

Copyright © 2017 Shawn Joseph Wilhite

All rights reserved. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has permission to reproduce and disseminate this document in any form by any means for purposes chosen by the Seminary, including, without limitation, preservation or instruction.

“ONE OF LIFE AND ONE OF DEATH”:
A CRITICAL ASSESSMENT OF APOCALYPTICISM IN THE
DIDACHE’S TWO WAYS

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
Shawn Joseph Wilhite
December 2017

APPROVAL SHEET

**“ONE OF LIFE AND ONE OF DEATH”:
A CRITICAL ASSESSMENT OF APOCALYPTICISM IN THE
DIDACHE’S TWO WAYS**

Shawn Joseph Wilhite

Read and Approved by:

Brian J. Vickers (Faculty Supervisor)

Michael A. G. Haykin

Jarvis J. Williams

Date _____

To Allyson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES.....	xix
PREFACE.....	xx
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Research Question and Thesis	3
Two Ways and Didache Apocalypticism in Contemporary Studies: A Review of Modern Research.....	9
Research from 1947–1981: Generation Two and Their Students	12
Research from 1983–Present: Generation Three and Their Students	20
Suggested Ways to Advance the History of Research	34
Methodology and Plan of Study	36
2. “THE MASTER SHALL INSTRUCT ALL THE SONS OF LIGHT”: A CONSIDERATION OF STRUCTURE AND APOCALYPTIC MOTIFS IN THE TWO WAYS METAPHOR.....	40
Apocalypticism and Its Heritage in Modern Scholarship: John J. Collins and Reception of <i>Semeia</i> 14.....	43
Two Ways as an Apocalyptic-Sapiential Sub-Genre of Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature.....	48
Two Ways Texts and Two Ways Traditions: A Consideration of Terminology and Structure	53
Summary and Consideration of a Two Ways Heuristic Taxonomy.....	57
Summary of Selected Apocalyptic Two Ways Texts.....	58

Chapter	Page
Summary of Apocalyptic Features in Two Ways Texts	64
Summary of Apocalyptic Features in Two Ways Traditions.....	67
3. “THE PATH OF LIGHT AND OF DARKNESS”: ANCIENT JEWISH AND EARLY CHRISTIAN TWO WAYS AND AN APOCALYPTIC WORLDVIEW	71
Treatise of the Two Spirits (1QS III, 13–IV, 26)	73
Literary structure and a Consideration of Genre	76
Cosmological and Angelic Dualism	79
Divine Determinism and Angelic Dominion	81
Anthropological Ethics and Angelic Conflict.....	82
Testament of Asher 1–8 and the Two Ways.....	85
Two Ways Literary Structure of Testament of Asher 1–8	88
Ethical Dualism, Role of Beliar, and Anthropological Destiny	92
Anthropological Ethics and the Problem of Determinism.....	95
Galatians 5:16–24 and the Two Ways.....	99
Divided Voices in Didache and New Testament Scholarship	99
McKenna’s Two Ways Typology and Galatians 5:16–24.....	103
Two Ways Literary Structure of Galatians 5:16–24.....	107
Salient Apocalyptic Motifs: An Apocalyptic Reading of Galatians 5:13–24.....	110
Epistle of Barnabas 18–21	116
Polarized Dualisms: Instruction and Optical	117
Angelic Dominion, Determinism, and Ethical Oversight	118
Polarized Paths: Light and Darkness.....	120
Is Barnabas 21 the Conclusion to the Two Ways Instruction?	121
ΓΝΩΣΙΣ and Apocalypticism	122
De Doctrina Apostolorum 1–6	124
Cosmology, Ethical Dualism, and Angelic Rule	124

Chapter	Page
What Is <i>De Doctrina</i> 's Relationship to Didache?	126
Shepherd of Hermas, Mandate 6.1–2 (35–36)	128
Is Herm. Mand. 6.1–2 (35–36) Considered a Two Ways?	129
Cosmology, Angelic Dualism, and Polarized Ethics	131
Summary: Ancient Two Ways as an Apocalyptic Worldview	137
4. “THE DIFFERENCE IS GREAT BETWEEN THE TWO PATHS”: A CONSIDERATION OF THE TEXTUAL INTEGRITY AND STRUCTURE OF THE DIDACHE’S TWO WAYS FRAME	139
Selected Summary of Scholarship: Suggested Structures of the Didache’s Two Ways	141
Delimitation Markers and the Didache’s Two Ways	145
Didache 1.1–6.2 and the Literary Structure of the Didache’s Two Ways	148
Comparison with Other Ancient Two Ways	149
Discourse Cohesion: Textual Consistency and Discourse Constraints	151
Discourse Boundaries: Textual Segments and Discourse Divisions	153
Didache 1.1–6.2 and the Structure of the Two Ways Literary Frame	159
Summary: Didache’s Two Ways Structure and Implications for the Present Study	163
5. “THIS IS THE WAY OF LIFE”: APOCALYPTIC WORLDVIEW AND THE DIDACHE’S TWO WAYS LITERARY FRAME	164
Didache Scholarship and the Apocalyptic Redaction of the Didache’s Two Ways	165
Didache 1–6 and Continuities with an Apocalyptic Worldview	171
Ethical Dualism and Polarized Ethical Traditions	171
Chastened Expressions of Anthropological Destiny	175
Didache 1–6 and Absence of an Apocalyptic Worldview	179
A Lack of Apocalyptic Cosmological Structures	179

Chapter	Page
A Lack of Angelic and Otherworldly Figures.....	187
Ethical Permissions and a Softening of Divine Determinism	201
Reduction of a Light-Darkness Cosmic Dualism	205
Summary: Literary Frame of Didache 1–6 and an Apocalyptic Worldview	206
6. “THE MEEK SHALL INHERIT THE EARTH”: APOCALYPTICISM AND INTERNAL READINGS OF THE DIDACHE’S TWO WAYS	209
“Since the Meek Shall Inherit the Earth” (Did. 3.7)	210
Literary Analysis of Didache 3.7	211
Didache 3.7 and its Relationship to Psalm 36:11 LXX and Matthew 5:5	214
Didache 3.7 and Related Two Ways Metaphors	223
History of Interpretation of Psalm 36:11 LXX and Matthew 5:5	225
Section Conclusion: Value of History of Interpretation and Didache 3.7	230
“Remember the One Who Speaks the Word of God to You” (Did. 4.1–2)	232
“Bear the Entire Yoke of the Lord . . . and You Shall be TEΛΕΙΟΣ” (Did. 6.2)	237
Literary Analysis of Didache 6.2	238
ΖΥΓΟΣ and Didache 6.2	243
TEΛΕΙΟΣ and Didache 6.2	250
Summary of Findings for Didache 6.2	262
Didache’s Two Ways and the Mini-Apocalypse in Didache 16.....	263
State of Discussion of Didache 1–6 and 16.....	264
Is Didache 1–6 and 16 a Former Literary Unity?	267
Summary: Apocalypticism and Internal Readings of Didache 1–6	270
7. CONCLUSION	272

	Page
Summary of Argument	273
Hypotheses and Further Areas of Research	276
Appendix	
1. TWO WAYS TEXTS AND TRADITIONS: A TAXONOMY OF APOCALYPTIC MOTIFS.....	278
BIBLIOGRAPHY	311

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

1. Ancient

<i>1 Apol.</i>	<i>1 Apology</i> , Justin Martyr
1 Clem.	1 Clement
1 En.	1 Enoch
2 Apoc. Jas.	NCH V 4 Second Revelation of James
<i>2 Apol.</i>	<i>2 Apology</i> , Justin Martyr
2 Bar.	2 Baruch
2 Clem.	2 Clement
2 En.	2 Enoch
2 Esd	2 Esdras
3 En.	3 Enoch
5 Apoc. Syr. Pss.	Five Apocryphal Syriac Psalms
<i>Abr.</i>	<i>De Abrahamo</i> , Philo
Acts Thom.	Acts of Thomas
<i>Aen.</i>	<i>Aeneid</i> , Vergil
<i>Ag.</i>	<i>Agamemnon</i> , Aeschylus
<i>Ag. Log.</i>	<i>Against Logicians</i> , Sextus Empiricus
<i>Ag. Prof.</i>	<i>Against Professors</i> , Sextus Empiricus
<i>Aj.</i>	<i>Ajax</i> , Sophocles
<i>Ant.</i>	<i>Jewish Antiquities</i> , Josephus
Apoc. Ab.	Apocalypse of Abraham
Apoc. El.	Apocalypse of Elijah
Apoc. Paul	Apocalypse of Paul

Apos. Con.	Apostolic Constitutions and Canons
Ascen. Isa.	Mart. Acen. Isa. 6–11
<i>Autol.</i>	<i>Ad Autolyicum</i> , Theophilus
Bar	Baruch
Barn.	Barnabas
<i>Bell. civ.</i>	<i>Bella civilian</i> , Appian
<i>B.J.</i>	<i>Bellum judaicum</i> , Josephus
Canons	Canons of the Holy Apostles
<i>Catech.</i>	<i>Catechism</i> , Cyril of Jerusaelm
<i>Cels.</i>	<i>Contra Celsum</i> , Origen of Alexandria
<i>Cher.</i>	<i>De cherubim</i> , Philo
<i>Dem.</i>	<i>Demosthenes</i> , Plutarch
<i>Dem. ev.</i>	<i>Demonstratio evangelica</i> , Eusebius
<i>Deus</i>	<i>Quod Deus sit immutabilis</i> , Philo
<i>Dial.</i>	<i>Dialogus cum Tryphone</i> , Justin Martyr
<i>Diatr.</i>	<i>Diatribai</i> , Epictetus
Did.	Didache
Did. Apos.	Didascalia Apostolorum
Diogn.	Diognetus
<i>Doctr.</i>	<i>De Doctrina Apostolorum</i>
<i>Ebr.</i>	<i>De ebrietate</i> , Philo
<i>Eccl. Can.</i>	<i>Ecclesiastical Canons of the Apostles</i>
<i>Eleg.</i>	<i>Elegiac Poems</i> , Theognis
<i>Ench.</i>	<i>Enchiridon</i> , Epictetus
<i>Epid.</i>	<i>Epideixis tou apostolikou kerygmatos</i> , Irenaeus
Epitome	Epitome of the Apostolic Commands
Ep. Apos.	Epistle to the Apostles

<i>Er. Ep.</i>	<i>Erotica Epistula</i> , Aristaenetus
<i>Eth. nic.</i>	<i>Ethica nicomachea</i> , Aristotle
<i>Euthyd.</i>	<i>Euthydemus</i> , Plato
<i>Fab.</i>	<i>Fables</i> , Babrius
<i>Frag.</i>	<i>Fragments</i> , Aristophanes
<i>Gorg.</i>	<i>Gorgias</i> , Plato
Gos. Thom.	Gospel of Thomas
God. Truth	NCH I 3 Gospel of Truth
Gr. Apoc. Ezra	Greek Apocalypse of Ezra
GTW	Greek Two Ways
H54	Codex Hierosolymitanus
<i>Haer.</i>	<i>Adversus haereses</i> , Irenaesus
Herm. Mand.	Shepherd of Hermas, Mandate(s)
Herm. Sim.	Shepherd of Hermas, Similitude(s)
Herm. Vis.	Shepherd of Hermas, Vision(s)
<i>Hist.</i>	<i>Historiae</i> , Herodotus
<i>Hist.</i>	<i>Historiae</i> , Polybius
<i>Hom.</i>	<i>Homily</i>
<i>Hom. Heb.</i>	<i>Homiliae in epistulam ad Hebraeos</i> , John Chrysostom
<i>Hom. Luc.</i>	<i>Homiliae in Lucam</i> , Origen of Alexandria
Ign. <i>Eph.</i>	Ignatius, <i>To the Ephesians</i>
Ign. <i>Magn.</i>	Ignatius, <i>To the Magnesians</i>
Ign. <i>Phld.</i>	Ignatius, <i>To the Philadelphians</i>
Ign. <i>Pol.</i>	Ignatius, <i>To Polycarp</i>
Ign. <i>Smyrn.</i>	Ignatius, <i>To the Smyrnaeans</i>
Ign. <i>Trall.</i>	Ignatius, <i>To the Trallians</i>
<i>Il.</i>	<i>Illiad</i> , Homer

Interp. Know.	Interpretation of Knowledge
<i>Ion</i>	<i>Ion</i> , Euripides
Jtd	Judith
Jub.	Jubilees
<i>Leg.</i>	<i>Leges</i> , Plato
<i>Leg.</i>	<i>Legum allegoriae</i> , Philo
<i>Leuc. Clit.</i>	<i>Leucippe et Clitophon</i> , Achilles Tatius
LXX	Septuagint
Mart. Pol.	Martyrdom of Polycarp
<i>Mem.</i>	<i>Memorabilia</i> , Xenophon
<i>Metaph.</i>	<i>Metaphysica</i> , Aristotle
<i>Migr.</i>	<i>De migration Abrahami</i> , Philo
<i>Mos.</i>	<i>De vita Mosis</i> , Philo
MT	Masoretic Text
<i>Nat. an.</i>	<i>De natura animalium</i> , Aelian
<i>Nem.</i>	<i>Nemeonikai</i> , Pindar
<i>Od.</i>	<i>Odyssea</i> , Homer
<i>Oec.</i>	<i>Oeconomicus</i> , Xenophon
<i>Op.</i>	<i>Opera et dies</i> , Hesiod
<i>Or.</i>	<i>Oratio</i> , Libanius
<i>Paed.</i>	<i>Paedagogus</i> , Clement of Alexandria
<i>Pan.</i>	<i>Panarion (Adversus haereses)</i> , Epiphanius
Paraph. Shem	NCH VII 1 Paraphrase of Shem
<i>Pat.</i>	<i>De patientia</i> , Tertullian
<i>Phaedr.</i>	<i>Phaedrus</i> , Plato
<i>Phileb.</i>	<i>Philebus</i> , Plato
<i>Plant.</i>	<i>De plantatione</i> , Philo

Pol. <i>Phil.</i>	Polycarp, <i>To the Philippians</i>
<i>Princ.</i>	<i>De principiis (Peri archōn)</i> , Origen of Alexandria
<i>Protr.</i>	<i>Protrepticus</i> , Aristotle
Ps.-Clem.	Pseudo-Clementines
Ps.-Clem. <i>H.</i>	Pseudo-Clementines, <i>Homilies</i>
Ps.-Clem. <i>Rec.</i>	Pseudo-Clementines, <i>Recognitions</i>
Pss. Sol.	Psalms of Solomon
<i>Pun.</i>	<i>Punica</i> , Silius Italicus
<i>Resp.</i>	<i>Respublica</i> , Plato
<i>Rhet.</i>	<i>Rhetorica</i> , Aristotle
<i>Sacr.</i>	<i>De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini</i> , Philo
<i>Sept.</i>	<i>Septem contra Thebas</i> , Aeschylus
Sib. Or.	Sibylline Oracles
Sir	Sirach
<i>Somn.</i>	<i>De somniis</i> , Philo
<i>Spec.</i>	<i>De specialibus legibus</i> , Philo
στεφ.	<i>Liber Peristephanon</i> , Aurelius Prudentius
<i>Strom.</i>	<i>Stromateis</i> , Clement of Alexandria
T. 12 Patr.	Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs
T. Ash.	Testament of Asher
T. Benj.	Testament of Benjamin
T. Dan.	Testament of Dan
T. Gad.	Testament of Gad
T. Iss.	Testament of Issachar
T. Job	Testament of Job
T. Jos.	Testament of Joseph
T. Jud.	Testament of Judah

T. Levi	Testament of Levi
T. Naph.	Testament of Naphtali
T. Reu.	Testament of Reuben
T. Sim.	Testament of Simeon
T. Zeb.	Testament of Zebulum
Teach. Silv.	NCH VII 4 Teaching of Silvanus
<i>Test.</i>	<i>Ad Quirinum testimonia adversus Judaeos</i> , Cyprian
<i>Tim.</i>	<i>Timaeus</i> , Plato
Tob	Tobit
<i>Vit. Apoll.</i>	<i>Vita Apollonii</i> , Philostratus
Vul.	Vulgate
Yas.	Yasna
<i>Zach.</i>	<i>In Zachariam</i> , Cyril of Alexandria
<i>Zach.</i>	<i>Commentarii in Zachariam</i> , Didymus the Blind
2. Modern	
AB	Anchor Bible
AF	The Apostolic Fathers
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
<i>ANF</i>	<i>The Ante-Nicene Fathers</i> . Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 1885–1887. 10 vols. Reprs. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994
<i>ATHR</i>	<i>Anglican Theological Review</i>
BDAG	Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000
BDF	Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961

BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
Br. Mus. Or.	British Library Oriental Manuscript
<i>BSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CHJ	Cambridge History of Judaism
ConBNT	Coniectanea Biblica: New Testament Series
ConcC	Concordia Commentary
CRINT	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
<i>CurBR</i>	<i>Currents in Biblical Research</i>
DAV	Die Apostolischen Väter
<i>DNTB</i>	<i>Dictionary of New Testament Background</i> . Edited by Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000
<i>DSSR</i>	<i>The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader</i> . Edited by Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov. 6 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2004–2005
<i>EBib</i>	Etudes bibliques
ECA	Early Christian Apocrypha
ECL	Early Christianity and Its Literature
ECS	Early Christian Studies
FC	Fathers of the Church
GAP	Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha
GE	Montanari, Franco. <i>GE – The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek</i> . Leiden: Brill, 2015
ICC	International Critical Commentary

<i>IDBSup</i>	<i>Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume.</i> Edited by Keith Crim. Nashville: Abingdon, 1976
<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
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KAV	Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern
JAJSup	Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JCTCRSS	Jewish and Christian Texts in Context and Related Studies Series
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LDSS	The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls
LEC	Library of Early Christianity
Lewis	Lewis, Charlton T. <i>An Elementary Latin Dictionary.</i> Oxford; Oxford University Press, 1969
Lewis & Short	Lewis, Charlton T. and Charles Short. <i>A Latin Dictionary: Founded on Andrews' Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary.</i> Oxford; Clarendon, 1879
LNTS	The Library of New Testament Studies
LSJ	Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon.</i> 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford; Clarendon, 1996
LSTS	Library of Second Temple Studies
MBPS	Mellen Biblical Press Series
NES	Near Eastern Studies
<i>Neot</i>	<i>Neotestamentica: Journal of the New Testament Society of South Africa</i>
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>

NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NTAF	The New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers
NTL	New Testament Library
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OAF	Oxford Apostolic Fathers
OECT	Oxford Early Christian Texts
OrChrAn	Orientalia Christiana Analecta
OTL	Old Testament Library
PG	Patrologia Graeca [= <i>Patrologia Cursus Completus: Series Graeca</i>]. Edited by Jacques-Paul Migne. 162 vols. Paris, 1857–1886
PPS	Popular Patristics Series
<i>PRSt</i>	<i>Perspectives in Religious Studies</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>RHR</i>	<i>Revue de l'histoire des religions</i>
<i>RSR</i>	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i>
SBLSS	Society of Biblical Literature: Symposium Series
SC	Sources chrétiennes
SEAug	Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum
SFSL	Studies in Functional and Structural Linguistics
Smyth	Smyth, Herbert Weir. <i>Greek Grammar</i> . Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SP	Sacra Pagina
STAC	Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
StPatr	Studia Patristica
STR	Studies in Theology and Religion

Str-B	H. Strack and P. Billerbeck, <i>Kommentar zum Nuen Testament</i> , 6 vols. (Munich, 1922–61)
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha
TDNT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1946–1976
TUGAL	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der alterchristlichen Literatur
VC	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
VCSup	Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Apocalyptic motifs and Two Ways summary (excluding Didache)	138
2. Occurrences of οὐρανός in the NT by singular and plural forms.....	183
3. Occurrences of οὐρανός in the Apostolic Fathers corpus by singular and plural forms.....	184
4. Apocalyptic motifs and Two Ways summary (including Didache).....	207
5. Μέν . . . δέ clause structure in the Didache's Two Ways.....	240
A1. Apocalyptic motifs in Two Ways texts and traditions.....	278

PREFACE

As I finished my baccalaureate education, I remained somewhat disinterested in writing, critical thinking, and academic research. Yet, something happened along the way where my skill-sets, interests, and growing giftedness collided with academic pursuits for the sake of scholarship and the church.

Although the task of writing happens in solitude, no writing project is without a community of persons. Over the past number of years, these persons have influenced this project in many different and necessary ways. First and foremost, I want to honor the faculty and mentors who encouraged, refined, and truly *mentored* me along the way. Professor Brian Vickers guided my thinking, writing, and critical analysis in many helpful ways. His relaxed demeanor helped provide balance to many areas of my life. Professor Michael Haykin brought to life many figures in the stream of Christian tradition. His mentorship in Patristic and Early Christian studies aided my development as a writer, thinker, lecturer, scholar, and mentor. Professor Jarvis Williams quickly brought to bear the need for minority voices in the field of early Christianity. His love for primary sources, contribution to the Society of Biblical Literature, and race shaped much of my interaction with scholars in the field.

Beyond these three mentors in particular, a number of others need to be mentioned. Dr. Jonathan Pennington incessantly and patiently painted a vision for soul care, contribution to scholarship, and the arts that will forever impact my work. Dr. Jeffrey Bingham played an early and humbling role in my initial reflections on early Christianity. As a classical educator, Sandra Lawson took interest in my labors and quickly deepened my love for classical literature. Steve Runge, Brian Arnold,

Matthew Emerson, Eric Vanden Eykel, Daniel Wilson, and Renee Flannery provided invaluable comments throughout the process of writing.

Many Didache scholars were far too kind in reading portions or discussing major ideas that take shape in this work, including Drs. Alan Garrow, Jonathan Draper, John Kloppenborg, and William Varner. Drs. Nancy Pardee and Clayton Jefford, in particular, went far and above in their assistance. I was able to visit Dr. Pardee in Chicago, and we enjoyed an extensive conversation about Didache scholarship. Her meticulous eye for detail and careful argumentation found its way into many pages of this work. Dr. Clayton Jefford, through this process, has become a close mentor. I am extremely grateful for his interest in me, my work, my development as a Didache scholar, and for serving as an external reader. Many ideas in these pages are rooted in keen editorial and conceptual nuances from Drs. Pardee and Jefford.

No adequate research is made possible without the helpful assistance of librarians, many of whom have become friends because of this work. While I was in residence at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Jason Fowler and Ryan Vasut, associate librarians, became friends and sounding boards for my research ideas. In fact, both Jason and Ryan were instrumental in my initial pursuits in Didache research and assisted in locating many of my sources. Dr. Barry Driver, Christi Osterday, and Whitney Motely also have helped my research in many ways. At California Baptist University, Keri Murcay and Barry Parker have gone far and above to help me locate books and articles.

A number of institutions need to be mentioned as they provided invaluable support, collegiality, and encouragement. California Baptist University has fulfilled a dream as I now play a small part in the intellectual and theological formation of students at this school in California. My gratitude is extended to Drs. Ronald Ellis, David Poole, and Dirk Davis—they took many risks by bringing me on board and

have provided ample space to write. In addition, Luke Stamps, John Gill, Jeff Mooney, Jeff Cate, and Chris Morgan have been incredible colleagues by providing laughter, support, and the necessary pressure to excel. Many of the following ideas have been shaped or “aired out” through my time at the North American Patristics Society and the Society of Biblical Literature, both groups have become pivotal for my development as a scholar in New Testament and Early Christianity. My deepest gratitude is extended to an anonymous financial donor through the CSBC who helped my family’s financial needs. Finally, Redeemer Baptist Church has come to be home for me and my family. The liturgy, friendships, and instruction have shaped many portions of these pages.

During this process, my soul was closely knit to a few colleagues that turned into the deepest of friendships. The “234” became a late-night tradition with Brian Davidson. His mind, careful attention to arguments, and honesty shaped much of my thinking. Coleman Ford, Trey Moss, and Brian Renshaw, in their individual ways, shaped my thoughts, brought relational joys, and encouraged me throughout the entire process. To each of these four, our hearts are uniquely joined for my good!

The whole Ph.D. process has been a very tiring and taxing season on my body, my mind, my familial relationships, and more. Especially during the final stages of writing my dissertation, I want to remember these moments as an Ebenezer of God’s provisions. These final moments of writing were marked by personal family heartaches, bouts with cancer and brain tumors, fears of death, and invasive surgeries. It comes as no surprise that even writers, scholars, and teachers are not immune to the pressing weights of life. Depression, stints of anxiety, sadness, and more mark many of these following pages. I am grateful for the encouragement, support, and love that family continues to extend—most notably, Joe and Sandra Holder (my Papa and Maga), Walter and Janet Price, and siblings (Merea, Jenni, Art, Hannah, and Kaitlyn). My mother, Kelli, was a constant source of encouragement

and support for both Ally and me.

I reserve the final space to give the highest honor and recognition to my dream and wife, Allyson, and the joys of my life, Mercy Rea and Caden Price. With regularity I would tell others that “we are almost done with the Ph.D.” Allyson walked through every step of the process with me, acted as a patient sounding board, endured my frustrations, accentuated my joys, and continued to offer the deepest love, support, and affection. My home study policy is to “never have a closed door” with regard to my family. I will forever have joyous memories of Mercy or Caden walking into my study with a coloring book and crayons only to “study with Daddy.” The completion of this dissertation only points to the patient co-laboring efforts of my beloved family.

Shawn J. Wilhite

Riverside, California

December 2017

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Over the past three decades, the ΔΙΔΑΧΗ ΤΩΝ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ (“Teaching of the Twelve Apostles”) has received considerable attention from Didache scholars.¹ Large commentaries have been published.² Specialized works have devoted attention to the composition and genre,³ liturgical traditions,⁴ and its relationship to Matthew, Q, and James.⁵ Yet, even with this devoted attention, many topics still remain relatively unexplored.

¹The following sample is a brief, non-exhaustive, recollection of anglophile monographs, neglecting to mention journal articles, book chapters, and non-English scholarship. Clayton N. Jefford, ed., *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission*, NovTSup 77 (Leiden: Brill, 1995); Jonathan A. Draper, ed., *The Didache in Modern Research*, AGJU 37 (Leiden: Brill, 1996); Vicky Balabanski, *Eschatology in the Making: Mark, Matthew, and the Didache*, SNTSMS 97 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Marcello Del Verme, *Didache and Judaism: Jewish Roots of an Ancient Christian-Jewish Work* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004); Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity*, CRINT: Section III Jewish Traditions in Early Christian Literature 5 (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002); William Varner, *The Way of the Didache: The First Christian Handbook* (New York: University Press of America, 2007); Thomas O’Loughlin, *The Didache: A Window on the Earliest Christians* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010); Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, ECL 14 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015).

²Kurt Niederwimmer, *Die Didache*, KAV 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993); Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache: A Commentary*, trans. Linda M. Maloney, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998); Aaron Milavec, *The Didache: Faith, Hope, & Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50–70 C.E.* (New York: Newman Press, 2003); Aaron Milavec, *The Didache: Text, Translation, Analysis, and Commentary* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003).

³Nancy Pardee, *The Genre and Development of the Didache*, WUNT 2/339 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012).

⁴Jonathan Schwiebert, *Knowledge and the Coming Kingdom: The Didache’s Meal Ritual and Its Place in Early Christianity*, LNTS 373 (New York: T&T Clark, 2008).

⁵Alan J. P. Garro, *The Gospel of Matthew’s Dependence on the Didache*, LNTS 254 (New York: T&T Clark International, 2004); Huub van de Sandt, ed., *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005); Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, eds., *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*, SBLSS 45 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008).

One such area concerns the intersection of apocalyptic categories and the Two Ways metaphor in Did. 1–6.⁶ Catalogues of the Two Ways are listed in the volumes of Margaret McKenna,⁷ Kurt Niederwimmer,⁸ Matthew Larson and Michael Svigel.⁹ Although Two Ways metaphors are found within many early Christian texts, the general consensus remains: the Two Ways antedate Christian tradition, being found in Jewish, Greek and Roman, ancient Persian, and ancient Egyptian literature.¹⁰ According to Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser, the Two Ways in the Didache “is just another witness to the flourishing of this type of teaching in Greek [and Jewish] antiquity.”¹¹

With the discovery of the Qumran Scrolls in 1947,¹² new directions of studies were kindled for both the ancient Two Ways tradition and the Didache.¹³ As 1QS III, 13–IV, 26 provide a sapiential and apocalyptic frame for the Two Ways instruction, other apocalyptic dualisms arise in additional Two Ways ancient forms.

⁶Jonathan Draper has listed and documented areas for further research. See Jonathan A. Draper, “The *Didache* in Modern Research: An Overview,” in *The Didache in Modern Research*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper, AGJU 37 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 1–42; Jonathan A. Draper, “Conclusion: Missing Pieces in the Puzzle or Wild Goose Chase? A Retrospect and Prospect,” in *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, ECL 14 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014), 529–43.

⁷Margaret Mary McKenna, “The Two Ways’ in Jewish and Christian Writings of the Greco-Roman Period: A Study of the Form of Repentance Parenesis” (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1981), 261–73.

⁸Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 59–63.

⁹Matthew Larsen and Michael Svigel, “The First Century Two Ways Catechesis and Hebrews 6:1–6,” in *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, ECL 14 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 481.

¹⁰M. Jack Suggs, “The Christian Two Ways Tradition: Its Antiquity, Form, and Function,” in *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren*, ed. David Edward Aune, NovTSup 33 (Leiden: Brill, 1972), 60–74.

¹¹van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 58.

¹²Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins, “Introduction: Current Issues in Dead Sea Scrolls Research,” in *The Oxford Handbook of The Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 1.

¹³Jean-Paul Audet, “Affinités Littéraires et Doctrinales du ‘Manuel de Discipline,’” *Review Biblique* 59 (1952): 219–38; Jonathan Alfred Draper, “A Commentary on the Didache in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents” (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 1983).

The cosmos and humanity are under the influence and oversight of two polarized heavenly spirits—spirits that depict forces of good and evil, light and darkness, and opposition between God and Beliar. According to Kurt Niederwimmer, “we must suppose that in certain streams of tradition within Judaism and early Christianity the two-ways doctrine was oriented to that of the two spirits.”¹⁴

To further accentuate a problem, the Didache neglects to retain these apocalyptic dualistic features and the two spirits scheme.¹⁵ “As a matter of fact,” assert van de Sandt and Flusser, “it will become clear that these versions are witnesses to a separate circulation of a Two Ways tradition and in some cases represent a closer connection with 1QS III, 13–IV, 26 than does the Didache.”¹⁶ To join the Two Ways with a binary angelic presence may reflect more distant contact with Jewish and Qumran sources.¹⁷

Research Question and Thesis

As one observes the catalogues of ancient Jewish and Christian versions of the Two Ways, particular features materialize such as repeatable literary structures,¹⁸ thematic fixtures, and apocalyptic dualisms. When the Didache is compared to similar Two Ways texts, certain questions arise. Some questions pertain to possible source traditions, the *Sitz im Leben*, or the composite structures of the Didache.¹⁹

¹⁴Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 62–63.

¹⁵van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 59.

¹⁶van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 59.

¹⁷Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 62.

¹⁸In a recent article, Draper inquires about the *Haustafel* in Did. 4.9–11 and parallel Two Ways. In his conclusion, Draper identifies how this portion of Did. is largely verbatim as a central block of teaching for Did., Barn., *Doctr.*, Apos. Con., *Vita Shenudi*, Canons, and Epitome. Jonathan A. Draper, “Children and Slaves in the Community of the Didache and the Two Ways Tradition,” in *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, ECL 14 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 85–121.

¹⁹See Niederwimmer’s commentary. Many of these questions, and more, are raised in

My particular question focuses upon the literary structures and apocalyptic dualisms that accompany an ancient Two Ways genre, especially as these features intersect with the Didache and those in Didache scholarship. If ancient Jewish and Christian Two Ways texts have a common literary structure and reoccurring apocalyptic dualisms, how and why does the Didache neglect to frame the Two Ways within an apocalyptic worldview? I will argue that the Didache's Two Ways coheres with an ancient apocalyptic Two Ways genre, yet the Didachist does not incorporate the apocalyptic features, dualistic connotations, and the two spirits scheme to maintain a purely ethical version of the Two Ways.

In order to consider such a question, it will prove beneficial to consider a few Jewish and early Christian Two Ways texts that demonstrate these apocalyptic dualisms and two spirits scheme. Didache scholars generally note the related texts in 1QS III, 13–IV, 26; Testament of Asher; Galatians 5:16–24; Barn. 18–20; *De Doctrina*; and Herm. Mand. 6.1–2 (35–36).²⁰ For example, the Treatise of the Two Spirits (1QS III, 13–IV, 26) begins with a literary cue of Jewish Wisdom tradition as a master instructs the “sons of light.” He tutors them about the nature of all the children of humanity, dualistic angelic forces that are in conflict with one another, and how the angelic figures interact with human constituents. These two angelic figures subsequently influence humanity in terms of Two Ways ethical instruction (1QS IV, 1–14). “All human behavior,” as Loren Stuckenbruck explains, “whether

relation to the Two Ways. Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 1–54.

²⁰Jean-Paul Audet, *La Didachè: Instructions des Apôtres*, EB (Paris: Gabalda, 1958), 121–66; Suggs, “Christian Two Ways Tradition”; Willy Rordorf and André Tuilier, *La Doctrine Des Douze Apôtres (Didachè): Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction, Notes, Appendice, Annexe et Index*, 2nd ed., SC 248 (Paris: Les Éditions Du Cerf, 1978), 22–34; Clayton N. Jefford, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, VCSup 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1989), 27n17; Niederwimmer, *Die Didache*, 48–54, 61n72; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 30–34, 40n73; Bart D. Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers I*, LCL 24 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 408; Del Verme, *Didache and Judaism*, 246–47; Garrow, *Matthew's Dependence on the Didache*, 67–92; John S. Kloppenborg, “Didache 1.1–6.1, James, Matthew, and the Torah,” in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew Gregory and Christopher Tuckett, NTAf (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 195; Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 50, 77–80, 126, 167.

socially on the inside or outside of the righteous community, comprise the battleground wherein the conflict between opposing spirits is carried out.”²¹ The cosmic distinction of light and darkness projects ethical contrasting boundaries.²² Even some ancient Persian literature is reminiscent of this Jewish tradition and maintains two angelic figures battling one another to vie for a person’s ethical disposition as expressed in two polar ways of being (Yas. 30.3–4).

Moreover, the Epistle of Barnabas continues this two-angel scheme along the lines of cosmological dualisms (Barn. 18–21). For example, the Two Ways is introduced as a form of light and darkness dualism that occupies appointed angelic figures to govern humanity (Barn. 18.1): “light-bearing angels of God” (φωταγωγοί ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ) and “angels of Satan” (ἄγγελοι τοῦ σατανᾶ). These angels, as they rule over humanity, express their influence through means of the Two Ways ethic.

The literary structure and apocalyptic frame of *De Doctrina* is most telling as it is a Latin rendering of a Greek original that contains the Two Ways. This Latin version, although an independent version of the Two Ways, reflects a strikingly similar to the Didache’s Two Ways structure. In this tradition (*Doctr.* 1.1), the two ways (*viae duae*) are framed within the metaphors of life and death (*vtiae ut mortis*), light and darkness (*lucis et tenebrarum*), and contain two angelic beings (*in his constituti sunt angeli duo*). Thus, *De Doctrina*, as a Christianized text, coheres mostly with the literary structure of the Didache. However, it finds more apocalyptic correspondence with the traditions in Barnabas and Treatise of the Two Spirits.²³

Finally, Shepherd of Hermas also likens an angelic presence with the ethical Two Ways (Herm. Mand. 6.1–2 [35–36]). Rather than having explicit

²¹Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *The Myth of Rebellious Angels: Studies in Second Temple Judaism and New Testament Texts*, WUNT 335 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 234.

²²Stuckenbruck, *Myth of Rebellious Angels*, 235.

²³van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 63.

cosmological dualisms, the two angels represent the ethics of the Two Ways and situate themselves within the human psyche. “There are two angels within a person, one of righteousness and one of wickedness” (Herm. Mand. 6.2.1 [36.1]). As Carolyn Osiek observes, the Two Ways theology is both rooted in Greek and Jewish moral traditions, share a general worldview, and “arise from an anthropological dualism that ascribes the experience of good and evil to external causality.”²⁴ Although the cosmological notions are not as prevalent as other traditions, cosmology is now expressed in terms of anthropological categories as angels dwell internally within humans and not externally over humanity.

Hence, I ask the primary question: if these more explicit Two Ways texts and many others like them, which will be discussed in chapter 2, contain nearly ubiquitous apocalyptic coloring and apocalyptic dualisms, how does the Didache refrain from shaping the Two Ways around apocalyptic dualisms and related apocalyptic themes? The Treatise of the Two Spirits, Barnabas, Shepherd of Hermas, *De Doctrina*, and many other Greek, Roman, Persian, Jewish, and early Christian traditions convey aspects of the following apocalyptic elements:

1. angelic or otherworldly figures
2. angelic or otherworldly ethical influence
3. dualistic cosmological structures
4. divine determinism
5. anthropological telic ends

And yet, the Didache neglects to maintain these salient features reminiscent in the Two Ways genre. Accordingly, I suggest the Didachist uses a version of the Jewish Two Ways to ground ethics in Torah-like instruction and communal formation, and

²⁴Carolyn Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 123.

yet does not retain prominent apocalyptic features that often accompany Two Ways texts.

Based on this brief textual survey, a few other secondary and related questions emerge. What is the generic compatibility between an apocalyptic worldview and Didache genres? In what ways are ancient Jewish and early Christian Two Ways texts and traditions influenced by an apocalyptic worldview, if at all? Does the Two Ways in Did. 1–6 correspond to an apocalyptic worldview? Does an apocalyptic worldview find any correspondence with other portions of the Didache? Each of these questions will be addressed in subsequent chapters.²⁵

In this dissertation I aim to contribute to at least four areas in Didache research. The first is the growing field of thematic studies on the Didache. The Didache consists of four literary parts: Two Ways (Did. 1–6); liturgical and ritual instruction (Did. 7–10); ecclesial order and additional instructions (Did. 11–15); and the eschatological paraenetic epilogue (Did. 16). I will assess the influence of the apocalyptic features and two spirits scheme within the first, and perhaps the oldest, major section of the Didache. This assessment will comprise one fourth of the work that could potentially be written on the Didache as it engages apocalyptic features.

Second, I will contribute to the burgeoning discussion of redaction and compositional development in Didache studies. In Nancy Pardee’s work, she notes

²⁵I am aware of some of the methodological problems of comparative literary studies. Michal Bar-Asher Siegal offers a helpful overview of these methodological considerations. In the course of this study, it is vital to distinguish how the appearance of similar concepts does not necessitate a similar literary tradition, source borrowing, or even specific knowledge of antecedent texts. My thesis refrains from making the claim of or speaking to the concepts of literary dependence or literary knowledge. Rather, I am noting some form of coherence in ideas, motifs, and a shared worldview. This approach still refrains from maintaining literary borrowing (though I am not ruling out this borrowing) or awareness of antecedent sources. Bar-Asher Siegal mentions Hindy Najman and the concept of a “constellation of features” that arise from antecedent texts and traditions. In theory, this concept is helpful because the comparison of ideas can be mentioned without reverting to source and literary influences. Michal Bar-Asher Siegal, *Early Christian Monastic Literature and the Babylonian Talmud* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 25–34, 107–8.

the Two Ways section is “the oldest part of the Didache” and “contains the most deeply embedded text-parts.”²⁶ According to Alan Garrow,

The similarity of Did. 1.1–2a, c; 2.2–7 and 3.8–5.2a to the Two Ways material in Barnabas 18–20 and the distinct difference in style and content between these verses and Did. 1.2b, d–e; 1.3–6 and 3.1–7 suggests that Did. 1.1–2a, c; 2.2–7 and 3.8–5.2a represents a Two Ways source separate from the surrounding material.²⁷

Although the origins of this unit cannot be traced precisely,²⁸ my argument does not explicitly entertain the redaction and source traditions of Did. 1–6. Rather, my research will implicitly corroborate some of the redactional nuances of how the Didachist reshapes the literary frame of its version of the Two Ways. As will also be noted, nearly all Two Ways texts offer a somewhat identifiable literary Two Ways structure that is introduced and framed in unique ways; thus, these components demonstrate that each redactor has a certain literary freedom to frame the Two Ways instruction.

Third, I will advance some of the traditional connections between the Didache and the Dead Sea Scrolls, as seen in the works of Audet²⁹ and Jonathan Draper.³⁰ Broader discussions of the Two Ways find corroboration in the Dead Sea Scrolls, including the Didache. This study will argue how first and second-century Two Ways maintain a similar apocalyptic worldview as 1QS III, 13–IV, 26, thereby advancing some of the research of Audet and Draper.

Finally, and most prominently, I will contribute to how Two Ways texts are perceived in early Judaism and early Christianity, thus advancing the brief works

²⁶Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 162.

²⁷Garrow, *Matthew's Dependence on the Didache*, 91.

²⁸Garrow, *Matthew's Dependence on the Didache*, 91n24.

²⁹Audet, *La Didachè*.

³⁰Draper, “Commentary on the Didache.”

of Jack Suggs³¹ and Alistair Stewart-Sykes,³² and Margaret Mary McKenna's dissertation on Two Ways traditions in the Graeco-Roman period.³³ My thesis suggests a concept of genre analysis. The Two Ways can function as a sub-genre of literature that can be used and adjusted to cohere with other prominent literary genres. If a Two Ways text contains a particular literary structure, then it will more often than not qualify as a sub genre coherent with apocalypticism.

Two Ways and Didache Apocalypticism in Contemporary Studies: A Review of Modern Research

In the past one hundred years of biblical and patristic scholarship, students of the Didache continue to build upon the foundations of their predecessors. As Clayton Jefford expressed, “the students of the students of the scholars,”³⁴ I likewise structure the following history of research in terms of generational studies. Prior to the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947,³⁵ first-generation Didache scholars were generally at a disadvantage. For, they were unable to assess ancient Jewish traditions in Qumranic literature—most notably The Treatise of the Two Spirits (1QS III, 13–IV, 26) and The Two Ways (4Q473). Prior to the discovery of Qumran,

³¹Suggs, “Christian Two Ways Tradition.”

³²Alistair Stewart-Sykes, ed., *On the Two Ways: Life or Death, Light or Darkness: Foundational Texts in the Tradition*, PPS 41 (Yonkers, NY: St. Vladimirs Seminary Press, 2011).

³³McKenna, “‘Two Ways’ in Jewish and Christian Writings.”

³⁴Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 3.

³⁵Lim and Collins, “Current Issues in Dead Sea Scrolls,” 1.

Didache scholars attributed the Didache's Two Ways to the creativity of Barnabas,³⁶ Talmud,³⁷ or were generally unclear as to its possible historic antecedent origins.³⁸

In the entire scope of Didache research, other eschatological and apocalyptic studies do emerge. Even Jonathan Draper opined of Did. 16, "It is regrettable that the short apocalypse in Didache 16 has not received much attention from scholars."³⁹ As it intersects with the current dissertation, some attention has been given as to whether or not Did. 16 functions as the original conclusion to the Two Ways and thus creates the notion of a Didache *Vorlage*.⁴⁰ Other studies have focused on the source, redactional, and compositional apocalyptic and eschatological features.⁴¹ Furthermore, a number of apocalyptic and eschatological studies have

³⁶J. Armitage Robinson, *Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache* (New York: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1920), 25. Robinson concludes, "There is no reason *a priori* for imagining that this section of the Epistle is borrowed from an early author: on the contrary, all the internal evidence goes to show that the Two Ways, which plays so great a part in later Christian literature, is the original composition of the writer whom we call Barnabas."

³⁷Charles Taylor, *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles with Illustrations from the Talmud* (Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1886).

³⁸H. D. M. Spence-Jones, *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (London: James Nisbet & Co., 1885), 113–14; Taylor suggest a possible older written or oral Two Ways tradition: Taylor, *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, 22, 44–45; Knopf is more willing to see possible connections between Hebrew Bible traditions: D. Rudolf Knopf, *Die Lehre Der Zwölf Apostel Dei Zwei Clemensbriefe*, DAV 1 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1920), 4; Edgar J. Goodspeed, "The Didache, Barnabas, and the Doctrina," *ATHR* 27 (1945): 228–47. Goodspeed is far clearer than previous research; he offers Jer 21:8; Deut 30:15; Ps 1:6; 16:11; T. Ash. 1.3–5; 1 En. 91; and Matt 7:13 as likely historical antecedents (Goodspeed, "Didache, Barnabas, and Doctrina," 236).

³⁹Draper, "Modern Research," 39.

⁴⁰Draper, "Modern Research," 39; P. Savi, *La dottrina degli apostoli. Ricerche critiche sull'origine del testo con una nota intorno all'eucaristia* (Rome: Begani, 1893); J. M. Creed, "The Didache," *JTS* 39 (1938): 370–87; George Eldon Ladd, "The Eschatology of the *Didache*" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1949), 179; Ladd suggests that the question of a literary unity is quite difficult and offering a solution "from the limited measure in which the subject has been treated" is indefinite; Ernst Bammel, "Schema und Vorlage von *Didache* 16," *StPatr* 4, no. 2 (1961): 253–62; Ernst Bammel, "Pattern and Prototype of *Didache* 16," in *The Didache in Modern Research*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper, *AGJU* 37 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 364–72; P. Vielhauer, "Die *Didache*," in *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur. Einleitung in das Neue Testament, die Apokryphen und die apostolischen Väter* (repr., New York: De Gruyter, 1985); Rordorf and Tuilier, *Didachè*, 80–83; Michelle Slee, *The Church in Antioch in the First Century CE: Communion and Conflict*, *JSNTSup* 244 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2003), 74–75; Del Verme, *Didache and Judaism*, 132, 226.

⁴¹Burnett H. Streeter, "The Much Belaboured *Didache*," *JTS* 37 (1936): 369–74; Richard Glover, "The *Didache's* Quotations and the Synoptic Gospels," *NTSV* (1959): 12–29; John S. Kloppenborg, "Didache 16 6–8 and Special Matthaean Tradition," *ZNW* 70, no. 1–2 (1979): 54–67; Hans Reinhard Seeliger, "Considerations on the Background and Purpose of the Apocalyptic Conclusion of the *Didache*," in *The Didache in Modern Research*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper, *AGJU* 37

focused on either the canonical influence⁴² or, more broadly, thematic studies of eschatology.⁴³ Yet, many of these studies still neglect the apocalyptic features in the Didache's Two Ways.

The following, then, seeks to highlight the history of research of Didache scholarship after the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls as they have entertained the apocalyptic dualisms and two spirits of the Two Ways in Didache and early Christian studies. It will begin in the second generation of Didache studies and then proceed to assess the third generation of Didache research. This section will conclude with overarching summaries and detailed attention given to Two Ways literature in Didache studies. The review of modern research, although some have garnered

(Leiden: Brill, 1996), 373–82; Robert E. Aldridge, “The Lost Ending of the Didache,” *VC* 53, no. 1 (1999): 1–15; Garrow, *Matthew's Dependence on the Didache*.

⁴²B. C. Butler, “The Literary Relations of Didache, Ch. XVI,” *JTS* 11 (1960): 265–83; Jonathan A. Draper, “The Development of ‘the Sign of the Son of Man’ in the Jesus Tradition,” *NTS* 39, no. 1 (1993): 1–21; Jonathan A. Draper, “Resurrection and Zechariah 14.5 in the Didache Apocalypse,” *J ECS* 5, no. 2 (1997): 155–79; Andreas Lindemann, “Die Endzeitrede in *Didache* 16 und die Jesus-Apokalypse in Matthäus 24–25,” in *Sayings of Jesus: Canonical and Non-Canonical: Essays in Honour of Tjitze Baarda*, ed. William L. Petersen, Johan S. Vos, and Henk J. De Jonge, *NovTSup* 89 (Leiden: Brill, 1997); Kari Syreeni, “The Sermon on the Mount and the Two Ways Teaching of the Didache,” in *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?*, ed. Huub van de Sandt (Philadelphia: Fortress, 2005), 87–103; Joseph Verheyden, “Eschatology in the Didache and the Gospel of Matthew,” in *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?*, ed. Huub van de Sandt (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2005), 193–215; Alan J. P. Garrow, “The Eschatological Tradition Behind 1 Thessalonians: *Didache* 16,” *JSNT* 32, no. 2 (2009): 191–215; Alan J. P. Garrow, “The Didache and Revelation,” in *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, *ECL* 14 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 497–514.

⁴³F. F. Bruce, “Eschatology in the Apostolic Fathers,” in *The Heritage of the Early Church: Essays in Honor of the Very Reverend Georges Vasilievich Florovsky*, ed. David Neiman and Margaret Schatkin, *OrChrAn* 195 (Rome: Pontificiae Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1973), 77–89; Aaron Milavec, “The Birth of Purgatory: Evidence of the *Didache*,” *Proceedings: Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Studies* 12 (1992): 91–104; Aaron Milavec, “The Saving Efficacy of the Burning Process in *Didache* 16.5,” in *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History, and Transmission*, ed. Clayton N. Jefford, *NovTSup* 77 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 131–55; Nancy Pardee, “The Curse That Saves (*Didache* 16.5),” in *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History, and Transmission*, ed. Clayton N. Jefford, *NovTSup* 77 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 156–76; Balabanski, *Eschatology in the Making*; Taras Khomych, “The Admonition to Assemble Together in *Didache* 16.2 Reappraised,” *VC* 61 (2007): 121–41; William C. Varner, “The Didache ‘Apocalypse’ and Matthew 24,” *BSac* 165 (2008): 309–22; Jonathan A. Draper, “Eschatology in the Didache,” in *Eschatology of the New Testament and Some Related Documents*, ed. Jan G. Van Der Watt, *WUNT* 2/315 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 567–82; Murray J. Smith, “The Lord Jesus and His Coming in the Didache,” in *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, *ECL* 14 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 363–407.

related arguments corresponding with my argument, still calls for an extended study and contribution to the apocalyptic and eschatological features of the Didache's version of the Two Ways.

Research from 1947–1981: Generation Two and Their Students

Jean-Paul Audet. On the cusp of a new era of biblical scholarship, Jean-Paul Audet made use of the Dead Sea Scrolls, which had then recently been published. He assessed their relationship to the Didache. In 1952 Audet published "Affinités Littéraires et Doctrinales du 'Manuel de Discipline'" that sought to address the origins of the *Duae viae*.⁴⁴ In this attempt he addressed Robinson's concerns about the *Duae viae* being created by Barnabas himself.⁴⁵ Audet suggested that the *Duae viae* was certainly used by Barnabas but was not the creator of such tradition.⁴⁶ Rather, the broader tradition of the *Duae viae*, especially that of the Didache, "breaths altogether the air of Judaism in its literary genre, in its expression and in its spiritual content."⁴⁷

By comparing *De Doctrina* with Didache, Audet questioned why the Christian translator of *De Doctrina* would labor to offer a Latin rendition of the *Viae duae* that more coheres with Judaism rather than with the Didache.⁴⁸ Thus, the

⁴⁴Audet, "Affinités Littéraires et Doctrinales du 'Manuel de Discipline'"; Jean-Paul Audet, "Literary and Doctrinal Relationships of the 'Manual of Discipline,'" in *The Didache in Modern Research*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper, AGJU 37 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 129–47; Audet's and Robert Kraft's findings are now seen to be too focused on an Essene origin. According to Nickelsburg, the Two Ways antedates 1QS. George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Seeking the Origins of the Two-Ways Tradition in Jewish and Christian Ethical Texts," in *A Multifform Heritage: Studies on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Robert A. Kraft*, ed. Benjamin G. Wright, *Homage Series 24* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 95–108.

⁴⁵Audet, "Literary and Doctrinal Relationships," 131; J. A. Robinson, "The Epistle of Barnabas and the Didache," *JTS* 35 (1934): 132, 142, 146.

⁴⁶Audet, "Literary and Doctrinal Relationships," 133.

⁴⁷Audet, "Literary and Doctrinal Relationships," 134.

⁴⁸Audet, "Literary and Doctrinal Relationships," 134–35.

Manual of Discipline, matched with *De Doctrina*, has “a literary framework which is closely related, and therefore also a general line of development which is almost identical.”⁴⁹ Because the metaphors and literary framework are nearly identical between the Manual and *De Doctrina*, Audet offered the following sentiment: “Facts so clearly determined are inexplicable, unless one admits a certain literary relation between the *Duae viae* and the moral instruction of the *Manual of Discipline*.”⁵⁰

This textual analysis, then, as it pertains to the Didache intersected with the following:

1. the *Viae duae* is more primitive than Barnabas and the Didache uses a more primitive tradition;
2. the moral instruction of the *Manual* suggests that the Didache may use a version of the *Duae viae* that is in circulation in Syria-Palestine within the first half of the first century.⁵¹

Although Audet’s work has been critiqued by P. Nautin,⁵² his general work on the Qumran and Two Ways found its way into the suggestions of J. Daniélou,⁵³ Barnard,⁵⁴ Suggs,⁵⁵ and Rordorf.⁵⁶

Audet’s discussion of the Didache continued in his 1958 commentary, *La Didachè: Instructions des Apôtres*.⁵⁷ As Audet concluded his section on Did. 6.1–3,

⁴⁹Audet, “Literary and Doctrinal Relationships,” 141.

⁵⁰Audet, “Literary and Doctrinal Relationships,” 144.

⁵¹Audet, “Literary and Doctrinal Relationships,” 147.

⁵²P. Nautin, “La composition de la ‘Didachê,’” *RHR* 78 (1959): 191–214.

⁵³Jean Daniélou, “Une Source de la Spiritualité Chrétienne dans les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte: La Doctrine des Deux Esprits,” *Dieu Vivant* 25 (1955): 127–36.

⁵⁴See chapter titled, “The Dead Sea Scrolls, Barnabas, the *Didache* and the Later History of the ‘Two Ways.’” L. W. Barnard, *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background* (New York: Schocken Books, 1966), 87–107.

⁵⁵Suggs, “Christian Two Ways Tradition.”

⁵⁶Willy Rordorf, “Une Chapitre d’éthique Judéo-Chrétienne: les deux voies,” *RSR* 60 (1972): 109–28; Willy Rordorf, “An Aspect of the Judeo-Christian Ethic: the Two Ways,” in *The Didache in Modern Research*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper, AGJU 37 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 148–64; also consult Draper, “Commentary on the Didache,” 5.

he offered comments pertinent to the eschatological absence in Did. 6. When comparing *Doctr.* 6.4–6, he asked whether or not this brief exhortation provided a disruption in the transmission of the *Duae viae*.⁵⁸ Noting the difficulty of such question, Audet suggested that the eschatology in *Doctr.* 6 may be more normal but proposed that the preferable Two Ways ends with the current form in Did. 6.1.⁵⁹ So, the eschatological components remained absent from the Didache’s version yet retained in *De Doctrina*.

B. C. Butler. B. C. Butler contributed to the Two Ways discussion by observing a literary influence of canonical material. Butler previously argued that Did. 16 is dependent upon a particular form of the Synoptic tradition that later becomes crystallized in the Gospel of Matthew.⁶⁰ When addressing the Didache’s version of the Two Ways, he argued, “no one can doubt that B [Barnabas], D [Didache], and LD [Doctrina Apostolorum] are related, and closely related to each in their Two Ways sections. The relationships may be collateral, or there may be filiation.”⁶¹ Butler suggested the following summary:⁶²

1. Didache’s version of the Two Ways has many links to M(g) [Matthean form of the Synoptic Tradition] that are absent from Barnabas
2. *De Doctrina* shares with Didache most of the links to M(g).

⁵⁷Audet, *La Didachè*.

