εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς, προσεύχεσθε περὶ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς |

The introductory ‘formula’ here claims that the words that follow are what ‘God’ says. However, there seems to be a clear echo of the Jesus tradition, especially the demand of Jesus to love one’s enemies in Matt. 5 // Luke 6. On the other hand, there is clearly no verbatim repetition of the synoptic texts. There is, for example, nothing explicit here of any contrast between those who follow such an ethic and Gentiles or sinners. However, a vestige of this may still be apparent in the language of *χάρις* that is used here. Further, this may be of considerable significance in that this language is closely parallel to the Lucan version of the tradition here, and moreover, this may well be due to LkR at this point in Luke.⁶⁹ Thus the language of 2 *Clement* here appears to presuppose Luke’s redactional work, and hence Luke’s finished gospel.

In support of this, one may also note that, with reference to the demand itself to love one’s enemies, 2 *Clement* agrees with Luke in referring to those who ‘hate’ you. It is not certain if Luke’s longer, fourfold form of the command, or Matthew’s shorter twofold form, is more original. And 2 *Clement* certainly does not have a fourfold form of the command here. On the other hand, 2 *Clement* does align with Luke against Matthew in referring to those who ‘hate’ you. Given the earlier agreement between 2 *Clement* and the (probably) LkR reference to *χάρις*, it seems most likely that 2 *Clement* is here again showing some dependence (direct or indirect) on the Lucan form of the tradition.

⁶⁹ See the discussion of *Did.* 1. 3b, with the literature cited there (p. 123 in this volume).

It is true that 2 *Clement* does not display verbatim agreement with Luke's text,⁷⁰ but the most 'economical' interpretation of the evidence is that 'Clement' is here presupposing Luke's version of the command to love one's enemies, possibly 'citing' it somewhat loosely (perhaps from memory).⁷¹

In any discussion of apparent citations by the author of 2 *Clement* of materials in other gospels, we should also mention the case of 2 *Clem.* 12. 2, where again 'Clement' cites a saying of 'the Lord'. Here, when asked when his kingdom is coming, the Lord 'said' (εἶπεν): 'When the two shall be one, and the outside as the inside, and the male with the female neither male nor female . . . then the kingdom of my father will come' (2 *Clem.* 12. 2, 6).

A very similar form of this saying is found in at least two other places. In the *Gospel of Thomas*, 22, there is another version of what appears to be the same basic saying: 'Jesus said to them, when you make the two one, and when you make the inside like the outside and the outside like the inside, and the above like the below, and when you make the male and the female one and the same, so the male not be male nor the female female . . . then you will enter [the kingdom]'. And Clement of Alexandria cites a saying as from the *Gospel of the Egyptians* in similar vein: in a response to an enquiry by Salome, 'The Lord said, when you tread upon the garment of shame, and when the two become one, and when the male with the female is neither male nor female . . .') (*Strom.* 3. 13. 92). Although the three versions are not identical, they are close enough to be recognizably variants of the same basic saying.

The situation regarding the relationship between the three versions is extremely complex.⁷² For present purposes, however, we may leave this example on one side, for it is clear that there is no real synoptic parallel to the substance of the saying.⁷³ Hence, in seeking to identify possible evidence for knowledge and/or use of the synoptic gospels by the author of 2 *Clement*, this text provides no further assistance. It does, however, show that 'Clement' had access to other sources of information about the words of Jesus, one of

⁷⁰ A fact exploited by Donfried, *Setting*, 78, to argue for dependence on an independent apocryphal gospel; cf. too Bartlet, *NTAF*, 132. Gregory, *Reception*, 139, appears undecided.

⁷¹ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 76. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1. 2. 243, takes it as a 'loose quotation from Luke vi. 32, 35'. Cf. too Köhler, *Rezeption*, 143: 'freier Zitation des Lk'. Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 388 ff., takes it as coming from his proposed apocryphal gospel, but this seems unnecessary.

⁷² For a valuable discussion, see T. Baarda, '2 Clement 12 and the Sayings of Jesus', in *idem*, *Early Transmission of Words of Jesus: Thomas, Tatian and the Text of the NT*, ed. H. Helderman and S. J. Noorda (Amsterdam: VU Boekhandel/Uitgeverij, 1983), 261–88.

⁷³ The only possible parallel might be in relation to the question about when the kingdom would come; cf. Luke 17. 20. But the continuation of Jesus' reply bears no relationship at all to anything in the canonical gospels.

which may then be the so-called *Gospel according to the Egyptians* apparently known to Clement of Alexandria.⁷⁴

Old Testament Citations Shared with the Synoptic Gospels

In addition to the evidence considered so far, we should also note a few instances where 2 *Clement* shares with the synoptic gospels some quotations of, or allusions to, verses from the Old Testament. In such cases, one theoretical possibility is that ‘Clement’ derives his wording from the Old Testament verse as used by the canonical evangelists; however, it is also possible that both ‘Clement’ and the gospel writers have cited the verse in question independently. There are three (or possibly four (cf. 2 *Clem.* 3. 4 below)) such instances.

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 2 <i>Clem.</i> 3. 5 | Isa 29. 13, LXX | Matt. 15. 8 // Mark 7. 6 |
| λέγει δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἑσαιοῖ ‘Ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χείλεσίν με τιμά, ἢ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπεστὶν ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ | καὶ εἶπεν κύριος ἐγγίξει μοι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χείλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσιν με ἢ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ μάτην δὲ σέβονταιί με | ὡς γέγραπται [ὅτι] Οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χείλεσίν με τιμά, ἢ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ |

1 *Clem.* 15. 1: λέγει γάρ πον· Οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χείλεσίν με τιμά, ἢ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπεστὶν ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ.

The text of 2 *Clement* here shares some features with Matthew’s/Mark’s citation of Isa. 29. 13 over against the LXX version of Isa. 29. 13 itself: e.g., in omitting the reference to ‘drawing near’, and hence using the verb *τιμάω* in the same way syntactically in the sentence. However, equally noteworthy is the existence of another citation of the same text in 1 *Clem.* 15. 1, which agrees with the version in 2 *Clement* almost verbatim, including the use of *ἀπεστὶν* over against *ἀπέχει* in both Isa. 29, LXX, and the canonical gospel versions. It would appear then that 2 *Clement* attests a version of the verse which was also known to the author of 1 *Clement* and which in turn was independent of the synoptic evangelists. Further, 2 *Clement* (unlike 1 *Clement*) explicitly cites this as a verse from Isaiah, not a saying of ‘the Lord’ or of a Christian gospel text. It thus seems most likely that, although a slight influence from the text of Matthew/Mark might be implied, the primary source for ‘Clement’s’ citation here is the book of Isaiah itself, perhaps in a Greek version differing slightly from the LXX version.⁷⁵

We may note another possible example in this category in the words of ‘Clement’ which just precede this citation of Isa. 29 in 2 *Clem.* 3. 4. Here the

⁷⁴ Assuming, of course, that Clement of Alexandria’s attribution is correct!

⁷⁵ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 105; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 208.

author exhorts his readers not to disregard the commandments, or to honour God only with their lips, but to do so ‘with all our heart and all our mind’. Some have seen here an echo of the words of the Shema in Deut. 6. 5. However, the text of Deut. 6 mentions three faculties with which to love God: heart, soul, and strength; but in the accounts of Jesus’ giving of the double love command in Mark 12. 30, this is expanded to a quartet of ‘heart, soul, mind and strength’.⁷⁶ Some have therefore argued that the text of 2 *Clement* here betrays influence of the gospel accounts of Jesus’ giving of the love command.⁷⁷

However, the evidence is extremely weak. There is nothing in the text of 2 *Clement* to indicate that a quotation is intended here (unlike so many other places in the document); further, the context is not really the same as that of Deut. 6 or Mark 12 pars.: in the latter, it is a question of ‘loving God’; in 2 *Clement* of ‘honouring him not only with our lips’. The evidence thus seems too flimsy to try to build any theory of dependence by the author of 2 *Clement* on the canonical gospel accounts of Jesus’ referring to the Shema and giving of the double love command.

2 *Clem.* 7. 6

ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ
τελευτήσκει καὶ τὸ πῦρ
αὐτῶν οὐ σβεσθήσεται καὶ
ἔσονται εἰς ὄρασιw πάση
σαρκί

Isa. 66. 24

ὁ γὰρ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ
τελευτήσκει καὶ τὸ πῦρ
αὐτῶν οὐ σβεσθήσεται καὶ
ἔσονται εἰς ὄρασιw πάση
σαρκί

Mark 9. 48

ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ
τελευτᾷ καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ
σβέννυται.

2 *Clem.* 7. 6 introduces a citation of Isa. 66. 24 (with a fairly general ‘he says’ (*φησίν*)), a verse which is also strongly echoed in Mark 9. 48. There is no evidence at all, however, that the text of 2 *Clement* has been influenced by the gospel text: the version here agrees almost verbatim with that of the LXX of Isa. 66. 24. There is no warrant, therefore, for concluding that ‘Clement’ is doing anything other than citing Isa. 66. 24 alone.

⁷⁶ In the parallel versions, Matthew omits the final ‘strength’; Luke 10. 27 has the same quartet as Mark, with the last two in reverse order.

⁷⁷ Cf. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1. 2. 217; Lightfoot’s comment is quoted in full by Bartlet, *NFAF*, 134, though Bartlet also says that ‘Mark may follow a current LXX text’. Lake, in his English translation of the LCL edition, places the words in inverted commas, but with no indication as to which text might be cited; Ehrman, in his LCL edition, does not use inverted commas but has a footnote reference to Mark 12. 30. Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 208, claims that there is a clear allusion to Mark 12. 30. Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 301, sees Luke 10. 27 as closest. In fact, all three synoptic versions are almost equally close (in using *καρδία* and *διανοία*) to the language of 2 *Clement*.

2 Clem. 14. 1

ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ποιήσωμεν τὸ
 ηέλημα κυρίου, ἐσόμεθα ἐκ
 τῆς γραφῆς τῆς λεγούσης·

ἐγενήθη ὁ οἶκός μου
 σπήλαιον ληστῶν

Jer. 7. 11

μὴ σπήλαιον ληστῶν ὁ
 οἶκός μου οὐδ' ἐπικέκληται
 τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτῷ

Mark 11. 17 pars.

Ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος
 προσευχῆς κληθήσεται
 πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν;

ὑμεῖς δὲ πεποιήκατε αὐτὸν
 σπήλαιον ληστῶν.

As in the previous example, there is no real evidence to support any suggestion that 2 *Clement* has been influenced by the text of the gospels here. The verse from Jer. 7 is placed on the lips of Jesus in the synoptic story of the 'cleansing' of the temple, where it acts as an antithesis to the citation of Isa. 56. 7 (the claim that the temple should be a house of prayer for all nations).⁷⁸ The version in 2 *Clement* knows nothing of this antithesis; nor does it give any hint of the verse being used as a charge against others for what they have already done (cf. the *πεποιήκατε* (or equivalent) in the synoptic versions). Once again, 2 *Clement* appears to be using the text from the Old Testament context with no evidence of its use in the gospel texts.⁷⁹

Common Vocabulary and Possible Verbal Reminiscences

Finally, we may consider briefly one or two instances where some have seen possible influence of the wording of the gospels on the text of 2 *Clement*.

The assertion in 2 Clem. 5. 5 that the promise of Christ 'brings us rest (*ἀνάπαυσις*)' has been seen by some as close to, and perhaps inspired by, the wording of Matt. 11. 29 ('you will find rest for your souls').⁸⁰ However, the idea of 'rest' is by no means unique to Matthew, and it represents a widespread notion in Jewish wisdom literature and elsewhere; it seems precarious, therefore, to build too much of a theory of dependence on the basis of this one word.⁸¹

⁷⁸ The differences between the different synoptic accounts here (e.g., Matthew and Luke both lack 'for all nations') do not affect the present discussion in any way.

⁷⁹ So also Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 241.

⁸⁰ Bartlet, *NTAF*, 130. Cf. too 2 Clem. 6. 7 ('find rest', which is slightly closer to the Matthean wording).

⁸¹ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 107. Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 269 ff., also considers the possible parallel (to the language of 'rest') to *Gospel of Thomas*, 2 (in the *P Oxy.* 654 version, and its parallel in the saying ascribed to the *Gospel of the Hebrews* in Clem. Al. *Strom.* 2. 45. 5).

Similarly, some have seen in the language of 2 *Clem.* 6. 7 an echo of Matthean language: ‘if we do the will of Christ we shall gain rest; but if not, nothing shall rescue us from eternal punishment (ἐκ τῆς αἰωνίου κολάσεως)’. Again, there is a reference to ‘rest’ (cf. Matt. 11. 29); and the phrase ‘eternal punishment’ also occurs in Matt. 25. 46.⁸² But again, it is not certain whether the language is sufficiently distinctive to justify any claim about dependence: the idea (of punishment) is too widespread to make any theory fully convincing.⁸³

We should perhaps also note here 2 *Clem.* 15. 4 (‘for the Lord says that he is more ready to give than we to ask’). The language is similar in one way to the synoptic saying in Matt. 7. 7 // Luke 11. 9 about asking and receiving (though this does not explicitly relate ‘giving’ to ‘asking’, and it does not have a statement that God (or Jesus) is *more* ready to give than we to ask: the synoptic version simply correlates asking and receiving as reciprocal). Possibly too there might be an echo of the saying ascribed to Jesus in Acts 20. 35 (‘it is more blessed to give than to receive’, though this does not refer to ‘asking’).⁸⁴ Certainty is not possible. In any case, *if* one should see a parallel with the synoptic tradition here, it is impossible to say whether 2 *Clement* might be reflecting Matthew’s gospel, Luke’s gospel, a prior source, or a post-synoptic harmony or tradition.

Further alleged parallels are probably too imprecise to carry any weight in the present discussion.⁸⁵

⁸² This is the only occurrence of the phrase in the synoptic gospels. See Bartlett, *NTAF*, 130. However, the singularity of the phrase in the NT does not mean that there must then be an allusion to the NT here. One must beware the danger of parallelomania!

⁸³ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 107.

⁸⁴ Cf. Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 319 (on Matt. 7. 7 // Luke 11. 9); also Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 194, 216.

⁸⁵ Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 283–322, has argued for a large number of instances (including some, but not all, of the instances listed here under ‘citations’: he includes 2. 4, 7; 3. 4; 15. 4 under this heading) showing knowledge of, and use of, various passages in Matthew/Luke by the author of 2 *Clement*. He lists them under the heading ‘Zitate aus Mt und Lk’. Thus he refers to 2 *Clem.* 4. 4 (cf. Matt. 10. 28); 7. 4 (cf. Matt. 22. 13); 14. 1 (cf. Matt. 6. 8–10); 12. 1 (cf. Matt. 25. 13; 24. 36); 5. 5–6 (cf. Luke 18. 18 // 10. 25); 1. 3 (Matt. 3. 8 // Luke 3. 8); 15. 4 (Matt. 7. 7 // Luke 11. 9); 2. 2 (Luke 18. 1). However, most of these seem very remote as parallels, and certainly considerably less close than a number of the other explicit citations where 2 *Clement* seems close to Matthew/Luke but where Warns argues against direct dependence on Matthew/Luke and for dependence on an apocryphal gospel (which in turn presupposes Matthew and Luke). Clearly there is debate about what can be called a ‘citation’ (see the discussion of Gregory and Tuckett in Ch. 4, pp. 63–5); but these examples seem to be too unlike the parallels in the gospels (and also lack any introductory formula) to qualify for the description ‘Zitat’/‘citation’.

Conclusions

At a number of places *2 Clement* presupposes the redactional activity of both Matthew and Luke in traditions of the sayings of Jesus which they have in common. At the very least, this suggests that the tradition on which *2 Clement* is based for its knowledge of Jesus tradition represents a stage which presupposes the finished gospels of both Matthew and Luke. *2 Clement* is thus primarily a witness to the post-synoptic development of the tradition, at least at these points. There are a number of other places where the evidence is not so clear-cut, and 'Clement' could in theory be dependent (directly or indirectly) on the gospels or on earlier traditions used by the synoptic evangelists. However, given his use of some redactional elements from the synoptic gospels, it seems simplest to assume that the rest of the common tradition shared by 'Clement' and the synoptic gospels is also to be explained as due to 'Clement's' dependence (again direct or indirect) on the finished synoptic gospels of Matthew and Luke. But there is no evidence that 'Clement' had access to the gospel of Mark except via the gospels of Matthew and/or Luke.

On the other hand, we cannot say that *2 Clement* necessarily used the gospels of Matthew and Luke as we have them, or even directly. It may be that the gospels were available to 'Clement' in a textual form not quite the same as the ones many use today (cf. above on possible textual variants which may be reflected in *2 Clement*). But much more important is the evidence suggesting that *2 Clement* may be accessing the synoptic tradition via a harmonized form of that tradition, a form which may also be attested in writers such as Justin. Thus *2 Clement* may well be accessing the tradition of Matthew's and Luke's gospels only indirectly. Further, it is clear that *2 Clement* also has access to, and uses, other gospel texts which are not now extant (cf. above on *2 Clem.* 12. 2).

What is not clear is how many 'gospel' texts 'Clement' may have used and had available. In some discussions it is almost assumed as self-evident that 'Clement' used just one 'gospel'.⁸⁶ Yet, while this is possible, it is by no means

⁸⁶ Cf., e.g., Lührmann and Schlarb, *Fragmente*, 134–7, who print all the sayings in 'Das Evangelium [sing.] im 2. Clemensbrief' (and even give a colophon τὸ εὐαγγέλιον at the end!). Cf. too Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 194. This is developed in considerable detail by Warns, *Untersuchungen*, who claims that a whole series of texts in *2 Clement* derive from a *single* apocryphal gospel (he argues that this gospel is cited at *2 Clem.* 3. 2; 4. 2, 5; 5. 2–4; 6. 1–2; 8. 5; 9. 11; 11. 6 (= 17. 4); 12. 2, 6; 13. 2, 4; 17. 4, 5); he also claims to be able to put these into their original order in this gospel (13. 4 → 4. 2, 5 → 5. 2–4 → 3. 2 → 13. 2 → 9. 11 → 8. 5 → 6. 1, 2 → 17. 4, 5 → 12. 2, 6. (See his summary on pp. 466–8.)) Such precision is, however, perhaps a little optimistic (cf. also Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 194). Given too that, at a number of points, Warns himself argues that this gospel is dependent on the gospels of Matthew and Luke, it is hard to see why such a theory is required, rather than positing more use of Matthew/Luke themselves (given

required. ‘Clement’ does refer to a (single) *εὐαγγέλιον* at 8. 5. But this in no way requires that all the other citations he gives are taken from this same *εὐαγγέλιον*.⁸⁷ It could well be that ‘Clement’ has access to, and/or uses, a variety of different texts for his Jesus tradition. Thus it could be that he uses a post-synoptic harmony of Matthew and Luke for some of his traditions, but other, apocryphal gospels for other traditions.

THE REST OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Acts

There appears to be only one possible reference to Acts,⁸⁸ at 2 *Clem.* 1. 1, where ‘Clement’ refers to Jesus as the judge of the living and the dead. The same phrase is found at Acts 10. 42, but similar expressions are found elsewhere in the New Testament, at 2 Tim. 4. 1, at 1 Pet. 4. 5, and (albeit less clearly) at Rom. 14. 9; and also in *Barn.* 7. 2 and Polycarp, *Phil.* 2. 1. Therefore it seems difficult to avoid the conclusion that this is a common liturgical or credal expression that cannot be taken as evidence of the use of any particular text.⁸⁹

Paul

‘As regards the N. T. Epistles’, wrote the Oxford Committee, ‘the phrase “The Books and the Apostles” prepares us to find pretty free use of them, even though they are not formally quoted.’⁹⁰ Yet it is to their credit that this predisposition did not lead the members of the committee to more comprehensive conclusions than the detailed examinations of such parallels as might be identified would allow, their understanding of this phrase notwithstanding. Thus their conclusions, that the use of 1 Corinthians and Ephesians

too that Warns himself is more than ready to posit such dependence in cases of much less close verbal agreement in some of the possible allusions: cf. previous note).

⁸⁷ Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 280, argues initially that one should not multiply assumptions (and supposed sources) unnecessarily. But in what is then effectively an application of Occam’s razor, it is not clear that assuming that, say, ten citations all come from one source involves any fewer assumptions than that each derives from a separate source!

⁸⁸ There is no discussion of Acts in the chapter on 2 *Clement* in *NTAF*, but Benecke notes 2 *Clem.* 1. 1 in his discussion of Pol. *Phil.* 2. 1 (*NTAF* 98).

⁸⁹ Pace Donfried (*Setting*, 100), who judges in favour of ‘a contact with 1 Peter or a similar tradition’. Cf. below, p. 291 n. 143.

⁹⁰ *NTAF*, 125.

should be classed D (i.e., ‘as books which may possibly be referred to, but in regard to which the evidence appeared too uncertain to allow any reliance to be placed upon it’⁹¹), and that possible parallels with Romans and 1 Timothy remain unclassified, are suitably cautious,⁹² as befits the available evidence. Others have since proposed that potential parallels to Galatians and Colossians also be considered,⁹³ but there is now a widespread consensus that although ‘Clement’ employed imagery used also by Paul, nevertheless the evidence suggests that at no point did he make conscious and deliberate reference either to Paul or to his writings, and that no direct citations of, or allusions to, Paul’s letters are to be found in *2 Clement*.⁹⁴ This need not mean that he had no acquaintance with Pauline traditions—not least, as Lindemann notes, if one assumes that he had read *1 Clement*⁹⁵—but it is possible that such ‘Pauline’ parallels that he displays were already part of the common discourse of early Christianity, regardless of whether or not they are likely to have originated with Paul. This conclusion is uncontroversial, so in what follows I shall set out potential parallels to Paul in canonical order, usually with only minimal comment. Parallels which arise from the presence of the same quotation from the Jewish Scriptures in *2 Clement* and in Paul are treated alongside other potential parallels in the same letter, not as a category of their own.

The silence of ‘Clement’ concerning Paul is not unparalleled in the Apostolic Fathers or in other Christian literature of the second century, and it is not necessary to draw any negative inferences from this.⁹⁶

⁹¹ *NIAF*, p. iii.

⁹² Indeed, they seem insufficient to justify Lindemann’s inclusion of the committee as among those who have held that ‘Clement’ used 1 Corinthians and Ephesians (A. Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, BHT 58 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979), 264, citing *NIAF*, 137, the first of the two summary tables).

⁹³ A. E. Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941), 215–16; Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 207–29.

⁹⁴ Thus, e.g., Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 270: ‘2 Clem keine unmittelbaren Anspielungen oder Zitate paulinischer Briefe enthält; es ließ sich auch nicht zeigen, daß der Vf es in irgendeiner Form mit paulinischer Tradition zu tun hat.’; *idem*, ‘Paul in the Writings of the Apostolic Fathers’, 27: ‘The Second Letter of Clement shows no connection to Paul’; Massaux, *Influence*, ii. 21: ‘it cannot be said that the literary influence of the texts of the Pauline epistles on 2 Clement was very great. I can merely point out the presence of images and ideas which are read in Paul, but which do not necessarily come into 2 Clement from the texts of the apostle.’ Barnett (*Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 217) is more confident, finding ‘fairly clear traces’ of 1 Corinthians and Ephesians, as well as data that is ‘scanty and indecisive’ for the influence of Romans, Galatians, and Colossians.

⁹⁵ Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 271.

⁹⁶ Lindemann, ‘Paul in the Writings’, 27; D. Rensberger, ‘As the Apostle Teaches: The Development of the Use of Paul’s Letters in Second-Century Christianity’ (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale, 1981), 331–2, and *passim*.

Romans

Five potential parallels may be noted. In two instances they may be explained by the independent use of a passage in the Jewish Scriptures. These are as follows.

2 Clem. 8. 2⁹⁷

Πηλὸς γάρ ἐσμην
εἰς τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ
τεχνίτου,

ὄν τρόπον γὰρ
ὁ κεραμεύς, ἂν ποιῇ
σκεῦος καὶ ἐν ταῖς
χερσὶν αὐτοῦ διαστραφῇ
ἢ συντριβῇ, πάλιν αὐτὸ
ἀναπλάσσει, ἂν δὲ
προφθάσῃ εἰς τὴν
κάμνον τοῦ πυρὸς αὐτὸ
βαλεῖν, οὐκέτι βοηθήσει
αὐτῷ.
Οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς . . .

Rom. 9. 21

ἢ οὐκ ἔχει ἑξουσίαν
ὁ κεραμεύς τοῦ πηλοῦ ἐκ
τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος
ποιῆσαι ὃ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν
σκεῦος ὃ δὲ εἰς
ἀτιμίαν . . .

Jer. 18. 4 ff.

⁴ καὶ διέπεσεν τὸ
ἀγγεῖον, ὃ αὐτὸς ἐποίει,
ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ,
καὶ πάλιν αὐτὸς
ἐποίησεν αὐτὸ ἀγγεῖον
ἕτερον, καθὼς ἤρεσεν
ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ τοῦ
ποιῆσαι. ⁵ καὶ ἐγένετο
λόγος κυρίου πρὸς με
λέγων ⁶ Εἰ καθὼς ὁ
κεραμεύς οὗτος οὐ
δυνήσομαι τοῦ ποιῆσαι
ὑμᾶς, οἶκος Ἰσραηλ; ἰδοὺ
ὡς ὁ πηλὸς τοῦ κεραμεύς
ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἐν ταῖς
χερσὶν μου.
⁷ πέρας λαλήσω ἐπὶ
ἔθνος ἢ ἐπὶ βασιλείαν
τοῦ ἐξάραι αὐτοὺς καὶ
τοῦ ἀπολλύειν, ⁸ καὶ
ἐπιστραφῇ τὸ ἔθνος
ἐκείνο ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν
κακῶν αὐτῶν . . .

The image of the potter appears in a wide range of texts,⁹⁸ so there is no need to assume the literary dependence of ‘Clement’ upon Paul. As Lindemann observes, the author of 2 *Clement* and Paul each appear to use the image in a different way: ‘Clement’ is concerned with the properties of the clay, and uses the image to warn his hearers to repent while there is still time; whereas Paul is concerned with the freedom of the potter, which he employs in defence of predestination.⁹⁹

⁹⁷ NTAF, 128; Donfried, *Setting*, 84–5; Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 216; Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 268; *idem*, *Clemensbriefe*, 221–2.

⁹⁸ Lindemann (*Clemensbriefe*, 221–2) notes that the image of the clay and the potter is used widely in Jewish texts, referring the reader to Billerbeck iii 271f., and adding a reference to *T. Naph.* 2. 2–5. The non-Jewish examples that he notes are Epictetus, *Diss.*, 4. 11. 27; Athenagoras, *Leg.* 15. 2; and Theoph., *Ad Autol.* 2. 26.

⁹⁹ Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 268.

2 Clem. 13. 2¹⁰⁰

Λέγει γὰρ ὁ κύριος,
διὰ παντὸς
τὸ ὄνομά μου
βλασφημεῖται ἐν πάσῃ
τοῖς ἔθνεσιν,
καὶ πάλιν,
οὐαὶ δι' ὃν βλασφημεῖται
τὸ ὄνομά μου.

Rom. 2. 24

τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ
δι' ὑμᾶς βλασφημεῖται
ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν,
καθὼς γέγραπται.

Isa. 52. 5b, LXX

τάδε λέγει κύριος,
δι' ὑμᾶς διὰ παντὸς
τὸ ὄνομά μου
βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς
ἔθνεσιν.

This parallel was not recorded by the Oxford Committee, and may be explained by 'Clement' citing Isaiah without direct recourse to Paul. The same passage appears to be used also in Ign., *Trall.* 8. 2; Poly. *Phil.* 10. 3; and *Ap Const.* 1. 10. 1 and 3. 5. 6¹⁰¹) The source of the second quotation is unknown.

The remaining three parallels are no more significant evidence for the use of Romans. They may be set out as follows.

2 Clem. 1. 8¹⁰²

ἐκάλεσεν γὰρ
ἡμᾶς οὐκ ὄντας
καὶ ἠθέλησεν
ἐκ μὴ ὄντος εἶναι ἡμᾶς

Rom. 4. 17

καθὼς γέγραπται
ὅτι Πατέρα πολλῶν ἔθνων
τέθεικά σε, κατέναντι οὐ
ἐπίστευσεν θεοῦ τοῦ
ζωοποιούντος τοὺς
νεκροὺς καὶ καλοῦντος
τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα.

cf. Gal. 4. 27

γέγραπται γάρ,
Εὐφράνθητι στείρα ἢ οὐ
τίκτουσα,
ῥῆξον καὶ βόησον, ἢ οὐκ
ὠδίνοσα.
ὅτι πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς
ἐρήμου μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς
ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα.

As the Oxford Committee observed, 'The correspondence is superficial, and the phrase [i.e. ἡμᾶς οὐκ ὄντας / τὰ μὴ ὄντα] in some sense is not uncommon.'¹⁰³ Thus they refer the reader to Lightfoot, who notes parallels in Philo, *De Creat. Princ.* 7; Herm. *Vis.* 1. 1; and Ps. Clem. Hom. 3. 32. Barnett notes another parallel in Philo, *De spec. leg.* 4. 7. 187, as also does Lindemann.

Warns suggests that 2 Clement contains an echo of Gal. 4. 27 as well as Rom. 4. 17, but this depends on his wider theories about the Valentianians whom (he believes) 'Clement' opposes.¹⁰⁴ The conceptual parallels between 2 Clem.

¹⁰⁰ NTAF, 128; Donfried, *Setting*, 53, 86–8; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 238–9.

¹⁰¹ Donfried, *Setting*, 53, 86–8; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 238.

¹⁰² NTAF, 128; Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 215; Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 236–44.

¹⁰³ NTAF, 128.

¹⁰⁴ See above, n. 7; also, Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 203, responding to Warns: 'Die Stelle erlaubt auch keinen Rückschluss auf die Paulus-Exegese der Valentinianer.'

1. 8 and Gal. 4. 27 seem too general to bear much weight, and no verbal parallels are present.

Two further parallels may be noted. Neither is substantial, and little weight may be put upon such similarities. These are as follows.

2 Clem. 17. 3¹⁰⁵

ἀλλὰ πυκνότερον προσερχόμενοι
πειρώμεθα προκόπτειν ἐν ταῖς
ἐντολαῖς τοῦ κυρίου, ἵνα πάντες
τὸ αὐτὸ φρονούντες συνηγμένοι ὦμεν
ἐπὶ τὴν ζωὴν

Rom. 12. 16

τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονούντες, μὴ
τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονούντες ἀλλὰ τοῖς
ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι. μὴ γίνεσθε
φρόνιμοι παρ' ἑαυτοῖς.

As Barnett observes, ἵνα πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ φρονούντες represents a type of moral exhortation that had perhaps become a commonplace in Christian preaching.¹⁰⁶ This obviates the need for any dependence, and accounts for the not dissimilar contexts in which the expression appears in each text. In 2 Clement the expression appears in the context of an exhortation to come together more frequently for worship; in Romans the paraenesis is of a more general kind, but it follows Paul's appeal that the Romans present their bodies as living sacrifices.

2 Clem. 19. 2b¹⁰⁷

ἐνίοτε γὰρ πονηρὰ
πράσσοντες οὐ
γνωσκομεν διὰ τὴν
διψυχίαν καὶ ἀπιστίαν
τὴν ἐνοῦσαν ἐν τοῖς
στήθεσιν ἡμῶν,
καὶ ἔσκοτίσμεθα
τὴν διάνοιν
ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν τῶν
ματαίων

Rom. 1. 21

διότι γνόντες τὸν θεὸν
οὐχ ὡς θεὸν ἐδόξασαν ἢ
ἠὺχαρίστησαν, ἀλλ'
ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς
διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν
καὶ ἔσκοτίσθη
ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν
καρδιά.

Cf. Eph. 4. 17–18

¹⁷ Τοῦτο οὖν λέγω
καὶ μαρτύρομαι ἐν κυρίῳ,
μηκέτι ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν,
καθὼς καὶ τὰ ἔθνη
περιπατεῖ ἐν ματαιότητι
τοῦ νοῦς αὐτῶν,¹⁸
ἔσκοτωμένοι
τῇ διανοίᾳ
ὄντες, ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι
τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ
τὴν ἄγνοιαν τὴν οὖσαν
ἐν αὐτοῖς, διὰ τὴν
πώρωσιν τῆς καρδίας
αὐτῶν

¹⁰⁵ Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 216.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid. As Lindemann notes (*Clemensbriefe*, 251), the phrase τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν is found elsewhere in Paul, at 2 Cor. 3. 11; Phil. 2. 2; 4. 2; Rom. 12. 16; 15. 5.

¹⁰⁷ NTAF, 128; Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 216; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 257.

These parallel references to a darkening of the understanding are examples of a commonplace, so there is no reason to posit literary dependence on either Romans or Ephesians.¹⁰⁸

1 Corinthians

Three potential parallels may be noted, but none offers strong evidence of a literary relationship with Paul. They are as follows.

2 Clem. 7. 1¹⁰⁹

ὥστε οὖν, ἀδελφοί μου, ἀγωνισώμεθα
εἰδότες, ὅτι ἐν χερσίν ὁ ἀγὼν καὶ ὅτι
εἰς τοὺς φθαρτοὺς ἀγῶνας
καταπλέουσιν πολλοί, ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες
στεφανοῦνται . . .

1 Cor. 9. 24–5

²⁴ Οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι οἱ ἐν σταδίῳ
τρέχοντες πάντες μὲν τρέχουσιν, εἷς
δὲ λαμβάνει τὸ βραβεῖον; οὕτως
τρέχετε ἵνα καταλάβητε. ²⁵ πᾶς
δὲ ὁ ἀγωνιζόμενος πάντα
ἐγκρατεύεται, ἐκεῖνοι μὲν οὖν ἵνα
φθαρτὸν στέφανον λάβωσιν, ἡμεῖς δὲ
ἄφθαρτον.

The metaphor of a race is a common one, and therefore insufficient to demonstrate dependence on Paul. The suggestion that competitors may have sailed (*καταπλέουσιν*) to the games has been interpreted as evidence of Corinthian provenance, on the grounds that failure to specify a port makes it likely that the games took place near to the point at which competitors disembarked.¹¹⁰ This would put the author (or at least those whom he addresses) in a city with strong associations with Paul. Should this hypothesis be accepted, it need not entail that we draw any inferences from the author's silence about Paul, though in this respect the contrast with *1 Clement* may be noted.

2 Clem. 9. 3¹¹¹

δεῖ οὖν ἡμᾶς ὡς ναὸν
θεοῦ φυλάσσειν τὴν
σάρκα

1 Cor. 3. 16

οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι
ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστε καὶ τὸ
πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν
ὑμῖν;

1 Cor. 6. 19

ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι
τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ
ἐν ὑμῖν ἀγίου πνεύματός
ἐστιν οὗ ἔχετε ἀπὸ θεοῦ,
καὶ οὐκ ἐστὲ ἑαυτῶν;

Cf. Eph. 2. 20–2; Ign., *Phld.* 7. 2; Eph. 15. 3.

¹⁰⁸ See below, p. 287 n. 125.

¹⁰⁹ NTAf, 126; Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 213; Donfried, *Setting*, 84; Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 265; *idem*, *Clemensbriefe*, 218–19.

¹¹⁰ Donfried, *Setting*, 2–7.

¹¹¹ NTAf, 126; Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 214; Donfried, *Setting*, 145; Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 265, 269–70; Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 230–5; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 225–6.

While a Pauline origin of this idea is not necessarily to be denied, it seems quite likely that it may quickly have become a Christian commonplace. ‘Clement’ is clearly making a point that is consistent with Pauline precedents, but he uses *σάρξ* rather than *σώμα*. It is quite possible that the whole of 2 *Clem.* 9. 1–6 reflects Pauline teaching about the resurrection such as is found in 1 Cor. 15, though Donfried’s claim that ‘it is likely that the author of 2 Clement has 1 Corinthians 15 in mind’ seems to claim too much.¹¹²

2 *Clem.* 11. 7¹¹³

ἄς οὐς οὐκ ἤκουσεν οὐδὲ
ὀφθαλμὸς εἶδεν,
οὐδὲ ἐπὶ καρδίαν
ἀνθρώπου ἀνεβη.

2 *Clem.* 14. 5

οὔτε ἐξειπεῖν τις
δύναται οὔτε λαλήσαι,

ἃ ἠτοίμασεν ὁ κύριος
τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ.

1 Cor. 2. 9

ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται,
ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ
οὐς οὐκ ἤκουσεν
καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν
ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη,
ἃ ἠτοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς
ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.

Isa. 64. 3, LXX: ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν οὐδὲ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν εἶδον θεὸν πλὴν σου καὶ τὰ ἔργα σου, ἃ ποιήσεις τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν ἔλεον.

Ps.-Philo, *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 26. 13: quod oculus non vidit nec auris audivit, et in cor hominis non ascendit.

1 *Clem.* 34. 8: λέγει γάρ, ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὐς οὐκ ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ὅσα ἠτοίμασεν κύριος [κύριος H L S: om. A] τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν αὐτόν

Cf. Justin, *Baruch*, apud Hippolytus, *Haer.* 5. 24; *Gos. Thom.* 17; *Mart. Pol.* 2. 3; *Pr. Paul.* A. 25–9, et al.¹¹⁴

Paul and the author of 1 *Clement* both use citation formulae, which imply that they are quoting from Scripture,¹¹⁵ but the words that they use do not correspond exactly with any otherwise known version of a scriptural text.¹¹⁶ It is possible that they quote Isa. 64. 3, but in a different form than that in the

¹¹² Donfried, *Setting*, 144–6; cf. Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 269–70.

¹¹³ NTAF, 126; Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 214; Donfried, *Setting*, 86; Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 265–7, 310, 324–5; *idem*, *Clemensbriefe*, 234.

¹¹⁴ For sources of further parallels, see C. M. Tuckett, ‘Paul and Jesus Tradition: The Evidence of 1 Corinthians 2:9 and Gospel of Thomas’, in T. J. Burke and J. K. Elliott (eds.), *Paul and the Corinthians: Studies on a Community in Conflict, Essays in Honour of Margaret Thrall*, NovTSup 109 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 55–73, on p. 60 n. 19.

¹¹⁵ The λέγει at 2 *Clem.* 11. 7 appears to pick up λέγει γάρ ἡ γραφή at 2 *Clem.* 11. 6.

¹¹⁶ It is possible that the latter may depend on the former, for the use of 1 Corinthians in 1 *Clement* seems clear on other grounds. See Gregory, Ch. 6 above, pp. 144–8.