⁵⁸Audet, *La Didachè*, 352. “Cette petite exhortation a-t-elle été ajoutée après coup au *Duae viae* dans une partie de sa transmission indépendante, ou au contraire, a-t-elle été enlevée au *Duae viae* de la Did.?”

⁵⁹Audet, *La Didachè*, 352. “Il est difficile de trancher l’alternative, bien que la seconde hypothèse paraisse en soi beaucoup moins probable. L’eschatologie de la *Doctr.* ne présente, semble-t-il, aucun caractère interne qui ait pu conduire qui que ce soit à l’écarter. En revanche, l’addition d’une telle perspective eschatologique à une instruction sur le « chemin de la vie et de la mort » serait en soi tout ce qu’il y a de plus normal à l’époque, à supposer que l’auteur primitif l’eût omise. Il semble donc préférable de croire que le *Duae viae* primitif se terminait avec notre actuel 6:1.”

⁶⁰Butler, “The Literary Relations of Didache, Ch. XVI.”

⁶¹B. C. Butler, “The ‘Two Ways’ in the Didache,” *JTS* 12, no. 1 (1961): 27.

⁶²Butler, “‘Two Ways’ in the Didache,” 28.

When incorporating 1QS III, 13–IV, 26, Butler argued for thematic links between *De Doctrina*, Barnabas, and 1QS as a means to show that Didache is not connected to *De Doctrina*'s version of the pre-Christian Two Ways.⁶³

L. W. Barnard. In 1966, L. W. Barnard observed the unmanageable proportions of scholarship on the Qumranic literature and sought to observe the literary affinities between the Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian post-Apostolic literature—most notably Epistle of Barnabas, Didache, and an Egyptian recension of the early form of the Two Ways.⁶⁴ Much like Audet, Barnard revisited the concerns of Barnabas as the source of the Two Ways for Didache. Instead, Barn. 18–20 corresponded high affinities with 1QS III, 13–IV, 26 and thus Barnard identified an older Two Ways that could influence the Didache's version.⁶⁵ Yet, when Barnard seeks to address the Didache, he briefly observed the Syrian⁶⁶ and Egyptian⁶⁷ traditions with no engagement of the literary features. His concern, especially when focusing on the Didache, was a two-fold textual transmission of a Two Ways recension.⁶⁸

M. Jack Suggs. The work of M. Jack Suggs resembles most closely the questions and concerns that I anticipate to address. In “The Christian Two Ways Tradition: Its Antiquity, Form, and Function,”⁶⁹ Suggs discussed the general form and content of selected Two Ways traditions. He argued that these traditions are

⁶³Butler, “‘Two Ways’ in the Didache,” 35.

⁶⁴Barnard, *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers*, 87.

⁶⁵Barnard, *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers*, 92–99.

⁶⁶Barnard, *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers*, 101–2.

⁶⁷Barnard, *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers*, 102–6.

⁶⁸Barnard, *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers*, 107.

⁶⁹Suggs, “Christian Two Ways Tradition.”

more than a metaphor of dualistic contrasts, but follow a general pattern that may represent a particular genre.⁷⁰ He rightly observed the following patterns: (1) sharply dualistic introduction; (2) lists of “virtues” and “vices”; (3) concluding eschatological admonition.⁷¹

The content of the Two Ways is thoroughly Jewish and extends beyond the Dead Sea Scrolls into the Hebrew Bible (cf. Deut 30:15–20; Jer 21:8; Ps 1; Prov 2:12–15).⁷² Building from previous research, Suggs suggested that the Two Spirits in 1QS III, 13–IV, 26, some early Christian virtue-vice catalogs, and the Two Ways patterns correspond to a common genre that is rooted in Judaism after coming in contact with Iranian mythology.⁷³ Upon evaluating the function and situation of 1QS III, 13–IV, 26, Testament of Asher, Galatians 5:17–24, Barnabas, *De Doctrina*, and Didache, Suggs concluded that these traditions form a particular genre of “in-group” and “out-group” consciousness that point to a sectarian community.⁷⁴

Willy Rordorf. Willy Rordorf wrote on the aspects of the ethical components of the Two Ways traditions.⁷⁵ In his 1972 article, Rordorf addressed three problems: (1) provenance of *Duae viae*; (2) Sitz im Leben of the *Duae viae*; (3) *Duae viae*'s relation to the *Nachleben* in Christianity.⁷⁶ As it pertains to the dualistic qualities of broader Two Ways traditions, Rordorf suggested two different recessions.

⁷⁰Suggs, “Christian Two Ways Tradition,” 63–64.

⁷¹Suggs, “Christian Two Ways Tradition,” 64.

⁷²Suggs, “Christian Two Ways Tradition,” 64.

⁷³Suggs, “Christian Two Ways Tradition,” 66–67.

⁷⁴Suggs, “Christian Two Ways Tradition,” 73.

⁷⁵Rordorf, “Une Chapitre d'éthique Judéo-Chrétienne: les deux voies”; Rordorf, “An Aspect of the Judeo-Christian Ethic.”

⁷⁶Rordorf, “An Aspect of the Judeo-Christian Ethic,” 148.

Is it not possible that the different forms of the Christian *duae viae* also reflect the *two* traditions? From this point of view, the *Doctrina apostolorum* and the Epistle of Barnabas take their place in the *dualistic* lineage of moral instruction that is found in the *Manual of Discipline*, while the Didache and the documents derived from it represent the non-dualistic lineage of moral instruction which was formed in the course of the history of Israel and which has passed into the sapiential and synagogal teaching of Judaism (and eventually into the catechism given to proselytes).⁷⁷

According to Rordorf's reconstruction, there were therefore two different recensions that emerge which contained dualistic categories. One was limited to non-dualistic moral instruction and was eventually used for catechumens.

Later in 1978, Rordorf, along with André Tuilier, commented on the text traditions in Did. 1–6 within the *Sources Chrétiennes* edition of the Didache and *De Doctrina*.⁷⁸ They commented on the commonality of dualistic traditions in Barnabas and *De Doctrina*, and how these three texts presented the traditions differently.⁷⁹

Upon noting the similar dualistic features between 1QS III, 13–IV, 26, Barnabas, and *De Doctrina*, Rordorf and Tuilier argued partially in favor of my proposed thesis. They concluded by suggesting that the Didache maintains a strictly ethical tradition as compared to the other Two Ways text recensions and is part of the sapiential tradition that excludes features of dualistic concepts.⁸⁰

Margaret Mary McKenna. In 1981 Margaret Mary McKenna completed a dissertation on the Two Ways literature during the Graeco-Roman era entitled, “The Two Ways’ in Jewish and Christian Writings of the Graeco-Roman Period: A Study

⁷⁷Rordorf, “An Aspect of the Judeo-Christian Ethic,” 153.

⁷⁸Rordorf and Tuilier, *Didachè*.

⁷⁹Rordorf and Tuilier, *Didachè*, 27. “Certes, l’*Épître de Barnabé* et la *Doctrina apostolorum* s’apparentent étroitement par la tradition dualiste qui leur est commune; mais l’ordre de présentation est très différent dans les deux textes, qui fournissent en définitive des recensions très éloignées l’une de l’autre pour les *Deux voies*.”

⁸⁰Rordorf and Tuilier, *Didachè*, 26. “Pour la *Didachè*, l’enseignement des *Deux voies* es situe sur un plan strictement éthique et il prolonge à cet égard la tradition sapientiale de l’Ancien Testament qui exclut pour sa part toute conception dualiste.”

of the Form of Repentance Parenthesis.”⁸¹ McKenna’s work asked and addressed three specific questions:

1. Do Two Ways texts have a typical structure, content, general function(s), life context(s) and common features? If so, how can Two Ways texts be defined in form critical terms?
2. Do Two Ways texts constitute a literary genre, or/and a *gattung* (an originally independent unit of pre-literary material with a typical structure, setting, content, function, etc. usually found embedded in a larger literary entity)?
3. How are the origin and transmission of this kind of text best explained within Judaism and Christianity? What sort of continuity and/or discontinuity exists between the Jewish and Christian Two Ways traditions in Greco-Roman times?⁸²

In terms of her specific contribution to the study of the Didache, she noted that it offers a simple presentation of the Two Ways metaphor as it relates to death and life. Yet, as she noted, “It is difficult to know whether this represents the introduction of the original Didache, or the work of a later redactor who purged it of dualistic connotations.”⁸³

With regard to the conclusion of the Two Ways tradition (Did. 6.1–2), she observed a corruption of the text tradition.

D’s [Didache] concluding section is extremely corrupt with regard to the representation of CS [common Jewish source], undoubtedly due to the expanded community manual context into which the Two Ways was placed. But at some point in its redactional history some traditional CS Two Ways materials regarding antithetical “ends” and parenesis was moved to the end of the manual. In its final redaction this material was expanded with apocalyptic materials from NT traditions. It is this that explains its present somewhat truncated ending.⁸⁴

⁸¹McKenna, “Two Ways’ in Jewish and Christian Writings.”

⁸²McKenna, “Two Ways’ in Jewish and Christian Writings,” 2–3.

⁸³McKenna, “Two Ways’ in Jewish and Christian Writings,” 185.

⁸⁴McKenna, “Two Ways’ in Jewish and Christian Writings,” 185–86.

In other words, McKenna's argument observed the redactional components of the Didache's Two Ways tradition and concluded the apocalyptic reduction in Did. 6 is due to the composite expansion of the *Manual* and relegated to Did. 16.

Furthermore, as it pertains to the light-darkness, life-death dualisms, as well as the angelic figures, McKenna again noted the similar redactional history.

This dynamic, mythopoetic element marks B's [Barnabas] and DA's [*De Doctrina*] version, and most probably it did CS' [common Jewish source] as well, and quite assuredly D1's [hypothetical vorlage of Didache or *Doctrina*] too. Its absence in D's [Didache] Two Ways is most probably the result of a deliberate purge at some point of its redactional history.⁸⁵

In terms of ancient Two Ways traditions, McKenna's contribution identified the broad forms in which Two Ways traditions appear. She argued the rhetorical element of ancient Two Ways tradition is that of repentance. For example, she argued that "the constancy of this function of repentance parenesis so understood in a variety of life contexts is no surprise since the very nature of the Two Ways metaphor is well geared to it."⁸⁶ With the Two Ways relating to *bundesformular*, prophetic preaching, wisdom teaching, communitarian manuals, catechesis literature, liturgy, ethical preaching/teaching, models for teaching, and missionary teaching, "these life contexts are appropriate to and expressive of the common function of repentance parenesis which constitutes one of the basic elements of Two Ways texts."⁸⁷

⁸⁵McKenna, "'Two Ways' in Jewish and Christian Writings," 195.

⁸⁶McKenna, "'Two Ways' in Jewish and Christian Writings," 276. Also, "We have found one persistent function common to all Two Ways texts, repentance parenesis" (McKenna, "'Two Ways' in Jewish and Christian Writings," 451)

⁸⁷McKenna, "'Two Ways' in Jewish and Christian Writings," 276–77. Of the broad literary forms and frameworks that McKenna identifies, the Two Ways can be identified in (1) legal, (2) paraenetic, (3) wisdom/philosophical, and (4) liturgical settings. Within the wisdom/philosophical categories, Two Way traditions can assume the following literary form or framework: wisdom poems, apologetic treatises, meditations, sayings, eschatological reflections, and apocalyptic revelations.

Because McKenna's work is similar to my suggested argument, a few comments are in order. First, my argument is not necessarily offering a form critical reading of the Two Ways. Second, I do not seek to offer comments on the social and rhetorical function of the vast majority of ancient Two Ways tradition—hence, her primary focus on the social rhetorical effect of repentance. Rather, I build from McKenna's historical efforts and identify the apocalyptic components of ancient Two Ways texts and traditions—of which, she does briefly note.⁸⁸

Research from 1983–Present: Generation Three and Their Students

Jonathan A. Draper. In 1983 Jonathan Draper wrote his dissertation on the text relations between the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Didache entitled, “A Commentary on the Didache in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents.”⁸⁹ In this volume, he contributed to Didache research by noting the similarities of the Didache and the DSS:

The scrolls and their related documents have been studied for parallels in the use of words, in religious practice, and in community organization, which throw light on the Did. No direct connection between the communities is assumed, or even expected, and the belief is that both similarities and difference may help to build up more clearly a picture of the community of the Did.⁹⁰

The DSS are selected and balanced by other ancient Jewish literature of a similar period, because “not everything which is contained in the Scrolls can be used as evidence of the origin of a particular practice or belief in that community, unless there is clear evidence of a divergence from other Jewish sources.”⁹¹

⁸⁸McKenna, “Two Ways’ in Jewish and Christian Writings,” 277.

⁸⁹Draper, “Commentary on the Didache.”

⁹⁰Draper, “Commentary on the Didache,” 7.

⁹¹Draper, “Commentary on the Didache,” 7–8.

With respect to Did. 1 and 6, Draper identified a close similarity between a variety of texts within Qumranic literature.⁹² Concerning Did. 6.1–2, *Doctr.* 6.4–6 recorded a different ending that finds closer eschatological correspondence with 1QS IV, 6–8, and Barn. 21.⁹³ Instead, Draper appeared to affirm the findings of Bammel in that Did. 1–6 and 16 are part of the same redactional stage.⁹⁴ Consequently, although 1QS IV, Barn. 21, and *Doctr.* 6 all contain apocalyptic features, alteration to the tradition may occur because Did. 1–6 and 16 may be part of a similar redactional stage. “Eschatological material is peculiarly subject to modification in the course of tradition, which would explain the lack of uniformity in the transmission of this part of the catechism.”⁹⁵

Regarding other versions of the Two Ways tradition, Draper expressed how little interest has been devoted to *why* and *how* Barnabas and Didache use the Two Ways instruction in such different contexts and styles.⁹⁶ Between Barnabas and Didache, two situations are presented that utilize “a binary opposition of irreconcilable forces.”⁹⁷ Whereas Barnabas has a particular polemic that undergirds a certain worldview, the binary Ways are heightened by the cosmological warfare between the angels of God and the angels of Satan.⁹⁸ Though these cosmological

⁹²Regarding Did. 1.1, note the following argument by Draper: Draper, “Commentary on the Didache,” 17, 20–26.

⁹³Draper, “Commentary on the Didache,” 130–31.

⁹⁴Draper, “Commentary on the Didache,” 132; Bammel, “Schema und Vorlage von *Didache* 16”; Bammel, “Pattern and Prototype.”

⁹⁵Draper, “Commentary on the Didache,” 132.

⁹⁶Jonathan A. Draper, “Barnabas and the Riddle of the Didache Revisited,” *JSNT* 58 (1995): 90.

⁹⁷Draper, “The Riddle of the Didache,” 96.

⁹⁸Draper, “The Riddle of the Didache,” 98.

structures are joined with paraenesis, the Didache utilizes this material as “conventional catechesis for new members of the community.”⁹⁹

Furthermore, Draper inquired as to why the Didachist (Did. 6.2–3) omitted the material in *Doctr.* 6.4–5, especially if it were originally present.¹⁰⁰ Appealing to *certamina* and *corona*, *De Doctrina* echos material in the Two Ways tradition of the Dead Sea Scrolls.¹⁰¹ Yet, *Doctr.* 6.6 is “clearly a late Christian interpolation, since it presupposes a late, high Christology nowhere in evidence in the rest of the Christian Two Ways tradition.”¹⁰²

Draper did, however, offer helpful comments as it pertains to the Didache’s Two Ways tradition and its relation to Did. 16. “It could be argued,” explains Draper, “that an eschatological conclusion had always been a part of the very early Two Ways catechetical tradition (as in *Doctrina apostolorum* and the Epistle of Barnabas 21; Did. 16, see Bammel 1996), which may even have been Jewish and pre-Christian in origin.”¹⁰³ Although relatively underdeveloped in Draper’s literature, he observed how Did. 16 may function as an eschatological component for the Two Ways Didache tradition—especially with ὑπερ τῆς ζωῆς (Did. 16.1) linking back to the Two Ways.¹⁰⁴ His *Doktorvator*, Bammel, argued for a similar theory.¹⁰⁵

⁹⁹Draper, “The Riddle of the Didache,” 99.

¹⁰⁰Jonathan A. Draper, “A Continuing Enigma: the ‘Yoke of the Lord’ in Didache 6.2–3 and early Jewish-Christian Relations,” in *The Image of the Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, ed. Peter J. Tomson and Doris Lambers-Petry, WUNT 158 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 114.

¹⁰¹Draper, “A Continuing Enigma,” 114.

¹⁰²Draper, “A Continuing Enigma,” 114.

¹⁰³Jonathan A. Draper, “The Two Ways and Eschatological Hope: A Contested Terrain in Galatians 5 and the *Didache*,” *Neot* 45, no. 2 (2011): 221; the article mentioned by Draper is Bammel, “Pattern and Prototype.”

¹⁰⁴Draper, “Two Ways and Eschatological Hope,” 241; Draper, “Eschatology in the Didache,” 568, 573.

¹⁰⁵Jonathan A. Draper, “Walking the Way of Life or the Way of Death in the Present

The resurrection of the saints in Did. 16 corresponded to ethics in the Two Ways: way of life adherents are the resurrected whereas way of death wayfarers will undergo judgment.¹⁰⁶ While it remains true that cosmological dualism and angelic beings reside over the Two Ways in other ancient literature, Draper argued “covenantal nomism is the earlier aspect of the Two Ways schema and more central to the logic of early Jewish ideas of the resurrection than cosmological dualism.”¹⁰⁷ So then, to walk along the way of life secures “life and gathering into the kingdom in the eschatological age,” which is maintained in order to ascertain “perfection” (Did. 6.2; 16.2) when the Lord comes with his resurrected righteous ones.¹⁰⁸

Draper then sought to address the oversight in Christopher Rowland’s volume, *The Open Heaven*,¹⁰⁹ by inquiring of the apocalyptic components within the Didache. Draper reads Did. 11.11 as the “performance arena” of heavenly visions and the increase of false prophesy as the signs of an imminent *eschaton*.¹¹⁰ He reads 1QS III, 13–IV, 26 in terms of this prophetic visitation—and not the Two Ways (Did. 1–6)—by observing, “In the *Manual of Discipline*, God established the spirit of truth and the spirit of falsehood from the beginning and the way of human beings is either

Existence as the Beginning of Eschatological Life or Death in the Renewed Earthly Kingdom: The Rationale for the Limitation of the Resurrection to the Righteous Departed in *Didache* 16,6–8,” in *Resurrection of the Dead: Biblical Traditions in Dialogue*, ed. Geert van Oyen and Tom Shepherd, BETL 249 (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 383.

¹⁰⁶Draper, “Walking the Way of Life,” 385; Draper, “Resurrection in the Didache,” 158n13, 167–68, 176–78; Also consider Milavec, “Saving Efficacy of the Burning Process,” 138n14.

¹⁰⁷Draper, “Walking the Way of Life,” 386.

¹⁰⁸Draper, “Walking the Way of Life,” 401.

¹⁰⁹Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1982).

¹¹⁰Jonathan A. Draper, “Performing the Cosmic Mystery of the Church in the Communities of the *Didache*,” in *The Open Mind: Essays in Honour of Christopher Rowland*, ed. Jonathan Knight and Kevin Sullivan, LNTS 522 (London: T&T Clark, 2015), 38.

on the one or the other in a cosmic battle between the angels of light and the angels of darkness before the ‘visitation’ puts an end to this (1QS III, 13–IV, 26).”¹¹¹

Clayton N. Jefford. Clayton Jefford has contributed nearly thirty years of research to the text of the Didache. In his 1988 revised dissertation, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*,¹¹² he investigated the Jesus traditions in the Didache with a particular focus towards M Matthean material.¹¹³ In the course of this study, Jefford addressed how the Didache shares common sayings tradition along with the Matthean redactor,¹¹⁴ yet the two texts represented two disparate worldviews.¹¹⁵ Jefford later modified his findings and noted how he has moved from a more traditional model to understand “that the Didache may have evolved alongside the composition of Matthew within a shared community setting.”¹¹⁶

This evolved notion is helpful to perceive Jefford’s contribution to the Didache’s use of other Two Ways traditions.¹¹⁷ With regard to Did. 1–5, Jefford offered two observations: (1) chaps. 1–5 (and 16) might reflect the earliest form of the Didache; and, (2) Did. 1.1 appeared as an original and integral part of the

¹¹¹Draper, “Performing the Cosmic Mystery of the Church,” 38.

¹¹²Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*.

¹¹³Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 18–19.

¹¹⁴Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 91.

¹¹⁵Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 117.

¹¹⁶Clayton N. Jefford, “The Wisdom of Sirach and the Glue of the Matthew-Didache Tradition,” in *Intertextuality in the Second Century*, ed. E. Jeffrey Bingham and Clayton N. Jefford, Bible in Ancient Christianity 11 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 9.

¹¹⁷Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 20–21. He observes layers within the Did.’s evolved composition. Helpfully, he notes five essential assumptions: (1) The Did. is an evolving tradition that may have up to four different layers; (2) Along with others, the Did. could possibly be the product of a later tradition (third through fourth century); (3) The Did. offers conflicting perspectives of the Synoptic Gospels. That is, it reflects knowledge of sayings from the Gospels, but liturgical traditions are in concert with, although not derived from, the Gospels; (4) Various witnesses attest to the Did., but H54 is used as the core of the discussion. Because this is an eleventh century text, it may reflect some development within the tradition; (5) The Did. reflects 6 primary topical divisions—reflective of minor redactional layers.

Didache's source.¹¹⁸ With respect to the second observation, Jefford considered the presence of other Two Ways motifs and Two Ways literary structures.¹¹⁹ Because Did. 1.1 does not find immediate corroboration with Barn. 18, it may demonstrate that Didache and Barnabas are dependent upon a similar source¹²⁰ and Didache may also reflect a specific Two Ways sayings strand from early Jewish wisdom traditions.¹²¹ A Two Ways metaphor does appear in Matthew 7:13–14 and Luke 13:24 that reflects an “eschatological setting whose dualism of a future judgment provides the rhetorical framework.”¹²² Accordingly, Jefford observed that the Didache retains a wisdom *logion* within a dualistic framework, but void of an eschatological setting.¹²³

Regarding the dualistic cosmology and angelology of 1QS III, 13–IV, 26, the Didache did not retain these features probably as a “result of the process of textual transmission or may be the intended effort of the Didachist to lend an ethical tone to Did. 1.1.”¹²⁴ So, Did. 1–6, according to Jefford, “combines both the elements of dualism that are common to the immersion ritual of 1QS III, 13–IV, 26 and the paraenetic character of sapiential literature that was spawned within the Jewish wisdom tradition” but has cast these traditions into an ethical framework.¹²⁵

¹¹⁸Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 23.

¹¹⁹Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 23.

¹²⁰Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 23.

¹²¹Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 24.

¹²²Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 26.

¹²³Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 26.

¹²⁴Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 27.

¹²⁵Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 28; both Kamlah and Suggs suggest the nature of “life and death” may be associated with baptismal rituals. Ehrhard Kamlah, *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament*, WUNT 7 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1964); Suggs, “Christian Two Ways Tradition.”

Concerning the apocalyptic elements in Did. 6, Jefford remains unpersuaded of their presence.¹²⁶ He opined that even some of the themes in Did. 16 are *atypical* of the general tenor of the Didache on the basis that the text does not direct any particularly eschatological urgency.¹²⁷ Although Did. 6 may reflect parallel materials in the Gospels, the Didache retains no knowledge of a synoptic context. Thus, a redactor has replaced an eschatological vision of the synoptic settings. “I suggest that the Redactor does not depend upon the witness of the Gospels for this material at all but, rather, is dependent directly upon the tradition that provided the material to the Gospels themselves—a tradition that was adapted into an apocalyptic context by the synoptic Evangelists alone.”¹²⁸ So, it is an apocalyptic context that remains with the synoptic Gospels material and does not necessarily transfer over to Did. 6.1–2. Instead, because Barn. 21.1 contains the notion of recompense and resurrection, Jefford suggested the removal of apocalyptic components is due to the insertion of Did. 7–15. “There may be some reason to think that a similar focus was originally associated with the ‘two ways’ of the Didache if chapter 16 once served as the conclusion to these materials before the insertion of chapters 7–15.”¹²⁹

John S. Kloppenborg. In 1976 John Kloppenborg assessed the use of Jesus Tradition in the Didache. His MA Thesis, “The Jesus Sayings in the Didache,”¹³⁰ more broadly concluded that Did. 1.3–2.1 harmonizes material from Mathew, Luke, and a few other traditions. In building upon this research,

¹²⁶Also see Clayton N. Jefford, “Tradition and Witness in Antioch: Acts 15 and Didache 6,” in *Perspectives on Contemporary New Testament Questions: Essays in Honor of T.C. Smith*, ed. Edgar V. McKnight (Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1992), 75–89.

¹²⁷Clayton N. Jefford, “Tradition and Witness in Antioch: Acts 15 and Didache 6,” *PRSt* 19, no. 4 (1992): 414.

¹²⁸Jefford, “Tradition and Witness in Antioch,” 414.

¹²⁹Clayton N. Jefford, *Didache: The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, ECA 5 (Salem, OR: Polebridge Press, 2013), 54.

Kloppenborg evaluated the moral exhortations in Did. 1–5 in, “The Transformation of Moral Exhortation in Didache 1–5.”¹³¹ Here, Kloppenborg noted that the Didache does not parallel *De Doctrina*, Barnabas, or the Canons of the Holy Apostles in some areas—most notably Did. 1.3b–2.1 and 6.2–3, which are a later interpolation into the Two Ways document.¹³² According to Kloppenborg, a total of at least three Two Ways recessions emerged after evaluating some early traditions:

(α) a loose topical organization, as reflected in Barnabas

(β) more topical organization, as reflected in Didache, Apostolic Constitutions, and *De Doctrina*

(γ) a recension that closely follows β , but lacks the Way of Death material and shares elements with α , as reflected in *Canons* and *Epitome*.¹³³

The similarities of the angelic components between 1QS III, 13–IV, 26, Barnabas, and Testament of Asher do not necessarily reflect literary dependence, but “serve to illustrate the extent to which the Didache has demythologized this language.”¹³⁴ Furthermore, even the ethical features after the Ways of Death in 1QS IV, 15 do “not lose sight of the apocalyptic framework and remains certain of the triumph of the spirit of light and the destruction of the spirit of perversity, it ethicizes eschatology and replicates the cosmic struggle of the Two Angels in the moral struggle within the human heart.”¹³⁵ Kloppenborg remarked that the Didache does not attempt to offer its ethical teaching with an eschatological ground¹³⁶—even

¹³⁰John S. Kloppenborg, “The Sayings of Jesus in the Didache” (MA thesis, University of St. Michael’s College, 1976).

¹³¹John S. Kloppenborg, “The Transformation of Moral Exhortation in *Didache* 1–5,” in *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History, and Transmission*, ed. Clayton N. Jefford, NovTSup 77 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 88–109.

¹³²Kloppenborg, “Transformation of Moral Exhortation,” 90–91.

¹³³Kloppenborg, “Transformation of Moral Exhortation,” 92.

¹³⁴Kloppenborg, “Transformation of Moral Exhortation,” 93.

¹³⁵Kloppenborg, “Transformation of Moral Exhortation,” 94.

¹³⁶Kloppenborg, “Transformation of Moral Exhortation,” 96.

Did. 16 is foreign to the Two Ways section and Did. 6.1 serves as the original conclusion to the Two Ways document.¹³⁷ Thus, whereas the *Manual* maintains the apocalyptic struggle of the two angels as an ethical motivation, “the Didache has eliminated both angels and eschatology”¹³⁸ and grounds the ethical notions of the Didache in Torah.¹³⁹

In his 2005 article, “Didache 1.1–6.1, James, Matthew, and the Torah,” Kloppenborg maintained a similar three-fold text recension.¹⁴⁰ Here, the role of speech ethics, partiality and *dypsychia*, and Leviticus 19:18 and the role of Torah joined together a Torah-observant Jesus movement.¹⁴¹ Yet, when the Two Ways section of Barnabas was compared with the Didache, this comparison allowed “us to track some of the redactional transformations that contributed to the final form of the TW.”¹⁴²

Sebastian P. Brock. A brief 1990 article by Sebastian Brock entitled, “The Two Ways and the Palestinian Targum,”¹⁴³ highlighted a coherent connection between Jewish Targum, Rabbinic literature and its Hebrew Bible antecedents. Brock inquired about the Palestinian Targum tradition of Deuteronomy 30:15 and 30:19.¹⁴⁴

¹³⁷Kloppenborg, “Transformation of Moral Exhortation,” 96–97.

¹³⁸Kloppenborg, “Transformation of Moral Exhortation,” 97.

¹³⁹Kloppenborg, “Transformation of Moral Exhortation,” 109. Kloppenborg notes, “It is also striking how different the Two Ways of the Didache/*Doctrina* is from that of Barnabas or the *Manual*, both in the lack of the apocalyptic appeals and in the marked shift toward the authority of the Torah.”

¹⁴⁰Kloppenborg, “*Didache*, James, Matthew, and Torah,” 196.

¹⁴¹Kloppenborg, “*Didache*, James, Matthew, and Torah,” 219.

¹⁴²Kloppenborg, “*Didache*, James, Matthew, and Torah,” 219.

¹⁴³Sebastian Brock, “The Two Ways and the Palestinian Targum,” in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History*, ed. Philip R. Davies and Richard T. White, JSOTSup 100 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 139–52.

¹⁴⁴Brock, “Two Ways and Palestinian Targum,” 140. Brock offers the following readings (Brock, “Two Ways and Palestinian Targum,” 140–41). Deut 30:15 MT: “See, I have provided before you (sing.) this day life and good, death and evil.” *Neofiti* (text): “See that I have set out before you

According to Brock, “the word of the Didache (1.1 ὁδοὶ δὲ δύο εἰσι, μία τῆς ζωῆς καὶ μία τοῦ θανάτου) is clearly closer to the Palestinian Targum tradition in Deut. 30 than is that of Barnabas 18.”¹⁴⁵ Whereas the Didache lacks the light/darkness, and angelic cosmology of 1QS and Barnabas, “the different witnesses to the Palestinian Targum tradition at Deut. 30.15, 19 all introduce an eschatological element: the two roads lead to life or death, the Garden of Eden, or Gehinnom, in the world to come.”¹⁴⁶

Kurt Niederwimmer. Kurt Niederwimmer composed a German commentary on the Didache in 1993,¹⁴⁷ later translated into English in 1998.¹⁴⁸ Clayton Jefford recognized Niederwimmer’s volume as the “pinnacle of Didache research toward the end of the twentieth century.”¹⁴⁹ As it pertains to the present research question, Niederwimmer regarded that the Didachist retains only the beginning of the conclusion to the Two Ways tractate (Did. 6.1). Whereas *De Doctrina* includes an eschatological prospect, the Didachist replaced such conclusion

(pl.) this day the order of life and the good, and the order of pestilence and their opposites.” *Neofiti* (margin): “See that I have set out before you this day the life of the world to come and the blessing of the Garden of Eden, and the death by which the wicked will die and the evil state of Gehinnom.” *Fragment Targum* (V): “See, I have put before you (pl.) this day the way of life, which the good way, and the way of mortality which is the evil way.” *Pseudo-Jonathan*: “See that I have set out before you this day the way of life, by which the good reward for the just is fulfilled, and the way of death by which the evil reward for the wicked is fulfilled.” Deut 30:19 MT: “(I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day), life and death have I provided before you (sing.), blessing and curse; and you will choose life, in order that you may live, (you and your seed).” *Neofiti*: “The way of life and the way of mortality have I provided for you, the blessing and the curses; and you will choose the way of life, in order that you may live.” *Pseudo-Jonathan*: “Life and death have I set out before you, blessing and its opposite; and you will take delight in the way of life, which is the Law, in order that you may live in the world to come.”

¹⁴⁵Brock, “Two Ways and Palestinian Targum,” 143.

¹⁴⁶Brock, “Two Ways and Palestinian Targum,” 144.

¹⁴⁷Niederwimmer, *Die Didache*.

¹⁴⁸Niederwimmer, *Didache*.

¹⁴⁹Clayton N. Jefford, “Introduction: Dynamics, Methodologies, and Progress in Didache Studies,” in *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, ECL 14 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 3.

with an appendix of his own pen (Did. 6.2–3).¹⁵⁰ It is, however, *Doctr.* 6.1, 4–5 that contains an “original parenetic epilogue.”¹⁵¹

In terms of the broader Two Ways metaphor, Niederwimmer observed a general stabilized pattern. Within some of the early Jewish traditions, “the topos of the two ways combined with a teaching about two spirits (or two angels).”¹⁵² The Qumranic doctrine, moreover, presented certain parallels about the two spirits/angels with the Two Ways that informs an early Two Ways tractate. This angelic component is part of a recension that informed Barnabas and *De Doctrina*, but was absent from the recension that informs the *Didache*.¹⁵³ So, for Niederwimmer, multiple recensions emerged that include the angelic component and one that does not.¹⁵⁴

In any case, we must suppose that in certain streams of tradition within Judaism and early Christianity the two-ways doctrine was oriented to that of the two spirits; we should further suppose that both were given additional and concrete form within different types of parenesis. A concluding eschatological warning was then added. From the combination of these elements (two ways, doctrine of the two spirits, forms of parenesis, eschatological epilogue) arose, among other things, the tractate that was the earliest ancestor of *Didache* 1–6.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵⁰Niederwimmer, *Die Didache*, 68–69; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 45. “Der Didachist hat davon nur den Anfang (5,2 fin. und 6,1) behalten und den Rest getilgt bzw. diesen Rest, den er nicht brauchen konnte, durch einen Nachtrag aus eigener Feder ersetzt (6,2f.)”

¹⁵¹Niederwimmer, *Die Didache*, 152; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 120.

¹⁵²Niederwimmer, *Die Didache*, 85; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 60. “Wichtig ist es zu beobachten, daß sich in einigen Traditionsbereichen des frühen Judentums der Topos von den beiden Wegen mit der Lehre von den beiden Geistern (oder beiden Engeln) verbunden hat.”

¹⁵³Niederwimmer, *Die Didache*, 86; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 61. “Die qumranische Doktrin bietet eine gewisse Parallele zur Verbindung der Lehre von den beiden Geistern oder beiden Engeln mit dem Zwei-Wege-Schema in Test. Ass. und in der uns hier interessierenden jüdischen Vorlage des Wege-Traktats.”

¹⁵⁴Niederwimmer, *Die Didache*, 86; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 62.

¹⁵⁵Niederwimmer, *Die Didache*, 87; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 62–63. “Man hat sich jedenfalls vorzustellen, daß sich in bestimmten Traditionsbereichen des Judentums und des frühen Christentums die Zwei-Wege-Lehre an der Lehre von den beiden Geistern orientierte; man hat sich weiters vorzustellen, daß beides wiederum zusätzlich durch verschiedene Formen der Paränese konkretisiert war. Dazu trat dann die eschatologische Schlußmahnung. Aus der Verbindung dieser Elemente (Zwei Wege / Lehre von den zwei Geistern / Paränese-Formen / Eschatologischer Epilog) ist u.a. auch der Traktat entstanden, der als Ahnherr Did. cc. 1–6 zugrundeliegt.”

As it relates to Did. 1.1, because it lacks an angelic component, Niederwimmer concluded, “it can no longer be said with certainty whether this source spoke not only of the two ways but also of the two angels or spirits who are placed over those ways (as we now find it, *mutatis mutandis*, in the version in Barnabas and *Doctrina*).”¹⁵⁶ So, the Didachist omitted *angeli duo* and the ways of light and darkness, “perhaps because it plays no part in the exposition that follows it.”¹⁵⁷

Aaron Milavec. Aaron Milavec, in his two 2003 commentaries *The Didache: Faith Hope, & Life*¹⁵⁸ and *The Didache: Text, Translation, Analysis, and Commentary*,¹⁵⁹ offered a completely different account of the textual history and textual reconstruction of the Didache when compared to the majority of Didache scholars. For Milavec, two textual convictions emerged as methodological cues:¹⁶⁰

1. A unity of the text of the Didache, dismissing source, redaction, and compositional development
2. The Didache is completely independent of the canonical Gospels.

These suppositions, then, permitted the Didachist to shape its version of the Two Ways, though familiar to a Jewish audience,¹⁶¹ as a form of Gentile apprenticeship.¹⁶²

¹⁵⁶Niederwimmer, *Die Didache*, 88; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 63. “Ob in dieser Vorlage außer von den beiden Wegen auch noch von den beiden Engeln oder Geistern die Rede war, die über diese beiden Wege gesetzt sind (wie wir es jetzt noch *mutatis mutandis* in der Version von Barn. und Doctr. finden), kann nicht mehr mit Sicherheit gesagt werden.”

¹⁵⁷Niederwimmer, *Die Didache*, 88; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 63. “Dann hätte der Didachist das Motiv der *angeli duo* weggelassen, — vielleicht, weil es in der folgenden Durchführung keine Rolle mehr spielt.”

¹⁵⁸Milavec, *Didache: Faith, Hope & Life*.

¹⁵⁹Milavec, *Didache: Commentary*.

¹⁶⁰Milavec, *Didache: Commentary*, xiii, 86–88; Milavec, *Didache: Faith, Hope & Life*, xii–xiii.

¹⁶¹Milavec, *Didache: Commentary*, 45.

¹⁶²Milavec, *Didache: Commentary*, 47; Milavec, *Didache: Faith, Hope & Life*, xiii.

The Two Ways, for Milavec, cannot be traced to a Jewish catechetical manual in the synagogues and demonstrates the following summary,

1. Way of Life reflects a clear and careful adaptation to the needs of Gentiles
2. Way of Life has an ordered progression
3. Way of Life is fashioned to address specific skills for those dwelling in this community¹⁶³

While Milavec recognized the angelic cosmology of *Manual of Discipline*, Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Barnabas, and *De Doctrina*, Milavec states, “the framers of the Didache clearly avoid it.”¹⁶⁴

Furthermore, on the basis of Did. 6.3, Milavec argued that Did. 16 and the Lord’s coming are also without an angelic component and “thus, there is an inherent consistency within the Didache. Since the gods are ‘dead,’ they play no role either now or in the future. Thus, with some circumspection, the Didache embraced the metaphors of life and death but deliberately avoids associating these with cosmic/angelic dualism.”¹⁶⁵

Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser. In 2002 Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser (1917–2000) assessed the Didache in terms of its Jewish sources and situation within early Judaism and Christianity.¹⁶⁶ The angelic and dualistic tradition of 1QS found their way into *De Doctrina*, of which they argued, “offers a more faithful form of the original Two Ways tradition than does the Didache” especially with an affinity to its Jewish origins.¹⁶⁷ Yet, the absence of these dualistic and

¹⁶³Milavec, *Didache: Faith, Hope & Life*, xiii.

¹⁶⁴Milavec, *Didache: Faith, Hope & Life*, 65.

¹⁶⁵Milavec, *Didache: Faith, Hope & Life*, 65.

¹⁶⁶van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*.

¹⁶⁷van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 62.

cosmological notions in the Didache “might have occurred by accident in the course of transmission or might have been the result of a deliberate attempt to ethicize the tradition.”¹⁶⁸ Barnabas, moreover, demonstrates an “apocalyptic part charged with present eschatological drama.”¹⁶⁹

Because of the similarities of the Two Ways between Barn. 18–21, *Apostolic Church Order*, and the *De Doctrina*/Didache source, the lack of apocalyptic features reflects different stages of the development of the Two Ways. “Both versions must have been derived from a later Two Ways form which linked the basic instruction to the emphasis on the nearness of the End, involving both judgment and reward.”¹⁷⁰

Nancy Pardee. In 2012 Nancy Pardee published her dissertation, written in 2002 at the University of Chicago, entitled, *The Genre and Development of the Didache*.¹⁷¹ Pardee carefully discussed the notions of genre and compositional structure of the Didache using delimitation, a text-linguistic methodology. Pardee observed that the Two Ways section is the oldest part of the Didache and contains the most deeply embedded text traditions.¹⁷² She observed that most scholars regard Did. 6 as lacking an original conclusion and that some (à la Niederwimmer and Kloppenborg)¹⁷³ regard the conclusion to *De Doctrina* as having an ending close to the original.¹⁷⁴ Yet, some retained Did. 16 as the conclusion to the Didache’s version

¹⁶⁸van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 63.

¹⁶⁹van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 38.

¹⁷⁰van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 38.

¹⁷¹Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*.

¹⁷²Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 162.

¹⁷³Kloppenborg, “Transformation of Moral Exhortation,” 96–97; Niederwimmer, *Die Didache*, 152–53; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 120, 207–8.

¹⁷⁴Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 164.

of the Two Ways.¹⁷⁵ Pardee permitted two different solutions:

1. Didache 16 differs radically from the conclusions in Barnabas and the *De Doctrina* that it seems like an editor modified the original Two Ways ending or composed a completely new conclusion for Did. 6.¹⁷⁶
2. Didache 16 first formed the conclusion to the Two Ways structure for Gentile converts from a Jewish-Christian perspective.¹⁷⁷

Pertaining to the older traditions of 1QS III, 13–IV, 26 and the dualistic and apocalyptic features, Pardee noted that “here, as was the case with the Christian Two Ways texts, 1QS may support the existence of a concluding eschatological section in a Two Ways document intended for the instruction and reception of members into a Jewish religious community.”¹⁷⁸ So, the apocalyptic components in 1QS III, 13–IV, 26 do permit an eschatological conclusion as a stable feature to the Two Ways, yet lack in the Didache’s tradition.

Suggested Ways to Advance the History of Research

Building from previous trajectories of Didache scholarship, specific discussions emerge that I will address.

Source backgrounds and redactional studies. Older Studies focused on the relationship between Barnabas and Didache as it pertains to the source tradition of the Two Ways. Other studies focus on the relationship to canon traditions and ancient Jewish literature. For example, part of Butler’s source traditions necessitates a previous source that influenced the Didache and *De*

¹⁷⁵Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 164.

¹⁷⁶Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 165.

¹⁷⁷Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 165.

¹⁷⁸Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 167.

Doctrina.¹⁷⁹ Eventually, after the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, it was recognized that the Two Ways precedes Barnabas. Suggs revisits the early source tradition of Dead Sea Scrolls (1QS III, 13–IV, 26) as opposed to the originality of the Two Ways in Barnabas.¹⁸⁰ Pride of place was often given to 1QS, whereas other texts need to be incorporated into this study.

Thus, during the third generation of Didache studies, scholars have been more open to recognize older and broader text traditions that have informed the Didache’s version of the Two Ways. In fact, third generation scholars are more willing to see multiple recensions of the Two Ways that answer why the Didache’s version and source is different than other versions. My argument will build upon these previous studies and incorporate more Two Ways versions into this discussion.

Text recension. Building upon the findings of source criticism, Didache scholars have sought to determine “source(s)” recensions of the Didache’s transmission. In order to note some of the angelic and cosmological differences, and some apocalyptic coloring, Didache scholars have rightly suggested that there is more than a single text recension of the ancient Two Ways from which ancient sources draw.¹⁸¹ Generally, one text recension retains these cosmological features whereas, at least, one other text recension does not retain these features—hence Barnabas and Didache disagree in terms of the cosmological elements. However, my

¹⁷⁹Butler, “Two Ways’ in the Didache,” 37. Butler develops Audet’s general position and then combines them with the view that Did. and *Doctr.* depend upon a previous Christian edition of the Two Ways that was influenced by Matt. If this is so, for Butler, then: (1) A Jewish form of the Two Ways exists in Greek form about AD 30; (2) This Jewish document survives without any Christian editing that becomes the source of Barn.; (3) This Jewish tradition is edited by Christian communities, most likely influenced by Matt; (4) The Matt edits inform the source used by the Didachist around AD 70; (5) The pre-Did. Christian version survived in a different line of textual transmission, independent of the Did., that becomes the source of *Doctr.*

¹⁸⁰Suggs, “Christian Two Ways Tradition,” 62.

¹⁸¹Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 40; Kloppenborg, “Transformation of Moral Exhortation”; Kloppenborg, “*Didache*, James, Matthew, and Torah.”

argument will suggest that Two Ways texts form a particular genre—thereby offering another means to assess Did. 1–6 with ancient sources and its tradition history.

Compositional history. This discussion introduced an internal discussion between Didache scholars regarding *why* Did. 1–6 fails to include these angelic and cosmological notions. Essentially, two reasons have been offered: (1) Did. 16 was originally joined with Did. 1–6 as a *Vorlage* and the evolution of the text inserted liturgical and ecclesiastical material (Did. 7–15) between an eschatological conclusion; (2) Did. 16 does not represent an original conclusion to Did. 1–6 and due to redactionary interests or corrupted text recensions, the angelic and apocalyptic conclusion to Did. 6 is lost.

My argument will continue many of these trends so as to suggest that Two Ways may form a particular, recognizable genre. With the affirmations of source influences, I am adding the concept of Two Ways genre as a means to observe the lack of apocalyptic motifs in Did. 1–6. By doing so, my research question permits an analysis of thematic traditions, as opposed to direct source traditions, and will implicitly address the internal debate regarding a Didache *Vorlage*.

Methodology and Plan of Study

The argument progresses in two stages that correspond to the topics of external texts and traditions and literary readings of Did. 1–6. These two foci enable the argument to find historical correspondence with other literary traditions as well as identify a particular literary logic in the Didache itself. Thus, part of my argument rests upon the cumulative data of text comparisons and an attempt to join thematically corresponding traditions.

The argument begins in chapter 2 with a discussion of apocalyptic definitions, categories of apocalyptic studies, and a consideration of generic compatibility between apocalyptic genre and Didache genre studies. In this chapter, my guiding question asks what is the generic compatibility of the apocalyptic genre, the genre of the Didache, and ancient Jewish and early Christian versions of the Two Ways? My research depends and builds upon the relevant work of John J. Collins and his extensive treatments of the apocalyptic genre.¹⁸² Nancy Pardee has provided the most up-to-date assessment of genre studies for the Didache.¹⁸³ Thus, I seek to place these two discussions in concert with one another so as to observe how these literary genres overlap and how the apocalyptic genre and Two Ways texts and traditions are generally compatible. Last, I will give attention to the literary structures of the Two Ways metaphors, distinguish between Two Ways texts and Two Ways traditions, and include a heuristic framework of Persian, ancient Jewish, Graeco-Roman, and early Christian Two Ways (see table A1 in appendix). This framework will provide the basis for the following chapters as it demonstrates how a literary structure conveys a genre of literature that is compatible with apocalyptic dualisms and a two spirits scheme.

¹⁸²John J. Collins, "Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre," in *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*, ed. John J. Collins, *Semeia* 14 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1979), 1–20; John J. Collins, "Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility," in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie*, ed. Leo G. Perdue, Bernard Brandon Scott, and William Johnston Wiseman (Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1993), 165–85; John J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, LDSS (London: Routledge, 1997); John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2nd ed., The Biblical Resource Series (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998); John J. Collins, "Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam, vol. 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 403–30; John J. Collins, ed., *The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*, vol. 1, The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism (New York: Continuum, 1999); John J. Collins, "What Is Apocalyptic Literature?," in *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*, ed. John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 1–16; John J. Collins, *Apocalypse, Prophecy, and Pseudepigraphy: On Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015).

¹⁸³Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*.

Chapter 3 pays attention to specific ancient Jewish and early Christian Two Ways texts. My argument focuses on the Treatise of the Two Spirits (1QS III, 13–IV, 26); Testament of Asher; Galatians 5:16–24; Barn. 18.1–21.1; *De Doctrina*; and Herm. Mand. 6.1–2 (35–36). These texts will be critically assessed to demonstrate their respective versions of the Two Ways and apocalyptic dualistic features. When comparing these texts, some apocalyptic motifs emerge, including the presence of angelic beings, angelic ethical influence upon humanity, cosmology, divine determinism, “light” and “darkness” dualism, and anthropological destiny.

In chapter 4 my argument will shift over to the Didache and remain on this text for the remainder of the thesis. This chapter will provide the basis for the subsequent analysis of the Didache’s Two Ways. My guiding question will inquire whether or not there is an identifiable Two Ways frame in the Didache and how we may speak of its textual integrity. My argument will assume Pardee’s application of delimitation to the Didache so as to identify the essential structures and divisions of the Didache.¹⁸⁴ Second, I will compare and contrast the frame of the Two Ways in the Didache with other Two Ways texts, and identify the discourse features of the Didache’s Two Ways. Thus, I will argue that the Didache’s Two Ways comprises the material in Did. 1.1–6.2 and has a clearly identifiable structure to both the ways of life and death.

Chapters 5 and 6 carry forward the argument to consider the absence of apocalyptic themes in Did. 1–6. My guiding question is the same for both chapters and investigates how the Didache does not include apocalyptic themes that are observably present in the Two Ways genre. Chapter 5 will focus on the literary frame of the Didache’s Two Ways (Did. 1–6) and chapter 6 will focus on internal readings within Did. 1–6. By a literary frame I refer to the manner in which the Didachist

¹⁸⁴Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*.

frames the content of the Two Ways. The Didachist introduces the whole Two Ways (Did. 1.1), introduces the way of life (Did. 1.2), concludes the way of life (Did. 4.14), introduces the way of death (Did. 5.1), concludes the way of death (Did. 5.2), and concludes the Two Ways (Did. 6.1–2). Chapter 6 will devote particular attention to Did. 3.7; 4.1; 6.2, offer a history of interpretation of Psalm 36:11 LXX and Matthew 5:5 that includes the reception of “meekness” and “inheritance” motifs, and an assessment of ζυγός and τέλειος in ancient literature. It is, also, in chapter 6 where I will briefly outline and address some arguments regarding a Didache *Vorlage*. Was Did. 16 an original ending to Did. 1–6? If so, does this concept explain why the Didachist neglect to incorporate apocalyptic features in Did. 1–6? To this final question, I suggest that the Two Ways literary genre may offer a fresh look at how Did. 16 cannot function as the conclusion to an earlier Didache *Vorlage*.

In the Conclusion I gather together my argument and offer brief concluding remarks. I seek to demonstrate *where* my argument may contribute to Didache scholarship and offer brief suggestions for further research. Because my primary question asks *how* the Didache differs from an apocalyptic Two Ways genre, I offer some suggestions as to *why* the Didachist might redact such traditions. These proposals will serve as ways to further the findings within these arguments.

CHAPTER 2

“THE MASTER SHALL INSTRUCT ALL THE SONS OF LIGHT”: A CONSIDERATION OF STRUCTURE AND APOCALYPTIC MOTIFS IN THE TWO WAYS METAPHOR

The Two Ways metaphor is rather replete in antiquity. It appears in a variety of situations and contexts. Margaret McKenna has helpfully documented and suggested the rhetorical function of the ancient Two Ways as a paraenetic repentance.¹ Yet, there remains one broader Two Ways concept that remains relatively unexplored: the intersection of apocalyptic motifs and the Two Ways metaphor.

My guiding question for this chapter concerns the apocalyptic nature of the Two Ways metaphor. What are the stable features (literary forms and motifs) of ancient Two Ways texts and traditions? If the Two Ways metaphor appears with regularity in antiquity, how may we speak of its genre, structure, and worldview assumptions?²

¹Margaret Mary McKenna, “The Two Ways’ in Jewish and Christian Writings of the Greco-Roman Period: A Study of the Form of Repentance Parenesis” (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1981).

²John Frow identifies three structural dimensions that join together to help identify a specific genre: (1) *Formal Organization* to shape material medium (i.e., oral, pitch, rhythm, painting, book, story); (2) *Rhetorical Structure* to convey the text transfer between sender and receiver; (3) *Thematic content* to include the shape and recurrent topics of the argument. Frow also likens the identity of genre to include the following qualities: (1) set of formal features; (2) thematic structure; (3) situation of address; (4) speaking position (i.e., “a certain kind of authority and moral force); (5) structure of implications that “invokes and presupposes a range of relevant background knowledge” from the receiver; (6) rhetorical function “to achieve certain pragmatic effects”; and (7) a communicative frame. John Frow, *Genre*, 2nd ed., *The New Critical Idiom* (London: Routledge, 2015), 9–10, 79–84.

In this chapter, I suggest that the Two Ways metaphor, if possessing a specific literary structure, will communicate specific motifs reflective of an apocalyptic genre. The motifs most often present are: (1) angelic or otherworldly figures, (2) angelic or otherworldly ethical influence, (3) dualistic cosmological structures, (4) divine determinism, and (5) anthropological telic ends.

In order to defend this argument, I will consider the Two Ways literary forms, the accompanying apocalyptic motifs, and how scholars have addressed these features. First, I will offer a cursory overview of research that demonstrates discussions are at a standstill and how a general Two Ways structure is affirmed. Next, I will suggest a more detailed Two Ways structure and clarified definitions. My argument makes a nuanced and necessary distinction between a Two Ways text and a Two Ways tradition. Third, I offer a taxonomy of early renditions of the Two Ways that lists texts and documents where apocalyptic motifs are present (see table A1 in appendix).

Given my primary concern for the Didache and the Two Ways, I will need to assume many discussions found within apocalyptic scholarship. I will assume much of the work in standard apocalyptic historical scholarship, more notably the works of John J. Collins.³ Furthermore, many of the criticism of Collins's works have

³John J. Collins, "Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre," in *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*, ed. John J. Collins, *Semeia* 14 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1979), 1–20; John J. Collins, "Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility," in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie*, ed. Leo G. Perdue, Bernard Brandon Scott, and William Johnston Wiseman (Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1993), 165–85; John J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, LDSS (London: Routledge, 1997); John J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*, OTL (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997); John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2nd ed., The Biblical Resource Series (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998); John J. Collins, "Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam, vol. 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 403–30; John J. Collins, ed., *The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*, vol. 1, The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism (New York: Continuum, 1999); John J. Collins, *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 2001); John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009); John J. Collins, "What Is Apocalyptic

already been documented at great length;⁴ concern for definition and categories of apocalypse, apocalyptic, and apocalypticism;⁵ methodological categories for apocalyptic analysis;⁶ and generic mixing of wisdom and apocalyptic genres.⁷

Literature?,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*, ed. John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 1–16; John J. Collins, *Apocalypse, Prophecy, and Pseudepigraphy: On Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015).

⁴Collins has identified and categorized many of these criticisms. Carol Newsom, likewise, has helped categorize a number of these criticisms too. Yet, Collins still suggests that the work in *Semeia* 14 has “won wide acceptance.” Generally, four categorical criticisms are presented as criticisms to Collins’s position: (1) Genre Function and *Semeia* 36; (2) Individuality of Texts and Jacques Derrida; (3) Idealized Cognitive Model and Carol Newsom; and (4) Family Resemblance Model, Uppsala Colloquium, and Ludwig Wittgenstein. Of these criticisms, Collins concedes that the Family Resemblance Model is “the most successful attempt” at directly addressing the genre of apocalypticism. See the following works for a more detailed account: Collins, *Apocalypse, Prophecy, and Pseudepigraphy*, 5–16; Collins, “What Is Apocalyptic Literature?”; Lorenzo DiTommaso, “Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity (Part I),” *CurBR* 5, no. 2 (2007): 235–86; David Hellholm, “The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre and the Apocalypse of John,” in *Early Christian Apocalypticism: Genre and Social Setting*, ed. Adela Yarbro Collins, *Semeia* 36 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1986), 13–64; Jacques Derrida, “The Law of Genre,” trans. Avital Ronell, *Critical Inquiry* 7, no. 1 (1980): 55–81; Carol A. Newsom, “Spying Out the Land: A Report from Genology,” in *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays Offered to Honor Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Ronald L. Troxel, Kelvin G. Friebel, and Dennis R. Magary (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 437–50; David Hellholm, “Introduction,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium of Apocalypticism Uppsala, August 12–17, 1979*, ed. David Hellholm, 2nd ed. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989), 1–6; Lars Hartman, “Survey of the Problem of Apocalyptic Genre,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium of Apocalypticism Uppsala, August 12–17, 1979*, ed. David Hellholm, 2nd ed. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989), 329–43; also see Sidnie White Crawford and Cecilia Wassen, eds., *Apocalyptic Thinking in Judaism: Engaging with John Collins’ The Apocalyptic Imagination* JSJSup 182 (Leiden: Brill, 2018).

⁵Frederick Murphy identifies and conveys the tension of terminology well. To define apocalypse, apocalypticism, and apocalyptic proves troublesome because not all three are synonymous. According to Murphy, apocalypse is solely reserved “to refer to a literary work of a particular genre.” Thus, apocalypse is solely reserved for a literary genre. Apocalypticism, then, is removed from literary works and comprises of a worldview in which Jewish and Christian literature is composed between 250 BCE and 250 CE For David Aune et al., “The term ‘apocalyptic,’ an adjective functioning as a noun, is synonymous with the noun ‘apocalypticism’. . . . Apocalyptic or apocalypticism is a slippery term used in at least three different ways: (1) as a type of literature, (2) as a type of eschatology, and (3) as a type of collective behavior.” For Collins, “apocalyptic” has no consensus in terms of a definition. Furthermore, he suggests that “apocalyptic” primarily refers to the *kind of material* found in apocalypses and “to use the word in any other way is to invite terminological confusion.” Aune helpfully summarizes and reduces Collins’s categories from *Semeia* 14). He, along with Geddert and Evans, suggest eight essential characteristics: (1) temporal dualism of the two ages; (2) discontinuity between the two ages; (3) division of history that reflects determinism; (4) expectation of the return of God to battle present conditions; (5) cosmic perspective; (6) cataclysmic intervention of God; (7) presence of angels and demons to explain events; and (8)

Apocalypticism and Its Heritage in Modern Scholarship: John J. Collins and Reception of *Semeia* 14

In 1979 a “Forms and Genres” project formed within the Society of Biblical Literature in an attempt to define and outline the genre of apocalypse. Its findings and contribution were recorded in *Semeia* 14, edited by John J. Collins.⁸ As Collins

introduction of new mediator. Frederick J. Murphy, *Apocalypticism in the Bible and Its World: A Comprehensive Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 1–26; Collins, “Towards the Morphology of a Genre”; David E. Aune, Timothy J. Geddert, and Craig A. Evans, “Apocalypticism,” *DNTB*, 45–58; David E. Aune, “Understanding Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic,” *Word & World* 25, no. 3 (2005): 233–45; Grant Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, JSJSup 115 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 1–25.

⁶In 2008 Gerbern Oegema presented a paper at the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies, later published in a collection of essays on Apocalyptic Interpretation of the Bible. This article summarizes seven different methodological approaches for the study of apocalypticism: (1) History of Literature Approach; (2) Religion and Tradition-Historical Approach; (3) Theological Approach; (4) Social Setting Approach; (5) Reception Historical Approach; (6) Intellectual History Approach; and (7) Religious Identity Approach. Gerbern S. Oegema, “From Prophecy to Apocalypticism in Second Temple Judaism” (paper, Canadian Society of Biblical Studies, Vancouver, Canada, June 1, 2008); Gergern S. Oegema, *Apocalyptic Interpretation of the Bible: Apocalypticism and Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism, the Apostle Paul, the Historical Jesus, and Their Reception History*, JCTCRSS (London: Bloomsbury, 2012), 3–16.

⁷Collins helpfully advances this discussion within an essay, entitled “Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility.” For Collins’s argument, he distinguishes five broad types of sapiential material: (1) wisdom sayings (*Spruchweisheit*, including aphorisms and more developed instruction and admonitions) such as one finds in Prov 10–30; (2) theological wisdom, including both speculative passages such as Prov 8 and reflections on theodicy (such as the entire book of Job); (3) nature wisdom, exemplified in Job 28, 38–41; (4) mantic wisdom (divination and dream interpretation); (5) higher wisdom through revelation, including apocalyptic revelations. Taking one’s cue from Grant Macaskill, “Collins’s article establishes a key point crucial to any research on the relationship between wisdom and apocalyptic.” Collins notes that there is no “necessary antithesis between ‘apocalyptic’ and ‘sapiential,’” and ultimately concludes there is no generic incompatibility. Although genres may be identified in distinct categories, this categorical distinction does not necessitate an influence and appearance of literary concepts from other genres. As Matthew Goff notes, “While the two comprise distinct literary categories, there is a priori no reason why they cannot influence and inform one another or take on characteristics from still other traditions.” Furthermore, as the notions of genre boundaries become fuzzy, overlap among genres do appear. Collins, “Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility”; Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology*, 1–25; Matthew Goff, “Wisdom and Apocalypticism,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*, ed. John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 52–68.

⁸John J. Collins, ed., *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*, *Semeia* 14 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1979).

later recalls, “From the beginning, it was not clear whether *Apokalyptik* designated a literary genre or a kind of theology.”⁹

The focus of this project was Jewish and Christian texts composed between 250 BCE and 250 CE, although Graeco-Roman, Gnostic, Rabbinic, and Persian material were included. Yet, the definition was produced primarily through an analysis of Jewish texts¹⁰ and subsequently refined after analysis of other Christian texts.¹¹

In *Semeia* 14 Collins offers a working definition that sought to advance the clarity of apocalyptic genre studies.

“Apocalypse” is a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world.¹²

This definition includes both a consideration of the framework of specific texts as well as the content communicated by this structure. Furthermore, when apocalyptic works are evaluated, this definition is not intended to describe adequately or completely each constituent work.¹³ The definition offers broad boundaries by which particular texts may be identified as an apocalypse genre, yet no individual text may be understood “without reference to some other elements of the paradigm.”¹⁴ The work of *Semeia* 14 was never intended to offer a stable definition of apocalypse, but

⁹Collins, “What Is Apocalyptic Literature?,” 1.

¹⁰Collins, *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*.

¹¹Adela Yarbro Collins, ed., *Early Christian Apocalypticism: Genre and Social Setting*, *Semeia* 36 (Decatur, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1986).

¹²Collins, “Towards the Morphology of a Genre,” 9.

¹³Collins, “Towards the Morphology of a Genre,” 10.

¹⁴Collins, “Towards the Morphology of a Genre,” 10.

“represents only the first stage in the study of the apocalypses and points to the need for much further study.”¹⁵

As has been recognized by others, the definition in *Semeia* 14 is a deliberate focus on form and content.¹⁶ Collins’s definition is subsequently assumed and further refined with a special focus upon early Christian apocalypticism in *Semeia* 36.¹⁷ David Hellholm, generally, affirms the aforementioned definition of an apocalypse and does not seek to modify the notions of apocalyptic form and content.¹⁸ Yet, Hellholm raises a notable question for consideration.

In addition to the concepts of form and content, the third feature of the function is considered. “This definition, operating on a fairly high abstraction level, brings to one’s mind the question: why were Apocalypses ever written?”¹⁹ Thus, Hellholm suggests the following addition that qualifies as the same level of abstraction: “intended for a group in crisis with the purpose of exhortation and/or consolation by means of divine authority.”²⁰

David Aune, likewise, finding dependence upon Hellholm, offers a proposed definition of the apocalypse genre, though with special reference to the

¹⁵Collins, “Towards the Morphology of a Genre,” 18.

¹⁶Adela Yarbro Collins, “Introduction: Early Christian Apocalypticism,” in *Early Christian Apocalypticism: Genre and Social Setting*, ed. Adela Yarbro Collins, *Semeia* 36 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1986), 2.

¹⁷Yarbro Collins, *Early Christian Apocalypticism*.

¹⁸Yarbro Collins, “Early Christian Apocalypticism,” 2–6; Hellholm, “Problem of Apocalyptic Genre,” 26–27.

¹⁹Hellholm, “Problem of Apocalyptic Genre,” 26.

²⁰Hellholm, “Problem of Apocalyptic Genre,” 27.

Apocalypse of John that includes form, content, and function.²¹ With regard to function, Aune offers the following inclusion:

(a) to legitimate the transcendent authorization of the message, (b) by mediating a new actualization of the original revelatory experience through literary devices, structures and imagery, which function to “conceal” the message which the text “reveals,” so that (c) the recipients of the message will be encouraged to modify their cognitive and behavioral stance in conformity with transcendent perspectives.²²

So, it appears that the additional components of function add a social situation and ethical component.

In light of these concerns by Hellholm and Aune, Adela Yarbro Collins amends the *Semeia* 14 definition of apocalypse. She adds the following statement: “intended to interpret present, earthly circumstances in light of the supernatural world and of the future, and to influence both the understanding and the behavior of the audience by means of divine authority.”²³

This addition does raise the question why features external to a particular text such as social situation and reception should determine a literary genre. According to Collins, some years later, the notion of function was an intentional omission.²⁴ Apocalypses that intend to offer comfort and exhort groups in crisis does “not necessarily hold true in all cases.”²⁵ And, the additional amendment of the definition in *Semeia* 36 offers a higher level of abstraction.²⁶ “Apocalypses, like other

²¹David E. Aune, “The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre,” in *Early Christian Apocalypticism: Genre and Social Setting*, ed. Adela Yarbro Collins, *Semeia* 36 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1986), 86–87.

²²Aune, “Problem of Genre,” 87.

²³Yarbro Collins, “Early Christian Apocalypticism,” 7.

²⁴Collins, “What Is Apocalyptic Literature?,” 5.

²⁵Collins, “What Is Apocalyptic Literature?,” 5.

²⁶Collins, “What Is Apocalyptic Literature?,” 6.

genres, could be bent to more than one purpose, even if some functions are more typical than others.”²⁷ Thus, for Collins, the notion of function does not necessarily share a correlation with the notion of form. Various works of apocalyptic literature may bear more than one function; so, it would place unneeded limitations if function were amended to the definition.

Although still open to revision, modification, and refinement, this definition has generally gained acceptance within broader scholarship.²⁸ According to Lorenzo DiTommaso, most of the discussions of apocalypse genre questions proceed from the terminology and definitions defined by Paul Hanson²⁹ and the efforts of the SBL Apocalypse Group in *Semeia* 14. Subsequent works have “further clarified, refined, and to some extent are defended in Collins’s subsequent publications.”³⁰

In 2015 Collins reflects on both the work produced in *Semeia* 14 and a number of criticisms that have emerged over the years.³¹ He addresses the original intents and aims of the project, critiques within language, genre criticisms from family resemblances and prototype theory, problems of synchronic and diachronic considerations, along with a few problem passages. Collins reiterates that the initial work of *Semeia* 14 was “never meant to be more than the first stage of a study of the genre.”³² With the first stage of genre study, Collins’s goal was to “identify and

²⁷Collins, “What Is Apocalyptic Literature?,” 6.

²⁸Bennie H. Reynolds III, *Between Symbolism and Realism: The Use of Symbolic and Non-Symbolic Language in Ancient Jewish Apocalypses 333–63 B.C.E.*, JAJSup 8 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011); Murphy, *Apocalypticism in the Bible*, 5–8.

²⁹Paul D. Hanson, “Apocalypse, Genre; Apocalypticism,” in *IDBSup*, 27–34.

³⁰DiTommaso, “Apocalypses and Apocalypticism,” 239–40.

³¹Collins, *Apocalypse, Prophecy, and Pseudepigraphy*, 1–20.

³²Collins, *Apocalypse, Prophecy, and Pseudepigraphy*, 16.

define” the prototypical core of apocalyptic literature—“even if there are also fuzzy fringes” with the overlap of genres.³³ Yet, even with these criticisms, Collins still affirms his original research. “I think that theory would have refined the analysis significantly, but I do not think it would have changed it substantially.”³⁴

Two Ways as an Apocalyptic-Sapiential Sub-Genre of Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature

As affirmed in historical scholarship,³⁵ the mutual generic compatibility of multiple genres with apocalypticism raises another question, especially within the intersection of the ancient Two Ways metaphor.³⁶ Can the Two Ways metaphor contain aspects of the apocalyptic literary genre—even if the Two Ways do not qualify as an apocalyptic genre? In other words, can the language of genre be applied to the ancient Jewish and early Christian Two Ways that simultaneously convey enough identifiable apocalyptic categories so as to associate the metaphor with an apocalyptic genre? As Freyne suggests, beyond the revelatory character of apocalypse genre, the literature will also include “interest in otherworldly regions, angels and demons, eschatological judgment and the promise of rewards for the faithful.”³⁷

³³Collins, *Apocalypse, Prophecy, and Pseudepigraphy*, 20.

³⁴Collins, *Apocalypse, Prophecy, and Pseudepigraphy*, 20.

³⁵For a brief overview and consideration of such idea, consult the following: Collins, “Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility”; Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology*, 1–25; Matthew Goff, “Wisdom and Apocalypticism,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*, ed. John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 52–68.

³⁶See Pardee’s helpful summary of the Genre of the Two Ways. My analysis in this entire section finds high amounts of dependency upon her initial evaluation. Nancy Pardee, *The Genre and Development of the Didache*, WUNT 2/339 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 50–52.

³⁷Sean Freyne, “Apocalypticism as the Rejected Other: Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Early Judaism and Early Christianity,” in *The “Other” in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins*, ed. Daniel C. Harlow et al. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 254.

Discovering the Dead Sea Scrolls proved valuable for the study of the Didache. In 1971 Klaus Baltzer indirectly addresses the generic identity of the Didache. His work, entitled *The Covenant Formulary*,³⁸ address the Didache's Two Ways and subsequently Barnabas as following the covenant formula (*bundesformular*) found in the Hebrew Bible. Accordingly, the Didache and 1QS III, 13–IV, 26 demonstrate the formula within a community, and Barnabas appropriated it within a setting for preaching.³⁹ Ehrhard Kamlah criticized the *bundesformular* of Baltzer as it did not necessarily match the structure of the Two Ways. Kamlah traces the Two Ways form to a dualistic, Persian myth.⁴⁰

In 1972 Jack Suggs builds from Kamlah's findings in "The Christian Two Ways Tradition."⁴¹ Suggs proposes that the form, as well as content, is more than a mere metaphor of contrasts.⁴² He rightly indicates the following patterns, even in the earliest representatives of the genre:

1. Sharply dualistic Introduction
2. Lists of "virtues" and "vices"
3. Concluding eschatological admonition⁴³

³⁸Klaus Baltzer, *The Covenant Formulary*, trans. David E. Green (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971).

³⁹Baltzer, *The Covenant Formulary*, 177.

⁴⁰Ehrhard Kamlah, *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament*, WUNT 7 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1964).

⁴¹M. Jack Suggs, "The Christian Two Ways Tradition: Its Antiquity, Form, and Function," in *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren*, ed. David Edward Aune, NovTSup 33 (Leiden: Brill, 1972), 60–74.

⁴²Suggs, "Christian Two Ways Tradition," 63–64.

⁴³Suggs, "Christian Two Ways Tradition," 64.

Furthering his argument, Suggs relates how the Two Ways is thoroughly Jewish in its content and reflects a “mixed genre” of legal and sapiential streams.⁴⁴ Yet, these two motifs lack a reflective representation of the cosmological and angelic interests of the Two Ways. Consequently, building from 1QS III, 13–IV, 26, Suggs offers the following paradigm once more:

1. Two Angels introduction
2. Exhortation in list format
3. Eschatological promise/threat conclusion⁴⁵

Furthering Kamlah’s observations, Suggs notes that the “Two Spirits” section of 1QS, some early Christian virtue-vice catalogues, and the Two Ways pattern belong to a common genre which was generated in Judaism by contact with Iranian mythology.⁴⁶ As it relates to the Didache, Suggs suggests that the Didache is further advanced in the tradition so that the angels/spirits have disappeared from the introduction, light/darkness completely gives way to life/death dualism, and the eschatological tone is reduced.⁴⁷ So, the *Sitz im Leben*, according to Suggs, utilizes the Didache’s Two Ways tradition, though not exclusively, within an initiatory setting (i.e., Baptismal catechesis).⁴⁸

During the same year, Willy Rordorf also published his findings, which were similar to Suggs’s observations.⁴⁹ Sympathetic to the findings of Baltzer’s

⁴⁴Suggs, “Christian Two Ways Tradition,” 64–65.

⁴⁵Suggs, “Christian Two Ways Tradition,” 66.

⁴⁶Suggs, “Christian Two Ways Tradition,” 66–67.

⁴⁷Suggs, “Christian Two Ways Tradition,” 71.

⁴⁸Suggs, “Christian Two Ways Tradition,” 72.

⁴⁹Willy Rordorf, “Une Chapitre d’éthique Judéo-Chrétienne: les deux voies,” *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 60 (1972): 109–28; Willy Rordorf, “An Aspect of the Judeo-Christian Ethic: the Two Ways,” in *The Didache in Modern Research*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper, AGJU 37 (Leiden: Brill,

bundesformular, Rordorf posits a notion of two different forms of the Two Ways witness.⁵⁰ These two forms result in both dualistic and non-dualistic versions of the Two Ways entering Christian tradition.⁵¹

Even still to date, Margaret McKenna's 1981 dissertation stands as a definitive work on the broader Two Ways metaphor.⁵² In her dissertation, McKenna explores the Two Ways within the Graeco-Roman period and ascertains whether or not the Two Ways may be classified as a *Gattung*, defined as an oral form, or a genre, or a literary form.⁵³ According to the findings of McKenna, the Two Ways were nurtured early within prophetic and/or levitical exhortations to repentance for covenant renewal. It was, however, the wisdom traditions that "brought the form to its full development, somewhat transforming it in the process, and continued its dissemination from the time of exile onwards, both as an oral tradition and in literary works."⁵⁴

Furthermore, the rise of apocalyptic genre—created by the crises of Antiochus Epiphanes 168 BCE, according to McKenna—"offered a resolution to the crises of the Two Ways theology."⁵⁵ As McKenna further clarifies, "Both the development of apocalyptic with its esoteric tendencies and the intercultural

1996), 148–64.

⁵⁰Rordorf, "An Aspect of the Judeo-Christian Ethic," 152–53.

⁵¹Rordorf, "An Aspect of the Judeo-Christian Ethic," 153.

⁵²McKenna, "'Two Ways' in Jewish and Christian Writings."

⁵³McKenna, "'Two Ways' in Jewish and Christian Writings," 2–3; Hartman, "Problem of Apocalyptic Genre," 330. According to Lars Hartman, *Gattung* is used by German scholars to "speak of smaller literary units. . . . But they can also speak of the *Form* of such texts and mean the same thing."

⁵⁴McKenna, "'Two Ways' in Jewish and Christian Writings," 386.

⁵⁵McKenna, "'Two Ways' in Jewish and Christian Writings," 386.

influences related to it, profoundly affected the development of the Two Ways genre which appears from this time onwards frequently in apocalyptic contexts.”⁵⁶

The Two Ways may appear in a variety of literary forms and frameworks, including some of the following: legal texts, Church Orders, homilies, epistles, wisdom poems, eschatological reflections, apocalyptic revelations, psalms, hymns, and odes.⁵⁷ McKenna concludes that the Two Ways functioned both as a *gattung* in oral tradition and as a genre in its literary form.⁵⁸ Although finding some similarities with *bundesformular*, enough differences emerge so as to identify the Two Ways “as a *gattung* in the earlier history of its oral transmission, and as a *genre* in its later literary history.”⁵⁹

So, the Didache and other Jewish Two Ways metaphors are not inherently an apocalyptic genre, per se, but they find its generic shape within an apocalyptic worldview. As I will argue in the following section, Two Ways texts create a specific literary genre that incorporates apocalyptic features as essential qualities in its literary frame. According to McKenna, Two Ways materials may overlap with testamentary literature (2 Enoch), apocalyptic texts (2 Enoch, Sibylline Oracles), as well as conversion apologetic (Aristotle, *Protr.*; Clement of Alexandria, Lactantius) and catechetical literature (Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.*; *Strom.*; and Irenaeus, *Epid.*).⁶⁰ Thus, it also seems plausible to identify apocalyptic features in some Two Ways material that appear in a variety of other non-apocalyptic literary contexts.

⁵⁶McKenna, “Two Ways’ in Jewish and Christian Writings,” 386.

⁵⁷McKenna, “Two Ways’ in Jewish and Christian Writings,” 277.

⁵⁸McKenna, “Two Ways’ in Jewish and Christian Writings,” 288.

⁵⁹McKenna, “Two Ways’ in Jewish and Christian Writings,” 290.

⁶⁰McKenna, “Two Ways’ in Jewish and Christian Writings,” 242.

Two Ways Texts and Two Ways Traditions: A Consideration of Terminology and Structure

Concerning the limits of extended textual analysis, a few comments are in order to delineate methodology. I am loosely following McKenna's list of texts with a judicial elimination of some that do not contain a clear antithetical structure.⁶¹

Furthermore, I have added some texts that she does not identify; so, the following data does uncover new and different texts. Albeit quite difficult to identify stable dates for each of these traditions, I have limited my evaluation to the Hebrew Bible, Jewish, Graeco-Roman literature, and selected early Christian and non-Christian literature.

A few distinguishing traits need to be identified between Two Ways texts and Two Ways traditions. I want to make a subtle, but necessary, distinction between text and tradition.⁶² By Two Ways tradition, I mean any literary text that conveys a bifurcated ethic and way of being (i.e., journey or road metaphor). By Two Ways text, I mean any literary text that conveys a bifurcated ethic and a way of being (i.e., journey or road metaphor) with an identifiable literary structure. In this way, all

⁶¹McKenna, "Two Ways' in Jewish and Christian Writings," 258–73.

⁶²This suggestion is my attempt to accomplish two purposes. First, my specific use of language (Two Ways texts and Two Ways traditions) is to make a necessary distinction that appears in ancient Two Ways literature. This subtle and, in my estimation, needed distinction helps differentiate the slight differences between two kinds of Two Ways expressions. It makes this subtle distinction that permits the apocalyptic, two angels, and related worldview to be presented predominantly within one strand of the Two Ways. Second, my concern for clearer categories will aim to clarify the non-uniform language found within Two Ways historical scholarship. If these categorical titles prove unsatisfactory, it will point to the inconsistency in scholarship and permit an avenue to begin clarifying such terminology. A simple survey of the quotations from Suggs, Niederwimmer, McKenna, Rordorf, and others reveal the inconsistency of language. For example, some use the simple language of "Two Ways," or "Two Ways theology/doctrine," and "Two Ways scheme." I have used the language of "Two Ways" and "Two Ways metaphor" to refer generally to the Two Ways in text or oral form. I have used the language of "Two Ways tradition" and "Two Ways text" to refer to literary texts that convey the Two Ways. The subtle difference between these latter two categories is the result of a literary structure as the primary distinguishing element.

Two Ways texts and traditions qualify as a Two Ways metaphor, but not all Two Ways metaphors adhere to a particular literary structure.

If a primary distinguishing factor exists between Two Ways traditions and texts, then brief comments are in order to highlight this particular structure. Observing a “way” metaphor or dualistic contrasts does not immediately determine a Two Ways metaphor. Even Suggs observes the carelessness of categories.⁶³ He recalls, “The temptation is always present to read Two Ways ideology into every use of the two ways metaphor.”⁶⁴ Albeit, within my paradigm, similarities readily appear between Two Ways traditions and Two Ways texts. A systemic qualifying distinction is that of a literary structure. In other words, a Two Ways text will have a particular literary structure that other Two Ways traditions do not have.

In terms of content and structure, three normal patterns appear in all Two Ways texts. By following a set literary structure (form) and containing certain topics for consideration (content), I suggest this literary form qualifies as a literary genre. The specific structure includes the following:⁶⁵

1. Sharp Dualistic Introduction: Often a “way” metaphor, but may include other polarized concepts
2. Virtue and Vice lists
3. Individual Eschatological Admonition

The dualistic introduction can include “way” language but is not bound to this metaphor. For example, some texts within the Graeco-Roman tradition convey the polarized opposites by means of two holes in the ground (cf. Plato, *Resp.* 614c). Often the lists of vices and virtues are not strictly ordered. For example, texts may

⁶³Suggs, “Christian Two Ways Tradition,” 63.

⁶⁴Suggs, “Christian Two Ways Tradition,” 63.

⁶⁵Used and adapted from the following: Suggs, “Christian Two Ways Tradition,” 64.

interweave the virtues and vices, or specific attention is given to one and then the other. In terms of the eschatological admonition, corporate elements are often lacking and admonitions address only the wayfarer.

McKenna's work does not overturn Suggs's initial observations. Rather, she supplements his suggestions. McKenna entertains the notion of *bundesformular*. So, for McKenna, the Two Ways may function both as a "form" of transmission that also exerts literary consciousness.⁶⁶ Affirming Baltzer's notion of an existing connection between Hebrew Bible *bundesformular* and Christian Two Ways texts,⁶⁷ McKenna then observes the following structure for the Two Ways:

1. Antithetical way or other metaphor
2. Antithetical guides
3. Antithetical ethical content
4. Antithetical ends
5. Antithetical intense repentance paraenesis⁶⁸

McKenna's contribution is an attempt to demonstrate the function of the Two Ways literary genre as repentance paraenesis.⁶⁹

Nearly twenty years beyond Suggs's initial article, Clayton Jefford continues this literary identification. Jefford's argument observes how Did. 1–5(6) "parallels such instruction in other early Jewish-Christian literature."⁷⁰ Noting the paralleled structure between Did. 1–6 and 1QS III, 13–IV, 26, Jefford suggests that

⁶⁶McKenna, "'Two Ways' in Jewish and Christian Writings," 288.

⁶⁷Baltzer, *Covenant Formulary*.

⁶⁸McKenna, "'Two Ways' in Jewish and Christian Writings," 289–90.

⁶⁹McKenna, "'Two Ways' in Jewish and Christian Writings," 290.

⁷⁰Clayton N. Jefford, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, VCSup 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1989), 27.

“there appears to be a pre-Christian pattern of initiation.”⁷¹ Jefford continues to advance the Two Ways literary structure as follows,

1. Dualistic introduction
2. Virtue and vice lists
3. Concluding eschatological exhortation⁷²

Slightly different than, though not in opposition to, McKenna’s function of the literary form, Jefford contends that this Two Ways structure, as it appears in Did. 1–6, joins together elements of dualism and the paraenetic character of sapiential literature.⁷³

I want to expand these elements and offer the following structure and contents for Two Ways texts:

1. Dualistic Literary Introduction
 - 1.a. Angelic or Otherworldly Guides
 - 1.b. Optical Dualisms (Light and Darkness)
 - 1.c. Anthropological Dualisms (Life and Death)
 - 1.d. Cosmological Dualisms (Heavenly/Earthly, Spiritual/Physical)
 - 1.e. Divine Ordination of Angelic and Cosmological Order
2. Sapiential Invitation to Consider Dualized Ethical Path
 - 2.a. Description of Different Pathways
 - 2.b. Invitation to Consider Right Path
3. Virtue and Vice Lists
 - 3.a. Intermixed Virtue and Vice qualities

⁷¹Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 27.

⁷²Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 27.

⁷³Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 28.

- 3.b. Virtue Lists followed by Vice Lists
- 3.c. Vice Lists followed by Virtue Lists
- 4. Eschatological Paraenetic Addressing Wayfarer
 - 4.a. Rewards System for Wayfarer
 - 4.b. Rhetorical Negative Consequences
 - 4.c. Deterministic Outcome for Humanity
- 5. Literary Redaction and Individuality of Two Ways Texts
 - 5.a. Introduction reflects individual concerns of redactor (i.e., no Two Ways introductions are same)
 - 5.b. Transitional cues between virtue and vice lists
 - 5.c. Conclusion reflects individual concerns of redactor (i.e., no Two Ways conclusions are same)

Although not every Two Ways text contains all these features equally, enough symmetry can be identified to communicate these concepts for ancient versions of Two Ways texts.

Summary and Consideration of a Two Ways Heuristic Taxonomy

In this following section, I aim to accomplish a few items. First, I highlight how the common apocalyptic features in the Two Ways texts totals five distinct features. These include,

- 1. angelic or otherworldly figures
- 2. angelic or otherworldly ethical influence
- 3. dualistic cosmological structures
- 4. divine determinism
- 5. anthropological telic ends

Second, I offer a brief summary of six ancient texts, beyond what will appear in subsequent chapters (1QS III, 13–IV, 26; T. Ash. 1–8; Gal 5:16–24; Barn. 18.1–21.1; *Doctr.* 1–6; Herm. Mand. 6.1–2 [35–36]; Did. 1–6). These texts serve as among the

stronger attestations to the apocalyptic undercurrents of the Two Ways metaphor. Third, I summarize many Two Ways texts and traditions and only highlight the salient apocalyptic features. Finally, I offer a heuristic taxonomy of many ancient Two Ways metaphors that identify how they include or exclude particular apocalyptic features followed by a small summary of these traditions (see table A1 in appendix). All of these traditions will serve to identify specific ways that apocalypticism influences the Two Ways metaphor.

No two traditions are the same, nor do they all contain the same ethical instruction. This lack of unanimity leaves open the possibility for individual redaction or an unstable source tradition—it is most likely that both are the case. There is no evidence that all Two Ways relate historically or connect to a single source. As a whole, each Two Ways metaphor has concepts that are similar in nearly all Two Ways, as well as having unique features that no other Two Ways possesses. Though there may be more than one way to structure the following data, I will evaluate the contents of Two Ways texts and Two Ways traditions.

Summary of Selected Apocalyptic Two Ways Texts

An apocalyptic version of the Two Ways appears in 1 Enoch. This text concludes with a broad summary of the righteous and the evil ones (1 En. 91–107). Somewhat like the Testament literature, 1 En. 91 begins with Enoch giving final admonitions and instructions to his children (1 En. 91.1–4). The content of such instruction characterizes a Two Ways instruction. Enoch’s instruction is to warn from the ways of the wicked while exhorting to maintain the ways of righteousness:

1 En. 91.18–19: And now I tell you, my children, and I show you the paths of righteousness and the paths of wrong-doing; I will show them to you again, that you may know what will come to pass. And now, harken unto me, my

children, and walk in the paths of righteousness, and walk not in the paths of wrong-doing; for all who walk in the paths of oppression shall perish everlastingly.⁷⁴

Prior to restating, once more, the Two Ways instruction (1 En. 94.1–5), the apocalyptic scene is demonstrated through the angelic mediators (1 En. 93.2–3) and the vision of the seven weeks (1 En. 93.1–14).

Then angelic presence manifests itself in a kind of protection over the righteous. In the last days, evil angels will descend to assist the sin of those along the evil way of life. In contrast, holy angels will likewise descend to protect the righteous.

1 En. 100.4–5: And angels shall descend into (their) hiding-places on that day, and they will gather together into the one place all who were aiding and abetting wrong-doing. . . . And he [the Most High] will set a guard from the holy angels over all the righteous and holy: they will guard them as the apple of an eye, until there is an end to all wickedness and to all sin.

So, at least two kinds of actions manifest between these two angelic groups. First, both sets of angels will descend from above to act on behalf of two ethical groups. The wicked angels descend to assist in the product of sin; the holy angels descend to protect the righteous. Second, the actions of the humans are affected by the cosmic activity of the angels. In other words, unrighteousness is the result of angelic influence and protection. It is more likely ethical preservation (cf. 1 En. 100.8–101.9) and is brought about because of the holy angels.

A very brief, though still relevant, version of an apocalyptic Two Ways appears in 2 En. 30. The instruction and dialogue is a divine voice that addresses Adam. The dialogue takes place during the seven creation days (2 En. 29–33 J). Within the sixth day, Adam is assigned to be a second angel and to function as king upon the earth (2 En. 30.11–12 J). His name, Adam, corresponds to the four corners

⁷⁴Matthew Black, *The Book of Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes*, SVTP 7 (Leiden: Brill, 1985).

of the earth: from the east, west, north, and south (2 En. 30.13 J). Eventually, Adam is assigned “four special stars” that will accompany him (2 En. 30.14 J). Upon assigning him these overseers, the instruction turns towards Two Ways instruction.

2 En. 30.14–15 J: And I gave him his free will; and I pointed out to him the two ways—light and darkness. And I said to him, “This is good for you, but that is bad”; so that I might come to know whether he has love toward me or abhorrence, and so that it might become plain who among his race loves me.

The Two Ways are framed in terms of optical categories—light and darkness. The angelic realm accompanies Adam as he is joined to the metaphorical way. Although determinism is not manifest in the actions of Adam, the outcome of Adam’s wayfaring journey produces a designated outcome for those who love God.

In Philo, *Sacr.* 20–40, the Two Ways is reminiscent of Greek Two Ways contents (cf. Xenophon, *Mem.* 2.21–24). The otherworldly characters are personified moral virtues: Virtue and Pleasure. Furthermore, these two polarized characters are described as two wives who loathe one another.

Philo, *Sacr.* 20–21: ἐπίγνωθι, ὦ ψυχὴ, καὶ γνώρισον, τίς ἐστὶν ἡ μισουμένη καὶ τίς ὁ τῆς μισουμένης υἱός, καὶ εὐθύς αἰσθήσῃ, ὅτι ἄλλω μὲν οὐδενί, μόνῳ δὲ τούτῳ καθήκει τὰ πρεσβεῖα. δύο γὰρ ἡμῶν ἐκάστῳ συνοικοῦσι γυναῖκες ἐχθραὶ καὶ δυσμενεῖς ἀλλήλαις, τῶν ζηλοτυπίας τὸν ψυχικὸν οἶκον ἀναμιμνῆσαι φιλονεικιῶν· τούτων τὴν μὲν ἑτέραν ἀγαπῶμεν χειροῦθι καὶ τιθασὸν καὶ φιλτάτην καὶ οἰκειοτάτην αὐτοῖς νομίζοντες, καλεῖται δὲ ἡδονή· τὴν δὲ ἑτέραν ἐχθαίρομεν ἀτίθασον ἀνήμερον ἐξηγριωμένην πολεμιωτάτην ἡγούμενοι, ὄνομα δὲ καὶ ταύτης ἐστὶν ἀρετὴ.⁷⁵

The remainder of the Two Ways instruction offers detailed descriptions of Virtue and Pleasure. God, moreover, is not necessarily portrayed as one who has provided cosmic order, but appoints the toil of those pursuing the virtuous life.

⁷⁵Philo, *Sacr.* 20–21: “Mark well then, my soul, and understand who is she that is hated, and who is her son, and thou wilt straightway perceive that to this last alone and to none other belong the honours of the elder. For each of us is mated with two wives, who hate and loathe each other, and they fill the house of the soul with their jealous contentions. And one of these we love, because we find her winning and gentle, and we think her our nearest and dearest. Her name is pleasure. The other we hate; we think her rough, ungentle, crabbed and our bitter enemy. Her name is virtue.” Philo, *Volume II*, trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, LCL 227 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929).

Philo, *Sacr.* 35–36: ἔστι δὲ ὁ ῥαστώνης ἐχθρὸς πόνος, πρῶτον καὶ μέγιστον ἀγαθόν, προσφερόμενος τὸν ἀκήρυκτον πρὸς ἡδονὴν πόλεμον· ἀρχὴν γάρ, εἰ δεῖ τὰ ληθῆς εἰπεῖν, παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ καὶ ἀρετῆς ἀπάσης ὁ θεὸς ἀνέδειξεν ἀνθρώποις πόνον, οὐ χωρὶς τῶν καλῶν παρὰ τῷ θνητῷ γένει συνιστάμενον οὐδὲν εὐρήσεις.⁷⁶

Prior to the close of the fourth-century BCE, an Iranian Two Ways text appears that encapsulates much of the apocalyptic features of the Two Ways. Two opposing Wills are placed in mutual opposition from the very beginning of time. These two Wills reflect mutually opposing virtues and vices and battle one another for the allegiance of humanity.

Yas. 30.3–4: They are the two Wills, the twins who in the beginning made themselves heard through dreaming, those two kinds of thought, of speech, of deed, the better and the evil; and between them well-doers discriminate rightly, but ill-doers do not. Once those two Wills join battle, a man adopts life or non-life, the way of existence that will be his at the last: that of the wrongful the worst kind, but for the righteous one, best thought.⁷⁷

From these two Wills, both are elected to reflect the moral opposites (Yas. 30.5).⁷⁸ Even the Daevas are unable to adjudicate between the two Wills and might be overtaken by the evil Will (Yas. 30.6).⁷⁹ The outcome for humanity is predetermined. Success and failure mark the two groups of humanity (Yas. 30.10–11). Either destruction or righteousness is given as the result of one’s association with the two Wills.

⁷⁶Philo, *Sacr.* 35–36: “This thing is toil, the first and greatest of blessings, the enemy of ease, waging war to the death against pleasure. For in very truth, God has appointed toil as the beginning of all goodness and true worth to men, and without it you shall find that nothing excellent takes shape amongst mortal men.” Philo, *Volume II*.

⁷⁷Translations taken from M. L. West, *The Hymns of Zoroaster: A New Translation of the Most Ancient Sacred Texts of Iran* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2010).

⁷⁸Yas. 30.5: “From these two mentalities the Evil One elected to perform the worst deeds. But the Most Bountiful Spirit who dwells in imperishable Light chose Truth.” Pilo Nanavutty, trans., *The Gathas of Zarathushtra: Hymns in Praise of Wisdom* (Ahmedabad, India: Mapin Publishing, 1999), 79.

⁷⁹Yas. 30.6: “Between those two the very Daevas fail to discriminate rightly, because delusion comes over them as they deliberate, when they choose the worst thought.” According to M. L. West, the Daevas are part of the traditional deities of Iran. In this instance, Zoroaster “has replaced with his own moral-intellectual deities, but who still guide the aggressive groups that harass his community.” West, *Hymns of Zoroaster*, 52–53.

Yas. 30.10–11: For then destruction will come down upon Wrong’s prosperity, and the swiftest (steeds) will be yoked from the fair dwelling of Good Thought, of the Mindful One, and of Right, and they will be the winners in good repute. When you grasp those rules that the Mindful One lays down, O mortals, through success and failure, and the lasting harm that is for the wrongful as furtherance is for the righteous, then thereafter desire will be fulfilled.

Another example of an apocalyptic Two Ways text is found in 2 Clem. 6.1–9. This Two Ways begins (2 Clem. 6.1) with “an explicit quotation (cf. the introductory λέγει δὲ ὁ κύριος)” of Jesus Tradition (Matt 6:24//Luke 16:13).⁸⁰ The author continues another citation of Jesus tradition, but this saying does not appear with any kind of introductory formula.⁸¹ Possibly, as Tuckett suggests, “The main point of the citation appears to be to drive a wedge between this world and the world to come.”⁸²

2 Clem. 6.1–2: Λέγει δὲ ὁ κύριος· Οὐδεὶς οἰκέτης δύναται δυσι κυρίοις δουλεύειν. ἐὰν ἡμεῖς θέλωμεν καὶ θεῷ δουλεύειν καὶ μαμωνᾶ, ἀσύμφορον ἡμῖν ἐστίν. τί γὰρ τὸ ὄφελος, ἐὰν τις τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσῃ τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν ζημιωθῇ;

The cosmological dualisms appear in how the two worlds are in opposition to one another (2 Clem. 6.3): “this age and the one that is to come are enemies.” The present age is marked by a list of vices (e.g., adultery, corruption, greed, deceit; 2 Clem. 6.4). Yet, it is the coming age that renounces such things (2 Clem. 6.4).⁸³ The

⁸⁰Tuckett provides a parallel analysis of 2 Clem. 6.1 with Matt 6.24; Luke 16:13; Gos.Thom. 47. Christopher Tuckett, ed., *2 Clement: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*, OAF (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 178.

⁸¹It is possible that 2 Clem. uses an independent circulating Jesus tradition for 2 Clem. 6.2. Tuckett suggests, “more likely, it would seem, the author of *2 Clement* is citing the Gospel of Luke.” Tuckett again provides a parallel analysis of 2 Clem. 6.2 with Matt 16:26; Mark 8:36; Luke 9:25; Clement, *Strom.* 6.112.3; Justin, *1 Apol.* 15.12; Interp. Know. 9.33–35. Tuckett, *2 Clement*, 179.

⁸²Tuckett, *2 Clement*, 182.

⁸³According to Tuckett, “The dualism is now spelt out in uncompromising terms: there are two ‘ages’, this and the age to come, and the two are ‘enemies’ of each others. The author takes up language and ideas from apocalyptic in talking this age and the age to come (cf. *4 Ezra* 7.50; 8.1; *2 Bar.* 44.9–12; Eph 1.21; Mark 10.30 pars). . . . Certainly, whilst such language is potentially open to dualistic ideas, with cosmic powers engaged in supra-mundane battles in which human beings are mere pawns in the struggle, the author makes it clear that human responsibility is paramount: human beings must choose which side they are on (and put here in terms of ethical behaviour.” Tuckett, *2 Clement*, 182.

cosmic ages are mutually opposed to one another and manifest in terms of the current ethical expressions of humanity (2 Clem. 6.5–7).

The angelic component is not as explicit as other traditions in that no angelic force resides over the cosmos or over humanity. Rather, 2 Clem. 6.8 offers a “fairly free and short, précis of the material of Ezek 14.30–20.”⁸⁴ In doing so, the “otherworldly figures” are personified in resurrection appearances of Noah, Job, and Daniel:

2 Clem. 6.8: λέγει δὲ καὶ ἡ γραφὴ ἐν τῷ Ἰεζεκιήλ ὅτι Ἐὰν ἀναστῆ Νῶε καὶ Ἰὼβ καὶ Δανιήλ, οὐ ρύσσονται τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ αἰχμαλωσίᾳ.

According to Tuckett, “the argument takes a slightly different turn with the assertion that no third party can act to benefit individuals other than themselves. . . . The main point being made is that not even the supremely righteous figures of Noah, Job, and Daniel could rescue their children.”⁸⁵ Thus, 2 Clem. 6.1–9 continues an apocalyptic version of the Two Ways metaphor that polarizes cosmic forces, as manifest in the present ethic of humanity, and conveys otherworldly figures through possible resurrected forms of Noah, Job, and Daniel.

The last, brief, summary of a Two Ways text is Ps.-Clem. *H.* XX.2. In this version of the Two Ways, Peter is portrayed as an angelic mediator that communicates the instruction of the Two Ways. Furthermore, the Two Ways are divinely appointed by God and summarized in terms of the two ages.

Ps.-Clem. *H.* XX. 2: And Peter said: “Listen, therefore, to the truth of the harmony in regard to the evil one. God appointed two kingdoms, and established two ages, determining that the present world should be given to the evil one, because it is small, and passes quickly away; but He promised to preserve for the good one the age to come, as it will be great and eternal.”⁸⁶

⁸⁴Tuckett, *2 Clement*, 184.

⁸⁵Tuckett, *2 Clement*, 184.

⁸⁶*ANF* 8:339.

In addition to this cosmic order, the polarized ethical options are personified in the genders of humanity: female depicts the evil way; male depicts the prosperous way. So, each person is comprised of the ethical make up of both male and female.

Ps.-Clem. *H. XX. 2*: And his body consists of three parts, deriving its origin from the female; for it has lust, anger, and grief, and what is consequent on these. But the spirit not being uniform, but consisting of three parts, derives its origin from the male; and it is capable of reasoning, knowledge, and fear, and what is consequent on these. And each of these triads has one root, so that man is a compound of two mixtures, the female and the male.

Two kings rule over these two ages and two cosmic spheres. These kings advise their constituents in accordance to the cosmological ethical correspondence.

Ps.-Clem. *H. XX.2*: Also two kings have been appointed, of whom the one is selected to rule by law over the present and transitory world, and his composition is such that he rejoices in the destruction of the wicked. But the other and good one, who is the King of the age to come, loves the whole nature of man; but not being able to have boldness in the present world, he counsels what is advantageous, like one who tries to conceal who he really is.

Summary of Apocalyptic Features in Two Ways Texts

The Two Ways readily fills the Hebrew Bible; yet, only some qualify as a Two Ways text and vaguely reference cosmology and divine influence. For example, Deuteronomy 11 and 30 utilize the literary structure to communicate wisdom and ethics. The material in Jeremiah 6:6–20 could convey an angelic “watcher,” but even this tradition refrains from having this figure influence humanity. If Proverbs 2 qualifies as a Two Ways text, then the personification of wisdom may function as an angelic means to influence humanity. Many of the Hebrew Bible references include anthropological ends that included some form of an eschatological return of YHWH. But, the early apocalyptic categories are quite infrequent in the Hebrew Bible.

In Jewish literature, the appearance of cosmological dualism, angelic dualism, and forms of angelic and anthropological intersection begin to emerge in

the rise of apocalyptic literature. For example, 2 Esd 7.1–140 (cf. 4 Ezra 7.1–140) utilizes an angelic mediator to communicate the Two Ways.

2 Esd 7.1–2: When I finished speaking these words, the angel who had been sent to me on the former nights was sent to me again. He said to me . . .

In T. Ash. 1.1–8.2, those that succumb to the wicked ways are overpowered by Beliar (T. Ash. 1.9).

T. Ash. 1.9: ὅταν γὰρ ἐνάρξῃται ὡς ἀγαθὸν ποιῶν τὸ τέλος τῆς πράξεως αὐτοῦ εἰς κακὸν ποιεῖν ἀνελαύνει· ἐπειδὴ ὁ θησαυρὸς τοῦ διαβουλίου ἰοῦ πονηροῦ πνεύματος πεπλήρωται.

The presence of the angelic realm or otherworldly figures within a dualistic cosmos appears both in Qumranic literature (1QS III, 13–IV, 26) and in Iranian literature (Yas. 30; 45).

Yas. 45.2: I will tell forth the two Wills at the world’s beginning, of whom the Bounteous one speaks thus to the Hostile one: “Neither our thoughts, nor our pronouncements, nor our intellects, nor our choices, nor our words, nor our deeds, nor our moralities, nor our souls, are in accord.”

When one evaluates ancient Graeco-Roman literature, a slightly different picture emerges. Rather than angelic mediators, Two Ways texts utilize “otherworldly” persons that embody a virtue quality. For example, in Silius, *Pun.* 15.24–25 two figures fly down to Scorpio by the name of “Pleasure” and “Virtue.”

Silius, *Pun.* 15.20–23: cum subito assistunt, dextra laevaue per auras allapsae, haud paulum mortali maior imago, hinc Virtus, illinc virtuti inimica Voluptas.⁸⁷

Although more Graeco-Roman literature appears to qualify as Two Ways tradition, they likewise continue the “otherworldly” figures. In Xenophon, *Mem.* 2.21–24, the wayfarer is approached by two women, each receiving a name of “Virtue” and “Vice.”

Xenophon, *Mem.* 2.21–22: When Heracles was passing from boyhood to young manhood, where the young, now becoming their own masters, show whether

⁸⁷Silius, *Pun.* 15.20–23: “Suddenly two figures, far exceeding mortal stature, flew down from the sky and stood to right and left of him: Virtue was on one side, and Pleasure, the enemy of Virtue, on the other.” Silius Italicus, *Punica*, vol. 2, Books 9–17, trans. J. D. Duff, LCL 278 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1934).

they will approach life by the path of virtue or the path of vice, he went out into a quiet place and sat pondering which road to take. And there appeared two women of great stature coming toward him. The one was fair to see and of noble stock; her body was adorned with purity, her eyes with modesty; sober was her figure, and her robe was white. The other had grown stout and soft with high feeding. Her skin was made up to heighten its natural white and pink, her figure to exaggerate her height. She had wide-open eyes and clothing that showcased her young beauty. She kept eyeing herself and looking to see whether anyone noticed her; and often stole a glance at her own shadow.⁸⁸

Even the Two Ways texts in the New Testament corpus continue to frame Two Ways with angelic and cosmological dualistic categories. For example, rather than an angelic figure, the Holy Spirit influences some to manifest particular virtues in Galatians 5:16–24 and also battles the “Flesh” of the individual. The cosmology is paired with a present earth and coming kingdom (Gal 5:21). In Ephesians 2:1–9 the dualistic otherworldly forces are the Prince of the Air and God.

Eph 2:2: ἐν αἷς ποτε περιεπατήσατε κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος, τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργοῦντος ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας

Eph 2:4–5: ὁ δὲ θεὸς πλούσιος ὢν ἐν ἐλέει, διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην αὐτοῦ ἦν ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς, καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ

Even Matthew 25:31–46 utilizes an angelic presence but neglects to offer an angelic and anthropological intersection.

Within other early Christian literature, if a text qualifies as a Two Ways, it will most likely contain dualistic cosmological and anthropological notions—except

⁸⁸Xenophon, *Mem.* 2.21–22: Φησὶ γὰρ Ἡρακλέα, ἐπεὶ ἐκ παίδων εἰς ἡβὴν ὠρμᾶτο, ἐν ᾗ οἱ νέοι ἤδη αὐτοκράτορες γιγνόμενοι δηλοῦσιν, εἴτε τὴν δι' ἀρετῆς ὁδὸν τρέψονται ἐπὶ τὸν βίον εἴτε τὴν διὰ κακίας, ἐξελεθόντα εἰς ἡσυχίαν καθῆσθαι ἀποροῦντα, ποτέραν τῶν ὁδῶν τράπηται. καὶ φανῆναι αὐτῷ δύο γυναῖκας προσιέναι μεγάλας, τὴν μὲν ἑτέραν εὐπρεπῆ τε ἰδεῖν καὶ ἐλευθέριον φύσει, κεκοσμημένην τὸ μὲν σῶμα καθαριότητι, τὰ δὲ ὄμματα αἰδοῖ, τὸ δὲ σχῆμα σωφροσύνη, ἐσθῆτι δὲ λευκῇ, τὴν δ' ἑτέραν τετραμμένην μὲν εἰς πολυσαρκίαν τε καὶ ἀπαλότητα, κεκαλλωπισμένην δὲ τὸ μὲν χρῶμα, ὥστε λευκοτέραν τε καὶ ἐρυθροτέραν τοῦ ὄντος δοκεῖν φαίνεσθαι, τὸ δὲ σχῆμα, ὥστε δοκεῖν ὀρθοτέραν τῆς φύσεως εἶναι, τὰ δὲ ὄμματα ἔχει ἀναπεπταμένα, ἐσθῆτα δέ, ἐξ ἧς ἂν μάλιστα ὥρα διαλάμποι, κατασκοπεῖσθαι δὲ θαμὰ ἑαυτήν, ἐπισκοπεῖν δὲ καὶ εἴ τις ἄλλος αὐτὴν θεᾶται, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ εἰς τὴν ἑαυτῆς σκιὰν ἀποβλέπειν. Xenophon, *Memorabilia. Oeconomicus. Symposium. Apology*, ed. Jeffrey Henderson, trans. E. C. Marchant and O. J. Todd, LCL 168 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013).

for the monastic traditions. For example, Barn. 18.1 has light-giving angels and angels of Satan.

Barn. 18.1: Μεταβῶμεν δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ἑτέραν γνῶσιν καὶ διδαχὴν. ὁδοὶ δύο εἰσὶν διδαχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας, ἡ τε τοῦ φωτὸς καὶ ἡ τοῦ σκότους· διαφορὰ δὲ πολλή τῶν δύο ὁδῶν. ἐφ' ἧς μὲν γάρ εἰσιν τεταγμένοι φωταγωγοὶ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐφ' ἧς δὲ ἄγγελοι τοῦ σατανᾶ.⁸⁹

In Ps.-Clem. *H.* XX.2, Peter functions as an angelic mediator for the coming two ages and kingdoms. Basil of Caesarea interprets Psalm 1 in terms of Two Ways that includes an angelic figure or demon to influence and travel alongside the wayfarer (*Hom.* 10.5).

Summary of Apocalyptic Features in Two Ways Traditions

Given the distinction between Two Ways texts and Two Ways traditions, Two Ways traditions lack a specific and identifiable literary structure. As the apocalyptic and two angels scheme is more identifiable with Two Ways texts, it does not necessitate that these apocalyptic features do not also appear; rather, they materialize with less frequency. The following summary will highlight some of the salient features of Two Ways traditions.

The more prominent features of Two Ways traditions are polarized ethics and virtue categories. Often they will contain polarized ethics, a virtue and vice list, or only contain a road metaphor. For example, Isaiah 59:8–15 utilizes a road metaphor, a way of peace, a crooked road, and a loose vice (59:9–15) and virtue list (59:16–18). Ezekiel 18:1–29 conveys the categories of a righteous and wicked person. In 2 En. 42.10, no virtue or vice lists are provided; rather, this tradition only utilizes

⁸⁹Barn. 18.1: “Now let us move on to another knowledge and teaching. There are two ways of teaching and powers, one of light and one of darkness; there is a great different between the two. For, over one are arranged light giving angels of God, but over another are angels of Satan.”

a road metaphor. Two sections in Hesiod's *Opera et dies* uses virtue qualities along with road metaphors (*Op.* 213–74; 287–92).

Op. 213–15: As for you, Perses, give heed to Justice and do not foster Outrageousness. For Outrageousness is evil in a worthless mortal; and even a fine man cannot bear her easily, but encounters calamities and then is weighed down under her. The better road is the one towards what is just, passing her by on the other side.⁹⁰

Op. 287–92: Misery is there to be grabbed in abundance, easily, for smooth is the road, and she lives very nearby; but in front of Excellence the immortal gods have set sweat, and the path to her is long and steep, and rough at first—yet when one arrives at the top, then it becomes easy, difficult though it still is.⁹¹

Furthermore in the New Testament, Sermon on the Mount material conveys ethical metaphors. For example, Matthew 7:13–14 conveys the beginning steps of the Two Ways through an invitation to enter a gate, rather than focusing on the anthropological telic outcome. As opposed to a road metaphor, Theophilus employs sensory metaphors: optical and audible dualisms (*Autol.* 1.2).

Theophilus, *Autol.* 1.2 (PG 6:338b): ἐπει δεῖξόν βλέποντας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς ψυχῆς σου, καὶ τὰ ὄψα τῆς καρδίας σου ἀκούοντα. Ὡσπερ γὰρ οἱ βλέποντες τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τοῦ σώματος κατανοοῦσι τὴν τοῦ βίου καὶ ἐπίγειον πραγματείαν, ἅμα δοκιμάζοντες τὰ διαφέροντα ἥτοι φῶς ἢ σκότος, ἢ λευκὸν ἢ μέλαν, ἢ αἰιδῆς ἢ εὐμορφον, ἢ εὐρυθμον καὶ εὐμετρον, ἢ ἄρρυθμον καὶ ἄμετρον, ἢ ὑπὲρ μέτρον ἢ κόλουρον· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰ ὑπ' ἀκοὴν πίπτοντα, ἢ ὀξύφωνα ἢ βαρύφωνα, ἢ ἠδύφωνα· οὕτως ἔχει ἂν καὶ περὶ τὰ ὄψα τῆς καρδίας καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοὺς τῆς ψυχῆς, δύνασθαι Θεὸν θεάσασθαι.

Selected versions that qualify as a Two Ways tradition contain some form of divine determinism, though quite confined. In two examples in Plato, the telic judgments are determined and unalterable (*Gorg.* 524 A; *Resp.* 10.614 C).⁹²

⁹⁰ *Op.* 213–15: ὦ Πέρση, σὺ δ' ἄκουε Δίκης, μὴδ' ὕβριν ὄφελλε· ὕβρις γὰρ τε κακὴ δειλῶ βροτῶ· οὐδὲ μὲν ἐσθλὸς ῥηιδίως φερέμεν δύναται, βαρῦθει δὲ θ' ὑπ' αὐτῆς ἐγκύρσας ἄτησιν· ὁδὸς δ' ἐτέρηφι παρελθεῖν κρείστων ἐς τὰ δίκαια· Hesiod, *Theogony. Works and Days. Testimonia*, ed. and trans. Glenn W. Most, LCL 57 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007).