LXX.¹¹⁷ However, there is no citation formula in *2 Clement*, and the parallels to Isa. 64 are less clear than those found in 1 Corinthians and in *1 Clement*. *2 Clem.* 11. 7 has ear before eye, and uses *οὐδε* twice, where Paul and the author of *1 Clement* use *οὐκ*. Thus it is possible that the author of *2 Clement* does not use Isa. 64 at all, or that he uses it in a different form from that used by Paul and by the author of *1 Clement*.

It is at this point that *2 Clem.* 14. 5 may be significant, for here the author includes an expression similar to one that both Paul and the author of *1 Clement* treat as part of the source that they are quoting. However, this expression is not part of Isa. 64 as found in the LXX or the MT. If it goes back to a version of Isa. 64. 3 (or indeed another source) known already to Paul, then the author of *2 Clement* (as also the author of *1 Clement*) may have used it quite independently of Paul. If, however, its association with the preceding words originates with Paul, then it might suggest (assuming that the distance between *2 Clem.* 11. 7 and *2 Clem.* 14. 5 may be collapsed in this way) that the author of *2 Clement* takes these expressions from Paul. This possibility cannot be excluded completely,¹¹⁸ but the distance between the two expressions in *2 Clement* and the possibility that the author of *2 Clement* drew on Paul's source means that this instance, though intriguing, falls short of providing sufficient evidence for it be considered as probably dependent on Paul. It is quite likely a commonplace, and the attestation in Ps.-Philo 26. 13 of the first part of the 'saying' (i.e., as found in *2 Clem.* 11. 7, but not 14. 5) suggests that at least part of this commonplace was known independently of the Christian tradition.¹¹⁹

Galatians

There is one potential parallel, *2 Clem.* 2. 1¹²⁰ and Gal. 4. 27, but this may be explained by each author's independent use of Isa. 54. 1.

| <i>2 Clem.</i> 2. 1 | Gal. 4. 27 | Isa. 54. 1 |
|--|--|--|
| <i>Εὐφράνθητι, στεῖρα ἢ οὐ τίκτουσα,</i> | <i>γέγραπται γάρ, Εὐφράνθητι στεῖρα ἢ οὐ τίκτουσα,</i> | <i>Εὐφράνθητι, στεῖρα ἢ οὐ τίκτουσα,</i> |

¹¹⁷ Donfried (*Setting*, 86) considers it likely that Paul and the authors of *1 Clement* and *2 Clement* each independently cite the same old Greek version of Isaiah. For further discussion of the origin of Paul's 'citation', see Tuckett, 'Paul and Jesus Tradition', 55–73, esp. 60–4.

¹¹⁸ But see Tuckett, 'Paul and Jesus Tradition', 71–2, where he critiques one recent attempt to explain why Paul may have added these words.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.* 63–4.

¹²⁰ Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 215–16; Donfried, *Setting*, 82, 108, 192–6; Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 268; *idem*, *Clemensbriefe*, 204.

ῥήξον καὶ βόησον, ἡ οὐκ
ὠδίνουσα,
ὅτι πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς
ἐρήμου μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς
ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα

ῥήξον καὶ βόησον, ἡ οὐκ
ὠδίνουσα·
ὅτι πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς
ἐρήμου μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς
ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα.

ῥήξον καὶ βόησον, ἡ οὐκ
ὠδίνουσα,
ὅτι πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς
ἐρήμου μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς
ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα,
εἶπεν γὰρ κύριος.

Cf Justin, *1 Apol.* 53. 5; *Dial.* 13. 8: *Εὐφράνθητι, στείρα ἢ οὐ τίκτουσα, ῥήξον καὶ βόησον, ἡ οὐκ ὠδίνουσα, ὅτι πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐρήμου μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα.*

As Lightfoot observes, both ‘Clement’ and Justin apply the prophecy of Isaiah in the same way, as referring to a time when there would be more Gentile than Jewish believers. This is quite different from the use to which Paul puts his citation, for he uses it to demonstrate that Sarah’s children (the followers of Christ) are free, whereas Hagar’s children (the Jews) are slaves to the Law. This would imply that ‘Clement’ and Justin drew on the same *Vorlage*, perhaps a testimony book, not on Paul’s letter to the Galatians.¹²¹

Ephesians

The most significant potential parallel to Ephesians is at *2 Clem.* 14. 2,¹²² though even this was rated only as d by the Oxford Committee. It may be set out as follows.

2 Clem. 14. 2

οὐκ οἶομαι δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ὅτι
ἐκκλησιάω ζῶσα σῶμά ἐστιν Χριστοῦ.
Λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή,
ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἄρσεν
καὶ θήλυ.
Τὸ ἄρσεν ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός, τὸ θήλυ ἡ
ἐκκλησία.
Καὶ ὅτι τὰ βιβλία καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι
τὴν ἐκκλησίαν οὐ νῦν εἶναι, ἀλλὰ
ἄνωθεν.

Eph. 1. 22; 5. 23

1. 22: καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς
πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν
κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ

5. 23: ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἐστὶν κεφαλὴ τῆς
γυναικὸς ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς
ἐκκλησίας, αὐτὸς σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος·

¹²¹ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1. 2. 214. I owe this observation, and the reference to Lightfoot, to Professor Petersen. Lindemann (*Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 268) reaches a similar conclusion: ‘zwischen 2 Clem 2, 1 bzw. 2,2f und der paulinischen Interpretation von Jes 54,1 besteht im übrigen keinerlei Zusammenhang’. For a different opinion, see John Muddiman, ch. 6 in companion volume, on pp. 114–16.

¹²² NTAF, 126–7; Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 215; Donfried, *Setting*, 88; Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 267–8; Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 211–15, who finds an indirect reference to Col. 1. 24; but cf. Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 241–2.

Cf. Eph. 1. 4: καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ.

Gen. 1. 27: καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν, ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς.

For Lindemann, who notes the possible influence of either a Gnostic concept of syzygies or Jewish apocalyptic thought in addition to that of Ephesians, 'Der ursprünglich paulinische Charakter der in 2 Clem 14 enthaltenen Ekklesiologie ist also kaum zu bestreiten; er ist aber dem Vf nicht bewußt', and he cites the Oxford Committee in support.¹²³ But John Muddiman has offered a number of reasons why a more direct relationship to Ephesians should be considered at this point. These are the assumption by 'Clement' that his audience is already familiar with the ideas to which he alludes, his explicit reference to the apostles, which he thinks suggests an apostolic writing, the author's appropriation of Jewish understandings of pre-existence to indicate that the Christian church is no recent upstart, and a contrast between the church as true temple and the Jewish temple to which the author alludes in his reference to the 'den of brigands' in 14. 1. These factors, claims Muddiman, together with the wider context of *2 Clement*, where he finds other echoes of Ephesians—most notably, conceptual similarities between the household code of Ephesians 5 and the sexual abstinence advocated in *2 Clem.* 12—'is sufficient to increase considerably the probability of his having read it'.¹²⁴

Other parallels have also been noted, but none is significant.¹²⁵ Their cumulative impact may be suggestive, but the similarities are very general and may be easily accounted for as commonplaces in early Christian

¹²³ Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 267. Similarly, Helmut Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament*, ii: *The History and Literature of Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982), 235; referring to the interpretation of Gen. 1. 27 in *2 Clement* he writes: 'This presupposes either the deutero-Pauline Letter to the Ephesians or analogous speculations about the heavenly beings "Church" and "Christ". The latter seems more likely, especially since 2 Clement elsewhere attests a knowledge of the Pauline letters only rarely or not at all.'

¹²⁴ Muddiman, ch. 6 in companion volume; quotation on p. 116. Other conceptual parallels that he notes include a belief in God's election in Christ of the saints before the creation of the world (Eph. 1. 4; cf. *2 Clem.* 1. 8; 14. 1); the idea of the universal lordship of Christ over creation and the church (Eph. 1. 22, using Pss. 110. 1 and 8. 7; cf. *2 Clem.* 17. 4–5); that the church is a spiritual temple (Eph. 2. 20; cf. *2 Clem.* 14. 1–2); that the ascended Christ is the source of apostolic ministry, such that the church's ministry exercises the authority of the glorified Christ (Eph. 4. 11; cf. *2 Clem.* 17. 3, 5); that Christ loved the church and gave himself to save her (Eph. 5. 25 f.; cf. *2 Clem.* 9. 5); that Gen. 2. 24 is an allegory of the union between Christ and the church (Eph. 5. 31 f.; cf. *2 Clem.* 14. 2, on which see the present discussion).

¹²⁵ These include the apocalyptic dualism found in *2 Clem.* 6. 3–5 // Eph. 2. 1–3; cf. Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, 216, where he notes also other examples in other early Christian texts; *2 Clem.* 9. 3–4 // Eph. 2. 20–2, the flesh/body as a temple, on which see above 283–4 on *2 Clem.* 9. 3 // 1 Cor. 5; *2 Clem.* 13. 1 // Eph. 6. 6 (cf. Col. 3. 22); the common use of the word ἄνθρωπάρεσκοι *2 Clem.* 14. 1 // Eph. 1. 4–5, references to God choosing his people before

paraenesis. Thus, even if their cumulative impact supports the possibility that ‘Clement’ was familiar with many of the ideas and much of the language found in Ephesians, nevertheless it falls short of convincing evidence for direct dependence on this text. This does not, of course, rule out the possibility that ‘Clement’ had read Ephesians at some point prior to the composition of his exhortation, though it by no means demands such a hypothesis. As Lindemann observes, there is no need to deny the originally Pauline character of such traditions, but the possibility that they may have been transmitted very widely, both among the proto-orthodox, such as ‘Clement’, and also among others often labelled Gnostics, indicates that the suitably cautious conclusions of the Oxford Committee should be upheld.

Colossians

References to Colossians do not feature prominently in discussions of the use of Paul in *2 Clement*. The Oxford Committee referred to Colossians only once in its discussion of *2 Clement*, and even that reference was no more than a note appended to their record of the single word ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι found in *2 Clem.* 13. 1 // Eph. 6. 6 // Col. 3. 22.¹²⁶ More recently, Rudiger Warns has argued that echoes of Colossians may be found in two other places: *2 Clem.* 14. 2–3¹²⁷ (an echo of Col. 1. 23 ff. and Gal. 4. 26 f.); and *2 Clem.* 17. 7–18. 1¹²⁸ (an echo of Col. 3. 16–17). As before, his arguments depend upon his understanding of the Valentinian exegesis of Paul that ‘Clement’ opposes. There are no verbal parallels in the first example that he gives, and those in the second are slight. They include words and phrases found in both *2 Clement* and Ephesians (νουθετέω in *2 Clem.* 17. 2, 3, and in Col. 3. 16; διὰ τῶν λόγων ἢ διὰ τῶν ἔργων in *2 Clem.* 17. 7 and ἐν λόγῳ ἢ ἐν ἔργῳ in Col. 3. 17; and τῷ θεῷ . . . εὐχαριστοῦντων in *2 Clem.* 17. 7; 18. 1, and εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ θεῷ in Col. 3. 17), but they are used in different ways and are distributed over a relatively long section of *2 Clement*. Therefore they seem insufficient to support the likelihood of literary dependence.

1 and 2 Timothy

Three possible references to 1 Timothy may be noted, and one to 2 Timothy. The first, a reference to Christ saving those who are perishing (*2 Clem.* 2. 5, 7 //

he created the world; and *2 Clem.* 19. 2 // Eph. 4. 18; cf. Rom. 1. 21), references to the darkening of the understanding, cf. above, p. 282–3.

¹²⁶ As noted above, n. 125.

¹²⁷ Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 207–20, esp. 211–15. Cf. Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 241; and above, p. 287, on *2 Clem.* 14. 2 // Eph. 1. 22, 5. 25.

¹²⁸ Warns, *Untersuchungen*, 221–9.

1 Tim. 1. 15 // Matt. 18. 11 // Luke 19. 10) seems too commonplace for it to be likely that it is a quotation of any of the parallels noted, and its reference to the ‘perishing’ rather than to ‘sinners’ differentiates it from each of the supposed ‘parallels’ that are noted. It seems better understood not as a reference to another text but as the author’s own statement of the intention and significance of Christ’s ministry.¹²⁹

The other two parallels are similarly commonplace. The first (2 *Clem.* 15. 1;¹³⁰ also 19. 1¹³¹ // 1 Tim. 4. 16; cf. Jas. 5. 19–20) refers to the responsibility of Christians, especially those in positions of authority, for each other. It is too general and too likely a standard *topos* of paraenesis (cf. 1 Cor. 3. 13 ff.; 2 Cor. 1. 4; *Barn.* 1. 4) to be considered evidence of literary dependence on an earlier text. The third parallel, a doxology (2 *Clem.* 20. 5¹³² // 1 Tim. 1. 17) does contain significant verbal parallels, but a basis in common liturgical forms¹³³ with a background in Hellenistic Judaism¹³⁴ is more likely than literary dependence on 1 Timothy.

The single potential parallel to 2 Timothy (2 *Clem.* 1. 1 // 2 Tim. 4. 1; cf. Acts 10. 42; 1 Pet. 4. 5; Poly. *Phil.* 2. 1; *Barn.* 7. 2; above, p. 278) is clearly a commonplace.

Other Letters and the Apocalypse

Hebrews

Four potential parallels may be noted with Hebrews, one of which the Oxford Committee considered sufficient to classify as ‘c’, indicating a low degree of probability that ‘Clement’ drew on this text. The passage in question is 2 *Clem.* 11. 6,¹³⁵ with a parallel at Heb. 10. 23.

2 *Clem.* 11. 6

πιστὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος
τὰς ἀντιμισθίας ἀποδιδόναι ἐκάστω
τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ

Heb. 10. 23

κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος
ἀκλινη,
πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος,

¹²⁹ For bibliography and fuller discussion, above 256.

¹³⁰ *NTAF*, 129; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 245.

¹³¹ Donfried, *Setting*, 89.

¹³² *NTAF*, 129; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 260–1.

¹³³ So too the Oxford Committee, *NTAF*, 129.

¹³⁴ Donfried, *Setting*, 188–9.

¹³⁵ *NTAF*, 125; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 234.

1 Clem. 27. 1: ταύτη οὖν τῇ ἐλπίδι προσεδέσθωσαν αἱ ψυχαὶ ἡμῶν τῷ πιστῷ ἐν ταῖς ἐπαγγελίαις καὶ τῷ δικαίῳ ἐν τοῖς κρίμασιν.

The committee claims that the ‘context of the two passages is similar, referring to the need of hope in the presence of grounds for doubt’. This is correct, although the doubt addressed explicitly at *2 Clem.* 11. 1–5 is addressed more implicitly in Hebrews. The writer to the Hebrews exhorts his readers to hold fast to the benefits that they have by virtue of the high-priestly ministry of Christ, maintaining the hope that they confess, because they can be confident in the faithfulness of God who does what he has promised. An eschatological element to this hope is not to be denied, but it results also in love, good works, and meeting together in the present as they prepare for the approaching Day of the Lord (Heb. 10. 19–24). This eschatological perspective is also important in *2 Clement*, where the same elements of confident hope on the basis of the faithfulness of the one who has promised and the ‘doing of righteousness before God’ are assurances of entry into God’s kingdom and receipt of his promises. Yet even the similarity of context between these passages and the verbal identity that they display are not compelling evidence for literary dependence. The claim that God is faithful is a general one that might be made in a wide range of contexts and for a wide range of reasons (cf. *1 Clem.* 1. 27), so it seems better to consider this parallel only as a possible rather than as a probable instance of direct dependence on Hebrews.¹³⁶

Three further potential parallels may be noted. The first was recorded by the Oxford Committee as d; the others as unclassified. They are as follows.

2 Clem. 1. 6¹³⁷

ἀμαύρωσιν οὖν περικείμενοι καὶ
τοιαύτης ἀχλύος γέμοντες ἐν τῇ
δράσει, ἀνεβλέψαμεν ἀποθέμενοι
ἐκεῖνο ὃ περικείμεθα νέφος τῇ αὐτοῦ
θελήσει

Heb. 12. 1

Τοιγαροῦν καὶ ἡμεῖς τοσοῦτον ἔχοντες
περικείμενον ἡμῖν νέφος μαρτύρων,
ὄγκον ἀποθέμενοι πάντα καὶ τὴν
εὐπερίστατον ἀμαρτίαν, δι’ ὑπομονῆς
τρέχωμεν τὸν προκείμενον ἡμῖν ἀγῶνα

‘Although the thought of these two passages is so different’, noted the Oxford Committee, ‘it seems difficult in view of the verbal coincidences, to resist the conclusion that the language of *2 Clement* is unconsciously influenced by that of Hebrews.’¹³⁸ Yet it is not clear that such a conclusion is in fact difficult to resist. The verbal coincidences are limited to the shared use of νέφος, ἀποθέμενοι, and περίκειμαι, but the cloud that surrounds each of the

¹³⁶ Cf. Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 234: ‘eine literarische Beziehung besteht nicht’.

¹³⁷ *NTAF*, 125–6; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 202.

¹³⁸ *NTAF*, 126.

addressees is of an entirely different nature,¹³⁹ as also are the objects that each lays aside.¹⁴⁰ Therefore it is difficult to find any clear evidence of the influence of Hebrews on *2 Clement* at this point, so the Oxford Committee's classification of this passage as d—'too uncertain to allow any reliance to be placed upon it'—seems more appropriate than their comments quoted above.

The two other possible parallels that the committee notes, but does not classify, are *2 Clem.* 16. 4¹⁴¹ // Heb. 13. 18 and *2 Clem.* 20. 2¹⁴² // Heb. 10. 32–9. The former refers to prayer and to a clean conscience (*καλή συνείδησις*), although the two are differently linked in each passage. The latter contains the expression *θεοῦ ζῶντος* (Heb. 10. 31), and the committee refers also to a 'general similarity' between the passages; but such similarities are of a commonplace nature. Neither 'parallel' offers any significant evidence for the dependence of the author of *2 Clement* on Hebrews.

Other Letters

The Oxford Committee noted a number of potential parallels between *2 Clement* and other letters in the New Testament. None is classed higher than d—'too uncertain to allow any reliance to be placed upon it'—and others are unclassified. Therefore they may be noted,¹⁴³ but need not be discussed. None indicates anything beyond the use of common language.

Revelation

There is one possible parallel, at *2 Clem.* 3. 2, where Jesus is quoted as saying, 'I will acknowledge before my Father the one who acknowledges me before others'. This saying has a potential parallel at Rev. 3. 5, and also at Matt. 10. 32 // Luke 12. 8. It has been discussed above,¹⁴⁴ where it is suggested that it is more likely to depend on the Q saying than on Revelation.

¹³⁹ So also Donfried, *Setting*, 184, where he notes frequent references to clouds in the Jewish Scriptures, especially the Wisdom tradition, and cites Job 22. 14.

¹⁴⁰ Similarly, Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 202: 'Der folgende Satz *περικείμενοι . . . ἀνεβλέψαμεν ἀποθέμενοι . . . νέφος* erinnert in Aufbau und Begrifflichkeit an Hebr 12, 1; aber inhaltlich liegt natürlich eine ganz andere Aussage vor.'

¹⁴¹ *NTAF*, 126.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*

¹⁴³ James: *2 Clem.* 6. 3, 5 // Jas. 4. 4; *2 Clem.* 15. 1 // Jas. 5. 16; *2 Clem.* 16. 4 // Jas. 5. 20; cf. 1 Pet. 4. 8; *1 Clem.* 49. 5; *2 Clem.* 20. 2–4 // Jas. 5. 7, 8, 10. 1 Peter: *2 Clem.* 14. 2 // 1 Pet. 1. 20; 2. 4; *2 Clem.* 16. 4 // 1 Pet. 4. 8; cf. Jas. 5. 20; *1 Clem.* 49. 5; Donfried, *Setting*, 91–2; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 249. On *2 Clem.* 1. 1 // 1 Pet. 4. 5, see above, p. 278. 2 Peter: *2 Clem.* 16. 3 // 2 Pet. 3. 5–7, 10. Jude: *2 Clem.* 20. 4 // Jude 6; Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 259–60.

¹⁴⁴ Above, pp. 257–8.

CONCLUSION

2 Clement contains a wide range of material that is paralleled in many of the writings that were later transmitted in the New Testament. It clearly uses material that has been shaped by Matthew and Luke, although not necessarily directly, but it also contains Jesus tradition that may originate elsewhere. Parallels with material elsewhere in the New Testament locate it firmly in the same general milieu, but none demands a literary relationship with any of those texts. The strongest evidence for such dependence is found with respect to Ephesians and Hebrews, but these parallels, though tantalizing, are insufficient to raise dependence to the level of probability, rather than mere possibility. Thus we have found firmer evidence for the use of Matthew and Luke than was claimed in 1905, but less secure evidence for Hebrews.

The *Shepherd of Hermas* and the Writings that later formed the New Testament

Joseph Verheyden

THE PROBLEM

The *Shepherd of Hermas* is by far the longest among the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, but it is widely regarded as the least rewarding for the question that concerns us here.¹ That question can be described most generally as looking for evidence that the author of the *Shepherd* knew and made use of one or another of the writings that will afterwards be included in the New Testament, or at least realised for some such material he uses that it has its origin in these writings.

Hermas has not been very helpful in addressing this question. He hardly tells us anything about himself or his work that is directly relevant or useful for our purpose. He presents himself as a member of the Christian community in Rome, or of one such community. Though based on external evidence only, it is commonly accepted that he wrote some time in the first half of the second century.² It is therefore a most reasonable assumption that he may have known some of the earliest Christian writings. This has been disputed in

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, quotations and English translation of *Shepherd* are taken from the edition of B. D. Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers*, LCL 24–5 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003).

² For a presentation and discussion of the evidence, see P. Lampe, *Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten: Untersuchungen zur Sozialgeschichte*, WUNT 2.18 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1987, 2nd edn. 1989), 71–8, 182–200, 447–8; M. Leutzsch, *Die Wahrnehmung sozialer Wirklichkeit im 'Hirten des Hermas'*, FRLANT 150 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 20–49 ('Zum Problem des Autobiographischen'); N. Brox, *Der Hirt des Hermas*, KAV 7 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 15–35; U. H. J. Kortner and M. Leutzsch, *Papias-fragmente—Der Hirt des Hermas*, SUC 3 (Darmstadt: WBG, 1998), 132–7; C. Osiek, *The Shepherd of Hermas: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1999), 18–24. A dating in the first century has (again) been argued for by J. C. Wilson, *Toward a Reassessment of the Shepherd of Hermas: Its Date and its Pneumatology* (Lewiston, Queenston, Lampeter: Mellen Biblical Press, 1993), 9–61.

the past, but seems to be generally accepted in current scholarship.³ We can only speculate about how he came to know such writings, how many of them he knew and how well he knew them, whether he had read them himself or heard them read in public, whether this had happened only once (long ago?) or repeatedly, and whether he had direct, constant access to these texts when composing the *Shepherd*. But all these questions are in a sense secondary to the basic assumption that, as a (moderately) literate person, Hermas must have known whatever such writings were available in his community.⁴

If Hermas knew some such writings, it is again a reasonable assumption that he made use of some of them in composing his work. Theoretically, therefore, one can say that the burden of proof lies with those scholars who would argue that he knew but did not use any of these writings. Unfortunately, however, if one wants to go beyond the theoretical level and try to identify which texts Hermas may have used, it appears that the *Shepherd* does not seem to contain evidence of a kind that is indisputable, or even just convincing and acceptable to a substantial proportion of the scholars who have studied the problem in more detail. Many will say that the evidence we have is at best ambivalent.

Also ambivalent is how to interpret the (seemingly) unreflective way in which Hermas makes use of such material that is paralleled in other Christian writings. He does not seem to need it to compose his work. He can go on for pages describing visions, developing lengthy allegorical explanations, and elaborating moral and paraenetic considerations, while relying on his own somewhat debatable skills as a preacher and a writer. But then, here and there, one stumbles upon words and phrases that are also attested in the gospels, in Paul, or in James. Hermas never identifies this material as such, and he seems to use it freely and sovereignly, and sometimes even for other purposes, but apparently part of it is still sufficiently close to these writings to have led some students of the *Shepherd* to regard it as resulting from literary influence. In short, the situation is such that some have taken it to be a sure sign that Hermas was

³ It was disputed by F. Spitta, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristentums*, ii. *Der Brief des Jakobus; Studien zum Hirten des Hermas* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896), 241–437, and most recently again by Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 133–4.

⁴ Scholars have been rather more interested in other aspects of the social situation of the author and his community than that of literacy. See, e.g., C. Osiek, *Rich and Poor in the Shepherd of Hermas: An Exegetical-Social Investigation*, CBQMS 15 (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1983), 91–135 (a community largely consisting of freedmen/women, with admittedly a sufficient level of education to prosper in business); H. O. Maier, *The Social Setting of the Ministry as Reflected in the Writings of Hermas, Clement and Ignatius* (Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1991), 55–86 (p. 78: ‘an ethic of love patriarchy’). Leutzsch (*Wahrnehmung*, 12–18) discusses various aspects of the community situation, including the position of women, slavery, and agriculture. His critical remarks on the authorial capacities of Hermas do not (and are not meant to) invalidate the above observation.

thoroughly familiar with a number of early Christian writings, while others have argued that it can only mean that the author was relying on common tradition and perhaps was not even aware that material similar to that he was using was to be found in written sources of his time, or at least did not seem to care about it.

It is doubtful whether this ambivalence on the part of the author of the *Shepherd* can be sufficiently explained by the genre, the purpose, or the composition history of the text. It has been argued that explicit quotations from Christian literature would not fit the visionary apocalypse that is the *Shepherd*.⁵ But could it have prevented Hermas from alluding more clearly to, and relying more extensively on, material from written tradition?⁶ The book's core message, allowing one more chance (but only one) for repentance from sin after baptism, would probably not have prevented Hermas from using any of the New Testament writings.⁷ Finally, paralleled material is found throughout the *Shepherd*, and cannot be used, and indeed has not played any role, in the discussion on the composition history and the unity of

⁵ 'Dass er keine christlichen Schrift zitiert, liegt an der Gattung: In Apokalypsen wird in der Regel nicht zitiert' (Leutsch, *Hirt*, 133). The latter part of this observation should be qualified. Hermas exceptionally does (pretend to) quote from another writing (ibid. 401 n. 206, and see below, p. 322). Defining the genre of the *Shepherd* has proved to be a vexed matter, though few will dispute that it contains at least a visionary framework that is comparable to what is found in other writings that are more commonly characterized as apocalypses. See the discussion in P. Vielhauer and G. Strecker, 'Apokalyptik des Urchristentums: Einleitung', in W. Schneemelcher (ed.), *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, ii, 6th edn. (Tübingen: Mohr, 1996), 537–47, esp. 540–4. Brox, *Hirt*, 33–43: the category 'apocalypse' is 'nicht ideal, aber bezeichnend und brauchbar für den PH' (p. 38); it is doubtful whether it is of much help to label the work a 'pseudo-apocalypse', as Brox proposes. Osiek (*Shepherd*, 10–12) is more positive, emphasizing the specific function of Hermas's apocalypticism as addressing a 'crisis' resulting from issues raised within the community. According to A. Schneider, *Shepherd* combines elements from prophetic, apocalyptic, epistolographic, and catechetical literature into one: 'Propter sanctam ecclesiam suam': *Die Kirche als Geschöpf, Frau und Bau im Bussunterricht des Pastor Hermae*, *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum*, 67 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1999), 42–61.

⁶ The description of Isaiah's vision of the church in the *Ascensio Isaiae* is a patchwork of words and phrases from the NT. See the comments on *Asc. Isa.* 3. 21–31 by E. Norelli, *Ascensio Isaiae: Commentarius*, CCSA 8 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1995), 211–34.

⁷ That this is (one of) the main purpose(s) of the *Shepherd* is widely recognized, whatever one thinks of the innovating character of the concept or of the procedures it involved. Much of the discussion has focused on whether Hermas merely wanted to restrict an existing practice (after baptism there is only one opportunity for repentance; so, e.g., Poschmann) or really introduced 'etwas grundsätzlich Neues' against the more rigoristic praxis of his time (e.g., Goldhahn-Müller, p. 287). Cf. B. Poschmann, *Paenitentia Secunda: Die kirchliche Busse im ältesten Christentum bis Cyprian und Origines*, *Theophaneia*, 1 (Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1940), 134–205; I. Goldhahn-Müller, *Die Grenze der Gemeinde: Studien zum Problem der zweiten Busse im Neuen Testament unter Berücksichtigung der Entwicklung im 2 Jh. bis Tertullian*, *GTA* 39 (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 240–88. See also Brox, *Hirt*, 476–85, who rightly warns us not to overinterpret disciplinary procedures.

the work.⁸ None of these issues, then, offers much help with the problem being addressed here.

Ambivalent, finally, and open to discussion are the criteria and the indications we have to tackle the problem. How much agreement in wording and meaning and how much similarity in content are needed to deduce literary dependence? How do we define the latter, and what is meant by ‘using a source’? What is the weight of a verbal agreement if the same or a very similar phrase is attested in a number of other sources? And what is the real importance of finding words and phrases that are considered to be redactional in the writings which Hermas supposedly may have used?⁹

The above may explain why, when looking at the history of research, one might get the double impression that it reads very much as a dispute between ‘believers’ and ‘disbelievers’, and that the latter have won.

CHAPTERS FROM THE HISTORY OF RESEARCH

Because of the ambivalence of the evidence, confidence (or lack thereof) seems to be the keyword whereby to understand this history. The dispute between the two groups can be exemplified with a few examples. In 1868 Theodor Zahn collected an impressive number of parallels from many of the New Testament writings to build a massive argument for Hermas’s dependence on written tradition.¹⁰ Nine years later Oskar von Gebhardt and Adolf von Harnack were rather more sceptical in their short treatment of the

⁸ The era of complicated literary-critical solutions to explain the composition of the *Shepherd* seems over. Osiek speaks of the ‘return to single authorship’, which should be qualified to the extent that she assumes that the author made use of various sources and that the work went through several stages of redaction (*Shepherd*, 8–10). A. Hilhorst has illustrated this ‘single authorship’ on the basis of a detailed stylistic analysis: *Sémitismes et latinismes dans le Pasteur d’Herma*, *Graecitas Christianorum Primaeva*, 5 (Nijmegen: Dekker & van der Vegt, 1976), 19–31, and *passim*. Ph. Henne has defended the (more exceptional) position that the various parts of *Herma* were brought together to form a kind of manual of initiation: cf. *L’unité du Pasteur d’Herma: Tradition et rédaction*, *Cahiers de la Revue Biblique*, 31 (Paris: Gabalda, 1992).

⁹ This kind of ‘meta-reflection’ has perhaps not always received sufficient attention in earlier studies on the reception history of biblical texts. See now, e.g., W.-D. Köhler, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus*, WUNT 2.24 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 7–17; T. Nagel, *Die Rezeption des Johannesevangeliums im 2. Jahrhundert: Studien zur vorirenäischen Aneignung und Auslegung des vierten Evangeliums in christlicher und christlich-agnostischer Literatur*, *Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte*, 2 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2000), 34–45; A. Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century*, WUNT 2.169 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 5–20.

¹⁰ T. Zahn, *Der Hirt des Herma untersucht* (Gotha, 1868), 391–482. Cf. also *idem*, *Hermae Pastoris e Novo Testamento illustratus* (Göttingen, 1867).

question.¹¹ Time and again they point out that Zahn's 'confidence' is unwarranted. Of Paul's letters, Hermas probably knew only Ephesians.¹² The *Shepherd* contains several similarities with Hebrews, but again Zahn goes too far when he concludes that this letter must have had 'great influence' ('ein bedeutender Einfluss') on the *Shepherd*.¹³ The case seems somewhat more convincing for James,¹⁴ but it is not the only possible explanation, and to von Gebhardt and von Harnack it is not the most probable one: rather Hermas and James seem to have relied independently upon Christian tradition.¹⁵ Zahn is most confident ('confidentissime') with regard to 1 and 2 Peter, but again the evidence for the first is 'admodum incerta', and for the second inconclusive, some similarities in content notwithstanding.¹⁶ One might be reminded of John's gospel on several occasions, 'at re vera nulla apparent certa vestigia'.¹⁷ Revelation, finally, was certainly unknown to Hermas, and the same is true of Acts.¹⁸ Von Gebhardt and von Harnack admit that Hermas may have been acquainted with the synoptic gospels, but certainly not with all three of them.¹⁹ In particular, the evidence that Hermas knew Mark is considered to be insufficient,²⁰ whereas that for Matthew and Luke is not listed in the introduction and has to be collected from the notes to the edition. Consequently, von Gebhardt and von Harnack argue that indications of literary dependence are strictly limited (basically only Ephesians). About twenty years later Friedrich Spitta would go a whole step further yet, and argue for a radical scepticism.²¹

A perhaps even more outspoken contrast than the one between Zahn and von Gebhardt and von Harnack can be found in Anglo-Saxon literature of

¹¹ O. von Gebhardt and A. von Harnack, *Hermae Pastoris graecae: Addita versione latina recentiore e codice palatino*, Patrum Apostolicorum Opera, 3 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1877), pp. lxxiii–lxxvi. This section is particularly rich in references to older literature.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. lxxv: 'quam eum legisse verisimile est', and n. 1: Zahn (*Hirt*, 410–20) 'fidentius' also argues for knowledge of 1 and 2 Corinthians.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. lxxv n. 2: 'Quod egomet confirmare nequeo'.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. lxxv: 'saepius putaveris, Pastoris verba in mandatis esse paraphrasin sententiarum Iacobi illius'.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*: 'utrumque pari condicione ac tempore usum ex iisdem theologiae vel potius praedicationis Christianae hausisse fontibus'. Interestingly, Zahn is now also criticized for arguing that Hermas's position on the relationship between 'faith' and 'good works' is *not* comparable to that of James (*ibid.* n. 4: 'vehementer igitur erravit Zahnus').

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. lxxvi.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ *Ibid.*: 'nullam Hermas prodit notitiam' and p. lxxiv n. 5: 'frustra quaeres vestigia Actorum Apost.'.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. lxxiv: 'Hermam historiae evangelicae in ev. Synopticis enarratae non ignarum fuisse, sponte concedes; sed utrum tria illa legerit evangelia annon, minime patet'.

²⁰ Cf. *ibid.* n. 5: 'Sed nimis fidenter Zahnus...'

²¹ See above, n. 3.

about the same period. In his monograph on the canon, B. F. Westcott briefly argued that Hermas was acquainted with James, Revelation, all four of the gospels, Acts, 1 Peter, and two letters of Paul (Ephesians and 1 Corinthians). His comment is worth quoting for the confidence it breathes:

The allusions to the Epistle of St James and to the Apocalypse are naturally most frequent, since the one is most closely connected with the Shepherd by its tone, and the other by its form. The numerous paraphrases of our Lord's words prove that Hermas was familiar with some records of His teaching. That these were no other than our Gospels is at least rendered probable by the fact that he makes no reference to any Apocryphal narrative and the opinion is confirmed by probable allusions to St John and the Acts. In several places also St John's teaching on 'the Truth' lies at the ground of Hermas' words; and the parallels with the First Epistle of St Peter are well worthy of notice. The relation of Hermas to St Paul is interesting and important. His peculiar object, as well as perhaps his turn of mind, removed him from any close connexion with the Apostle; but their divergence has been strangely exaggerated. In addition to marked coincidences of language with the First Epistle to the Corinthians and with that to the Ephesians, Hermas distinctly recognises the great truth which is commonly regarded as the characteristic centre of St Paul's teaching.²²

Westcott then goes on to illustrate the influence of Paul for the doctrine of faith and that of John on Hermas' Christology by quoting *Vis.* 3. 8 and *Sim.* 8. 3, 5, 6, and 9. 2, 12. 14 respectively, but without linking these passages to a particular text from Paul or John.²³ In the notes to the text just quoted Westcott offers a number of illustrations for particular passages, but perhaps more important than these is a word of comment on his arguments. The evidence for James is based rather vaguely on 'the tone' of the writing and the great number of parallels that can be listed. These are of two sorts: shorter passages and more substantial similarities.²⁴ The agreement with Revelation lies in the genre ('its form') and the use of a similar kind of symbolism.²⁵ The agreements with the gospels are primarily to be found in the parables (*Sim.* 8. 3 and 9. 19–21 and Matt. 13; *Sim.* 9. 29 and Matt. 18. 3), but also in other sayings material (*Vis.* 2. 2 and Matt. 10. 33).²⁶ Three parallels are quoted for

²² B. F. Westcott, *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament* (Cambridge and London: Macmillan, 1855), 223–4; 5th rev. edn. (1881), 201–2. In the notes Westcott gives the list of parallels with James and Revelation.

²³ Except for the final clause of *Sim.* 5. 6, for which he refers to John 15. 15.

²⁴ Cf. *Man.* 12. 5–6 (Jas. 4. 7, 12) and *Sim.* 8. 6 (Jas. 2. 7) for the first, and *Vis.* 3. 9; *Man.* 2; 9; 11; *Sim.* 5. 4 for the second group.

²⁵ The church represented as a woman (*Vis.* 2. 4 and Rev. 12. 1), as a bride (*Vis.* 4. 2 and Rev. 21. 2), and its opponent the beast (*Vis.* 4. 2 and Rev. 12. 4). The construction of the tower in *Vis.* 3. 5 and those entering it (*Sim.* 8. 2–3) are compared to Rev. 21. 14; 6. 11; and 7. 9, 14.

²⁶ The argument from the apocryphal gospels was used also by Zahn against Schweigler and Hilgenfeld, who thought that they had discovered traces of the *Gospel of Peter* in *Shepherd*.

Paul, two for 1 Peter, and one each for John and for Acts.²⁷ In later editions the latter has been degraded from ‘a clear’ (so 1855, on p. 224) to ‘a probable allusion’.

The great authority of the later Bishop of Durham failed to impress William Sanday.²⁸ Hermas is mentioned only in the section on the Fourth Gospel, with the brief comment that ‘the indications are too general and uncertain to be relied upon’, that some of the similarities are ‘a commonplace of Christianity, not to say of religion’ (on the phrase ‘keeping the commandments’), that the image of the gate and the rock in *Sim.* 9. 12 might be ‘a possible reference to the fourth Gospel; probable it might be somewhat too much to call it’, and the very open and therefore frustrating conclusion that ‘we must leave the reader to form his own estimate.’²⁹ In Index II at the end of the book the case for the *Shepherd* is summed up laconically: ‘No distinct traces of any writing of Old or New Testament’, *Shepherd* being the only one among the Apostolic Fathers to receive this verdict.³⁰

Confidence turned into fantasy in the monograph of Charles Taylor on Hermas’ use of the gospels.³¹ Taylor divided his work into two parts (the Synoptic Gospels, John), and he also discussed some evidence from other New Testament writings.³² Basically, Taylor reads through the three synoptics taken together as a kind of harmony, and he orders the material (more or less) according to the overall structure of the gospels. More than once his comments sound naively optimistic, much in them far-fetched³³ or not to the point,³⁴ some of them are utterly wrong,³⁵ and sometimes one needs a good

²⁷ Cf. *Sim.* 5. 7 and 1 Cor. 3. 16–17; *Sim.* 9. 13 and Eph. 4. 4; *Man.* 3 and 9. 1 and Eph. 4. 30; *Vis.* 4. 3 and 1 Pet. 1. 7; *Vis.* 4. 2 and 1 Pet. 5. 7; *Man.* 3 and 1 John 2. 27; 4. 6 (but see also Jas. 4. 5 and compare *Sim.* 9. 12); *Vis.* 4. 2 and Acts 4. 12.

²⁸ W. Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century: An Examination of the Critical Part of a Work Entitled ‘Supernatural Religion’* (London: MacMillan, 1876).

²⁹ Comments from *ibid.* 273 and 274.

³⁰ *Ibid.* 382. Cf. the ‘doubtful traces’ for Polycarp and the verdict ‘probably/possibly’ for the others.

³¹ C. Taylor, *The Witness of Hermas to the Four Gospels* (London: C. J. Clay and Sons; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press Warehouse, 1892).

³² See *ibid.* 25–7 on James.

³³ See esp. the comment in the miracle section, in which the strange image of the stones being cut (?) is compared to the healing of one group of people, the lepers, and that of the stones that were too hard to be hewn (*Sim.* 9. 8. 6) to those who could not be healed because of their unbelief. See also on John 2. 6–10, 19–21, and *Man.* 12.

³⁴ See the comment in the section on the nativity. The word εὐθύτης in *Vis.* 3. 5. 3 (Taylor: ‘straightness’; Ehrman: ‘uprightness’) refers to the name of Jesus, in which the iota, according to Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* 1. 9), ‘represents the straight and natural way’. If Hermas was acquainted with such speculations, which in itself is not impossible, the comment offers no evidence that Hermas had in mind here the nativity story.

³⁵ See, e.g., the comment on *Sim.* 9. 7. 1–4 and the stones ‘lying by the tower’ waiting to be cleansed and to be ‘cast into the building’ (Taylor, *Witness*, 45), which is then likened to the

deal of allegorical explanation to be able to follow Taylor's exegesis.³⁶ Yet there is perhaps one element in his work that is still worth quoting. It is his description of Hermas' method and style. In an earlier publication, from which he quotes in his book, Taylor described Hermas' method in more general terms:

He allegorises, he disintegrates, he amalgamates. He plays upon the sense or varies the form of a saying, he repeats its words in fresh combinations or replaces them by synonyms, but he will not cite a passage simply and in its entirety. This must be taken into account in estimating the value of the Shepherd as a witness to the canonical Books of the New Testament.³⁷

A recent commentator has labelled this description of Hermas' method as 'originell und richtig'.³⁸ In the book Taylor summarizes the whole procedure, perhaps somewhat unfortunately, as 'the light touch with which the author of the *Shepherd* handles his material'.³⁹ According to Taylor, this 'light touch' signals a strong familiarity on the part of Hermas with the written tradition, but the description and the conclusion can probably also be accepted by those arguing that Hermas relied only on common Christian tradition.

The members of the Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology (henceforth 'the committee') that took upon themselves the task of producing a collection of those passages from the Apostolic Fathers that might be compared with the New Testament writings clearly proceeded in a more prudent way than did Taylor.⁴⁰ John Drummond, who was responsible for the chapter on the *Shepherd* presented a list of fifty cases, several of them referring to more than one passage from the *Shepherd* or from the New Testament. He followed the model that was also used for the other Fathers: Epistles, Acts, Gospels: the synoptic gospels, the synoptic tradition, the Fourth Gospel (no instance from Apocryphal gospels is mentioned for the *Shepherd*). He discusses evidence from 1 Corinthians and Ephesians (rated B), Matthew, Mark, Hebrews, and James (C), and Luke, John, Acts, Romans, 1 Thessalonians, and 1 Peter (D).⁴¹ There is no instance of an A rating, just as there is

description in John 5. 7 of the multitude of sick '*laying* about the pool of Bethesda, waiting to step or be *cast* into the water'. The verbal parallel that is suggested here by the italics is completely lacking in the Greek.

³⁶ See above all his notoriously famous comment on the fourfold gospel (below, n. 198).

³⁷ Ibid. 29 n.

³⁸ Brox, *Hirt*, 47 n. 11.

³⁹ Taylor, *Witness*, 29.

⁴⁰ A Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology, *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905).

⁴¹ On these ratings, see the Preface, pp. iii–iv. A reader (É. Massaux?) of the copy of the book in the Faculty library at the University of Leuven has summarized the description in a written note on p. 138: 'A = certain; B = très probable; C = assez probable; D = simple possibilité'.

none for *Barnabas*, *Didache*, and *2 Clement*, but this is hardly a surprise taking into account the very strict definition given for A ('certain'), which allows for evidence only from 1 Corinthians (*1 Clement*, Ignatius, Polycarp), Romans and Hebrews (*1 Clement*), and 1 Peter (Polycarp) to be assigned to this class.

The complex, at times almost paradoxical, situation in searching the *Shepherd* for allusions to New Testament writings is described as follows: 'He [Hermas] may sometimes be consciously borrowing ideas from N.T. writers when the reference is veiled by an intentional change of words; and sometimes he may use identical words, and yet have derived them from some other source, oral or written.'⁴² However, the committee seems to have been more confident about the project than this comment would suggest. And the same can also be concluded when it further notes, apparently with regret and clearly indicating where its preferences are, that because there is no A-case, 'the following arrangement of passages, therefore, does not represent what the editors may consider historically probable, but what they think may be reasonably deduced from a mere comparison of texts'.⁴³

The case for 1 Corinthians is built on one instance that is not further commented upon,⁴⁴ and for Ephesian essentially on two instances.⁴⁵ A minimal agreement in wording and meaning, as in the instances just mentioned, is the major argument. The probability of (some sort of) dependence on written tradition is strengthened if the parallel words are rather striking, as is the phrase on 'saddening the Holy Spirit' in Eph. 4. 30.⁴⁶ The parallelism is explained either as Hermas 'developing in his own way a phrase that had lodged in his mind',⁴⁷ or as imitating his source, which seems to suggest a stronger or more direct form of dependence.⁴⁸ Unfortunately, the committee does not go into this further. It does not comment either upon the rather different procedures that are involved in 'imitating' or alluding to one specific passage (thus for 1 Cor. 7. 39–40 in *Man.* 4. 4. 1–2) and in repeating the same phrase, or variations of it, while apparently also introducing echoes from other passages from the same letter, as Hermas is thought to have done in *Sim.*

⁴² *NTAF*, 105.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ *Man.* 4. 4. 1–2 and 1 Cor. 7. 39–40. It is one of only a few such instances in the whole list.

⁴⁵ *Man.* 10. 2. 1–5 and Eph. 4. 30; *Sim.* 9. 13. 5 and Eph. 4. 3–6.

⁴⁶ 'In view of the originality and boldness of the phrase in Ephesians' (*ibid.* 106).

⁴⁷ *Ibid.* 106, on Eph. 4. 30. The alternative, that Hermas independently of Ephesians comes to use the phrase because he regards the Spirit as joyous, is rejected because it is 'so remarkable a phrase'.

⁴⁸ Thus *Sim.* 9. 13. 5–7 and related passages (9. 17. 4; 9. 18. 4) 'have all the appearance of being imitated from Ephesians'.

9. 17. 4.⁴⁹ The two procedures are of course not mutually exclusive, but they are certainly different.

A c rating is given to *Sim.* 9. 23. 2–4 (Jas. 4. 11–12) with its combination of the motif of *καταλαλία* and of God having the power to save and to destroy, but in its comment the committee seems to feel a bit uneasy about this rating. ‘Here both the identity of expression and the resemblance in the context are strongly suggestive of literary dependence.’⁵⁰ There is the same kind of discrepancy between the rating and the comment for the evidence from Mark and for one of the three cases from Matthew (all c). The combination of ‘not understanding’ (*συνίημι*) because of ‘the hardening of the heart’ (*ἡ καρδία* and a form of *πωρόω*) in *Man.* 4. 2. 1 is otherwise ‘confined to Mark, where it occurs twice, and the verbal agreement is sufficient to suggest dependence. It is as if Hermas said, “I am like those men who are reproached in the Gospel”’.⁵¹ The only argument that pleads against a higher rating for Mark is, it seems, that the parallels with this gospel are limited to this one case.⁵² The parallel between *Sim.* 3. 3. 3; 4. 2. 4; 5. 5. 2; and Matt. 13. 30, 38–40 also seems to have been underrated, or there is at least a gap between the rather strongly affirmative comment and the c rating: ‘the general idea being similar, and the last-quoted words being almost identical [*Sim.* 5. 5. 2 and Matt. 13. 38]. It is the custom of Hermas to transform ideas of which he avails himself, and adapt them to his own composition.’⁵³ Some of the strongest arguments for dependence are to be found in the ambivalent section on ‘the synoptic tradition.’⁵⁴ The problem here is that, according to the committee, the parallel cannot be connected with one particular gospel.

⁴⁹ Hermas takes up here the theme of Eph. 4. 3–6 that he had used before in 9. 13. 5, but he might also have alluded to Eph. 1. 13 or 4. 30 (cf. *ἐσφραγίσθητε* and *τὴν σφραγίδα* in *Sim.* 9. 17. 4) and perhaps also to Eph. 5. 25–6, according to the synopsis of Drummond.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.* 109.

⁵¹ *Ibid.* 120.

⁵² The committee compares this case with two others (#43 and 46: *Sim.* 9. 20. 2 and *ἐπαισχύνομαι* at *Sim.* 8. 6. 4; 9. 14. 6; 9. 21. 3) from the section on ‘the synoptic tradition’ that lists parallels that cannot be traced to one gospel in particular and for that reason are not rated. This comparison is rather puzzling. Unlike in these two cases, the parallel cited for *Man.* 4. 2. 1 is exclusive to Mark. Moreover, the parallel in *Sim.* 9. 20. 2 receives the strong comment, ‘We can hardly doubt that this is a quotation’ (on p. 121), which comes close to that of *Man.* 4. 2. 1 (‘It is as if...’, quoted above) and would suggest a higher rating for *Man.* 4. 2. 1.

⁵³ *Ibid.* 119. The other cases in the list from Matthew ‘suggest’ some sort of dependence, but either it is thought that ‘the resemblance is not very close’ (on p. 119: on the motif of the dress in *Man.* 12. 1. 2; *Sim.* 9. 13. 2; and Matt. 22. 11), or that the parallel words are ‘too few to admit of a confident inference’ (on *Sim.* 5. 6. 4 and Matt. 28. 18; 11. 27).

⁵⁴ In addition to that on Matt. 19. 23 par. quoted above (#46), see the comments on the resemblances with elements from the parable of the sower (p. 121: ‘may very well indicate acquaintance with the parable’), with Matt. 26. 24 par. Mark (p. 121: ‘This might certainly be borrowed from the Synoptic saying, the change being no greater than we may expect when there is no express quotation’, and *1 Clem.* 46. 8 ‘proves that the saying was known in Rome’), with

Exceptionally another solution is suggested for what is considered to be 'a strong parallel'. Thus, in discussing the complex case involving Jas. 1. 4, 5, 6–8, 17; 3. 15, 17; 5. 11 and several passages from (mainly) *Man.* 9 (all discussed under the same # 11),⁵⁵ the committee draws attention to the combined presence of the motif of 'asking from God' (*Man.* 9. 1. 1–2 and Jas. 1. 5, 6) and that of *διψυχία*. However, the association of *διψυχία* and *διστάζω* in *Man.* 9 is not found in James, whereas it is in *1 Clem.* 23. 3 and in *2 Clem.* 11. 2, and both seem to refer it to a source (*ἡ γραφή* in *1 Clement*; *ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος* in *2 Clement*). And this is decisive for the committee's conclusion: 'The resemblance is not sufficient to prove direct dependence, and may perhaps be explained by the use of a common source.'⁵⁶

A wide variety of reasons is given as to why the greater number of the cases in the general list are rated only d. The verbal agreement is said not to be close enough or to be wanting,⁵⁷ or to be too limited,⁵⁸ too common,⁵⁹ accidental,⁶⁰ or 'a natural one',⁶¹ or the words and phrases have a different meaning,⁶²

Matt. 19. 9 par. Mark (p. 121: 'resembles the Gospels both in thought and language'), and with the parable of the vineyard (p. 122: 'the whole parable seems framed on the model of the evangelical parables').

⁵⁵ Most of these parallels are limited to the common use of one more or less remarkable word. Thus, *ἐπίγειος* in *Man.* 9. 11 and 11. 6 and Jas. 3. 15; *πολύσπλαγχνος* in *Man.* 9. 2 and Jas. 5. 11; 'the gift from above' in *Man.* 9. 11 and 11. 5. 7–8 and Jas. 1. 17; 3. 17.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.* 109. The passages from *1* and *2 Clement* are not discussed in the respective chapters dedicated to these writings. A similar conclusion was defended and further elaborated upon several years later by O. F. J. Seitz in a number of publications (with no reference to the committee). Hermas borrowed the word *διψυχος* from the same writing that was mentioned by *1* and *2 Clement*, which Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2. 80, had tentatively identified as 'the Book of Eldad and Modad' (cf. *Vis.* 2. 3. 4, and below n. 65), a suggestion that at first did not have the full support of Seitz ('Relationship', 133: 'Whether this identification is correct or not, ...'), though he is more positive about it in a later contribution ('Afterthoughts', 333: the apocryphal writing, or less probable, a midrash on the relevant passage on Eldad and Modad in Scripture). See O. F. J. Seitz, 'Relationship of the Shepherd of Hermas to the Epistle of James', *JBL* 63 (1944), 131–40; *idem*, 'Antecedents and Signification of the Term *διψυχος*', *JBL* 66 (1947), 211–19; *idem*, 'Afterthoughts on the Term "Dipsychos"', *NTS* 4 (1957–8), 327–34. Cf. also Brox, *Hirt*, 551–3; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 30–1.

⁵⁷ In the case of *Man.* 4. 3. 1–2 and Heb. 6. 4–6 (*NTAF*, 108); also *Sim.* 9. 14. 6 and 1 Pet. 4. 14–16 (*NTAF*, 117).

⁵⁸ Restricted to one or two words only. Thus, *ζωή* in *Sim.* 2. 2. 8 and John 11. 25; 14. 6 (*NTAF*, 123); *Man.* 2. 2 and Jas. 3. 8 (*NTAF*, 111); *ἐπισκέπτομαι* of widows and orphans in *Sim.* 1. 8 *et al.* and Jas. 1. 27 (*NTAF*, 112–13).

⁵⁹ The motif of entering the Kingdom in *Sim.* 9. 15. 3 and John 3. 3–5 (*NTAF*, 123); or that of 'speaking the truth' in *Man.* 3. 1 and Eph. 4. 25, 29 (*NTAF*, 106); further also *Man.* 4. 3. 4 and Acts 1. 24 (*NTAF*, 114); *Vis.* 4. 3. 4 and 1 Pet. 1. 7 (*NTAF*, 116); *Vis.* 3. 9. 8 and Matt. 5. 35 (*NTAF*, 119); and the list of references in #22 (*NTAF*, 113).

⁶⁰ 'To receive the Law from the Father' in *Sim.* 5. 6. 3 and John 10. 18 (*NTAF*, 123).

⁶¹ The gate admitting to the tower in *Sim.* 9. 12. 1. 5–6 and John 10. 7, 9 (*NTAF*, 123). Also *Sim.* 9. 29. 1. 3 and 1 Pet. 2. 1–2 (*NTAF*, 117).

⁶² 'Life' referring to Christ in John 11. 25, but perhaps not so in *Sim.* 2. 2. 8 (*NTAF*, 123); or 'rock' for Christ in 1 Cor. 10. 4, but not in *Sim.* 9. 12. 1 (*NTAF*, 105).

or are used differently;⁶³ or it is argued that ‘the sentiment is different’,⁶⁴ or that the parallel is attested also in the OT, or is commonly known in Christian tradition, or could stem from another (unidentified) source;⁶⁵ or still, a combination of some of the above.⁶⁶ However, in a few cases again the comment would suggest that the committee was secretly pleading for a higher rating.⁶⁷

The evidence as analysed by the committee would suggest that Hermas was at least acquainted with the synoptic tradition, probably even with Matthew and Mark, and also with two of Paul’s letters. The committee does not speculate too much on how the influence has played, but seems to assume that (in all c rated cases) Hermas was consciously borrowing from or relying upon these writings, whether Hermas actually looked up the relevant passage,⁶⁸ or merely had it ‘in mind’.⁶⁹ The comments illustrate that it would be unwise to try to explain all of the evidence from one and the same perspective. That certainly is the main reason why the committee is hesitant to extrapolate the relatively assured conclusions it has reached for some of the parallels, and one sees it literally struggling in some of its comments to restrain itself from a more ‘confident’ defence of the dependence hypothesis. A major problem with the whole approach is that the lists that are drawn up invite one to discuss the evidence in an atomistic way. There is a real danger that one concentrates (almost) exclusively on particular verses, phrases, or even words,

⁶³ The motif of ‘seeing and entering the Kingdom’ used synonymously in John and contrastively in *Sim.* 9. 15. 3 (*NTAF*, 123).

⁶⁴ So at *Vis.* 2. 2. 7 and *Jas.* 1. 12 (*NTAF*, 110). See also *Man.* 11. 16 and *Matt.* 7. 15–16 (*NTAF*, 120).

⁶⁵ Thus at *Vis.* 3. 9. 4–6 and *Jas.* 5. 1, 4, but also *Lev.* 19. 13; *Deut.* 24. 15; *Ps.* 17. 7 (*NTAF*, 110); at *Man.* 3. 1 and *Sim.* 5. 6. 5. 7 and *Jas.* 4. 5 (*NTAF*, 111: speculating about a possible quotation from the ‘Book of Eldad and Modad’); at *Sim.* 2. 5 and *Jas.* 2. 5 and the motif of the poor as rich in the spiritual life (*NTAF*, 114, for which the committee refers to Luke and 2 Corinthians); see also *Vis.* 3. 3. 5 and 1 *Pet.* 3. 20–1 (*NTAF*, 115: the practice of baptism), and the passages listed under #22.

⁶⁶ Cf. *Sim.* 2. 5 and *Jas.* 2. 5 (*NTAF*, 113); *Vis.* 4. 2. 4 and *Acts* 4. 12 (*NTAF*, 114); *Vis.* 3. 11. 3 and 1 *Pet.* 5. 7 (*NTAF*, 115); *Sim.* 9. 12. 2–3 and 1 *Pet.* 1. 20 (*NTAF*, 116).

⁶⁷ Thus, on *Sim.* 9. 14. 3 and *Eph.* 2. 20: ‘Indeed the whole figure of the tower may have been suggested by *Eph.* 2. 10–22’ (*NTAF*, 107). Cf. also on *χαλναγωγέω* in *Man.* 12. 1. 1 and *Jas.* 1. 26; 3. 2, 4: ‘the word is of rare occurrence . . . we must notice the presence of the ideas of willing and taming, which occur also in the context of James’ (*NTAF*, 111–12); the motif of ‘fleeing from evil’ in *Man.* 12. 4. 7 and 12. 5. 2. 4 and *Jas.* 4. 7 (*NTAF*, 112); and esp. the one case from Luke (18. 1, *προσεύχομαι* and *ἐγκακέω*) and *Man.* 9. 8 (*NTAF*, 120: ‘This connexion of ideas is confined to Luke in the N.T., and the expression is sufficiently close to suggest dependence’).

⁶⁸ As one might perhaps conclude from the concept of imitation used in the comment on *Sim.* 9. 3. 5 (*Eph.* 4. 3–6) and from the paraphrase, ‘It is as if . . .’ (see quotation above for Mark), though elsewhere the committee seems to be uncommitted, as when it concludes for *Man.* 4. 1. 6 (*Matt.* 19. 9 par. Mark) ‘that we may reasonably infer some kind of literary dependence’ (*NTAF*, 121).

⁶⁹ See above on *Man.* 10. 2. 1–5 (*Eph.* 4. 30).

while little or no attention is given to the larger context or to the function the paralleled material plays in the *Shepherd's* composition.

Far more sceptical again is Martin Dibelius. Hermas was thoroughly influenced by early Christian paraenetic tradition and by Jewish tradition at large. This would explain the obvious similarities with other Christian writings, though Dibelius does not in principle exclude the possibility that Hermas may also have used some of these writings. 'Daher [from common Jewish-Christian tradition] lassen sich dann auch gewisse Berührungen mit neutestamentlichen Schriften (vor allem Jac) begreifen, die durchaus *nicht immer* als Zeichen literarischer Abhängigkeit gedeutet werden müssen.'⁷⁰ However, it appears that in the commentary itself this latter possibility is hardly ever considered, and instances for which literary dependence could be argued are virtually non-existent. Thus, to give only a few examples, of the two cases rated b by the committee, Dibelius says only that Hermas in *Man.* 4. 4. 1–2 defends the same position as Paul in 1 Cor. 7. 39–40, while Eph. 4. 30 is not even mentioned at *Man.* 12. 2. 1–3.⁷¹ *Sim.* 3. 3 'reminds' one of Matt. 13. 24–30,⁷² but nothing is said about a possible influence, and Matt. 13. 38 is not cited at *Sim.* 5. 5. 2. The prohibition at *Man.* 4. 1. 1 is regarded as not specifically Christian,⁷³ and consequently there is no reference to Matt. 5. 28. The 'almost verbal agreement'⁷⁴ of *Man.* 4. 1. 6 with Mark 10. 11 is sufficiently explained from tradition. Likewise, the many similarities between James and the *Shepherd*, while duly recognized, are systematically explained from the common use of Christian paraenetic tradition.⁷⁵

Almost half a century after the Oxford Committee had published its results, the whole effort of looking for traces of the influence of New Testament writings on the Apostolic Fathers was repeated by Édouard Massaux as part of an even broader project, which covered the whole of the second-century literature.⁷⁶ While focusing on Matthew, Massaux also carefully studied the

⁷⁰ M. Dibelius, *Der Hirt des Hermas*, HNT; Ergänzungs-Band: Die Apostolischen Väter, 4 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1923), 424 (italics mine).

⁷¹ Ibid. 513 and 533–4 resp.

⁷² Ibid. 558: 'erinnert'.

⁷³ Ibid. 504: 'nicht ausgesprochen christlich'.

⁷⁴ Ibid. 506: 'fast wörtlich'.

⁷⁵ Thus, there is no reference to Jas. 4. 11–12 at *Sim.* 9. 23. 2. 4 (ibid. 631), of which the committee still thought it was 'strongly suggestive of literary dependence' (NTAF, 119). Dibelius had already argued for the same conclusion in his commentary on James: *Der Brief des Jakobus*, KEK 15 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 7th edn., 1921, 11th edn. 1964), 30–1 (49–50): 'Schlüsse auf literarischen Abhängigkeit lassen sich aus den genannten Stellen überhaupt nicht mit Sicherheit ziehen. . . . In Wahrheit handelt es sich wohl darum, dass beide Schriften über einer verhältnismässig grossen gemeinsamen paränetischen Besitz verfügen, den Hermas meist in verarbeitetem Zustand . . . , Jak in Spruchform wiedergibt'.

⁷⁶ É. Massaux, *Influence de l'Évangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée*, BETL 75 (Leuven: Peeters, 1986; original French publication, 1950), 261–325 (*Hermas*). ET:

evidence from the other writings. As a rule, he distinguishes the material for which a comparison with Matthew can be made into three sections: influence of Matthew is 'certain' or 'very probable'; Matthew is one witness among others; influence of Matthew is to be excluded. Massaux follows more or less the same pattern for the other writings of the New Testament. This division comes close to that of the committee but does not completely overlap. Massaux's first category seems to cover classes A ('certain') and B ('very probable') of the committee. The third category covers class D. The middle category coincides more or less with that of 'the synoptic tradition', but is not limited to it, for it also includes texts for which a parallel can be found in writings other than the synoptics. Class C is no longer identified as a separate group.

Massaux's evaluation of the evidence for Matthew differs rather considerably from that of the committee. He discusses a greater number of passages from the gospel, and he also assigns no fewer than nine passages from *Shepherd* to his first category.⁷⁷ He clearly is much more 'confident' again about tracing the influence of Matthew in the *Shepherd*. In his second category Massaux discusses fifteen passages, of which several figure in the sections on the synoptic gospels and the synoptic tradition in the list of the committee.⁷⁸ The third category comprises seven passages, none of which are listed by the committee.⁷⁹

The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Saint Irenaeus, 3 vols. New Gospel Studies, 5, 1–3 (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1990–3), ii, 111–63, and the synopsis at ii, 170–1. Quotations are from the original French text, with page references of the translation in parentheses.

⁷⁷ Here listed in the order in which they are discussed by Massaux. For those instances that also figure in the list of the committee, the rating is added (c, d, or St (synoptic tradition)). *Vis.* 1. 1. 8 (Matt. 5. 28); *Man.* 4. 1. 1 (Matt. 5. 28; #42: St); *Man.* 6. 2. 4 (Matt. 7. 16 par. Luke); *Man.* 11. 16 (Matt. 7. 16 par. Luke; #37: d); *Man.* 12. 1. 2 (Matt. 22. 11–13; #33: c); *Sim.* 3. 3 and 4. 2. 2. 4, taken together (Matt. 13. 24–30, 38–40; #34: c); *Sim.* 5. 2 (Matt. 21. 31–43 par., 25. 14, and some elements from Matt. 13; #44: St); *Sim.* 6. 3. 6 (Matt. 21. 22 par. Mark); *Sim.* 9. 20. 2 (Matt. 19. 23 par. Mark, Luke; #43: St); and a few cases in which the parallel is limited to one word only (NTAF 272). The second d case in the list of the committee belongs to this last group (*Vis.* 3. 9. 8 and Matt. 5. 35; #36). The third c case (*Sim.* 5. 6. 4 and Matt. 28. 18; #35) figures in Massaux's second category.

⁷⁸ *Vis.* 2. 2. 8 (Matt. 10. 32–3 par.; #47, in the section on John); *Vis.* 3. 6. 5 (Matt. 13. 20–2 par.; #40: St); *Vis.* 3. 6. 6 (Matt. 19. 21–4 par.); *Vis.* 3. 7. 3 (Matt. 13. 20–2 par.); *Vis.* 3. 8. 3 (Matt. 9. 22 par.); *Vis.* 4. 2. 6 (Matt. 26. 24 par. Mark; #41: St); *Man.* 9. 4 (Matt. 7. 7, 11; 21. 22 par.); *Man.* 10. 1. 5 (Matt. 13. 22 par.); *Sim.* 5. 3. 3 (Matt. 19. 21 par.); *Sim.* 5. 6. 1. 4 (see above, n. 77); *Sim.* 6. 3. 6 (Matt. 16. 27 par.); *Sim.* 9. 13. 2 (Matt. 22. 11–13; #33; above, n. 77); *Sim.* 9. 20. 1 (Matt. 13. 22 par.; #40: St); *Sim.* 9. 28. 6 (Matt. 5. 11 par.); *Sim.* 9. 29. 3 and 9. 31. 3, taken together (Matt. 18. 3 par.; #45: St). In addition, he again lists a number of agreements on isolated words (p. 280).

⁷⁹ *Man.* 5. 2. 7 (Matt. 12. 32 par. Luke); *Man.* 7. 4 (Matt. 10. 28 par. Luke); *Man.* 12. 5. 4 (Matt. 12. 43–5 par. Luke); *Sim.* 5. 3. 2–3 (Matt. 19. 17 par.); *Sim.* 5. 3. 8 (Matt. 5. 24); *Sim.* 8. 7. 6 (Matt. 18. 4; 23. 12 par. Luke); *Sim.* 9. 31. 6 (Matt. 26. 31 par. Mark).

Except for the title, Massaux nowhere uses the qualification ‘certain’ in his comments on the first category. He prefers to speak of degrees of probability, ranging from ‘possible’ (*Man.* 12. 1. 2) to ‘très probable’, or even to ‘indéniable’ (*Man.* 6. 2. 4). He builds his conclusions on two arguments: similarity in idea or content (in Massaux’s words, ‘une similitude d’idée’) and (a minimum of) verbal agreement, while at the same time repeatedly recognizing that Hermas has used the source text ‘à sa façon’.⁸⁰ The case for dependence is obviously strengthened if it can be argued that a passage is closer to Matthew than to other parallel texts, or that it is perhaps exclusive to Matthew for one or both of these aspects. The latter is the case according to Massaux with the motif of ‘sinning by desire’ in *Vis.* 1. 1. 8 (in the NT only in Matt. 5. 28 and partly using the same wording) and also with the distinction between the good and the bad at judgement in *Sim.* 3. 3 that reminds one of the parables in 13. 24–30, 38–40, which are peculiar to Matthew.⁸¹

Massaux does not formally describe the relationship between the two aspects. Ideally, of course, the two should be present, but that is not necessarily so for each and every case. The motif of lustful desire at *Vis.* 1. 1. 8 returns at *Man.* 4. 1. 1, but without the verbal parallel with Matt. 5. 28 that is found in *Vis.* 1. 1. 8 (ἐπιθυμία, -έω). Yet *Man.* 4. 1. 1 also figures in this first category, because ‘Hermas reprend ici, sous une autre forme, la doctrine déjà donnée en *Vis.* I,I,8’.⁸² Likewise, the verbal agreement with Matt. 7. 16 is less strong at *Man.* 11. 16 (the verb γίνωσκω is missing) than at *Man.* 6. 2. 4, but ‘la similitude d’idée avec les textes évangéliques est indubitable’.⁸³

Other instances illustrate that verbal agreement, even on a rather common word, can be sufficient reason to include a passage, admittedly with some hesitation, in the first category. At *Man.* 12. 1. 2 (Matt. 22. 11–13), ‘la ressemblance n’est pas vraiment stricte’ (p. 264) and the word ἔνδυμα ‘n’est pas tellement rare’ (p. 265), but Massaux nevertheless concludes that ‘il serait donc possible qu’Hermas se soit inspiré plus ou moins profondément de la parabole évangélique’.⁸⁴ Verbal agreement in the smallest detail can play an important role in deciding between several possible sources. That is clearly the case at *Sim.* 6. 3. 6 (Matt. 21. 22 par.). Influence from Matthew is favoured because he offers the most complete parallel to the phrase πάντα ὅσα + αἰτέω.⁸⁵ Verbal agreement also plays a role in identifying different sources,

⁸⁰ This qualification is repeated on many occasions, and clearly constitutes for Massaux an essential element in the overall appreciation of Hermas’ redaction.

⁸¹ Massaux, *Influence*, 262 and 265–6 (ii. 111–12 and 155–6).

⁸² *Ibid.* 263 (ii. 112). He is critical of the parallel with Ps.-Phocylides (ll. 195–7) cited by Dibelius (*Hirt*, 505), because the perspective and purpose are quite different.

⁸³ *Ibid.* 264 (ii. 113).

⁸⁴ *Ibid.* 265 (ii. 114: ‘more or less’).

⁸⁵ The first half is missing in 1 John 3. 22; the verb is missing from Mark.

though there is a certain danger in using the argument rather mechanically, without considering the consequences this may have for describing the redaction of the *Shepherd*. Thus, at *Sim.* 9. 20. 2 Massaux seems to reckon with a combined use of Matt. 19. 23 (πλοῦσιος) and the parallel in Mark and/or Luke (βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ). The situation is more complicated still for the parable in *Sim.* 5. 2. 2–11, where Hermas would seem to have combined elements from the various versions in the synoptics of the parable of the vineyard, the parable of the talents, the parable of the sower, and the parable of the tares.⁸⁶

It is important to note that the difference between the first and the second of Massaux's categories is not primarily a question of a greater or lesser amount of similarity or verbal agreement. In many instances of the second category the similarity of idea and the verbal agreement are as striking as in instances listed under the first category. The problem is that an identical or very similar phrase or idea occurs in more than one possible source text. But for the rest the same arguments of similarity and agreement are used, with the same degrees of probability. Thus, the first case in the list, *Vis.* 2. 2. 8 (Matt. 10. 32–3 par.; 2 Tim. 2. 12), is placed here because the motif of denying the Lord (with ἀρνέομαι as in Matthew and 2 Timothy) is not used 'à l'état pur'.⁸⁷ Such a consideration does not come into play in *Vis.* 3. 6. 5 (Matt. 13. 20–2 parr.), and Massaux notes that, according to the committee, 'ce passage peut très bien indiquer une connaissance de la parabole du semeur',⁸⁸ but it is not possible to be more precise about which version of the parable was used.⁸⁹ *Vis.* 3. 6. 6 is listed in this category, even though the verbal agreement is almost non-existent, because it is comparable to a passage from the first category (cf. *Sim.* 9. 20. 2–3 and the motif of wealth). This probably also goes for *Sim.* 9. 13. 2, though this is not stated explicitly.⁹⁰ For *Man.* 10. 1. 5 (Matt. 13. 22 parr.), Massaux reckons with the possibility of influence from another source: 'On voit donc que des embarras du même genre que ceux notés dans le *Pasteur* étaient déjà spécifiés dans les évangiles; leur réunion chez Hermas peut provenir d'une autre source que nos évangiles; les termes en effet sont trop différents pour affirmer un contact littéraire.'⁹¹

⁸⁶ See the synopsis on pp. 268–9 (ii. 117–18).

⁸⁷ *Ibid.* 273 (ii. 120–1: 'in its pristine state').

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

⁸⁹ The same applies to the 'parallèle' passage in *Vis.* 3. 7. 3. See also at *Sim.* 9. 20. 1 (Matt. 13. 22 parr.): 'peuvent très bien trahir ici une connaissance de la parabole du semeur, bien qu'il soit impossible de rattacher ce passage du *Pasteur* à un évangile particulier' (p. 279 (126)); *Sim.* 9. 28. 6 (Matt. 5. 11 par.): 'A-t-il puisé son inspiration chez *Mt.* ou chez *Lc.*?' (*ibid.* 279 (ii. 126)); *Sim.* 9. 29. 3 and 9. 31. 3: 'fait défaut tout indice' (*ibid.* 280 (ii. 127)).

⁹⁰ See *ibid.* 279 (ii. 126).

⁹¹ *Ibid.* 277 (ii. 124).

The second category also harbours a number of passages for which the evidence for dependence is regarded as rather weak. Massaux does not have much of a problem with *Vis.* 4. 2. 6 (Matt. 26. 24 par.) and *Man.* 9. 4 (Matt. 7. 7, 11 par.), even though he points out that the verbal agreement is minimal in the first case, and that the *Shepherd* reads ἀπολαμβάνω for λαμβάνω in the second.⁹² He also seems to favour Matt. 28. 18 over other parallels at *Sim.* 5. 6. 1. 4, while acknowledging that the verbal agreement is not impressive ('trop peu nombreux') and that Hermas 'exprime ici un thème courant'; but he then adds that at *Sim.* 5. 7. 3 Hermas is 'littéralement plus proche de Mt.'⁹³ But for *Vis.* 3. 8. 3 ('the elect of God will be saved') he has to recognize that it is not just a matter of not being able to decide between various witnesses from written sources: 'Hermas énonce simplement une idée traditionnelle.'⁹⁴ Lack of verbal agreement prohibits a clear decision at *Sim.* 5. 3. 3.⁹⁵ In *Sim.* 6. 3. 6 (Matt. 16. 27 parr.), Massaux also leaves open the decision, but at the same time expresses a slight preference for Sir. 35. 22.⁹⁶

Hermas's acquaintance with other early Christian literature is not limited to the gospel of Matthew, but extends to 'almost all the other New Testament writings', as Massaux perhaps somewhat over enthusiastically notes at one point.⁹⁷ The evidence for Mark and Luke is minimal indeed, as Massaux himself acknowledges. He discusses six passages that can be compared with Mark, none of which is exclusively 'Marcan'. Five of them are mentioned also by the committee.⁹⁸ At *Man.* 4. 2. 1 Massaux seems to be even less confident than was the committee (c rating). He adds references to Mark 3. 15 and 8. 17, which would make the phrase more 'Marcan', but then weakens the argument again by also quoting Eph. 4. 18 and other instances of πωρόω in the New Testament.⁹⁹ For the one instance of a parallel with Luke (*Man.* 9. 8 and Luke

⁹² Ibid. 276 (ii. 124).

⁹³ Ibid. 278 (ii. 125).

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ There is but 'une simple similitude d'idée' (ibid. 278 (ii. 125)) in the first case, and there are several other possible parallels from NT and OT texts in the other case (ibid. 280 (ii. 127)).

⁹⁶ Ibid. 279 (ii. 125). See also his comments on *Sim.* 5. 3. 2–3. 8 (ibid. 282–3 (ii. 129)).

⁹⁷ Ibid. 284 (ii. 130): 'Le Pasteur d'Hermas trahit des relations littéraires avec presque tous les autres écrits néotestamentaires.'

⁹⁸ One in the section on Mark (*Man.* 4. 2. 1 and Mark 6. 52; #38), four in that on the synoptic tradition (*Man.* 4. 1. 6 and Mark 10. 11 parr.; #42; three passages from *Sim.*, 8. 6. 4; 9. 14. 6; 9. 21. 3, and Mark 8. 38 parr.; #46). The sixth case (*Vis.* 3. 6. 3 and Mark 9. 50; 1 Thess. 5. 13; Rom. 13. 11) figures in the section on Paul (#26), but the committee compares with *Vis.* 3. 9. 10 and with 1 Thess. only, which offers the closest parallel also for Massaux: 'À vrai dire, seul 1 Thess., iv, 13 contient matériellement cette expression' (ibid. p. 286 (ii. 132)).

⁹⁹ Ibid. 286 (ii. 132) n. 2. In the case of *Sim.* 8. 6. 4 parr. it is impossible to decide between Mark and Luke (ibid. 285 (ii. 131)). On *Man.* 4. 1. 6, see below.