⁹¹ *Op.* 287–92: τὴν μὲν τοι Κακότητα καὶ ἰλαδὸν ἔστιν ἐλέσθαι ῥηιδίως· λείη μὲν ὁδός, μάλα δ' ἐγγύθι ναίει· τῆς δ' Ἀρετῆς ἰδρώτα θεοὶ προπάραιθεν ἔθηκαν ἀθάνατοι· μακρὸς δὲ καὶ ὄρθιος οἶμος ἐς αὐτὴν καὶ τρηχὺς τὸ πρῶτον· ἐπὴν δ' εἰς ἄκρον ἵκηται, ῥηιδίη δῆπειτα πέλει, χαλεπὴ περ εὐοῦσα· Hesiod, *Theogony. Works and Days. Testimonia*.

⁹² Plato, *Lysis. Symposium, Gorgias*, ed. and trans. W. R. M. Lamb, LCL 166 (Cambridge,

Gorg. 524: Now I, knowing all this before you, have appointed sons of my own to be judges; two from Asia, Minos and Rhadamanthus, and one from Europe, Aeacus. These, when their life is ended, shall give judgement in the meadow at the dividing of the road, whence are the two ways leading, one to the Isles of the Blest, and the other to Tartarus.⁹³

In Diphilus, the comic poet, also found in Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* V.14 and Eusebius *Dem. ev.* XIII.13, judgment is an unaltered status of one's conduct on two roads that lead to Hades.

Clement, *Strom.* V.14: καὶ γὰρ καθ' ἄδην δύο τρίβους νομίζομεν· Μίαν, δικαίων· ἑτέραν δ' ἀσεβῶν εἶναι Ὅρον.⁹⁴

Although quite limited, some Two Ways traditions contain angelic features. For example, in 1QS IX, 22–XI, 24, an angelic council gathers for the righteous (1QS XI, 7–8). Also, in 4Q544 fr. 2, watchers, Melkiresha, and prince of darkness rule over the domain of darkness. In some instances, an angel is substituted with something else. A serpent is used in Philo, *Leg.* 2.97–98,⁹⁵ prince of the air and God are two polarized figures in Ephesians 2:1–10,⁹⁶ two women appear

MA: Harvard University Press, 1925).

⁹³*Gorg.* 524: ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ταῦτα ἐγνωκῶς πρότερος ἢ ὑμεῖς ἐποίησάμην δικαστὰς υἱεῖς ἑμαυτοῦ, δύο μὲν ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας, Μίνω τε καὶ Ῥαδάμανθυν, ἓνα δὲ ἐκ τῆς Εὐρώπης, Αἰακόν· οὗτοι οὖν ἐπειδὴν τελευτήσωσι, δικάσουσιν ἐν τῷ λειμῶνι, ἐν τῇ τριόδῳ, ἐξ ἧς φέρετον τὴν ὁδὴν, ἢ μὲν εἰς μακάρων νήσους, ἢ δ' εἰς Τάρταρον.

⁹⁴Clement, *Strom.* V.14 (PG 9:180a–b): “for also we perceived that two paths lead to hades: one, of righteousness; the other to be according to ungodliness.”

⁹⁵Philo, *Leg.* II.97–98: “So he says, ‘Let Dan become a serpent on the road.’ The soul is our road; for as on the roads it is possible to see the distinction of existences, lifeless, living; irrational, rational; good, bad; slave, free; young, or older; male, female; foreign, or native; sickly, healthy; maimed, entire; so in the soul too there are lifeless, incomplete, diseased, enslaved, female, and countless other movements full of disabilities; and on the other hand movements living, entire, male, free, sound, elder, good, genuine, and, in a real sense, of the fatherland. | Let then the principle of self-mastery become a serpent upon the soul whose road lies through all the circumstances of life and let it seat itself upon the well worn track. What is this? The path of virtue is unworn, for few tread it, while that of vice is well worn. He calls on him to beset with his ambush and to lie in wait upon the beaten road of passion and vice, on which reasoning powers that flee from virtue wear out their life.” Philo, *On the Creation. Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis 2 and 3*, trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, LCL 226 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929).

⁹⁶Eph 2:2, 4: ἐν αἷς ποτε περιεπατήσατε κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος, τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργοῦντος ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας . . . ὁ δὲ θεὸς πλούσιος

in Xenophon, *Mem.* 2.21–34, “Virtue” and “Pleasure” are personified in Silius, *Pun.* 15.18–23.⁹⁷ Justin Martyr reuses the Xenophon tradition and includes demons and angels (*2 Apol.* 11).

Justin, *2 Apol.* 11.3–5: τὸν Ἡρακλέα ἐπὶ τρίοδόν τινα, ἔφη ὁ Ξενοφῶν, βαδίζοντα εὐρεῖν τὴν τε ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν κακίαν ἐν γυναικῶν μορφαῖς φαινομένας. καὶ τὴν μὲν κακίαν, ἄβρᾶ ἔσθῆτι καὶ χρώματι πεποικιλμένῳ καὶ ἀνθοῦντι ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων προσώπῳ θελκτικὴν τε εὐθὺς πρὸς τὰς ὄψεις οὔσαν . . . καὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν ἀχμηρὰν ἐν τῷ προσώπῳ καὶ τῇ περιβολῇ οὔσαν.⁹⁸

An angel of justice and an angel of iniquity appear in Origen of Alexandria (*Hom. Luc.* 35.3–6).⁹⁹

Although these selected features appear within Two Ways traditions, they appear at a much more infrequent rate than Two Ways texts. Each of these traditions do not frame their Two Ways equally, nor are there set patterns when angelic or apocalyptic features do appear.

ὦν ἐν ἐλέει, διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην αὐτοῦ ἣν ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς.

⁹⁷Silius, *Pun.* 15.18–23: “These anxious thoughts filled the young man’s mind, as he sat beneath the green shadow of a bay-tree that grew behind the dwelling; and suddenly two figures, far exceeding mortal stature, flew down from the sky and stood to right and left of him: Virtue was on one side, and Pleasure, the enemy of Virtue, on the other.” Silius Italicus, *Punica*, vol. 2, Books 9–17.

⁹⁸Justin, *2 Apol.* 11.3–5: “Heracles, Xenophon said, when he came to a fork in the road, found virtue and vice apparent in the form of women. Vice was luxuriously dressed, her face painted with colours to make it bloom, here eyes immediately bewitching. . . . Virtue, on the other hand, was sordid in countenance and dress.” Denis Minns and Paul Parvis, eds., *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies*, OECT (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

⁹⁹Origen, *Hom. Luc.* 35.3: “We read that the angel of justice and the angel of iniquity argued about Abraham’s salvation and his loss, as each of the camps wished to claim for himself. The condition is of course, that someone should be willing to accept a writing of this kind. But, if it displeases anyone he should go to the book entitled *The Shepherd*. There he will find that two angels are present to every man: a wicked angel exhorts him to wrongdoing; and a good angel, who urges him to do everything good. Elsewhere, too, it is recorded that two angels attend a man, for good and for evil.” Origen, *Homilies on Luke, Fragments on Luke*, trans. Joseph T. Lienhard S.J., FC 94 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1996).

CHAPTER 3

“THE PATH OF LIGHT AND OF DARKNESS”: ANCIENT JEWISH AND EARLY CHRISTIAN TWO WAYS AND AN APOCALYPTIC WORLDVIEW

In the previous chapter I placed historical apocalyptic discussions in concert with Two Ways literature. Among the myriads of ancient texts from Judaism, Persian, Greek and Roman, and early Christian traditions, a few patterns begin to emerge for Two Ways literature (see table A1 in appendix). Among those patterns are two kinds of categories: Two Ways instruction that contains a clearly identifiable, literary structure and Two Ways instruction that does not contain a clearly identifiable, literary structure. I have titled the Two Ways material that contain a literary structure “Two Ways texts” and categorized the salient apocalyptic concepts that emerge within these collections of texts.

Thus, in the present chapter, I will assess the apocalyptic motifs from a set of Two Ways texts that are often placed in conversation with the Didache’s Two Ways.¹ These texts are: 1QS III, 13–IV, 26; Testament of Asher; Galatians 5:16–24;

¹See Jean-Paul Audet, *La Didachè: Instructions des Apôtres, EBib* (Paris: Gabalda, 1958), 121–66; M. Jack Suggs, “The Christian Two Ways Tradition: Its Antiquity, Form, and Function,” in *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren*, ed. David Edward Aune, NovTSup 33 (Leiden: Brill, 1972), 60–74; Willy Rordorf and André Tuilier, *La Doctrine Des Douze Apôtres (Didachè): Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction, Notes, Appendice, Annexe et Index*, 2nd ed., SC 248 (Paris: Les Éditions Du Cerf, 1978), 22–34; Clayton N. Jefford, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, VCSup 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1989), 27n17; Kurt Niederwimmer, *Die Didache*, KAV 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 48–54, 61n72; Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache: A Commentary*, trans. Linda M. Maloney, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 30–34, 40n73; Bart D. Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers I*, LCL 24 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 408; Marcello Del Verme, *Didache and Judaism: Jewish Roots of an Ancient Christian-Jewish Work* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 246–47; Alan J. P. Garrow, *The Gospel of Matthew’s Dependence on the Didache*, LNTS 254 (New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), 67–92; John S. Kloppenborg, “Didache 1.1—6.1, James, Matthew, and the

Barn. 18.1–21.1; *De Doctrina*; and Herm. Mand. 6.1–2 (35–36). Although debate may surround an individual text and its specific contribution to Didache or Two Ways studies, I will document some of these observations as they arise.

Given the possibilities of source contribution to the Didache’s tradition history, I will only give attention to the apocalyptic motifs in each text. I will inquire how and in what ways these individual texts accentuate the Two Ways with an apocalyptic worldview. In this manner, I will be more centrally focused on the individual voices of these traditions than with how they may or may not influence one another.

Accordingly, in the present chapter, I will argue for the prominence of apocalyptic motifs in these chosen Two Ways texts. I will argue that not only do each of these texts qualify as a Two Ways text, but also these texts incorporate the following apocalyptic motifs: (1) angelic or otherworldly figures, (2) angelic or otherworldly ethical influence, (3) dualistic cosmological structures, (4) divine determinism, and (5) anthropological telic ends. Only applicable to 1QS III–IV, Barn. 18–21, and *De Doctrina*, I will add an additional category of “light and darkness” dualism as a means to frame the Two Ways. Some of these apocalyptic motifs will be made quite explicit, whereas others are less prominent.

The following argument will give a further in-depth analysis of 1QS III, 13–IV, 26; Testament of Asher; Galatians 5:16–24; Barn. 18.1–21.1; *De Doctrina*; and Herm. Mand. 6.1–2 (35–36). By giving attention to the individual texts, I will be able to assess their unique contribution and unique outlook regarding the intersection of apocalyptic motifs and the Two Ways instruction. Some sections will also include

Torah,” in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew Gregory and Christopher Tuckett, NTAf (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 195; Nancy Pardee, *The Genre and Development of the Didache*, WUNT 2/339 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 50, 77–80, 126, 167.

discussion of genre and literary structure, especially where scholarship deems them appropriate. But primary attention will be given to how each text describes the apocalyptic worldview for its version of the Two Ways. Each text will express some diversity, but in general, they all maintain these broad apocalyptic concepts in one way or another.

Treatise of the Two Spirits (1QS III, 13–IV, 26)

1QS III, 13–IV, 26, often titled the Treatise on the Two Spirits (c. 100–75 BCE),² combines a two, non-corporeal angelic motif with two cosmic realms and two groups of humanity (1 QS III, 16–18). The “God of Knowledge” predetermines the existence of the two angelic creatures and humanity, along with their deeds (1QS III, 15–16).³ There is a Prince of Lights (שר אורים) and an Angel of Darkness (מלאך הושך) with distinct ethical dispositions. Humanity, moreover, self-identifies with one of these two cosmic beings, is ruled by these two Spirits, and walks in accordance with their ways (1QS IV, 18). The cosmic sphere houses the Angel of Darkness, a myriad of angels, and the Prince of Light (1QS III, 18–IV, 1). Human ethics become the theater that displays the ethical influence from the angelic beings (1QS IV, 2–14).

Thus, the Treatise on the Two Spirits presents a cosmological scene whereby theological anthropology becomes the space through which two forces interact. The actions of humanity and the two spirits are nearly indiscernible. Jörg

²Jean Duhaime, “Dualism,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam, vol. 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 216; Jutta Leonhardt-Balzer, “Dualism,” in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, ed. John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 555.

³Text and translation helps come from “1QS,” translated by M. Wise, M. Abegg, and E. Cook with N. Gordon, in the following volume: Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, eds., *Texts Concerned with Religious Law, Exegetical Texts and Parabiblical Texts*, 2nd ed., vol. 1, *DSSR* (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 8–13.

Frey identifies this conflation as a “creation-founded and eschatologically confined cosmic dualism with a subordinate ethical dualism, that comes to effect not only in the respective deeds, but even in a psychological division within every single person as well.”⁴ As Loren Stuckenbruck notes, the cleansing of humanity from their deeds, as compared to 1 En. 10, is eschatological in nature.⁵

The Two Ways are the result of the ethical influence of two spirits (1QS IV, 2–14). The Prince of Light is the spirit of truth (1QS III, 18–19). The ethical nature, as ruled by the Prince of Light, is humility, patience, loving-kindness, charity, and similar characteristics (1QS IV, 3–8). The Angel of Darkness is the spirit of falsehood (1QS III, 18–19)—quite contrary to the Prince of Light. His ways are marked with deceit, wickedness, folly, lust, and of like items “so that humanity walks in all the ways of darkness and guile” (1QS IV, 9–14). These polar ethical features, according to Charlotte Hempel, become a “defining feature of the community.”⁶

This cosmological determinism also governs the ethics of humanity. That is, the two angelic forces rule and influence the directives of humanity: “The authority of the Prince of Light extends to the governance of all righteous people” and “the authority of the Angel of Darkness further extends to the corruption of all the righteous” (1QS III, 20–21; cf. 1 En. 108.11–14). The relationship between the two angelic forces and the identity of the humans are intertwined to associate the

⁴Jörg Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library: Reflections on Their Background and History,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Cambridge 1995*, ed. Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen, STDJ 23 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 294.

⁵Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *The Myth of Rebellious Angels: Studies in Second Temple Judaism and New Testament Texts*, WUNT 335 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 239.

⁶Charlotte Hempel, “The *Treatise on the Two Spirits* and the Literary History of the *Rule of the Community*,” in *Dualism in Qumran*, ed. Géza G. Xeravits, LSTS 76 (London: T&T Clark, 2010), 116.

synonymous actions of the two (cf. 1 En. 10). Although the angels are an apparent external force under the auspice of God, the virtues and vices of humanity are intertwined with the headship of the two angels. A clear delineation of responsibility is indistinguishable between humans and the cosmic forces.⁷ According to Stuckenbruck,

Although the Angel of Darkness initially appears as an external force under the auspices of God the creator of all, the association of the ‘spirit of deceit’ in 1QS IV with vices for which human beings are held responsible suggests a close association between such a figure and a notion of theological anthropology that renders the angel’s influence as part of the human condition.⁸

Theological anthropology is intertwined with the cosmological forces of the two angels that manifest along the lines of virtues and vices. These ethics become a physical expression and battleground of cosmic conflict—most likely in the heart of man (“Until now the spirits of truth and perversity have contended within the human heart. And all people walk in both wisdom and foolishness”; 1QS IV, 23–24). It is debated, moreover, as to whether the angelic influence is an external cosmic battle or a psychological disposition within persons.⁹

⁷Stuckenbruck argues, “All human beings, whether socially on the inside or outside of the righteous community, comprise the battleground wherein the conflict between opposing spirits is carried out.” That is, the ethics of the community—either morally good or morally evil—also reflects the sphere whereby the angelic opposing beings are able carry out their ends and purposes. Stuckenbruck, *Myth of Rebellious Angels*, 234.

⁸Stuckenbruck, *Myth of Rebellious Angels*, 93–94.

⁹Mladen Popović, “Light and Darkness in the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* (1 QS III 13–IV 26) and in 4Q186,” in *Dualism in Qumran*, ed. Géza G. Xeravits, LSTS 76 (London: T&T Clark, 2010), 153; John R. Levison, “The Two Spirits in Qumran Theology,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, vol. 2, The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 172–85.

Literary structure and a Consideration of Genre

Because the Two Ways are embedded within a larger discourse in 1QS III–IV, a few comments on the literary structure are needed. The literary structure of 1QS III, 13–IV, 26 can generally be divided over six sections. According to Jutta Leonhardt-Balzer, 1QS III, 13–IV, 26 may be structured as follows:¹⁰

1QS III, 13–15: Title and Topic

1QS III, 15–18: ‘Hymn of creation’: God as lord of creation places it under the dominion of mankind.

1QS III, 18–IV, 1: The Two Spirits

1QS IV, 2–14: The effect of both spirits and the fate of both kinds of people

2–8: Spirit of Light

9–14: Spirit of Deceit

1QS IV, 15–23: Struggle of the two spirits and final intervention of God

1QS IV, 23–26: Summary and conclusion.

Parts I and II provide an “Introduction” to the section whereby a teacher will instruct “the sons of light” regarding the *kind* of spirits humanity possesses, their ethics upon the earth, and their divine reward based upon their particular ethic (1QS III, 13–18a). Part III, then, describes the cosmological and dualistic angelic forces that wage upon humanity (1QS III, 18b–IV, 1)—both positively and negatively.

Part IV describes the Two Ways within the world (1QS IV, 2–14). Two paralleled subsections detail the two different ways. The way of life is introduced (1QS IV, 2), followed by a list of virtues (1QS IV, 3–7), and concludes with a

¹⁰Jutta Leonhardt-Balzer, “A Case of Psychological Dualism: Philo of Alexandria and the Instruction on the Two Spirits,” in *Early Christian Literature and Intertextuality*, vol. 2 of *Exegetical Studies*, ed. Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias, LNTS 392 (London: T&T Clark, 2009), 30; Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought,” 290.

description of rewards for those adhering to such way (1QS IV, 7b–8). The way of falsehood, as it pertains to the Angel of Darkness, is introduced (1QS IV, 9a), followed by a list of vices (1QS IV, 9b–11), and concludes with a description of damnation for those adhering to such way (1QS IV, 12–14).

The final two parts describe the predetermined hostility between the two angelic forces as expressed through humanity (1QS IV, 15–26). Humanity is ruled by the conflict between these angelic forces (1QS IV, 15). The ordination of justice, moreover, is overturned through cleansing humanity with a spirit of truth so as to purify them (1QS IV, 20b–21). Yet, God has allotted a determined time for such angelic influence (1QS IV, 25–26).

The Treatise of the Two Spirits conveys a drastically different set of descriptions when compared to the whole of 1QS.¹¹ It introduces a different manner of expressing instruction. Thus, does 1QS III–IV offer a different literary genre than the rest of the community rule?

The genre of 1QS III–IV jointly combines sapiential and apocalyptic features.¹²

¹¹One more observation, though unnecessary for my overall argument, considers the relation of 1QS III, 13–IV, 26 to the whole of 1QS. As scholars consider the thematic and structural differences, these conclusions suggest that the Treatise on the Two Spirits may be a textual insertion, especially given the little thematic connections to the rest of the *Community Rule*—with the possible exception of 1QS II, 5–9 and cursings of Belial. Recent studies have pointed to the floating tradition of 1QS III, 13–IV, 26. Loren Stuckenbruck offers the following comments: “It is appropriate, therefore, to interpret the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* as a document in its own right rather than, in context, simply as an extension of its immediate literary context.” Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought,” 289, 95; Stuckenbruck, *Myth of Rebellious Angels*, 231; Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*, STDJ 21 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 106; Alison Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for The Community Rule*, STDJ 77 (Leiden: Brill, 2009); John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 52–53.

¹²Frey observes the following: “The ‘*instruction on the two spirits*’ in 1QS 3:13–4:26 is the most impressive example of the pattern of dualism which I characterize as sapiential.” Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought,” 289.

This discourse is in the form of a sapiential instruction; it is not presented as a revelation. Nonetheless the content is strongly reminiscent of the apocalypses. Supernatural forces shape human behavior; the era of conflict has a set limit; eventually there will be a divine judgment followed by eternal reward and punishment. Whether this dualistic understanding of the world is presupposed in all other the sectarian scrolls is a matter of dispute, but the other scrolls have their own apocalyptic features.¹³

This text permits another good example to observe the flexibility of literary genres.

In this case, as Collins identifies, 1QS III–IV can be both apocalyptic and sapiential.¹⁴

In order to situate such genre concept, a few of these literary features ought to be present within 1QS III–IV. First, 1QS III–IV is framed by a teacher-pupil form of instruction. For, the spirit of true counsel will instruct humanity concerning their ways (1QS III, 6). Such instruction provides a means to contemplate “light of life” and its accompanying virtues (1QS III, 7). Then, the Treatise of the Two Spirits elaborates upon how humanity ought to perceive the spirits that dwell with them and the expression of such ethics. Furthermore, a tutor continues to instruct a pupil (1QS III, 13). The sapiential tier structure is accentuated by the expression of “master” and “son,” and “enlighten” and “teach’ (1QS III, 14). These sapiential elements frame the following description of Treatise of the Two Spirits as a form of instruction to the “sons of light.”

Second, apocalyptic features appear within the tutor-pupil instruction. So, any apocalyptic themes are part of sapiential instruction. Apocalyptic motifs are

¹³John J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, LDSS (London: Routledge, 1997), 10.

¹⁴Collins also notes, in an earlier work, the particular flexibility of the apocalyptic genre. He identifies, at the least, three different possibilities. A text can wholly contain apocalyptic features. A text can be apocalyptic with other subordinate genres that are interpolated into the narrative. Or, a text does not qualify as an apocalyptic genre, per se, but includes subsidiary apocalyptic features. In the case of 1QS III–IV, both forms are prominent enough to prohibit that one literary form is exclusive to the other. That is, the sapiential and apocalyptic are too intertwined to discern totally which form is primary. John J. Collins, “Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre,” in *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*, ed. John J. Collins, *Semeia* 14 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1979), 8.

readily observed. Whether it be the cosmological dualism (1QS III, 17–18), angelic dualism (1QS III, 20, 24), divine determinism (1QS III, 15–16, 25; IV, 16b–17, 25), or cosmic conflict expressed within anthropological categories (1QS III, 14, 19, 20, 24; IV, 15, 26), apocalyptic motifs and features prevail within 1QS III, 13–IV, 26. So, the genre of the Treatise is determined both by the literary structure of a tutor-pupil frame as well as the apocalyptic features that predominantly encompass the worldview of such instruction.¹⁵

Cosmological and Angelic Dualism

As a whole, the Treatise of the Two Spirits is marked by dualistic categories and binary opposites.¹⁶ In Part II of the work, God appoints two spirits to govern the cosmos (1QS III, 18). These spirits correlate to both “truth” and “falsehood” (1QS III, 18). Two *kinds* of people are under the auspice of the two angelic beings: the Prince of Lights and the Angel of Darkness (1QS III, 20). Humanity is ruled by these two angelic beings characterized in polarized ethics. Stuckenbruck insightfully notes how the dualistic categories falter when observing the angelic influence upon humanity. The Angel of Darkness will lead all the “sons of light” astray along with his allotted spirits (1QS III, 24). However, the counter does not contain an equaled opposition.¹⁷ It is the “God of Israel” and his “Angel of Truth” that come to the aid of the sons of light (1QS III, 24).

¹⁵Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 40.

¹⁶Duhaime observes, “The dualism found in the Treatise is multiform. It is cosmic and mythological in that the fundamental structure of the world, as planned and created by God, consists in the division between light and darkness as two separate domains under the power of antagonistic supernatural leaders.” Duhaime, “Dualism,” 216.

¹⁷Frey suggests, “The assumption seems to be very likely” regarding an entourage of good angels for the prince of light. Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought,” 292–93.

The language is not completely “dualistic.” For example, whereas the text refers to a group of spirits that comprise the entourage of the Angel of Darkness and cause the sons of light to stumble, no contrasting host of beings is associated with “the Angel of his Truth” who, with “the God of Israel” comes to their aid (1QS iii 24–25).¹⁸

According to Archie Wright, “The two angelic spirits operate under the sovereignty of God within the human realm where the lives of individuals are directed by either one of the two spirits.”¹⁹ Angelic forces are personified elsewhere in 4Q543–547 and the *War Scroll*.

The images of cosmic opposition are followed by a list of ethical opposites along with polarized rewards.²⁰ The Two Ways of the spirits contrasted by righteous virtues (1QS IV, 3–7) and indecent vices (1QS IV, 9–11). The rewards of such ethics correspond to eternal opposites: “long life,” “fruitfulness,” “everlasting blessing,” “perpetual joy,” and “crown of glory” (1QS IV, 7–8) contrasted with “multiple afflictions at the hand of all the angels of perdition,” “everlasting damnation,” “never ending terror and reproach,” “doleful sorrow,” “bitter evil,” and “dark happenstance” until destruction ensues with no survivor (1QS IV, 12–14).

Transitioning from the Two Ways, cosmological, anthropological, and ethical contrasts intersect in the final two sections (1QS IV, 15–26). The nature of humanity is governed by two spirits for the remainder of their lives as expressed *via* anthropological ethics (1QS IV, 15). The ethical and angelic opposition is most expressively seen in the following expression (1QS IV, 15–17):

¹⁸Stuckenbruck, *Myth of Rebellious Angels*, 231n41.

¹⁹Archie T. Wright, *The Origin of Evil Spirits: The Reception of Genesis 6. 1–4 in Early Jewish Literature*, WUNT 2/198 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 169.

²⁰Leonhardt-Balzer rightly notes, “Thus the scenario is set for a cosmic battle and the above mentioned final cleansing and destruction of darkness (i.e., 1QS III, 20–IV, 1) is not restricted to ethical aspects but also describes a cosmic dualism and a battle to end all darkness. This cosmic dualism is also eschatological in the sense that it finds its end in the final destruction of evil.” Leonhardt-Balzer, “Case of Psychological Dualism,” 33.

The character and fate of all humankind reside with these spirits. All the hosts of humanity, generation by generation, are heirs to these spiritual divisions, walking according to their ways. . . . God has appointed these spirits as equals until the last age, and set an everlasting enmity between their divisions.

The clash of cosmology, anthropology, and ethical opposites “demonstrates that the *Treatise* is informed by a more complex frame of understanding which reflects on the position of humanity itself.”²¹

Divine Determinism and Angelic Dominion

Divine determinism is yet another categorical idea prevalent in the *Treatise*. The instruction begins with an ordination of decrees from God. Epistemological foundations stem from God (1QS III, 15). Furthermore, the entire foundations of epistemology were established prior to any expression of knowledge (1QS III, 15–16). These decrees are in accordance with God’s design and are immutable, thus creating a type of epistemological determinism. God has ordered the design of all things and they come to existence—“at their appointed times as ordained by His glorious plan” (1QS III, 15–16). Afterward, he dispenses them according to the needs of his creation (1QS III, 16–17).

Prior to any other instruction on the divine relation to humanity or to angels, immutable epistemological determinism serves as a decreed ordination. It remains difficult not to assess this initial framework as operating along with the subsequent angelic rule and anthropological ethics. Is the divine determinism an imposition to the expression of ethics? Does the divine directive extend to the expressions and influences of the Angel of darkness? Additionally, if the epistemological determinism is a foreordained component of God, and the *Treatise*

²¹Stuckenbruck, *Myth of Rebellious Angels*, 231–32.

is essentially a sapiential instruction to the sons of light (1QS III, 13–14), then does divine epistemology eventually manifest itself through anthropological ethics?

Divine determinism also extends its boundaries into the ethical influence from angelic creatures. For God has “created the world” for humans to govern, appointing “two spirits in which to walk” until his visitation (1QS III, 18). Even if humans portray the ethics of the Prince of Darkness, the influence of the angelic beings is still divinely appointed. Human involvement works within this divine determinism as God aids the “sons of light,” although “It is actually He who created the spirits of light and darkness, making them the cornerstone of every deed” (1QS III, 25).

The oversight of the angelic beings expresses a two-fold form of determinism. Humans, then, are ruled by the two spirits—even receiving recompense for their ways—which are then given boundaries until the final age (1QS IV, 15–16). Eventually, these two angelic influences will come to an end according to God’s ordination (1QS IV, 19). Moreover, God’s rule over the angelic realm also helps undergird his epistemological influence with humanity: “He has granted them dominion over humanity, so imparting knowledge of good [and evil, de]ciding the fate of every living being by the measure of which spirit predominates in [. . .] visitation” (1QS IV, 26). Wright suggests that 1QS IV, 26 brings together both a dualistic worldview and predestination.²²

Anthropological Ethics and Angelic Conflict

As already suggested, humanity appears to experience the effects of a cosmic battle between angelic beings. As the community possesses divinely

²²Wright, *Origin of Evil Spirits*, 169.

appointed spirits, humanity's ethics correspond to cosmic rule and conflict of a particular spirit. Either the Angel of Light or the Prince of Darkness expresses dominion over humanity. As a result, humanity will "walk" in such a manner that reflects one of the angelic dispositions (1QS III, 18–19): "upright character and fate originate with the Habitation of Light; perverse, with the Fountain of Darkness."

The wayward "sons of light" transpires when the Prince of Darkness influences them (1QS III, 21). "Sins, iniquities, shameful and rebellious deeds" are due to the rule of the Prince of Darkness (1QS III, 22). All of the distress of humanity is based upon the "this Angel's [i.e., Prince of Darkness] diabolic rule" (1QS III, 24).

Yet, the contrary does not seem to occur in the Treatise. If the Prince of Darkness seeks to influence the counter human realm, would we not expect the Angel of Light to influence those under the dominion of the Prince of Darkness? This tradition does not seem to be present within the Treatise. Instead, the "God of Israel" and the Angel of Light help "all the sons of light" (1QS III, 24–25). Consequently, divine expression of ethics, and more specifically divine aid, only extends to a form of anthropological particularism.

After the Two Ways (1QS IV, 2–14), a less explicit cosmological portrait appears. Instead of cosmological dualism, the angelic beings appear to dwell inside each person. The nature of humanity is still ruled by these two spirits (1QS IV, 15). Yet, God purifies humanity by uprooting the spirit of injustice (1QS IV, 22). The two spirits, rather than having dominion over all humanity within the cosmic sphere (1QS III, 17–26), simultaneously dwell within a given individual (1QS IV, 23). The cosmic battle between the Angelic beings takes place "within the human heart" (1QS IV, 23).

So the question remains, where does this angelic battle take place? Do the angelic beings rule over all of humanity within a dual cosmos (1QS III, 17–26) or do

two angels dwell within each person (1QS IV, 15–26)? The cosmological conflict between the polarized spirits takes place seemingly within a polarized world and within humanity. “All humanity” as Stuckenbruck rightly identifies, “whether socially on the inside or outside of the righteous community, comprise the battleground wherein the conflict between opposing spirits is carried out.”²³

Within Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship, a debate exists over this issue. Is the cosmic battle of these spirits an internal psychological dimension of humanity or is the cosmic spiritual dualism a battle expressed within the cosmic realm? For example, P. Wernberg-Møller argues that 1QS III–IV can reflect a psychological mood or disposition of a person.²⁴ Wright appeals to 1QS III, 18–19 as the introduction to a psychological dualism.²⁵ Collins argues for a both/and argument and rightly notes that Wernberg-Møller’s comment, “we are therefore not dealing here with a kind of metaphysical, cosmic dualism,” is a *non sequitur*.²⁶ The scene and narrative development of 1QS III–IV contains elements of cosmic, moral, and psychological dispositions. So, it would be a form of reductionism to utilize a single category, while neglecting others. In affirming both the cosmological and anthropological theater, the opposing spirits manifest polar opposites within the cosmos and in the heart of humanity.²⁷

²³Stuckenbruck, *Myth of Rebellious Angels*, 234.

²⁴P. Wernberg-Møller, “A Reconsideration of the Two Spirits in the Rule of the Community (1QSerek III, 13–IV, 26),” *RevQ* 3 (1961): 413–41.

²⁵Wright, *Origin of Evil Spirits*, 168.

²⁶Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 41.

²⁷Stuckenbruck, *Myth of Rebellious Angels*, 235.

Testament of Asher 1–8 and the Two Ways

According to Joel Marcus, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs are among the more puzzling documents in Jewish Pseudepigrapha and for many reasons.²⁸ The Twelve Patriarchs are known primarily through Greek MSS from, none older than, the tenth-century, and a thirteenth-century Armenian MS.²⁹ Marinus de Jonge identifies a number of Christian interpolations in the Testaments and contends that there is no possible retrieval of getting behind the text in order to observe a pre-Christian, Jewish *Vorlage*.³⁰ Due to these Jewish and Christian influences, dating the Twelve Patriarchs have proved problematic as scholarship vacillates “between a Christian document written in the 1st or 2nd centuries CE and a Jewish document written in the 2nd or 1st centuries BCE with various stages of both Jewish and Christian interpolations.”³¹ De Jonge has suggested that the form we currently possess was composed in Christian circles during the second half of the second-century CE.³²

²⁸Joel Marcus, “The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and the *Didascalia Apostolorum*: A Common Jewish Christian Milieu?,” *JTS* 61, no. 2 (2010): 596.

²⁹Marcus, “Common Jewish Christian Milieu?,” 596.

³⁰M. de Jonge, “Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” *NovT* 4 (1960): 182–235; M. de Jonge, “Once More: Christian Influence on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” *NovT* 5 (1962): 311–19; M. de Jonge, “Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation*, ed. M. de Jonge, SVTP 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 193–246.

³¹Vered Hillel, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Structure, Source, and Composition* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2013), 5; Also consult: H. Dixon Slingerland, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research*, SBLMS 21 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), 5–33.

³²Marinus de Jonge, “The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and Related Qumran Fragments,” in *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*, ed. Randal A. Argall, Beverly A. Bow, and Rodney A. Werline (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000), 64; M. de Jonge, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature: The Case of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve*, SVTP 18 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 77.

The Testament of Asher, one of twelve farewell discourses,³³ is of particular value for the present study. According to some in Didache scholarship, Testament of Asher is often viewed as part of the tradition history of the Jewish Two Ways or closely related to Two Ways Didache material.³⁴ Yet, scholars invested in Testament of Asher and Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs research do not affirm the continuity of a Two Ways motif.³⁵ For example, Robert Kugler notes, “While Asher’s speech seems to propose a two-ways theology (cf. 1QS 3.13–4.26; Barnabas 18–20; Shepherd of Hermas, Mandates VI.1–2), almost all commentators speak against that conclusion, and rightly so.”³⁶ Hillel, likewise, suggests that the Testament of Asher does not advocate a Two Ways theology that is continuous with

³³Tom de Bruin rightly observes that the order of the testaments are ordered in accordance to the mothers of the patriarchs: first, Leah’s sons, then Bilhah’s, then Zilpah’s, and last Rachel’s. Tom de Bruin, *The Great Controversy: The Individual’s Struggle Between Good and Evil in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and in Their Jewish and Christian Contexts*, NTOA 106 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 42.

³⁴Audet, *La Didachè*, 160; John S. Kloppenborg, “The Sayings of Jesus in the Didache” (MA thesis, University of St. Michael’s College, 1976), 27–31; Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 24; Niederwimmer, *Die Didache*, 57; John S. Kloppenborg, “The Transformation of Moral Exhortation in *Didache* 1–5,” in *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History, and Transmission*, ed. Clayton N. Jefford, NovTSup 77 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 95; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 36; Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity*, CRINT: Section III Jewish Traditions in Early Christian Literature 5 (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 57, 141; Alistair Stewart-Sykes, ed., *On the Two Ways: Life or Death, Light or Darkness: Foundational Texts in the Tradition*, PPS 41 (Yonkers, NY: St. Vladimirs Seminary Press, 2011), 13; Matthew Larsen and Michael Svigel, “The First Century Two Ways Catechesis and Hebrews 6:1–6,” in *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, ECL 14 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 481.

³⁵H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*, SVTP 8 (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 339; Johannes Thomas notes, “T. Ash. 1 is one of the classic texts for the two ways motif.” Thomas is more willing to see a similar connection to the Two Ways. Johannes Thomas, “The Paraenesis of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*: Between Torah and Jewish Wisdom,” in *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context*, ed. James Starr and Engberg-Pedersen, Troels (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005), 169.

³⁶Robert A. Kugler, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, GAP (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001), 77–78.

1QS III–IV, Barn. 18–20, Herm. Mand. 2.4–6 (27.4–6); 6.1–2 (35–36), Did. 1.2–4.14, or other relevant Iranian and Gnostic literature.³⁷

Although the Testament of Asher is the only Testament to use “the two ways” expression,³⁸ de Jonge suggests it is not related to the Two Ways. The Testament of Asher, along with the rest of the Twelve Testaments, neglects to elaborate upon an ethical Two Ways instruction nor include a dualistic pneumatology/angelology,³⁹ even though the Testaments may have points of agreement with 1QS III–IV.⁴⁰ Furthermore, de Jonge concludes, “The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* do not offer any real help to those who want to go back to the Jewish roots of the ‘Two Ways’/‘Two Angels’—instruction found in the Didache, Barnabas and related sources.”⁴¹ In the following section, I will argue that de Jonge’s

³⁷Hillel, *Twelve Patriarchs*, 77; Marcus concludes that the Testaments and the Latin Did. Apos. have a thematic relation to one another. If this thematic relation is so, this claim strengthens the relationship of T. Ash. to a stream of tradition for a Two Ways metaphor. Marcus suggest that comparing these two texts strengthens the case that the T. 12 Patr. is a Jewish Christian Document because: “(a) there seems to be some literary relation between the two texts; (b) the main ‘heresy’ against which the *Didascalia* battles is a version of Christianity that insists on observance of the whole Mosaic Torah; and (c) we sometimes find the *Testaments* advocating precisely the sorts of positions that the *Didascalia* opposes.” Marcus, “Common Jewish Christian Milieu?,” 625.

³⁸Marinus de Jonge, “The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the ‘Two Ways,’” in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*, ed. Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu, JSJSup 111 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 189.

³⁹de Jonge, “Twelve Patriarchs and the ‘Two Ways,’” 194.

⁴⁰de Jonge, “Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” 1975, 246n1; Hollander and de Jonge, *Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*, 339.

⁴¹De Jonge further suggests, “Their place is further down the line of transmission, in Christian circles. And they should be studied as an interesting case of incorporation and assimilation of traditional material (which may be called ‘Jewish’ and ‘Christian’)—alongside other Christian documents, such as the Didache and Barnabas, but especially the Shepherd of Hermas.” These comments seem to suggest that de Jonge is considering the tradition-history of the Jewish Two Ways. If he is suggesting that T. Ash. is not part of the Did. source development, I along with other Did. scholars would agree. But his final concession seems to permit that T. Ash. can and should be compared to other early Christian Two Ways texts that include Did., Barn., and Herm. de Jonge, “Twelve Patriarchs and the ‘Two Ways,’” 194.

exact arguments do in fact cause Testament of Asher to qualify as a Two Ways text, and Didache scholars are generally correct to identify this early Jewish-Christian tradition as part of the Two Ways paradigm even if Testament of Asher is not part of the tradition history of Didache and related sources.⁴²

Two Ways Literary Structure of Testament of Asher 1–8

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, more broadly, and the Testament of Asher, more narrowly, are often part of the generic discussion of farewell testaments or farewell discourses.⁴³ According to de Bruin, “Little headway has been made in attempting to define the farewell discourse genre. There is general acceptance of a few characteristics, including the imminent death of an important figure, the calling together of the audience, the speech of the person about to die, and the death of that figure.”⁴⁴ Because the Testaments move beyond the simple qualities of the farewell features, they also announce the recipients’s future, contain predictive elements, and thus are apocalyptic farewell discourses.⁴⁵

Standard introductions mark each Testament. The beginning of each Testament conveys its contents as a copy (ἀντίγραφον) of the patriarch. Next, each

⁴²De Jonge rightfully clarifies that T. Ash. 1.3 and 6.4–6 help situate T. Ash. as a Two Ways metaphor. And, I partially affirm his comment: “In view of what I argued in the opening section I will treat them as another Christian writing that adopted ‘Jewish’ paraenetical teaching, and not as evidence for Jewish use of the ‘Two Ways’-scheme.” De Jonge appears to presume that a Two Ways scheme is strictly situated in the source traditions of the Did. If this observation is so, then McKenna, Niederwimmer, and my assessment in chapter 2 (also see table A1) document and demonstrate that the Two Ways concept extends far beyond than the Did. source traditions. de Jonge, “Twelve Patriarchs and the ‘Two Ways,’” 184–85.

⁴³For an extended discussion and critical interaction with scholarship regarding this concept, consult de Bruin, *Great Controversy*, 36–42.

⁴⁴de Bruin, *Great Controversy*, 42.

⁴⁵Kugler, *Twelve Patriarchs*, 16.

introduction will contain the patriarch’s age and comment on his pending death. Each Testament will proceed by calling forth the family and the patriarch gives his final comments to his sons (υἱοί; T. Sim. 1.1; T. Levi. 1.1; T. Jud. 1.1; T. Iss. 1.1; T. Naph. 1.2; T. Gad. 1.1; T. Ash. 1.1; T. Benj. 1.1), grandchildren (υἱοὶ τῶν υἱῶν; T. Reu. 1.2), includes “brothers” of Joseph (ἀδελφοί; T. Jos. 1.1), children (τέκνα; T. Zeb. 1.1), and the family (πατριά; T. Dan. 1.2).⁴⁶ As de Bruin observes, “Whatever the prologue contains, it introduces the narrative frame in which the farewell discourse will take place.”⁴⁷

Beyond the introductory frame, the patriarch’s speech begins the discourse. The discourses often contain three categories: biographical, exhortatory, and future-oriented instructions.⁴⁸ According to Hillel, the Testaments comprise paraenetic prose, paraenetic exhortations, and pronouncements.⁴⁹ Thus, this bi-part pattern of paraenesis and prophecy encompass the macro-structure of each Testament.

As I narrow upon the Testament of Asher, I seek to build from Hillel’s structural analysis and identify the symmetry with a Two Ways structure. According to Hillel’s structure, the Testament of Asher reflects the bi-part features of paraenesis and prophecy:

1. Opening (1.1–2)
2. Body (1.3–7.7)
 - 2.a. Preface – none

⁴⁶de Bruin, *Great Controversy*, 43, 43n192.

⁴⁷de Bruin, *Great Controversy*, 43.

⁴⁸de Bruin, *Great Controversy*, 43.

⁴⁹Hillel, *Twelve Patriarchs*, 25–36.

2.b. Parenesis (1.3–7.1)

2.b.1. Parenetic Prose (1.3–2.10)

2.b.2. Parenetic Exhortations (3.1–7.1)

2.c. Prophecy (7.2–7)

2.c.1. Predictions (7.2–3; 5–7)

2.c.2. Predictive Exhortations (7.4)

3. Closing (8.1–2)⁵⁰

As already documented, some scholars reject that the Testament of Asher qualifies as a Two Ways instruction. I want to use and modify Hillel’s structural analysis and demonstrate how the structure does, in fact, resemble a Two Ways text. Hillel suggests that the paraenetic prose “is a didactic exposition on the two ways that intricately applies the two-part pattern in both macro-and micro-forms and on multiple levels.”⁵¹ After the normal and customary introduction, T. Ash. 1.3 begins the instruction of the patriarch. This instruction is a broad description of God providing two different ways for humanity (δύο ὁδοὺς), two ways of thinking (δύο διαβούλια), two courses of action (δύο πράξεις), two kinds of life (δύο τρόπους), and two goals (δύο τέλη). The remainder of the opening section reflects an extended discussion of these polarized features, undefined ethical dispositions, and the influence of Beliar (T. Ash. 1.4–9).

On this basis, T. Ash. 2.1 begins the paraenetic section that reflects upon the negative disposition. Rather than beginning with the positive ethics, T. Ash. 2.1–10 explains how goodness may be couched in evil. Testament of Asher 3.1 offers a transition to the discourse and exhorts “my children” (ὕμεῖς οὖν τέκνα μου) to refrain from the two-faced disposition (μὴ γίνεσθε κατ’ αὐτοὺς διπόσωποι) but only cling to

⁵⁰Hillel, *Twelve Patriarchs*, 75.

⁵¹Hillel, *Twelve Patriarchs*, 78.

goodness (*ἀλλὰ τῇ ἀγαθότητι μόνῃ κολλήθητε*). Testament of Asher 4–6 focuses on a paraenetic exhortation or instruction on the two dispositions in life. To be single-minded is to maintain righteousness before God (T. Ash. 4.1). In everything, there will remain two opposing factors that reflect virtue and vice (T. Ash. 5.1–4).

Testament of Asher 6 concludes the positive instruction and gives attention to the Lord's commands by pursuing truth with a single mind (T. Ash. 6.1). The basis of these commands builds upon the negative consequences that will follow if these commands remain unheeded (T. Ash. 6.2–5).

Following Hillel's structure, T. Ash. 7 and 8 mark two different transitions. Abiding by the customary conclusion, T. Ash. 8 concludes the Testament's speech, includes burial instruction, and the patriarch's death. Yet, T. Ash. 7 ends with anthropological and genealogical consequences (T. Ash. 7.4). If T. Ash. 1.3 begins the Two Ways and T. Ash. 6.1–5 provide concluding remarks to the positive ethic, then T. Ash. 7 can, in fact, qualify as the conclusion to the Two Ways instruction. If the previous analysis is so, then the following structure appears:

1. Customary Testament Introduction (T. Ash. 1.1–2a)
2. Apocalyptic Introduction to the Two Ways (T. Ash. 1.2b–9)
 - 2.a. Evil Way: Two Aspects, but Whole is Evil (T. Ash. 2.1–10)
 - 2.b. Good Way: Instruction on the Positive Ethic (T. Ash. 3.1–6.5)
 - 2.b.1. Paraenetic Instruction: Refrain from Evil and Cling to Goodness (T. Ash. 3.1–2)
 - 2.b.2. Basis of Instruction: Single-mindedness is Righteousness before God (T. Ash. 4.1–5)
 - 2.b.3. Two Factors in Life and Cosmos, and Example of Patriarch (T. Ash. 5.1–4)
 - 2.b.4. Paraenetic Conclusion: Give Attention to Lord's Commands and Be Single-minded (T. Ash. 6.1–5)
3. Prophetic Consequences (T. Ash. 7.1–7)
4. Customary Testament Conclusion (T. Ash. 8.1–2)

Ethical Dualism, Role of Beliar, and Anthropological Destiny

The Two Ways structure of the Testament of Asher blends together ethical dualisms and the partial role of Beliar. Both of these concepts have a telic effect upon the destiny of humanity. First, the Two Ways is introduced by the patriarch as all-encompassing and what is right before God (πᾶν τὸ εὐθές ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑποδείξω ὑμῖν; T. Ash. 1.2). The following paraenesis, then, is shaped in terms of the Two Ways metaphor (T. Ash. 1.3). God gives two ways (δύο ὁδοὺς), two frames of mind (δύο διαβούλια), two courses of action (δύο πράξεις), two models (δύο τρόπους), and two outcomes (δύο τέλη). This Testament is not solely dependent upon a wayfarer and road metaphor, but harkens polarized features that are intended to demonstrate what is right.

Totality, all-encompassing, and polarized options characterize the two different ways of being. Everything is represented in pairs, and one will reside over the other (διὰ τοῦτο πάντα δύο εἰσὶν ἕν κατέναντι τοῦ ἑνός; T. Ash. 1.4). Testament of Asher 5 provides a more comprehensive list of examples. Again, the notion of totality is expressed in two features whereby they compete to conceal the other (δύο εἰσὶν ἕν πᾶσιν ἕν κατέναντι τοῦ ἑνός καὶ ἕν ὑπὸ ἑνός κέκρθηται; T. Ash. 5.1a). Greed is accompanied with possessions, drunkenness with joy, sorrow with laughter, and dissipation with marriage (ἕν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἑνός κέκρθηται; T. Ash. 5.1b). Death subsequently supersedes life, shame to glory (τὴν δόξαν ἢ ἀτιμία), night to day, and lastly, darkness to light (T. Ash. 5.2a). These polarized opposites are mutually exclusive and neglect to exist in equal relationships. Yet, the patriarch inverts a subsequent etiological list that explains, “all these things lead to the day” (τὰ δὲ πάντα ὑπὸ ἡμέραν εἰσὶ): righteousness leads to life, unrighteousness leads to death (T. Ash. 5.2c).

The interplay between good and evil displays an antagonistic relationship. Five different topics are introduced in T. Ash. 2 that all conclude with the same expression: “this also has two aspects, but is evil as a whole” (καίγε τοῦτο διπρόσωπον ἀλλὰ τὸ ὅλον πονηρὸν ἐστίν; T. Ash. 2.2; cf. 2.3, 5, 7, 9). The ethic of mercy, love for another person, pity upon the poor, and fasting are all matched with a counter-vice that corrupts the whole. Thus, in this way, some virtue may be expressed but is soon countered and overshadowed by the vices of evil deeds, thievery, sexual deviancy, social oppression (“through the power of his wealth he ravages many”; T. Ash. 2.8). Though some express goodness, “the outcome of the action leads to evil” (τὸ τέλος τοῦ πράγματος εἰς κακίαν ἄγει; T. Ash. 2.1). These persons are likened to hares, because they are “halfway clean” but as a whole, they are unclean (ὅτι ἐξ ἡμισείας εἰσὶ καθαροὶ τὸ δὲ ἀληθὲς ἀκάθαρτοί εἰσιν; T. Ash. 2.9). This bipartite conflict is countered with the “single-minded” person (οἱ γὰρ ἀγαθοὶ ἄνδρες καὶ μονοπρόσωποι; T. Ash. 4.1), who also models “two aspects, but is good on the whole” (καίγε τοῦτο διπρόσωπον ὅλον δὲ καλὸν ἐστίν; T. Ash. 4.4). These persons are likened to “gazelles” and “stags” because although they appear wild and unclean, as a whole, they are clean (T. Ash. 4.5).

The role of Beliar intersects with these two ethical dispositions.⁵² The cognitive elements of the person will result in specific correlation to the work of Beliar. For example, if the person contemplates righteous actions, then the inner soul will overcome evil (T. Ash. 1.8). However, if the mind is disposed towards evil (ἐὰν δὲ ἐν πονηρῷ κλίνῃ τὸ διαβούλιον), then they are lorded over (κυριεύω) by Beliar

⁵²The goal of my analysis is not to demonstrate the exhaustive portrayal of Beliar in the T. 12 Patr., but to mention Beliar’s role as it only related to the Two Ways in the T. Ash. For a more thorough and focused analysis of Beliar in the T. 12 Patr., consult the following work: Graham H. Twelftree, “Exorcism and the Defeat of Beliar in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” *VC* 65 (2011): 170–88.

(T. Ash. 1.8). The cognitive disposition towards evil removes goodness and permits the entrance of evil. Furthermore, even when the cognitive disposition is good, Beliar still attempts to influence the person with evil (T. Ash. 1.9). The “venom of the evil spirit” may still influence the person who has chosen goodness (T. Ash. 1.9).

In addition, to be “two-faced” (διπρόσωποι; T. Ash. 3.1) is to embrace both the good and evil dispositions as listed in T. Ash. 2. This lack of single solidarity demonstrates enslavement to evil desires and thereby pleases Beliar (T. Ash. 3.2). The “two-faced” individual will undergo double punishment because they not only practice evil, they likewise approve of others who practice similarly (T. Ash. 6.2). In doing so, they model the “spirits of error” (τὰ πνεύματα τῆς πλάνης) and join their struggle against humanity (T. Ash. 6.2). As a result, the cosmic influence of Beliar extends through the “two-faced” individual, who might influence other persons.

The interplay between ethics and Beliar likewise influences anthropological destinies.⁵³ The end of humanity conveys a cosmological theater whereby human righteousness is on display to a cosmic audience (T. Ash. 6.4).⁵⁴ Righteousness is made known to both angels of the Lord and to the angels of Satan (τοὺς ἀγγέλους

⁵³One further example could be mentioned in T. Ash. 7. The final exhortation is to avoid likeness to Sodom (T. Ash. 7.1). This example mentions the failure to recognize the “Lord’s angels” (ἥτις ἠγνόησε τοὺς ἀγγέλους κυρίου). A failure to heed this warning will result in a dispersion-like exile to the four corners of the earth and become worthless (T. Ash. 7.2). This uselessness will remain until “the Most High visits the earth” (ὁ ὑψιστος ἐπισκέπεται τὴν τῆν; T. Ash. 7.2). This language may give hint to a Christian influence or interpolation into the T. Ash. This figure will appear as a man who eats and drinks with humanity, and will crush the dragon’s head in water (συντριβὼν τὴν δεφαλὴν τοῦ δράκοντος δι’ ὕδατος; T. Ash. 7.3). This crushing of the head recalls the imagery of creation (Gen 3:14–15) and the destruction of the dragon with water (Isa 27:1; cf. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.* III, 2.3 [PG 33:441]). This cosmic imagery is most reticent of Rev 12 whereby the scene escalates between land and water, and a human-like figure and the dragon. For a discussion of Greek *marginalia* in T. Ash. 7, consult de Jonge, *Case of the Testaments*, 89.

⁵⁴Kugler argues that this Testament lacks an identifiable cosmology that is reflective of the apocalyptic and Two Ways theology. “The testament lacks ethical and cosmic dualism, hallmarks, of the two-ways theology. . . . Here the authors only seem to know a dualistic angelology that they adapt for their own use.” Kugler, *Twelve Patriarchs*, 78.

κυρίου καὶ τοῦ σατανᾶ; T. Ash. 6.4). Depending upon one's righteousness, it will determine which angel receives the soul. If an evil soul departs, then the spirits of Beliar will harass (βασανίζω) the departed spirit (T. Ash. 6.5). Yet, if peace and joy are manifest, then this soul will come to know the angel of peace and enter into eternal life (T. Ash. 6.5). Thus, the dual angelic realm is relegated to the telic end of a person's life, whereas Beliar and related spirits continually influence humans through their dispositions in the present life. As these angelic concepts are joined to the judgment of humanity, de Jonge opines, "This leads to the question whether the author of the *Testaments*, who did not adopt any ethical 'Two Ways'-instruction, was perhaps familiar with the two angels-scheme known in 1QS 3:13–4:26; Barn. 18–20 (21); cf. *Doctr.* 1:1."⁵⁵

Anthropological Ethics and the Problem of Determinism

The anthropology of the Testament of Asher lacks specific instances of divine determinism outside of telic judgment. Rather, the destiny of humanity is relegated to whether or not the person can adhere to the Law of God, display righteousness, and withstand the influences of Beliar. For example, the two ways of good and evil are two dispositions that reside already within the person (T. Ash. 1.5).⁵⁶ The choice of good and evil is left to the person. As Kugler identifies, "While the evil spirits and God's angel influence a person's choices (as they do throughout the *Testaments*), in the end the individual's fate is still under his or her own

⁵⁵de Jonge, "Twelve Patriarchs and the 'Two Ways,'" 190.

⁵⁶"Although the author speaks of two διαβούλια, he intends to say that every person has one διαβούλιον faced with two fundamentally different options. Hence the translation 'disposition' is to be preferred to 'inclination'." de Jonge, "Twelve Patriarchs and the 'Two Ways,'" 189n20.

control.”⁵⁷ Hillel continues such judgment, “A person’s choice determines their disposition and consequently, whether they are basically good or basically evil.”⁵⁸ Therefore, if their soul desires the good way, then righteousness and repentance soon follow (T. Ash. 1.5).

Furthermore, not only does the bipartite disposition reside already in humanity, the cognitive element plays a vital component to the polarized way of being. In other words, through the cognitive and thinking choices of humanity, the two polarized ethics will manifest. For the soul to overcome evil and sin, it must “contemplate” (λογιζόμενος) righteous actions and despise wickedness (T. Ash. 1.7). Yet, “if the mind” is oriented towards evil (ἐάν δὲ ἐν πονηρῷ κλίνη τὸ διαβούλιον), then evil deeds will follow (T. Ash. 1.8).