18. 1) Massaux paraphrases the comments of the committee (d rating), though he seems to be slightly more positive.¹⁰⁰ He is also somewhat more optimistic for the two instances of material parallel with Acts that figure in the list of the committee (d rating). *Vis.* 4. 2. 4 may reflect an archaic theology of ‘the name’, but ‘une réminiscence de *Act.*, iv, 12 paraît au moins possible’.¹⁰¹ More confident still is his conclusion with regard to the phrase *καρδιογνώστης* in *Man.* 4. 3. 4 (*Acts* 1. 24 and 15. 8). Instead of the committee’s rather puzzling ‘If we suppose a direct connexion, there is nothing to show on which side the priority lies’, Massaux firmly notes that the word is found only in Acts in the New Testament, and he does not speculate about its possible use by ‘the many who had not read Acts’.¹⁰²

Of the four parallels with John in the list of the committee, Massaux does not mention *Vis.* 2. 2. 8 (*John* 11. 25; 14. 6), but he considers the evidence for the others to be stronger than the Committee’s d rating.¹⁰³ *Sim.* 5. 6. 3 is said to have ‘une teinte nettement johannique’, because of the close verbal agreement with *John* 10. 18 and the connection between *ἐντολή* and ‘receiving life’ in *John* 12. 49–50 (cf. also 14. 31; 15. 10), which in Massaux’s opinion sufficiently counters the difficulty raised by the substitution of *νόμος* for *ἐντολή*.¹⁰⁴ Special mention should be made of Massaux’s discussion of *Sim.* 9. 12. 1. 3 (*John* 10. 7, 9). He repeats the comments of the committee (‘Johannine colouring’, but insufficient to show literary dependence) and he also refers to the parallel in 1 *Cor.* 10. 4.¹⁰⁵ On the other hand, Massaux reckons with the possibility that Hermas may here have collected ‘plusieurs réminiscences du Nouveau Testament’, which would account for the remarkable combination of ‘door’ and ‘rock’ and for the substitution of *πύλη* for *θύρα*, ‘qui rappelle *Mt.*, vii, 14, dans un endroit où le salut est également en vue’.¹⁰⁶ But ultimately, it seems, the crucial argument for accepting the

¹⁰⁰ ‘Hermas s’est peut-être référé au texte lucanien’ (ibid. p. 287 (ii. 132)).

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 288 (ii. 133).

¹⁰² *NTAF*, 114. Massaux also adds a couple of other instances from Acts, but these are considered to be less compelling.

¹⁰³ In doing so, he also goes against the more sceptical views of W. von Loewenich, *Das Johannes-Verständnis im zweiten Jahrhundert*, BZNW 13 (Giessen: Topelmann, 1932), 8–14, and of J. N. Sanders, *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church: Its Origin and Influence on Christian Theology up to Irenaeus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943), 16–17. The latter discussed five passages (*Vis.* 2. 2. 8; *Sim.* 5. 6. 3; 5. 6. 4–5; 9. 12. 1. 6; 9. 15. 3). The similarities can, as a rule, be explained by ‘common doctrine’, the use of ‘current expressions’, and ‘common conceptions’ on certain issues. With regard to the ‘muddled’ Christology of *Sim.* 5. 6. 4–5, Sanders uses an argument *e contrario*: ‘Had Hermas read the Gospel, even he could hardly have remained in such a state of confusion’ (p. 17). See also the survey of earlier research on the reception of John in Nagel, *Rezeption*, 18–34.

¹⁰⁴ Massaux, *Influence*, 290 (ii. 134). Contrast the committee’s ‘may be accidental’ (*NTAF*, 123).

¹⁰⁵ Which was ‘purely accidental’ for the committee (*NTAF*, 105 (#2)).

¹⁰⁶ Massaux, *Influence*, 290 (ii. 135).

influence of John in *Sim.* 9. 12. 1–3 rests upon what follows in the immediate context in 9. 12. 4 and its ‘important parallel’ with John 3. 5, where ‘similarity of idea’ (both passages are on baptism) coincides with a partial verbal agreement (‘entering the Kingdom’), while the difference in wording to refer to the baptism itself (the *Shepherd* λαβεῖν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ) echoes a phrase dear to Hermas.¹⁰⁷ As a matter of fact, Massaux detects echoes of the same Johannine passage throughout *Sim.* 9. 12–16,¹⁰⁸ and argues that Hermas has used this verse to elaborate on the theme of initiation, which has to do not only with receiving baptism, but also with receiving the Spirit (see 9. 13).¹⁰⁹ ‘Le texte johannique fait figure de *leitmotiv* du passage.’¹¹⁰

Traces of a possible influence of Paul are said to be minimal, limited to the symbolism of baptism and some formulae on unity, used exclusively in contexts of ethical teaching, and with no regard for Paul’s theological speculations.¹¹¹ But even so, Massaux accepts that Paul’s influence was greater and more secure than the committee would allow. ‘Hermas connaissait certainement des épîtres pauliniennes.’¹¹² He does of course list the three passages rated b: *Man.* 4. 4. 1. 2 (1 Cor. 7. 8–9, 28, 39–40); *Man.* 10. 2. 1–6; 10. 3. 2; and also 3. 4 (Eph. 4. 30; 2 Cor. 7. 10); and *Sim.* 9. 13. 5–7; 9. 17. 4; 9. 18. 4 (Eph. 4. 3–6).¹¹³ Hermas has found inspiration in the letters of Paul. This must have been the case at *Man.* 10. 2. 1–6,¹¹⁴ and therefore most probably also at *Man.* 3. 4.¹¹⁵ This type of argument is here given some weight, even though the Spirit is qualified differently in both texts, and Hermas in *Man.* 10. 2. 1–6 was also influenced by 2 Cor. 7. 10.¹¹⁶ Equally ‘certain’ is the influence of Eph. 4.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid. 291 (ii. 135): ‘une des expressions habituelles chez lui pour désigner le baptême.’

¹⁰⁸ Including 9. 15. 3, the fourth passage discussed by the committee. See further 9. 12. 8 and all other occurrences of the phrase εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ together with a phrase referring to baptism. A further echo of John 3. 5 might be found in *Sim.* 9. 31. 2, where those who ‘must enter the Kingdom’ are the same as those of 9. 31. 1 ‘who had not received the seal’ but had then been prepared for it (ibid. 300 (ii. 142)).

¹⁰⁹ See the long excursus on this text, ibid. 295–300 (ii. 138–43).

¹¹⁰ Ibid. 293 (ii. 137).

¹¹¹ Ibid. 310 (ii. 150).

¹¹² Ibid. 312 (ii. 152). And Massaux is certainly far more positive than was E. Aleith some years earlier, when he dismissed the whole case in one line: ‘der “Hirte des Hermas”, in dem von paulinischen Einfluss nichts mehr zu spüren ist’ (*Paulusverständnis in der Kirche*, BZNW 18 (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1937), 3). See also A. E. Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941), 198–203.

¹¹³ ‘On admettra dès lors qu’... il a puisé son inspiration au chapitre vii de la *Ia ad Corinthios*’ (Massaux, *Influence*, 303 (ii. 144)); Eph. 4. 30, ‘la source où est venu puiser Hermas’ and ‘un *leitmotiv*’ (ibid. 304 (ii. 145)).

¹¹⁴ Ibid. 305 (ii. 146): ‘un emploi certain.’

¹¹⁵ Ibid.: ‘il est donc très possible qu’ici encore...’

¹¹⁶ Massaux speaks of the same ‘doctrine’ of salutary grief in *Man.* and in Paul, and points to the minimal agreement on σωτηρία and on the verb/noun μετάνοια, -έω (ibid. 304–5 (ii. 145–6)).

3–6.¹¹⁷ Of some importance, and not mentioned by the committee, is the observation that the motif of ‘being united in mind’ (τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν) is a good Pauline expression that occurs at *Sim.* 9. 13. 7 and is paraphrased as *μίαν φρόνησιν ἔσχον* at *Sim.* 9. 17. 4.¹¹⁸ In this context Massaux also hesitantly refers to *Sim.* 9. 4. 3 (Eph. 2. 20), rated d only by the committee.¹¹⁹ A similarly ambivalent position is assigned to *Sim.* 9. 12. 1 (1 Cor. 10. 4) and the motif of the rock (also rated d). It figures among the ‘certain’ texts, but the comments switch between ‘on pense naturellement à Paul’ and ‘il y a peut-être ici une allusion’.¹²⁰ Literary dependence is again assumed, however, for the baptism motif at *Sim.* 9. 16. 2–4. 6 (Rom. 6. 3–5 and Col. 2. 12).¹²¹

Not one of the parallels with James discussed by the committee received a rating higher than c. Massaux is again more confident: ‘Hermas l’a connue et s’en est inspiré en plusieurs endroits.’¹²² He studied ten instances that would point to literary dependence. Two of these, *Man.* 1. 1 (Jas. 2. 19) and *Sim.* 6. 1. 1 (Jas. 1. 21), did not figure in the list of the committee. At *Man.* 1. 1 Massaux decides for James because there is not only an element of verbal agreement between *Man.* and James (πιστεύω) that is missing in Mark 12. 28–9 (the parallel given by Zahn), but there is also ‘similarity of idea’, which takes precedence over the at first look impressive agreement between *Mandates* (πρώτον πάντων) and Mark (ἐντολή πρώτη πάντων). As a matter of fact, Hermas and James both speak of the unicity of God and not of love for God, as do Mark and his source text Deut. 6. 5. Moreover, *πρώτον πάντων* is used differently in *Mandates* (absolutely) and in Mark (the first of two commandments). ‘Reste donc l’unique solution: Hermas s’est référé à *Jac.*, ii,19.’¹²³ There is strong verbal agreement as well between *Sim.* 6. 1. 1 (δυνάμεναι σώσαι ψυχὴν ὑμῶν) and Jas. 1. 21 (τὸν δυνάμενον σώσαι τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν), with both passages agreeing also on the subject of the verb δύναμαι, while Hermas’s ‘precepts’ correspond to James’s τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον. The verdict: ‘une réminiscence littéraire de ce texte paraît très probable.’¹²⁴

¹¹⁷ Ibid. 306 (ii. 147): ‘aucun doute’.

¹¹⁸ Ibid. 305 (ii. 146).

¹¹⁹ Ibid.: ‘on peut rapprocher peut-être...’.

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ Ibid. 306 (ii. 147). Less certainty can be reached for a number of other texts, among them *Man.* 3. 1 and Eph. 4. 25 (ibid. 307 (ii. 147–8)): ‘peu probable’, given the different reason for speaking the truth) and *Man.* 4. 3. 1 and Heb. 6. 4–6 (on ‘repentance/conversion’), which were both rated d by the committee, and further also *Vis.* 2. 3. 2; 3. 7. 2 (Heb. 3. 12), rated c. In this latter case, the striking verbal agreement of ἀποστάντες θεοῦ ζῶντος (ibid. 308 (ii. 149): ‘L’identité est parfaite’) does not balance the different context.

¹²² Ibid. 310 (ii. 150).

¹²³ Ibid. 311 (ii. 151).

¹²⁴ Ibid. 316 (ii. 155).

Five passages were rated c by the committee: *Man.* 9. 1–7 (Jas. 1. 5–9); *Man.* 9. 11 (Jas. 1. 17; 3. 15); *Man.* 11. 5–6 (Jas. 1. 17); *Man.* 12. 6. 3 (Jas. 4. 12); *Sim.* 9. 23. 4 (Jas. 4. 11–12). Massaux hesitates about the first case. Verbal agreement, though with a remarkable difference (James: διακρίνω, Hermas: διαστάζω), and ‘similarity of idea’ are countered by what Massaux describes rather vaguely as ‘les textes eux-mêmes d’Hermas sont assez éloignés de ceux de Jacques’,¹²⁵ but for which he then also offers an explanation by suggesting that Hermas may have been commenting somewhat freely (‘à sa façon’) on the text of James. The final argument, however, is one of analogy, as in other instances.¹²⁶ While recognizing that the contrast between ἄνωθεν and ἐπίγειος is perhaps not that exceptional,¹²⁷ Massaux rightly points to the structural agreement between Jas. 3. 15 (and 1. 17) and *Man.* 9. 11, by quoting the latter as a whole and not as two halves, as did the committee, which destroys the contrast. He also emphasizes more strongly the importance for the argument of literary dependence of the fact that the ‘association’ between Jas. 1. 17 and 3. 15 is repeated at *Man.* 11. 5–6.¹²⁸ Massaux of course does not miss the opportunity to quote in full the very positive opinion of the committee in favour of literary dependence with regard to *Man.* 12. 6. 3.¹²⁹ He gives much weight to the absolute use of the double phrase σώσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι, which brings this passage closer to James than to Matt. 10. 28 par. Luke, but it is a bit surprising that he passes over the verbal and thematic agreement with Matthew on φοβήθητε and the fact that the same two verbs are used in a different order, in a disjunctive phrase, and with an object at *Sim.* 9. 23. 4, the second passage that may have been influenced by Jas. 4. 11–12. Of course, this latter case is dominated by another motif (καταλαλέω, -ία) that also occurs at Jas. 4. 11–12.¹³⁰

The three remaining passages were rated d. The case for *Man.* 12. 2. 4; 12. 4. 6–7; 12. 5. 2 (Jas. 4. 7) is based on the last of these instances, the only one that includes the two elements (ἀντιστήμι and φεύγω ἀπό) that are also present in James, and Massaux can again refer to the surprisingly positive judgement of the committee.¹³¹ The formulation at the end of *Sim.* 8. 6. 4 could be the result of an association of passages from several New Testament writings (see

¹²⁵ Ibid. 312 (ii. 152).

¹²⁶ Ibid. 312–13 (ii. 152): ‘Si par ailleurs, il est établi qu’Hermas utilise largement de l’épître de Jacques, l’hypothèse d’une référence sera confirmée.’

¹²⁷ Ibid. 313 (ii. 153): ‘obvie’.

¹²⁸ Ibid. ‘un autre indice sérieux’.

¹²⁹ Ibid. 315 (ii. 155) (see above, p. 302).

¹³⁰ Ibid. 317 (ii. 156): ‘un contact littéraire s’impose’.

¹³¹ Ibid. 314 n. 1 (see above, p. 304). He differs from the committee in his assessment of the other parallels (1 Pet. 5. 9; *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*), which for the committee were a reason to nuance its conclusion, whereas Massaux points out that none of these other witnesses shows such a close verbal agreement with *Mandates* as does James.

Mark 8. 38 and Jas. 2. 7, though there is no mention of 1 Pet. 4. 16, as in the list of the committee), a possibility that Massaux did not explore for *Sim.* 9. 23. 4 (see above). The presence of βλασφημέω is decisive, so it seems, for looking towards James, rather than the Old Testament, where the phrase τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐπ' αὐτούς, or a similar one, is frequently found. Massaux's comment on the last case (*Vis.* 2. 2. 7 and *Jas.* 1. 12) looks like a response to the committee's 'the sentiment is quite different'.¹³² In addition to the agreement in wording and genre (a macarism and the verb ὑπομένω), Massaux also points out that there is 'similarity of idea', because Hermas 'considère la tribulation à venir comme une épreuve'.¹³³ A number of other passages show a certain amount of similarity, but no strong evidence for literary dependence.¹³⁴

While rating all instances of a possible parallel with 1 Peter as d, the committee nevertheless concluded, 'on the whole, then, the evidence seems to place 1 Peter on the border line between C and D'.¹³⁵ Massaux is certainly no more confident. 'Hermas a peut-être connu la *Ia Petri*, mais les textes où un rapprochement avec cette épître reste possible sont peu favorables à une véritable influence littéraire.'¹³⁶ He discusses almost the same passages as the committee.¹³⁷ Insufficient verbal agreement in keywords or characteristic phrases and/or the fact that other parallels can be cited plead against *Vis.* 11. 3 and 1 Pet. 5. 7;¹³⁸ *Sim.* 9. 28. 5 and 1 Pet. 4. 13–16;¹³⁹ *Vis.* 3. 3. 5 and 1 Pet. 3. 20–1;¹⁴⁰ *Sim.* 9. 12. 2–3 and 1 Pet. 1. 20;¹⁴¹ *Vis.* 4. 3. 4 and 1 Pet. 1. 7.¹⁴²

Overall, Massaux offers a balanced defence of the dependence hypothesis, and it would be absolutely wrong to put him in the same category as Taylor.¹⁴³ If the committee struggled with aligning its ratings and its comments, Massaux's conclusions are in a number of cases more nuanced than the title of his

¹³² *NIAF*, 120; cf. Massaux's 'Les deux textes sont fort similaires' (*Influence*, 318 (ii. 157)).

¹³³ Massaux, *Influence*, 318 (ii. 157). He does not envisage the possibility of another 'association' of various passages (James and Matt. 24. 9–12). See on this, for Hermas, rather important motif, R. J. Bauckham, 'The Great Tribulation in the Shepherd of Hermas', *JTS* 25 (1974), 27–40.

¹³⁴ Massaux, *Influence*, 318–20 (ii. 157–9).

¹³⁵ *NIAF*, 117.

¹³⁶ Massaux, *Influence*, 323 (ii. 161).

¹³⁷ Exceptions are *Sim.* 9. 29. 1. 3 and 1 Pet. 2. 1–2; Matt. 18. 3; 1 Cor. 14. 20 (#32).

¹³⁸ While Hermas is not factually quoting Ps. 55(54). 23, the agreement on ἐπὶ κύριον against 1 Peter's ἐπὶ θεόν is considered as 'un indice suffisant' (ibid. 321 (ii. 159)) to decide in favour of the former option.

¹³⁹ Perhaps the strongest case for literary dependence on 1 Peter, because the combination of πάσχω and δοξάζω offers 'un excellent parallèle'; yet Massaux finally settles for a mere 'permet peut-être' (ibid. 322 (ii. 160)).

¹⁴⁰ Ibid. 322 (ii. 160); liturgical praxis as a serious alternative to literary dependence.

¹⁴¹ But see also Col. 1. 15, which itself, however, is not a primary parallel (ibid. 308 (ii. 148)).

¹⁴² Too common a metaphor (cf. OT and Rev. 3. 18).

¹⁴³ As Brox (*Hirt*, 47) seems to do.

first category would suggest. Significant in this respect is the difference between the way in which he defines his position at the beginning ('almost all' ('presque tous') New Testament writings¹⁴⁴) and that in his conclusion ('several' ('plusieurs'), in particular Matthew, John, James, and some letters of Paul¹⁴⁵). For Massaux literary dependence is an arguable explanation in a number of cases, when based on verbal agreement and similarity in content, and taking into account the impact of Hermas's concerns and redaction. This latter aspect is somewhat further commented upon in the conclusion. According to Massaux, Hermas shows a kind of familiarity with the gospel of Matthew that would suggest that it was for him and his community 'l'évangile habituel, l'évangile courant auquel on se réfère'.¹⁴⁶ John and Paul are used more selectively.

Scepticism reigns again in the work of Helmut Köster.¹⁴⁷ Strongly influenced by the tradition inaugurated by Spitta and forcefully defended by Dibelius,¹⁴⁸ Köster follows a more thematic division, discussing in three sections the parallels with parable material, proverbial sayings, and, more generally, 'remarkable contacts with the Synoptics'.¹⁴⁹ One immediately feels the difference in approach, and in atmosphere. The basic principle is the same for all cases: the *Shepherd* is heavily indebted to its Jewish context and roots, and many concepts and motifs that are paralleled in the synoptic gospels are commonly known from Judaism. This is often (but not always!) illustrated with references to Rabbinic literature. If no such parallels from Judaism are quoted, it is argued that the *Shepherd* relies on sayings that were commonly known in tradition, or that the paralleled element is merely an integral part of the story, or a Christian interpolation.

The three passages in the first group (*Sim.* 5. 2. 1–8; 5. 5. 2; 9. 20. 2–3) all figured in Massaux's list of 'certain' parallels, but none has found acceptance in the eyes of Köster. His comment on *Sim.* 5. 2 basically consists of the (correct, but not necessarily explicative) observation that the synoptic parables are neater, shorter, and omit redundant characters, and a long quote from Dibelius arguing (without further illustrations) that all the phrases and motifs which have a parallel in the synoptics are commonly known also from

¹⁴⁴ Massaux, *Influence*, 284 (ii. 130).

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.* 323 (ii. 160).

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.* 324 (ii. 161: 'the usual gospel, the common gospel to which to refer').

¹⁴⁷ H. Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern*, TU 65 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957).

¹⁴⁸ Dibelius was already a discussion partner of Massaux. Köster did not know the work of the latter.

¹⁴⁹ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 246: 'Verbreitete Wendungen und Sprichworte', and 250: 'Auffallende Berührungen'.

Judaism.¹⁵⁰ The obviously Christian reference to the beloved son and heir in 5. 2. 6 is an interpolation in an original Jewish text, and does not echo the parable of the vineyard but is inherent in the parable itself and is in compliance with Hermas's interest in allegorization.¹⁵¹ The same explanation prevails for the verbal agreement between *Sim.* 5. 5. 2 and Matt. 13. 38.¹⁵² The warning to the wealthy in *Sim.* 9. 20. 2–3 is comparable to the one in Mark 10. 23–5 par. Luke (but not Matthew, because he reads 'the Kingdom of heaven'), and Köster even offers a plausible explanation of why Hermas would have replaced the image of the camel with the more appropriate one of 'walking barefoot in thistles'.¹⁵³ Yet he concludes that nothing argues for dependence on Mark or Luke, for the saying must have circulated freely in the tradition.¹⁵⁴

In his second category Köster studies nine passages. It is a rather puzzling list.¹⁵⁵ Except for the motif of the 'Schutzengel' in *Sim.* 5. 6. 2, for which Köster refers to Ps. 90. 11, these passages were also discussed by Massaux, most of them in the section of 'possible' parallels, and for some of which Massaux reached a conclusion similar to that of Köster; but in a number of cases Massaux offers a different parallel (see above). Again, the evidence for literary dependence is utterly negative:

Aus allen in diesem Teilabschnitt genannten Stellen lässt sich, auch wenn sie summiert und womöglich noch um gleichartige Anklänge vermehrt werden, keine Abhängigkeit von den synoptischen Evangelien beweisen. Auch wenn sich aus weiteren Stellen eine solche Abhängigkeit sicherstellen lassen sollte, muss es bei den meisten dieser Stellen noch fraglich bleiben, ob sie aus den synoptischen Evangelien stammen.¹⁵⁶

The one argument that pleads against literary dependence on the synoptic gospels in all these instances is the fact that other parallels can be cited from Jewish and from Christian tradition. *Sim.* 9. 22. 3 is probably a better parallel to the saying on 'exalting and humbling' than Massaux's (*Sim.* 8. 7. 6), because of the explicit contrast, but Massaux agrees that there is little evidence

¹⁵⁰ Ibid. 243.

¹⁵¹ Ibid. 244. The interest in the slave's reward resulting from his efforts and loyalty, on the other hand, is contrasted with Luke 17. 7–10.

¹⁵² Ibid. 244: 'dieser Satz (musste sich) fast notwendig aus einer Deutung des jeweils vorher im Gleichnis genannten "Ackers" ergeben.'

¹⁵³ Ibid. 245: 'Herm. (hat) aus der Bergallegorie ein anderes Bild näher gelegen.'

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.: 'ob es sich dabei um Mk. 10,23.25 handelte, ist unsicher, abgesehen davon, dass diese Logien schon frei umgelaufen sein können.'

¹⁵⁵ *Sim.* 9. 22. 3 (Matt. 23. 12 par.); *Vis.* 4. 2. 6 (Matt. 26. 24 par.); *Sim.* 6. 3. 6a (Matt. 16. 27); *Man.* 12. 6. 3 (Matt. 10. 28 par. Luke; Jas. 4. 12); *Sim.* 6. 3. 6b (Matt. 7. 7; 21. 22); *Sim.* 5. 6. 2 (Matt. 18. 10); *Sim.* 5. 6. 4 (Matt. 28. 18; 11. 27); *Vis.* 3. 10. 9 (Mark 8. 17); *Sim.* 9. 12. 3 (Matt. 19. 24 parr.).

¹⁵⁶ Ibid. 250.

to support literary dependence.¹⁵⁷ There is also agreement with Massaux with regard to Matt. 10. 28, though here again Köster has a different parallel (*Sim.* 12. 6. 3 instead of *Man.* 7. 4) and gives little or no weight to the remarkable agreement with Jas. 4. 12 (cf. also *Sim.* 9. 23. 4).¹⁵⁸ Finally, they also agree on *Sim.* 5. 6. 4, for which Köster again cites other parallels from Christian tradition (John 17. 2; *Corpus Hermeticum*, 1. 32).¹⁵⁹ Köster is more sceptical with regard to *Vis.* 4. 2. 6;¹⁶⁰ *Sim.* 6. 3. 6a;¹⁶¹ 6. 3. 6b;¹⁶² and 9. 12. 3.¹⁶³ Mark 8. 17 is compared with *Vis.* 3. 10. 9 by Köster for the motif of being ἀσύνετος, and with *Man.* 4. 2. 1 by Massaux for that of the ‘hardening of the heart’.¹⁶⁴

Köster’s third group includes only four texts, but among them are some of the strongest parallels, noticeably all of them with Mark!¹⁶⁵ Again, Christian tradition seems to take precedence over Christian literature. For *Man.* 4. 1. 6 Köster acknowledges the neat verbal agreement,¹⁶⁶ but the divorce saying is of course also ‘eine Gemeinderegel’. The phrase τὸν λόγον ἀκούειν in *Vis.* 3. 7. 3 echoes kerygmatic language,¹⁶⁷ as does the motif of being baptized in the name of the Lord. Massaux reached the same conclusion with regard to Acts 19. 5, but discussed the parallel in Mark in his list of ‘possible parallels’ and was more positive,¹⁶⁸ even though he refrained from assigning the parallel to one of the gospels in particular. For *Sim.* 9. 31. 2 (and the parallel passage in 9. 29. 2) Köster leaves open the possibility that Hermas may have been referring to the gospel passage.¹⁶⁹

¹⁵⁷ Besides Matt. 23. 14 par. Luke, Köster also refers to Luke 1. 51–2 and to Rabbinic literature.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.* 247.

¹⁵⁹ Compare his qualification of the motif of the Son who receives his authority from the Father (*ibid.* 249: ‘allgemein-christlich’) and Massaux’s ‘exprime un thème courant’ (Massaux, *Influence*, 278 (ii. 125)).

¹⁶⁰ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 246: ‘eine populäre Wendung’, that is also attested in *1 Clem.* 46. 8, but there likewise independent of the gospels.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.* 247. Attested in the OT and in *2 Clem.* 11. 6, but no connection with the gospels.

¹⁶² *Ibid.* 248: ‘ganz allgemein’ in Christian literature (John 14. 13–14; 16. 23; 1 John 3. 22) and in Jewish tradition. Massaux compared with *Man.* 9. 4.

¹⁶³ Among the ‘certain’ cases in Massaux, but only ‘allgemein gebräuchliche Wendung urchristlicher Sprache’ for Köster (*Synoptische Überlieferung*, 250).

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.* 250; Massaux, *Influence*, 286 (ii. 132).

¹⁶⁵ *Man.* 4. 1. 6 (Mark 10. 11); *Vis.* 3. 7. 3 and *Sim.* 8. 6. 4 (Mark 4. 18–20; Acts 19. 5); *Sim.* 9. 29. 3 and 9. 31. 2 (Mark 10. 13–16); and *Vis.* 3. 13. 1–3 (below, n. 198).

¹⁶⁶ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 251: ‘fast mit den gleichen Worten wie Mk.’ and ‘enge wortlautmässige Berührung’.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.* 252, with reference to Dibelius, *Hirt*, 470.

¹⁶⁸ Massaux, *Influence*, 275 (ii. 123): ‘expressions fort voisines’.

¹⁶⁹ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 253: ‘In *Sim.* ix,31,2 scheint wenigstens einmal in der ganzen Schrift ausdrücklich auf ein Wort Jesu oder einen synoptischen Bericht Bezug genommen zu sein’, and 253: ‘Ist das der Fall gewesen, so kommt dafür wohl nur Mk. in Frage’. Massaux was more hesitant with regard to this latter point: ‘fait défaut tout indice permettant de déterminer une référence littéraire à l’un ou l’autre des textes signalés’ (*Influence*, 280

Jewish tradition and common Christian tradition, with the occasional help of an interpolator, can explain (almost) all of the evidence in *Shepherd*, as well as the origin of the parallels in the gospels. Even in the few 'remarkable' parallels, including *Sim.* 9. 31. 2 and 9. 29. 2, nothing points to direct literary dependence. 'Diese Stellen . . . mögen auf das Mk.-Evangelium zurückgehen, können aber lediglich auf Kenntnis mündlicher Überlieferung beruhen.'¹⁷⁰ It sounds almost redundant when Köster then adds that, even if Hermas knew the gospel of Mark, he did not really 'use' it.¹⁷¹ One could say that, in a sense, Köster and Massaux ask different questions. For Massaux a sufficient amount of verbal agreement and similarity in ideas are workable criteria for demonstrating literary dependence, and the question he asks is which texts qualify on the basis of these criteria. Köster, on the other hand, precisely questions whether these criteria can prove the case, and concludes that they cannot. Yet, in another way, their approaches are also comparable. They both work with some sort of 'standard' explanation, Jewish or Christian tradition, or literary influence. The difference between them seems to be that Massaux allows for the other explanation to be a real alternative in a number of cases.

Köster's (and Dibelius's) shadow looms large over later research, and their conclusions with regard to the *Shepherd* have dominated much, if perhaps not all, of the subsequent discussion. Building on the conclusions that were reached by Massaux, F.-M. Braun argues for literary dependence on John in at least two instances (*Sim.* 9. 12. 3–6 and 9. 16).¹⁷² This conclusion can probably be extended to include other cases as well.¹⁷³ Most recently Charles E. Hill has studied anew the evidence for John in a monograph in which he critically evaluates the 'orthodox Johannophobia theory', as he calls it, that has dominated Johannine studies since Walter Bauer, while duly recognizing the

(ii. 126)). Interestingly, Köster even reckons with the possible ('möglich, lässt sich aber nicht sicher feststellen') influence of John 3. 3 in 9. 29. 3.

¹⁷⁰ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 255.

¹⁷¹ Ibid. 256: 'von einer wirklichen Benutzung eines Evangeliums (kann) doch keine Rede sein'.

¹⁷² F.-M. Braun, *Jean le théologien et son Évangile dans l'église ancienne*, EB (Paris: Gabalda, 1959), 160–70. 'Il s'agissait de savoir si le fait d'une dépendance du *Pasteur* par rapport à saint Jean était bien réel. Sur les deux points de la Porte unique et du baptême, il ne paraît pas douteux' (p. 170; cf. also p. 164). P. Henne, *La Christologie chez Clément de Rome et dans le Pasteur d'Herma*, Paradosis 33 (Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires, 1992), 249 n. 114, refers to Braun, but it is not clear whether he subscribes to the latter's views. In line with Braun is R. Kieffer, 'Les premiers indices d'une réception de l'évangile de saint Jean', in F. Van Segbroeck et al. (eds.), *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift for F. Neirynck*, BETL 100/C (Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1992), 2225–38, on p. 2231.

¹⁷³ Braun, *Jean le théologien*, 170: 'Si, ne fût-ce que sur un point ou deux, la dépendance du *Pasteur* par rapport au quatrième Évangile se reconnaît sans trop de peine, il serait raisonnable de l'étendre aux autres passages d'inspiration johannique. Ici cependant gardons-nous d'être trop catégorique.' Other possible parallels are listed on pp. 163–4.

exceptional position of Braun.¹⁷⁴ The evidence from *Shepherd* 'may not be too impressive',¹⁷⁵ though just before, Hill had regarded the exclusivity of the claim that Jesus is the sole way to salvation and the 'many evocations of Johannine themes' in *Sim.* 9. 12–16 as making 'a strong case' for the author's knowledge of John,¹⁷⁶ at least in this latter part, which in his opinion might stem from a later, or the latest, stage (i.e., c.140) in the composition history of the work.

Another notable exception is Andreas Lindemann, who accepts that Hermas's version of the parable of the vineyard in *Sim.* 5. 2 is clearly composed on the basis of Mark 12. 1–9 and was transformed by Hermas into an ethical teaching on the benefits resulting from one's efforts.¹⁷⁷ Lindemann also seems to reckon with possible influence of Jas. 2. 14–26 in *Man.* 10. 1. 4, though he here speaks only of 'reminding'.¹⁷⁸ Influence of Paul's letters is less prominent, but is in a way expected and explainable, for as a 'Busschrift ohne theologischen Anspruch', the *Shepherd* shows no interest in the subtleties of Paul's arguments.¹⁷⁹ Exceptionally, however, there is some indication that Hermas had in mind one of Paul's letters. This can best be argued for *Man.* 4 and 1 Cor. 7, which was possibly used to counter rigoristic tendencies in the community, though without explicitly relying on the authority of the apostle.¹⁸⁰ An unreflective use of elements from Paul's letters can be assumed for the unity formula, which is not yet rendered in one fixed form (see *Sim.* 9. 13. 9; 9. 17. 4; 9. 18. 4), and for Hermas's understanding of baptism (*Sim.* 9. 16. 2–4 and Rom. 6. 3–5; Eph. 2. 1–5).¹⁸¹ The same conclusion goes for the observation in *Vis.* 3. 5. 1, which is irrelevant in its context, that some of the

¹⁷⁴ C. E. Hill, *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004). See the survey of research on pp. 13–56 (on Braun, pp. 19–20) and the section on *Shepherd* on pp. 374–80 (also 128–38, on *Shepherd* and the Muratorian Fragment).

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.* 378; cf. 380: 'may hold only limited weight'.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.* 376. The first of these observations, however, is said not to be enough to argue for 'literary allusion', but Hermas 'seems to know the Fourth Gospel at the level of ideas' (p. 377). The second observation sounds like an echo of Massaux's analysis of the impact of John 3. 5 on *Sim.* 9. 12–16, though he is not mentioned in this respect.

¹⁷⁷ A. Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum: Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion*, BHT 58 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979), 289 n. 198: 'Dieses Gleichnis, das eindeutig an Mk 12,1–9 anknüpft, ...'.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.* 288: 'Diese Abwertung des "nur" Glaubens erinnert geradezu an Jak 2.'

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.* 290. The situation is not the result of any anti-Pauline stance on the part of its author.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.* 284: 'Es fällt schwer, anzunehmen, der Vf habe hier nicht an 1 Kor 7 gedacht.' For E. Dassmann, on the contrary, not even this passage would illustrate literary dependence. 'Gewiss gibt es in diesem Text Übereinstimmungen mit 1 Kor 7,28.39 f.—auch in sprachlicher Hinsicht—, aber die ergeben sich notwendigerweise aus dem gleichen Gegenstand, dem Hermas jedoch bei grundsätzlicher Übereinstimmung nicht nur mit Paulus, sondern mit der gesamten frühchristlichen Praxis einen unpaulinischen Verdienstakzent gibt' (*Der Stachel im Fleisch: Paulus in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Irenäus* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1979), 226–31, on p. 227).

¹⁸¹ Because the Christological perspective is lacking, Lindemann concludes that Hermas did not consciously make use of Ephesians (*Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 286).

members of the hierarchy have died and others not, which sounds like a 'Nachklang' of 1 Cor. 15. 6.¹⁸²

But the positions of Braun (and Hill) and Lindemann have become the exceptions in current research. In the commentaries the question of 'the New Testament in Hermas' is a marginal issue that is discussed briefly, and answered negatively, in the introduction. Already in his first edition of 1958 Robert Joly cuts short any expectation of the reader in this respect.¹⁸³ Yet he still spoke of 'citations', and concluded that Hermas had probably read Matthew, Mark, John, some of the letters of Paul, James, and maybe even Luke.¹⁸⁴ In the second edition, the 'citations' have been problematized: 'Nous serions beaucoup plus réservé aujourd'hui sur ce problème difficile qui ne nous avait pas assez retenu à l'époque.'¹⁸⁵ Graydon F. Snyder shows more openness to discussing the possibility of literary dependence, but the end result is equally negative. He repeats with Köster, 'though Hermas surely knew the [synoptic] Gospels, there is no evidence that he used them.'¹⁸⁶ Manfred Leutzsch reduces the discussion to its bare minimum, and is even sceptical about whether Hermas actually knew any such Christian writings.¹⁸⁷ The situation is not really different in the major commentaries. For Norbert Brox, Hermas must have known about the origin of certain traditions he used,¹⁸⁸ but his free handling of the material prevents any sure identification of this material.¹⁸⁹ But if so, can one then just go on arguing that 'sämtliche

¹⁸² Ibid. 286. Some verbal agreement notwithstanding, no influence is accepted at *Man.* 3. 4 and 10. 3. 2, because in both cases the paralleled theme is developed in quite the opposite way, and in *Man.* 10 Hermas has probably integrated a source of non-Christian origin (ibid. 287, with reference to Dibelius, *Hirt*, 535).

¹⁸³ R. Joly, *Hermas le Pasteur*, SC 53 (Paris: Cerf, 1958; 2nd edn. 1968), 46: 'Éliminons bien vite la question des textes canoniques. Il ne s'agit pas à proprement parler de sources et l'examen des réminiscences des Deux Testaments ne permet aucune conclusion certaine.'

¹⁸⁴ Ibid. 'Ici plus que jamais, le silence ne prouve rien.'

¹⁸⁵ Ibid. (2nd edn. 1968), 414.

¹⁸⁶ G. F. Snyder, *The Shepherd of Hermas*, Apostolic Fathers, 6 (Camden, NJ: T. Nelson, 1969), 15. The same goes for James and for Paul, though the 'one-body' motif may be 'not as alien to Paul as has been claimed' (p. 14). The closest one gets to something like dependence concern the motifs of 'entering the Kingdom' (John 3. 5) and that of Christ as 'the door' (John 10. 9), but any firm conclusion is hampered by the fact that Hermas shows no interest at all in John's emphasis on defining Christian life in relation to Christ (p. 14). The agreements with Revelation are basically 'only in form' (p. 16), and the suggestion (of Goodspeed and others) that *Shepherd* might have been composed with Heb. 6. 4–6 in mind is discarded because 'based on a misreading of the history of repentance' (p. 15 n. 8).

¹⁸⁷ 'Das gilt auch für Jak, dessen gelegentliche Nähe zu Hermas sich aus einer gemeinsam benutzten parännetischen Tradition erklärt' (Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 134).

¹⁸⁸ 'Der Eindruck aus der Lektüre des PH, dass die Motive und verschiedenartigen Themen anonym auf H gekommen sind, kann kaum richtig sein' (Brox, *Hirt*, 48).

¹⁸⁹ Brox speaks of Hermas's 'irritierend freien Umgang mit seinen Quellen, die er hinter seiner eigenen Verarbeitung und Veränderung verschwinden lässt' (ibid. 47).