The “single-minded” individual (μονοπρόσωποι) is counter to the “two-faced” person. In this way, the cognitive devotion to goodness or evil is portrayed with a particular ethic. To be “single-minded” is to be righteous before God (T. Ash. 4.1). And this cognitive identity is contrasted with those who are “two-faced” and identified as sinners (νομισθῶσι παρὰ τῶν διπροσώπων ἀμαρτάνειν; T. Ash. 4.1). Therefore, to have two faces is a cognition problem who do not accept the good (cf. T. Ash. 3.1; 4.3). The Two Ways imagery is aimed “to teach the patriarch’s descendants that though there are two ways, they should love and obey God with a single face.”⁵⁹

Cognitive anthropology correlates to adherence to the Law of God and a pursuit of truth (T. Ash. 6.1).⁶⁰ Thus, it is the “two-faced” person who disregards the

⁵⁷Kugler, *Twelve Patriarchs*, 78.

⁵⁸Hillel, *Twelve Patriarchs*, 77.

⁵⁹Hillel, *Twelve Patriarchs*, 78.

⁶⁰According to Dixon Slingerland’s analysis of νόμος in the T. 12 Patr., he suggests, “In

Law of God (T. Ash. 2.6). In contrast to the hare (T. Ash. 2.9), the gazelles and stags refer allegorically to obedient persons (T. Ash. 4.5).

Imitation motifs provide the model to propagate and continue the positive ethic. For example, the patriarch claims complete adherence to the “Lord’s truth” (ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας) and modeled all commandments of God “according to all my strength” (T. Ash. 5.4). The patriarch’s commands and past life becomes the model by which the Two Ways are lived out. The one who is “single-minded” performs good work, “because he imitates the Lord” (ὅτι μιμείται κύριον; T. Ash. 4.3), and abstains from what God hates (T. Ash. 4.5).

So, the paraenetic conclusion to the good way is based on *imitatio dei* and *imitatio patri* (T. Ash. 6). “My children” are to give attention to the commands of the Lord (T. Ash. 6.1), which were perfectly obeyed by the patriarch (T. Ash. 5.4). By keeping the Law of God and lacking attention to evil as good,⁶¹ they will assume this obedience as the way of Life and “find rest in it” (ἐν αὐτῷ καταπαύοντες; T. Ash. 6.3). This motif of rest is previously an activity of God in relation to goodness (T. Ash. 3.1). The non-“two-faced” person must cling to goodness, “because in it the Lord God is at rest” (ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἀναπαύεται εἰς αὐτήν; T. Ash. 3.1). So, the imitation of God

spite of the fact that the authors of the *T. 12 Patr.* intend their work to stress love of neighbor and other such general aspect of the law, there is no basis for scholarship’s consensus that *nomos* has been limited to this sphere. These authors conceived of the law as a written body of jurisprudence to be read, studied, and taught; they hold the role of Israel’s traditional teachers in high regard; they refer to the ‘Law and the Prophets’; they call for obedience to *all* this legal matter; and they reflect much interest in several aspects of Israel’s ritual laws. There is no reason to think otherwise, therefore, than that when these writers speak of *nomos* they have in mind Israel’s traditional legal corpus understood in its wholeness.” Dixon Slingerland, “The Nature of *Nomos* (Law) within the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*,” *JBL* 105, no. 1 (1986): 48.

⁶¹De Jonge rightly notes that while the Testaments speak of many virtues and vices, they often summarize these concepts in more general terms. Especially in T. Ash. 6.3, the generalized paraenesis is framed in terms of the “law/commandments of God.” de Jonge, *Case of the Testaments*, 147n13.

and the imitation of the patriarch function as the prime models for the way of life especially countered to the imitation of evil spirits (T. Ash. 6.2).

The final exhortations of the patriarch merge together the problems of divine determinism. In the Testament of Asher, determinism is not so much framed with God organizing the cosmic and ethical make-up of the world but is rather seen in the prophetic decree of the patriarch. The final commands and comments of the patriarch are one of defeat and one of prophetic indictment. He displays a lack of confidence in his audience. The patriarch exhorts that these Two Ways need to be told to the subsequent generations of children (T. Ash. 7.4) because “[I know] upon the surfaces of the heavens that you will be thoroughly disobedient and thoroughly irreligious” (ἀνέγνων γὰρ ἐν ταῖς πλαξὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν ὅτι ἀπειθοῦντες ἀπειθήσετε αὐτῷ καὶ ἀσεβοῦντες ἀσεβήσετε εἰς αὐτόν; T. Ash. 7.5). He continues to suggest that they will lack religion (ἀσεβοῦντες ἀσεβήσετε), disobey God’s Law, obey human law, and be thoroughly corrupted by evil (T. Ash. 7.5).

The determinism is not bound by a divine decree or divine involvement, but rather the patriarch’s prophetic orientation. “Asher’s speech affirms the *Testaments’* argument,” as Kugler concludes, “by making clear once more the congruence between keeping God’s double commandment and Hellenistic moral standards. But it also advances the thesis by making clearer than ever before in the *Testaments* that they promote a ‘decision theology’.”⁶² John Collins provides the clearest suggestion, notes a development in the mythological symbolism, and he broadly connects Testament of Asher to 1QS and Barn. 18–21: “The *Testaments* lack the strong deterministic note that we will find in the scrolls. *T. Asher* emphasizes that men are free to choose between the two ways.”⁶³

⁶²Kugler, *Twelve Patriarchs*, 79–80.

⁶³John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic*

Galatians 5:16–24 and the Two Ways

The next text under consideration is Galatians 5:16–24. Prior to such evaluation, we must inquire as to whether or not Galatians 5 should even be considered. It is a text not readily recognized in scholarship as part of the Two Ways tradition.

Divided Voices in Didache and New Testament Scholarship

Within Didache scholarship, two positions often appear: (1) scholars mention Galatians 5 in relation to Did. 1–6; or (2) scholars neglect to mention and/or disavow Galatians 5 as part of the Two Ways. For example, Aaron Milavec neglects to mention Galatians 5 altogether.⁶⁴ Kurt Niederwimmer neglects to see Galatians 5 as part of the Didache’s Two Ways tradition.⁶⁵ Yet, some in Didache and early Christian Research appeal to Galatians 5 as part of the Two Ways. For example, Jack M. Suggs joins Galatians 5 to a similar initiatory trajectory as that of 1QS III–IV.⁶⁶ Furthermore, John Kloppenborg,⁶⁷ Clayton Jefford,⁶⁸ and Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser⁶⁹ join Galatians 5 to a discussion of either Did. 1–6 or the

Literature, 2nd ed., The Biblical Resource Series (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 140.

⁶⁴Aaron Milavec, *The Didache: Faith, Hope, & Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50–70 C.E.* (New York: Newman Press, 2003); Aaron Milavec, *The Didache: Text, Translation, Analysis, and Commentary* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003).

⁶⁵Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 76n62.

⁶⁶Suggs, “Christian Two Ways Tradition,” 69.

⁶⁷Kloppenborg, “*Didache*, James, Matthew, and Torah,” 212–13.

⁶⁸Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 27n17.

⁶⁹van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 180n127.

Two Ways. Jonathon Draper, moreover, has written a full article attempting to identify the similarities of Galatians 5 and the Didache Two Ways.⁷⁰

Within New Testament scholarship, however, a debate also emerges as to whether or not Galatians 5 is part of the broader Two Ways tradition history. Richard Longenecker offers the clearest disavowal for Galatians 5 and its relationship to the Two Ways.⁷¹ According to Longenecker, Galatians 5:19–23 is best viewed “as modeled after the Hellenistic ‘catalogue’ genre and not a Jewish ‘Two Ways’ tradition.”⁷² Even though the virtue and vice lists, original to Greek tradition, becomes quite common in the ancient world, a catalogue of virtue and vice in Two Ways traditions is “not their primary context in Jewish writings.”⁷³ The duality in Galatians 5:19–23, then, does not stem from a Jewish Two Ways stream, but “from the apostle’s own ethical dualism of ‘the flesh’ versus ‘the Spirit.’”⁷⁴ Longenecker offers four considerations to distance Galatians 5 from Jewish Two Ways traditions. I offer the following summary:⁷⁵

1. “Two-ness” is not explicitly delineated in Galatians. The “two ways,” “two spirits,” or “two angels” is altogether absent from Galatians 5.
2. Although a Jewish Two Ways tradition may have influenced the NT catalogues of virtues and vices, none of the other NT catalogues are associated with the Two Ways. Thus, Galatians 5:19–23 ought to be seen in a similar regard.
3. Although Galatians 5:19–23 offers a duality of catalogues, this concept does not necessitate a concept foreign to the Hellenistic catalogue genre.

⁷⁰Jonathan A. Draper, “The Two Ways and Eschatological Hope: A Contested Terrain in Galatians 5 and the *Didache*,” *Neot* 45, no. 2 (2011): 221–51.

⁷¹Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, WBC 41 (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1990), 251–52.

⁷²Longenecker, *Galatians*, 252.

⁷³Longenecker, *Galatians*, 252.

⁷⁴Longenecker, *Galatians*, 252.

⁷⁵Longenecker, *Galatians*, 252.

4. Paul's ethical dualism is that of "the Flesh" versus "the Spirit" and does not necessarily imply a Jewish Two Ways.

While offering no interlocutor outside of Suggs,⁷⁶ Longenecker does offer his strongest consideration for a relationship between Galatians 5 and the Jewish Two Ways. Longenecker notes that 1QS III, 25–IV, 11; T. Ash. 2.5–8 (cf. 1.3–9); Did. 1–5; Barn. 18–20; and Herm. Mand. 6.2.1–7 (36.1–7) combine the catalogues of virtue and vice within a Two Ways setting. "All of this," as Longenecker references, "it has been proposed, suggest that while catalogues of virtues and vices were common in the Hellenistic world, Galatians 5:19–23 is probably more accurately to be seen against the background of a Jewish 'Two Ways' ethical tradition that was taken over by the early Christians."⁷⁷

J. Louis Martyn, on the other hand, seems to offer both negative and positive remarks regarding the relationship of Galatians 5 and the Jewish Two Ways. The opposition between the "Flesh" and the "Spirit" "is a genuine conflict, an apocalyptic war."⁷⁸ "It follows," as Martyn argues, "that the opposition between the Spirit and the Flesh cannot be grasped either in the image of an infection and a medicinal antidote or in the picture of the Two Ways that are set before the human being, in order to call for a decision."⁷⁹ Thus, the cosmic war concept, for Martyn, is not adequately expressed by the Two Ways concept. Rather, Martyn suggests that Paul is doing something altogether new. "Paul is said to see in the opposition between the Spirit and the Flesh a new edition of the doctrine of the Two Ways."⁸⁰

⁷⁶Suggs, "Christian Two Ways Tradition."

⁷⁷Longenecker, *Galatians*, 251.

⁷⁸J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 33A (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997), 530.

⁷⁹Martyn, *Galatians*, 530.

⁸⁰Martyn, *Galatians*, 534; In an earlier article, Martyn writes, "Our analysis of pairs of opposites in Galatians shows that Paul's use of this pattern does not fall in the line of wisdom

Susan Elliott rightly notes the problem that these two figures contribute to this discussion. Because both Martyn and Longenecker offer two completely different sets of presuppositions and reasons, it gives great pause to pivot and affirm Galatians 5 as part of the ancient Jewish Two Ways traditions. Elliott says, “The fact that Martyn and Longenecker can concur in their opposition to the relevance of the Two Ways tradition for Gal. 5.19–23 based on diametrically opposed assumptions about the Two Ways tradition reveals a pervasive difficulty on this issue.”⁸¹ Yet, one fundamental problem pervades both Longenecker’s and Martyn’s discussion of the Jewish Two Ways. While both figures comment on the “two spirits” concept, their prevailing assumption about the Two Ways seems to be that of a pure ethical list of virtues and vices.

Although some in New Testament critical research either reject or distance Galatians 5 from the Jewish Two Ways, there do remain a number of New Testament researchers that affirm this connection. For example, the following figures are a select sampling of New Testament scholars who use language that is reminiscent of the Two Ways or comment on Galatians 5 as part of the Jewish Two Ways: John Bligh,⁸² Hans Dieter Betz,⁸³ Frank Matera,⁸⁴ James Dunn,⁸⁵ Bruce Longenecker,⁸⁶ C.

tradition, with its marriage of the pairs to the doctrine of the Two Ways, but rather in the line of apocalyptic, in which the pairs are seen to be at war with one another.” J. Louis Martyn, “Apocalyptic Antinomies in Paul’s Letter to the Galatians,” *NTS* 31 (1985): 423–24n25.

⁸¹Susan Elliott, *Cutting Too Close for Comfort: Paul’s Letter to the Galatians in Its Anatolian Cultic Context*, LNTS 248 (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 296.

⁸²John Bligh, *Galatians: A Discussion of St Paul’s Epistle*, Housholder Commentaries 1 (London: St Paul Publications, 1970), 447–63. Bligh Proceeds to offer 7 distinct ways Gal 5:16–25 resembles characteristics of Two Ways texts (Bligh, *Galatians*, 458). (1) There are two contrasting catalogues, the works of the flesh (vv. 19–21a) and the harvest of the spirit (vv. 22–23a). (2) The image of the Two Ways is not explicitly used, but is implied in the phrases “walk by the spirit” and “if you led by the Spirit.” (3) The Holy Spirit is mention, but not the ‘spirit of wickedness’ or the powers of darkness or Beliar. But the ‘Flesh’ itself tends to become a demonic power in the thought of St Paul. (4) The two ways of life are linked with two conflicting elements in man’s physical constitutions — the flesh and the spirit. (5) The destinations to which the two ways lead are not described in detail, but v. 23 shows that those who follow the way of flesh are not allowed to enter the kingdom. (6)

Marvin Pate,⁸⁷ Susan Elliott,⁸⁸ and Andrew Das.⁸⁹ Martinus de Boer likens the catalogue of vices (Gal 5:19–21) to similar qualities in Did. 2–5.⁹⁰ He also suggests that “this material is itself an apocalyptic adaptation of the historic Jewish tradition of the Two Ways, the way of the righteous and the way of the wicked (Ps 1; cf. T. Ash. 1–4; Barn. 19.1–2; Did. 1–2).”⁹¹

McKenna’s Two Ways Typology and Galatians 5:16–24

Given this debate, I will describe how Galatians 5 does, in fact, qualify as a Two Ways text; although, it may not be part of the tradition history of Didache and related Two Ways traditions. I want to proceed by suggesting that Galatians 5 has

There is a summary-statement on the side of the spirit (v. 14), but not on the side of the flesh. (7) There is no suggestion that each man’s destination is predetermined. On the contrary, the implication of the whole passage is that the Christian, after receiving the Holy Spirit in baptism, is still free to choose his way—whether he will be guided by the Spirit or not.

⁸³Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 277–90.

⁸⁴Frank J. Matera, *Galatians*, SP 9 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992), 208–9.

⁸⁵James D. G. Dunn, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*, BNTC (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1993), 295.

⁸⁶Bruce W. Longenecker, “‘Until Christ Is Formed in You’: Suprahuman Forces and Moral Character in Galatians,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 61, no. 1 (1999): 92–108.

⁸⁷C. Marvin Pate, *The Reverse of the Curse: Paul, Wisdom, and the Law*, WUNT 2/114 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 180–81.

⁸⁸Elliott, *Too Close for Comfort*, 287–322.

⁸⁹A. Andrew Das, *Galatians*, ConcC (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2014), 559–60.

⁹⁰Martinus C. de Boer, *Galatians: A Commentary*, NTL (Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 2011), 356–57.

⁹¹de Boer, *Galatians*, 356; also see Martinus C. de Boer, “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*, ed. Joel Marcus and Marion L. Soards, JSNTSup 24 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 185.

the necessary motifs to identify as a Two Ways tradition and to detail the literary structure as a Two Ways text.

In *Cutting Too Close for Comfort*,⁹² Susan Elliott builds from Margaret McKenna's dissertation⁹³ to argue that Galatians 5–6 is part of the Two Ways. Of the five elements in McKenna's antitheses,⁹⁴ Elliott suggests that four of the five elements are operating in Galatians 5–6.⁹⁵

Of McKenna's five-fold rubric, the first is that of antithetical ways or metaphors. Although this feature is the only item missing from Galatians 5–6 according to Elliott's analysis, she suggests that Galatians 4:21–5:1 “functions as a complex statement of Way Imagery.”⁹⁶ She proposes that the allegory of Hagar and Sarah, and the choice between the sons of Abraham (Gal 4:22) constitute the way imagery.⁹⁷ Furthermore, Elliott joins together Paul's metaphorical images and summarizes the following: “with this Way imagery, Paul constructs a choice that relies metaphorically on the image of the Mountain Mother ruling a city and a territory and possessing cultic ‘slaves’ by ritual self-castration.”⁹⁸

Regardless of the validity of such reading, Elliott bypasses the more obvious lexemes and motifs that suggest a walking or road metaphor.⁹⁹

⁹²Elliott, *Too Close for Comfort*, chap. 9 (esp. 297–321).

⁹³Margaret Mary McKenna, “‘The Two Ways’ in Jewish and Christian Writings of the Greco-Roman Period: A Study of the Form of Repentance Parenthesis” (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1981).

⁹⁴McKenna, “‘Two Ways’ in Jewish and Christian Writings,” 289–90.

⁹⁵Elliott, *Too Close for Comfort*, 305.

⁹⁶Elliott, *Too Close for Comfort*, 305.

⁹⁷Elliott, *Too Close for Comfort*, 310–11.

⁹⁸Elliott, *Too Close for Comfort*, 311.

⁹⁹Dunn notes the following: “The choice of metaphor — walk = conduct oneself,

Gal 5:7: ἐτρέχετε καλῶς τίς ὑμᾶς ἐνέκοψεν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι

Gal 5:16: λέγω δέ πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσητε

Gal 5:18: εἰ δὲ πνεύματι ἄγεσθε οὐκ ἐστὲ ὑπὸ νόμον

Gal 5:25: εἰ ζῶμεν πνεύματι πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν

Even if the “way” metaphor is not as explicit in Galatians 5, these verbal cues become more prominent to construct a cumulative case.

Second, antithetical guides do not manifest as angelic creatures in Galatians 5:16–24. Rather, the “Flesh” (ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς) and “Spirit” (Gal 5:17), “Law” and “Spirit” (Gal 5:18), and “Flesh” and “Christ” (Gal 5:24) function as personified dual forces that compete for the person. I’m postponing further elaboration upon this argument because it will play a pivotal role in a Two Ways apocalyptic reading of Galatians 5, as argued below. Rather, suffice for the present argument, these features function as antithetical guides.¹⁰⁰

Third, polarized ethical content is manifest in the catalogue of vices and virtues (Gal 5:19–23). Vices are listed in accordance with the Flesh (Gal 5:19–21); whereas virtues are listed in accordance with the Spirit (Gal 5:22–23). Although insufficient evidence requires a definitive parallel, Draper has rightly listed and identified that “there is a moderate correlation of virtues and vices between the two texts” (i.e., Did. 1–5 and Gal 5).¹⁰¹ Of the initial fourteen vices in Galatians 5:19–21, eight are likewise found in the Didache.

πορνεία (Gal 5:19)

πορνεία (Did. 3.3; 5.1)

Christianity seen as a ‘way’ to be ‘walked’ (cf. Acts ix.2; xix.9, 23; xxii.4; xxiv.14, 22) — is no doubt deliberate.” He likewise joins the metaphor of walk to 1QS III, 18–IV, 26 and observes, “the repeated use of the metaphor in 1QS iii.18–iv.26 makes a fascinating comparison with Paul here.” Dunn, *Epistle to the Galatians*, 295.

¹⁰⁰Elliott, *Too Close for Comfort*, 310; Draper, “Two Ways and Eschatological Hope,” 225.

¹⁰¹Draper, “Two Ways and Eschatological Hope,” 229–30.

εἰδωλολατρία (Gal 5:20)	εἰδωλολατρία (Did. 3.4; 5.1)
φαρμακεία (Gal 5:20)	φαρμακεύω (Did. 2.2); φαρμακεία (Did. 5.1)
ἔρις (Gal 5:20)	ἔριστικός (Did. 3.2)
ζῆλος (Gal 5:20)	ζηλωτής (Did. 3.2)
θυμοί (Gal 5:20)	θυμικός (Did. 3.2)
διχοστασίαι (Gal 5:20)	διπλοκαρδία (Did. 5.1); διστάζω (Did. 4.7); διψυχέω (Did. 4.4)
καὶ τὰ ὄμματα τούτοις (Gal 5:21)	καὶ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὁμοίου αὐτοῦ (Did. 3.1)

Of the subsequent ten virtues in Galatians 5:22–23, only four virtues are found in the Didache.

ἀγάπη (Gal 5:22)	ἀγαπάω (Did. 2.7)
μακροθυμία (Gal 5:22)	μακρόθυμος (Did. 3.8)
ἀγαθωσύνη (Gal 5:22)	ἀγαθός (Did. 3.8)
πραΰτης (Gal 5:23)	πραῦς (Did. 3.8); πραΰτης (Did. 5.2)

It is notable for consideration that the vices and virtues in Galatians 5 have a high concentration of material from Did. 3.

Fourth, the vices and virtues produce antithetical ends and results. At the conclusion of the vice list, one is prohibited from inheriting the kingdom (οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες βασιλείαν θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν; Gal 5:21). Furthermore, it seems to imply that those who continue in the virtues not only take part in this inheritance but also belong to Christ and participate in a crucifixion metaphor (Gal 5:24). According to Draper, the outcome of the virtue list and the way of the Spirit is “the hope of righteousness.”¹⁰²

¹⁰²Draper, “Two Ways and Eschatological Hope,” 225.

The final category, as offered by McKenna, is that of antithetical intense repentance paraenesis. The initial command in Galatians 5:16 offers such statement: “I say, ‘Walk by the Spirit and you will not carry out the passions of the flesh’” (λέγω δέ πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσητε). Likewise, the statement in 5:25–26 (esp. v. 25) evokes such repentance concept: “if we live by the Spirit, let us also conform to the Spirit” (εἰ ζῶμεν πνεύματι πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν).¹⁰³

Two Ways Literary Structure of Galatians 5:16–24

If Galatians 5:16–24 corresponds to a Jewish Two Ways concept, even if thematically reshaped by Paul, this text will still need to include a clearly defined literary structure to qualify as a Two Ways text. In the subsequent section, I will introduce the salient apocalyptic features that accompany Galatians 5:16–24 as a Two Ways text.

John Barclay identifies two chief groups who approach the material in Galatians 5:13–6:10: (1) those who treat this section as a whole or largely unrelated to the main letter; and (2) those who attempt to integrate this material in the main letter.¹⁰⁴ Barclay proceeds to suggest that the majority of literary divisions occur between Galatians 5:1 and 5:13, whereas 6:11 is regularly seen as the beginning of the epilogue.¹⁰⁵ Both de Boer and Martyn pose the question whether or not Galatians

¹⁰³Elliott, *Too Close for Comfort*, 309; Draper, “Two Ways and Eschatological Hope,” 225.

¹⁰⁴John M. G. Barclay, *Obeying the Truth: A Study of Paul’s Ethics in Galatians* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988), 9–23.

¹⁰⁵Barclay, *Obeying the Truth*, 24.

5:2–6:10 is a necessary section in Paul’s argument and likewise follow Barclay’s divisions for Galatians 5:13–6:10.¹⁰⁶

If Galatians 5:13–6:10 qualifies as a literary section, how then does Galatians 5:16–24 affect the literary structure and flow in this portion of the book? According to de Boer, this section has two main subdivisions: 5:13–24 and 5:25–6:10.¹⁰⁷ Barclay,¹⁰⁸ Martyn,¹⁰⁹ Dunn,¹¹⁰ Betz,¹¹¹ and others likewise follow this similar structure.¹¹²

This first main section coalesces around motifs of freedom, introducing the character “Flesh” and communal relations. The interplay of freedom from the law is replaced with communal servitude (*δουλεύετε ἀλλήλοις*; Gal 5:13) and the fulfillment of the law of love (Gal 5:14). The Flesh possesses a threat to the communal expression of love and servitude.

The solution to this communal threat (Gal 5:13–15) is the work of another outside character (the Spirit) and the ethics that proceed from the Spirit (Gal 5:16–18).¹¹³ Thus, servitude to one another and love for one another in Galatians 5:13–15 is further picked up as the par excellence virtue of the Spirit (Gal 5:22).¹¹⁴ Love is the

¹⁰⁶de Boer, *Galatians*, 329–32; Martyn, *Galatians*, 479–82.

¹⁰⁷de Boer, *Galatians*, 331.

¹⁰⁸Barclay, *Obeying the Truth*, 149.

¹⁰⁹Martyn, *Galatians*, 481.

¹¹⁰Dunn, *Epistle to the Galatians*, 22, 295.

¹¹¹Betz, *Galatians*, 271–90.

¹¹²See a brief list of scholars who disagree with this sub-division. de Boer, *Galatians*, 331n458.

¹¹³de Boer, *Galatians*, 351.

¹¹⁴de Boer, *Galatians*, 332.

primary virtue that is used as a weapon to combat the flesh in order to maintain communal relations.

According to de Boer this initial section of Galatians 5:13–6:10 has four discernable elements. He does not provide a literary structure but provides a thought-flow argument:

1. Galatians are warned about the Flesh and fulfillment of the Law as a means to thwart the Flesh (vv. 13–15)
2. The world after the coming of Christ and his Spirit to strive with the Flesh (vv. 16–18)
3. List of vices and failure to inherit the kingdom of God (vv. 19–21)
4. Product of the Spirit and the crucifixion of the Flesh (vv. 22–24)¹¹⁵

Therefore, if Galatians 5:16–24 does in fact qualify as a Two Ways text, then it is evoked to communicate a kind of ethics and in-breaking of conflict between the Flesh and the Spirit as it relates to fulfilling the law. As a Two Ways text, Galatians 5:16–24 is structured in the following way:¹¹⁶

1. Two Ways Introduction (5:16–18)
 - 1.a. Exhortation to “Walk by the Spirit” (5:17)
 - 1.b. Enmity Between Dual Forces: Flesh and Law, and Spirit (5:18–19)
2. The Way of the Flesh (5:19–21)
 - 2.a. Catalogue of Vices (5:19–21a)
 - 2.b. Anthropological End of Way of Flesh (5:21b)
3. The Way of the Spirit (5:22–23)
 - 3.a. Catalogue of Virtues (5:22–23a)
 - 3.b. Removing Domain of Law (5:23b)
4. Christ and the Death of the Flesh (5:24)

¹¹⁵de Boer, *Galatians*, 333.

¹¹⁶Matera likewise suggests a similar text division. *Matera, Galatians*, 205.

Salient Apocalyptic Motifs: An Apocalyptic Reading of Galatians 5:13–24

Cosmological warfare as spirit and flesh dualism. According to de Boer, this section in Galatians (Gal 5:13–24) has a primary function to alert the Galatians of the present dangers of the malevolent force called, “the Flesh.”¹¹⁷ The argument that proceeds conveys two kinds of opposing forces that manifest themselves into two different realms.¹¹⁸ The conflicts between the “Spirit” and the “Flesh” are in opposition to one another and they compete for the public ethics of the Galatian community.

The conflict exists between two opposing forces. The passions of the Flesh and the Spirit are in mutual opposition¹¹⁹ to one another (Gal 5:17).

Gal 5:17a: ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος

Gal 5:17b: τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκός

This mutual opposition (ταῦτα γὰρ ἀλλήλοις ἀντίκειται) prohibits the adequate responses from the Galatians. This term ἀντίκειμαι is also used to refer to an opposing force of God, which results in the faulty ethics of humanity. For example, the Evil One is in opposition to Polycarp’s ethic as well as the race of the righteous:

Mart. Pol. 17.1: ὁ δὲ ἀντίζηλος καὶ βάσκανος καὶ πονηρός ὁ ἀντικείμενος τῷ γένει τῶν δικαίων ἰδὼν τό τε μέγεθος αὐτοῦ τῆς μαρτυρίας καὶ τὴν ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς ἀνεπίληπτον πολιτείαν¹²⁰

Likewise, in 1 Clem. 51.1, the sins of the people occur through the works of an Adversary (διὰ τινος τῶν τοῦ ἀντικειμένου).

¹¹⁷de Boer, *Galatians*, 332.

¹¹⁸Matera, *Galatians*, 119.

¹¹⁹BDAG, *κατά*, A.2.b.γ.

¹²⁰Mart. Pol. 17.1: “But the jealous and envious and Evil One, the One opposing the people of righteousness, beholding the greatness of his martyrdom and his irreproachable conduct from beginning.”

If these two figures are in mutual opposition, an important starting point is inquiring who and how these two terms (*σάρξ* and *πνεῦμα*) function in Galatians 5:16–24. “Flesh” (*σάρξ*) appears a total of five times in Galatians 5:16–24 (vv. 16, 17 [2x], 19, 24), and eight times in section 5:13–6:10 (5:13; 6:8 [2x]). Throughout Galatians, *σάρξ* extends from actual persons (Gal 1:16; 2:16; 4:23), to the present life (2:20; 6:12–13), fleshly ailments (4:13–14), and to opposition with the Spirit (3:3; 4:29; 6:8).

The “Spirit” (*πνεῦμα*) on the other hand appears a total of five times in Galatians 5:16–24 (vv. 16, 17 [2x], 18, 22), and ten times in section 5:13–6:10 (5:25 [2x]; 6:1, 8 [2x]). Similar to *σάρξ*, *πνεῦμα* conveys a few distinct ideas throughout Galatians: given by God (3:2, 5; 4:6), received by faith (3:2, 14), in opposition to Law (4:6), in opposition to the Flesh (3:3; 4:29; 6:8).

In terms of their mutual relationship, Galatians provides a dualistic foil between *σάρξ* and *πνεῦμα*.¹²¹ To “begin by the Spirit” is impossible to finish by the Flesh (Gal 3:3). Even the two-son allegory in Galatians 4 re-narrates the two births as one according to the Flesh and one according to the Spirit (Gal 4:29). Using a horticulture metaphor, to sow in the Flesh will not produce something other than its kind, and likewise for the Spirit (Gal 6:8). Barclay notes the apocalyptic framework by which Paul is operating when using the dualism of *σάρξ* and *πνεῦμα*.¹²²

In this context *πνεῦμα* is not an anthropological entity nor is it a general term for the spiritual (non-material or divine) realm: it is the eschatological token of the new age, the power that establishes the sovereignty of Christ in the new creation. As its opposite, *σάρξ* is caught up into the dualism inherent in all apocalyptic thought and is thus associated with “the world” and “the present age” which stands in contrast to the new creation. *It is this apocalyptic dualism which gives to σάρξ its negative “colouring”*: just as the present age is an evil

¹²¹Barclay offers an extended study on *σάρξ* and *πνεῦμα*. Barclay, *Obedying the Truth*, 178–215.

¹²²Barclay, *Obedying the Truth*, 204–5.

age (1.4), so the flesh is at best inadequate and a word thoroughly tainted with sin.¹²³

So, in Galatians 5:16–24, the Galatians are already presented with another competing entity between Flesh and Spirit.¹²⁴ Given the combat and opposition motif (cf. Gal 5:17), *σάρξ* can be seen in an apocalyptic framework. According to Louis Martyn, “Paul refers to a cosmic power arrayed against God, standing, as it does, in the company of other anti-God powers, the cursing voice of the Law, Sin, and the elements of the cosmos.”¹²⁵ In this section of Galatians, Flesh has been personified as a counter to the Spirit.

This actor is not a mere component of the human being, a person’s flesh as distinguished from his spirit. The Flesh is rather a supra-human power, indeed an inimical, martial power seeking to establish a military base of operations in the Galatian churches, with the intention of destroying them as genuine communities (5:13, 19–21).¹²⁶

Such cue is taken from 5:16, where Paul uses the term “the desire of the flesh” (*ἡ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ*). This expression most likely reflects the “Evil Inclination or Impulse.”¹²⁷ Having its origins in Genesis 6:5 and 8:21, the concept is more clearly identified in Sir 15.14: “he made humanity from the beginning and he left them in the hand of their deliberation” (*αὐτὸς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐποίησεν ἄνθρωπον καὶ ἀφήκεν αὐτὸν ἐν χειρὶ διαβουλίου αὐτοῦ*). De Boer proceeds to document Sir 17.31; 25.24; 27.5–6; 1QS V, 4–6; Philo, *Migr.* 92, and *Sipre Deut* 45 as further documentation of this “Evil Inclination.”¹²⁸ For de Boer, this personification of Evil “reflect[s] the experience of a

¹²³Barclay, *Obeying the Truth*, 205.

¹²⁴Das observes that “the flesh is a sphere of influence, an active quasi-personified force that challenges God and his people.” Das, *Galatians*, 558.

¹²⁵Martyn, *Galatians*, 493.

¹²⁶Martyn, *Galatians*, 483.

¹²⁷de Boer, *Galatians*, 337.

¹²⁸de Boer, *Galatians*, 337.

powerful force in human affairs, one not capable of being brought under control without divine assistance . . . [and] is a mark of the ‘forensic’ pattern of Jewish apocalyptic eschatology.”¹²⁹

Furthermore, this cosmic and apocalyptic framework for the Evil Inclination places it in direct opposition to the Spirit given by God. Rather than the law (Gal 5:13–15; cf. 5:18), it is now the Spirit who is in battle with and in opposition to this cosmic force.

The extent and locale of this battle, however, need to be briefly mentioned. The virtues of the Spirit prohibit the expression of vices from the Flesh (v. 16). Thus, these competing forces are dual forces of opposition. Yet, no comments are hinted at in terms of equal or un-equal dual opposition. One Power may express dominion over the other. Thus, two different forces have domain over two different realms.

The communal ethical expressions are the physical manifestation of such conflict. The apocalyptic Two Ways of Galatians 5:16–24 is prompted by the communal warning of biting and devouring of one another (Gal 5:15). Love and subjection to one another (*διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης δουλεύετε ἀλλήλοις*; 5:13) mark the new communal identity after freedom from the Law. Love, now, is the par excellence virtue of the product of the Spirit (5:22).

Thus, the space of such battle is initially performed between two opposing forces that eventually permeate within the Galatian community. Yet, it is Christ Jesus and those who self-identify with such additional figure that this victory is finally settled. The death knell to the Flesh is via crucifixion to the cross (Gal 5:24). The implications being, the Flesh along with the physical ethics will cease in and

¹²⁹de Boer, *Galatians*, 339.

through this crucifixion metaphor.¹³⁰ The cross is used elsewhere in Galatians (2:19–20; 5:11; 6:14–15) as a symbol for the change of an era.¹³¹ As Das suggests, “The Jewish apostle is describing the results of a cosmic battle between the present, evil age and the dawning new creation in Christ.”¹³²

Anthropological destiny and problem of determinism. The destiny of humanity, and more particularly the community of Galatians, relates to the two temporal ages that are present in Galatians 5:13–6:10. The vices produced by the Flesh (5:21) have a prohibitive, telic reward. Rather than commenting on the active punishments, retributive wrath, or otherwise, the vices of the Flesh prohibit “inheritance of the kingdom” (οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες βασιλείαν θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν).

Counter to the vices of the Flesh, the rewards or outcomes of the virtues of the Spirit are two-fold. First, the Galatians will not be under the law (κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος; Gal 5:23b). Second, to belong to Christ Jesus results in the death of the Flesh (Gal 5:24). These two concepts, as reward and telic outcome, may be mutually related. If the Galatians are led by the Spirit, then they will not gratify the Flesh (5:16) nor be under law (5:18). Thus, to manifest the virtues of the Spirit results in both a removal of Law and the death of the Flesh. If this reward-telos structure is so, then the cross metaphor parallels the kingdom prohibition in 5:21. As a result, the ethics determine one’s identity to the two realms and the two ages.

¹³⁰“‘Crucifixion’ of the flesh,” as Betz concludes, “results in its neutralization: having lost its life it is not longer capable of producing the ‘works of the flesh.’” Betz, *Galatians*, 289–90.

¹³¹Barclay, *Obeying the Truth*, 206.

¹³²Das, *Galatians*, 260.

Epistle of Barnabas 18–21

According to Robert Kraft, “The framework in which the two-ways section of Barnabas is cast, however, is explicitly ‘apocalyptic,’ with reference to angels of God and of Satan and with contrast between the present lawless time and the eternal age, and between eternal death and its opposite.”¹³³ With this present affirmation of an apocalyptic framework, the Two Ways (Barn. 18–21) appears in the overall structure of Barnabas as a concluding and separate section. Though James Rhodes builds his argument upon Barn. 1–17 for the Deuteronomic tradition, Julian Smith suggests that Barnabas scholarship inadequately assesses the Two Ways as part of the overall argument of Barnabas.¹³⁴ Both Smith and James Rhodes, in recent years, have adequately demonstrated that the Two Ways permeates the preceding portions of Barnabas.¹³⁵

The Two Ways, namely the way of life, offer “a positive presentation of the Christian ethic” and subsequently joins the “way of darkness” with a Jewish identity.¹³⁶ “Let us turn to another knowledge and teaching” (μεταβῶμεν δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ἑτέραν γνώσιν καὶ διδασχὴν; Barn. 18.1a) signifies a structure break from the previous section. Yet, to mention ἑτέραν γνώσιν, the author joins the Two Ways to the opening instruction of the epistle (cf. Barn. 1.5–6) and the ethical implications of the perfect

¹³³Robert A. Kraft, “Early Developments of the ‘Two-Ways Tradition(s),’ in Retrospect,” in *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*, ed. Randal A. Argall, Beverly A. Bow, and Rodney A. Werline (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000), 141.

¹³⁴Julien C. H. Smith, “The *Epistle of Barnabas* and the Two Ways of Teaching Authority,” *VC* 68 (2014): 469.

¹³⁵Smith, “*Epistle of Barnabas* and the Two Ways,” 472–84; James N. Rhodes, “The Two Ways Tradition in the *Epistle of Barnabas*: Revisiting an Old Question,” *CBQ* 73 (2011): 801–9.

¹³⁶Reidar 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), 201.

gnosis (Barn. 2–16).¹³⁷ The following analysis predominantly assesses the apocalyptic worldview of Barn. 18–21.¹³⁸

Polarized Dualisms: Instruction and Optical

For Barnabas, the Two Ways are reflected in two different forms of dualism. The Two Ways reflect polarized instruction (διδασχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας; Barn. 18.1) and optical imagery (ἡ τε τοῦ φωτὸς καὶ ἡ τοῦ σκοτοῦς; Barn. 18.1). Because these two expressions are paralleled with one another, it may be argued that the two phrases are interpretive cues. In this way, διδασχῆ and φῶς are mutually reflective of one another and ἐξουσία and σκοτος are mutually reflective of one another.¹³⁹

First, διδασχῆ is used in one other place and refers to those coming to repentance and joining the temple of God (Barn. 16.9). Its literary parallel, φῶς, is mentioned three other times beyond the positive feature of the way of light (cf. Barn. 18.1; 19.1, 12). Two uses are reflective of some form of quotation that refers to the Isaianic “light to the nations” (Barn. 14.7//Isa 42:6–7 LXX; Barn. 14.8//Isa 49:6–7 LXX). Thus leaving the other use of φῶς (Barn. 3.4) in another extended Isaianic expression (cf. Isa 58:6–10). Either way, the use of διδασχῆ and φῶς throughout Barnabas are reflective of positive identity markers.

¹³⁷Ferdinand R. Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief*, KAV 8 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), 157, 534; Smith, “*Epistle of Barnabas and the Two Ways*,” 484–85.

¹³⁸I echo a similar sentiment as Rhodes. I make this limited decision to only focus on Barn. 18–21 not as an intentional way to identify with those that classify Barn. 18–21 as an appendix. Rather, it permits further research to explore the continuity and discontinuity of an apocalyptic worldview between Barn. 1–17 compared with Barn. 18–21. James N. Rhodes, *The Epistle of Barnabas and the Deuteronomistic Tradition: Polemics, Paraenesis, and the Legacy of the Golden-Calf Incident*, WUNT 2/188 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 34n1.

¹³⁹Smith identifies this similar argument and then proceeds to offer a “better possibility” that understands διδασχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας as a hendiadys. Thus, the concept of “teaching authority” would reflect the use of the two terms. Smith, “*Epistle of Barnabas and the Two Ways*,” 487–88.

The converse is also emblematic of negative features. The use of *ἐξουσία* and *σκότος* in Barnabas are negative identity markers. With the exception of Barn. 6.18 (in a quotation of Gen 1:28) and 8.3 (an allusion to Matt 28:19), the other three uses of *ἐξουσία* reflect negative connotations. In Barn. 2.1, the current days are evil (*οὐσῶν πονηρῶν*) and the one working these days possesses *τὴν ἐξουσίαν*. Both uses in Barn. 4 convey the compulsory rule of lawlessness (Barn. 4.2) and the evil ruler (*ὁ πονηρὸς ἄρχων*) receiving authority (*ἐξουσία*) over persons lax in their virtue (Barn. 4.13). The description of teaching and authority are identity characteristics of those upon the paths (*ὁδοὶ δύο*) of light and darkness, respectively.

Angelic Dominion, Determinism, and Ethical Oversight

The Barnabas tradition modifies the Qumranic tradition with regard to angelic beings. One angelic being does not reside over each of the two respective ways. Rather, multiple angels express dominion over both ways. In this manner, many light-giving angels (*φωταγωγοὶ ἄγγελοι*) are appointed (*εἰσιν τεταγμένοι*) over the pathway of light (Barn. 18.1c). Many angelic beings related to Satan (*ἄγγελοι τοῦ σατανᾶ*) are appointed over the pathway of darkness. Although there remain notable differences between 1QS and Barnabas, Wilhelm Michaelis identifies the two angels as to be “derived from a Jewish rather than a non-Jewish view.”¹⁴⁰

It could then be implied that, like 1QS III, these two spheres of angelic beings not only have divine oversight over the particular ways—as noted by *εἰσιν τεταγμένοι*, but also anthropological influence. By residing over these two ways and “having been appointed,” then divine determinism is relegated in these instances. This tradition, moreover, does not mention *how* or *where* the cosmological and

¹⁴⁰Wilhelm Michaelis, “ὁδός,” *TDNT* 5:95.

anthropological conflict intersects. While cognizant of the dual cosmology is minimized, including determinism, each person is required to know and to keep the way of righteousness (Barn. 5.4). By quoting Proverbs 1:17 LXX (“not unjustly are the nets spread out for the birds”), this particular Two Ways metaphor softens the determinism and places blame upon the person—δικαίως ἀπολείται ἄνθρωπος (“a person rightly will perish”)—who does not keep the way of righteousness.¹⁴¹

These two angelic spheres of dominion are followed with two regel temporal references (Barn. 18.2). The two clauses connected by *καί* may signify a higher order of dominion that parallel Barnabas’s Two Ways and angelic dominion. The first is ordered under *ὁ κύριος* (Barn. 18.2). The use of *κύριος* has quite a broad range in Barnabas. It is used to refer to human masters (Barn. 19.7) and a reference to the Trinitarian Son or Christ (Barn. 2.6; 5.1, 5 [2x]; 6.3; 7.2; 12.10; 14.5). The remaining uses of *κύριος* may either refer to the Father, if relating to the Son, or a generic term for God. Thus, this way of light, immediately under the rule of “light-giving angels,” is ultimately under the auspice and rule of God. This dominion has always and will continue (*ἀπ’ αἰώνων καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*) to reside over the pathway of light. This rule has no disruption in terms of length.

The other pathway—that of “darkness”—is under the dominion of “the ruler of season, the one of this present age” (*ὁ δὲ ἄρχων καιροῦ τοῦ νῦν τῆς ἀνομίας*; cf. Eph 2:1–2). With the polar rulers and the use of temporal terms, the current age is the *only* era in which the “way of darkness” has any dominion over humanity. Moreover, it does not appear that the ruler of this current season disrupts the

¹⁴¹Barn. 5.4: λέγει δὲ ἡ γραφή· Οὐκ ἀδίκως ἐκτείνεται δίκτυα πτερωτοῖς. τοῦτο λέγει ὅτι δικαίως ἀπολείται ἄνθρωπος, ὃς ἔχων ὁδοῦ δικαιοσύνης γνῶσιν, ἑαυτὸν εἰς ὁδὸν σκότους ἀποσυνέχει (“the scripture says, ‘Not unjustly are the nets spread out for the birds.’ It says this because a person rightly will perish, those having knowledge of the way of righteousness, *and* keep themselves for the way of darkness.”).

existence, presence, and dominion of the rule of κύριος. Instead, this second dominion has a temporary rule and one that co-exists with the rule of κύριος.

Polarized Paths: Light and Darkness

Two other features are worth noting as Barnabas continues an apocalyptic trajectory. First, the initial literary frame of the ways of light and darkness provide additional comments to reiterate apocalyptic features and eschatological personal judgment. In Barn. 19.1, the teachings regarding the way of light begin. But first, addressing the traveler, an admonition is given. Those desiring to travel in such manner ought to be diligent to obey such way of being. The ὁδός is a predetermined place (ἐπὶ τὸν ὠρισμένον τόπον; Barn. 19.1). In other words, the pathway of light is a metaphorical road that leads to an appointed place that such adherence to personal ethics will secure one's arrival.

The pathway of darkness is far more explicit. The way is renamed as the “way of the Black One” (ἡ τοῦ μέλανος ὁδός; Barn. 20.1). The “Black One” is previously likened to the one who works within the current lawless age (νῦν ἐν τῷ ἀνόμῳ καιρῷ; Barn. 4.9)—a reference to Satan (ὁ μέλας). Like Herm. Mand. 6.1.2–3 (35.2–3), this black and dark road is crooked and full of cursing. Another description of the road is given and related to the telic personal judgment of a person on this road. This way is of eternal death (θανάτου αἰωνίου) accompanied with judgment (μετὰ τιμωρίας). Moreover, on this pathway of the Black One are *things* that destroy a person's soul (τὰ ἀπολλύντα τὴν ψυχὴν; Barn. 20.1). Thus, the ethic, as conveyed by Barnabas, offers both present destruction of souls as well as future judgment of persons.¹⁴² Apocalyptic features of eschatological judgment extend into the present

¹⁴²Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 556.

age as well as accompany the telic result of such way of light and of darkness. The way of light offers an appointed place whereas those on the way of darkness experience current destruction of souls and appointed telic judgment.

Is Barnabas 21 the Conclusion to the Two Ways Instruction?

It seems odd, however, that Barn. 20 does not provide a clearly defined conclusion for its version of the Two Ways. Barnabas 21 is often unrecognized as part of the Two Ways metaphor as it is an epistolary ending to the whole book (cf. Barn. 21.9).

Yet, I suggest that the epistolary conclusion to the letter may also serve as the conclusion to Barnabas's Two Ways. Barnabas 21.1 can be considered a conclusion to the form of the Two Ways (Barn. 18–20) that transitions into the epistolary conclusion of the letter.¹⁴³ For example, Barn. 21.1 reiterates the telic result of the two different ways and evokes a “walking” metaphor. The one who does such deeds will be glorified in the Kingdom of God (ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ δοξασθήσεται; Barn. 21.1). Conversely, those who choose otherwise (ἐκεῖνα) will be destroyed along with their works (Barn. 21.1).

Second, a walking metaphor evokes the previously mentioned ways of light and darkness. It is good for those having learned the upright commandments (τὰ δικαιώματα) of the Lord to walk in them (ἐν τούτοις περιπατεῖν; Barn. 21.1). Although the Two Ways instruction finishes in Barn. 20.2, it is difficult to refrain from

¹⁴³Athanasius Schneider is willing to include up to Barn. 21.9 as part of the Two Ways tradition within Barn. Athanasius Schneider, *“Propter Sanctam Ecclesiam Suam”: Die Kirche als Geschöpf, Frau und Bau im Bußunterricht des Pastor Hermae*, SEAug 67 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1999), 94n2.

concluding that the literary images and polarized telic outcomes of Barn. 21.1 do not refer to the conclusion of the Two Ways in Barnabas.

ΓΝΩΣΙΣ and Apocalypticism

Concepts of *gnosis* or some esoteric knowledge is not foreign to apocalyptic readings.¹⁴⁴ For example, both Barn. 18.1 and 19.1 are used to frame the initial Two Ways instruction and the way of light.¹⁴⁵ As the initial introduction begins, Barn. 18.1 notes μεταβῶμεν δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ἑτέραν γνῶσιν. Furthermore, this γνῶσις only appears once more in the Barnabas version of the Two Ways. Here, γνῶσις both relates to the way of light and the ethics therein: ἔστιν οὖν ἡ δοθεῖσα ἡμῖν γῶσις τοῦ περιπατεῖν ἐν αὐτῇ τοιαύτη (Barn 19.1).

According to Draper, “Gnosis for *Barnabas* in chs. 1–16 signifies especially the right spiritualized meaning of Scripture which lies beneath its surface, and stands in tension with its surface meaning.”¹⁴⁶ Jewish sapiential (Prov 1:17 LXX) traditions in Barn. 5.4 assist in linking apocalyptic, wisdom, and way of life traditions together. These intertwined elements incorporate γνῶσις to the way of righteousness (Barn. 5.4). Barnabas 5.4 reads,

Now the scripture says, “Not unjustly are nets spread out for the birds” [Prov 1:17 LXX]. This means that people deserve to perish if, having knowledge of the way of righteousness (ἔχων ὁδοῦ δικαιοσύνης γνῶσιν), they ensnare themselves in the way of darkness (εἰς ὁδὸν σκότους).¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁴Christopher C. Rowland, “Apocalyptic: The Disclosure of Heavenly Knowledge,” in *The Early Roman Period Part Two*, ed. William Horbury, W. D. Davies, and John Sturdy, CHJ 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 790.

¹⁴⁵Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 556.

¹⁴⁶Jonathan A. Draper, “Barnabas and the Riddle of the Didache Revisited,” *JSNT* 58 (1995): 95; Hvalvik, *Scripture and Covenant*, 83.

¹⁴⁷Holmes’s trans.

This reading, although unclear of the influencing tradition (Prov 1:17 LXX), appears to be the contribution of Barnabas as he remains concerned for the Two Ways and γνῶσις (cf. Barn. 21.5).¹⁴⁸ Even the final comments in the greeting may link together angelic beings, γνῶσις, and way of life traditions (Barn. 1.5).¹⁴⁹

Barn. 1.5b: I have hastened, then, to send you a brief letter that you may have perfect knowledge (τελείαν ἔχητε τὴν γνῶσιν) to accompany your faith.

The appearance of *gnosis* in Jewish apocalyptic traditions helps accentuate the continuance or heightened version of apocalypticism in Barnabas (cf. 2.3; 5.4; 6.9; 9.8; 10.10; 13.7; 18.1; 19.1).¹⁵⁰ It is not as though Barnabas demonstrates dependence or influence from these texts, per se, but that *gnosis* is a feature of Jewish apocalyptic literature. According to David Frankfurter, along with Barnabas, “Egyptian Jewish apocalypses like 2 Enoch, ‘apocalyptic’ works like the Third Sibylline Oracle and Wisdom of Solomon, and the writings of Philo offer various reflections of the *gnosis* typical of Jewish apocalypticism in general.”¹⁵¹ Secrecy is kept hidden from the angels in 2 En. 24.3a “And not even to my angels have I explained my secrets.”¹⁵² It remains open as to how much Barnabas reflects a version

¹⁴⁸Hvalvik, *Scripture and Covenant*, 86.

¹⁴⁹As Hvalvik notes, “At first glance the author’s statement concerning his purpose in 1:5 seems very general. Further investigation, however, has revealed that the ‘knowledge’ he speaks about has clear connections to all the main semantic fields in the letter: it is related to the understanding of Scripture, it is related to the question concerning the two peoples (the Jews and the Christians), and it is related to the Two Ways. . . . All these semantic fields seem to converge in the Two Ways motif.” Hvalvik, *Scripture and Covenant*, 86.

¹⁵⁰David Frankfurter, “The Legacy of Jewish Apocalypses in Early Christianity: Regional Trajectories,” in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*, ed. James C. VanderKam and William Adler, CRINT: Section III Jewish Traditions in Early Christian Literature 4 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1996), 144.

¹⁵¹Frankfurter, “Legacy of Jewish Apocalypses,” 144.

¹⁵²See the following article, especially page 429, that makes a similar relationship about gnostic and apocalyptic concepts. Pierluigi Piovanelli, “‘Much to Say and Hard to Explain’: Melchizedek in Early Christian Literature, Theology, and Controversy,” in *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*, ed. Andrei Orlov, Gabriele Boccaccini, and Jason Zurawski, Studia

of second-century Gnosticism or whether $\gamma\nu\tilde{\omega}\sigma\iota\varsigma$ functions as a hermeneutical idea—as Draper suggests.

De Doctrina Apostolorum 1–6

Another, and more obvious, text to consider in antiquity is *De Doctrina*.¹⁵³ *De Doctrina* survives in two mediaeval Latin manuscripts, *Monacensis lat. 6264* and *Mellicensis 597*.¹⁵⁴ When comparing the whole Two Ways of the Didache, *De Doctrina* is most like the Didache's Two Ways in terms of structure, textual divisions, and lexical symmetry. Although *De Doctrina* may be the most similar to the Didache's Two Ways structure, *De Doctrina* still manifests a unique and individual voice for the Two Ways. The most noticeable features will appear in the introduction and conclusion to the Two Ways.

Cosmology, Ethical Dualism, and Angelic Rule

The apocalyptic trajectory of *De Doctrina* is prominently found in the introduction and conclusion of its version of the Two Ways. When compared to Did. 2–5 and Apos. Con. 7.2–18, *Doctr.* 2–5 reflects a more stabilized tradition that is quite similar to the Didache. It is only the literary bookends of the document that reflect apocalyptic literary cues. First, the cosmos reflects an ethical dualism (*Doctr.* 1.1). The Two Ways are manifest *in saeculo*. In 1QS IV, 2, the ways in the “world” seem to lack a strict referent to a dualistic cosmos. Rather, the influence of the

Judaeoslavica 4 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 411–29.

¹⁵³Rordorf and Tuilier, *Didachè*, 203–10.

¹⁵⁴Both of these MSS also contain another Two Ways tradition from the Mediaeval era. They preserve the fifteenth sermon of St. Boniface that already contain Ps. St. Boniface's sermon *De abrenuntatione in Baptismate*. This preservation could indicate a use of *Doctr.* in Medieval homilies.

angelic realm enact particular ethics upon humans “in the world”—limiting world, here, to an observable world. *De Doctrina’s* use of *saeculo* may reflect a Christian influence.

Saeculo in classical literature can resemble the Greek concept of γενεά.¹⁵⁵ For example, *cupide generatim saecula propagent* (Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura* 1.20) conveys the idea “eternal kinds” (cf. *De Rerum* 2.173). It also conveys the idea of an extended time, particularly for the life of a person. For example, *quot saeculis Aristoteles didicit* (Quintillian, 12.11.22; Vul. Exod 21,6). Beyond these few examples that convey a temporal referent for *saeculo*, there is also an idea of “worldly” or “worldiness.” For example, *Vulg. Jacob* 1.27 exchanges ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου with *ab hoc saeculo* (cf. Prud., στεφ, 2,583). Thus, both temporal and cosmological concepts appear in *Doctr.* 1.1. Yet, the dualistic ethics, appearance of angels, expression of ethics, and *in saeculo* may permit a meaning of cosmological dualism.¹⁵⁶

Second, the dualistic concepts capture an apocalyptic idea. Life is matched with its counter, death (*vitae et mortis*). Light is matched with its counter, darkness (*lucis et tenebrarum*).