Anklänge an urchristliche Schriften erklären sich aus gemeinsamen Gedankengut bzw. aus tradiertem Formelgut?¹⁹⁰ The two explanations (dependence on oral and on written tradition) are not mutually exclusive, but one cannot resolutely opt for the second only because Hermas has made it difficult to demonstrate the first. Carolyn Osiek summarizes the question with regard to the gospels in one sentence: ‘Any similarity between parables in Hermas and those in the Gospels is better explained on the basis of a common oral tradition.’¹⁹¹ Common tradition also accounts for the paralleled material with James (and Paul): it is ‘insufficient to prove literary dependence. Both writings [the *Shepherd* and James] reflect the common world of Hellenistic Jewish moral instruction.’¹⁹² The same picture can be found in many a monograph on *Shepherd*. Thus, L. Pernveden clearly follows in the steps of Köster when confining the whole issue to the observation that ‘It would be incorrect to deny that Hermas was acquainted with Apostolic tradition. . . . But it seems just as incorrect for us to assume that the Apostolic tradition in its fixed written form made up the basis of Hermas’ concept of faith. . . . It points to a closer affinity with Jewish sapiential tradition and Jewish apocalyptic . . . than we can observe in general in the New Testament texts.’¹⁹³ In recent studies on the reception history of the New Testament in the early church, ‘the New Testament in Hermas’ has virtually, and often indeed effectively, disappeared from the discussion, Hill’s recent book being an exception (see above). Wolf-Dietrich Köhler basically reduces Massaux’s extensive analysis to a mere list, and his introduction says it all: ‘Der “Hirt des Hermas” gibt für die Antwort auf die Frage nach der Rezeption des Mt in der frühchristlichen Literatur

¹⁹⁰ Ibid. 49.

¹⁹¹ Osiek, *Shepherd*, 26.

¹⁹² Ibid.

¹⁹³ L. Pernveden, *The Concept of the Church in the Shepherd of Hermas* (Lund: Gleerup, 1966), 277–91, quoted from pp. 279–80. In criticizing S. Giet, *Hermas et les Pasteurs* (Paris: PUF, 1963), 157–8, for accepting literary dependence on John at *Sim.* 9. 12. 5–6 (Giet here follows Massaux, but he also cites John 20. 31), Pernveden relies on the rather strange argument that the similarity between the *Shepherd* and John is more fundamental (both use the same ‘scheme’ of ‘hear—believe—have life’ (see John 5. 24), which they have borrowed from tradition) than that of an occasional influence of one particular passage (p. 282). Besides Pernveden see also, *inter al.*, L. W. Nijendijk, ‘Die Christologie des Hirten des Hermas exegetisch, religions- und dogmengeschichtlich untersucht’ (diss. Utrecht, 1986), 189 (cf. 112); *Sim.* 9. 12–16 is tributary to Jewish exegetical tradition. Schneider, *Die Kirche als Geschöpf*, 15–17 and 38–42, surveys several positions and warns of an exclusive interest in the Jewish background (p. 40 n. 22), but remains sceptical about the possibility of recovering the use of a written source. Others do not even address the question at all: see, e.g., J. Reiling, *Hermas and Christian Prophecy: A Study of the Eleventh Mandate*, NovTSup 37 (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 58–9 and 72, citing Matt. 7. 15–16, but without linking it to *Man.* 11. 16. The same is true for another analysis of this chapter: M. Wünsche, *Der Ausgang der urchristlichen Prophetie in der frühkatholischen Kirche*, Calwer Theologische Monographien, B/14 (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1997), 103–30 (*Man.* 11).

kaum etwas her.’¹⁹⁴ He distinguishes three groups (‘möglich’, ‘allenfalls theoretisch möglich jedoch nicht naheliegend’, ‘unwahrscheinlich’), and qualifies the first one by comparing it to the committee’s already weak c rating: ‘Das ist immerhin noch etwas mehr, als ich zugestehen will.’¹⁹⁵ Arthur J. Bellinzoni echoes Köster’s position when stating, ‘To be sure, some passages are close enough (Mand. 4.1.6; Sim. 9.20.2–3. 29.3; 31.2) that literary dependence on the synoptic gospels is not impossible, but neither can it be established. Passages that are similar to Mark (Sim. 9.31.2; Mand. 4.1.6; Vis. 3.7.3) may well go back to oral tradition.’¹⁹⁶ But what is needed to ‘establish’ literary dependence? *Shepherd* is not mentioned in Titus Nagel’s work on John, and is also missing from Andrew Gregory’s on the reception of Luke–Acts.¹⁹⁷

Should it all end like this? I hope it does not, if only because nothing can be gained from no longer studying the evidence.

EVIDENCE REVISITED

The two most compelling indications that the author of the *Shepherd* may have relied on one or another of the New Testament writings for some of the paralleled material are simply lacking. Hermas does not formally quote from any of these, and he does not otherwise refer to such writings. Taylor’s fanciful interpretation of the ‘good news’ as referring to the gospel and of ‘the four legs’ of the woman’s couch in *Vis.* 3. 13. 1–3 as symbolizing the four canonical gospels has been rejected unanimously and often ridiculed.¹⁹⁸ The *Shepherd* contains only one explicit quotation. In *Vis.* 2. 3. 4 Hermas is probably quoting from the ‘Book of Eldad and Modad’, but the precise extent of the quotation and its wording cannot be established with any certainty.¹⁹⁹ The committee compared some of the paralleled material to a quotation.²⁰⁰ More recently,

¹⁹⁴ Köhler, *Rezeption*, 125.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.* 127. He further hazards the guess that Hermas avoided using Matthew because he differed from it on the question of the sinners in the community (on p. 128).

¹⁹⁶ A. J. Bellinzoni, ‘The Gospel of Matthew in the Second Century’, *Second Century* 9 (1992), 197–258, on p. 212.

¹⁹⁷ References above, n. 9.

¹⁹⁸ Taylor, *Witness*, 8–18. Cf. the comments of Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 253–4; Brox, *Hirt*, 46 n. 6 and 159 n. 81.

¹⁹⁹ Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, gives the quotation as ‘See affliction is coming. If it seems right to you, make another denial’, but notes (p. 191 n. 1) that it may also have included what follows (‘The Lord is near, etc.’). However, it is equally possible that the quotation is limited to this latter part only. See A.-M. Denis, *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique*, ii (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 477–89, esp. 481–2 and n. 12.

²⁰⁰ See above, n. 52.

A. Carlini has argued that the wording in *Vis.* 1. 1. 9 and 2. 3. 1–2 verbally echoes part of 2 Cor. 7. 10,²⁰¹ but even so, Hermas does not technically identify or qualify the text as a quotation.

Of course, formal quotations are not the only way to make use of written sources, even though the evidence that can be cited in this respect must necessarily always remain ‘circumstantial’ to some degree. A great deal of such material has been collected and studied, as the above survey has shown. In the following I will briefly illustrate with one example that it may nevertheless perhaps still be worthwhile to look once more at some of this evidence. The case I have chosen is *Man.* 4, a passage that readily invites a comparison and further study because of the strong verbal agreement and the similarity in content with particular New Testament texts, and also because the parallel is not just with general paraenetic material but seems to be more ‘factual’ and specific.

The structure of this chapter is somewhat odd, but that is not really exceptional in the *Shepherd*.²⁰² It begins with a section on chaste behaviour and forms of adultery (4. 1), continues with a longer one on conversion (4. 2–3), and ends with a short one on the possibility of marrying in widowhood (4. 4). In 4. 1. 1–3 the Shepherd warns against desiring another’s wife. The same motif had been developed already in *Vis.* 1. 1. 4–8, where Rhoda accuses Hermas of having sinned against her in this way, and was mentioned again briefly in *Vis.* 1. 2. 4. Osiek is a bit hesitant about connecting *Man.* 4 with *Vis.* 1,²⁰³ because the episode with Rhoda is not explicitly recalled again in *Man.* 4 and Hermas’ experience is not used as an example for the reader (as in *Vis.* 3. 6. 7 with regard to his wealth), but the wording is very similar in both passages, as Brox rightly observes.²⁰⁴ In 4. 1. 4 Hermas interrogates the Shepherd about the related but not altogether identical topic of committing adultery in marriage. The Shepherd’s teaching is rather straightforward. If one (the ruling applies to both husband and wife, as Hermas notes in 4. 1. 8, 10) discovers that one’s partner has committed adultery and the partner does not repent, divorce is necessary, lest one becomes guilty of the other’s sin. However, one is not allowed to remarry—for that would entail being guilty of adultery oneself—in order to give the partner a chance to repent and to be reconciled. In 4. 1. 9 Hermas discusses other forms of adultery that are not further identified (‘behaving like the outsiders’). He now considers the case of a partner who does not want to repent, and rules that one should avoid any

²⁰¹ A. Carlini, ‘Erma (vis. II 3,1) testimone testuale di Paolo?’, *Studi Classici e Orientali* 37 (1987), 235–9. See the comments by Osiek, *Shepherd*, 56 n. 16, and Brox, *Hirt*, 102: not a quotation from Paul’s letter, and ‘so bleibt die kleine Sensation aus’.

²⁰² Cf. Dibelius, *Hirt*, 504–5; Giet, *Hermas*, 22–5; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 109–10.

²⁰³ Osiek, *Shepherd*, 110: ‘Possibly, but not surely’.

²⁰⁴ Brox, *Hirt*, 204.

contact and not live with such a person. In 4. 4 Hermas turns back from the Shepherd's more general teaching on conversion (4. 2–3) to discuss the case of marriage in widowhood. Again, the ruling is clear: one is allowed to remarry after the death of the partner and does not sin, but it is 'a superior honour' to remain unmarried.

Man. 4. 1 and 4. 4 contain some remarkable parallels with the teaching on marriage and adultery of Matthew and of Paul in 1 Corinthians.²⁰⁵ The commandment 'not to allow any thought to rise up in your heart about someone else's wife' (4. 1. 1, with the comments at 4. 1. 2–3) reminds one of Matt. 5. 28. The verbal agreements between *Man.* 4. 1. 1–3 and Matt. 5. 28 may be rather limited (the 'obvious' *γυνή*, the phrase 'in the heart', which is connected with *μοιχεύω* in Matthew and with *ἀναβαίνω* in *Shepherd*, and a synonym for '(to) desire'²⁰⁶), but they may be more significant than the committee and Massaux were ready to admit.²⁰⁷ There is some disagreement on the impact of Matthew's redaction in 5. 28. Many have argued that it is probably limited to *ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ*.²⁰⁸ R. H. Gundry takes the more exceptional position that 'the evidence for composition by Matthew is overwhelming'.²⁰⁹ The saying has clearly been formulated in light of Exod. 20. 17 and Deut. 5. 21, which also read *ἐπιθυμέω*, but not *ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ*. The motif of lustful desire is known from Jewish tradition, but the Old Testament passages that are usually cited as parallels do not have *ἐπιθυμέω* or *ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ*.²¹⁰ The agreement with Matthew on this 'detail' may then perhaps be all the more important.

The committee compared the ruling on divorce after adultery with Matt. 19. 9 par. Mark and noted that it 'resembles the Gospels both in thought and language' and that 'we may reasonably infer some kind of literary dependence', which would be with Mark rather than with Matthew, for Hermas

²⁰⁵ Cf. Hilhorst, *Sémitismes*, 121 (specifically with regard to the use of parataxis, and without explicitly arguing for literary dependence): 'les problèmes du divorce et du remariage s'expriment chez Hermas d'une manière analogue à ce que nous trouvons ailleurs.'

²⁰⁶ Matthew has *ἐπιθυμέω*, Hermas *ἐνθύμησις*, but see *ἐπιθυμία* at in *Vis.* 1. 1. 4.

²⁰⁷ Massaux, *Influence*, 262. Massaux nevertheless concluded in favour of dependence, because the motif is found only in Matthew in Christian literature before the *Shepherd*: 'le premier évangile pourrait dès lors être à son origine'. The committee was even more reserved: 'similar in sentiment, though not in words, to Matthew' (*NTAF*, 121).

²⁰⁸ References in U. Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Mt 1–7), i, EKK, 1/1 5th rev. edn. (Düsseldorf and Zürich: Benziger Verlag; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2002), 347 n. 2, who himself is hesitant: 'Stammt vielleicht *ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ* von Mt?'

²⁰⁹ R. H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on his Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1982), 87.

²¹⁰ See Job 31. 1; Ps. Sol. 4. 4–5; Sir. 9. 8; 26. 9–11 (23. 4–6 has *ἐπιθυμία*, but it is not said of desiring a woman); 4 Macc. 2. 5; see also *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Issachar 7. 2–3, with *πάν ἐπιθυμημα* in v. 3).

‘omits the qualification in Matthew [i.e., *μη ἐπι πορνεία*].’²¹¹ Massaux offered a similar comment: ‘une influence littéraire de la part de *Mt.* sur la rédaction d’Hermas est à exclure; en effet, ce qui distingue *Mt.* des autres parallèles, c’est une restriction qu’il apporte aux affirmations de *Mc.* et de *Lc.*, et cette restriction est précisément absente du texte d’Hermas: pas de trace dans le Pasteur de *παρεκτός λόγου πορνείας* (*Mt.*, v,32) ou de *μη ἐπι πορνεία* (*Mt.*, xix,9). Restent les textes de *Mc.* et de *Lc.*’²¹² Köster did not discuss the exception clause and noted the strong agreement with Mark: ‘fast mit den gleichen Worten wie *Mk.*’²¹³ Yet direct dependence on the gospel was excluded, because Mark did of course not create the ruling, it is not introduced as a saying of Jesus, and Hermas does not systematically comment on the divorce pericope in Mark 10.²¹⁴ It is most surprising that all three commentators seem to have missed the crucial point that Hermas introduces the question in 4. 1. 4 as a case of a man discovering that his wife is committing adultery, which is here called *μοιχεία*, and repeats this right after in 4. 1. 5, when the case is further developed into one of continuing adultery, now called *πορνεία*. Hermas deals with the problem of divorce and remarriage in the specific situation that one of the partners has committed adultery, which is precisely the specification that is found in Matthew’s version of the divorce saying in both 19. 9 and 5. 32, but not in the other gospels! It is widely agreed that Matthew’s exception clause represents an important but secondary development of the divorce saying.²¹⁵

Hermas agrees with Matthew (and with Paul in 1 Cor. 7. 10–11) that as a rule divorce is not permitted. He further agrees with both Matthew and Paul in that he also envisages a situation in which divorce can occur, and like Matthew he specifies this as divorce after adultery. The prohibition to remarry after divorce (4. 1. 6) follows Paul’s advice (or ruling: note the third person imperatives),²¹⁶ and has long been the dominant line of interpretation of Matthew’s divorce saying in the ancient church.²¹⁷ Finally, like Paul in 1 Cor.

²¹¹ *NTAF*, 121.

²¹² Massaux, *Influence*, 284–5 (ii. 130–1). He finally opts for Mark because of the combination *γαμήση . . . μοιχᾶται*.

²¹³ Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 251 (cf. above, n. 166).

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, with quotation from Dibelius, *Hirt*, 506.

²¹⁵ See the comments by Luz, *Matthäus*: ‘Matthäus zeigt durch seine Klausel auf jeden Fall deutlich, dass er Jesu Scheidungsverbot als in seiner Gemeinde gültige Ordnung versteht und eben darum eine Ausnahme formulieren kann’ (p. 361) and ‘In der Gemeinde des Matthäus wurde Jesu Grundsatz so praktiziert, dass Scheidung nur im Falle von *πορνεία* zulässig war’ (p. 362).

²¹⁶ Cf. J. Dupont, *Mariage et divorce dans l’Évangile: Matthieu 19,3–12 et parallèles* (Bruges: Desclée De Brouwer, 1959), 153: ‘semble faire écho à I Cor. vii,11: *μενέτω ἄγαμος*’.

²¹⁷ See the discussion and references in Luz, *Matthäus*, 365–8, and *idem*, *Matthäus*, iii (1997), 98–9. Cf. Osiek, *Shepherd*, 111 (with references to older literature in n. 9).

7. 10–11, Hermas describes the case from the perspective of the wife committing adultery, but he also explicitly indicates that the ruling goes for both parties (4. 1. 8), and he likewise envisages the possibility of reconciliation.

In three ways, however, Hermas goes beyond the teaching as found in Matthew and/or Paul. All three have to do with his specific interest in offering an opportunity for repentance. First, he argues that such an opportunity should be given after the partner finds out about the adultery but before the divorce (4. 1. 5). Second, he adds an explanation of why one should not remarry after divorce (4. 1. 7–8), but the reason he gives accords with the perspective of reconciliation that is emphasized by Paul.²¹⁸ And third, and perhaps most important of all, he has the Shepherd rule that only one opportunity for repentance is allowed (4. 1. 8). This most probably implies that the prohibition on remarrying becomes obsolete if the same partner commits adultery for a second time.²¹⁹ It is important to note that Hermas does not radically oppose the views of Matthew and Paul. His position can perhaps best be regarded as a further specification, probably stemming from pastoral concerns, of a rule that in its absolute form (no divorce) was already, before Hermas, felt to be difficult to meet and had begun to be modified, in more or less similar ways, by Matthew and by Paul.²²⁰

In 4. 4. 1–2 Hermas asks the Shepherd about remarriage after the death of one of the partners. The topic had also been dealt with by Paul in the same context of chapter 7 of 1 Corinthians. Hermas is in full agreement with Paul's teaching. But perhaps more important still than the agreement on the praxis is the agreement in the way the argument is formulated. Remarrying is allowed, but refraining from it is 'better' (*κρείσσον* in 1 Cor. 7. 38, *μακαριωτέρα* in v. 40, and *περισσοτέραν τιμὴν* in 4. 4. 2).²²¹ Moreover, Paul and Hermas agree in qualifying the rule in terms of 'sinning'. This is found only once in Paul (1 Cor. 7. 28, here with regard to marriage itself) and not in Matthew in the context of the divorce sayings, but it is used by Hermas both

²¹⁸ One can therefore not conclude that Hermas's position goes against Paul's; so, N. Baumert, *Antifeminismus bei Paulus? Einzelstudien*, FzB 68 (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1992), 237: 'bürstet unseren Text [1 Cor. 7. 10–11] gegen den Strich'.

²¹⁹ In 4. 1. 9 Hermas seems to restrict the possibility of reconciliation in yet another way. Here he probably speaks of adultery in a metaphorical sense, though it is not clear what exactly he is referring to (participation in pagan rituals, or an illicit sexual relationship). The perspective is one of 'persistent adultery' with apparently no hope of conversion, which will inevitably end in separation or even excommunication (see Osiek, *Shepherd*, 112).

²²⁰ Luz, *Matthäus*, i. 368: 'Sowohl Matthäus mit seiner Einfügung der Unzuchtsklausel als auch besonders Paulus mit seinen situationsbezogenen Weisungen von 1Kor 7,10–16 zeigen, wie flexibel im Neuen Testament auch vom Herrn selbst gesetztes Recht an die Situation angepasst werden konnte.'

²²¹ Brox acknowledges the similarity with Paul ('(trifft) sich in der Lösung der Frage mit Paulus'), but of course, 'ohne aber literarische Beziehung zu 1Kor 7,39f. aufzuweisen' (*Hirt*, 214).

here and in *Man.* 4. 1. At the end of his comment on Matt. 5. 32 Luz rightly observes: 'Auffällig bleibt, dass der Evangelist hier die Praxis seiner Gemeinde nicht, wie etwa bei der Exkommunikationsordnung 18,15–17, unter den Grundgedanken der Vergebung Gottes stellt. Insofern ist unser Text nicht spezifisch matthäisch.'²²² Did Hermas have the same feeling, and did he adapt the ruling accordingly? And did Matthew perhaps play a role in this after all? If 4. 1. 9 alludes to a situation of continuing refusal to repent, the outcome to separate from the adulterer could be likened to the procedure that is described in Matt. 18. 15–17. An opportunity for repentance is offered to the one who has 'sinned' (18. 15!), but there is a limit to it.

In addition to elements of verbal agreement and agreement in content with both Paul and Matthew, there is also a striking agreement with Matthew in structure. Most remarkably, Hermas moves directly from the question of lustful desire to that of divorce and remarriage after adultery, which is precisely the sequence in Matt. 5. (27–)28, (31–)32. There is of course a certain logic to this arrangement, but one does not really need the first aspect to deal with the second one, as Paul demonstrated. In 4. 1. 6 the prohibition on remarrying is formulated in a way that is slightly closer (but not identical) to Matt. 19. 9, but that is hardly an objection, for the same prohibition also occurs at 5. 32 (here with regard to remarrying a divorced wife²²³), and the two divorce sayings are otherwise closely parallel in Matthew. The 'thesis' in 5. 31 is modelled after 19. 7, and the two central verbs in the prohibition are formulated identically in both versions and in *Man.* 4. 1. 6. In Matthew *μοιχεύω, μοιχάω* is the keyword that links vv. 27–8 to 31–2. Hermas also clearly had the intention of connecting the two motifs right from the beginning. In 4. 1. 1 he speaks not only of *περὶ γυναικὸς ἀλλοτρίας* (the issue dealt with in 4. 1. 1–3), but also of *περὶ πορνείας τινος ἢ περὶ τοιούτων τινῶν ὁμοιωμάτων πονηρῶν* (cf. 4. 1. 4–8. 9).²²⁴

Man. 4 contains material that bears traces of Matthean and Pauline authorship. It means at least that there circulated in the community of Hermas elements from traditions that went back to Matthew and to Paul. Could Hermas have been aware of this? The fact that he does not 'systematically' comment upon Paul's teaching and that he goes beyond Paul's and Matthew's teaching in 4. 1. 4–8, but without radically opposing it, is not in itself an

²²² Luz, *Matthäus*, i. 365.

²²³ But that is not a problem for Luz, *Matthäus*, iii. 98–9: Matt. 5. 32 and 19. 9 'ergänzen sich'.

²²⁴ There are several other indications of redactional activity at the beginning and the end of the chapter. In 4. 1. 1–3, and again in 4. 1. 11 ('the one who provides healing'), Hermas almost certainly looks back at *Vis.* 1. 1. 8. The words *ἀγνεία* and *σεμνότης* of 4. 1. 1. 3 return in 4. 4. 3–4, and the closing sentence 'if they guard these my commandments and proceed in this purity' (*φυλάξωσι καὶ πορευθῶσιν ἐν τῇ ἀγνότητι ταύτω*) echoes the commandment in the opening clause to 'guard your holiness' (*φυλάσσειν τὴν ἀγνείαν*).

objection to such a possibility. The first is an argument from silence. As for the second, much depends, it would seem, on the role one is prepared to assign to Hermas himself in the composition of *Man.* 4. If he is made (co-)responsible for creating the ruling in *Man.* 4. 1. 4–8 and introducing it in the community, and there is a good chance that he was, for what would be the reason to present as ‘revelation’ what was common knowledge and practice, he must have realized that he was adapting received teaching, and he must have known or inquired about its origins. Because of their specificity and ‘developed’ character, when compared to the ‘pure’ form of the divorce saying in Mark, these traditions were already perhaps not just identified as ‘Jesus sayings’ or ‘Jesus tradition’, but as ‘Pauline’ or ‘Matthean’. If so, they could in principle be traced back to their origin in the gospel or the letter to the Corinthians.²²⁵

Does Hermas indicate in some way in *Man.* 4 that he was aware of the origins of the paralleled material? Again it would seem that much depends on how one sees his role in the composition of *Man.* 4. I can imagine that some at least may be convinced that the combined argument of agreements with Matthew/Paul in redactional vocabulary, in the basic principles regarding divorce and remarriage, and also in structure (from ‘lustful desire’ to ‘adultery in marriage’), forms a strong indication that Hermas was aware of it. The chapter also contains a few elements that are not really crucial in explaining the ruling on divorce and remarriage, and that again remind one of similar phrases in Matthew and in Paul. In 4. 1. 11 Hermas concludes the section on remarriage after divorce with the warning, ‘I am not giving an occasion for things to turn out this way’. He is clearly concerned that some might abuse the opportunity for repentance that he is offering. He expresses the same concern again in 4. 3. 6. Does one hear the Paul of Rom. 6. 1 when formulating a similar warning to those who might think that one can continue to live in sin after having received baptism? In the same context of 4. 3. 6 (also in 4. 3. 4) Hermas speaks of Christians being ‘called’ (κλησις). Paul uses the same image in 1 Cor. 7. 17–24, and in both Paul and the *Shepherd* it may be an allusion to baptism.²²⁶ In 4. 1. 3 the Shepherd concludes his teaching on lustful desire with a final warning: ‘where reverence dwells, lawlessness should not rise up in the heart of an upright man’ (ἀνὴρ δίκαιος). The reference to ‘the upright

²²⁵ This can perhaps be argued more plausibly for Paul than for Matthew. *1 Clement* contains strong indications that Paul’s letter to the Corinthians was known in Rome. Cf. in this respect the comment of Osiek, and how she struggles with the issue of Hermas’s acquaintance with Christian writings: ‘The teaching on remarriage in widowhood follows closely that of Paul in 1 Cor. 7:39–40. The language is so different that no literary dependence can be claimed, but *1 Clement* shows that 1 Corinthians was known very early in Rome, so that the Pauline text may well be the direct or indirect inspiration’ (*Shepherd*, 116).

²²⁶ Thus, Brox, *Hirt*, 213; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 115.

man' is one of several that links this section to *Vis.* 1. 1. 8, where one reads the same warning. It is in a sense a completely unnecessary element in its immediate context. The phrase occurs a couple of other times in the *Shepherd* with different applications. The same phrase is used in Matt. 1. 18 to qualify 'the just man' Joseph deliberating about divorcing his wife in order not to expose her as an adulterer. Could such 'minor' elements make the difference in arguing the case?

Finally, does all this make it a plausible conclusion (for plausibility rather than certainty is all to which we can aspire) that Hermas effectively made use of the gospel of Matthew and of one of Paul's letters to the Corinthians? I can live with this idea, and with the idea that others will probably remain unconvinced. *Man.* 4 may be somewhat special, because it contains concrete teaching that can be linked more directly to specific texts than would perhaps be possible with some of the paraenetic teaching of a more general kind, but the chapter certainly offers a solid basis for revisiting material that is paralleled in Matthew and in 1 Corinthians, and perhaps also in other writings.

This page intentionally left blank

Bibliography

- Aland, B., *et al.* (eds.), *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27th edn. (= NA²⁷) (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993).
- *et al.* (eds.), *Novum Testamentum Graecum* (= *Editio Critica Maior*) (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997–).
- Aland, K., *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*, ANTF 1, 2nd edn. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994).
- *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, 15th rev. edn. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2001).
- and Aland, B., *Der Text des Neuen Testaments*, 1st edn. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1982).
- — *The Text of the New Testament*, 2nd edn. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans; Leiden: Brill, 1989).
- Albl, M. C., ‘*And Scripture Cannot be Broken*’: *The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections*, NovTSup 96 (Leiden: Brill, 1999).
- Aleith, E., *Paulusverständnis in der Kirche*, BZNW 18 (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1937).
- The American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project, *The New Testament in Greek*, iii: *The Gospel of Luke*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984, 1987).
- Amphoux, C.-B. and J. K. Elliott (eds.), *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity*, HTB 6 (Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2003).
- Aono, T., *Die Entwicklung des paulinischen Gerichtsgedanken bei den apostolischen Vätern* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1979).
- Attridge, H., *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989).
- Audet, P., *La Didachè: Instructions des apôtres* (Paris: Gabalda, 1958).
- Baarda, T., ‘Gadarenes, Gerasenes and Gergesenes and the “Diatessaron” Tradition’, in E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox (eds.), *Neotestamentica et Semitica* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969), 181–97.
- ‘2 Clement 12 and the Sayings of Jesus’, in *idem*, *Early Transmission of Words of Jesus: Thomas, Tatian and the Text of the NT*, ed. H. Helderman and S. J. Noorda (Amsterdam: VU Boekhandel/Uitgeverij, 1983), 261–88.
- ‘1 Thess 2: 14–16: Rodrigues in “Nestle-Aland”’, *NTT* 39 (1984–5), 186–93.
- ‘What Kind of Apparatus for the New Testament do we Need? The Case of Luke 23:48’, in B. Aland and J. Delobel (eds.), *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis and Church History: A Discussion of Methods*, CBET 7 (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994), 37–97.
- Balabanski, V., *Eschatology in the Making: Mark, Matthew and the Didache*, SNTSMS 97 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

- Barnett, A. E., *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941).
- Barrett, C. K., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, i ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994).
- Bauchham, R. J., 'The Great Tribulation in the Shepherd of Hermas', *JTS* 25 (1974), 27–40.
- 'The Study of Gospel Traditions Outside the Canonical Gospels: Problems and Prospects', in D. Wenham (ed.), *The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels*, Gospel Perspectives, 5 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 369–403.
- Bauer, J. B., *Die Polykarpbriefe*, KAV 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995).
- Bauer, W., *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Polykarpbrief*, HNT 18; Die apostolischen Väter, 2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1920).
- *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*, BHT 10 (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1934; 2nd edn. 1964, ET: *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* (London: SCM, 1972; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971).
- Baumert, N., *Antifeminismus bei Paulus? Einzelstudien*, FzB 68 (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1992).
- Beatrice, P. F., 'Une citation de l'Évangile de Matthieu dans l'Épître de Barnabé', in J.-M. Sevrin (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity*, BETL 86 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 231–45.
- Bell, H. I., and Skeat, T. C. (eds.), *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel and Other Early Christian Papyri* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1935).
- Belle, G. van, *The Signs Source in the Fourth Gospel: A Historical Survey and Critical Evaluation of the Semeia Hypothesis*, BETL 116 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1994).
- Bellinzoni, A. J., *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr*, NovTSup 17 (Leiden: Brill, 1967).
- 'The Gospel of Matthew in the Second Century', *Second Century*, 9 (1992), 197–258.
- Berding, K., *Polycarp and Paul: An Analysis of their Literary and Theological Relationship in Light of Polycarp's Use of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Literature*, VCSup 62 (Leiden: Brill, 2002).
- Betz, H. D., *Galatians*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979).
- Betz, J., 'The Eucharist in the *Didache*', in J. A. Draper (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 244–75.
- Bihlmeyer, K. (ed.), *Die apostolischen Väter: Neuarbeitung der Funkschen Ausgabe*, 3rd edn. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1956).
- Black, C. C., *Mark: Images of an Apostolic Interpreter* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1994).
- 'Was Mark a Roman Gospel?', *ExpTim* 105 (1994–5), 36–40.
- Bousset, W., *Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament*, TU 11.4 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1894).
- Braun, F.-M., *Jean le Théologien et son Évangile dans l'église ancienne*, EB (Paris: Gabalda, 1959).
- Brown, R. E., *The Epistles of John*, AB 30 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1982).

- and Meier, J. P., *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983).
- *An Introduction to the New Testament* (New York: Doubleday, 1997).
- Brox, N., 'Häresie', *RAC* 13 (1986), 248–97.
- *Der Hirt des Hermas*, KAV 7 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991).
- Bultmann, R., 'εὐλαβής, etc.', *TDNT* ii (1964), 751–4.
- *History of the Synoptic Tradition* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1968).
- Burton, E., *Galatians*, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921).
- Butler, B. C., 'The Literary Relations of Didache, ch. XVI', *JTS* 11 (1960), 265–83.
- 'The "Two Ways" in the Didache', *JTS* 12 (1961), 275–38.
- Cadoux, C. J., *The Early Christian Attitude to War: A Contribution to the History of Early Christian Ethics* (London: Headley Brothers, 1919).
- Campanhausen, H. von, 'Polykarp von Smyrna und die Pastoralbriefe', in *SHAW.P-H Jahrgang 1951* (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag, 1951), 5–51; repr. in *idem, Aus der Frühzeit des Christentums: Studien zur Kirchengeschichte des ersten und zweiten Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1963), 197–252.
- *The Formation of the Christian Bible* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972).
- Carleton Paget, J., *The Epistle of Barnabas: Outlook and Background*, WUNT 2.64 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994).
- Carlini, A., 'Erma (vis. II 3,1) testimone testuale di Paolo?', *Studi Classici e Orientali*, 37 (1987), 235–9.
- Charles, R. H., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St John*, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1920).
- Clabeaux, J. J., *A Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul: A Reassessment of the Text of the Pauline Canon Attested by Marcion*, CBQMS 21 (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989).
- A Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology, *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905).
- Corssen, P., *Der Cyprianische Text der Acta apostolorum* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1892).
- Cotelier, J., SS. *Patrum qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt: Barnabae, Clementis, Hermae, Ignatii, Polycarpi. Opera edita et inedita, vera et supposititia. Una cum Clementis, Ignatii, Polycarpi Actis atque Martyriis* (Antwerp, 1672).
- Court, J. M., 'The Didache and St. Matthew's Gospel', *SJT* 34 (1981), 109–20.
- Crossan, J. D., *Sayings Parallels: A Workshop for the Jesus Tradition* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986).
- Dassmann, E., *Der Stachel im Fleisch: Paulus in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Irenäus* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1979).
- Davies, W. D., and Allison, D. C., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Matthew*, 3 vols. ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988–97).
- Dehandschutter, B., 'Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians: An Early Example of "Reception"', in J.-M. Sevrin (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity: la réception des écrits néotestamentaires dans le christianisme primitif*, BETL 86 (Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1989), 275–91.

- Dehandschutter, B., 'The Text of the Didache: Some Comments on the Edition of Klaus Wengst', in C. N. Jefford (ed.), *The Didache in Context*, NovTSup 37 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 37–46.
- Delobel, J., 'The Lord's Prayer in the Textual Tradition: A Critique of Recent Theories and their View on Marcion's Role', in J.-M. Sevrin (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity*, BETL 86 (Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1989), 293–309.
- 'Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Siamese Twins?', in B. Aland and J. Delobel (eds.), *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis and Church History: A Discussion of Methods*, CBET 7 (Kampen: Kok-Pharos, 1994), 98–117.
- Denis, A.-M., *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique*, ii (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000).
- Dibelius, M., *Der Brief des Jakobus*, KEK 15 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 7th edn. 1921; 11th edn. 1964).
- and Conzelmann, H., *The Pastoral Epistles*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972).
- Donahue, J. R., 'The Quest for the Community of Mark's Gospel', in F. Van Segbroeck *et al.* (eds.), *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*, BETL 100 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), ii. 817–38.
- 'Windows and Mirrors: The Setting of Mark's Gospel', *CBQ* 57 (1995), 1–26.
- Donfried, K. P., *The Setting of Second Clement in Early Christianity*, NovTSup 38 (Leiden: Brill, 1974).
- Draper, J. A. (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research*, AGAJU 37 (Leiden: Brill, 1996).
- 'The Jesus Tradition in the *Didache*', in J. A. Draper (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research*, AGAJU 37 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 72–91.
- Drijepontd, H. F. L., '1 Clement 2, 4 and 59, 3: Two Emendations', *Acta Classica* 8 (1965), 102–5.
- Dunn, J. D. G., *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament*, 2nd edn. (London: SCM, 1990).
- 'Jesus Tradition in Paul', in B. Chilton and C. A. Evans (eds.), *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*, NTTs 19 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 155–78.
- *Christology in the Making: An Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*, 2nd edn. (London: SCM, 1989; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1996).
- *Jesus Remembered* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003).
- Dupont, J., *Mariage et divorce dans l'Évangile: Matthieu 19,3–12 et parallèles* (Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1959).
- *The Sources of Acts* (London: DLT, 1964).
- Ehrman, B. D., *Lost Christianities: The Battles for Scripture and the Faiths We Never Knew* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).
- Ehrman, B. D. (ed.), *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).
- *The Apostolic Fathers*, i and ii, LCL 24 (Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard University Press, 2003).

- 'A Sinner in the Hands of an Angry Jesus', in Amy Donaldson and Tim Sailor (eds.), *Essays in the Text and Exegesis of the New Testament: In Honor of Gerald W. Hawthorne* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2004), 77–98.
- Elborowe, Thomas, *The Famous Epistles of Saint Polycarp and Saint Ignatius, Disciples to the Holy Evangelist and Apostle Saint John: With the Epistle of St Barnabas and Some Remarks upon their Lives and Deaths...* (London: William Grantham, 1668).
- Ellingworth, P., 'Hebrews and 1 Clement: Literary Dependence or Common Tradition?', *BZ* 23 (1979), 262–9.
- Elliott, J. H., *1 Peter: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 37B (New York: Doubleday, 2000).
- Elliott, J. K., 'The Purpose and Construction of a Critical Apparatus to a Greek New Testament', in W. Schrage (ed.), *Studien zur Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments*, BZNW 47 (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1986), 125–43.
- (ed.), *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays of G. D. Kilpatrick*, BETL 96 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990).
- (ed.), *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).
- 'Extra-Canonical Early Christian Literature', in J. Barton and J. Muddiman (eds.), *The Oxford Bible Commentary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 1306–30.
- Fee, G. D., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1987).
- 'The Use of the Greek Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism', in B. D. Ehrman and M. W. Holmes (eds.), *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, SD 46 (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1995), 191–207.
- Fischer, J. A., *Die Apostolischen Väter*, 6th edn. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970).
- Fuller, R. H., 'The Double Love Commandment of Love: A Test Case for the Criteria of Authenticity', in *idem* (ed.), *Essays on the Love Commandment* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978), 41–56.
- Gamble, H. Y., *Books and Readers in the Early Church* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).
- Garrow, A. J. P., *The Gospel of Matthew's Dependence on the Didache*, JSNTSup 254 (London and New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2004).
- Gebhardt, O. von, and Harnack, A. von, *Hermae Pastoris graece: Addita versione latina recentiore e codice palatino*, Patrum Apostolicorum Opera, 3 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1877).
- Gero, S., 'So-Called Ointment Prayer in the Coptic Version of the Didache: A Re-evaluation', *HTR* 70 (1977), 67–84.
- Giet, S., *Hermas et les Pasteurs* (Paris: PUF, 1963).
- Gilmour, M. J., *The Significance of Parallels between 2 Peter and Other Early Christian Literature* (Atlanta: SBL, 2002).

- Glover, R., 'The Didache's Quotations and the Synoptic Gospels', *NTS* 5 (1958), 12–29.
- 'Patristic Quotations and Gospel Sources', *NTS* 31 (1985), 234–51.
- Gokey, F. X., *The Terminology for the Devil and Evil Spirits in the Apostolic Fathers*, Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, 93 (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1961).
- Goldhahn-Müller, I., *Die Grenze der Gemeinde: Studien zum Problem der zweiten Busse im Neuen Testament unter Berücksichtigung der Entwicklung im 2 Jh. bis Tertullian*, GTA 39 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989).
- Goodenough, E. R., 'John a Primitive Gospel', *JBL* 64 (1945), 174–5.
- Goodspeed, E. J. (ed.), *Die ältesten Apologeten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914).
- Grant, R. M., 'Polycarp of Smyrna', *ATR* 28 (1946), 137–48.
- Green, H. B., 'Matthew, Clement and Luke: Their Sequence and Relationship', *JTS* 40 (1989), 1–25.
- Gregory, A., 'Disturbing Trajectories: 1 Clement, the Shepherd of Hermas and the Development of Early Roman Christianity', in P. Oakes (ed.), *Rome in the Bible and the Early Church* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2002), 142–66.
- *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century*, WUNT 2.169 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003).
- Grenfell, B. P., and Hunt, A. S., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part 4 (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1904).
- Guillaumont, A., Puech, H.-C., Quispel, G., Till, W., and 'Abd al Masih, Y. (eds.), *The Gospel According to Thomas* (Leiden: Brill; New York: Harper & Row, 1959).
- Gundry, R. H., *Matthew: A Commentary on his Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1982).
- Haenchen, E., *The Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971).
- Hagner, D. A., *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*, *NovTSup* 34 (Leiden: Brill, 1973).
- 'The Sayings of Jesus in the Apostolic Fathers and Justin Martyr', in D. Wenham (ed.), *The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels*, *Gospel Perspectives*, 5 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 233–68.
- Harnack, A. von, *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel nebst Untersuchungen zur ältesten Geschichte der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1884).
- *Die Apostellehre und die jüdischen beiden Wege* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1896).
- *Die Briefsammlung des Apostels Paulus und die anderen vorkonstantinischen christlichen Briefsammlungen* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1926).
- *Militia Christi: The Christian Religion and the Military in the First Three Centuries* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981).
- Harrison, P. N., *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936).

- Hartog, P., *Polycarp and the New Testament: The Occasion, Rhetoric, Theme, and Unity of the Epistle to the Philippians and its Allusions to New Testament Literature*, WUNT 2.134 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002).
- Haynes, S. R., *Noah's Curse: The Biblical Justification of American Slavery* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).
- Hays, R. B., *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).
- Helms, C. R., 'The Apocalypse in the Early Church: Christ, Eschaton and Millennium' (unpublished D.Phil. dissertation, Oxford University, 1991).
- Henderson, I. H., 'Style-Switching in the *Didache*: Fingerprint or Argument?', in C. Jefford (ed.), *The Didache in Context: Essays on its Text, History and Transmission* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 177–209.
- Hengel, M., *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ* (London: SCM, 2000).
- Henne, P., *La christologie chez Clément de Rome et dans le Pasteur d'Hermas*, Paradosis 33 (Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires, 1992).
- *L'Unité du Pasteur d'Hermas: Tradition et rédaction*, Cahiers de la Revue Biblique, 31 (Paris: Gabalda, 1992).
- Hennecke, E. (ed.), *New Testament Apocrypha*, i (ET London: SCM, 1963).
- Hilhorst, A., *Sémitismes et latinismes dans le Pasteur d'Hermas*, Graecitas Christianorum Primaeva, 5 (Nijmegen: Dekker & van der Vegt, 1976).
- Hill, C. E., *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
- Hoffmann, P., 'Der Menschensohn in Lukas 12,8', *NTS* 44 (1998), 357–79.
- Holmes, M. W., *The Apostolic Fathers*, 2nd edn. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 1992).
- 'A Note on the Text of Polycarp *Philippians* 11.3', *VC* 51 (1997), 207–10.
- Holtzmann, H. J., *Kritik der Epheser- und Kolosserbriefe auf Grund einer Analyse ihres Verwandtschaftsverhältnisses* (Leipzig: Englemann, 1872).
- Huck, A., *Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien*, rev. Heinrich Greeven (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981).
- Hübner, R. M., 'Thesen zur Echtheit und Datierung der sieben Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochien', *ZAC* 1 (1997), 44–72.
- Hultgren, A. J., 'The Double Commandment of Love in Mt 22: 34–40: Its Sources and Compositions', *CBQ* 36 (1974), 373–8.
- Hvalvik, R., *The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant: The Purpose of the Epistle of Barnabas and Jewish-Christian Competition in the Second Century*, WUNT 2.82 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996).
- Incigneri, B. J., *The Gospel to the Romans: The Setting and Rhetoric of Mark's Gospel*, Biblical Interpretation Series, 65 (Leiden: Brill, 2003).
- Inge, W. R., 'Ignatius', in *NTAF*, 61–83.
- Jacquier, E., *Le nouveau testament dans l'église chrétienne*, 2 vols. (Paris: Gabalda, 1911, 1913).
- Jefford, C., *The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, VCSup 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1989).

- Jefford, C., (ed.), *The Didache in Context: Essays on its Text, History and Transmission*, NovTSup 77 (Leiden: Brill, 1995).
- Jellicoe, S., *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (repr. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1989).
- Jenks, G. C., *The Origins and Early Development of the Antichrist Myth*, BZNW 59 (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1991).
- Jeremias, J., 'The Lord's Prayer', repr. in *idem, Jesus and the Message of the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 39–62.
- Johnson, L. T. *The Writings of the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1986).
- Joly, R. (ed.), *Hermas le Pasteur*, SC 53 (Paris: Cerf, 1958; 2nd edn. 1968).
- Kelhoffer, J. A., *Miracles and Mission: The Authentication of Missionaries and their Message in the Longer Ending of Mark*, WUNT 2.112 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).
- '“How Soon a Book” Revisited: ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ as a Reference to “Gospel” Materials in the First Half of the Second Century', *ZNW* 95 (2004), 1–34.
- Kieffer, R., 'Les premiers indices d'une réception de l'évangile de saint Jean', in F. Van Segbroeck *et al.* (eds.), *The Four Gospels 1992*, FS F. Neiryneck, BETL 100/C (Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1992), 2225–38.
- Kilpatrick, G. D., 'Conjectural Emendation in the New Testament', in E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee (eds.), *New Testament Textual Criticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), 349–60.
- Klassen, W., 'Judas Iscariot', in D. N. Freedman (ed.), *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), iii. 1091–6.
- Kloppenborg, J. S., 'Didache 16.6–8 and Special Matthean Tradition', *ZNW* 70 (1979), 54–67.
- 'The Use of the Synoptics or Q in Did. 1.3b–2.1' in H. van de Sandt (ed.), *The Didache and Matthew: Two Documents from the same Jewish-Christian Milieu?* (Assen: Van Gorcum; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 105–29.
- Klostermann, E. (ed.), *Apocrypha*, ii: *Evangelien*, KT 8, 3rd edn. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1929).
- Knight, G. W. III, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1992).
- Knoch, O., 'Kenntnis und Verwendung des Matthäus-Evangeliums bei den Apostolischen Vätern', in L. Schenke (ed.), *Studien zum Matthäusevangelium: Festschrift für Wilhelm Pesch* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk), 159–77.
- Knox, J., *Marcion and the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942).
- Köhler, W.-D., *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus*, WUNT 2.24 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987).
- Koester, H., *Introduction to the New Testament*, ii: *The History and Literature of Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1982).
- *Ancient Christian Gospels* (London: SCM; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990).
- 'Q and its Relatives', in James E. Goehring, Charles W. Hendrik, and Jack T. Sanders (eds.), *Christian Origins and Christian Beginnings: In Honor of James M. Robinson* (Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge Press, 1993), 49–63.

- 'Written Gospels or Oral Tradition?', *JBL* 113 (1994), 293–7.
- Köster, H., *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern*, TU 65 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957).
- Koperski, V., 'The Early History of the Dissection of Philippians', *JTS* 44 (1993), 599–600.
- Kortner, U. H. J., and Leutzsch, M., *Papiasfragmente—Der Hirt des Hermas*, SUC 3 (Darmstadt: WBG, 1998).
- Krans, J., 'Theodorus Beza and New Testament Textual Emendation', in W. Weren and D.-A. Koch (eds.), *Recent Developments in Textual Criticism: New Testament, Other Early Christian and Jewish Literature*, Studies in Theology and Religion, 8 (Assen: Royal van Gorcum, 2003), 109–28.
- Kraus, T. J., and Nicklas, T., *Das Petrusevangelium und die Petrusapokalypse*, GCS (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004).
- Kyrtatas, D., 'The Transformations of the Text: The Reception of John's Revelation', in A. Cameron (ed.), *History as Text: The Writing of Ancient History* (London: George Duckworth & Co., 1989), 146–62.
- Lake, K., 'The Didache', in *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), 24–36.
- *The Apostolic Fathers*, i and ii, LCL 24–25 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1912–13).
- Lambrecht, J., 'The Parousia Discourse: Composition and Content in Mt. XXIV–XXV', in M. Didier (ed.), *L'Evangile de Matthieu* (Gembloux: Duculot, 1972), 309–42.
- Lampe, P., *Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten: Untersuchungen zur Sozialgeschichte*, WUNT 2.18 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1987; 2nd edn. 1989).
- *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003).
- Layton, B., 'The Sources, Date and Transmission of *Didache* 1.3b–2.1', *HTR* 61 (1968), 343–83.
- Leutzsch, M., *Die Wahrnehmung sozialer Wirklichkeit im 'Hirten des Hermas'*, FRLANT 150 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989).
- Lietzmann, H., *A History of the Early Church*, trans. B. L. Woolf (London: Lutterworth, 1961).
- Lightfoot, J. B., *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, 6th edn. (London: Macmillan, 1881).
- *The Apostolic Fathers*, 5 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1889–90; repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1989).
- Linds, B., *New Testament Apologetic* (London: SCM, 1961).
- Lindemann, A., *Paulus im ältesten Christentum: Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion*, BHT 58 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979).
- 'Der Apostel Paulus im 2. Jahrhundert', in J.-M. Sevrin (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity*, BETL 86 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 39–67.
- 'Paul in the Writings of the Apostolic Fathers', in W. S. Babcock (ed.), *Paul and the Legacies of Paul* (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990), 25–45.

- Lindemann, A., *Die Clemensbriefe*, HNT 17 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992).
- ‘Die Endzeitrede in Didache 16 und die Jesus-Apokalypse in Matthäus 24–25’, in W. L. Petersen, J. S. Vos, and H. J. de Jonge (eds.), *Sayings of Jesus: Canonical and Non-Canonical: Essays in Honour of Tjitze Baarda*, NovTSup 89 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 155–74.
- Loewenich, W. von, *Das Johannes-Verständnis im zweiten Jahrhundert*, BZNW 13 (Giessen: A. Töpelman, 1932).
- Lohmann, H., *Drohung und Verheissung: Exegetische Untersuchungen zur Eschatologie bei den Apostolischen Vätern*, BZNW 55 (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1989).
- Lona, H. E., *Der erste Clemensbrief*, KAV 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998).
- Lührmann, D., *Die apokryph gewordenen Evangelien*, NovTSup 112 (Leiden: Brill, 2004).
- ‘POxy4009: Ein neues Fragment des Petrus-evangeliums?’, *NovT* 35 (1993), 390–410; repr. and rev. in *idem*, *Die apokryph gewordenen Evangelien*, NovTSup 112 (Leiden: Brill, 2004).
- Lührmann, D., and Schlarb, E., *Fragmente apokryph gewordener Evangelien* (Marburg: N. G. Elwert, 2000).
- Luz, U., *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 1–7)*, i, EKK, 1/1, 5th rev. edn. (Düsseldorf and Zürich: Benziger Verlag and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2002). ET *Matthew 1–7* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989).
- *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 18–25)*, EKK 1/3 (Zürich and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benziger & Neukirchener, 1997).
- MacDonald, D. R., *Christianizing Homer* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).
- Maier, H. O., *The Social Setting of the Ministry as Reflected in the Writings of Hermas, Clement and Ignatius* (Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1991).
- Marchant, E. C., and Todd, O. J. (eds.), *Xenophon IV*, LCL (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1923).
- Marcus, J., ‘The Jewish War and the Sitz im Leben of Mark’, *JBL* 111 (1992), 441–2.
- *Mark 1–8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 27 (New York: Doubleday, 2000).
- Marshall, I. H., *The Pastoral Epistles*, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1999).
- Massaux, É., *Influence de l’Évangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée*, BETL 75 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986 [original 1950]).
- *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Irenaeus* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1990), an edited and expanded translation of É. Massaux, *Influence de l’Évangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986/1950).
- Meier, J. P., *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, i (New York: Doubleday, 1991).
- Metzger, B. M., ‘Greek Manuscripts of John’s Gospel with “Hermeneiai”’, in T. Baarda et al. (eds.), *Text and Testimony: Essays on New Testament and Apocryphal Literature in Honour of A. F. J. Klijn* (Kampen: Kok, 1988), 162–9.

- *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd edn. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft; New York: UBS, 1994).
- Michaels, J. R., *1 Peter*, WBC 49 (Waco, Tex.: Word, 1988).
- Milavec, A., 'Synoptic Tradition in the *Didache* Revisited', *J ECS* 11 (2003), 443–80.
- Moule, C. F. D., 'A Note on *Didache* IX. 4', *JTS* 6 (1955), 240–3.
- *The Birth of the New Testament*, 3rd edn. (London: A. & C. Black, 1966).
- Muddiman, J., *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, BNTC (London and New York: Continuum, 2001).
- Musurillo, H. (ed.), *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).
- Nagel, T., *Die Rezeption des Johannesevangeliums im 2. Jahrhundert: Studien zur vorirenäischen Aneignung und Auslegung des vierten Evangeliums in christlicher und christlich-gnostischer Literatur*, Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte, 2 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2000).
- Neiryneck, F., 'Preface to the Reprint', in E. Massaux, *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Irenaeus* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press 1990), pp. xiii–xxviii.
- Niederwimmer, K., *The Didache: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1998).
- Nijendijk, L. W., 'Die Christologie des Hirten des Hermas exegetisch, religions- und dogmengeschichtlich untersucht' (diss. Utrecht, 1986).
- Norelli, E., *Ascensio Isaia: Commentarius*, CCSA 8 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1995).
- 'Au sujet de la première réception de 1 Pierre: Trois exemples', in J. Schlosser (ed.), *The Catholic Epistles and the Tradition*, BETL 176 (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 327–66.
- Osiek, C., *Rich and Poor in the Shepherd of Hermas: An Exegetical-Social Investigation*, CBQMS 15 (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1983).
- *The Shepherd of Hermas: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999).
- Parker, D. C., *Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript and its Text* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
- Taylor, D. G. K., and Goodacre, M. S., 'The Dura Europos Gospel Harmony', in D. G. K. Taylor (ed.), *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts*, Texts and Studies, iii. 1 (Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 1999), 192–228; repr. in *SBL Text Critical Studies*, 1 (Atlanta: SBL, 1999).
- Patterson, S. J., *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus* (Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge Press, 1993).
- Parsons, P. J., and Lührmann, D. '4009: Gospel of Peter?', in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, lx (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1994), 1–5.
- Paulsen, H., *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Brief des Polykarp von Smyrna*, zweite, neubearbeitete Auflage der Auslegung von Walter Bauer, Die Apostolischen Väter, 2; HNT 18 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985).
- Pernveden, L., *The Concept of the Church in the Shepherd of Hermas* (Lund: Gleerup, 1966).

- Petersen, W. L., 'Review of the American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project, *The New Testament in Greek*, iii: *The Gospel of Luke*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984, 1987)', *JBL* 107 (1988), 758–62.
- *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century*, Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity, 3 (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989).
- 'Zion Gospel Edition', in D. N. Freedman (ed.), *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), vi.1097–8.
- *Tatian's Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship*, VCSup 25 (Leiden: Brill, 1994).
- 'What Text Can New Testament Textual Criticism Ultimately Reach?', in B. Aland and J. Delobel (eds.), *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis and Church History: A Discussion of Methods*, CBET 7 (Kampen: Kok-Pharos, 1994), 136–51.
- 'The Genesis of the Gospels', in A. Denaux (ed.), *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis*, BETL 161 (Leuven: Peeters and Leuven University Press, 2002), 33–65.
- Pickering, S. R., 'The Significance of Non-continuous New Testament Materials in Papyri', in D. G. K. Taylor (ed.), *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts*, 121–41.
- Plumpe, J. C., *Mater Ecclesia* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1943).
- Porter, S. E., 'The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology', in C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders (eds.), *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*, JSNTSup 148 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 79–96.
- 'Why So Many Holes in the Papyrological Evidence for the Greek New Testament?', in S. McKendrick and O. O'Sullivan (eds.), *The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text* (London: The British Library; New Castle: Oak Knoll Press, 2003), 167–86.
- 'When and How was the Pauline Canon Compiled? An Assessment of Theories', in *idem* (ed.), *The Pauline Canon*, Pauline Studies, 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 95–127.
- Poschmann, B., *Paenitentia Secunda: Die kirchliche Busse im ältesten Christentum bis Cyprian und Origines*, Theophaneia, 1 (Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1940).
- Prostmeier, F., *Der Barnabasbrief*, KAV 8 (Göttinger: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999).
- Pryzylbyski, B., *Righteousness in Matthew*, SNTSMS 41 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).
- Quasten, J., *Patrology* (Utrecht: Spectrum, 1950).
- Reiling, J., *Hermas and Christian Prophecy: A Study of the Eleventh Mandate*, NovTSup 37 (Leiden: Brill, 1973).
- Rensberger, D. K., 'As the Apostle Teaches: The Development of the Use of Paul's Letters in Second-Century Christianity' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale, 1981).
- Richards, E. R., 'The Codex and the Early Collection of Paul's Letters', *BBR* 8 (1998), 151–66.

- Roberts, A. and Donaldson, J. (eds.), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, American edn., 3rd edn., (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1985).
- Robinson, J. M., Hoffman, P., and Kloppenborg, J. S., *The Critical Edition of Q* (Minneapolis: Fortress; Leuven: Peeters, 2000).
- Rordorf, W., 'Le problème de la transmission textuelle de Didachè 1,3b-2,1', in F. Paske (ed.), *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, TU 125 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1981), 499-513.
- 'Does the Didache contain Jesus Tradition Independently of the Synoptic Gospels?', in H. Wansbrough (ed.), *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*, JSNTSup 64 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 394-423.
- and Tuilier, A., *La Doctrine des douze apôtres*, SC 248 (Paris: Cerf, 1978; 2nd edn. 1998).
- Rudolph, K., *Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism*, trans. R. McL. Wilson (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1977).
- Sanday, W., *The Gospels in the Second Century: An Examination of the Critical Part of a Work Entitled 'Supernatural Religion'* (London: Macmillan, 1876).
- Sanders, E. P., *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969).
- Sanders, J. N., *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943).
- Sandt, H. van de, and Flusser, D., *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Assen and New York: Royal Van Gorcum, Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002).
- Schmid, U., *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der Marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe*, ANTF 25 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995).
- Schmidtke, A., *Neue Fragmente und Untersuchungen zu den judenchristlichen Evangelien*, TU 37.1 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1911).
- Schneider, A., 'Propter sanctam ecclesiam suam': *Die Kirche als Geschöpf, Frau und Bau im Bussunterricht des Pastor Hermae*, *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum*, 67 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1999).
- Schoedel, W. -R., *Polycarp, Martyrdom of Polycarp, Fragments of Papias*, (Camden, NJ: Nelson, 1967).
- *Ignatius of Antioch*, *Hermeneia* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985).
- 'Review of Édouard Massaux, *Influence de l'Évangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée*; and Wolf-Dietrich Köhler, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1987', *CBQ* 51 (1989), 562-4.
- 'Ignatius and the Reception of Matthew in Antioch', in D. L. Balch (ed.), *Social History of the Matthean Community* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 129-77.
- Schulz, S., *Q—Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zurich: TVZ, 1971).
- Seitz, O. F. J., 'Relationship of the Shepherd of Hermas to the Epistle of James', *JBL* 63 (1944), 131-40.
- 'Antecedents and Signification of the Term "διψυχος"', *JBL* 66 (1947), 211-19.
- Seitz, O. F. J., 'Afterthoughts on the Term "Dipsychos"', *NTS* 4 (1957-8), 327-34.

- Sellew, P., 'Laodiceans and the Philippians Fragments Hypothesis', *HTR* 87 (1994), 17–28.
- Skarsaune, O., *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-type, Provenance, Theological Profile*, NovTSup 56 (Leiden: Brill, 1987).
- Smit Sibinga, J., 'Ignatius and Matthew', *NovT* 8 (1966), 263–83.
- Smith, M., 'The Report about Peter in 1 Clement v.4', *NTS* 7 (1960/1), 86–8.
- Snyder, G. F., *The Shepherd of Hermas* (Camden, NJ: T. Nelson, 1969).
- Souter, A., *Text and Canon of the New Testament*, 4th edn. (London: Duckworth, 1935).
- Spicq, C., *Saint Paul: Les Épîtres Pastorales*, 2 vols., EB, 4th edn. (Paris: Gabalda, 1969).
- Spitta, F., *Zur Geschichte and Literatur des Urchristentums, ii: Der Brief des Jakobus; Studien zum Hirten des Hermas* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896).
- Staniforth, M. (ed.), *Early Christian Writings* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968).
- Stanley, C. D., *Paul and the Language of Scripture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- Stanton, G. N., 'Jesus Traditions and Gospels in Justin Martyr and Irenaeus', in J.-M. Auwers and H. J. de Jonge (eds.), *The Biblical Canons*, BETL 163 (Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 2003), 353–70.
- 'The Fourfold Gospel', *NTS* 43 (1997), 317–46; repr. (with minor revisions) in *idem*, *Jesus and Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 63–91.
- *Jesus and Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- Stendahl, K., *The School of Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968).
- Stewart-Sykes, A., *From Prophecy to Preaching: A Search for the Origins of the Christian Homily*, VC Supp 59 (Leiden: Brill, 2001).
- Stirewalt, M. L., Jun., *Studies in Ancient Greek Epistolography*, SBLSPS 27 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993).
- Strecker, G., *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971).
- Streeter, B. H., *The Four Gospels* (London: Macmillan, 1924).
- Strugnell, J., 'A Plea for Conjectural Emendation in the New Testament: With a Coda on 1 Cor. 4:6', *CBQ* 36 (1974), 543–58.
- Sullivan, F. A., *From Apostles to Bishops: The Development of the Episcopacy in the Early Church* (New York and Mahwah, NJ: Newman Press, 2001).
- Taylor, C., *The Witness of Hermas to the Four Gospels* (London: C. J. Clay and Sons; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press Warehouse, 1892).
- Thompson, M. B., *Clothed with Christ*, JSNTSup 59 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991).
- 'The Holy Internet: Communication between Churches in the First Christian Generation', in R. J. Bauckham (ed.), *The Gospels for all Christians* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998), 49–70.

- Tov, E., *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1992).
- Trevett, C., 'Approaching Matthew from the Second Century: The Under-Used Ignatian Correspondence', *JSNT* 20 (1984), 59–67.
- Tuckett, C. M., *The Revival of the Griesbach Hypothesis*, SNTSMS 44 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).
- 'Thomas and the Synoptics', *NovT* 30 (1988), 132–57.
- *Q and the History of Early Christianity* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1996).
- 'Synoptic Tradition in the Didache', in J.-M. Sevrin (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity*, BETL 86 (Leuven: Peeters and Leuven University Press, 1989), 197–230; repr. in J. Draper (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 92–128.
- 'Paul, Scripture and Ethics: Some Reflections', *NTS* 46 (2000), 403–24.
- 'Q 12,8 once again—"Son of Man" or "I"?' in J. M. Asgeirsson, K. de Troyer, and M. V. Meyer (eds.), *From Quest to Q: Festschrift James M. Robinson*, BETL 146 (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 171–88.
- 'Paul and Jesus Tradition: The Evidence of 1 Corinthians 2: 9 and Gospel of Thomas', in T. J. Burke and J. K. Elliott (eds.), *Paul and the Corinthians: Studies on a Community in Conflict, Studies in Honour of Margaret Thrall*, NovTSup 109 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 55–73.
- Tuilier, A., 'La *Didachè* et le problème synoptique', in C. Jefford (ed.), *The Didache in Context: Essays on its Text, History and Transmission* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 110–30.
- Unnik, W. C. van, 'Die Motivierung der Feindesliebe in Lukas VI 32–35', *NovT* 8 (1966), 288–300.
- Uro, R., 'Thomas and Oral Gospel Tradition', in R. Uro (ed.), *Thomas at the Crossroads: Essays on the Gospel of Thomas* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998), 8–32.
- Vaganay, L., *An Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*, 2nd edn. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
- Vielhauer, P., and Strecker, G., 'IV. Jewish Christian Gospels, 1: The Gospel of the Nazaraeans', in W. Schneemelcher (ed.), *New Testament Apocrypha*, 2nd English edn. (Cambridge/Louisville, Ky.: James Clarke/Westminster Press, 1991). i. 154–65.
- 'Apokalyptik des Urchristentums. Einleitung', in W. Schneemelcher (ed.), *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, ii, 6th edn. (Tübingen: Mohr, 1996), 516–47.
- Verheyden, J., 'Assessing Gospel Quotations in Justin Martyr', in A. Denaux (ed.), *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel*, BETL 161 (Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 361–77.
- Völter, D., *Polykarp und Ignatius und die ihnen zugeschriebenen Briefe, Die Apostolischen Väter*, 2.2 (Leiden: Brill, 1910).
- Vokes, F. E., *The Riddle of the Didache* (London: SPCK, 1938).
- Wake, William, *The Genuine Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers, S. Barnabas, S. Clement, S. Ignatius, S. Polycarp, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Martyrdoms of St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp* (London, 1693).
- Warns, R., *Untersuchungen zum 2. Clemens-Brief* (dissertation; Marburg, 1985).

- Welborn, L. L., 'On the Date of 1 Clement', *BR* 24 (1984), 34–54; repr. as 'The Preface to 1 Clement: The Rhetorical Situation and the Traditional Date', in C. Breytenbach and L. L. Welborn (eds.), *Encounters with Hellenism: Studies on the First Letter of Clement*, AGAJU 53 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 197–216.
- Wengst, K., *Didache (Apostellehre), Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Clemensbrief, Schrift an Diognet*, SUC 2 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1984).
- Werline, R., 'The Transformation of Pauline Arguments in Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*', *HTR* 92 (1999), 79–93.
- Westcott, B. F., *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament* (Cambridge and London: Macmillan, 1855, 5th edn. 1881).
- Whittaker, J., 'The Value of Indirect Tradition in the Establishment of Greek Philosophical Texts, or the Act of Misquotation', in John N. Grant (ed.), *Editing Greek and Latin Texts* (New York: AMS Press, 1989), 63–95.
- Wilson, J. C., *Toward a Reassessment of the Shepherd of Hermas: Its Date and its Pneumatology* (Lewiston, Queenston, Lampeter: Mellen Biblical Press, 1993).
- Witherington, B., 'The Anti-Feminist Tendencies of the "Western" Text in Acts', *JBL* 103 (1984), 82–4.
- Wright, L. E., *Alterations of the Words of Jesus as Quoted in the Literature of the Second Century*, Harvard Historical Monographs, 25 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952).
- Wünsche, M., *Der Ausgang der urchristlichen Prophetie in der frühkatholischen Kirche*, Calwer Theologische Monographien, B/14 (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1997).
- Young, F. M., *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- Zahn, T., *Hermae Pastoris e Novo Testamento illustratus* (Göttingen, 1867).
- *Der Hirt des Hermas untersucht* (Gotha, 1868).
- *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Erlangen: A. Deichert, 1888–92).
- *Introduction to the New Testament*, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909; German original 1906–7).

Index of Primary Sources

Old Testament and Apocrypha

- Genesis
1. 27 287
2. 24 287 n.124
3. 22 237
15. 6 240
17. 4–5 240
25 240
48 240
- Exodus
20. 13–16 100
20. 17 324
23. 20 19
- Leviticus
16 246
16. 8 242, 246
16. 10 242
- Numbers
12. 7 153
12. 12 167 n.33
21. 7–8 237–8
- Deuteronomy
5. 17–20 100
5. 21 324
6. 5 274, 312
13. 2 115 n.99
24. 13 210
24. 15 210, 304 n.65
27. 26 242
28. 66 151 n.92
- Joshua
22. 24 219
- 1 Samuel
13. 14 140–1
- Job
3. 16 167 n.33
31. 1 324 n.210
- Psalms
2. 7–8 153
2. 11 (LXX) 219
4. 5 210–11
6. 9 (LXX) 260, 261 n.38, 262
8. 7 287 n.124
17. 7 304 n.65
18 (17). 6 200
21. 17 19
22. 19 57
31 (32). 1–2 151
37 (36). 11 100–1
68. 22 235
77 12
88 (89). 21 140–1
90. 11 316
103 (104) 56
103. 4 152–3
109. 1 236
110. 1 287 n.124
116 (114). 3 200
- Proverbs
1. 30 208 n.92
3. 12 153
3. 34 154 n.101, 162–3
10. 12 57, 154 n.101
24. 12 154 n.102
28. 14 219
- Ecclesiastes
6. 3 167 n.33
- Isaiah
28. 16 248
29. 1 138–9
29. 13 273
33. 18 165
40. 3 19
40. 10 154 n.102
40. 11 253
43. 19 249
49. 14–21 209
50. 1 209
51. 18 209
52. 5 151
52. 5b 278
53. 4–12 221 n.151
53. 4a 220–1
53. 9b 220–1
53. 12b 220–1
54. 1 209, 251, 255, 285–6
56. 7 275
60. 4 209
62. 11 154 n.102
64. 3 284–5
64. 4 148
66. 24 274

Jeremiah

- 7.11 275
- 15. 9 210
- 18. 4–7 278
- 31 247
- 50 (27). 12 209

Ezekiel

- 8. 17 208 n.92
- 34. 4 223

Daniel

- 7. 13 113–14, 116
- 12. 1 114 n.99
- 12. 12 115

Hosea

- 4. 5 209
- 6. 6 255 n.19

Zechariah

- 12. 10 249
- 13. 7 234–5
- 14. 5 86 n.15

Wisdom of Solomon

- 17. 8 219

Sirach

- 9. 8 324 n.210
- 12. 2 86 n.15
- 23. 4–6 324 n.210
- 26. 9–11 324 n.210
- 37. 26 237
- 51 102 n.69

2 Maccabees

- 2. 28 222 n.153

New Testament**Matthew**

- 1. 18 329
- 2. 23 41 n.41
- 3. 7 181
- 3. 8 276 n.85
- 3. 15 174–6, 174 n.76, 177, 180, 185
- 4. 23 234
- 5–9 234
- 5 119
- 5. 3 193–4
- 5. 5 57, 100–1
- 5. 6 174 n.76
- 5. 7 56, 101 n.65, 131–2, 190–1
- 5. 10 121, 174 n.76, 193–4
- 5. 11 306 n.78
- 5. 16 33
- 5. 18 139 n.37
- 5. 20 102 n.68, 174 n.76
- 5. 22 194 n.28
- 5. 24 306 n.79

- 5. 25 125
- 5. 27–8 327
- 5. 28 305, 306 n.77, 307, 324
- 5. 31–2 327
- 5. 32 325, 327
- 5. 35 303 n.59, 306 n.77
- 5. 39–47 48
- 5. 39–42 31
- 5. 39–41 123–4
- 5. 40 124–5
- 5. 42 124–5
- 5. 44 32, 33, 85 n.12, 92, 120–1, 196–7, 271–2
- 5. 46 271–2
- 5. 46–7 121–3
- 5. 48 101–2, 124, 196–7
- 6. 1 174 n.76
- 6. 5 55, 104–6
- 6. 7 55
- 6. 8–10 276 n.85
- 6. 9–13 48, 104–6
- 6. 9 48
- 6. 12 48, 194
- 6. 13 48, 94, 195–6
- 6. 14–15 194
- 6. 14 132, 190–1, 194
- 6. 15 194
- 6. 16 103
- 6. 19 194 n.28
- 6. 24 266–7
- 6. 33 102 n.68, 174 n.76
- 7. 1–2 132–3, 190–1, 194 n.28
- 7. 2 56, 191
- 7. 5 38, 48
- 7. 6 41 n.39, 57, 86 n.15, 106
- 7. 7 276, 276 n.85, 306 n.78, 309, 316 n.155
- 7. 11 306 n.78, 309
- 7. 12 98–9, 132, 191 n.17
- 7. 13–14 96, 99
- 7. 14 310
- 7. 15–16 304 n.64, 321 n.193
- 7. 15 112–14, 117
- 7. 16 306 n.77, 307
- 7. 21–7 102 n.68
- 7. 21 32, 139 n.37, 258–60, 261–2 n.42
- 7. 22 261 n.40
- 7. 23 260–3
- 8. 17 180
- 8. 28 51 n.14
- 9. 9–13 243
- 9. 13 56, 234, 254–5
- 9. 22 306 n.78

9. 35 234
 10. 10 55, 92, 109
 10. 16 55, 178–9, 263–6
 10. 22 115
 10. 25 276 n.85
 10. 28 263–5, 276 n.85, 306 n.79, 313,
 316 n.155, 317
 10. 32–3 306 n.78, 308
 10. 32 32, 257–8, 291
 10. 33 298
 10. 40–1 106–7, 180
 10. 40 180
 11. 27 302 n.54, 316 n.155
 11. 28–30 102 n.69
 11. 28 102
 11. 29 275, 276
 12. 31–2 107–9
 12. 31 55
 12. 32 306 n.79
 12. 33b 181–2, 185
 12. 43–5 306 n.79
 12. 50 270–1
 13 298
 13. 17 197 n.39, 220
 13. 20–2 306 n.78, 308
 13. 22 306 n.78, 308
 13. 24–30 305, 306 n.77, 307
 13. 30 302
 13. 38–40 302, 306 n.77, 307
 13. 38 305, 316
 15. 7–8 138–9
 15. 8 273
 15. 13 177–8
 16. 26 267–8
 16. 27 306 n.78, 309, 316 n.155
 16. 28 102 n.68
 18. 2–3 42 n.42
 18. 3 298, 306 n.78, 314 n.137
 18. 4 306 n.79
 18. 6 135–7
 18. 10 316 n.155
 18. 11 256, 289
 18. 15–17 110, 327
 18. 17 197 n.39
 18. 19–20 180
 19. 3–12 179
 19. 3–9 179
 19. 7 327
 19. 9 302–3 n.54, 304 n.68, 324–5, 327
 19. 10–11 179
 19. 12 179
 19. 12d 179–81
 19. 16–17 44 n.48
 19. 17 306 n.79
 19. 18–19 99–100
 19. 21–4 306 n.78
 19. 21 306 n.78
 19. 23 306 n.77, 308
 19. 24 316 n.155
 20. 16 233
 20. 28 197 n.39
 21. 19 44 n.48
 21. 22 306 n.77, 306 n.78, 307, 316 n.155
 21. 28–32 102 n.68
 21. 31–43 306 n.77
 21. 32 174 n.76
 21. 43 102 n.68
 22. 11–14 102 n.68
 22. 11–13 306 n.78, 307
 22. 11 302 n.53
 22. 13 276 n.85
 22. 14 55, 232–3, 239
 22. 19 180
 22. 34–40 97
 22. 36–9 96–9
 22. 39 236 n.24
 22. 44 55
 23. 3 102 n.68
 23. 12 306 n.79, 316 n.155
 23. 13 178
 23. 14 317 n.157
 24 78, 114–19
 24. 4 101
 24. 9–12 314 n.133
 24. 10–12 33, 54, 112–14, 117–18
 24. 10 117
 24. 11–12 117
 24. 12 117
 24. 13 54, 113–14, 115
 24. 14 234
 24. 21 114
 24. 24 57, 112–14, 117
 24. 29 116
 24. 30 56, 113–14, 116
 24. 30a, 31 118–19
 24. 35 139 n.37
 24. 36 276 n.85
 24. 42 110–12
 25. 13 110–12, 276 n.85
 25. 14 306 n.77
 25. 21 220
 25. 23 220
 25. 31–46 102 n.68
 25. 46 276
 26. 6–13 40 n.36
 26. 7 180

Matthew (*cont.*):

- 26. 24 134–7, 302 n.54, 306 n.78, 309, 316 n.155
- 26. 28 139 n.37
- 26. 31 55, 234–5, 306 n.79
- 26. 41 195–6
- 26. 67 235 n.25
- 27. 28 235 n.25
- 27. 34 235
- 27. 48 235
- 27. 52 180
- 28. 18 302 n.54, 306 n.77, 309, 316 n.155
- 28. 19 55, 102–3

Mark

- 1–2 234
- 1. 2 19
- 1. 3 19
- 1. 14 234
- 1. 41 12–13
- 2. 7 57
- 2. 17 254–5
- 3. 5 101
- 3. 15 309
- 3. 17 155 n.107
- 3. 28–9 55, 107–9
- 3. 35 270–1
- 4. 10–12 44 n.46
- 4. 18–20 317 n.165
- 4. 24 132
- 4. 33–4 44 n.46
- 5. 1 51 n.14
- 6. 43 94
- 6. 52 309 n.98
- 7. 6 103 n.73, 138–9
- 8. 17 309, 317
- 8. 36 267–8
- 8. 38 181 n.102, 309 n.98, 314
- 9. 29 20
- 9. 35 197 n.39
- 9. 37 107 n.82
- 9. 42 135–7
- 9. 43 181 n.102
- 9. 48 274
- 9. 50 309 n.98
- 10 325
- 10. 11 305, 317 n.165
- 10. 13–16 317 n.165
- 10. 17–18 44 n.48
- 10. 19 99–100
- 10. 23–5 316
- 11. 13 44 n.48
- 11. 17 275
- 11. 25 132, 191, 194

- 12. 1–9 319
- 12. 27–9 312
- 12. 28–31 96–9
- 12. 30 274
- 12. 36 55
- 12. 37 54
- 13 78, 114
- 13. 10 234
- 13. 13 54, 113–14, 115
- 13. 19 114
- 13. 22 112–14
- 13. 26 113–14, 115
- 13. 33 111
- 13. 35 110–12
- 14. 3–9 40 n.36
- 14. 9 234
- 14. 21 134–7
- 14. 25 44 n.48
- 14. 27 234–5
- 14. 38 195–6
- 14. 48 49
- 14. 65 235 n.25
- 15. 19 235 n.25
- 15. 23 235
- 15. 36 235
- 16. 8 40 n.35
- 16. 9–20 42