Last, the presence of two angelic beings, along with the ethical dispositions, reflects the Treatise of the Two Spirits in 1QS III–IV. Unlike the observable determinism in 1QS III–IV, *De Doctrina* lacks such explicit references. Instead, the two angels may express some form of dominion. The two angels are *in his constituti* (*Doctr.* 1.1). The Latin, *in his constituti*, parallels the previous expression, *in saeculo*—use of *his* helps secure such connection.¹⁵⁷ Their reflective

¹⁵⁵Lewis & Short s.v. “saeculum.”

¹⁵⁶Lewis & Short s.v. “saeculum.”

¹⁵⁷J. B. Greenough et al., eds., *Allen and Greenough’s New Latin Grammar for Schools and Colleges* (Newburyport, MA: Focus Publishing, 2000), §297.e.

rule reflects two opposites (*unus aequitatis, alter iniquitatis*). The representatives of justice and iniquity refer to the constituted order of the two angels that rule such *saeculum*. Thus, *De Doctrina's* version of the two angels reflects both a form of sovereignty over the *saeculum* and representatives of two ethics, referring to the Two Ways.

De Doctrina 6, however, depicts a second cosmological rule that differs from *Doctr.* 1. So, it is not as though the two Angels are the sole proprietors of the cosmos. Albeit brief, the final verse (*Doctr.* 6.6) describes a Trinitarian expression that functions as a second tradition for the dominion motif. It is Jesus that rules (*regnantem*) and governs (*dominantem*) along with the Father and the Spirit (*Doctr.* 6.6). Draper suggests that this doxological conclusion is reminiscent of the eschatology in 1QS IV, 6–8.¹⁵⁸ Hence, *De Doctrina* concludes, counter to a two angelic rule, with an equaled Trinitarian rule over the ages (*in saecula saeculorum*).

What Is *De Doctrina's* Relationship to Didache?

But what of *De Doctrina's* literary connection to the Didache? Are there signs of literary cues to indicate borrowing? Too many differences between the two texts exist to affirm literary borrowing. First, the opening of the Two Ways differs altogether. Didache 1.3b–2.1 reflects an editorial insertion that *De Doctrina* lacks. Furthermore, *Doctr.* 1.1 reflects an angelic and cosmological dualism (*viae duae sunt in saeculo . . . lucis et tenebrarum; in his constituti sunt angeli duo*). *De Doctrina* 1.3 may correspond to Did. 1.3a or 2.1 whereby both redactors attempt to provide literary symmetry into chapter 2 and the reshaped *Decalogue* material.

¹⁵⁸Jonathan Alfred Draper, “A Commentary on the Didache in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents” (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 1983), 130.

Second, as briefly mentioned, the insertion of the *section evangelica* (Did. 1.3b–2.1) in the Didache argues against a literary borrowing from *De Doctrina*. For, why would the editor of *De Doctrina* exclude a Christian interpolation—especially as a Christian text (cf. *Doctr.* 6.6)?

Last, for our present purposes, both *Doctr.* 6 and Did. 6 show editorial influences that mark *idiolectic* material. Both texts encourage continual observance of the way of life instruction, but demonstrate no textual symmetry. *De Doctrina* 6 concludes with a Trinitarian formula whereas Did. 6.2 offers permission to obey what they can as they bear “the yoke of the Lord” (cf. Matt 11:29–30).

While *De Doctrina* simultaneously has similar and particularly unique material when compared with the Didache, it is probable that the Didache and *De Doctrina* share a similar source rather than making use of one another. Alistair Stewart identifies this shared material as an “indirect literary relationship.”¹⁵⁹ Van de Sandt and Flusser move beyond literary relationships to state “the *Doctrina* is more likely to be derived from an independent Greek original of the Two Ways . . . circulated separately from the rest of the Didache.”¹⁶⁰ Either *De Doctrina* and Didache are mutually independent from one another—which, in my estimation, is less likely—or they share a particular source. The two texts are so close together on the internal content (Did. 2–5; *Doctr.* 2–5), that the stark differences in the introduction (Did. 1; *Doctr.* 1) and conclusion (Did. 6; *Doctr.* 6) can reflect editorial and redacted material.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁹Stewart-Sykes, *On the Two Ways*, 49.

¹⁶⁰van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 62.

¹⁶¹This argument does not suggest that material from Did. 2–5 and *Doctr.* 2–5 is symmetrical. It is not. Rather, the introductions and conclusions reflect two completely different editorial hands, whereas the internal material of the Two Ways will demonstrate slight differences. For example, *Doctr.* 3.1–6 lacks the repeated *τέκνον μου* as found in Did. 3.1–6. Instead, *Doctr.* 3.1–6 only mentions *filii* in 3.1. Moreover, *Doctr.* 3.3 is completely missing. Rather than only observing

So, my position rests upon two essential features. First, *De Doctrina* continues the apocalyptic, angelic, and cosmological dualism of Jewish Two Ways tradition. Second, no literary borrowing exists between Didache and *De Doctrina*, but there is an indirect dependency upon a prior source. These slight nuances point out that, although *De Doctrina* continues a particular Jewish apocalyptic motif, the editors of the Didache moved away from such apocalyptic traditions.

Shepherd of Hermas, Mandate 6.1–2 (35–36)

The final text under consideration is that of the Shepherd of Hermas. This tradition offers a much different version of a Two Ways text, but is still pertinent for our present discussion. As J. Christian Wilson observes, Herm. Mand. 6.2 (36) is notably similar to 1QS III–IV, even observing, “an intriguing parallel in genre element[s].”¹⁶² As the previous texts have offered forms of cosmology, ethical and angelic dualism, and determinism, Hermas offers a rather unique expression of these motifs. As scholars assess the overall genre of the Shepherd,¹⁶³ Norbert Brox comments that the genre of “apocalypse” is still a suitable genre for the entire work:

what Doctr. lacks, it has added words that the Did. does not reflect. For example, *Doctr.* 3.7 reads *santam terram* whereas Did. 3.7 reads τὴν γῆν.

¹⁶²J. Christian Wilson, *Toward a Reassessment of the Shepherd of Hermas: Its Date and Its Pneumatology* (Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1993), 79.

¹⁶³Carolyn Osiek, “The Genre and Function of the Shepherd of Hermas,” in *Early Christian Apocalypticism: Genre and Social Setting*, ed. Adela Yarbro Collins, *Semeia* 36 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1986), 113–122; Osiek observes the following sentiment: “Most who attempt an answer to this question end in some way by saying both yes and no.” Carolyn Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 10; J. Christian Wilson, *Five Problems in the Interpretation of the Shepherd of Hermas: Authorship, Genre, Canonicity, Apocalyptic, and the Absence of the Name “Jesus Christ,”* MBPS 24 (Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1995), 38–50.

“Die Gattungsbezeichnung „Apokalypse“ ist, faßt man zusammen, also nicht ideal, aber bezeichnend und brauchbar für den PH.”¹⁶⁴

Is Herm. Mand. 6.1–2 (35–36) Considered a Two Ways?

From the outset, it must be asked whether or not *Hermas* contains a Two Ways text because *Hermas* does not immediately share the same structure, literary cues, or even potential *Vorlage* as that of *Barnabas*, *Didache*, or *De Doctrina*. For example, according to Charles Taylor, *Hermas* has a “general acquaintance with the Christian and other forms of the *Two Ways*.”¹⁶⁵ Near the conclusion of Oscar Seitz’s evaluation of Epistle of James and *Hermas*, he notes “the doctrine of the Two Ways, which is found not online in the *Didache* and *Barnabas*, but also in Mandate VI of *The Shepherd*, is itself a Jewish conception.”¹⁶⁶ Although for Carolyn Osiek, the Mandates’s aim is always “the formation of the Christian community along the lines of Jewish wisdom paraenesis.”¹⁶⁷

I bring up these broad positions because of how different the Two Ways material is when compared to *Barnabas* and *Didache*. In fact, they are quite different enough for Mark Grundeken to assert, “The Two Ways material in *Hermas* is, however, not specifically Jewish.”¹⁶⁸ He further suggests that although *Hermas* may

¹⁶⁴“The generic name “apocalypse” can be altogether understood, though not ideal, yet representative and useful for the *Shepherd of Hermas*.” Norbert Brox, *Der Hirt des Hermas*, KAV 7 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 38.

¹⁶⁵C. Taylor, “The Two Ways in *Hermas* and Xenophon,” *Journal of Philology* 21 (1893): 257.

¹⁶⁶Oscar J. F. Seitz, “Antecedents and Signification of the Term ΔΙΨΥΧΟΣ,” *JBL* 66, no. 2 (1947): 218.

¹⁶⁷Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 103.

¹⁶⁸Mark Grundeken, *Community Building in the Shepherd of Hermas: A Critical Study of Some Key Aspects*, VCSup 131 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 32.

show several signs and patterns of Jewish moral teaching, it remains doubtful whether or not Hermas emphasizes continuity with Jewish tradition. Instead, Hermas may inherit these patterns from Christian tradition.¹⁶⁹

Hermas, given the brief acceptance above, does emerge as a Two Ways text with a similar background to Jewish traditions, two angels, and two pathways. As Brox observes, “Daß in *TestAss* I 3–5 der „Leitgedanke von Mand VI–VIII“ vorliegt, wird man wegen des anderen Kontextes nicht sagen können, aber der jüdische Hintergrund mit der Lehre von den zwei Wegen (VI 1, 2–5), den zwei Trieben und zwei Geistern ist evident.”¹⁷⁰ Athanasius Schneider offers the clearest affirmation of Herm. Mand. 5–7 as a form of Two Ways tradition. “*Mand* V–II sprechen von einer grundsätzlichen moralischen Gegensätzlichkeit unter den Geschöpfen. Dieser Sachverhalt wird in *Mand* VI, 1, 2–5 unter dem Bild der zwei Wege veranschaulicht.”¹⁷¹

The middle portion of the Shepherd consists of twelve mandates (Herm. Mand. 1–12.6 [26–49]). All the mandates include virtues and vices that the teacher incorporates while instructing Hermas. Nearly every commandment extolls good virtue, and if obeyed, he “will live to God” (Mand. 1.2 [26.2]; 2.6 [27.6]; 3.5 [28.5]; 4.2.3–4 [30.3–4]; 6.2.10 [36.10]; 7.4–5 [37.4–5]; 8.12 [38.12]; 9.12 [39.12]; 10.3.4 [42.4]; 12.2.2 [45.2]; 12.3.1 [46.1]; 12.6.3, 5 [49.3, 5]) and suggests a form of security for salvation (Mand. 12.3.6 [46.6]). The command of belief in God serves

¹⁶⁹Grundeken, *Community Building in the Shepherd of Hermas*, 32–33.

¹⁷⁰“It is impossible to say that *TestAss* I 3–5 is the “central theme of Mand VI–VII” because of their context, but the Jewish background of the two ways, the two desires, and the two spirits is evident.” Brox, *Hermas*, 224.

¹⁷¹Schneider, *Propter Sanctam Ecclesiam Suam*, 94. “*Mand* V–VII speak of a fundamental moral opposition among creatures. This situation is illustrated in *Mand*. VI, 1, 2–5 among the illustrated picture of two paths.”

both as the first mandate as well as the introduction (Mand. 1.1–2 [26.1–2]), followed by twelve total commandments, and then a conclusion section (Mand. 12.3.2–6.5 [46.2–49.5]).

Hermas presents the Two Ways in terms of a polarized list of virtues followed by a list of vices. The twelve commandments reflect a dualistic ethic of opposites, and Mand. 6.1–2 [35–36] depicts both the Two Ways and two angels that are reflective of contrasting ethics.¹⁷²

Cosmology, Angelic Dualism, and Polarized Ethics

The cosmic and angelic form of the specific Two Ways appears in Herm. Mand. 6.1.1 (35.1). The Shepherd seeks to instruct Hermas regarding the first commandment (ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἐντολῇ) so as to guard faith, fear, and self-control (ἐγκράτεια).¹⁷³ An appeal is made in the first mandate, which concerns faith, fear, and self-control (Mand. 1.2 [26.2]). In these three items, it pertains to two forms of inner-workings (Mand. 6.1.1 [35.1]; διπλαῖ γὰρ εἰσιν αἱ ἐνέργειαι). Within these three virtues, the twofold features are appointed to particular dispositions of persons: just and unjust. The two components of self-control are subsequently explained to show “restraint from some items but not others” (Mand. 8.1 [38.1]; ἐπί τινων γὰρ δεῖ ἐγκρατεῦσθαι, ἐπί τινων δὲ οὐ δεῖ). Brox situates the motif of faith as an appropriate concept for the Two Ways metaphor. “Glaube ist Wahl und Verwirklichung des

¹⁷²Lage Pernveden, *The Concept of the Church in the Shepherd of Hermas*, Studia Theologica Lundensia: Skrifter Utgivna av Teologiska Fakulteten I Lund 27 (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1966), 135.

¹⁷³So Erhman (Bart D. Ehrman, ed. and trans., *The Apostolic Fathers*, vol 2. LCL 25 [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 2003]). Contra Holmes: “in the first commandments” (Michael W. Holmes, ed. and trans., *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, 3rd ed. [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007]).

Rechten oder der Gerechtigkeit, diese ihrerseits eine Chiffre für christliche Moralität, die ebensogut mit der (hier als Bild nicht gerade passenden, aber des Dualismus wegen gewählten) schon altgriechischen Zwei-Wege-Metapher ausgedrückt wird.”¹⁷⁴

The twofold inner features reflect the anthropological workings of righteousness (*δικαιος*) and the counter of righteousness (*ἄδικος*; Mand. 6.1.2 [35.2]). These two inner features follow two non-corporeal paths. The path of righteousness is straight and level.¹⁷⁵ However, the unrighteous have a crooked path (cf. Tob 4.19).¹⁷⁶ The path lacks roads, is filled with impassible places, and contains many stumbling blocks as it is uneven and full of thorns (Mand. 6.1.3 [35.3]). The word that describes the road is *τρίβος* and is found also in Herm. Sim. 5.6.3 [59.3]. Within this later use, it is metaphorically used to convey a right way of life, expressed in keeping the commandments (*πρόσταγμα*; Sim. 5.1.5 [54.5]), and subsequently encompassed as “law” (*νόμος*; Sim. 5.6.3 [59.3]).¹⁷⁷ The telic function of both paths reflect their respective dispositions. Either, the crooked way will harm (*βλαβερός*; cf. Herm. Vis. 3.9.4 [17.4]) those who walk upon it (Mand. 6.1.3 [35.3]), or the straight path, which is level for those walking and without offense (*ἀπροσκόπτως*), will be level and permit others to walk without stumbling (Mand. 6.1.4 [35.4]).

¹⁷⁴“Faith is the choice and realization of righteousness or justice, which in turn is a cipher for Christian morality. Which is also expressed with the ancient Greek Two-Ways-Metaphor (while the image here is not entirely suitable, but chosen for the dualism).” Brox, *Hermas*, 225.

¹⁷⁵Pernveden helpfully describes Herm. Mand. 1.2 (26.2) as a way of life that “is presented as a straight path.” And this way of life “is carried out by walking in the commandments.” Pernveden, *The Concept of the Church in the Shepherd of Hermas*, 93.

¹⁷⁶Tobit offers a particular tradition that corresponds to the opposite of Hermas. In Tob 4.19, a prayer is given whereby they are to bless the Lord all the days and ask from him so as to make their ways straight (*αἱ ὁδοί σου εὐθείαι γένωνται*). Although possessing different lexemes, Tobit conveys a similar *sense* of the straight and crooked path.

¹⁷⁷Pernveden, *The Concept of the Church in the Shepherd of Hermas*, 93.

The next section switches metaphors from a pathway metaphor to an angelic metaphor (Mand. 6.2.1 [36.1]). Beginning with ἄκουε νῦν, this second section is giving a further explanation of the previous. The expression ἄκουε νῦν is used in eight other places to give a deeper meaning or interpretation of preceding ideas (Vis. 3.6.1 [14.1]; 3.8.3 [16.3]; Mand. 5.2.1 [34.1]; 10.2.1 [41.1]; 11.11 [39.11]; Sim. 5.5.1 [58.1]; 5.7.1 [60.1]; 9.33.3 [110.3]). In each of these uses—possibly with the exception of Sim. 5.7.1 [60.1]—ἄκουε νῦν serves as a discourse marker to identify a topic in the preceding section and give deeper interpretive comments. For example, Vis. 3.5.1 (13.1) gives additional detail about the stones, previously mentioned in Vis. 3.4.2–3 (12.2–3). Also, Vis. 3.8.3 (16.3) offers an additional thought to the Lady in the previous verse (Vis. 3.8.2 [16.2]). The clearer referents are located in the Mandates. In Mand. 5.2.1 (34.1), the deeper innerworkings (ἐνέργεια) of irritability (ὀξύχολία) is elaborated upon (cf. Mand. 5.1.6–7 [33.6–7]).

ἄκουε νῦν does not change the subject; rather, it gives a deeper meaning of faith and the road metaphor (Mand. 6.2.1 [36.1]). Each person possesses two angels: one of righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) and one of wickedness (πονηρία). The image of two angels with one person is the converse image of the angelic dualism in both 1QS III–IV and Barn. 19–21. There, the two angels appear as the sole proprietor of human ethics. Instead, Mand. 6.2.1–2 (36.1–2) present the single human as a sole proprietor, who possesses two angelic beings that will influence their ethics. In Mand. 6.2.2 (36.2), both angels dwell within the individual, although space for one spirit exists within a person (Mand. 5.1.2–4 [33.2–4]; 5.2.5 [34.5]).

The angelic dualism expresses the interworking of polarized ethics within the person. The angel of righteousness is “gentle, and modest, and meek, and well-ordered” (Mand. 6.2.3 [36.3]).¹⁷⁸ This angel speaks virtue within the person. Some

¹⁷⁸According to Grundeken, Hermas does little to distinguish between “spirits” and

have suggested that the “angel of righteousness” is synonymous with the Holy Spirit due to analogous actions and description (cf. *τῆς ἀρετῆς* in Mand. 5.2.6 [34.6]; *τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ δικαίου* in Mand. 5.2.7 [34.7]).¹⁷⁹ Moreover, the concept of *διδασχὴ* conveys negative implications: either teaching of the evil angel (Mand. 6.2.7 [36.7]) or a matter of strange doctrine that corrupts God’s servants (Sim. 8.6.5 [72.5]).¹⁸⁰ “Delicate” (*τρυφερός*), “meek”/“meekness” (*πραός/πραότης*), and “tranquil”/“tranquility” (*ἡσύχιος/ἡσυχία*) are used to describe the “angel of righteousness” (Mand. 6.2.3 [36.3]) and the “spirit of righteousness” (Mand. 5.2.6 [34.6]).¹⁸¹ On the contrary, the angel of wickedness is “irratibility (*ὀξύχολία*; cf. Mand. 5.1.6–7 [33.6–7]; 5.2.1 [34.1]), and bitter, and imprudent,” resulting in ruin coming upon the slaves of God (Mand. 6.2.4 [36.4]).¹⁸² The antagonistic struggle of the two spirits, as Brox identifies, has little to do with the expression of faith; but is the dualist outline of split moral efforts, doubt (*διψυχία*) and inner unity, and simplicity and divisiveness.¹⁸³

The determinism is both affirmed and softened in the tradition of Hermas. First, if any thought of unrighteousness, as reflected in the angel of wickedness, should rise upon the heart of the person, then that man or woman is bound to

“angels.” “For Hermas, angels are ‘spirits’. Whereas *Man.* 5,1–2 refers to ‘indwelling spirits (*πνεύματα*) that lead persons in one direction or the other’, in *Man.* 6,2 they are called ‘angels (*ἄγγελοι*) of justice and evil’.” Grundeken, *Community Building in the Shepherd of Hermas*, 62; cf. Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 32.

¹⁷⁹Wilson, *Toward a Reassessment*, 78–79.

¹⁸⁰Pernveden, *The Concept of the Church in the Shepherd of Hermas*, 117.

¹⁸¹So, Bogdan Gabriel Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology: Clement of Alexandria and Other Early Christian Witnesses*, VCSup 95 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 118.

¹⁸²According to Wilson, “The Holy Spirit is indeed so delicate that it cannot effectively dwell in a person in whom any evil spirit is dwelling at the same time.” Wilson, *Toward a Reassessment*, 72.

¹⁸³Brox, *Herms*, 226–27.

comment sin (δεῖ . . . ἐξαμαρτῆσαι; Mand. 6.2.7 [36.7]). The contrary is also true. If thoughts of the angel of righteousness should rise upon the heart of the person, then that man or woman is bound to do something good (ἐξ ἀνάγκης δεῖ ἀγαθόν τι ποιῆσαι; Mand. 6.2.8 [36.8]). Thus, the struggle between virtue and vice, or allegiance to one of the two angels is reflective of the human commitment (Mand. 6.2.9 [36.9]).¹⁸⁴

Other traditions in Hermas reflect a broad range of cosmological angelic influence.¹⁸⁵ Angels are the first creatures of God and are given the entire creation to increase, build, and rule over it (Vis. 3.2.5 [10.5]; 3.4.1–2 [12.1–2]).¹⁸⁶ They watch over humanity for the entirety of their lives (Vis. 5.1–2 [25.1–2]; Sim. 8.3.3 [69.3])—even given the divine directive to protect humanity (Sim. 5.5.3 [58.3]; 5.6.2 [59.2]).

Problems abound in Sim. 5 (54–60), as identified by Bucur, whether or not the Shepherd portrays a form of Spirit-Christology, or if there is a clearer separation between the identity of the Holy Spirit and Christ.¹⁸⁷ Even beyond Mand. 6.1–2 (35–36), the anthropological angelic influence is still expressed through polarized Two

¹⁸⁴Wilson identifies the struggle between Holy Spirit and the evil spirits in much the same way. The struggle between the spirits and the virtues “takes place within the human heart. The human being is the deciding factor in the outcome of the struggle.” Wilson, *Toward a Reassessment*, 74.

¹⁸⁵Adela Yarbro Collins, “The Early Christian Apocalypses,” in *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*, ed. John J. Collins, *Semeia* 14 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1979), 75.

¹⁸⁶Rüpke notes the appearance of the six young men but neglects to connect these figures to angelic beings. In his argument, “The role of the companions speaks against the interpretation of the *subsellium* as ‘sigma bank’ for the presbyters.” Yet, Herm. Vis. 3.4.1 (12.1) is not mentioned in his argument that identifies the six young men as the “holy angels of God, those first being created” (οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ ἅγιοι ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ οἱ πρῶτοι κτισθέντες). Jörg Rüpke, “Two Cities and One Self: Transformations of Jerusalem and Reflexive Individuality in the Shepherd of Hermas,” in *Religious Dimensions of the Self in the Second Century CE*, ed. Jörg Rüpke and Greg Woolf, STAC 76 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 59n70.

¹⁸⁷Bogdan G. Bucur, “The Son of God and the Angelomorphic Holy Spirit: A Rereading of the *Shepherd’s* Christology,” *ZNW* 98, no. 1–2 (2007): 138; Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 135–36; Grundeken, *Community Building in the Shepherd of Hermas*, 60–62.

Ways ethics. A parable of two shepherds is emblematic for the angel of punishment, who acts unbecomingly upon persons all their earthly lives (Sim. 6.2.5–3.6 [62.5–63.6]). Sheep are grazing while they are entangled in thorns and thistles, and the shepherd has miserably beaten the sheep (Sim. 6.2.6–7 [62.6–7]). Humanity is under the affliction of this wicked shepherd to mete out punishments until they have suffered affliction (Sim. 6.3.3–6 [63.3–6]). And then, they will live the remainder of their lives with pure hearts after repentance (Sim. 6.3.6 [63.3]). Similarly, the Lord grants humans to fall under the influence of this angel to lead them to repentance (Sim. 7.2–3 [66.2–3]).

Contrary to the work of an evil angel, if the Holy Spirit dwells within a human, it cannot be overshadowed by an evil spirit (Mand. 5.1.2 [33.2]). If vices continue to reflect the human disposition, the Holy Spirit is driven out and replaced by an evil spirit (Mand. 5.1.3 [33.3]; 5.2.5–7 [34.5–7]). Irratibility is the most wicked spirit that can drive away the Spirit (Mand. 5.2.8 [34.8]). “The Holy Spirit,” as J. Christian Wilson identifies in Mand. 5 (33–34), “is indeed so delicate that it cannot effectively dwell in a person in whom any evil spirit is dwelling at the same time.”¹⁸⁸ When the devil comes upon the person, the angel of repentance will drive him out (Mand. 12.4.6–7 [47.6–7]). But if unaware, the devil will dwell within the slaves of God, put them to test, and make them subservient (Mand. 12.5 [48]). With this expression, even the devil is portrayed as an angelic being. If humans turn from their increased sins, the devil will flee, and the angel of repentance will dwell within them (Mand. 12.6 [49]). Thus for Hermas, angelic dualism affects anthropological ethics. A mutual opposition emerges when humans portray ethics reflective of a particular angel, they are able to be subverted by the polarized angelic force and display the counter ethic.

¹⁸⁸Wilson, *Toward a Reassessment*, 72.

Summary: Ancient Two Ways as an Apocalyptic Worldview

In the present chapter, I have assessed the apocalyptic motifs that accompany ancient Jewish and early Christian Two Ways texts. The texts under consideration were chosen on the basis of their reoccurring appearance in both New Testament and early Christian scholarship, and more specifically Didache scholarship. A judicial choice limited the texts to 1QS III, 13–IV, 26; Testament of Asher; Galatians 5:16–24; Barn. 18–21; *De Doctrina*; and Herm. Mand. 6.1–2 (35–36). I inquired about the manner in which these specific Two Ways texts follow a Two Ways literary structure, even loosely, and how they display an apocalyptic worldview.

Among these texts, at least 5 apocalyptic motifs emerge: (1) angelic or otherworldly figures, (2) angelic or otherworldly ethical influence, (3) dualistic cosmological structures, (4) divine determinism, and (5) anthropological telic ends. These five concepts offer a cumulative case for an apocalyptic worldview to undergird these Two Ways texts. In each text, these five concepts appear in a variety of ways and are not all equally expressed. For example, 1QS III–IV present a myriad of angels that fill the cosmos so as to influence humanity, but Herm. Mand. 6.1–2 (35–36) presents two angels that currently dwell inside a single individual. The cosmology of T. Ash. 1–8 and Galatians 5:16–24 differ in many regards, but is nonetheless present within their individual expressions. Only 1QS III–IV, Barn. 18, and *Doctr.* 1–6 provide an additional description of the Two Ways in terms of optical expressions: “light” and “darkness.” In each of the texts, the telic ends of humanity are tied to ethical dispositions of the Two Ways.

As an additional observation, not all of these aforementioned texts share the same tradition history. Given that the purpose of this chapter is to offer a broad base of ancient Jewish and early Christian apocalyptic concepts, the temporal divide

and ideological differences of each text point to the common feature of apocalypticism as part of early Two Ways texts. This apocalyptic symmetry points to the undercurrent of an apocalyptic worldview as part of the ideological framework of a Two Ways genre.

Table 1. Apocalyptic motifs and Two Ways summary (excluding Didache)

	1QS III-IV	T. Ash. 1-8	Gal 5:16-24	Barn. 18-21	<i>Doctr.</i> 1-6	Herm. Mand. 6 (35-36)
Two Ways Text	X	X	X	X	X	X
Angelic/Otherworldly Beings	X	X	X	X	X	X
Angelic ethical influence	X	X	X	X	X	X
Cosmology	X	X	X	X	X	X
Divine Determinism	X	X	X	X	X	X
Anthropological Destiny	X	X	X	X	X**	X*
Two Ways as “Light” and “Darkness”	X			X	X	

Note: * Although anthropological destiny is not as observable for both ways of life, those who trust the works of the Angel of Righteousness “will live to God” (Herm. Mand. 6.2.10 [36.10]).

** *De Doctrina* 6.5 envisions how one “will acquire a crown” (*sed per haec sancta certamina peruenies ad coronam*).

CHAPTER 4

“THE DIFFERENCE IS GREAT BETWEEN THE TWO PATHS”: A CONSIDERATION OF THE TEXTUAL INTEGRITY AND STRUCTURE OF THE DIDACHE’S TWO WAYS FRAME

In the previous chapters I examined some of the issues that pertain to apocalypticism and the apocalyptic worldview. I also documented how two versions of the Two Ways metaphors appear in ancient literature: one that abides by a literary structure and one that does not. Two Ways texts, delineated by a Two Ways literary structure, assume some form of an apocalyptic worldview that will inform their structure and motifs—especially observed in a closer reading of 1QS III, 13–IV, 26; T. Ash. 1–8; Galatians 5:16–24; Barn. 18–21; *Doctr.* 1–6; and Herm. Mand. 6.1–2 (35–36).

The analysis from this point onward will build upon the previous concepts and devote exclusive attention to the text of the Didache. As the focus shifts to a specific literary text, a particular question often asked by Didache scholars needs to be raised. Is there an identifiable literary frame—a limit or boundary that structures the contents—for the Didache’s version of the Two Ways? And, if a frame can be identified, with what amount of probability may scholars speak of its textual integrity? In other words, if there is a literary frame, how can scholars analyze the frame along with the potential compositional developments and redaction insertions? These questions and the corresponding thesis function to demarcate the Didache’s Two Ways for the subsequent chapters. In order to assess the apocalyptic features of the Two Ways, we must identify where the Two Ways appears in the Didache.

Prior to addressing the following argument, brief comments about the status of the Didache text are warranted. The textual history of the Didache is quite complicated. The Didache is reflective of a second-century social setting, while the manuscript tradition dates to the eleventh-century. Codex Hierosolymitanus (H54) dates to the mid-eleventh-century and remains the only surviving, complete manuscript. Beyond this extant version, two fourth-century fragments, Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1782, contain Did. 1.3c–4a and 2.7–3.2;¹ one fifth-century Coptic fragment, Br. Mus. Or. 9271, includes Did. 10.3b–12.2;² and early in the twentieth-century a Georgian version of the Didache appeared but was subsequently lost. Recently, David Palmer has collated variants from many versions and copies of the Didache.³ So, the starting point of this critical and linguistic discussion begins with the 1887 transcription of Rendel Harris⁴ and subsequently selected modern translations.⁵ The problem is further accentuated when assumptions of a stable

¹A. S. Hunt, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 15 (London: Oxford University Press, 1922), 12–15.

²G. Horner, “A New Papyrus Fragment of the *Didache* in Coptic,” *JTS* 25 (April 1924): 225–31; F. Stanley Jones and Paul A. Mirecki, “Considerations of the Coptic Papyrus of the *Didache* (British Library Oriental Manuscript 9271),” in *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History, and Transmission*, ed. Clayton N. Jefford, *NovTSup* 77 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 37–46.

³David Robert Palmer, “The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles: A Critical Greek Edition with Footnotes Covering Textual Variants,” accessed January 5, 2017, <http://www.bibletranslation.ws/trans/didache.pdf>.

⁴J. Rendel Harris, *The Teaching of the Apostle: Newly Edited, with Facsimile Text and a Commentary* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1887).

⁵Willy Rordorf and André Tuilier, *La Doctrine Des Douze Apôtres (Didachè): Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction, Notes, Appendice, Annexe et Index*, 2nd ed., SC 248 (Paris: Les Éditions Du Cerf, 1978); Klaus Wengst, *Didache (Apostellehre), Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Klemensbrief, Schrift an Diognet: Eingeleitet, herausgegeben, übertragen und erläutert*, *Schriften des Urchristentums* 2 (München: Kösel-Verlag, 1984); Andreas Lindemann and Henning Paulsen, eds., *Die Apostolischen Väter: Griechisch-deutsche Parallelausgabe* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1992); Kurt Niederwimmer, “Der Didachist Und Seine Quellen,” in *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission*, ed. Clayton N. Jefford, *NovTSup* 77 (Leiden: Brill, 1995); Kurt Niederwimmer, “Der Didachist und seine Quellen,” in *Quaestiones theologicae: Gesammelte Aufsätze*, *BZNW* 90 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1998), 243–66; Bart D. Ehrman, *The Apostolic*

second-century context are reflected in an eleventh-century MS with no modern critical edition.

As I will argue, the Didache's Two Ways comprises the material within Did. 1.1–6.2. By making this division a literary segment, I will be distancing myself from some in Didache scholarship who argue for the frame to consist of 1.1–5.2c; 1.1–6.1; or 1.1–6.3. These arguments and figures will be listed below. My argument will essentially have two salient points. First, I will assume and document the linguistic analysis of Nancy Pardee and her application of delimitation to the Didache. This argument will identify the essential structures and divisions of the Didache as a whole. Second, I will build upon her assessment and add source comparison and discourse features as a means to identify how the Didache's Two Ways have both cohesive and disjunctive elements. This methodology will help demonstrate the basic divisions and broad textual unity of the Didache's Two Ways.

Selected Summary of Scholarship: Suggested Structures of the Didache's Two Ways

The Two Ways instruction is readily recognized among Didache scholars. The divergence of opinions does not generally coalesce where the Two Ways begins but rather where the Two Ways concludes. Does the Didache's version of the Two Ways end at 5.2a, 6.1,⁶ or 6.3? For example, according to Alan Garrow, the Two Ways in the Didache comprises the material in Did. 1–5, and more specifically Did. 1.1–5.2a. "At its simplest Did. 1–5 is a Two Ways tractate into which a number of

Fathers I, LCL 24 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003); Michael W. Holmes, ed., *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007). Palmer, "Critical Greek Edition."

⁶D. Rudolf Knopf, *Die Lehre Der Zwölf Apostel Dei Zwei Clemensbriefe*, DAV 1 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1920), 3–7.

previously existing traditions have been incorporated.”⁷ To be fair, Garrow is identifying the tractate version of the Two Ways and not necessarily how it functions in the Didache. Later, he suggests that Did. 6.1–3 is an interpolation to link the Two Ways and baptism.⁸ The baptismal liturgy, as Garrow explains, would move through 5.2 (the end of the Two Ways) to 7.1.⁹ The same redactor inserts Did. 6.2 and 6.3 as a joined unit due to similarities in language and 6.1 provides the necessary transition.¹⁰

Another possible option is to conclude the Two Ways at Did. 6.1 and identify Did. 6.2–3 as a collective editorial insertion.¹¹ According to Kurt Niederwimmer, “the redactor would therefore have concluded the quotation from his source at Did. 6.1. What he now added in 6.2–3 has the character of interpretation and expansion.”¹² The material in Did. 6.2 is thus an interpretive addendum to the tractate, joined with Did. 1.3b–2.1, and designed to emphasize the moral instruction for the whole Two Ways.¹³

Jonathan Draper has summarized well a number of the options regarding the Two Ways material and Did. 6.2–3.¹⁴ Of the few options summarized, Did. 6.2–3

⁷Alan J. P. Garrow, *The Gospel of Matthew's Dependence on the Didache*, LNTS 254 (New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), 67.

⁸Garrow, *Matthew's Dependence on the Didache*, 97.

⁹Garrow, *Matthew's Dependence on the Didache*, 100.

¹⁰Garrow, *Matthew's Dependence on the Didache*, 100–1.

¹¹Kari Syreeni, “The Sermon on the Mount and the Two Ways Teaching of the Didache,” in *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?*, ed. Huub van de Sandt (Philadelphia: Fortress, 2005), 90.

¹²Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache: A Commentary*, trans. Linda M. Maloney, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 123.

¹³Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 124.

¹⁴Jonathan A. Draper, “A Continuing Enigma: the ‘Yoke of the Lord’ in Didache 6.2–3 and

frequently functions as an amended text to Did. 6.1.¹⁵ Within these observations, Did. 6.2–3 often stands as a secondary unit in relation to the Two Ways instruction (Did. 1.1–6.1). This argument was especially so in early scholarship that attempted to identify an *Urtext*.¹⁶ As scholarship continues to discuss this concept, Did. 6.2–3 forms a single unit that comprises part of the “original Jewish substructure of the Two Ways,”¹⁷ an independent tradition to bridge the gap between Jewish Two Ways and Christian liturgy,¹⁸ or redacted by the Didachist to join a Jewish Two Ways with Christian liturgy.¹⁹

One additional theory is worth noting. According to Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser, Did. 6.2–3 reflects a marked shift in ethics and values from the preceding instruction.²⁰ The sharp warning in Did. 6.1 is subsequently followed in 6.2–3 “with an atmosphere of concession and tolerance.”²¹ These comments place

early Jewish-Christian Relations,” in *The Image of the Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, ed. Peter J. Tomson and Doris Lambers-Petry, WUNT 158 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 106–23.

¹⁵Draper, “A Continuing Enigma,” 111–12.

¹⁶Adolf Harnack, *Die Apostellehre und die jüdischen bei den Wege* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1886), 57–65; Charles Taylor, *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles with Illustrations from the Talmud* (Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1886); Draper, “A Continuing Enigma,” 112.

¹⁷Draper, “A Continuing Enigma,” 112.

¹⁸Clayton N. Jefford, “Tradition and Witness in Antioch: Acts 15 and Didache 6,” in *Perspectives on Contemporary New Testament Questions: Essays in Honor of T.C. Smith*, ed. Edgar V. McKnight (Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1992), 75–89; Jonathan A. Draper, “Torah and Troublesome Apostles in the *Didache* Community,” in *The Didache in Modern Research*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper, AGJU 37 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 340–63.

¹⁹Rordorf and Tuilier, *Didachè*, 32–34; Draper, “A Continuing Enigma,” 113.

²⁰Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity*, CRINT: Section III Jewish Traditions in Early Christian Literature 5 (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 238.

²¹van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 238.

van de Sandt and Flusser in the tradition that affirms 1.1–6.1 as the Two Ways and 6.2–3 as a Christian emendation.²²

The uniqueness of van de Sandt and Flusser’s argument is their reconstruction of the Two Ways. They suggest that the “Doctrina is probably our best guide to the Jewish Two Ways edition that was most widely known in ancient times,” and Didache and Barnabas are independent modifications to this version.

Thus, the Two Ways conclusion for *De Doctrina* consists of the following:

Doctr. 6.1: Et uide, ne quis te ab hac doctrina auocet, et si minus, extra disciplinam doceberis.

Doctr. 6.4: Haec in consulendo si cottidie feceris, prope eris uiuo deo; quod si non feceris, longe eris a ueritate.

Doctr. 6.5: Haec omnia tibi in animo pone et non deciperis de spe tua, sed per haec sancta certamina peruenies ad coronam.

Doctr. 6.6: Per dominum Iesum Christum regnantem et dominantem cum deo patre et spiritu sancto in saecula saeculorum. Amen.

In order to retain the Jewish elements of the Two Ways, van de Sandt and Flusser suggest the “Jewish Two Ways is preserved more accurately in *De Doctrina*, although without the final doxology in 6:6.”²³ Therefore, they seek to reconstruct the Greek Two Ways version as follows:²⁴

GTW 6:1: Ὅρα, μή τις σε πλανήσῃ ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς διδαχῆς, ἐπεὶ παρεκτὸς τῆς διδαχῆς σε διδάσκει.

GTW 6:4: Ἐὰν μὲν συμβουλεύων ταῦτα ποιῆς καθ’ ἡμέραν, ἐγγὺς θεοῦ ζῶντος ἔσει· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ποιῆς, μακρὰν ἀπ’ ἀληθείας ἔσει.

GTW 6:5: Ταῦτα πάντα εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα σου ἐνβάλλων οὐ πεσεῖ τῆς ἐλπίδος σου (ἀλλὰ διὰ τουτούς ἀγίους ἀγῶνας στέφανον λήψει).

²²van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 112.

²³van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 119.

²⁴van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 128.

Delimitation Markers and the Didache's Two Ways

Nancy Pardee's 2012 volume, *The Genre and Development of the Didache*,²⁵ is the first of its kind within Didache studies. She assumes the field of text linguistics and applies this methodology to H54 in an attempt to ascertain the genre of the Didache.²⁶ Text linguistics refers to the application of "linguistic concepts and methodologies to the *text* as an act of communication."²⁷ With the variety of methods that accompany text linguistics, Pardee's analysis assesses the text as a primary unit. Text linguistic methods "allow for the individuality of an author and presuppose that a given text is comprehensible."²⁸ As Pardee depends upon Bruce Johanson, he suggests that this text-centered approach "is necessary in order to be able to judge the extent to which conventional influence has controlled individual expressions or to which the individual author has bent and shaped the conventional into something new and appropriate to the situation in hand."²⁹

Within the broad field of text linguistics, Pardee follows the method first outlined by David Hellholm's study of the Shepherd of Hermas.³⁰ In order to

²⁵Nancy Pardee, *The Genre and Development of the Didache*, WUNT 2/339 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012).

²⁶For Pardee, text linguistics is compared to and seemingly equated with what she titles, "its American relation, *discourse analysis*." Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 65.

²⁷Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 65.

²⁸Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 65.

²⁹Bruce C. Johanson, *To All the Brethren: A Text-Linguistic and Rhetorical Approach to 1 Thessalonians*, ConBNT 16 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1987), 6.

³⁰Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 69; David Hellholm, *Das Visionenbuch des Hermas als Apokalypse: Formgeschichtliche und texttheoretische Studien zu einer literarischen Gattung. Methodologische Vorüberlegungen und makrostrukturelle Textanalyse*, vol. 1, ConBNT 13.1 (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1980); Also see Mikael Isacson, *To Each Their Own Letter: Structure, Themes, and Rhetorical Strategies in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*, ConBNT 42 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2004).

describe the structure of a text, Pardee defines delimitation markers as “signs within a text that serve to set off its component parts from one another while yet connecting these parts in an overarching structure.”³¹ These delimitation markers contain a three-level hierarchical system: pragmatic, semantic, and syntactic dimensions.³² Pragmatic dimensions assess the text on the meta-level of a discourse. Semantic dimensions assess the text on a sub-text level, not on a meta-level. Syntactical dimensions assess the text on the lowest level of text units. Pardee selected delimitations markers and adapted them for the Didache in the following way:

1. Pragmatic markers
 - 1.a. meta-communicative sentences
 - 1.b. substitutions on the meta-level
2. Semantic markers
 - 2.a. episode markers (temporal, local)
 - 2.b. change in *dramatis personae*
 - 2.c. change in topic via word association
3. Syntactical markers
 - 3.a. renominalization
 - 3.b. exact repetition of phraseology
 - 3.c. change in syntactical style
 - 3.d. sentence and text connectors³³

³¹Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 69.

³²Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 69.

³³Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 74.

Pardee uses text linguistics and delimitation markers to identify the Two Ways section of the Didache as it relates to the whole. As part of the first text level (¹ST), there are two primary text-parts to the whole Didache text:³⁴

1.1–15.4: Body of the Document

16.1–7: Conclusion

This decision is based upon thematic changes between 15.4 and 16.1; *γρηγορεῖτε* and the addition of an asyndeton mark a transition in the discourse; and “the gospel” in 15.4 has an anaphoric function to refer to the abstract terms *εὐχάς* (“prayers”), *ἐλεημοσύνας* (“alms”), and *πάσας τὰς πράξεις* (“all practices”) in 15.4.³⁵

For text-level 2 (²ST), there are two sub-texts for Did. 1.1–15.3. According to Pardee, the two divisions are 1.1–11.2 and 11.3–15.3. This decision is based upon the anaphoric nature of both *ταῦτα πάντα τὰ προειρημένα* (11.1) and *ἄλλῃν διδαχὴν* (11.2); the concluding particle *οὖν* to begin the concluding section (11.1); and the *περὶ δέ + genitive* that begins 11.3.³⁶

For text-level 3 (³ST), there are again two sub-texts for 1.1–11.2: Did. 1.1–6.3 and 7.1–11.2. These text divisions are based upon the following reasons: *ταῦτα πάντα προειπόντες* (7.1) anaphorically refer to chapters 1–6 and the preceding material; a change in communication and *dramatis personae* between Did. 6 and Did. 7; and the structural features of *περὶ δέ + genitive + οὕτω(ς) + imperative* in 7.1.³⁷

Finally, for text-level 4 (⁴ST), there remain two additional sub-texts for 1.1–6.3. For Pardee, the two substitutions at the meta-level in 6.1–2 (*ταύης τῆς ὁδοῦ*

³⁴Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 125.

³⁵Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 125–27.

³⁶Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 133–38.

³⁷Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 138–39.

τῆς διδαχῆς [6.1] and ἄλλον τὸν ζυγὸν [6.2]) and the shift in topics in 6.3 (περὶ δέ + genitive) create the final division in the Two Ways: 1.1–6.2 and 6.3.³⁸ The material in 6.3 most likely originated “at a stage later than the Two Ways text of 1.1–6.2” and was considered part of the baptismal text at some point in the textual history.³⁹

For Pardee, then, the following outline serves to reflect the Didache’s delimitation structure. Delimitation markers help segment sections that present four layers of textual divisions. This structure only reflects how the Two Ways section relates to the whole of the Didache. Thus, it does not document how Pardee structures the imbedded features of the remaining portions of the Didache according to a delimitation structure of Didache’s Two Ways.

¹ST1: Did. 1.1–15.4: Body of the Document

²ST1.1: Did. 1.1–11.2

³ST1.1.1: Did. 1.1–6.3

⁴ST1.1.1.1: Did. 1.1–6.2: Two Ways

⁴ST1.1.1.2: Did. 6.3: Additional Amendment to Two Ways

³ST1.1.2: Did. 7.1–11.2

²ST1.2: Did. 11.3–15.4

¹ST2: Did. 16.1–7: Conclusion

Didache 1.1–6.2 and the Literary Structure of the Didache’s Two Ways

Building on Pardee’s delimitation, I will further substantiate how the Two Ways comprises of material in Did. 1.1–6.2. By offering a two-pronged argument, I

³⁸Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 139–40.

³⁹Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 139–40.

will further substantiate the literary structure of the Two Ways in the Didache through source comparisons and discourse features.

Comparison with Other Ancient Two Ways

When the Didache's version of the Two Ways is compared with other Two Ways texts, a few notable observations can be ascertained. First, redaction and literary creativity are seen in the introductory frame of the Two Ways. In other words, no single Two Ways text maintains complete symmetry when framing its version of the Two Ways. For example, consider the similar and dissimilar introductions of the following Two Ways when compared to Did. 1.1:

T. Ash. 1.3–5: δύο ὁδοὺς ἔδωκεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ δύο διαβούλια καὶ δύο πράξεις καὶ δύο τρόπους καὶ δύο τέλη· διὰ τοῦτο πάντα δύο εἰσιν, ἐν κατέναντι τοῦ ἑνός· ὁδοὶ δύο, καλοῦ καὶ κακοῦ· ἐν οἷς εἰσι τὰ δύο διαβούλια ἐν στέρνοις ἡμῶν διακρίνοντα αὐτάς

Gal 5:16–17: Λέγω δέ, πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσητε. ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκὸς, ταῦτα γὰρ ἀλλήλοις ἀντίκειται, ἵνα μὴ ἂ ἐὰν θέλητε ταῦτα ποιῆτε

Did. 1.1: Ὅδοι δύο εἰσί, μία τῆς ζωῆς καὶ μία τοῦ θανάτου, διαφορὰ δὲ πολλὴ μεταξὺ τῶν δύο ὁδῶν

Admittedly, these Two Ways texts do not necessarily share a similar tradition-history. Yet, broad thematic continuities and Two Ways instructions join these traditions together. When comparing these texts, their introductions bear very little literary symmetry. No introduction or conclusion to the Two Ways agree with one another. This observation, then, points to the literary creativity of each redactor to frame the Two Ways suitable for their respective situation.

Second, Two Ways texts that are historically related to the Didache, both temporally and possibly through source composition, also offer little symmetry in

terms of their Two Ways literary frame.⁴⁰ That is, Two Ways texts that are in a similar, source compositional stream also show some signs of literary freedom in the way they shape their Two Ways frame. For example, consider only the introductory comments to the Two Ways by Barnabas, Canons, Epitome, and Apostolic Constitutions:

Barn. 18.1–2: Μεταβῶμεν δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ἑτέραν γνῶσιν καὶ διδαχὴν. ὁδοὶ δύο εἰσὶν διδαχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας, ἢ τε τοῦ φωτὸς καὶ ἢ τοῦ σκότους· διαφορὰ δὲ πολλὴ τῶν δύο ὁδῶν. ἐφ’ ἧς μὲν γὰρ εἰσὶν τεταγμένοι φωταγωγοὶ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐφ’ ἧς δὲ ἄγγελοι τοῦ σατανᾶ. καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐστὶν κύριος ἀπὸ αἰῶνων καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ὁ δὲ ἄρχων καιροῦ τοῦ νῦν τῆς ἀνομίας

Canons: Ἰωάννης εἶπεν. ὁδοὶ δύο εἰσὶ, μία τῆς ζῆς ζωῆς καὶ μία τοῦ θανάτου, διαφορὰ δὲ πολλὴ μεταξὺ τῶν δύο ὁδῶν⁴¹

Epitome: Ἰωάννης εἶπεν. ὁδοὶ δύο εἰσὶ, μία τῆς ζῆς ζωῆς καὶ μία τοῦ θανάτου, καὶ διαφορὰ πολλὴ τῶν δύο⁴²

Apos. Con. 7.1: φαμέν ὡς δύο ὁδοὶ εἰσὶν, μία τῆς ζωῆς καὶ μία τοῦ θανάτου· οὐδεμίαν δὲ σύγχρισιν ἔχουσιν πρὸς ἑαυτάς, πολὺ γὰρ τὸ διάφορον, μᾶλλον δὲ πάντη κεχωρισμέναι τυγχάνουσιν, καὶ φυσικὴ μὲν ἔστιν ἡ τῆς ζωῆς ὁδός, ἐπεισακτος δὲ ἡ τοῦ θανάτου, οὐ τοῦ κατὰ γνώμην θεοῦ ὑπάρξαντος, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐξ ἐπιβουλῆς τοῦ ἄλλοτρίου

The strongest possible objection to this claim is that of *De Doctrina*.

Though some suggest *De Doctrina* is the more stable version for the Two Ways,⁴³ I do observe enough discontinuity between the two texts to suggest some amounts of literary freedom. As already previously documented, the conclusions to both *Didache* and *De Doctrina* differ considerably, with the exception of *Did.* 6.1//*Doctr.* 6.1.

⁴⁰At least three different source genealogies of the Two Ways are argued by the following authors that will include Barn. Canons, Epitome, Apos. Con., and *Doctr.*: Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 40; John S. Kloppenborg, “*Didache* 1.1—6.1, James, Matthew, and the Torah,” in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew Gregory and Christopher Tuckett, NTAF (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 195–96; Alistair Stewart-Sykes, ed., *On the Two Ways: Life or Death, Light or Darkness: Foundational Texts in the Tradition*, PPS 41 (Yonkers, NY: St. Vladimirs Seminary Press, 2011), 103.

⁴¹Text taken from: Alistair Stewart-Sykes, *The Apostolic Church Order: The Greek Text with Introduction, Translation and Annotation*, ECS 10 (Strathfield AU: St Pauls Publications, 2006).

⁴²Text taken from, Stewart-Sykes, *The Apostolic Church Order*.

⁴³van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 120.

Consider a comparison of the introductory comments in both Didache and *De Doctrina*:

Did. 1.1

Ὅδοι δύο εἰσί,
μία τῆς ζωῆς καὶ μία τοῦ θανάτου,

διαφορὰ δὲ πολλή
μεταξὺ τῶν δύο ὁδῶν

Doctr. 1.1

*Viae duae sunt
in saeculo,
vitae et mortis,
lucis et tenebrarum;
in his constituti sunt angeli duo,
unus aequitatis, alter iniquitatis;
distantia autem magna est
duarum viarum*

So, even texts that are assumed to reside in a similar source transmission, each version still contains a different introduction and conclusion to the Two Ways. Texts that share a similar source composition and genealogy demonstrate a considerable amount of freedom in terms of how each text shapes its literary frame for the Two Ways. This freedom is quite frequent that the Two Ways function as the stable instruction whereas the literary frame reflects redacted material in every case.

Additionally, if literary creativity exists in how Two Ways texts frame their respective Two Ways instruction, then the Didache will likewise demonstrate this literary creativity. To utilize discourse grammar and to identify linguistic cues will permit readers to assess the manner in which the Didachist provides textual coherence and cohesion, and discourse boundaries for its version of the Two Ways.

Discourse Cohesion: Textual Consistency and Discourse Constraints

First, a μέν . . . δέ expression joins together Did. 1.2 and 5.1. The discourse function of μέν creates an “anticipation of a related sentence that follows.”⁴⁴ While

⁴⁴Steven E. Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010), 75.

applying to narrative texts, Stephen Levinsohn may overstate the discourse function. “The presence of μέν not only anticipates a corresponding sentence containing δέ. Frequently, in narrative, it also downgrades the importance of the sentence containing μέν.”⁴⁵ As Steven Runge notes, “I contend that μέν simply creates anticipation of a related clause, most often introduced by δέ.”⁴⁶

Did. 1.2a: ἡ μὲν οὖν ὁδὸς τῆς ζωῆς ἐστὶν αὕτη

Did. 5.1a: ἡ δὲ τοῦ θανάτου ὁδὸς ἐστὶν αὕτη

As the discourse feature relates to Did. 1.2 and 5.1, this μέν . . . δέ expression anticipates these two sections. There is no corresponding δέ in the near context of Did. 1.2. In addition, the nearly identical clausal structure in Did. 5.1a strengthens a connection to 1.2a.⁴⁷ To introduce the way of life with μέν will produce an anticipation of another clause. Here, Did. 5.1a, marked with δέ, is reasonably understood to be the anticipated clause.

Second, the introductory clause in 6.2a, as marked by γάρ, does not introduce a new section but is constrained material that supports 6.1.⁴⁸

Did. 6.2a: εἰ μὲν γὰρ δύνασαι βαστάσαι

According to Levinsohn, “The presence of γάρ constrains the material that it introduces to be interpreted as *strengthening* some aspect of the previous assertion, rather than as distinctive information.”⁴⁹ As Runge suggests, “The information

⁴⁵Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*, 2nd ed. (Dallas: SIL International, 2000), 170.

⁴⁶Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 75n7.

⁴⁷Smyth §2906.

⁴⁸Nancy Pardee, “Visualizing the Christian Community at Antioch: The Window of the *Didache*,” *Forum* 3, no. 1 (2014): 73; cf. Smyth §2803.

⁴⁹Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 91. Also, BDF, §447 (5).

introduced does not advance the discourse but adds background information that strengthens or supports what precedes.”⁵⁰ So, for Did. 6.2a, γάρ supports the previous information as expressed in the preceding clause (Did. 6.1).

Finally, if γάρ constrains Did. 6.2a to the preceding clause, then the μέν . . . δέ construction in 6.2a and 6.2c are joined together and serve to strengthen collectively the argument in 6.1.⁵¹

Did. 6.2a: εἰ μὲν γὰρ δύνασαι βαστάσαι ὅλον τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου

Did. 6.2c: εἰ δ' οὐ δύνασαι

As previously argued, the μέν . . . δέ clausal relationships are mutually connected. The clause introduced by μέν often anticipates the clause introduced by δέ. Thus, all of Did. 6.2 is constrained material that serves to strengthen and support the preceding material in Did. 6.1 rather than the subsequent material.

Discourse Boundaries: Textual Segments and Discourse Divisions

If there are discourse features that provide cohesion to the discourse, then there should be some discourse features that help segment or signal breaks in the discourse. As these discourse features are identified, they will help signal changes and section breaks in the discourse. It often proves problematic to identify set criteria, which are used to recognize section and discourse boundaries. These criteria often support evidence that can be used to identify conflicting data.⁵² Levinsohn offers two specific problems that emerge when identifying section boundaries, and

⁵⁰Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 52.

⁵¹Smyth §2803.