Luke

- 1. 46 51
- 1. 51–2 317 n.157
- 2. 37 197 n.39
- 3. 7 181
- 5. 8 243 n.52
- 5. 32 56, 254
- 6 91 n.38
- 6. 20 193–4
- 6. 27–8 120–1, 271–2
- 6. 27 32, 33, 92, 196
- 6. 28 55
- 6. 29–30 31, 124–5
- 6. 29 123–4
- 6. 31 56, 98–9, 131–2, 191 n.17
- 6. 32–5 121–3
- 6. 32 33, 271–2
- 6. 34–5 125
- 6. 36–8 56, 132–3
- 6. 36 101–2, 123–4
- 6. 37–8 190–1
- 6. 38 132
- 6. 44a 181–2, 185
- 6. 46 258–9
- 7. 36–50 40 n.36
- 8. 21 41 n.41

8. 26 51 n.14
 9. 25 267–8
 9. 26 181 n.103
 10 98
 10. 2 220
 10. 3 263–4
 10. 7 55, 92, 109
 10. 25–8 97
 10. 27 55, 274 nn.76–7
 11. 2–4 104–6
 11. 4 194, 195–6
 11. 52 178
 12. 4–5 263–5
 12. 8 32, 257–8, 291
 12. 10 55, 107–9
 12. 35 110–12, 126
 12. 36–8 112
 12. 40 111
 12. 59 125
 13. 24 96 n.54
 13. 25 262
 13. 26 261 n.40
 13. 27 260–3
 14. 26–8 11–12
 16. 10–12 268–70
 16. 11–12 260
 16. 13 57, 266–7
 17. 2 135–7
 17. 7–10 316 n.151
 17. 20 272 n.73
 18. 1 304 n.67, 310
 19. 10 256, 289
 19. 20 99–100
 22. 19–20 20–1
 22. 19b–20 55
 22. 22 134–7
 23. 7–12 181 n.103
 23. 48 41, 52–3
 24. 36–43 182
 24. 37 41
 24. 39 181 n.103
 24. 50–1 237
 24. 53 18
- John
1. 1 ff. 253 n.10
 1. 5–6 52
 1. 14 253
 2. 6–10 299 n.33
 2. 19–21 298 n.24
 3. 3–5 303 n.59
 3. 3 317–18 n.169
 3. 5 51, 253 n.10, 311
 3. 8 183 n.113, 184, 185
3. 14 237–8
 3. 15 238 n.32
 4. 10 183 n.113
 4. 10b 183–4
 4. 14 183–4, 183 n.113
 5. 7 299–300 n. 35
 5. 21 198
 5. 39 49
 6 93
 6. 13 94
 6. 33 183 n.115
 6. 39 198
 6. 40 198
 6. 44 198
 6. 51 237
 6. 54 198
 7. 53–8. 11 40 n.35
 8. 28–9 183
 8. 44 199, 225
 10. 7 303 n.59, 310
 10. 9 183 n.115, 303 n.61, 310
 10. 18 303 n.60, 310
 11. 25 303 n.58, 303 n.62, 310
 12. 1–8 40 n.36, 183 n.115
 12. 49–50 310
 13. 20 183 n.115
 13. 23 253
 13. 34 198 n.41, 204 n.71
 14. 6 310
 14. 13–14 317 n.162
 14. 31 310
 15 93
 15. 1 93
 15. 10 310
 15. 12 204 n.71
 15. 15 298
 15. 16 198 n.41
 15. 17 204 n.71
 16. 23 317 n.162
 17 93
 17. 2 317
 17. 3 94
 17. 11 94
 17. 15 12, 94
 17. 21–2 94
 17. 26 94
 19. 24 57
 19. 34–5 235 n.25
 20. 31 321 n.193
- Acts
1. 14 21
 1. 24 303 n.59, 310
 1. 25 173 n.63

Acts (*cont.*):

- 2-5 90
- 2. 5 213 n.114
- 2. 24 199-200
- 2. 34 236 n.27
- 2. 44 89-90
- 3-5 142
- 3. 15 200
- 4. 10 200
- 4. 12 299 n.27, 304 n.66
- 4. 32 89-90
- 5. 4 142
- 5. 30 221
- 7. 52 201 n.52
- 10. 28 173 n.63
- 10. 29 173 n.63
- 10. 39 221
- 10. 41 173 n.63
- 10. 42 200-1, 278, 289
- 12 142
- 12. 3ff. 142
- 13. 22 140-2
- 15. 8 310
- 16. 12-40 201 n.52
- 17. 4 21
- 17. 12 21
- 19. 5 317
- 20. 35 140, 190 n.13, 201 n.52, 276
- 26. 18 140, 151 n.92, 201 n.52

Romans

- 1. 3 170 n.44
- 1. 4 170 n.44
- 1. 21 151, 287-8 n.125
- 1. 29-32 54, 148-9
- 1. 29 282-3
- 1. 32 56
- 2. 24 151, 202 n.59
- 2. 29b 151
- 2. 4 281
- 3. 27 165 n.23
- 3. 31 241
- 4. 3 240
- 4. 7-9 151
- 4. 7 281-2
- 4. 11 240, 242
- 4. 16 202 n.59, 209-10
- 4. 24 223
- 5. 1-5 206
- 5. 1 241 n.44
- 5. 18 243
- 5. 21-6. 2a 150
- 6. 1 54, 148, 151, 328
- 6. 3-5 312, 319

- 6. 4 170 n.44
 - 6. 13 207
 - 7. 3-25 243
 - 8. 5 170 n.44
 - 8. 8 170 n.44
 - 8. 11 208
 - 8. 12 243
 - 8. 17 202 n.59
 - 9. 5 148, 150-1
 - 9. 7-13 31, 240 n.40
 - 9. 16 243
 - 9. 18 243
 - 9. 21 280
 - 11. 36 151
 - 12. 3-8 49
 - 12. 4 151
 - 12. 9 92
 - 12. 10 204-5
 - 12. 14 92, 120-1
 - 12. 16 282
 - 12. 17 202 n.59
 - 13. 2 207
 - 13. 8-10 203-4, 208 n.90
 - 13. 11 309 n.98
 - 14. 9 278
 - 14. 10 202-4
 - 14. 12 202-4, 243
 - 14. 19 202-4, 243
 - 15. 1 145
 - 15. 5 282 n.106
 - 15. 29 170 n.44
 - 16 23
 - 16. 5 163 n.17
- 1 Corinthians
- 1. 1-3 148
 - 1. 7 167 n.36
 - 1. 11-13 54
 - 1. 12 20, 144-5
 - 1. 18 80, 165
 - 1. 20 57, 80, 165
 - 1. 23 57, 165
 - 2. 9 20, 57, 148, 284
 - 2. 10 167 n.36
 - 3. 1-2 167 n.36
 - 3. 13 ff. 289
 - 3. 16-17 241, 299 n.27
 - 3. 16 167 n.36, 283-4
 - 3. 22 20
 - 4. 1 167 n.36
 - 4. 4 166
 - 4. 8 218, 241
 - 4. 14 243 n.50
 - 5 287 n.125

5. 7–8 165–6
 5. 27 148
 6. 2 56, 205–6
 6. 9–10 164–5, 205
 6. 9 193 n.25
 6. 14 208
 6. 15 151
 6. 19 283–4
 7 319
 7. 8–9 311
 7. 10–11 325–6
 7. 10 89 n.28
 7. 17–24 328
 7. 22 167 n.36
 7. 28 311, 325
 7. 38 326
 7. 39–40 301, 305, 311, 328 n.225
 7. 40 326
 8 93 n.44
 8. 6 151
 8. 7–13 145
 9. 14 89 n.28, 109
 9. 15 167 n.36
 9. 21 241
 9. 24–5 283
 9. 24 147
 9. 27 167 n.36
 10. 4 303 n.62, 310, 312
 10. 16–17 167 n.36
 11. 23–5 89 n.28
 12. 8–9 147
 12. 10 93 n.44
 12. 12 145–6, 151
 12. 14 145–6
 12. 20–8 145–6
 13. 4–7 146
 13. 13 206
 14. 20 314 n.137
 14. 29 93 n.44
 14. 34–5 21, 22
 15 137–8
 15. 6 320
 15. 8–10a 166–7
 15. 8–9 167, 243
 15. 12 147
 15. 20 57, 147
 15. 23 57, 147
 15. 28 212–13
 15. 32 163 n.18
 15. 36–7 147
 15. 51–5 147
 15. 58 213 n.114
 16. 8 163 n.18
 16. 22 92
 16. 23 148
 2 Corinthians
 1. 4 289
 1. 8 163 n.17
 1. 12 170 n.45
 3. 2 207 n.83, 213–14 n.114
 3. 7 241
 3. 11 241, 282 n.106
 3. 13 241
 3. 18 151 n.92
 4. 14 170 n.45, 207–8
 5. 10 202–3, 207 n.83, 248
 6. 7 207
 6. 13 243 n.50
 6. 16 170 n.45
 7. 10 311, 323
 8. 21 207 n.83
 9. 8 151 n.93
 10. 1 204 n.71, 207 n.83
 10. 11 201 n.55
 11. 9 170 n.45
 11. 23–7 151 n.92
 12. 16 170 n.45
 Galatians
 1. 1 170 n.46, 208 n.90
 2. 2 208 n.90, 212
 2. 9 151 n.92
 2. 21 170 n.46
 3. 1 151 n.92
 3. 6 240
 3. 10 242
 3. 13 221, 242
 4. 23–31 44 n.46
 4. 26–7 288
 4. 26 202 n.59, 209–10
 4. 27 281–2, 285–6
 5. 1 241
 5. 5–6 206
 5. 9 166
 5. 11 170 n.46
 5. 14 204, 208 n.90
 5. 17 208 n.90, 223
 5. 21 170 n.46
 5. 25 148
 6. 2 241
 6. 7 188, 208–9
 6. 10 243
 6. 14 170 n.46
 Ephesians
 1. 1 163 n.19
 1. 3–14 168–9
 1. 4–6 244

Ephesians (*cont.*):

- 1. 4–5 287 n.125
- 1. 4 287
- 1. 13 302 n.49
- 1. 18 151 n.92
- 1. 19 169
- 1. 22 286–7
- 1. 23 169
- 2. 1–5 319
- 2. 1–3 287 n.125
- 2. 5 188, 211
- 2. 8–9 188, 211
- 2. 10 17, 244
- 2. 15 169, 241
- 2. 16 169
- 2. 19 243
- 2. 20–2 283, 287 n.125
- 2. 20 287 n.124, 304 n.67, 312
- 2. 21–2 244
- 3. 8 243
- 3. 17 244
- 4. 2 169
- 4. 3–6 301 n.45, 302 n.49, 304 n.68, 311–12
- 4. 4–6 151 n.92
- 4. 4 151, 299 n.27
- 4. 11 287 n.124
- 4. 17–18 282–3
- 4. 18 151, 151 n.92, 287–8 n.125, 309
- 4. 22–3 244
- 4. 24 169
- 4. 25 151, 303 n.58, 312 n.121
- 4. 26 210–11
- 4. 29 303 n.59
- 4. 30 299 n.27, 301, 302 n.49, 305, 311
- 4. 32 223
- 5. 5 211 n.103, 213 n.114
- 5. 21–6. 9 217 n.128
- 5. 21 211 n.103
- 5. 23 286–7
- 5. 25–6 287 n.124, 302 n.49
- 5. 25 169
- 5. 30 151
- 5. 31–2 287 n.124
- 6. 6 287 n.125, 288
- 6. 13 207
- 6. 14 111, 211 n.103
- 6. 18 211 n.103
- 6. 24 163–4 n.19

Philippians

- 1. 25 51
- 1. 27 151 n.92, 213–14 n.114
- 1. 29–30 213–14 n.114

- 2. 2 282 n.106
- 2. 3 170 n.47
- 2. 5 170 n.47
- 2. 10 212–13
- 2. 16 212
- 2. 17 170 n.47, 213–14 n.114
- 3. 14 147
- 3. 15 170 n.47
- 3. 18 213
- 4. 2 282 n.106
- 4. 13 170 n.47
- 4. 15 151 n.92, 213–14 n.114
- 4. 18 213–14 n.114

Colossians

- 1. 4–5 206
- 1. 5 213 n.114
- 1. 6 213 n.114
- 1. 9 151 n.92
- 1. 12–13 151 n.92, 154 n.101
- 1. 12 213 n.114
- 1. 13 140
- 1. 15 314 n.141
- 1. 23 ff. 288
- 1. 23 213 n.114
- 1. 24 286 n.122
- 2. 1 151 n.92
- 2. 12 312
- 2. 15 51
- 3. 5 211 n.103, 213 n.114
- 3. 16–17 288
- 3. 16 288
- 3. 17 288
- 3. 18–4. 1 217 n.127
- 3. 22 287 n.125, 288
- 4. 13 51

1 Thessalonians

- 1. 3 206
- 2. 11 243 n.50
- 2. 14–16 51 n.16
- 4. 11 93 n.44
- 5. 6 243
- 5. 8 206
- 5. 13 309 n.98
- 5. 22 213

2 Thessalonians

- 1. 4 213–14 n.114, 214
- 2. 15 243
- 3 93 n.44
- 3. 10 51
- 3. 15 214–15

1 Timothy

- 1. 1 217
- 1. 3–5 170, 171

1. 3 164 n.20
 1. 4 171
 1. 5 244–5 n.57
 1. 12 170 n.48
 1. 13 170 n.48
 1. 15–16 243
 1. 15 243 n.52, 244, 254, 255 n.14, 256, 289
 1. 17 151 n.92, 289
 1. 19 244–5 n.57
 2. 1–2 217
 2. 2 215 n.119
 2. 4 244–5 n.57
 2. 6–6.1 217 n.127
 2. 8 151 n.92, 154 n.101
 2. 11 22
 2. 15 244–5 n.57
 3. 5 217 n.130
 3. 8 217
 3. 16 238 n.33, 244 n.55
 4. 7 171
 4. 15 217 n.131
 4. 16 244–5 n.57, 289
 5. 5 217
 5. 8 244–5 n.57
 5. 18 92, 109
 5. 19 215 n.119, 217 n.130
 6. 2 170 n.48
 6. 7 215–16
 6. 10 188, 215–16
 6. 11 244–5 n.57
 6. 17 217 n.130
- 2 Timothy
1. 3 170 n.49
 1. 5 218
 1. 9 244–5 n.57
 1. 10 244, 245
 1. 16 170 n.49
 1. 18 164 n.21
 2. 3 170 n.49
 2. 10 244–5 n.57
 2. 11–12 218
 2. 12 218, 308
 2. 21 151 n.93
 2. 22 244–5 n.57
 2. 25 218
 3. 6 170 n.49
 3. 15 210 n.99, 244–5 n.57
 3. 16 244–5 n.57
 3. 17 151 n.93
 4. 1 201 n.51, 278, 289
 4. 6 170 n.49
 4. 10 217–18, 217 n.130
4. 12 164 n.21
 4. 22 164 n.21
- Titus
1. 5–9 217 n.128
 1. 7 170 n.50
 1. 14 170 n.50, 171
 2. 1–10 217 n.127
 2. 4–5 151
 2. 5 56
 2. 12 217 n.130
 2. 14 223
 3. 1 151 n.93
 3. 5 244–5 n.57
 3. 7 241 n.44
 3. 9 170 n.50
- Hebrews
1. 3–5 248 n.65
 1. 3–4 152–3
 1. 4 56
 1. 5 153
 1. 7 56, 152–3, 248 n.65
 1. 8 248 n.65
 1. 13 153, 248 n.65
 1. 14 244
 2. 5–9 246
 2. 14 245
 2. 18 153
 3–4 248
 3. 1 153
 3. 2 153
 3. 5 153
 3. 12 312 n.121
 3. 18 247, 248
 4. 6–7 248
 4. 12 153
 4. 14 219–20
 5. 6 247
 5. 13 219 n.144
 6. 4–6 303 n.57, 320 n.186
 6. 18 153
 6. 20 219–20, 247
 7. 3 219–20, 247
 7. 17 247
 7. 21–2 247
 7. 24–5 247
 7. 28 247
 8. 8–9 247
 9. 8 153
 9. 9 247
 9. 10 247 n.61
 9. 12–13 246
 9. 13 246
 9. 14 247

Hebrews (*cont.*):

- 9. 19 246
- 10. 2 247
- 10. 4 246
- 10. 16 247
- 10. 19–24 290
- 10. 20 153
- 10. 22–4 206
- 10. 22 247
- 10. 23 153, 289–90
- 10. 31 291
- 10. 32–9 291
- 11. 1 153
- 11. 37 153
- 11. 39 153
- 12. 1 153, 290–1
- 12. 6 153
- 12. 10–11 236 n.27
- 12. 24 246, 248
- 12. 28 219
- 13. 8 247
- 13. 12 246
- 13. 18 247, 291
- 13. 19 143
- 13. 24 143

James

- 1. 4 303
- 1. 5–9 313
- 1. 5 303
- 1. 6–8 303
- 1. 12 304 n.64, 314
- 1. 17 298 n.24, 303, 313
- 1. 21 312
- 1. 26 304 n.67
- 1. 27 303 n.58
- 2. 5 304 n.65, 304 n.66
- 2. 7 314
- 2. 8 204
- 2. 14–26 319
- 2. 19 312
- 3. 2 304 n.67
- 3. 4 304 n.67
- 3. 8 303 n.58
- 3. 15 303, 303 n.55, 313
- 3. 17 303
- 4. 4 291 n.143
- 4. 5 299 n.27, 304 n.65
- 4. 6 154 n.101, 163
- 4. 7 304 n.67, 313
- 4. 11–12 302, 305 n.75, 313
- 4. 12 313, 316 n.155, 317
- 5. 1 304 n.65
- 5. 4 304 n.65

- 5. 7 291 n.143
- 5. 8 291 n.143
- 5. 10 291 n.143
- 5. 11 298 n.24, 303
- 5. 16 291 n.143
- 5. 19–20 289
- 5. 20 154 n.101, 291 n.143

1 Peter

- 1. 1–2 154 n.101
- 1. 2 246, 248
- 1. 7 299 n.27, 303 n.59, 314
- 1. 8 54, 220
- 1. 12 220, 223
- 1. 13 111, 223
- 1. 17 248
- 1. 18–19 154 n.101
- 1. 20 291 n.143, 304 n.6, 314
- 1. 21–2 206
- 1. 21 223
- 2. 1–2 303 n.61, 314 n.137
- 2. 1 154 n.101
- 2. 4 291 n.143
- 2. 9 140, 151 n.92, 154 n.101
- 2. 11 90–1, 223
- 2. 12 49, 56, 222–3
- 2. 17 154 n.101, 198 n.41, 204 n.71, 223 n.160
- 2. 18–3. 7 217 n.127
- 2. 20 91 n.38
- 2. 21–4 220–1
- 2. 25 223
- 3. 8 198 n.41, 204 n.71, 223
- 3. 9 223
- 3. 13 223
- 3. 14 222
- 3. 20–1 304 n.65, 314
- 4. 1 207
- 4. 3 154 n.101
- 4. 5 201 n.51, 278, 289, 291 n.143
- 4. 7 223
- 4. 8 57, 291 n.143
- 4. 11–12 248
- 4. 13–16 314
- 4. 14–16 303 n.57
- 4. 16 220–1, 222, 314
- 4. 19 154 n.101
- 5. 5 154 n.101, 163, 211 n.103
- 5. 7 299 n.27, 304 n.66, 314
- 5. 9 154 n.101, 313 n.131

2 Peter

- 3. 5–7 291 n.143
- 3. 10 291 n.143

- 1 John
 2. 18 224
 2. 22 224
 2. 27 299 n.27
 3. 8 199, 223–5
 3. 10 225
 3. 12 225 n.168
 3. 22 307 n.85, 317 n.162
 4. 2 238
 4. 2–3 223–5
 4. 3 224
 4. 6 299 n.27
 4. 8 225 n.168
 4. 9 221, 225 n.168
 4. 16 225 n.168
 4. 18 154 n.101
 5. 6–9 225 n.168
- 2 John
 7 223–5, 238
- 3 John
 2 51
- Jude
 6 291 n.143
 18 51
- Revelation
 1–3 163 n.17
 1. 7 235 n.25, 249
 1. 13 249
 3. 5 257, 291
 3. 18 314 n.142
 6. 11 298 n.25
 7. 9 298 n.25
 7. 14 298 n.25
 7. 16 51
 12. 4 298 n.25
 21. 1 298 n.25
 21. 2 298 n.25
 21. 5 249
 21. 14 298 n.25
 22. 12 154 n.102
- Apostolic Fathers*
- Barnabas, Epistle of*
 1. 1 243 n.50
 1. 3 244–5 n.57
 1. 4 189, 244–5 n.57
 1. 5 244–5 n.57, 249
 2. 6 241–2, 247 n.61
 2. 10 244–5 n.57
 3. 5–6 247
 3. 6 244
 4. 1 244–5 n.57
 4. 3 232
 4. 4 19
 4. 7 229 n.1, 232 n.10
 4. 8 247
 4. 9 19
 4. 10 241
 4. 11–12 241, 248
 4. 11 229 n.1, 232 n.10
 4. 11a 229 n.1
 4. 14 55, 232–3, 239, 249
 5. 1 246, 248
 5. 2 232 n.10
 5. 4 229 n.1, 232 n.10
 5. 6 238, 244, 245
 5. 7 57, 247
 5. 8 9, 234
 5. 9–10 233–4
 5. 9 233, 238, 243, 244,
 254–5
 5. 10–11 238
 5. 12 55, 234–5
 5. 13 19, 221
 6. 2–4 248
 6. 3 237
 6. 6 57
 6. 7 238, 244
 6. 8–9 248
 6. 9 238, 244
 6. 11–12 244
 6. 11 244–5 n.57
 6. 12 232 n.10
 6. 12a 229 n.1
 6. 13 239, 249
 6. 14 238, 244, 244–5 n.57
 6. 17–19 246
 7. 2 201 n.51, 278, 289
 7. 3–5 235
 7. 4 246
 7. 5 239, 247
 7. 7 242
 7. 9 247, 249
 7. 9b 235–6
 7. 11 239
 8. 1 246
 8. 3 233
 8. 5 221
 8. 7 237
 9. 2 237
 9. 6 242–3
 11. 2 19
 11. 10 237
 12. 1 232
 12. 7 237–8
 12. 10–11 55
 12. 10 238, 244

Barnabas, Epistle of (cont.):

12. 11 54
 12. 19 236
 13–14 249
 13 249
 13. 2–3 31
 13. 2 229 n.1, 232 n.10
 13. 7 240–1
 14. 4 247
 14. 5 247
 14. 6 232 n.10
 15. 1 232 n.10
 15. 3–4 248
 15. 9 236–7
 16. 5 229 n.1, 232
 16. 6 232 n.10
 16. 8–10 244
 18–20 84
 19. 2 98
 19. 8 90
 21. 3 154 n.102
 47–8 249

1 Clement

1. 3 56, 151, 217 n.127
 2. 1 140, 151 n.92
 2. 2 141 n.51, 154 n.101
 2. 4 13–14, 151 n.92, 154 n.101
 2. 7 151 n.93
 3. 4 151 n.92
 5. 1–5 147
 5. 2 140, 151 n.92
 5. 4 142
 5. 5–7 144
 5. 5–6 151 n.92
 5. 7 222 n.153
 6. 2 17–18
 6. 9 56
 7. 2 154 n.101
 7. 4 139 n.37, 154 n.101
 12. 2 141 n.51
 13 56
 13. 1–2 190 n.13, 191
 13. 2–7 131–4
 13. 2 56, 190–3
 14. 1 141 n.51
 15. 1 273
 15. 2 138–9
 15. 5 12
 16. 10 221
 16. 17 222 n.153
 17. 1 153, 221
 17. 5 153
 18. 1 140–1

19. 2 153
 21. 1 151 n.92, 213–14 n.114
 21. 6–8 217 n.128
 21. 6 140 n.43
 21. 7 22
 21. 9 153
 23. 3 303
 23. 4 68 n.15
 24. 1 57, 146–7
 24. 4–5 147
 24. 4 147, 151 n.93
 24. 5 137–8
 27. 1 153, 290
 27. 2 153
 27. 5 139 n.37
 29. 1 151 n.92, 154 n.101
 30. 1–2 154 n.101
 30. 1 148
 30. 2 163
 30. 3 139 n.37
 30. 6 151
 31. 1 151
 32. 2 148, 150–1
 32. 4–33. 1 150
 32. 4 12
 33. 1 54, 148
 33. 8 222 n.153
 34. 2 151
 34. 3 154 n.102
 34. 8 20, 148, 284
 35. 5–6 54, 56, 148–9
 36. 1–2 153
 36. 1 153, 219
 36. 2 151
 36. 2–5 56, 152–3, 248 n.65
 36. 3 56
 36. 4 219
 37. 5–38. 1 145–6
 37. 5 151
 38. 1 151
 38. 2 145
 39. 1 208 n.92
 40. 1 202 n.56
 42 12
 42. 1–2 140 n.43
 43. 1 153
 43. 6 140
 44. 1 17
 45. 2 140 n.43, 202 n.56
 46. 6 140, 151 n.92
 46. 7–8 134–7, 190 n.13
 46. 8 302 n.54, 317 n.160
 47. 1–4 144–5

47. 1–2 151 n.92
 47. 1 54, 80
 47. 3 20
 47. 7 151
 48. 5 147
 49. 1 140
 49. 2 154 n.101
 49. 4 12
 49. 5 145, 146, 154 n.101, 291 n.143
 50. 3 154 n.101
 50. 6–7 151
 51. 3 140 n.43
 51. 5 151
 52. 1 140 n.43
 53. 1 202 n.56
 56. 4 153
 59. 2–3 140 n.43
 59. 2 16, 140, 151 n.92
 59. 3 16, 140, 151 n.92
 61. 2 151 n.92
 61. 3 153
 62. 3 202 n.56
 64 153
 65. 2 148
- 2 Clement**
 1. 1 201 n.51, 259 n.31, 278, 289,
 291 n.143
 1. 3 276 n.85
 1. 6 290–1
 1. 7 259 n.31
 1. 8 281–2, 287 n.124
 2. 1–3 251
 2. 1 285–6
 2. 2 276, 276 n.85, 291
 2. 4 56, 251, 254–5, 276 n.85
 2. 5 259 n.31, 288
 2. 7 255 n.14, 256, 259 n.31, 276 n.85, 288
 3. 1 255 n.19
 3. 2 32, 257–8, 277 n.86, 291
 3. 3 259 n.31
 3. 4 138 n.33, 273–4, 276 n.85
 3. 5 259 n.32, 273
 4. 1 259
 4. 2 32, 258–60, 277 n.86
 4. 4 276 n.85
 4. 5 32, 253, 260–3, 269 n.63, 277 n.86
 4. 5a 38–9
 4. 7 259 n.31
 5. 2–4 32, 258 n.27, 263–6, 277 n.86
 5. 5–6 276 n.85
 5. 5 275
 6. 1–2 277 n.86
 6. 1 57, 255 n.17, 266–7
 6. 2 267–8
 6. 3–5 287 n.125
 6. 3 291 n.143
 6. 5 291 n.143
 6. 7 253 n.10, 275 n.80, 276
 7. 1 283
 7. 4 276 n.85
 7. 6 274
 8. 2 280
 8. 5 46, 69 n.17, 251, 267 n.57, 268–70,
 277 n.86, 278
 8. 6 243
 9. 1–6 284
 9. 3–4 287 n.125
 9. 3 283–4, 287 n.125
 9. 5 16, 253, 287 n.124
 9. 6 253 n.10
 9. 11 269 n.63, 270–1, 277 n.86
 11. 1–5 290
 11. 2 68 n.15, 303
 11. 6 277 n.86, 284 n.115, 289–90,
 317 n.161
 11. 7 57, 148 n.77, 259 n.32, 284–5,
 284 n.115, 285
 12. 1 276 n.85
 12. 2 35–6, 38 n.30, 272, 277, 277 n.86
 12. 6 272, 277 n.86
 13. 1 287 n.125, 288
 13. 2 277 n.86, 281
 13. 4 33, 271–2, 277 n.86
 14. 1–2 287 n.124
 14. 1 255 n.17, 275, 276 n.85, 287
 14. 2–3 288
 14. 2 251–2, 253 n.10, 255 n.17, 286–7,
 287 n.124, 291 n.143
 14. 3 243
 14. 5 284–5
 15. 1 289, 291 n.143
 15. 4 276, 276 n.85
 16. 3 291 n.143
 16. 4 57, 291, 291 n.143
 17. 2–3 288
 17. 3 251, 282, 287 n.124
 17. 4–5 287 n.124
 17. 4 269 n.63, 277 n.86
 17. 5 277 n.86, 287 n.124
 17. 7–18. 1 288
 17. 7 288
 18. 1 288
 19. 1 251, 289
 19. 2 287 n.125
 19. 2b 282–3
 19. 3 259 n.32

2 *Clement (cont.):*

- 20. 2-4 291 n.143
- 20. 4 291 n.143
- 20. 5 289

Didache

- 1-6 84, 119
- 1. 1 96, 97 n.57, 99
- 1. 2 55, 96-8
- 1. 2b 98-9
- 1. 3-5 86 n.16
- 1. 3 48, 55, 85 n.12, 91 n.38, 92, 120-1, 197 n.37
- 1. 3b-2. 1 48, 84, 85 n.10, 91, 95, 119-25, 126
- 1. 3b 121-3
- 1. 4-6 31
- 1. 4-5 124-5
- 1. 4 102, 123-4
- 1. 4a 90-1
- 1. 5 125
- 1. 6 85
- 2. 1 48
- 2. 2-3 99-100
- 3. 1 243 n.50
- 3. 2 243 n.50
- 3. 4-6 243 n.50
- 3. 7 57, 100-1
- 4. 1 243 n.50
- 4. 8 89-90
- 4. 9-11 217 n.128
- 5. 2 92
- 6. 1 101
- 6. 2 101-2, 124
- 6. 3 93 n.44
- 7. 1 102-3
- 7. 3 55
- 8 84, 110
- 8. 1-2a 55
- 8. 1 55, 103
- 8. 2 48, 69 n.17, 85-6, 104-6
- 9-10 84, 93
- 9 55
- 9. 2 93, 94
- 9. 3 93, 94
- 9. 4 94
- 9. 5 41 n.39, 48, 57, 85, 106
- 10. 2 94
- 10. 3 93, 94
- 10. 5 94
- 10. 6 92
- 11. 2-4 106-7
- 11. 3 69 n.17, 86, 105
- 11. 7 55, 93 n.44, 107-9

- 13. 1 55, 92, 109
- 15 84
- 15. 3-4 105, 109-10
- 15. 3 69 n.17, 86
- 15. 4 86
- 16 78, 110-19
- 16. 1 110-12, 126
- 16. 3-8 33, 112-14
- 16. 3-5 54, 57, 117-18
- 16. 3 117
- 16. 4 114-15, 116, 117
- 16. 5 54, 115, 116, 117
- 16. 6 118-19
- 16. 7 86
- 16. 8 56, 115-17, 118-19

Diognetus, Epistle to

- 3. 2 15
- 5. 7 15-16

Ignatius of Antioch

Ephesians

- 2. 1 170 n.49
- 5. 2 180, 183 n.115
- 5. 3 162-3
- 6. 1 180, 183 n.115
- 7. 2 24-5
- 8. 2 170 n.44
- 9. 1 17
- 11. 1 181
- 12. 2 163
- 14. 1 170, 171
- 14. 2 181-2, 185
- 15. 3 167 n.36, 170 n.45, 283
- 16. 1 164-5, 170 n.46, 181 n.102
- 16. 2 172, 185
- 17. 1 170 n.49, 180, 183 n.115
- 18. 1 57, 80, 164-5, 170 n.46
- 18. 2 175 n.78
- 19. 3 170 n.44
- 20. 1 169, 170, 171
- 21. 2 167
- inscript. 168-9, 170 n.44

Magnesians

- 1. 1 13 n.6
- 5. 1 173 n.63
- 5. 2 180
- 7. 1 183
- 8. 1 170, 171
- 8. 2 23-4, 183
- 9. 3 180
- 10. 2 165-6

Philadelphians

- 1. 1 170 n.46, 170 n.47
- 2. 1-2 173 n.63

2. 1 243 n.50
 3. 1 177–8
 4. 1 167 n.36
 6. 3 170 n.45
 7. 1 167 n.36, 183 n.113, 184, 185
 7. 2 283
 8. 2 170 n.47
 9. 1 183 n.115
- Polycarp*
 1. 2–3 180
 1. 2 169
 2. 1–2 55
 2. 1 122 n.126
 2. 2 178–9
 4. 3 170 n.48
 5. 1b 169
 6. 1 170 n.50
 6. 2 170 n.49, 207
- Romans*
 1. 1 13 n.6
 2 170 n.47
 2. 2 170 n.49
 4 170 n.47
 4. 3 167 n.36
 5. 1 166
 6. 1 167 n.36
 7. 2 170 n.46, 183–4
 7. 3 183 n.115
 9. 2 166–7, 170 n.48
 9. 3 180
- Smyrnaeans*
 1. 1 169, 170 n.44, 174–6, 177, 180, 185
 1. 2 181 n.103
 3. 2–3 182
 3. 2 181 n.103
 3. 3 173 n.63
 4. 2 170 n.47, 170 n.48
 6. 1 179–81
 10. 2 170 n.49, 181 nn.102–3
 11. 1 167
 11. 3 170 n.47
 inscript. 167 n.36
- Trallians*
 1. 1 13 n.6
 2. 3 167 n.36
 5. 1 167 n.36
 7. 2 170 n.49
 8. 2 281
 9. 2 170 n.45
 10 243
 10. 1 170 n.46
 11. 1 177–8
12. 3 167 n.36
 13. 1 167
- Polycarp, Philippians*
 1. 1 187 n.3, 213–14 n.114, 225 n.169
 1. 2–12. 3 187 n.3
 1. 2 199–200, 213–14 n.114, 222 n.152
 1. 3 54, 188, 197 n.39, 211, 220, 223
 2. 1 201, 208, 211 n.103, 212–13, 219, 223, 278, 289
 2. 2 207–8, 223
 2. 3 131 n.10, 133, 189–94, 197, 201 n.52, 204 n.71, 207 n.83
 3. 1 201 n.55
 3. 2–3 206
 3. 2 201–2, 211–12, 213–14 n.114
 3. 3 202 n.59, 203, 204 n.71, 208 n.90, 209–10
 4. 1–6. 2 217
 4. 1 188, 207, 215–16
 4. 2 204 n.71
 4. 3 213–14 n.114, 217
 5. 1 188, 208–9
 5. 2 197 n.39, 198, 207 n.83, 213–14 n.114, 217, 218, 223
 5. 3 193 n.25, 205, 208 n.90, 223
 6. 1 188–9, 197, 215 n.119, 217 n.130, 223
 6. 2 194, 195, 202–4, 207
 6. 3 201 n.52, 219, 223
 7. 1 198–9, 223–5, 225 n.169
 7. 2 191, 194–6, 223
 8. 1 217, 220–1, 222 n.153, 225 n.168
 9. 1 201, 213–14 n.114, 220 n.144, 222 n.152
 9. 2 202 n.59, 207 n.83, 208 n.90, 212, 217–18
 10. 1 198 n.41, 201, 204, 207 n.83, 213 n.114, 223 n.161
 10. 2–3 202 n.59
 10. 2 56, 211 n.103, 222–3
 10. 3 281
 11. 1 213
 11. 2 56, 197 n.39, 201, 205–6, 211 n.103, 213 n.114, 217 n.130
 11. 3 201, 207 n.83, 213–14 n.114, 214
 11. 4 214–15, 218
 12. 1 210–11, 218
 12. 2 201 n.52, 208 n.90, 213 n.114, 219–20, 222 n.153, 223
 12. 3 32, 191, 196–7, 198 n.41, 211 n.103, 213, 215 n.119, 217
 13–14 187 n.3
 13. 2 201 n.55, 222 n.153

*Shepherd of Hermas**Mandates*

- 1. 1 312
- 2 298 n.24
- 2. 2 303 n.58
- 3 299 n.27
- 3. 1 303 n.59, 304 n.65, 312 n.121
- 3. 1. 1 305
- 3. 4 311, 320 n.182
- 4 319, 323–9
- 4. 1 324, 327
- 4. 1. 1–3 323–4, 327
- 4. 1. 2–3 324
- 4. 1. 1 306 n.77, 307, 323–4, 327
- 4. 1. 1–3 327 n.224
- 4. 1. 3 328–9
- 4. 1. 4–8. 9 327–8
- 4. 1. 4 325
- 4. 1. 5 325–6
- 4. 1. 6 304 n.68, 305, 309 n.98, 317, 322, 325, 327
- 4. 1. 7–8 326
- 4. 1. 8 10, 323, 326
- 4. 1. 9 323, 326 n.219, 327
- 4. 1. 11 327 n.224, 328
- 4. 2–3 323, 324
- 4. 2. 1 302, 309, 317
- 4. 3. 1–2 303 n.57
- 4. 3. 1 312 n.121
- 4. 3. 4 303 n.59, 310, 328
- 4. 3. 6 328
- 4. 4 323–4
- 4. 4. 1–2 301, 305, 326–7
- 4. 4. 1. 2 311
- 4. 4. 2 326
- 4. 4. 3–4 327 n.224
- 5. 2. 7 306 n.79
- 6. 2. 4 306 n.77, 307
- 7. 4 306 n.79, 317
- 9 298 n.24
- 9. 1–7 313
- 9. 1 299 n.27
- 9. 1. 1–2 303
- 9. 2 303 n.55
- 9. 3. 5 304 n.68
- 9. 4 306 n.78, 309, 317 n.162
- 9. 8 304 n.67, 309
- 9. 11 303 n.55, 313
- 10. 1. 4 319
- 10. 1. 5 306 n.78, 308
- 10. 2. 1–6 309, 311
- 10. 2. 1–5 301 n.45
- 10. 3. 2 311, 320 n.182

- 11 298 n.24
- 11. 5–6 313
- 11. 5. 7–8 303 n.55
- 11. 6 303 n.55
- 11. 16 303 n.58, 306 n.77, 307, 321 n.193
- 12 299 n.33
- 12. 1. 1 304 n.67
- 12. 1. 2 302 n.53, 306 n.77, 307
- 12. 2. 1–3 305
- 12. 2. 4 313
- 12. 4. 6–7 313
- 12. 4. 7 304 n.67
- 12. 5. 2 313
- 12. 5. 2. 4 304 n.67
- 12. 5–6 298 n.24
- 12. 5. 4 306 n.79
- 12. 6. 3 313, 316 n.155