⁵²Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 271.

then one additional feature that builds from John Beekman and John Callow's⁵³ list of supporting evidence:

1. The paragraph or section is a semantic or pragmatic unit characterized by having a single theme, not by the presence of certain surface features.
2. The presence of any specific surface features is seldom a sufficient criterion on which to identify a paragraph or section boundary.
3. Beekman and Callow's list of potential supporting evidence is sufficiently all-inclusive to justify alternative segmentations of the same passage.⁵⁴

The presence or absence of a “point of departure,” then, function as the foremost reason to signal some form of discontinuity.⁵⁵ A “point of departure” operates as the primary basis for what relates within the subsequent discourse, often called *topicalization*.⁵⁶ Therefore, it offers validation or invalidation in determining the presence of discourse boundaries.⁵⁷

First, a renaming pronoun functions as a substitution and thereby creates subtexts for two primary sections (Did. 1.2a; 4.14c; 5.1a). The pronoun will often convey a cataphoric, forward-pointing, discourse function; or it may convey an anaphoric, summative, discourse function. Through substitutions and renominalizations, a literary *inclusio* is created.⁵⁸ According to Levinsohn, “summary

⁵³John Beekman and John C. Callow, *Translating the Word of God* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974), 279–80.

⁵⁴Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 271.

⁵⁵Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 273–74. Furthermore, Levinsohn subsequently suggests the following potential supportive evidence to function as confirmation of discourse boundaries: (1) Conjunctions and Asyndeton; (2) Spatiotemporal Changes; (3) Summary Statements; (4) Chiasmic Structures; (5) *Inclusio* Structures; (6) Rhetorical Questions; (7) Participant Reference; (8) Vocatives; (9) Changes of Cast and Role; (10) Change of Verb Tense-Aspect, Mood and/or Person; and (11) Back-Reference. (Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 275–81).

⁵⁶Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 7.

⁵⁷Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 274.

⁵⁸Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 86–87.

statements unite together the information they summarize and thereby indicate that the preceding material should be treated as a block, over against what is to follow.”⁵⁹

Did. 1.2a (cataphoric): ἡ μὲν ὁδὸς τῆς ζωῆς ἐστὶν αὕτη

Did. 4.14c (anaphoric): αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ζωῆς

This substitution in 4.14c signals a conclusion. Most pronouns will carry an anaphoric feature unless a pronoun neglects to have an antecedent and they will be forward pointing.⁶⁰ Pardee, likewise, observes how the pronouns in Did. 1.2a and 4.14c have both a cataphoric and anaphoric role, respectively, and thus form a literary inclusio.⁶¹

The subtext created by Did. 5.1a does not have a similar discourse conclusion. Didache 5.1a has a similar cataphoric pronoun discourse feature. Yet, this construction is matched in Did. 5.2b with a vocative, renaming feature, and a summative demonstrative pronoun.

Did. 5.1a: ἡ δὲ τοῦ θανάτου ὁδὸς ἐστὶν αὕτη

Did. 5.2b: ῥυσθεῖητε τέχνα ἀπὸ τούτων ἀπάντων

Often pronouns will fill a “mental space” that substitutes a concept forthcoming in the discourse.⁶² As Michael Smith comments, “The use of the cataphor in effect results in a kind of double-mention in which the space designated by the pronoun metonymically relates to the proposition located conceptually within that space by prefiguring the space grammatically.”⁶³ So, the renominalization of the subject

⁵⁹Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 277.

⁶⁰Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 64; Cf. Smyth §1247; BDF §290.3.

⁶¹Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 87.

⁶²Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 63; Cf. Smyth §1241.

⁶³Michael B. Smith, “Cataphoric Pronouns as Mental Space Designators: Their Conceptual Import and Discourse Function,” in *Cognitive and Communicative Approaches to Linguistic Analysis*, ed. Ellen Contini-Morava, Robert S. Kirsner, and Betsy Rodríguez-Bachiller,

(τέκνα; 5.2b) recalls the recipients of Did. 3.1–6; 4.1 and τούτων ἀπάντων (5.2b) is a substitution for what precedes (Did. 5.1–2a).⁶⁴ This conclusion to the second sub-text provides a change in the discourse structure and serves to summarize the previous section (τούτων ἀπάντων; “all these things”).

Next, The use of asyndeton (6.1a),⁶⁵ substitutions (ἀπὸ τούτων ἀπάντων; 5.2b), and a change in the *dramatis personae* cumulatively suggest a transition in the discourse (cf. Did. 6.1). As Did. 5.2 concludes, no connectives join together with the following clause in 6.1.

Did. 5.2b: ῥυσθεῖητε τέκνα ἀπὸ τούτων ἀπάντων

Did. 6.1a: ὄρα μη τις σε πλανήσῃ

Asyndeton can often appear in two different kinds of contexts:

1. when there is a *close* connection between the information concerned (i.e., the information belongs together in the same unit)
2. when there is *no* direct connection between the information concerned (i.e., the information belongs to different units)⁶⁶

According to Pardee’s argument in Did. 16.1, the joined elements of asyndeton in conjunction with the imperative mark a shift in the discourse.

Within the Didache itself other examples of asyndetic warning/summary/conclusion statements can be found in 4.12–13; 5.2 and especially 6.1, i.e., at endings of text-parts in the Two Ways. It is likely, therefore, that the asyndetic, fronted, and eschatologically imbued imperative γρηγορεῖτε in 16.1 functioned as a marker of delimitation.⁶⁷

SFSL 51 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2004), 81; Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 63n6.

⁶⁴Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 88.

⁶⁵Asyndeton is a default mode to connect clauses whereby the author does not feel compelled to specify the relationship or whereby the author “judges that the implicit relation between the clauses is sufficiently clear” and offers “no processing constraint on how the following material was to be related to its context.” Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 20; Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 118.

⁶⁶Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 118.

⁶⁷Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 127.

Likewise, if Did. 5.2b evokes the hearer through the use of a vocative, second person plural imperative, and substitution markers, then the asyndetic connection to 6.1a provides no specific discourse constraint. Consequently, the change in person helps distinguish the two discourse sections.⁶⁸

Third, the use of *περὶ δέ* + genitive in Did. 6.3 signals a new topical break from Did. 6.2.

Did. 6.3a: *περὶ δὲ τῆς βρώσεως ὃ δύνασαι βάστασον*

Throughout the Didache, *περὶ δέ* + genitive is used to mark and begin a new topical discussion. In addition, Margaret Mitchell observes how *περὶ δέ* signals new topics and new discussions in a variety of ancient Greek literature.⁶⁹ According to Pardee, *περὶ δέ* signals a new topic and is a “pragmatic marker, a substitution on the meta-level, in essence a chapter heading standing for the material that follows.”⁷⁰ The *περὶ δέ* construction, along with *οὕτω(ς)*, also appears elsewhere in Did. 7.1; 9.1; 11.3:

Did. 7.1: *περὶ δὲ τοῦ βαπτίσματος οὕτω βαπτίσατε*

Did. 9.1: *περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε*

Did. 11.3: *περὶ δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν κατὰ τὸ δόγμα τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὕτω ποιήσατε*

Two additional uses of *περὶ* + genitive appear in 9.2 and 9.3 and function as an additional instruction to 9.1. I would suggest, however, Did. 9.3 is not holistically

⁶⁸According to Levinsohn, “Asyndeton is the norm between *paragraphs* with different topics when *no* direct connection between units is intended.” Asyndeton, then, can convey both a close or no direct relation or connection to the subsequent clause and discourse. Often, clauses that “evaluate” or “summarize” previous material help convey a transition in the discourse. Thus, *ταύτης τῆς ὁδοῦ τῆς διδαχῆς* in Did. 6.1 helps to convey such summative function. It “summarizes” because *ταύτης* is a substitution on the abstract level and *διδαχῆς* on the meta level. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 119.

⁶⁹Margaret Mitchell, “Concerning ΠΕΡΙ ΔΕ in 1 Corinthians,” *NovT* 31, no. 3 (1989): 229–56.

⁷⁰Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 135.

changing the major discourse in Did. 9; it is moving to the second topic of interest because of its further description of the Eucharist.

Did. 9.2: *πρῶτον περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου*

Did. 9.3: *περὶ δὲ τοῦ κλάσματος*

As this discourse marker relates to Did. 6.3, *περὶ δέ* + genitive functions as a new topic marker so as to signal a topical division between 6.2 and 6.3.

Fourth, two anaphoric elements appear in Did. 6.1–2 providing a topical conclusion to a section. *Ταύτης τῆς ὁδοῦ τῆς διδαχῆς* is a summation expression to refer back to the whole two ways (6.1)⁷¹ or to the way of life.⁷² At this point I will wait until the final chapter to explain *ἄλλο τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου* in Did. 6.2. Suffice for the present argument, Pardee suggests that both of these expressions “are substitutions that both refer back to the preceding text in 1.1–5.2”⁷³—that is, the hierarchical arrangement of substitutions on the meta-level.⁷⁴

Finally, summative and anaphoric elements likewise appear in Did. 7.1. Many discourse markers appear in 7.1 that highlight these clauses as transitional in nature.

Did. 7.1: *περὶ δὲ τοῦ βαπτίσματος οὕτω βαπτίσατε ταῦτα πάντα προειπόντες*
Not only is the *περὶ δέ* + genitive highlighting a change in topics, but *ταῦτα πάντα* is a substitution for concepts that refer back to 1.1–6.3 and *προειπόντες* conveys an act of communication. These concepts cumulatively indicate that Did. 1.1–6.3 “is itself a separate text.”⁷⁵

⁷¹A demonstrative pronoun often conveys an antecedent idea. Smyth §1245.

⁷²van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 138.

⁷³Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 84.

⁷⁴Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 74, 83, 85.

⁷⁵Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 84.

A problem does arise as to what section Did. 6.3 belongs. If Did. 6.2 ends a major section, Did. 6.3 begins with *περὶ δέ* + genitive, and Did. 7.1 includes both a section break and cataphoric elements, to what section does 6.3 belong? It appears, then, Did. 6.3 is amended to the conclusion of the Two Ways *only* in the Didache text, for this tradition appears in no other ancient Two Ways, and it later functioned as part of the catechesis as marked by 7.1.⁷⁶

Didache 1.1–6.2 and the Structure of the Two Ways Literary Frame

If the delimitation markers from Pardee are valid, then the Two Ways material consists of a literary introduction and conclusion, and two sub-texts that comprise the material in Did. 1.1–6.2. With these textual constraints, the Didachist has carefully arranged the Two Ways with such care. Literary cues and textual structures appear to be arranged in such a way to suggest that the Didache stands out as one of the more structured versions of the ancient Two Ways texts. It is not as though other Two Ways texts lack similar textual cues, but the Didache contains a high amount of structural comments that are often missing in other Two Ways texts—with the notable exception of *De Doctrina*. As such, the Didache provides cues that frame the entire Two Ways (outer frame) and frame both the ways of being (internal frame).

The entire frame of the Didache's Two Ways contains two essential parts. Beyond the *inscriptio* and *incipit*,⁷⁷ the beginning of the Didache's Two Ways is

⁷⁶My argument does not hinge on whether or not the Didachist is adapting, creating, or receiving this tradition. More research can expand upon the development of the text and the compositional development of the Did. My current argument is merely assessing the discourse features of H54 as opposed to suggesting something about the textual development.

⁷⁷Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 101–25.

strikingly brief (Did. 1.1). Kurt Neiderwimmer likewise remarks, “the document begins abruptly, without any particular introduction.”⁷⁸

Introduction to Two Ways (Did. 1.1): ὁδοὶ δύο εἰσὶ, μία τῆς ζωῆς καὶ μία τοῦ θανάτου, διαφορὰ δὲ πολλή μεζαξὺ τῶν δύο ὁδῶν

The abrupt description merely polarizes two forms of ethics for humanity that present the pathway of life and the pathway of death. The additional description of the Two Ways only comments on their polarized differences. A “great difference between” (διαφορὰ πολλή μεταξὺ) the two ways conveys an opposed ethic (cf. Barn. 19.1; Opening of Epitome). The use of διαφορὰ μεταξὺ likewise conveys an ethical difference between the elect and unbelieving persons in Mart. Pol. 16.1.

The conclusion of the Two Ways according to the Didache, likewise, lacks an extended conclusion. In short, it offers an exhortation to remain unpersuaded from those leading them astray from the ταύτης τῆς ὁδοῦ τῆς διδαχῆς (Did. 6.1) and a permissive clause.

Conclusion to Two Ways (Did. 6.1–2): Ὅρα μὴ τις σε πλανήσῃ ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς ὁδοῦ τῆς διδαχῆς, ἐπεὶ παρεκτὸς θεοῦ σε διδάσκει. εἰ μὲν γὰρ δύνασαι βαστάσαι ὅλον τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου, τέλειος ἔσῃ· εἰ δ' οὐ δύνασαι, ὃ δύνῃ, τοῦτο ποίει.

The antecedent remains relatively vague if ταύτης τῆς ὁδοῦ τῆς διδαχῆς is a substitution only for the way of life instruction (Did. 1–4) or if it includes the way of death instruction as well (Did. 5), or if it refers back to the title (διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων), or τούτων δὲ τῶν λόγων ἡ διδαχὴ ἔστιν αὕτη (Did. 1.3). Because the way of death instruction (Did. 5) also includes an admonition to be delivered from such people (Did. 5.2b), it would seem permissible for Did. 6.1 to refer to the entire Two Ways instruction. Also, ταύτης τῆς ὁδοῦ τῆς διδαχῆς and ὅλον τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου

⁷⁸Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 59.

function as substitution markers that are anaphoric in function.⁷⁹ These anaphoric functions are summations and substitution words of what precedes (Did. 1–5).

The internal frame of the Two Ways consists of two individual parts. As the Didachist introduces the way of life, little additional descriptors or modifiers are mentioned. The introductory statement is a simple predication.

Introduction to Way of Life (Did. 1.2a): ἡ μὲν οὖν ὁδὸς τῆς ζωῆς ἐστὶν αὕτη

Conclusion to Way of Life (Did. 4.14c): αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ζωῆς

Although I am not suggesting a chiasmic structure, the lexeme word order of the conclusion is the inversion of the introduction. I would suggest this literary and lexeme cohesion help provide literary coherence to this section.

The way of death (Did. 5.1–2), much like the way of life, lacks any additional descriptors. Furthermore, the Didache's conclusion to the way of death may show additional signs of uniqueness on behalf of the Didachist.

Introduction to Way of Death Instruction (Did. 5.1a): ἡ δὲ τοῦ θανάτου ὁδὸς ἐστὶν αὕτη

Conclusion to Way of Death Instruction (Did. 5.2b): ῥυσθεῖητε, τέκνα, ἀπὸ τούτων ἀπάντων

The conclusion to the way of death instruction is a paraenetic exhortation to refrain from these previous negative ethics.⁸⁰ The use of τούτων ἀπάντων likewise conveys a summative concept that anaphorically encapsulates the previous material in Did. 5.1–2.

As compared to the traditions in 1QS IV and Barn. 20, the introductions to this faulty way differ. The final admonition of the Didache for deliverance is a petition to flee the previous way of death. This admonition is absent in both 1QS IV

⁷⁹Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 84.

⁸⁰Stanley K. Stowers, *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*, LEC (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 92.

and Barn. 20. Rather, Did. 5.2 and *Doctr.* 5.2 demonstrate far more continuity with one another.

Introduction to the Way of Death Instruction (*Doctr.* 5.1a): *mortis autem via est illi contraria*

Conclusion to the Way of Death Instruction (*Doctr.* 5.2b): *Abstine te, fili ab istis omnibus*

The way of death literary tradition of the Didache, then, may be more closely tied to the *De Doctrina's* tradition than both 1QS IV and Barn. 20.

So, by way of summary, the Didache contains a highly structured frame that encapsulates the Two Ways instruction. Didache 1.1–6.2 utilizes the following literary frame to communicate the Two Ways instruction:

1. Introduction to Two Ways (Did. 1.1): ὁδοὶ δύο εἰσὶ, μία τῆς ζωῆς καὶ μία τοῦ θανάτου, διαφορὰ δὲ πολλή μεζαξὺ τῶν δύο ὁδῶν

1.a. Sub Text 1: Way of Life Instruction (Did. 1.2–4.14)

1.a.1. Introduction to Way of Life (Did. 1.2a): ἡ μὲν οὖν ὁδὸς τῆς ζωῆς ἐστὶν αὕτη

1.a.2. Conclusion to Way of Life (Did. 4.14c): αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ζωῆς

1.b. Sub Text 2: Way of Death Instruction (Did. 5.1–2)

1.b.1. Introduction to Way of Death (Did. 5.1a): ἡ δὲ τοῦ θανάτου ὁδὸς ἐστὶν αὕτη

1.b.2. Conclusion to Way of Death (Did. 5.2b): ῥυσθείητε, τέκνα, ἀπὸ τούτων ἀπάντων

2. Conclusion to Two Ways (Did. 6.1–2): Ὅρα μή τις σε πλανήσῃ ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς ὁδοῦ τῆς διδαχῆς, ἐπεὶ παρεκτὸς θεοῦ σε διδάσκει. εἰ μὲν γὰρ δύνασαι βαστάσαι ὄλον τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου, τέλειος ἔσῃ· εἰ δ' οὐ δύνασαι, ὃ δύνῃ, τοῦτο ποίει.

This highly structured frame is the vehicle to communicate and frame the relevant instruction for the Two Ways.

Summary: Didache's Two Ways Structure and Implications for the Present Study

The structure for the Didache's Two Ways proceeds as follows. The Two Ways instruction comprises the material in Did. 1.1–6.2—excluding 6.3. The introduction to the Two Ways is Did. 1.1, whereas the conclusion is 6.1–2. Within this larger frame, two internal subtexts appear. Didache 1.2a introduces the way of life, whereas Did. 4.14c concludes the way of life. Likewise, Did. 5.1a introduces the way of death, whereas Did. 5.2b concludes the way of death. This literary frame serves as the vehicle to communicate the Two Ways for the Didachist. In terms of a tiered structure, the Didache will abide by the following structure for the Two Ways,

1. Introduction to the Two Ways (Did. 1.1)
 - 1.a. Way of Life Instruction (Did. 1.2–4.14)
 - 1.a.1. Introduction to Way of Life (Did. 1.2a)
 - 1.a.2. Conclusion to Way of Life (Did. 4.14c)
 - 1.b. Way of Death Instruction (Did. 5.1–2)
 - 1.b.1. Introduction to Way of Death (Did. 5.1a)
 - 1.b.2. Conclusion to Way of Death (Did. 5.2b)
2. Conclusion to Two Ways (Did. 6.1–2)

Moreover, the implications of this structure now provide focus and constraint to the subsequent study of the Didache's Two Ways. In the successive two chapters, attention will be given to the Didache's Two Ways material (Did. 1.1–6.2). A single question will be asked in both chapters. These chapters will inquire how the Didache's Two Ways does not reflect basic apocalyptic motifs, often present in a Two Ways genre.

CHAPTER 5

“THIS IS THE WAY OF LIFE”: APOCALYPTIC WORLDVIEW AND THE DIDACHE’S TWO WAYS LITERARY FRAME

As previously argued, a discourse assessment of Did. 1–6 distinguishes an identifiable literary frame that structures the Two Ways. Advancing Nancy Pardee’s application of delimitation to the whole Didache,¹ I argued that the essential structures of the Didache’s Two Ways begins in Did. 1.1 and concludes with Did. 6.1–2. Embedded in this literary unit also exists two additional sub-texts: Did. 1.2–4.14 and Did. 5.1–2.

The following two chapters will essentially ask the same question about the apocalyptic features in the Didache’s Two Ways. In this chapter, I will inquire about the salient apocalyptic concepts that do or do not appear in the Didache’s Two Ways literary frame. If the typology of Two Ways texts validates embedded apocalyptic components in a Two Ways genre, does the Didache reflect a similar corresponding apocalyptic worldview within its Two Ways literary frame? In other words, if Two Ways texts often convey a form of the apocalyptic components, expressed as (1) angelic or otherworldly figures, (2) angelic or otherworldly ethical influence, (3) dualistic cosmological structures, (4) divine determinism, and (5) anthropological telic ends, does the Didache retain a similar apocalyptic worldview in its version of the Two Ways?

¹Nancy Pardee, *The Genre and Development of the Didache*, WUNT 2/339 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012).

I will argue that the Didache's Two Ways does not retain these salient apocalyptic concepts. In fact, the Didache is somewhat unique in that it stands out as one of the more structured Two Ways texts in antiquity yet it remains among the least apocalyptic in orientation.

Three broad features comprise my argument. First, I will briefly document how some Didache scholars have observed this neglect of apocalyptic themes. Scholars remain divided as to *why* this neglect is so and they offer reasons that range from source transmission to theological discontinuity. Next, two of the apocalyptic features loosely appear in the Didache's Two Ways frame, namely dualistic ethics and telic ends for humanity. Because they appear in isolation, these two aspects do not in and of themselves reflect an apocalyptic worldview. Last, I will assess how the Didache's Two Ways frame does not reflect apocalyptic motifs, namely cosmology, angelic or otherworldly figures, divine determinism, and light/darkness dualisms.

Didache Scholarship and the Apocalyptic Redaction of the Didache's Two Ways

It is helpful to begin by considering how some Didache scholars have commented upon this absence of apocalyptic motifs.² That others have noted these apocalyptic features in the Didache does not necessarily make this observation unique, per se. Rather, a lack of unanimity quickly emerges as the field addresses these similar features.

For example, according to Margaret McKenna, "one is led to strongly suspect that the non-dualistic non-mythological impression of the D's present state

²According to Robert Kraft, "Didache 1-6 shows no real interest in eschatology," and subsequently suggests that the eschatological themes are subsumed in the liturgical section (Did. 8.2; 9.4; 10.5-6) or the apocalyptic conclusion (Did. 16). Robert A. Kraft, *Barnabas and the Didache*, ed. R. M. Grant, AF 3 (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1965), 7.

is the result of a purge.”³ Aaron Milavec suggests that the Didache “clearly avoids” the angelic dualism and remains agnostic as to why this choice is made.⁴ Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser note the similarities of *De Doctrina* with 1QS III–IV and suggest that the absence of the apocalyptic elements in the Didache may be deliberate redaction or the result of transmission.⁵ *De Doctrina*, for van de Sandt and Flusser, reflects a “more faithful form of the original Two Ways tradition” and has traits of a Jewish pre-Christian tradition.⁶ The disappearance, as they continue, of light/darkness dualisms, angelic beings, and cosmological dualisms “might reflect a deliberate effort to ethicize and demythologize a type of traditional materials” in the Didache.⁷

Clayton Jefford briefly acknowledges this apocalyptic absence in *The Sayings of Jesus*.⁸ He attributes these changes to intentional redaction or the result of textual transmission. A literary pattern is identified that likewise corresponds between 1QS III, 13–IV, 26 and Did. 1–6.

1. Dualistic introduction
2. Virtue and vice lists

³Margaret Mary McKenna, “The Two Ways’ in Jewish and Christian Writings of the Greco-Roman Period: A Study of the Form of Repentance Parennesis” (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1981), 197, cf. 185.

⁴Aaron Milavec, *The Didache: Faith, Hope, & Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50–70 C.E.* (New York: Newman Press, 2003), 65.

⁵Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity*, CRINT: Section III Jewish Traditions in Early Christian Literature 5 (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 63. “The dualistic introduction of the two ways in 1:2 as being ‘one of light, the other of darkness,’ on which ‘two angels are appointed, one of righteousness, the other of iniquity,’ bears the stamp of the sharply antithetical construction of the Two Ways pattern in 1QS 3–4. In the Didache, these elements of dualistic cosmology and angelology are missing. The absence of these elements from the Didache might have occurred by accident in the course of transmission or might have been the result of a deliberate attempt to ethicize the tradition.”

⁶van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 62–63.

⁷van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 119.

⁸Clayton N. Jefford, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, VCSup 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1989).

3. Concluding eschatological exhortation

“The first element of this schema,” as Jefford observes, “within the Didache itself diverges from many other catechetical documents in that the elements of *dualistic* cosmology and angelology are missing.”⁹ This comment is the only text comparison that Jefford entertains—maybe with the exception of mentioning John Kloppenborg’s analysis of Did. 1–6, 1QS III–IV, T. Ash. 1–7, and Galatians 5:17–24.¹⁰ Two reasons are given as to why dualistic cosmology and angelic influences are absent. This absence either “may be the result of the process of textual transmission or may be the intended effort of the Didachist to lend an ethical tone to Did. 1.1.”¹¹ Jefford additionally remarks, “Apart from the eschatological statements of Did. 10.5 . . . chap 16 alone preserves any true emphasis upon eschatology in the Didache.”¹² Commenting on Did. 6.1–3, Jefford notes, “There is clearly a return to the ‘two ways’ motif found at the beginning of the section (Barn. 18.1–2; cf. Did. 1.1), which includes an eschatological element not otherwise found in H or Doct.”¹³

Kloppenborg, as another example, likewise suggests that the Didachist demythologizes the apocalyptic components. He observes the thematic similarity between 1QS III–IV and Barnabas, and subsequently Testament of Asher. These similarities, for Kloppenborg, create a means to assess the language of the Didache. Kloppenborg observes,

The Two Ways section in Barnabas bears a striking similarity to the “Two Angels” section of 1QS 3.13–4.26, though Barnabas is much less deterministic.

⁹Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 27.

¹⁰Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 27n17; John S. Kloppenborg, “The Sayings of Jesus in the Didache” (MA thesis, University of St. Michael’s College, 1976), 27–31.

¹¹Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 27.

¹²Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 85. Furthermore, Jefford suggests that the material in Did. 16 “probably derive(s) from some early collection of apocalyptically-oriented sayings that was widely popular within the primitive church.”

¹³Clayton N. Jefford, *Didache: The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, ECA 5 (Salem, OR: Polebridge Press, 2013), 54.

For both, the two ways are presided over by angels. . . . These similarities do not necessarily suggest the literary dependence of Barnabas upon either the *Manual* or, still less, upon the Testament of Asher, but they serve to illustrate the extent to which the Didache has demythologized this language.¹⁴

Without commenting on the possible textual influence, Kloppenborg presents a way to assess the language of the Didache by way of these three Jewish and Christian texts. The angelic presence, or lack thereof, as Kloppenborg suggests, is the means to observe the demythologized language of the Didache.¹⁵

As Kloppenborg comments on *De Doctrina*, apocalyptic and eschatological contents have been deemphasized. *De Doctrina* still reveals the result of a “progressive de-eschatologization” of the Two Ways instruction.

In both the *Doctrina* and the Didache one sees the result of a progressive “de-eschatologization” of the Two Ways schema. Ethical motivation is not derived from the figure of the coming judgment or from the σύγκρισις of the respective fates of the just and the unjust. Where the *Manual* has harnessed the image of the apocalyptic struggle of the Two Angels in order to motivate ethics, the Didache has eliminated both angels and eschatology.¹⁶

As a result, these four traditions (1QS, Testament of Asher, Barnabas, *De Doctrina*) demonstrate how the Didache eliminates the angelic and eschatological features.

Although not explicitly mentioned in Kloppenborg’s article, 1QS III–IV appears to function as the pinnacle of apocalyptic angelic dualism and the basis for which other texts are evaluated.

Kurt Niederwimmer suggests that the Didachist has no theological or thematic necessity to include the angelical creatures. As such, the catechism-like features of Did. 1–6 (cf. Did. 7.1) help provide reasons to reduce this apocalyptic two

¹⁴John S. Kloppenborg, “The Transformation of Moral Exhortation in *Didache* 1–5,” in *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History, and Transmission*, ed. Clayton N. Jefford, NovTSup 77 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 92–93.

¹⁵Kloppenborg suggests, “The editor of the Two Ways in the *Didache* has significantly reduced the cosmic dualism of the earlier Two Ways tradition, and has perhaps assimilated the introduction to the language of Jer 21:8: ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ δέδωκα πρὸς προσώπου ὑμῶν τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς ζωῆς καὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θανάτου.” Kloppenborg, “Transformation of Moral Exhortation,” 93.

¹⁶Kloppenborg, “Transformation of Moral Exhortation,” 97.

angels scheme. Niederwimmer questions the validity of a previous source, which influenced the Didache, to contain two spirits residing over the two polarized ways.¹⁷ If the two angels did appear in this antecedent source, then “the Didachist would have omitted the motif of the *angeli duo*, perhaps because it plays no part in the exposition that follows.”¹⁸ Accordingly, the Didachist redacts the angelic scheme because it plays no role in the subsequent exposition of the Didache’s instruction or contains any functional need.

Although some have identified the absence of these apocalyptic features, others are still willing to see the Didache arising from apocalyptic environments. For example, according to Marcello Del Verme, because dualism was not a universally accepted belief in ancient Judaism, the Didache’s Two Ways dualisms may offer a correlation to both Enochic and Qumran movements. He proceeds to suggest, “The section of the ‘Two Ways’, in fact, expounds ideas treasured by both the Enochic and the Qumran movement, in particular dualism, as is shown by a series of parallels with the *Community Rule* (1QS) and by other writings.”¹⁹

The question is extremely important: dualism was not a universally accepted belief in the world of Middle Judaism, and it appears to have been a peculiarity of the Essenes and the Qumranites. Such a conception postulates a certain pre-determinism in the sphere of human action, although the individual remains free with respect to divine will.²⁰

For Del Verme, the Didache may share the ideological concerns of the Essenes and Qumran.

¹⁷Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache: A Commentary*, trans. Linda M. Maloney, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 63.

¹⁸Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 63.

¹⁹Marcello Del Verme, *Didache and Judaism: Jewish Roots of an Ancient Christian-Jewish Work* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 246.

²⁰Del Verme, *Didache and Judaism*, 246n53.

Matti Myllykoski identifies the redaction of many apocalyptic elements but remains unwilling to affirm a lack of eschatological outlook. He observes,

A significant group of scholars assumes that the apocalyptic frame (light and darkness) in Barn. 18.1 (with reference to the angels of God and the angels of Satan), 19.1, and Doctr. 1.1 is original. . . . By and large, the Two Ways treatise in Did. 1–6 is by no means noneschatological, since it concerns the ways of life and death.²¹

That is, even though the Didache seemingly neglects to include the light/darkness dualisms and the angelic figures, the life/death concepts convey eschatological, rather than apocalyptic, motifs. Moreover, because of the prevalence of light/darkness notions and angelic creatures in the other two early Christian traditions, Myllykoski is willing to assume a more stable thematic tradition that links these texts together. In this way, the Didache lacks an underlying worldview that retains some eschatological, non-apocalyptic outlook.

As these brief and selected comments suggest, Didache scholarship is a bit divided as to whether or not the Didache assumes an apocalyptic and eschatological framework, and to what extent there is apocalyptic redaction. Whereas redaction is affirmed, the reasons offered as to *why* range from purposeful redaction and source transmission to theological incoherence. However, these brief comments do suggest that a select number of ancient Jewish and Christian texts function as the lens by which Didache is analyzed, à la 1QS III–IV, Testament of Asher, Barnabas, and *De Doctrina*. My analysis of the missing apocalyptic motifs in the Didache's Two Ways stems from the broader trends of an ancient Two Ways metaphor and I will comment on the specific ways in which the Didache does not reflect some of these apocalyptic motifs that seem to permeate a Two Ways genre.

²¹Matti Myllykoski, "Without Decree: Pagan Sacrificial Meat and the Early History of the Didache," in *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, ECL 14 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 438–39.

Didache 1–6 and Continuities with an Apocalyptic Worldview

If my overall argument signifies the missing apocalyptic features, then some apocalyptic traditions *ought* to be identifiable to note the literary and generic symmetry with the Two Ways genre. Thus, I begin with the continuity of apocalyptic traditions. A particular question will guide the following section. Within the literary frame of the Didache’s Two Ways, what apocalyptic motifs, if any, are retained in the Didache to continue an apocalyptic worldview?

Ethical Dualism and Polarized Ethical Traditions

The concept of ethical dualism loosely links the Didache’s version of the Two Ways with apocalyptic traditions. Two polarized “paths” (ὁδοὶ δύο; Did. 1.1) begin the Didache tradition. These polarized roads consist of “life” (μία τῆς ζωῆς) and of “death” (μία τοῦ θανάτου).

Immediately after this introduction, a brief statement begins the first path way in Did. 1.2: “The way of life, then, is this” (ἡ μὲν οὖν ὁδὸς τῆς ζωῆς ἐστὶν αὕτη). This introductory phrase parallels the literary traditions in Barn. 19.1 and *Doctr.* 1.2. Note the grammatical symmetry:

Did. 1.2: ἡ μὲν οὖν ὁδὸς τῆς ζωῆς ἐστὶν αὕτη

Barn. 19.1: ἡ οὖν ὁδὸς τοῦ φωτός ἐστὶν αὕτη

Doctr. 1.2: *via ergo vitae haec est*

The thematic and possible lexical symmetry connects these traditions together. It is a different matter, of which has been written on extensively, to speak of textual influence.²²

²²Richard H. Connolly, “The Didache in Relation to the Epistle of Barnabas,” *JTS* 33 (1932): 237–53; J. A. Robinson, “The Epistle of Barnabas and the Didache,” *JTS* 35 (1934): 113–46; Edgar J. Goodspeed, “The Didache, Barnabas, and the Doctrina,” *ATHR* 27 (1945): 228–47; Jonathan A. Draper, “Barnabas and the Riddle of the Didache Revisited,” *JSNT* 58 (1995): 89–113.

Likewise, the conclusion of the first pathway also coheres conceptually and syntactically with similar Two Ways texts. Observe the thematic and grammatical symmetry in the following traditions:

Did. 4.14: αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ζωῆς

Barn. 19.12: αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ὁδὸς τοῦ φωτός

Doctr. 4.14: haec est via vitae

These similarities show a high degree of symmetry between the ways of life/light literary frame.

The differences quickly emerge when the second way is compared. The Didache maintains simplicity as it introduces the way of death: ἡ δὲ τοῦ θανάτου ὁδὸς ἐστὶν αὕτη (Did. 5.1). Briefly comparing the introductions of the way death in the Didache with these similar Two Ways texts demonstrate unique reshaping of traditions. In other words, the grammatical features in the way of death literary frame exhibit individual redaction, especially from Barnabas.

Did. 5.1a: Ἡ δὲ τοῦ θανάτου ὁδὸς ἐστὶν αὕτη

Barn. 20.1a: Ἡ δὲ τοῦ μέλανος ὁδὸς ἐστὶν σκολιὰ καὶ κατάραις μεστή. ὁδὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν θανάτου αἰωνίου μετὰ τιμωρίας, ἐν ᾗ ἐστὶν τὰ ἀπολλύντα τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν

Doctr. 5.1a: mortis autem via est illi contraria

The way of life is introduced with μέν (Did. 1.2) and then proceeds to give detail on the way of life. The way of death is introduced with δέ (Did. 5.1) and then proceeds to give detail on the way of death. Thus, the μέν of Did. 1.2 anticipates the δέ in 5.2 at the larger discourse level.²³ Second, the word order is also patterned in such a way to cohere with the word order of the introductory phrase.

Did. 1.2: ἡ μὲν οὖν ὁδὸς τῆς ζωῆς ἐστὶν αὕτη

²³Steven E. Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010), 73–76; Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*, 2nd ed. (Dallas: SIL International, 2000), 170.

Did. 5.1: ἡ δὲ τοῦ θανάτου ὁδὸς ἐστὶν αὕτη

This μέν . . . δέ pattern and the word order symmetry both hint towards internal coherence. If this internal coherence is maintained, it further corroborates redaction on behalf of the Didachist and a literary uniqueness when compared to other Two Ways texts. At least, the high amounts of literary symmetry between Didache, Barnabas, and *De Doctrina* join together a similar thematic and conceptual worldview—if not, a similar source tradition.

Each of these three previous texts contains a literary introduction and conclusion that cohere literarily and thematically as they introduce the polarized set of ethics. Yet, as 1QS IV, 9 is compared with these three texts, even more symmetry appears. The Treatise likewise contains simple and brief expressions for both the way of life and of death.

1QS IV, 3: This spirit engenders humility, patience, abundant compassion, perpetual goodness, insight, understanding, and powerful wisdom.

1QS IV, 9: The operations of the spirit of falsehood result in greed, neglect of righteous deeds, wickedness, lying, pride and haughtiness, cruel deceit and fraud.

However, 1QS IV clearly retains apocalyptic imagery by mentioning the Spirit and the implication of angelic influences (“But the ways of the spirit of falsehood are these”; 1QS IV, 9). The “Spirits” are primary agents and cosmic influences as mentioned earlier in the Treatise (1QS III, 18–26).

The most lengthy and developed way of death introduction appears in Barn. 20.1. It gives three adjectives that further describe this particular way: μέλαινα (“black”), σκολιά (“crooked”), and κατάρας μεστή (“full of curses”).

Barn. 20.1a: Ἡ δὲ τοῦ μέλανος ὁδὸς ἐστὶν σκολιά καὶ κατάρας μεστή. ὁδὸς γάρ ἐστιν θανάτου αἰωνίου μετὰ τιμωρίας, ἐν ᾗ ἐστὶν τὰ ἀπολλύντα τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν

Also, this version joins together temporal restraints of this death and the punishments that accompany this pathway: ὁδὸς γάρ ἐστὶν θανάτου αἰωνίου μετὰ τιμωρίας (“for this is the way of eternal death along with punishments”; Barn. 20.1a).

De Doctrina 5.1 is the most similar to Did. 5.1. No explicit apocalyptic introduction is mentioned. Rather, *Doctr.* 5.1 makes a comparison between both ways, in that the “the way of death” is contrary to the previous way of being: *mortis autem mia est illi contraria* (*Doctr.* 5.1).

Although some unique literary differences appear in terms of the ethical polarized expressions, these texts are mutually joined together through thematic symmetry in particular, and potential tradition history in general. These previous texts affirm some form of apocalyptic features; whereas the Didache does not incorporate these more salient apocalyptic features, and yet the text clearly maintains forms of ethical dualism.

The Two Ways metaphor couched within polar tendencies of good and evil, moral and immoral qualities, and righteous and wicked people. This dualism refers to a pattern of thought which expresses two mutually exclusive categories and, as such, stresses the importance on the part of man of making fundamental choice between right and wrong.²⁴

These dualistic features help link traditions together with Sir 33.7–15; T. Ash. 1.3–5; 1 En. 91.18–19; 94.1–4; and more even beyond the aforementioned Two Ways, including a pre-Essene form of the Two Ways.²⁵ The Didache’s polarized ethics link together the Two Ways metaphor with other apocalyptic-like texts.²⁶ The similarities join these ethical traditions together as a Two Ways metaphor. Yet, it is this literary and thematic symmetry of the Two Ways frame that further accentuates the Didache’s apocalyptic redaction.

²⁴van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 146.

²⁵van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 154.

²⁶Draper, building upon Klaus Wengst, summarizes the following: “Eschatology thus becomes a subordinate aspect of ethics, a simple piece of instruction about the ‘Last Things’.” Wengst suggests that a way of salvation in Did. 16 is through ethical behaviour and possibly joined with the Two Ways through the use of “perfection.” Jonathan A. Draper, ed., *The Didache in Modern Research*, AGJU 37 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 41.

Chastened Expressions of Anthropological Destiny

Another way the Didache continues a form of the apocalyptic paradigm is *via* anthropological destinies. That is, the Didache, like similar text traditions, continues some form of telic role for humanity. A systemic problem, however, emerges as the Didache speaks to the outcome of humanity. For instance, if the literary frame of the Didache offers no clear apocalyptic tradition for the outcome of humanity, then, this position must be implicitly identified. Hence, the Didache offers a chastened form of and implicit outcome for humanity that coheres with an apocalyptic Two Ways genre. I describe this position as chastened not because the worldview of the Didachist offers a softened form of the outcome of humanity, but the literary tradition of the Didache implicitly coheres with an apocalyptic tradition.

As observed in the other Two Ways texts, the anthropological outcomes of humanity appear within the literary frame of their respective texts. For example, 1QS IV, 7–8 and IV, 13–15 have extended comments on the anthropological outcome of humanity.

1QS IV, 7–8: They will receive a crown of glory with a robe of honour, resplendent forever and ever.

1QS IV, 12–15: The judgment of all who walk in such ways will be multiple afflictions at the hand of all the angels of perdition, everlasting damnation in the wrath of God's furious vengeance, never ending terror and reproach for all eternity, with a shameful extinction in the fire of Hell's outer darkness. For all their eras, generation by generation, they will know doleful sorrow, bitter evil and dark happenstance, until their utter destruction with neither remnant nor rescue.

Barnabas offers an anthropological outcome for those who adhere to either ethic.

Way of Light (Barn. 19.1): *ἐάν τις θέλων ὁδὸν ὁδεύειν ἐπὶ τὸν ὠρισμένον τόπον σπεύσῃ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ*²⁷

Way of Darkness (Barn. 20.1): *ὁδὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν θανάτου αἰωνίου μετὰ τιμωρίας, ἐν ᾗ*

²⁷Barn. 19.1 trans: "If *there are* some desiring to travel up to the appointed place, they should hasten to their works."

ἔστιν τὰ ἀπολλύντα τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν²⁸

Although *De Doctrina* refrains from mentioning additional comments for the way of death, the way of life is likened to competing in a race followed by receiving a crown.

Doctr. 6.5: sed per haec sancta certamina peruenies ad coronam

These three brief texts demonstrate that the Two Ways can explicitly detail the outcome of humanity that is beyond the description of “life” and “death” as modifying the pathway metaphor.

If the Didache lacks these additional anthropological outcomes, then the corresponding ethics in the Didache’s Two Ways reflect ideas different than other traditions in the available genre. In other words, the present ethical efforts of humanity in the Didache’s Two Ways relate to the corresponding ways of life and death. Thus, one’s love for God and one’s love for neighbor are ethics that reflect human relationships prior to their telic destiny (Did. 1.2). Even the Torah-like commandments and prohibitions likewise reflect a similar temporal framework (Did. 2.1–7). The list of prohibitions and commandments in Did. 3–4 similarly correspond to humanity’s ethic prior to death. So, if the literary frame lacks explicit detail regarding anthropological destinies, then the content of the way of life (Did. 1–4) will define the way of life expression (Did. 1.1, 2; 4.14). The way of life generally corresponds to particular ethics prior to physical death.

The way of death literary frame is likewise limited in terms of additional descriptions (“And the way of death is this”; Did. 5.1) and it only reflects human-to-human interactions. Murders, adulteries, hypocrisies, jealousies, and haughtiness reflect human-to-human relations (Did. 5.1). Likewise, persecution, oppression of the poor, and murders continue the human-to-human relations (Did. 5.2). Even the

²⁸Barn. 20.1 trans: “For the way is of eternal death along with its punishments, in it are things that destroy their soul.”

call to be delivered ἀπὸ τούτων ἀπάντων (Did. 5.2b) presupposes that humanity has yet to receive their current outcome. Thus, the way of death implies the current faulty ethic of humanity.

Yet, the question still remains how the Didache corresponds, if at all, to the apocalyptic traditions with regard to human destiny and judgment. If the anthropological destinies rarely appear in the Didache literary frame of the Two Ways, then, how can the telic role of humanity cohere with apocalyptic genre in the Two Ways? The Didache refrains from answering this question directly or addressing an apocalyptic anthropological destiny directly; rather, it is an implicit deduction of the Two Ways metaphor and a possible result of “bearing the whole yoke of the Lord” (Did. 6.2).

When comparing the Didache with other Two Ways texts, it may prove difficult to identify how the Didachist continues the apocalyptic tradition of the destiny of humanity. Yet, the metaphor of ὁδός may also relate to these destinies. As argued above, the predominant focus of the Didache’s version of the Two Ways generally corresponds to the current expression of human ethics prior to a telic outcome. Thus, the metaphor of “way” also secondarily implies this kind of anthropological destiny. That is, this “way” leads to life or this “way” leads to death. “The superscription,” explains Niederwimmer, “ἡ μὲν οὖν ὁδὸς τῆς ζωῆς ἐστὶν αὕτη, is followed by a kind of basic demand or summary of all commandments that, if kept, will lead to the attainment of life.”²⁹ Although the literary frame lacks direct expressions regarding humanity’s end, it is the implications of such ethics that correspond to particular outcomes. Therefore, I argue the Didache affirms a both/and idea of current ethics and telic outcome that correspond to life and death.

²⁹Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 64.

In order to support this both/and idea, one need not look further than the Treatise on the Two Spirits (1QS III, 13–IV, 26) for a similar idea. Following both instructions on the good and evil ways, present and subsequent implications appear. The ethics convey present and immediate implications, as well as apocalyptic and eschatological results of such ethics. For those obeying the Prince of Light, this ethic gives healing, fruitfulness, and even peace within a long life (1QS IV, 8). Also, such ethic will achieve everlasting blessings, eternal joy, a crown of glory, as well as a garment of majesty with unending light (1QS IV, 9). Likewise, for those obeying the Angel of darkness, this ethic will inflict subsequent generations until they are without remnant and live with sorrowful mourning, bitter misery, and calamities (1QS IV, 14). Also, this ethic will produce a multitude of plagues by the angels of destruction, everlasting damnation, eternal torment, and potential extinction by fire (1QS IV, 13). So, this both/and possibility is not totally unfamiliar within other Two Ways texts.

Next, a relationship between obedience and outcome is expressed in the following expression:

Did. 6.2a–b: εἰ μὲν γὰρ δύνασαι βαστάσαι ὅλον τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου, τέλειος ἔσῃ. The following chapter will devote further and exclusive analysis of this text. Suffice for the present argument, I will only note a few initial observations that potentially identify some form of apocalyptic anthropological destiny. First, a reward system is created for obedience. If the community members of the Didache “bear the whole yoke of the Lord,” then their specific reward will be τέλειος. Although the following expression permits an exception (Did. 6.2c–d), the “yoke” corresponds to current ethics (Did. 6.2a).

Second, the future form of εἰμί (ἔσῃ), attached with τέλειος, identifies the reward as something other than the present situation. Therefore, if ὅλον τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου refers to the Two Ways, then the temporal referent of τέλειος ἔσῃ is after such

obedience. The condition of bearing the yoke of the Lord precedes the reception of rewards.

So, although the Didache's literary frame of the Two Ways tradition lacks explicit anthropological destiny, some features still can be identified. Because they are not explicitly identified, the implicit identification reveals a chastened form of anthropological rewards/punishments. First, the metaphor of a road corresponds to both the manner in which someone travels and location in which someone travels (Did. 1.1, 2; 5.1). The path of life and death conveys a both/and of current human ethics as well as a telic outcome. Second, and this idea will be developed further in the next chapter; an obedience-reward system is created by obeying the "whole yoke of the Lord" along with its subsequent reward of *τέλειος* (Did. 6.2).

Didache 1–6 and Absence of an Apocalyptic Worldview

Another, and similar, question now needs to be raised. If the Didache maintains some apocalyptic theme—even if vaguely emerging, does the inverse materialize in the Didache? In what ways, then, does the Didache forgo Two Ways apocalyptic motifs in its version of the Two Ways? In order to answer this question, the following will offer a reading of the Didache's literary frame and then identify the ways in which it differs or extracts the broadly apocalyptic Two Ways motifs: (1) cosmological structures; (2) angelic or otherworldly figures; (3) determinism; and (4) light/darkness dualisms.

A Lack of Apocalyptic Cosmological Structures

In terms of cosmology, does the Didache's Two Ways literary frame offer any explicit or implicit cosmological hints or allusions? In short, there is nothing in

the Didache's Two Ways frame that corresponds to cosmology. There is no hint or allusion of cosmology as if it could be partially or vaguely identified.

Cosmological structures in other Two Ways texts. Although different expressions of a cosmological tradition appear in comparable Two Ways texts, dualistic cosmology frames polarized ethical traditions. For example, the cosmic portrayal of the world is portrayed in the Treatise of the Two Spirits. Even in the psychologized interpretive position—that is, the cosmic and angelic dualism takes place within the heart of humanity³⁰—the internalized cosmology still frames a particular worldview. As I argued above, humanity expresses two polarized forms of ethics under some spiritualized angelic influences that ultimately influence the outcome and eternal destiny of man (1QS III, 17–21; IV, 6–8, 11–13).

The angelic and cosmological dualism is more explicit in Barnabas than in the Didache. Barnabas 18.1 utilizes the features of light and darkness, which are completely absent in Did. 1–6. Furthermore, even *Doctr.* 1.1 conveys some form of cosmological expressions. *De Doctrina*, admittedly, abbreviates the Two Ways literary frame in *Doctr.* 1.1 and 5.1. Yet, although highly undefined and underdeveloped, *in saeculo* corresponds to this cosmological notion (*Doctr.* 1.1). It could be argued that *in saeculo* in *Doctr.* 1.1 corresponds to בתבל in 1QS IV, 2. According to van de Sandt and Flusser, this textual connection joins the *De Doctrina* closer to a Jewish origin in 1QS, than it does to its counterpart in the Didache.³¹

³⁰P. Wernberg-Møller, “A Reconsideration of the Two Spirits in the Rule of the Community (1QSerek III, 13–IV, 26),” *RevQ* 3 (1961): 413–41; Archie T. Wright, *The Origin of Evil Spirits: The Reception of Genesis 6. 1–4 in Early Jewish Literature*, WUNT 2/198 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 168; John J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, LDSS (London: Routledge, 1997), 41.

³¹van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 63.

Didache’s cosmological structures beyond the Two Ways (Did. 1.1–6.2). Yet, this brief assessment does raise another question. If the Didache lacks any form of cosmology in the literary frame, do any cosmological expressions appear in other portions of the Didache? Further inquiry is needed in order to answer this question in any satisfactory manner. But if cosmological expressions, whether explicit or implicit, materialize in other literary sections of the Didache, then material is available to incorporate these concepts in the literary frame of the Didache’s Two Ways.

Four passages in other sections of the Didache exhibit some kind of cosmological ideas. Cumulatively, the Didache neglects to offer a fully or clearly orbed cosmology. First, the single use of earth and two uses of heaven in Did. 8.2 (ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ; ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς) do not contribute to the Didache’s cosmology, per se. This occurrence qualifies as outside material from Jesus tradition.³² The Didachist makes use of the Lord’s Prayer (cf. Matt 6:9–13; Luke 11:2–4). The form and literary similarities are “much more closely aligned to the Matthean version rather than the Lukan.”³³ Consider the comparison of Matthew 6:9–13, Luke 11:2–4, and Did. 8.2.

Matt 6:9–13	Luke 11:2–4	Did. 8.2
Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· ἀγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου· ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου·	Πάτερ, ἀγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου· ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου·	Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ἀγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου, ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου,

³²On Jesus tradition in the Did. and Apostolic Fathers, consult Stephen E. Young, *Jesus Tradition in the Apostolic Fathers: Their Explicit Appeals to the Words of Jesus in Light of Orality Studies*, WUNT 2/311 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011).

³³Paul Foster, “The Text of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers,” in *The Early Text of the New Testament*, ed. Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 287. A text-comparison between the three texts (Matt, Luke, and Did.) help substantiate the closeness between Did. and Matt. The two only differ in spelling (3 words), plus the additional doxology in the Did.

γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου,
 ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς·
 τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν
 τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν
 σήμερον·
 καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν
 τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν,
 ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν
 τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν·
 καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς
 εἰς πειρασμόν,
 ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ
 πονηροῦ.

τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν
 τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν
τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν·
 καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν
τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν,
καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίεμεν
παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν·
 καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς
 εἰς πειρασμόν.

γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου
 ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς.
 Τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν
 τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν
 σήμερον,
 καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν
τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἡμῶν,
 ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν
 τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν,
 καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς
 εἰς πειρασμόν,
 ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ
 πονηροῦ·
ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ
δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

A notable difference is reflected in the singular use of οὐρανός in Did. 8.2 and the plural form in Matthew 6:9b. Jonathan Pennington argues this difference is more of an “idiolectic pattern” of Matthew uninherited from Semitic morphology or forms of multiple heavens cosmology.³⁴ Thus, the literary differences, in this case, may speak more to the unique use of οὐρανός in Matthew than it does in the Didache. Although not a literary discrepancy, the second use of οὐρανός (Matt 6:10//Did. 8.2) shares the singular form when paired with ἐπὶ γῆς in both forms of the Lord’s Prayer. The plural and singular forms reflect Matthew’s nuanced terminology rather than idiolectic patterns in the Didache.³⁵ As can be observed from Pennington’s research, the New Testament authors differ and vary in their use of οὐρανός (see table 2).

³⁴Jonathan T. Pennington, *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew*, NovTSup 126 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 149. Pennington further concludes how the use of the singular forms one semantic pole, whereas the plural forms the other. The singular form identifies the visible, earthly realm, whereas the plural the invisible, divine realm.

³⁵Consult Pennington’s “Table 6.1 Occurrences of Οὐρανός in the NT by Singular and Plural Forms” (also listed as table 2) in Pennington, *Heaven and Earth*, 125.

Table 2. Occurrences of οὐρανός in the NT by singular and plural forms

	Singular	Plural	Total
Matthew	27	55	82
Mark	13	5	18
Luke	31	4	35
John	18	0	18
Acts	24	2	26
Pauline Epistles	11	10	21
Hebrews	33	7	40
Catholic Epistles	5	6	11
Revelation	51	1	52
Total	183	90	273

It is improbable that the Didache assumes the unique “heaven and earth” tradition from Matthew 6 or assumes the cosmological structures within Jesus tradition.³⁶ Matthew 6 is being used as liturgy (Did. 8.3) and retaining the Jesus tradition is more likely the assumed function. While the “heaven and earth” vocabulary is rather disproportionate in the Gospel of Matthew, the use of οὐρανός does not mimic this uneven use in the Apostolic Fathers corpus in general and the Didache in particular (see table 3).

Second, the use of κοσμικόν in Did. 11.11 can signify an earthly form of mystery as opposed to a “heavenly” expression.³⁷ That is, ποιῶν εἰς μυστήριον κοσμικὸν ἐκκλησίας reflects the action of a “true prophet” (Did. 11.9–11).

³⁶For more on the pairing of “heaven and earth,” consult, Pennington, *Heaven and Earth*, 99–216.

³⁷Jonathan A. Draper, “Performing the Cosmic Mystery of the Church in the Communities

Table 3. Occurrences of οὐρανός in the Apostolic Fathers corpus by singular and plural forms

	Singular	Plural	Total
1–2 Clement	6	4	10
Letters of Ignatius	2	1	3
Polycarp, <i>To the Philippians</i>	0	0	0
Martyrdom of Polycarp	3	0	3
Didache	8	1	9
Barnabas	6	1	7
Shepherd of Hermas	11	4	15
Diognetus	5	7	12
Fragment of Quadratus	0	0	0
Fragments of Papias	0	1	1
Total	45	19	64

Did. 11.11: πᾶς δὲ προφήτης δεδοκιμασμένος ἀληθινός ποιῶν εἰς μυστήριον κοσμικὸν ἐκκλησίας, μὴ διδάσκων δὲ ποιεῖν ὅσα αὐτὸς ποιεῖ, οὐ κριθήσεται ἐφ' ὑμῶν· μετὰ θεοῦ γὰρ ἔχει τὴν κρίσιν. ὡσαύτως γὰρ ἐποίησαν καὶ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι προφῆται.

The prophets act on behalf of the earthly mystery, as opposed to the heavenly, non-visible mystery of the church. Κοσμικόν is most likely used to distinguish physical and non-physical. The term may be used to distinguish physical cultic practices (cf. *B.J.*, 4.324; Heb 9:1), physical beatings (Mart. Pol. 2.3), or generic physical objects (2 Clem. 5.6). In Did. 11.11, there remains too little information to identify an explicit

of the *Didache*,” in *The Open Mind: Essays in Honour of Christopher Rowland*, ed. Jonathan Knight and Kevin Sullivan, LNTS 522 (London: T&T Clark, 2015), 37–57.

counterpart to εἰς μυστήριον κοσμικὸν ἐκκλησίας other than to affirm the general physical mystery of the gathering.