Similitudes

- 1. 8 303 n.58
- 2. 2. 8 303 nn.58, 62
- 2. 5 304 nn.65–6
- 3. 3 305, 306 n.77, 307
- 3. 3. 3 302
- 4. 2. 2. 4 306 n.77
- 4. 2. 4 302
- 5. 2 306 n.77, 315–16, 319
- 5. 2. 1–8 315
- 5. 2. 2–11 308
- 5. 2. 6 316
- 5. 3. 2–3 306 n.79
- 5. 3. 2–3. 8 309 n.96
- 5. 3. 3 306 n.78, 309
- 5. 3. 8 306 n.79
- 5. 4 298 n.24
- 5. 5. 2 302, 305, 315, 316
- 5. 6 298, 298 n.23
- 5. 6. 1. 4 306 n.78, 309
- 5. 6. 2 316
- 5. 6. 3 303 n.60, 310
- 5. 6. 4–5 310 n.103
- 5. 6. 4 302 n.53, 306 n.77, 316 n.155, 317
- 5. 6. 5. 7 304 n.65
- 5. 7 299 n.27
- 5. 7. 3 309
- 6. 1. 1 312
- 6. 3. 6 306 n.77, 306 n.78, 307, 309, 316 n.155, 317
- 8. 2–3 298 n.25
- 8. 3 298
- 8. 6 298 n.24

8. 6. 4 302 n.52,
309 nn.98–9, 313–14,
317 n.165
8. 7. 6 306 n.79, 316–17
9. 2. 12. 14 298
9. 4. 3 312
9. 7. 1–4 299 n.35
9. 8. 6 299 n.33
9. 12–16 311, 319, 321 n.193
9. 12 299
9. 12. 1 303 n.62
9. 12. 1. 3 310, 312
9. 12. 1. 5–6 303 n.59
9. 12. 1. 6 310 n.103
9. 12. 2–3 304 n.66, 314
9. 12. 3 316 n.155, 317
9. 12. 3–6 318
9. 12. 4 311
9. 12. 5–6 321 n.193
9. 12. 8 311 n.108
9. 13 299 n.27
9. 13. 2 302 n.52, 306 n.78, 308
9. 13. 5–7 301 n.48, 311
9. 13. 5 301 n.45, 302 n.49
9. 13. 7 312
9. 13.9 319
9. 14. 3 304 n.67
9. 14. 6 302 n.52, 303 n.57,
309 n.98
9. 15. 3 303 n.59,
304 n.63, 310 n.103,
311 n.108
9. 16 318
9. 16. 2–4 319
9. 16. 2–4. 6 312
9. 17. 4 301–2, 311, 312, 319
9. 18. 4 301 n.48, 311, 319
9. 19–21 298
9. 20. 1 306 n.78, 308 n.89
9. 20. 2–3 315, 316
9. 20. 2 302 n.52, 306 n.77, 308
9. 20. 2–3. 29. 3 322
9. 21. 3 302 n.52, 309 n.98
9. 22. 3 316
9. 23. 1. 3 303 n.61
9. 23. 2–4 302
9. 23. 2. 4 305 n.75
9. 23. 4 313–14, 317
9. 28. 5 314
9. 28. 6 306 n.78, 308 n.68
9. 29 298
9. 29. 1. 3 314 n.137
9. 29. 2 311 n.108, 317–18
9. 29. 3 306 n.78, 308 n.89,
317 nn.165, 169
9. 31. 1 311 n.108
9. 31. 2 311 n.108, 317–18,
322
9. 31. 3 306 n.78, 308 n.68
9. 31. 6 306 n.79
10. 2. 1–6 311
12. 6. 3 317
- Visions*
1. 1 281
1. 1. 4–8 323
1. 1. 4 324 n.206
1. 1. 7 22
1. 1. 8 306 n.77, 307,
327 n.224, 329
1. 1. 9 323
1. 2. 4 323
2. 2 298
2. 2. 7 304 n.64, 314
2. 2. 8 306 n.78, 308, 310
2. 3. 1–2 323
2. 3. 2 312 n.121
2. 3. 4 303, 322
2. 4 298 n.25
2. 7. 2 312 n.121
3. 3. 5 304 n.65, 314
3. 5 298 n.25
3. 5. 1 319–20
3. 5. 3 299 n.34
3. 6. 3 309 n.98
3. 6. 5 306 n.78, 308
3. 6. 6 306 n.78, 308
3. 6. 7 323
3. 7. 3 306 n.78, 308 n.89, 317, 322
3. 8 298
3. 8. 3–7 209 n.96
3. 8. 3–5 170
3. 8. 3 306 n.78, 309
3. 9 298 n.24
3. 9. 4–6 304 n.65
3. 9. 8 303 n.59, 306 n.77
3. 9. 10 309 n.98
3. 10. 9 316 n.155, 317
3. 11. 3 304 n.66
3. 13. 1–3 317 n.165, 322
4. 2 298 n.25, 299 n.27
4. 2. 4 304 n.66, 310
4. 2. 6 137, 306 n.78,
309, 316 n.155, 317
4. 3 299 n.27
4. 3. 4 303 n.59, 314
11. 3 68 n.14, 314

Other non-biblical Christian literature

Apostolic Constitutions

- 1. 2. 2 197 n.37
- 1. 10. 1 281
- 3. 5. 6 281

Athenagoras

Legatio

- 11. 2 197 n.37
- 15. 2 280 n.98

Clement of Alexandria

Eclogae ex scripturis prophetis, 20. 3
270

Paedagogus, 1. 9 299 n.34

Stromateis

- 2. 18. 91 131 n.10
- 2. 45. 5 275 n.81
- 3. 13. 92 35–6, 272
- 5. 10 41 n.41
- 6. 112. 3 268

Corpus Hermeticum

1. 32 317

Didascalia Apostolorum

2. 21. 42 131 n.10

Epiphanius,

Panarion

- 30. 13. 7–8 176
- 30. 14. 5 170–1

Eusebius of Caesarea

Ecclesiastical History

- 3. 38. 4 251
- 4. 14. 9 223 n.158
- 5. 1. 45 167 n.35
- 6. 13. 1–3 143 n.59
- 6. 14. 1–3 143 n.59
- 6. 43. 3 201 n.55

Gospel of Peter

- 3. 9 236 n.25
- 5. 16 235

Gospel of Thomas

- 2 275 n.81
- 17 284
- 22 35–6, 272
- 37 37 n.29
- 39 266 n.55
- 47 266–7
- 99 270

Hilary

Epistula seu libellus, 1 269

Hippolytus

Haereses, 5. 24 284

Irenaeus of Lyons

Adversus omnes Haereses

- 2. 34. 2 269
- 3. 3. 4 199

Demonstratio

82 235 n.23

Justin Martyr

1 Apology

- 1. 16 31
- 14. 3 197 n.37
- 15. 8 254–5
- 15. 9 197 n.37
- 15. 12 268
- 16. 9 261–2 n.42
- 16. 11 260, 261
- 19. 7 264
- 53. 5 286

Dialogue with Trypho

- 11 241 n.42
- 13. 8 286
- 23 241 n.42
- 40. 4 ff. 236 n.24
- 76. 5 261
- 91 238 n.32
- 96. 3 197 n.37
- 106 155 n.107
- 119 241 n.42
- 120. 5 231 n.9
- 133. 6 197 n.37

Martyrdom of Justin and Companions

4. 8 209 n.96

Martyrdom of Polycarp

- 1. 1 26
- 2. 3 284

Melito of Sardis

Peri Pascha

- 79 235 n.23
- 80 235 n.23
- 93 235 n.23

Odes of Solomon

11. 6 183

Origen

Contra Celsum

- 1. 63 234, 243
- 2. 37 235 n.23

Pr. Paul

A. 25–9 284

Pseudo-Clementine

Homilies

- 3. 32 281
- 17. 5. 2 264

Pseudo-Macarius
Homilies, 37. 3 131 n.10

Tertullian

Adversus Marcionem
 3. 7. 7 236 n.26, 242
 3. 7. 8 236 n.24

Theophilus, *Ad Autolyicum*
 2. 26 280 n.98
 3. 14 197 n.37

Pseudepigrapha and other extra-biblical Jewish literature

Ascension of Isaiah
 3. 21–31 295 n.6

1 Enoch
 85–90 232 n.13
 89. 61–4 232 n.13
 90. 17–18 232 n.13

4 Ezra
 6. 25 115
 8. 3 232
 9. 15 232

M. Yoma
 6 236 n.24

4 Maccabees
 1. 32 91
 2. 5 324 n.210

Philo
De Creat. Princ., 7 281
De specialibus legibus
 1. 76 167 n.34
 1. 294–5 216 n.126

4. 7. 187 281

4. 65 216 n.126

Psalms of Solomon

4. 4–5 324 n.210
 14. 2 237

Pseudo-Philo

Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, 26. 13
 284–5

Pseudo-Phocylides
 195–7 307 n.82

Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs

Asher, 3. 1 92

Dan, 5. 3 97 n.55

Issachar

5. 2 97 n.55

7. 2–3 324 n.210

7. 6 97 n.55

Naphthali, 2. 2–5 280 n.98

Classical sources

Aristotle

Gen. an., 4, 5, 4
 167 n.34

Epictetus

Diss., 4. 11. 27 280 n.98

P Teb

iii. 800, 30 167 n.34

Pseudo-Crates

Epistola 16 207

Suetonius

Nero, 11. 11 17 n.14

Xenophon

Symposium, 3. 5 43

This page intentionally left blank

Index of Subjects

- Acta Pilati* 53
- Acts of the Apostles 78–9
and *1 Clement* 130, 140–2
and *2 Clement* 278
and *Didache* 89–90
and Ignatius 173
and Polycarp 199–201
and *Shepherd of Hermas* 297–8, 310
textual transmission 21
- allusions to NT 20, 54, 63–6, 68–9, 80
in *1 Clement* 146, 148, 152, 154
in *2 Clement* 253, 279
in *Didache* 85–6, 107–10, 118, 122, 127
in *Epistle of Barnabas* 230, 242, 245–8, 249
in Ignatius 161, 174
in Polycarp 194, 198, 200, 202–3, 207–8, 212–13, 217–18, 219, 220
in *Shepherd of Hermas* 32, 295
- Apocalypse *see* Revelation
- Apostolic Constitutions* 21, 84, 90–1, 122 n.125
- Apostolic Fathers
definition 1
in NT critical apparatus 47–58
in recent publications 57–8
and reception of NT 1–5, 61–82
textual traditions 9–27
1905 investigation 30–4, 61–2
accidental variation 11–18
intentional changes 18–26
modern study 34–45
and NT text 29–46
quotations and allusions 63–8
- Athanasius, and canon 46 n.52
- Barnabas* *see* *Epistle of Barnabas*
- Beza, Theodor 51
- Bodmer papyrus 38 10
- Book of Eldad and Modad* 68, 303 n.56, 322
- Cassianus, Julius 35, 37
- Catholic Epistles, citations 49
- 1 Clement*
and Acts 130, 140–2
and Apostolic Fathers 1
as catechesis 135
date 155
and John's Gospel 130, 139–40
and New Testament text 31, 47, 54, 57–8, 129–57
and Old Testament 19, 31, 139
and Pauline letters 20, 22–3, 31, 54, 68, 130, 142–3, 154, 156–7
and Polycarp 190–3
and Synoptic tradition 130, 131–9, 154, 156
transmission 10, 12–17, 20, 22–3
- 2 Clement*
and Apostolic Fathers 1
and critical apparatus of Greek New Testament 47–8
date 251
and Gospels 68–9, 70
and Jesus tradition 65 n.11, 252–78, 292
and John's Gospel 252–3
and New Testament text 23–7, 32, 35–8, 57–8, 251–92
and Pauline letters 278–89
and Synoptic tradition 69–70, 251, 254–78
transmission 10, 16
- Clement of Alexandria 22, 35–7, 268, 272–3
- Codex Alexandrinus, and *1 and 2 Clement* 10, 13–14, 17, 22, 39, 251
- Codex Athous 10
- Codex Bezae 46 n.52, 200 n.47
- Codex Hierosolymitanus 10, 12, 17, 19
- Codex Sinaiticus 10, 19, 34, 55 n.29
- Codex Vaticanus 12, 34
- Colossians
and *1 Clement* 130, 143, 151
and *2 Clement* 279, 288
and Polycarp 213
- conflations 18, 33, 137–8, 141, 240
- 1 Corinthians*
and *1 Clement* 20, 23, 31, 54, 143, 144–8, 154, 157, 338 n.225
and *2 Clement* 278–9, 283–5
and Ignatius 161, 163, 164–7, 169, 172, 185
and Polycarp 205–7
and *Shepherd of Hermas* 298, 301, 324–6, 328–9

- 2 Corinthians, and *1 Clement* 130,
 143, 151
 and Ignatius 170
 and Polycarp 207–8
- Didache*
 and Acts 89–90
 and Apostolic Fathers 1
 and critical apparatus of Greek New
 Testament 47–8, 54
 date 83, 86
 and John's Gospel 93–4
 and New Testament text 31, 57–8, 83–127
 and non-Pauline letters 90–1
 and Pauline letters 91–3
 and synoptic tradition 48, 54,
 68–9, 70, 78, 83, 85–8, 95–125, 126–7
 text 83–5, 122
 transmission 10, 21
- doctrine, and textual transmission
 23–6, 27
- Editio Critica Maior* 49
- Egerton Papyrus 2 35, 49
- Ephesians
 and *1 Clement* 130, 151
 and *2 Clement* 278–9, 286–8, 292
 and *Epistle of Barnabas* 244
 and Ignatius 163, 168–9, 171, 185
 and Polycarp 210–11
 and *Shepherd of Hermas* 297–8, 301, 312
 and synoptics 88
- Epistle of Barnabas* 1
 date 229
 and John's Gospel 237–9
 and New Testament text 31, 47,
 57–8, 96, 229–49
 and Old Testament 19, 229–31, 239
 and Pauline letters 239–45, 249
 and synoptic tradition 232–7,
 238–9, 249
 transmission 10, 19
 and Two Ways tradition 90, 98
- Epistle to Diognetus* 1 n.1, 47, 11, 15–16
- Erasmus, Desiderius 51
- Eusebius of Caesarea 25, 167, 251
- Galatians
 and *1 Clement* 130, 151
 and *2 Clement* 279, 285–6
 and *Epistle of Barnabas* 242
 and Ignatius 170
 and Polycarp 208–10
- Gnosticism, and textual transmission of
 the Fathers 24, 26, 288
- gospel
 in *2 Clement* 68–9, 277–8
 in *Didache* 68, 86, 105–6, 107,
 109–10, 126
- Gospel according to the Egyptians* 35–7,
 263 n.49, 272–3
- Gospel of the Ebionites* 176, 270
- Gospel of the Hebrews* 275 n.81
- Gospel of the Nazaraeans* 39, 43 n.44, 262,
 264 n.50
- Gospel of Nicodemus* 53
- Gospel of Peter* 53, 235, 264–6
- Gospel of Thomas* 53, 77 n.51, 88 n.25
 and *2 Clement* 35–8, 266–7, 272
 and Ignatius 178–9
- Gospels *see* synoptic tradition
- Greek New Testament (United Bible
 Societies) 47–50
- Grotius, Hugo 51
- harmonizations 19–20, 33, 48, 261, 265–6,
 270, 277–8
- Hebrews
 and *1 Clement* 130, 142–3, 152–3,
 154, 157, 247 n.60, 248 n.65
 and *2 Clement* 289–91, 292
 and *Epistle of Barnabas* 245–8, 249
 and Polycarp 219–20
 and *Shepherd of Hermas* 297
- Hermas *see Shepherd of Hermas*
- homoteleuton 11–12
- Ignatius of Antioch
 and Apostolic Fathers 1
 dating 159–60, 172
 and Gospels 70
Letter to the Ephesians 13, 17, 24–5
 and New Testament text 31, 47,
 57–8, 159–86
 and Pauline letters 68, 159, 160, 162–72,
 185–6
 and synoptic tradition 74, 160, 173–82,
 185–6
 textual transmission 10, 23–4
- Irenaeus of Lyons
 and New Testament text 53
 and Polycarp 224–5
- James, and *Shepherd of
 Hermas* 297–8, 305,
 312–14, 320–1

- Jesus tradition 54, 71
 in *1 Clement* 154, 157
 in *2 Clement* 65 n.11, 252–78
 in *Didache* 89, 92, 95
 in Paul 63–4, 89, 92
 in Polycarp 204
 in synoptic gospels 91 n.38, 127
- Johannine epistles, and Polycarp 1,
 198, 223–5
- John 78–9
 and *1 Clement* 130, 139–40
 and *2 Clement* 252–3
 and *Didache* 93–4
 and *Epistle of Barnabas* 237–9
 and Ignatius 183–4, 185
 and Polycarp 197–9
 and *Shepherd of Hermas* 297–9, 310–11,
 315, 318–20, 322
- 1 and 2 John, and Polycarp 1, 198,
 223–5
- Jude, and 2 Peter 160 n.5, 162
- Justin Martyr
 and *2 Clement* 261, 268
 and Mark 155 n.107
 and New Testament text 31, 42
 n.43, 53, 277
 and synoptic gospels 156
- Letter of Barnabas* see *Epistle of Barnabas*
Letter to Diognetus see *Epistle to Diognetus*
- liturgy
 and *Didache* 84, 92, 93–4, 102–3, 106
 and textual transmission 20–1, 27
- Lord's Prayer
 in *Didache* 48, 104–6
 in Polycarp 194–5
- Luke
 and *Barnabas* 237
 and *1 Clement* 131–4
 and *2 Clement* 70, 254, 257, 258–63,
 265–7, 270–2, 277–8, 292
 and *Didache* 54, 70, 85, 111–12, 119–23,
 124–5, 126–7
 and Ignatius 70, 181–2, 185
 and Polycarp 70, 194, 197
 and *Shepherd of Hermas* 309–10,
 316, 320
 and synoptics 88
 use by Apostolic Fathers 75
- Marcosians 26
- Mark
 and *Barnabas* 236
 and *1 Clement* 131, 135, 139, 155
 and *2 Clement* 255 n.19, 268, 277
 and *Didache* 78, 97–8, 112–17, 119, 126
 and Ignatius 181, 185
 and Polycarp 197
 and *Shepherd of Hermas* 297, 302,
 304, 309, 312, 316–18, 320,
 322, 324–5, 328
- Martyrdom of Polycarp* 1, 25–6, 57
- material, extra-canonical 33, 41, 46
 and *1 Clement* 133–4, 136, 139, 154
 and *2 Clement* 35–9, 263–6, 272–3, 277–8
 and *Epistle of Barnabas* 232, 236
 and Ignatius 178
- Matthew 70–5
 and *1 Clement* 131–7, 139
 and *2 Clement* 255, 257–62, 265–8, 270–1,
 276–8, 292
 and *Didache* 48, 54, 69, 78, 85,
 87–8, 95–110, 111, 112–22, 124–5,
 126–7
 and *Epistle of Barnabas* 232–9, 249
 and Ignatius 70, 159, 173–82, 185–6
 and Polycarp 70, 190–7
 and *Shepherd of Hermas* 302,
 304–9, 315, 320, 322, 324–9
- Sondergut* 73–4
 and synoptics 88
- methodology 2, 61–82, 130 n.5, 157, 187,
 188–97
 of Köhler 71–5, 173–4, 230, 321–2
 of Köster 70–1, 74–6, 79, 173–6,
 180, 230, 315–18, 321
 of Lindemann 80, 319–20
 of Massaux 70–1, 74, 173, 180,
 230, 305–18
 Oxford Committee 30–4, 61–2,
 81–2, 161
 and quotations and allusions 63–8
- Michigan papyrus 10
- MS 0212 50
- MS 0250 50
- MS 1424 38, 43 n.44, 260, 261 n.38, 262–3
- Muratorian Canon 10 n.2
- NA see *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Nestle-
 Aland)
- New Testament
 canon 9–10, 40, 46, 159
 critical apparatus to Greek text
 47–58
Editio Critica Maior 49
 proto-canon 159

- New Testament (*cont*)
 quotations and allusions 63–8
 sources 230–1
 textual traditions 9–27
 accidental variation 11–18
 intentional changes 18–26, 51
 transmission history 35–46, 75
- Novum Testamentum Graece*
 (Nestle-Aland) 47–51, 56
- Old Testament 68
 in *1 Clement* 19, 31, 139
 in *2 Clement* 273–5
 in *Didache* 100
 in *Epistle of Barnabas* 19, 229–31,
 239, 240, 248–9
 in Ignatius 162–3, 165
 in Paul 65
 in Polycarp 221
- oral tradition 34 n.22, 56, 70, 231
 and *1 Clement* 68, 133, 136–7
 and *2 Clement* 32
 and *Didache* 48, 88, 95, 127
 and Ignatius 31 n.12, 175, 177–8, 182, 184,
 185
 and Irenaeus 53
 and Polycarp 192–5
 and *Shepherd of Hermas* 321–2
 and synoptics 68–71, 74–5, 77–8, 88
- Oxford Committee 1–2, 29, 30–4, 35–40, 45,
 47, 54
 and *1 Clement* 31, 54, 56 n.31,
 130, 131–3, 135, 138–43,
 145–8, 150–1, 152–4, 157
 and *2 Clement* 32, 36–7, 38–9, 274 n.77,
 278–9, 281, 287–8, 289–91
 and *Didache* 31, 90–2, 93, 267
 n.58, 268 n.61, 274 n.77
 and *Epistle of Barnabas* 31, 32, 235, 237,
 240, 244, 246, 248–9, 253 n.6,
 263 n.49, 274 n.77
 and Ignatius 31, 39 n.33, 160–3, 165–7,
 168, 170–2, 177, 178–85
 methodology 30–4, 61–2, 81–2, 161
 and Polycarp 32, 187, 192 n.23, 194,
 196 n.32, 197, 198–200, 202,
 202 n.59, 203–24, 225 n.169, 226,
 278 n.88
 and *Shepherd of Hermas* 32, 300–6,
 308–14, 322, 324–5
- P Oxy.* 654 35 n.26, 275 n.81
P Oxy. 655 35 n.26, 178
- P Oxy.* 1224 197 n.37
P Oxy. 1782 84, 85, 91
P Oxy. 4009 264–6
 P² 50
 P⁴⁻⁶⁴⁻⁶⁷ 2, 34
 P⁷ 50
 P¹⁰ 50
 P¹¹ 50
 P¹² 50
 P¹³ 50
 P¹⁸ 50
 P²⁵ 50
 P³¹ 49
 P⁴² 50
 P⁴³ 50
 P⁴⁴ 50
 P⁴⁵ 2, 50
 P⁴⁶ 50, 143, 156
 P⁴⁷ 50
 P⁵⁰ 50
 P⁵⁵ 50
 P⁵⁹ 50
 P⁶⁰ 50
 P⁶³ 50
 P⁶⁶ 34
 P⁷² 10
 P⁷⁵ 2
 P⁷⁶ 50
 P⁷⁸ 50
 P⁸⁰ 50
 P⁹³ 50
 P⁹⁹ 50
 Papias 48, 57, 81
 parablepsis 11–12
 paraphrases of NT 64, 66, 165, 206
 passion story
 and *Epistle of Barnabas* 235–6, 238, 249
 and *Martyrdom of Polycarp* 26
- Pastoral Epistles
 and *Epistle of Barnabas* 244
 and Polycarp 220–5
- Paul 79–81
 and *1 Clement* 20, 22–3, 31, 54, 68, 130,
 142–3, 156–7
 and *2 Clement* 278–89
 and *Didache* 91–3
 and *Epistle of Barnabas* 239–45, 249
 and Ignatius 68, 159, 160, 162–72, 185–6
 and Jesus tradition 63–4, 89, 92
 Pauline corpus 142–3, 163–4, 226–7
 and Polycarp 68, 201–5, 226–7
 and *Shepherd of Hermas* 297–8, 304,
 311–12, 315, 319–21, 324–9

- 1 Peter
 and *1 Clement* 130
 and *Didache* 89 n.28, 90–1
 and *Epistle of Barnabas* 248
 and Polycarp 49, 220–3
 and *Shepherd of Hermas* 297–8
- 2 Peter
 date 160 n.5
 and Jude 160 n.5, 162
 and *Shepherd of Hermas* 297
- Philippians
 and *1 Clement* 130, 151
 and Ignatius 170
 and Polycarp 211–13
- Polycarp of Smyrna
 and critical apparatus of Greek NT 47–8
 and Hebrews 219–20
 and John's Gospel 197–9
Letter to the Philippians 1, 49
 and NT text 32, 57–8, 187–227
 and Pastoral Epistles 220–5
 and Pauline letters 68, 201–5, 226–7
 and synoptic tradition 70, 188–97
- Prudentius of St Maur 15
- Q source
 and *2 Clement* 257, 259, 260, 262, 291
 and *Didache* 97–8, 108, 109, 111–12, 119, 126
 and Ignatius 174–5, 181–2, 185
 quotations from NT 19–20, 63–82, 85–6, 111, 122, 215–16, 221–3
 and accuracy 161
 in *1 Clement* 137
 formal markers 33, 64, 66–8, 69, 71
 in *1 Clement* 80
 in *2 Clement* 254–73, 284–5
 in *Epistle of Barnabas* 229–30, 232–3
 in Ignatius 162
 in Polycarp 188, 190 n.13, 208, 210, 215 n.120
 from memory 42–4, 67
 in *1 Clement* 130 n.5, 135
 in *2 Clement* 258, 272
 in *Didache* 127
 in Ignatius 31, 161, 165–7, 168–9, 172, 185
 in Polycarp 191, 193
 redactional material 71–2, 75–8, 79, 87–8
 in *2 Clement* 257–60, 262, 265, 268–71, 277
 in *Didache* 108–27
 in *Epistle of Barnabas* 238
 in Ignatius 174–7, 180–2
 in *Shepherd of Hermas* 296, 324–5, 328
- references to NT 64, 66–8
 John and Acts 78–9
 Pauline letters and Apocalypse 79–81
 synoptic tradition 69, 70–8
 Revelation 81, 154, 173, 297–9
 and *1 Clement* 130
 and *2 Clement* 291
 and *Epistle of Barnabas* 249
- Romans
 and *1 Clement* 23, 31, 130, 142–3, 148–51, 154, 157
 and *2 Clement* 279, 280–3
 and *Epistle of Barnabas* 240–3, 249
 and Ignatius 170
 and Polycarp 202–5
- Sermon on the Mount
 and *1 Clement* 131
 and *Didache* 119–25
 and Ignatius 180 n.100
 and Polycarp 32, 189 n.12, 190 n.14, 192–4
- Shepherd of Hermas* 1
 date 293
 in earlier research 296–322
 genre 295
 and John's Gospel 297–9, 310–11, 315, 320
 method and style 300
 new research 322–9
 and NT text 32, 47, 57, 293–329
 and Pauline letters 297–8, 304, 311–12, 315, 319–21, 324–9
 and synoptic tradition 297–9, 302–9, 315–18, 320–2, 324–5
 transmission 10–11, 22, 26
 succession, apostolic, in *1 Clement* 16–17
 synoptic tradition
 and *1 Clement* 130, 131–9, 154, 156
 and *2 Clement* 69–70, 251, 254–78
 and *Didache* 54, 68–9, 70, 83, 85–8, 95–125, 126–7
 and *Epistle of Barnabas* 232–7, 238–9, 249
 Griesbach hypothesis 76–7
 and Ignatius 74, 160, 173–82
 and Polycarp 70, 188–97

- synoptic tradition (*cont*)
 references to 19–20, 69, 70–8, 230–1
 and *Shepherd of Hermas* 297–9, 302–9,
 315–18, 320–2, 324–5
 Two Source Theory 76–7, 108
- Tatian, *Diatessaron* 31, 50, 53
Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs 97
- testimony books 139, 141, 200, 229,
 286
 1 & 2 Thessalonians
 and *1 Clement* 143
 and Polycarp 213–15
- 1 Timothy
 and *1 Clement* 130, 143, 151
 and *2 Clement* 279, 288–9
 and Ignatius 164, 170–2, 185
 and Polycarp 215–17
- 2 Timothy
 and *1 Clement* 143
 and *2 Clement* 288–9
 and Ignatius 164, 170, 172, 185
 and Polycarp 217–18
- Titus
 and *1 Clement* 143, 151
 and Ignatius 170
- Two Ways tradition 83, 84–5, 90, 96,
 98, 119
- UBS *see* *Greek New Testament* (United Bible
 Societies)
- women, status in early church 21–3, 27
- Zion Gospel Edition 35, 38

Index of Modern Authors

- Aland, B. 40–1, 50
Aland, K. 40–1, 50, 57, 178
Albl, M. C. 141
Aleith, E. 311 n.112
- Baarda, T. 51 n.16, 52–3
Balabanski, V. 111n.88, 119 n.119
Baljon, I. M. S. 51
Barnett, A. E. 216 n.123, 279 n.94, 281–2,
287 n.125
Barrett, C. K. 141–2, 173 n.63
Bartlet, J. V. 31, 32, 36–7, 235, 237, 240, 244,
246, 248–9, 253 n.6, 263 n.49, 274 n.77
Bauckham, R. 173
Bauer, J. B. 203 n.61
Bauer, W. 159 n.4, 164 n.22, 210 n.99,
211 n.100, 318
Baumert, N. 326 n.218
Beatrice, P. F. 233
Bellinzoni, A. J. 63, 64 n.8, 261, 265,
322
Benecke, P. V. M. 32, 194, 198–200,
202, 205–7, 209, 211–12,
214–20, 222, 225 n.167,
278 n.88
Berding, K. 194, 195 n.31, 196, 199 n.46,
200–2, 203–4, 206 n.81, 207–9,
211 nn.100, 103, 212–13, 217–20, 223,
225 nn.165, 168
Betz, H. D. 209
Bihlmeyer, K. 16
Bousset, W. 35 n.24
Braun, F.-M. 140, 318–20
Brown, R. E. 224 nn.161–2
Brox, N. 225 n.166, 295 n.5, 314
n.143, 320–1, 323, 326 n.221
Bryennois, P. 10, 83
Butler, B. C. 111
- Campenhausen, H. von 216 n.123,
224 n.163, 225 n.166
Carlini, A. 323
Carlyle, A. J. 31, 32, 54, 56 n.31, 130,
131–3, 138–43, 145–8, 150–1, 152, 157
Charles, R. H. 81
Cotelier, J. 1, 9
- Crossan, J. D. 58
- Davies, W. D. and Allison, D. 233 n.16
Dehandschutter, B. 189 n.12, 195
n.31, 196–7 n.35, 225 n.168
Dibelius, M. 305, 307 n.82, 315, 318
Dibelius, M. and Conzelmann, H. 216
Donahue, J. R. 155–6 n.107
Donfried, K. P. 33, 253 n.6, 255
n.18, 258 n.27, 261, 268 n.62, 269 n.63,
272 n.70, 278 n.89,
284, 285 n.117, 291 n.139
Draper, J. A. 54, 55
Drijepontd, H. F. L. 14
Drummond, J. 32, 300–1
Dunn, J. D. G. 77 n.52, 193 n.24
Dupont, J. 325 n.216
- Ehrman, B. D. 1, 267 n.58, 268 n.61,
274 n.77, 322 n.199
Ellingworth, P. 152
Elliott, J. H. 154 n.101, 222 n.154
Elliott, K. 15
Ewald, H. G. A. 51
- Fee, G. D. 21, 53
Fischer, J. A. 224 n.164
Funk, F. X. 12
- Garrow, A. J. P. 91 n.37, 97 n.57, 101 n.65,
106 n.79, 110 n.86, 114 n.97
Gebhardt, O. von 12, 296–7
Giet, S. 321 n.193
Glover, R. 86 n.17, 97, 101 n.66, 108 n.83,
115, 120 n.122
Gokey, F. X. 224 n.164
Goodenough, E. R. 62 n.3
Goodspeed, E. J. 187
Grant, R. M. 198 n.42
Green, B. H. 134 n.16
Greeven, H. 57
Gregory, A. 89 n.29, 175, 182, 187,
191, 200, 230, 257 n.23, 322
Grenfeld, B. P. and Hunt, A. S. 178
Gundry, R. H. 324

- Hagner, D. A. 129–30, 131, 133,
136–7, 138–9, 140–3, 148–9,
151, 154, 173, 192, 195 n.32
- Harnack, A. von 93 n.44, 296–7
- Harrison, P. N. 191 n.17, 195 n.31, 225 n.170
- Hartog, P. 195 n.31, 196–7 n.35,
197–8, 201, 224 n.164, 225
- Helms, C. R. 81
- Hengel, M. 156
- Henne, P. 318 n.172
- Henne, Ph. 296 n.8
- Hilgenfeld, 15, 22, 298 n.26
- Hilhorst, A. 296 n.8, 324 n.205
- Hill, C. E. 139, 184 n.123, 198–9, 231 nn.8, 9,
237 n.31, 318–21
- Holtzmann, H. J. 162 n.11
- Hort, F. J. A. 17, 51
- Hultgren, A. J. 98 n.59
- Incigneri, B. J. 155–6 n.108
- Inge, W. R. 31, 32, 39 n.33, 160–1,
163, 165–7, 168, 170–2, 177, 179–85
- Jefford, C. 96 n.54, 98 n.59, 99 n.63
- Jenks, G. C. 225 n.166
- Joly, R. 320
- Kelhoffer, J. A. 105
- Kilpatrick, G. 15
- Kloppenborg, J. S. 86, 114 n.98, 116
- Koester, H. 33, 40, 54, 70–2, 74–6, 77 n.52, 79,
88 n.24, 98, 108, 110 n.86,
114 nn.100–2, 116,
117, 119, 173–7, 180, 185, 191, 193 n.24,
195 n.31, 196, 230,
233, 261–2, 264 n.50, 265, 267 n.60,
269 nn.63–4, 287 n.123, 315–18, 320,
325
- Köhler, W.-D. 71–5, 87 n.20, 173–4,
177, 195 n.31, 196 n.35, 230, 233, 235,
237, 239, 255–6 n.20, 259 n.32,
260 n.34, 268 n.62, 321–2
- Koperski, V. 201–2 n.55
- Köster, H. *see* Koester, H.
- Lachmann, K. 51
- Lake, K. 1, 14, 31, 68 n.15, 90–2, 93,
267 n.58, 268 n.61, 274 n.77
- Lampe, P. 17
- Layton, B. 119
- Leutzsch, M. 294 n.3, 295 n.5, 320
- Liddell, H. G. and Scott, R. 17
- Lietzmann, H. 159 n.1
- Lightfoot, J. B. 12, 14, 16, 17, 22–6,
163, 164 n.22, 165 n.24, 166
n.27, 167 n.32, 168–9, 172,
182–3, 191, 201 n.55, 203 n.61,
204, 208, 210 n.99, 263
n.49, 272 n.71, 274 n.77, 281, 286,
303 n.56
- Lindemann, A. 80, 139, 142–7, 149, 151, 153,
188–9 n.8, 189 n.9, 201 n.55, 202 n.58,
203 n.61,
206, 211, 243, 255 n.19, 256
n.22, 274 n.77, 279–81, 279 n.94,
282 n.106, 286 n.121, 287–8, 291 n.140,
319–20
- Lona, H. E. 23, 140, 143, 151 n.94, 152 n.97,
154 n.103
- Lührmann, D. 264–5
- Lührmann, D. and Schlarb, E. 277 n.86
- Luz, U. 325 n.215, 326 n.220, 327
- Massaux, É. 70–1, 74, 90, 136, 139 n.37, 173,
177–80, 189 n.12, 191 n.17, 192 n.19,
195 n.31, 197, 220 n.145, 230,
255–6 n.20, 269–70 n.66, 279 n.94,
305–18, 321, 324–5
- Mees, M. 42 n.43
- Milavec, A. 87 n.20, 88 n.23
- Moule, C. F. D. 157 n.117
- Muddiman, J. 162 n.11, 287
- Nagel, T. 139, 322
- Neiryneck, F. 70, 74
- Niederwimmer, K. 41 n.39,
83 n.2, 91–2, 93, 94 n.49
- Nijendijk, L. W. 321 n.193
- Osiek, C. 295 n.5, 296 n.8, 321, 323,
328 n.225
- Paulsen, H. 192–3 n.23,
195 n.31, 201 n.55
- Pearce, Z. 51
- Pernveden, L. 321
- Petersen, W. L. 53 n.24,
182, 252 n.5
- Pickering, S. R. 52, 53
- Piscator, J. 51
- Plumpe, J. C. 209 n.97
- Porter, S. E. 52, 53, 64–5
- Prostmeier, F. 230 n.6, 240 n.41, 242 n.46,
243, 246

- Reiling, J. 321 n.193
Rensberger, D. K. 203 n.61, 216 n.122
Roberts, A. and Donaldson, J. 42 n.43
Rordorf, W. 87 n.20, 96 n.54
- Sanday, W. 138, 299
Sanders, E. P. 171 n.57
Sanders, J. N. 139, 310 n.103
Schmidtke, A. 34–5, 38–9
Schmiedel, P. W. 51
Schneider, A. 295 n.5, 321 n.193
Schoedel, W. R. 74, 163, 164 n.22, 165 n.23,
166–7, 169 n.39, 171–2, 183–4,
191 n.18, 195 n.31, 201 n.55, 204 n.71,
210 nn.98–9
Schwegler, A. 298 n.26
Seitz, O. F. J. 303 n.56
Smit Sibinga, J. 173, 176, 179 n.92,
181 n.104
Smith, M. 142
Snyder, G. F. 320
Souter, A. 47
Spitta, F. 294 n.3, 297, 315
Staniforth, M. 42 n.43
Stanton, G. N. 53
Stewart-Sykes, A. 251 n.1
Streeter, B. H. 108 n.83
Swete, H. B. 138
- Thompson, M. B. 65 n.11
Trevett, C. 174, 175, 180
Tuckett, C. M. 54
- Unnik, W. C. van 123
Uro, R. 77 n.51
- Verhayden, J. 42 n.43
Vielhauer, P. 262
Vielhauer, P. and Strecker, G. 39
Von Wyss, H. L. 51
- Wake, W. 9 n.1
Warns, R. 253 nn.7, 10, 256 n.22, 258 n.27,
259 n.32, 267 n.57, 268 n.62,
269 nn.65–6, 272 n.71, 274 n.77,
276 n.85, 277 n.86, 278 n.87, 281, 288
- Wendt, H. H. 51
Wengst, K. 241 n.44
Westcott, B. F. 51, 298–9
Whittaker, J. 67 n.13, 231 n.8
Windisch, H. 229, 232 n.13
Woodsworth, 18 n.15
- Zahn, T. 14, 31, 156 n.115, 204 n.69,
210 n.99, 296–7, 298 n.26, 312
- Taylor, C. 299–300, 314, 322