Third, the “four winds of the earth” (σύναξον αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων) may evoke an apocalyptic setting in Did. 10.5 (cf. Did. 9.4). This corporate gathering is generally associated with the final gathering of the elect of God (cf. Jer 49:46; Matt 24:31; Mark 13:27), an expression to signify the furthest extremities of the earth (cf. Ezek 37:9; Rev 7:1), or judgment (Dan 7:2). Identifying a similar expression “four corners,” 1 En. 34–36 also conveys the furthest extremities of the earth. In Did. 10.5, the gathering most likely conjures a similar Jesus tradition (Matt 24:31 and Mark 13:27). The “four winds” are limited to where the church is scattered upon the earth (cf. Did. 10.5a). This tradition parallels the previous expression in Did. 9.4.

Did. 9.4: οὕτω συναχθήτω σου ἡ ἐκκλησία ἀπὸ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν

Did. 10.5: σύναξον αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων, τὴν ἁγιασθεῖσαν, εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν

In Did. 9.4, the scattering of the church is likened to the fragments of the Eucharist bread that will be gathered “from the ends of the earth” (συναχθήτω σου ἡ ἐκκλησία ἀπὸ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς).³⁸

A final potential cosmological tradition in Didache appears in the final mini-apocalypse (Did. 16.6, 8).

Did. 16.6: καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὰ σημεῖα τῆς ἀληθείας· πρῶτον σημεῖον ἐκπετάσεως ἐν οὐρανῷ, εἶτα σημεῖον φωνῆς σάλπιγγος, καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν

Did. 16.8: τότε ὄψεται ὁ κόσμος τὸν κύριον ἐρχόμενον ἐπάνω τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

Two uses of οὐρανός are not paired with γῆ, so as to express the totality of the cosmos (cf. Did. 8.2).³⁹ Rather, these two uses are comparable to the Jesus tradition in the

³⁸Brant Pitre, *Jesus and the Last Supper* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 481, 510.

Olivet Discourse (Matt 24:30). Thus, in these two cases, *οὐρανός* refers to the visible sky upon the earth (cf. Herm. Mand. 11.18 [43.18]).

According to van de Sandt and Flusser, the differing traditions between the Didache and the other comparable Two Ways texts are the result of two options. Either, the sharp cosmological and angelic dualism was left out during the transmission process or this absence was a purposeful decision to leave out in order to “ethicize the tradition.”

In the Didache, these elements of dualistic cosmology and angelology are missing. The absence of these elements from the Didache might have occurred by accident in the course of transmission or might have been the result of a deliberate attempt to ethicize the tradition.⁴⁰

So, the cosmological redaction is the result, according to van de Sandt and Flusser, of a purely ethical paradigm.

By way of summary, the Didache does not contain any cosmological features within the Two Ways literary frame. Cosmological descriptions appear in other Two Ways traditions (cf. 1QS III–IV; Barn. 19, 20; *Doctr.* 1.1). So, counter to van de Sandt and Flusser, cosmological structures and ethics may still co-exist. It is not as though the Didache, as a whole, lacks any form of cosmology. Rather, it is relatively underdeveloped. If cosmological ideas were absent from the whole of the Didache, then it is possible that the literary frame lacks such cosmology. Yet, this concept is not so, further leaving open the probability of literary redaction when compared to other Two Ways texts.

³⁹Pennington, *Heaven and Earth*, 151, 154.

⁴⁰van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 63.

A Lack of Angelic and Otherworldly Figures

If little cosmology appears in the *Didache* as a whole and none in the literary Two Ways frame, another question needs to be asked. Are there any signs of the angelic realm in the literary Two Ways frame? Much like the lack of cosmology, no angelic features emerge in the *Didache*'s Two Ways literary frame. And if there are no angelic or otherworldly figures, then there is no subsequent angelic ethical influence upon humanity. So, the lack of angelic or otherworldly mediators has a consequential effect of also neglecting to propagate the ethical influence from these angelic figures.

Angelic realm in *Didache* Two Ways frame. It is striking, that of all the overlapping motifs among texts in the Two Ways genre, the angelic notion is absent from the *Didache*. The Qumran tradition is, far and away, the most attuned to this angelic component within the broader Two Ways metaphor. Sapiential instruction begins with angelic dominion over humanity (1QS III, 14). An angelic ruler, the Prince of Light, embodies the ways of life and influences humanity to abide by such an ethic (1QS III, 20; IV, 3–8). An angelic counterpart, the Angel of Darkness, embodies the ways of death, influences the sons of light, and influences humanity to abide by such an ethic (1QS III, 21–23; IV, 12–14). The angelic component permeates the sapiential and ethical instruction in the *Treatise of the Two Spirits*. As van de Sandt and Flusser suggest, the appearance of two groups of opposing angels in the introduction “marks the primitiveness of the tradition.”⁴¹ Yet, if angelic beings, or forms of otherworldly beings, are a stable fixture of the Two

⁴¹van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 71. Van de Sandt and Flusser proceed to suggest that Barn. made use of an earlier form of the Two Ways. I remain positive to this position but desire to suggest otherwise for the primitive angelic tradition. Though of course, to use an older source will invariably include primitive ideas. Yet, “primitive” conveys a pejorative concept that suggests the angelic tradition is antiquated. If this conception is present, then such theory needs to be revisited in light of the Two Ways typology and formation of the Two Ways genre (cf. Chap. 2).

Ways, angels are not the mark of primitiveness. Not only do angels continue to appear in early Christian traditions after the Didache's composition (e.g., Ps.-Clem. Rec. VIII.54–55; XX.2; Justin, *2 Apol.* 9, 11; Origen, *Hom. Luc.* 35.3–6; Basil, *Hom.* 10), but also found in more primitive traditions.

Likewise, the Epistle of Barnabas continues the angelic dominion over humanity. Barnabas is distinguished from the Treatise tradition by having the multitude of angelic creatures appointed over both roads. Thus, φωταγωγοί ἄγγελλοι and ἄγγελοι τοῦ σατανᾶ are appointed to rule the way of life and way of death respectively (Barn. 18.1).

Although *De Doctrina* offers an abbreviated literary frame for its version of the Two Ways, it too includes an angelic component. Still having no additional explanations, the ways of life and light, and of death and darkness are under the decree of two angels: *in his constituti sunt angeli duo* (*Doctr.* 1.1).

The Didache clearly breaks from this angelic and otherworldly tradition and the Didachist refrains from incorporating such traditions. So, a few more questions need to be raised if such assessment holds sway. If the Didache lacks an angel component within its version of the Two Ways literary frame, do angelic traditions appear in other portions of the Didache? Only a cursory analysis is needed to answer this question. For, if angelic traditions appear in other literary sections of the Didache, then it may help contribute to the overall claim that the Didache's literary frame has been redacted—especially if, angelic traditions are already found within the Didache. In order to answer briefly such questions, we must first address two others. First, who are the οἱ ἄγιοι in both Did. 4.2 and 16.7? Second, can an angelic tradition be loosely connected with the gathering motif in Did. 10.5?

οἱ ἄγιοι as teachers or baptized community members (Did. 4.2).

In some traditions, οἱ ἄγιοι can refer to the angelic realm—hence the question is

raised. According to Otto Procksch, ἄγιοι is often a term used for both the angelic and human realm within apocalyptic settings.⁴² For example, angels are deemed holy within Jesus tradition (Mark 8:38 μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἁγίων; Luke 9:26 τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων). In the Apocalypse of John, the angelic realm is also deemed holy (Rev 14:10 ἐνώπιον ἀγγέλων ἁγίων).

Additionally, the angelic realm may be alluded to without the use of ἄγγελος. In an apocalyptic and judgment tradition, angels are referenced as the ἐν ἁγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ (Jude 14). In Pauline tradition, the return of Jesus is accompanied μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ (1 Thess 3:13; cf. 2 Thess 1:7). A good example of this conflation of human and angelic beings is found in Revelation 18:20 and Daniel 7:18, 21 LXX. Among the human beings, οἱ ἄγιοι is listed among οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ προφῆται (Rev 18:20). It is the οἱ ἄγιοι that will receive the kingdom (Dan 7:18, 22 LXX) and judgment (Dan 7:22 LXX).

All of the aforementioned traditions are sufficient to posit, at the least, that οἱ ἄγιοι can refer to both the angelic and human realm—especially in apocalyptic contexts. Does the Didache maintain such angelic tradition when using οἱ ἄγιοι? Of the nine uses of ἄγιος in the Didache, only two are plural (Did. 4.2; 16.7). In Did. 4.2, οἱ ἄγιοι refers to humanity. There are two options for the referent of οἱ ἄγιοι in Did. 4.2. It either refers to the teachers in 4.1, or, if the liturgical section (Did. 9–10) may be considered, then it refers to baptized community members who are permitted to take the Eucharist (cf. Epitome 9).⁴³

⁴²Otto Procksch, “ἄγιος, ἀγιάζω, κτλ,” *TDNT* 1:109–10.

⁴³Given that the broader guild of Did. scholarship affirms and recognizes composite and evolutionary development of the Did.’s composition, I recognize the grave difficulty of assessing individual parts of the Did. in relation to the whole. More work and settled positions can still assess the specifics of the compositional development of the Did. My comment above is neither arguing for compositional unity nor affirming the evolutionary development. *Wirkungsgeschichte* will be a helpful category of reception in the coming years of Did. studies. As compositional theories develop, the Did.’s internal attestation to itself modifies. That is, at some point in the Did.’s compositional history, if this theory holds sway, Did. 4 and Did. 9 are read together. To prove this theory, however, still will undergo serious difficulty. See the following works to gain a brief awareness of composition.

The way of life instruction exhorts the person to “seek daily the presence of the holy ones” (Did. 4.2; ἐκζητήσεις δὲ καθ’ ἡμέραν τὰ πρόσσπα τῶν ἁγίων).⁴⁴ In the preceding instruction, these persons are to remember, night and day, τοῦ λαλοῦντός σοι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ (Did. 4.1). These teachers are part of the hierarchy for a pupil and mentor—accentuated by the use of τέκνον μου (Did. 4.1). If these teachers speak τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, then τέκνον μου are to seek the comfort τοῖς λόγοις (Did. 4.2). In this way, pupils remember night and day their teachers (Did. 4.1), and they are to seek daily οἱ ἅγιοι in order to find comfort in their teachings (Did. 4.2).⁴⁵

However, if the use of δέ in Did. 4.2 is “used to mark new developments, in the sense that the information it introduces builds on what has gone before and makes a distinct contribution to the argument,”⁴⁶ then οἱ ἅγιοι may refer to a different group of persons than the immediate antecedent, τοῦ λαλοῦντός τὸν λόγον. That is, δέ continues the logical connection between 4.1 and 4.2, but it offers a distinguishing connection among persons.

If topics in the liturgical section (Did. 9–10) can influence the Two Ways section (Did. 1–6), then οἱ ἅγιοι refer to baptized community members, who are permitted to take the Eucharist (Did. 9.5).

Did. 9.5: μηδεὶς δὲ φαγέτω μηδὲ πιέτω ἀπὸ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὑμῶν, ἀλλ’ οἱ

Willy Rordorf and André Tuilier, *La Doctrine Des Douze Apôtres (Didachè): Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction, Notes, Appendice, Annexe et Index*, 2nd ed., SC 248 (Paris: Les Éditions Du Cerf, 1978), 36, 63; van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 55–190; Alan J. P. Garrow, *The Gospel of Matthew’s Dependence on the Didache*, LNTS 254 (New York: T&T Clark International, 2004); Christopher M. Tuckett, “The *Didache* and the Writings That Later Formed the New Testament,” in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 83–85; Clayton N. Jefford, “Social Locators as a Bridge between the *Didache* and Matthew,” in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett, NTAf (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 245–64; Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*.

⁴⁴Epitome reads αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἁγίους (“him and the other holy ones”). Apostolic Church order reads αὐτοῦ καθ’ ἡμέραν καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἁγίους (“his [presence] each day and the other the holy ones”). *Doctr.* 4.2 reads *facies santorum*.

⁴⁵Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 105–6.

⁴⁶Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 112.

βαπτισθέντες εἰς ὄνομα κυρίου, καὶ γὰρ περὶ τούτου εἶρηκεν ὁ κύριος· Μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσί

The concept of purity and ritual washing precludes participants from taking the Eucharist (cf. Did. 9.1–4). Furthermore, the parallel liturgical expression joins together ἅγιος and μετανοέω as a prerequisite to approach the Eucharist (Did. 10.6).

Did. 10.6: Εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω· εἴ τις οὐκ ἐστί, μετανοεῖτω·

Thus, ἅγιός is a mandatory quality for participating in the Eucharist liturgy.⁴⁷

Nothing in Did. 7.1–4 joins together ritual purity and washing. Rather, implications are brought to bear in Did. 9.5 when the Eucharist is prohibited from the non-baptized (ἀλλ’ οἱ βαπτισθέντες εἰς ὄνομα κυρίου). According to Draper, τὸ ἅγιον is the reason why the non-baptized are excluded from the meal.⁴⁸ As τὸ ἅγιον refers to food permitted to priests (cf. Lev 21:1–16 LXX), this Eucharist is cultic and sacred for the new community. “The result is that the purity of food and drink become the boundary marker and guarantor between insiders and outsiders for both Qumran and the community of the Didache. Those outside are in a state of impurity which prohibits them from sharing in the pure meal of the community.”⁴⁹ Regardless of the historical connection, baptism is the needed purification to partake of the sacred meal according to the Didachist.

⁴⁷John Chrysostom conveys a similar idea: τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις “the holy things for holy persons” (*Hom. Heb.* 17.5; PG 63:133).

⁴⁸See Carsten Claussen, “The Eucharist in the Gospel of John and in the *Didache*,” in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett, NTAf (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 135–63; Johannes Betz, “The Eucharist in the Didache,” in *The Didache in Modern Research*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper, AGJU 37 (New York: Brill, 1996), 244–75; Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence on the Didache*, 13–14. Debate surrounds the meaning of the Eucharist in the Did. At least five options appears: Whether it is (1) an agape meal, denoting a fellowship meal; (2) the bread and wine instituted by the Lord; (3) a Eucharist meal, whereby a community is simultaneously eating a meal and celebrating the Eucharist; (4) celebration of the Eucharist followed by an agape feast; and (5) “table prayers, reworked out of Eucharistic prayers, used in ascetic circles” (Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence Upon the Didache*, 13–14).

⁴⁹Jonathan A. Draper, “‘You Shall Not Give What Is Holy to the Dogs’ (*Didache* 9.5): The Attitude of the *Didache* to the Gentiles,” in *Attitudes to Gentiles in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. David C. Sim and James S. McLaren, LNTS 499 (New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013), 245.

So, οἱ ἅγιοι in Did. 4.2 may refer to either a community of teachers (Did. 4.1) or is a quality marker for the community, who have been baptized and permitted to partake in the Eucharist liturgy (Did. 9.5; cf. Did. 10.6).⁵⁰ Nonetheless of these two options, οἱ ἅγιοι does not contain an angelic referent in Did. 4.2.

οἱ ἅγιοι as a non-angelic martyr tradition (Did. 16.7). Another occurrence of ἅγιοι appears in Did. 16.7. Here, πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι (“all the holy ones”) return with God.

Did. 16.7: οὐ πάντων δέ, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἐρρέθη. Ἡξει ὁ κύριος, καὶ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι μετ’ αὐτοῦ

Pertinent to the present inquiry, this use of οἱ ἅγιοι raises a question about their identity. I contend that the tradition of God returning with a company of persons more often conveys a martyrological trajectory.⁵¹ In this way, I suggest that the Didache fits within a particular first and second centuries CE apocalyptic stream of literature that identifies the collective beings returning with God as martyrs who are observing the retribution of God’s judgment and/or rescuing other martyrs.⁵²

This tradition appears in the final few expressions of Did. 16. Didache 16 begins with a paraenetic exhortation of personal and communal vigilance (Did. 16.1–2; cf. Matt 25:1–13; Luke 21:34; 1 Thess 5:6). In the description of the last days (Did. 16.3–8), four groups of people emerge. Group one is false prophets (Did. 16.3), and eventually one as “a son of God” appears (Did. 16.4). The second group is those who

⁵⁰Milavec suggests that rest is to be found “in the words of a community living the Way of Life.” Milavec, *Didache: Faith, Hope & Life*, 161.

⁵¹See Draper’s article that develops the Son of Man tradition in antiquity, and includes Did. 16 in its discussion. Jonathan A. Draper, “The Development of ‘the Sign of the Son of Man’ in the Jesus Tradition,” *NTS* 39, no. 1 (1993): 1–21.

⁵²More work can be done on the rhetorical effect of the return of God. It is possible that the identity of those accompanying God in His return can have an affect upon the rhetorical impetus. In my readings of the subsequent primary material, I noticed something of the following pattern: (1) When humans accompany God in His return, it is often martyrological vindication. (2) When angels or undefined persons accompany God in His return, it often accentuates a gathering motif for the elect or a judgment motif.

receive chastisement from those in group one (Did. 16.4), yet they endure in their faith (Did. 16.5). The third and fourth groups are saints and non-saints that perish during the fiery trail (Did. 16.5)—implied by the partial resurrection of the dead in Did. 16.6.⁵³

Appearing in the middle of a quotation, οἱ ἄγιοι is identified as those who return with the Lord.⁵⁴ It is possible that Zechariah 14:5 (cf. 1 Thess 3:13) is the textual referent and therefore functioning as a proof text for affirming a partial resurrection of the dead—only the dead saints.⁵⁵ According to the Didachist, there will be three signs of truth: (1) opening of heaven; (2) sound of a trumpet; and (3) the resurrection from the dead (Did. 16.6). The expression “but not all” limits who is resurrected (Did. 16.7a). Because Did. 16.3–8 only mentions the outcome of those who endure “in their faith” (Did. 16.5), it is by implication the partial resurrection is limited to the saints who have died.⁵⁶

There remains a question regarding the identity of οἱ ἄγιοι in Did. 16.6. Ancient Jewish and Christian traditions will, at times, specify that it is angels that return with God (1 En. 100.5; Dan 7:13–14;⁵⁷ Matt 25:31; Mark 8:38; Luke 9:26; 2

⁵³Joseph Verheyden, “Eschatology in the Didache and the Gospel of Matthew,” in *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?*, ed. Huub van de Sandt (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2005), 211.

⁵⁴Providing little exegetical argument, Niederwimmer suggests that οἱ ἄγιοι refers to “the dead Christians who are now reawakened to life.” This brief observation is wanting for the very reason that οἱ ἄγιοι return with God to accompany Him in the partial resurrection. Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 225.

⁵⁵Del Verme joins οἱ ἄγιοι to those who have following the way of life and are now the righteous ones. Del Verme, *Didache and Judaism*, 249–51.

⁵⁶Garrow suggests, “The addition of 16.7 creates a situation where the only characters capable of appearing in the heavenly court are those who have *already* been judged holy enough to enjoy resurrection.” Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence on the Didache*, 43.

⁵⁷Murray Smith has an extended discussion on the relationship between Dan 7 and Did. 16. Murray J. Smith, “The Lord Jesus and His Coming in the Didache,” in *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, ECL 14 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 395–406.

Thess 1:7; Ascen. Isa. 4.14–16a).⁵⁸ In the Apocalypse of Elijah, sixty-four thousand angels will accompany God in vengeance (Apoc. El. 5.2, 20–21). Other traditions remain vague about who returns with God (1 En. 1.9; Sib. Or. 8.221; T. Job. 43.14–15; Zech 14:5; 1 Thess 3:13)—1 En. 1.9 and Sib. Or. 8.221 connect the return of God with vindictive judgment, which is different than the apocalyptic scene in Did. 16.

Some Jewish and Christian traditions begin to merge resurrected humanity with an angelic identification. For example, Enoch looks at himself and declares, “I had become like one of his glorious ones, and there is no observable difference” (2 En. 22.10). In Qumran literature, the King of Glory dwells together with “the Holy Ones,” which are both the angelic beings and elect people of God (1QM XII, 1–7). “Holy Ones” may also be a title given to resurrected saints in Sib. Or. 8.227–28.⁵⁹ By second-century CE, the Gospel of the Ebionites offers a picture of heaven whereby Jesus is likened to an archangel⁶⁰—pertinent to this discussion is noting the mixture of human and angelic identity. Within Jesus tradition, the resurrection may convey a change in substance so that resurrected humans will be *ὡς ἄγγελοι* (Matt 22:20; Mark 12:25; cf. 1 Cor 15:40, 42, 44)⁶¹ or *οἱ ἅγιοι* refers solely to saints distinct from angels (1 Cor 6:2–3). Moreover, Cyril of Alexandria and Didymus the Blind interpret the “holy ones” in Zechariah 14:5 as both humans and angels.⁶² Even the language of the

⁵⁸For example, the textual variants for Matt 25:31 read *ἅγιοι* instead of *ἀγγελοι* (A K W Γ Δ). I’m not suggesting *ἅγιοι* or *ἀγγελοι* is a better reading. Rather, I’m noting how the variant may point towards a conflating tradition to make *ἀγγελοι* less explicit.

⁵⁹Sib. Or. 8:227–28: “Then all the flesh of the dead, of the holy ones, will come to the free light.”

⁶⁰Epiphanius, *Pan.* 30.16: “They say that he is not begotten by God the Father but created like one of the archangels, being greater than they. He rules over the angels and the beings created by God.”

⁶¹Also, Jonathan A. Draper, “Resurrection and Zechariah 14.5 in the Didache Apocalypse,” *J ECS* 5, no. 2 (1997): 165.

⁶²Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, *Zach.* 14. Also, note the reading from Didymus the Blind: “He comes also with great ‘power,’ however, because holy ones accompany him, not men only but also angels. It is logical, in fact, that ‘those who have been eyewitnesses and servants’ and ‘ministering spirits assigned to his service’ by him should with him be resplendent, so that he should be acknowledged as their king, and they as his powers, that is, his forces.” Didymus, *Zach.* 14.

Constitutions highlights the angelic presence (Apos. Con. 7.32): τότε ἕξει ὁ κύριος καὶ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐν συσσεισμῷ ἐπάνω τῶν ωφελεῶν μετ' ἀγγέλων δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ θρόνου βασιλείας.

With these selected anthropological and angelic traditions in Jewish and Christian traditions, the persons, who accompany God during his return, function as part of a martyrological Christian tradition. That is, not only are the persons identified as martyrs, but they also function as part of a martyrological paraenetic when they accompany God in his return. For example, Ignatius notes how the return of Christ will bring a reward to those having been martyred (Ign. *Magn.* 8.2–9.2).⁶³ Often, martyrs will accompany God so as to vindicate other persecuted persons (cf. Rev 19:11–16). These martyrs are an army arrayed in white and pure linen (Rev 19:14). The souls are given a white robe, are slain on behalf of the word of God, and cry out to God in order to avenge their blood (Rev 6:9–11). The Apocalypse of Abraham details the “chosen one” returning to summon those “humiliated by the heathen” (Apoc. Ab. 31.1). The persecution of the saints in the Apocalypse of Elijah offers an assurance of a resurrection (Apoc. El. 4.25–27). Finally, the Epistle of the Apostles details how the return of God will “come with those who were killed for my sake” (Ep. Apos. 15).

The partial resurrection in Did. 16.7 suggests that the return of God will only provide restitution to some. Hatred and persecution (μισήσουσιν ἀλλήλους καὶ διώξουσιν; Did. 16.4) characterize the false prophets and corruptors. As the entire creation of humanity approaches the fire (Did. 16.5), some will endure and some will perish. Thus, the return of God and the partial resurrection are framed within an apocalyptic martyrological setting.⁶⁴ It is possible, then, that the tradition of the

⁶³Draper also notes this Ignatius reference. Draper, “Resurrection in the Didache,” 174.

⁶⁴Vicky Balabanski presents a study on the development of Did. 16 in Christian eschatology as compared with Gospel traditions. She observes, “In the Zechariah passage, the holy

Didache resides within a similar stream of martyr paraenetic traditions. In this way, οἱ ἅγιοι in Did. 16.7 are former martyrs returning with God, not in vindictive judgment, but to provide resurrection to the formerly slain.⁶⁵

The gathering of ἐκκλησία from the “four winds” (Did. 9.4 and 10.5). Another tradition to consider is the ecclesiological gathering in Did. 10.5 and 9.4. Of all the traditions in the Didache to present a form of angelic presence, these texts in particular would be the easiest to include one. A similar, and paralleled, tradition appears in both Did. 10.5 and 9.4.

Did. 9.4: οὕτω συναχθήτω σου ἡ ἐκκλησία ἀπὸ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν

Did. 10.5: σύναξον αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων, τὴν ἁγιασθεῖσαν, εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν

Both accounts share the motif of gathering the ἐκκλησία from among the ends of the earth. Didache 9.4 likens this gathering of ἐκκλησία to the Eucharist and, more specifically, to the process of making the Eucharist bread: “As this broken bread (κλάσμα) was scattered upon the mountains and gathered, *it* became one; thus let your ἐκκλησία from the ends of the earth into your kingdom” (Did. 9.4).

The paralleled tradition of Did. 10.5 evokes more of an eschatological setting.⁶⁶ A call to remember (μνήσθητι) the ἐκκλησία and deliver (τοῦ ῥύσασθαι) it

ones presumably referred to the angels, but they are here [Did. 16.7] interpreted as the Christian saints who have died and been raised again. In this there is no longer any problem reflected as to the issue of Christians dying before the return of Christ, as was seen in the study of Matthew 25. . . . This therefore reveals an eschatology that has confronted and moved beyond the shock of the death of community members, and has embraced a doctrine similar to that which Paul sets out in 1 Thess. 4.” Vicky Balabanski, *Eschatology in the Making: Mark, Matthew, and the Didache*, SNTSMS 97 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 204–5.

⁶⁵According to Niederwimmer, “The Didache interprets the ἅγιοι instead as the dead Christians who are now reawakened to life.” Thus, Niederwimmer identifies this similar conclusion without any of the background and foreground text traditions. Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 225.

⁶⁶Jonathan A. Draper, “Do the Didache and Matthew Reflect an ‘Irrevocable Parting of the Ways’ with Judaism?,” in *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?*, ed. Huub van de Sandt (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 237.

from every form of evil (cf. Matt 6:13) sets up the gathering motif: “And gather it from the four winds (ἀπὸ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων) into your kingdom, which you have prepared for it” (Did. 10.5). According to Wim Weren, the use of ἐκκλησία in Did. 9 and 10 contains at least two elements: (1) an imperfect church, needing protection from evil, and (2) the preparation of the kingdom for the church.⁶⁷ Although no mention or hint of angelic beings appear in either of these two Didache texts, the “gathering” motif joined with the eschatological-like features and the “four winds” cumulatively provide a context that is ripe to include angelic traditions—one that often does include angelic beings in other ancient traditions.

First, angelic traditions may accompany traditions that include “four corners” or “four winds” of the earth. For example, consider the tradition in Ezekiel 37:8–9 LXX. The son of man is to prophecy ἐπὶ τὸ πνεῦμα and to say τῷ πνεύματι that they are to come from the four winds of the earth (ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων πνευμάτων) and give life. Angelic beings are represented as the four chariot horses in Zechariah 6:1–5. The horses are described as τοῦτα ἐστὶν οἱ τεσσαρες ἄνεμοι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (“these are the four winds of heaven”; Zech 6:5 LXX). As Metatron describes some of the angelic realm to Enoch, a question is posed (3 En. 26.9): “how many seraphim are there?” He responds by describing that there are four angels that correspond to the four winds of the earth along with six wings that correspond to the days of creation. Within the Apocalypse of John, four angels are seen standing upon the four winds of the earth (τέσσαρες ἀγγέλους ἐστῶτας ἐπὶ τὰς τέσσαρας γωνίας τῆς γῆς; Rev 7:1).

Also, Hermas portrays an angelic tradition along with the four corners of the earth.⁶⁸ Hermas details a large white rock that is hewn out of the fields and is

⁶⁷Wim J. C. Weren, “The Ideal Community According to Matthew, James, and the Didache,” in *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*, ed. Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, SBLSS 45 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 182.

⁶⁸Christian Wilson documents some of the differences between Did. and Herm. Mand. “There are some telling points on the basis of internal evidence which go against the idea of Hermas’s

higher than the mountains (Herm. Sim. 9.2.1 [79.1]). This rock is square shaped (τετράγωνος) and is able to contain the whole world (δύνασθαι ὅλον τὸν κόσμον χωρῆσαι; Herm. Sim. 9.2.1 [79.1]). Those standing on the four corners “seemed glorious to me” (ἐνδοξότεραί μοι ἐδόκουν εἶναι; Herm. Sim. 9.2.3 [79.3]; cf. Sim. 9.10.7 [87.7]). These “glorious” figures are later described as spirits embodying both virtues and vices that govern humanity until they die (Sim. 9.15.1–6 [92.1–6]).⁶⁹ Thus, a tradition appears that when the “four corners” or “four winds” are mentioned, angelic creatures do accompany such tradition.⁷⁰

Second, another set of traditions includes both the angelic beings and the “four corner”/“four winds”, but also with a “gathering” motif. Jesus tradition often joins together these three concepts. In Matthew 24:31, the angelic realm gathers the elect from the four winds of the heavens (ἐπισυνάξουσιν τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων ἀπ’ ἄκρων οὐρανῶν). This comparable tradition differs slightly, as seen in Mark 13:27. The “coming son of man” will send out the angels, yet it is the son of man who will gather the elect—noted by the singular form of ἐπισυνάγω, and not the plural to match τοὺς ἀγγέλους—from the four winds of the earth and heaven (ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων ἀπ’ ἄκρου γῆς ἕως ἄκρου οὐρανοῦ). Also, Matthew 13:41 likens

dependence on Didache for his dualism. First, there is no two spirits dualism in Didache, only a two ways dualism. Second, the two ways section begins Didache; whereas, it come in the middle of the Shepherd of Hermas. Third, the larger pneumatology and angelology which lies behind the Shepherd of Hermas has nothing in common with Didache, but very much in common with Qumran. Fourth, the Mandates as a whole are ethical precepts for Christian living. They contain no liturgical instructions or principles of church order. In contrast, Didache, beyond its two ways section is almost entirely liturgical instruction and principles of church order with a brief eschatological admonition at the end. While the genre of the Mandates and of Didache is very similar, the content is quite different both within the two ways/spirits sections and beyond them.” J. Christian Wilson, *Five Problems in the Interpretation of the Shepherd of Hermas: Authorship, Genre, Canonicity, Apocalyptic, and the Absence of the Name “Jesus Christ,”* MBPS 24 (Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1995), 46.

⁶⁹According to Mark Grundeken, Hermas offers very little comments to distinguish between “spirits” and “angels.” In fact, Grundeken suggests they are one in the same. Mark Grundeken, *Community Building in the Shepherd of Hermas: A Critical Study of Some Key Aspects,* VCSup 131 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 62; cf. Carolyn Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas,* Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 32.

⁷⁰It is even notable that two cherubim appear on the four edges of the mercy seat (cf. Exod 25:22).

a “son of man” sending out angels to gather from the kingdom, not the elect, but all the lawless ones (τοὺς ποιοῦντας τὴν ἀνομίαν) for judgment. As it relates to Matthew’s tradition, Weren offers the following comparison with the Didache: “In the Didache, the term ἐκκλησία does not have the connotation, encountered in Matthew, of contrast with the wider Jewish community or certain movements within it.”⁷¹

However, it is not as though all “four corners”/“four winds” and “gathering” motifs contain angelic traditions. Some, in fact, do not mention the angelic element. For example, Isaiah 11:12 and Jeremiah 49:36 both convey an exile motif but lack an angelic tradition (cf. Zech 2:6). In Ezekiel 7:2, the four corners are set within a judgment context with no angelic tradition. In an apocalyptic tradition, 2 Esd 13.5 gathers a multitude of people from the four winds of heaven, yet there remains no mention of the angelic realm. Judgment motifs, combined with four corners, appear in the Gr. Apoc. Ezra 3.6. The three traditions of “four winds of heaven” in Daniel appear in an apocalyptic context but lack gathering and angelic themes (Dan 7:2; 8:8; 11:4). Likened to a similar tradition in 2 Esd 13.5, the “four corners of the earth” (ἐν ταῖς τέσσαρσιν γωνίαις τῆς γῆς) will include some form of war (εἰς τὸν πόλεμον) in Revelation 20:8.

Returning to the traditions in Did. 10.5 and 9.4, if an angelic tradition avails itself, this section would have suited an opportune moment to include such angelic features. Enough ancient traditions merge together “four corners”/“four winds,” “gathering” motifs, and angelic beings. If the Didachist desired to include angelic beings within the Didache, beyond the literary Two Ways frame, Did. 10.5 would have been the most auspicious moment to do so.

⁷¹Weren, “Ideal Community,” 182.

Section conclusion. According to Kurt Niederwimmer, the Didache's source begins with Did. 1.1 and is a citation from one version of a Two Ways tractate. For him, it remains impossible to speak with certainty whether or not this source contained the angelic tradition. "It is probable, though," as Niederwimmer opines, "if that is that case, the Didachist would have omitted the motif of the *angeli duo*, perhaps because it plays no part in the exposition that follows."⁷²

Niederwimmer's position is rather problematic. First, it may be so that the Didache's source may not contain the angelic features. However, this consideration is an argument of silence for both positions, and therefore a mute point until further certainty can be granted for a possible source. According to Draper, "It is an important feature of the Two Ways teaching in Did. that it has removed all references to the two spirits or angels, although these must have been present in its source, since they are features of Dc. and Ba. 18:1."⁷³

Second, for the Didachist to refrain from including the Angelic tradition due to a lack of angelic exposition within the Two Ways does not cohere with other Two Ways texts. As a pattern, other Two Ways literature does not present the angelic beings within the Two Ways content but presents the angelic beings within the literary frame of the Two Ways. This pattern has been noted in the appearances of angels in 1QS III–IV, Barn. 18–21, and *De Doctrina*. Yet, no angelic beings immediately present themselves within the actual content of the ethical Two Ways instruction (cf. 1QS IV, 2–12; Barn. 19–20; *Doctr.* 1.3–5.12). For Niederwimmer's position to be sustainable, he needs to explain why other expressions of the Two Ways do not contain angelic instruction in the specific ways of life and ways of

⁷²Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 63.

⁷³Jonathan Alfred Draper, "A Commentary on the Didache in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents" (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 1983), 23.

death, but they are still present in the broader Two Ways literary frame. Aaron Milavec observes likewise and offers the following summary: “One can now note that the Greek Epistle of Barnabas, the Latin *Teaching of the Apostles*, and the Hebrew *Manual of Discipline* clearly embrace an angelic dualism when defining the Two Ways, while the framers of the Didache clearly avoid it.”⁷⁴

Thus, the Didache offers no angelic tradition in its version of the Two Ways literary frame. Moreover, when consulting the rest of the material in the Didache, no angelic traditions emerge—even when Did. 10.5 and 16.7 could have presented such traditions. As J. Christian Wilson observes,

Like 1QS and the Shepherd of Hermas, Didache contains also a treatise on a dualistic struggle in the Two Ways section (Didache 1–5). The only difference is that in Didache the struggle is between the good and the evil ethical ways of living rather than good and evil angels or spirits.⁷⁵

As a whole, the Didache veils any angelic tradition and vies for an ethical antithesis rather than a dual angelic presence.

Ethical Permissions and a Softening of Divine Determinism

Some form of divine determinism helps frame other Two Ways texts. Thus, the question of inquiry here is, does the Didache likewise provide similar deterministic tendencies to reflect the divine undercurrents of the Two Ways? I will show how the frame of the Two Ways and broader teachings in the Didache actually

⁷⁴Milavec proceeds to explain why the Did. lacks an angelic referent. Although he suggests that the “full story behind this choice cannot be known,” Did. 6.3 and idols as “dead gods” function as the means by which angels are missing. He proceeds to note that even the events in Did. 16 and the Lord’s coming “unfold without any angelic or demonic forces playing any role whatsoever. Therefore, the apocalyptic concepts are altogether lacking. “Thus, with some circumspection,” as Milavec concludes, “the Didache embraces the metaphors of life and death but deliberately avoids associating these with cosmic/angelic dualism.” Milavec, *Didache: Faith, Hope & Life*, 65.

⁷⁵J. Christian Wilson, *Toward a Reassessment of the Shepherd of Hermas: Its Date and Its Pneumatology* (Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1993), 80.

replicate the opposite of determinism by offering exception clauses and a softening of ethical paradigms.

As compared to other Two Ways texts, 1QS III–IV may offer the most deterministic tradition. For, God has created and ordained all humanity, including their outcomes (1QS III, 15–16). Even the two ruling spirits are ordained to rule over humanity (1QS III, 17). God also determined and ordained the temporal rule, designated end, and the mutual animosity between the two angels (1QS IV, 17, 25). As van de Sandt and Flusser observe, “In order to really appreciate the relevance of this post-biblical Jewish Two Ways tradition, two things have to be taken into account: firstly, the sharply deterministic and dualistic tone in the Qumran model and, secondarily, the plurality of the Christian Two Ways forms.”⁷⁶

Divine determinism is slightly nuanced when observing the Barnabas tradition. For, it only extends over the appointment of angels (Barn. 18.1) and anthropological end of the way of light (Barn. 19.1). Even in the brief frame of *De Doctrina*, divine determinism appears vaguely in the phrase *in his constituti* (*Doctr.* 1.1) and in the Trinitarian rule and dominion: *per dominum Iesum Christum regnantem et dominantem cum deo patre et spiritu sancto in saecula saeculorum* (*Doctr.* 6.6). Although relatively minimal in Herm. Mand. 6 (35–36), determinism may extend to the human expression of virtues or vices as a result of the indwelling rule of the spirits (Herm. Mand. 6.1.1 [35.1]). For the Testament of Asher, determinism is not directly conveyed through the acts and organization of God as it is framed through prophetic decree of the patriarch. The final commands and comments of the patriarch are one of defeat and one of prophetic indictment (T. Ash. 7.4–5).

⁷⁶van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 59.

But, these similar questions need to be asked of the Didache. If divine determinism appears, even in variegated form in other Two Ways texts, does the Didache likewise continue such apocalyptic theme? No such motif is present in the frame of the Didache's Two Ways except one possible tradition. In Did. 6.2, τέλειος will be the reward if the wayfarer adheres to the whole “yoke of the Lord” (ὅλον τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου; Did. 6.2). If divine determinism is bound up within this expression, then divine reward is combined with human involvement. Furthermore, even if determinism is present, it is not the prominent motif.

However, rather than maintaining the strict standards of keeping the ὅλον τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου, a permission is granted. If one is unable to maintain the strict ethical rigors, then they may bear what they are able (εἰ δ' οὐ δύνασαι, ὃ δύνη, τοῦτο ποίει; Did. 6.2). Rather than determinism, exceptions and permissions to ethical rigors are softened.⁷⁷ It still remains uncertain what the anthropological outcome is for those who are able to do what they can. If τέλειος is the outcome for those adhering to “the whole yoke of the Lord,” then what is the outcome for those who partially maintain “the whole yoke of the Lord”? Is it still τέλειος or is it something else?

Furthermore, these “exceptions” to the ethical rigors of the Didachist appear throughout the rest of the Didache. Concerning food laws, they are to bear what they are able (ὃ δύνασαι βάσπασον; Did. 6.3). Even after the baptismal instructions, the community is given three more options for baptism procedures. If baptism with running water (ἐν ὕδατι ζῶντι) is not an option, then other ways will suffice (Did. 7.2). If not, to use warm water remains an option (Did. 7.2). If not, to

⁷⁷John S. Kloppenborg, “Didache 1.1—6.1, James, Matthew, and the Torah,” in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew Gregory and Christopher Tuckett, NTAf (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 220; Huub van de Sandt, “Matthew and the Didache,” in *Matthew and His Christian Contemporaries*, ed. David C. Sim and Boris Repschinski, LNTS 333 (London: T&T Clark International, 2008), 137.

pour water over the head in accordance with the Trinitarian confession remains permissible (Did. 7.3). Within the Eucharist liturgy, the prophets are granted an exception (Did. 10.7). If exceptions are present in other portions of the Didache, then it may be possible that redaction is a viable option for Did. 6.2 in order to maintain rhetorical unity with other portions of the Didache text.

Van de Sandt and Flusser offer a caution for the conclusion to the soft-determinism in the Didache.

The rendering of the Two Ways in the Didache definitely represents a concession. The unit's first part agrees with the *Doctrina* in cautioning against anyone who "leads you astray from this way of the doctrine," but it ends with the statement that the reader is not required to measure up to the preceding guidelines. This means we should treat 6.2–3 with great caution as being evidence of a concessional attitude. It is hard to believe that after it presents rigorous teaching in a comprehensive ethical blueprint and imposes a high standard for the Way of Life, the manual would, in the end, offer a concession as if suggesting that partial compliance would suffice.⁷⁸

Van de Sandt and Flusser rightly identify this tension. Why do the extreme ethical demands of the Two Ways instruction end with a concession of partial compliance?

So, it is rather striking that the Didache offers an inversed mismatch of ideas when compared to the other Two Ways texts. The *Treatise of the Two Spirits*, *Barnabas*, *De Doctrina*, *Testament of Asher*, and even *Hermas* offer forms of determinism, even though each tradition differs in their individual expression. However, the Didache demonstrates no such signs of these deterministic categories and avows more of permissions and exceptions to the ethical standards. Even if strict ethical categories have a divine reward, further problems are created to adjudicate to whom these rewards are given. If one is unable to fulfill the ethical demands of the Two Ways, how much must the person obey to receive *τέλειος*? That is, the deterministic softening poses problems for anthropological rewards and liturgical practices for the Didache community.

⁷⁸van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 120.

Reduction of a Light-Darkness Cosmic Dualism

The last element under examination will be rather brief. If some Two Ways texts, more specifically, *Treatise of Two Spirits*, *Barnabas*, and *De Doctrina*, include optical dualisms of “light” and “darkness,” does the *Didache* retain this tradition? In short, the *Didache* refrains from maintaining these dualistic expressions. As van de Sandt and Flusser observe,

The disappearance of the light-darkness dichotomy and the powerful angels in the latter introduction, which come down to a significant reduction of the cosmic dualism in the earlier Two Ways, might reflect a deliberate effort to ethicize and demythologize a type of traditional materials.⁷⁹

The “light” and “darkness” connection to the ways of life and death, respectively, appear in some Two Ways texts. For example, the Angel of Light and Prince of Darkness correspond to the ways of light and of darkness in 1QS III–IV. With regard to *Barnabas*, the expression of “life” and “death” are not the descriptors of the Two Ways. Rather, the two paths are that of light (ἡ . . . τοῦ φωτός) and that of darkness (ἡ τοῦ σκότους; Barn. 18.1; cf. Barn. 19.1, 12). Furthermore, the angelic realm is light-giving angels (φωταγωγοὶ ἄγγελοι; Barn. 18.1). Even the ways of life and death are given a further description of *lucis et tenebrarum* in *Doctr.* 1.1.

Of the motifs that the *Didache* does not include, it is rather perplexing that the themes of “light” and “darkness” remain absent. Especially given the source relationship between *De Doctrina* and *Didache*, “light” and “darkness” expressions remain absent in *Didache*’s version of the Two Ways.⁸⁰ *De Doctrina* includes both

⁷⁹van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 119.

⁸⁰Garrow suggests two different sources for the two different versions. “If, as Audet allows,” Garrow opines, “a combination of two separate strands took place before the *Didache* came to depend on the *Doctrina*, then the *Didachist* is required to *reverse* that process by choosing to include only the ‘life and death’ strand in his work. The need for this regressive move is avoided if the *Doctrina*’s unique double qualification was created by the simple conflation of *Did.* 1.1a and a text such as *Barnabas* 18.” Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence on the Didache*, 72.

concepts of life and death as well as light and darkness (*vitae et mortis, lucis et tenebrarum*; *Doctr.* 1.1).

Summary: Literary Frame of Didache 1–6 and an Apocalyptic Worldview

This present chapter inquires about the apocalyptic features that appear in the Didache's Two Ways literary frame. In the two previous chapters, a typology of Two Ways texts and traditions, as well as selected readings of Two Ways texts, reveals at least five apocalyptic motifs. These five motifs cumulatively suggest that an apocalyptic worldview undergirds the Two Ways metaphor. These five concepts are: (1) angelic or otherworldly figures, (2) angelic or otherworldly ethical influence, (3) dualistic cosmological structures, (4) divine determinism, and (5) anthropological telic ends.

The question in this present chapter inquired about the ways in which the Didache expresses these salient apocalyptic motifs reflected in a Two Ways genre? This question helps place the Didache in comparison with other Two Ways texts that express an apocalyptic worldview. As demonstrated above, the Didache, in fact, neglects to cohere with the apocalyptic components often appearing within the Two Ways genre. The two components that the Didache's Two Ways literary frame do retain are related to forms of polarized ethics and a chastened form of anthropological ends. In and of themselves, these two components do not necessitate an apocalyptic worldview.

Moreover, the Didache lacks the essential motifs to continue an apocalyptic worldview. For example, the Didache contains no angelic or otherworldly figures. Even in the remainder of the Didache, and in particular places that one could expect an angelic being, the Didache neglects to portray these angelic figures. Consequently, if angelic beings are lacking, then ethical influence of humanity

cannot be accomplished by these otherworldly figures. Furthermore, the concept of divine determinism is not prominent, leading the ethical stipulations to have a permissive quality. Even though other related Two Ways texts, namely 1QS III–IV, Barn. 18, and *Doctr.* 1 frame the Two Ways in terms of “light” and “darkness,” the Didache lacks these additional optical dualisms.

In the next chapter, I will still inquire whether or not the apocalyptic motifs appear in the Didache’s Two Ways. However, unlike the present chapter that devotes special attention to the literary frame, I will inquire about select individual readings within the Didache’s Two Ways instruction.

Table 4. Apocalyptic motifs and Two Ways summary (including Didache)

	1QS III–IV	T. Ash. 1–8	Gal 5:16–24	Barn. 18–21	<i>Doctr.</i> 1–6	Herm. Mand. 6 (35–36)	Did. 1–6
Two Ways Text	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Angelic/Otherworldly Beings	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Angelic ethical influence	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Cosmology	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Divine Determinism	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Anthropological Destiny	X	X	X	X	X**	X*	X
Two Ways as “Light” and “Darkness”	X			X	X		

Note: * Although anthropological destiny is not as observable for both ways of life, those who trust the works of the Angel of Righteousness “will live to God” (Herm. Mand. 6.2.10 [36.10]).

** *De Doctrina* 6.5 envisions how one “will acquire a crown” (*sed per haec sancta certamina peruenies ad coronam*).

CHAPTER 6

“THE MEEK SHALL INHERIT THE EARTH”: APOCALYPTICISM AND INTERNAL READINGS OF THE DIDACHE’S TWO WAYS

This chapter is concerned with assessing the possible apocalyptic features within the Didache’s version of the Two Ways. I will inquire how individual readings in Did. 1.1–6.2 address apocalyptic features. Within the Didache’s Two Ways, do apocalyptic components appear? In addition to the lack of apocalypticism in the Didache’s Two Ways frame, does apocalyptic features appear in the individual readings within the Didache’s Two Ways?

While it remains rather difficult, if not impossible, to identify intent, specific redaction, or influence from a particular tradition, I will assess a few Didache texts with respect to their literary structure, their relation to other Two Ways texts, and comparison with other early Jewish and Christian traditions. Although I refrain from identifying specific literary or source influences in the composition of the Didache, this assessment will identify comparable traditions in other ancient sources.

Thus, in this chapter, I will devote attention to Did. 3.7 and document traditions that combine “inheritance” and “meekness” motifs. Next, I will offer a reading of Barn. 19.9–10 and Did. 4.1–2. In this text comparison, Barnabas maintains an eschatological judgment and anthropological telic feature, whereas the Didachist does not incorporate such instruction. Then, I will offer an extended reading of Did. 6.2, highlight the mutual relationship between ζυγός and τέλειος, and document how other early traditions utilized these salient traditions.

Given the eschatological features and motifs in Did. 16, a particular question needs to be raised as to whether or not Did. 16 has affected the lack of apocalypticism in the Didache's Two Ways. That is, if Did. 1–6 lacks apocalyptic features that often appear in other ancient Two Ways texts, is Did. 16 credited for this influence? It is often argued that Did. 16 functioned as a conclusion to an earlier version of the Didache's Two Ways.¹ Hence, I will conclude this chapter by documenting this argument in Didache scholarship and suggest how the typology of Two Ways texts (see table A1 in appendix) and Did. 6.1–2 correspond to individual reward systems that are different than Did. 16. Therefore, Did. 16 is remotely affecting the apocalypticism of Did. 1–6, if at all. If Did. 16 does play a direct or indirect role in the apocalypticism of Did. 1–6, then Did. 16 presents a different apocalyptic portrait, asymmetrical with the Two Ways genre.

**“Since the Meek Shall Inherit the Earth”
(Did. 3.7)**

The first text under consideration is Did. 3.7. This text, *prima facie*, could suggest a form of eschatological orientation, especially given the conditional rewards.

Did. 3.7: Ἰσθι δὲ πραῦς, ἐπεὶ οἱ πραεῖς κληρονομήσουσι τὴν γῆν.

Although difficult to ascertain if Psalm 37:11 (36:11 LXX), Matthew 5:5, or some other source tradition secures the source tradition of Did. 3.7,² Psalm 36:11 LXX and

¹J. M. Creed, “The Didache,” *JTS* 39 (1938): 379; Ehrhard Kamlah, *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament*, WUNT 7 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1964), 214; Ernst Bammel, “Schema und Vorlage von *Didache* 16,” *StPatr* 4, no. 2 (1961): 253–62; Robert A. Kraft, *Barnabas and the Didache*, ed. R. M. Grant, AF 3 (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1965), 12–16; Ernst Bammel, “Pattern and Prototype of *Didache* 16,” in *The Didache in Modern Research*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper, AGJU 37 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 364–72; Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity*, CRINT: Section III Jewish Traditions in Early Christian Literature 5 (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 37.

²Clayton N. Jefford, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, VCSup 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1989), 73.

Matthew 5:5 are frequently appealed to within Didache scholarship as the more probable solutions.³ According to Christopher Tuckett, “The saying ‘the meek shall inherit the earth’ in Did 3:7 could derive from Mt 5:5 though position and presence of that beatitude in Matthew is textually uncertain and common dependence on the Didache and Matthew on Psalm 36:11 is equally likely.”⁴ In addition to these text similarities, the following section will explore the apocalyptic concerns of Did. 3.7, similar expressions in other Two Ways texts, and a history of interpretation of the intersection of “meekness” and “inheritance” motifs.

Literary Analysis of Didache 3.7

Didache 3.7 appears in a unique place in this version of the Two Ways. It marks the beginning of a new section (cf. Did. 3.1–6) and is the first in a series of virtues. Literarily, Did. 3.1–6 can comprise a single unit, whereas 3.7–10 forms another unit.⁵ Didache 3.1–6 encompasses, what has traditionally been called, the “*teknon* sayings” or “*teknon* section.”⁶ It is a form of sapiential instruction whereby

³According to van de Sandt and Flusser, “This expansion is dependent upon Ps 37:11a (MT), ‘and the meek shall inherit land/earth’ (=36:11a, LXX), a text which has been used in Matt 5:5 too, but presented there in the form of a macarism.” Van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 134; Clayton N. Jefford, “The Milieu of Matthew, the Didache, and Ignatius of Antioch: Agreements and Differences,” in *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?*, ed. Huub van de Sandt (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 40; Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache: A Commentary*, trans. Linda M. Maloney, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 100; Kurt Niederwimmer, *Die Didache*, KAV 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 131; John W. Welch, “From the Sermon on the Mount to the Didache,” in *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, ECL 14 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 345; Matti Myllykoski, “Without Decree: Pagan Sacrificial Meat and the Early History of the Didache,” in *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, ECL 14 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 441–42.

⁴Christopher M. Tuckett, “Synoptic Tradition in the Didache,” in *The Didache in Modern Research*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper, AGJU 37 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 108.

⁵Nancy Pardee, *The Genre and Development of the Didache*, WUNT 2/339 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 86–87.

⁶Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 94; Huub van de Sandt, “James 4, 1–4 in the Light of the Jewish Two Ways Tradition 3, 1–6,” *Bib* 88 (2007): 43; Huub van de Sandt, “Law and Ethics in Matthew’s Antitheses and James’s Letter: A Reorientation of Halakah in Line with the Jewish Two Ways 3:1–6,” in *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*, ed. Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, SBLSS 45 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 316.

the pupil (τέκνον μου) is exhorted to flee from all forms of evil (Did. 3.1). This initial command situates the subsequent list of vices. Furthermore, even though Barnabas neglects to incorporate the material found in Did. 3.1–6, Barnabas may know the material that is similar to Did. 3.7, especially given the phrase ἔση πραῦς (Barn. 19.4). This expression is likewise located in *De Doctrina* and Apostolic Church Order.⁷

The vice list (3.1–6) is ordered as a unique and structured discourse. The Didachist structures this instruction with five groups of sayings, all marked by τέκνον μου as a transitional marker. Each of the sayings follows a similar structure that presents a primary prohibition, followed by a subsequent group of vices.

Did. 3.1–6 and Discourse Structure:

τέκνον μου μὴ γίνου + Chief Vice

ὁδηγεῖ γὰρ/ἐπειδὴ + Chief Vice + πρὸς/εἰς + Vice B

μηδὲ Vice C + μηδὲ Vice D + (μηδὲ Vice E)

ἐκ γὰρ τούτων ἀπάντων + Vice B/F + γεννῶνται⁸

In order to prohibit a list of vices, the Didachist identifies and forbids a head vice. In other words, the chief vice, whether or not it is the vilest, operates as a gateway to other vices and expressions unbecoming for the community. To commit the head vice results in the utter demise of the community member's life—hence the etiology of other vices.

In contrast to the *teknon* sayings, Did. 3.7 is the first virtue to suggest another kind of ethics for the community member. Rather than succumbing to the previous list of vices (Did. 3.1–6), the community member ought to pursue

⁷Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 163.

⁸Of the five sayings, four maintain a similar form, whereas the other one differs. Sayings 1, 3–5 correspond to the following in the last line. The final vice is a repeated vice from second line Did. 3.2, 4, 5, and 6: ἐκ γὰρ τούτων ἀπάντων + Vice B + γεννῶνται. Saying 2 corresponds to the following in the last line. It introduces a new vice lexeme, although somewhat related to its corresponding Vice B (πορνεία): Did. 3.3: ἐκ γὰρ τούτων ἀπάντων + (New Vice) μοιχεῖται + γεννῶνται.

meekness, patience, innocence, gentleness, humility, and other such qualities (Did. 3.7–10). The use of δὲ in Did. 3.7 helps to provide a transition in the discourse.⁹ The polarized ethics between 3.1–6 and 3.7–10 help identify this transition as well.

Maintaining a similar rhetorical structure as the vice lists, the Didachist arranges the subsequent list of virtues in a similar way. They must become meek (ἴσθι πραῦς), since (ἐπεὶ; cf. Did. 3.4, 5, 6) there will be a reward. In the same way that a chief vice produces subsequent vices, it is quite possible that πραῦς functions as the etiological chief virtue. In this way, πραῦς produces a number of virtues as well as secures a particular reward (κληρονομήσουσι τὴν γῆν; Did. 3.7). Didache 3.8 provides a positive pursuit of virtue (γίνου + adjectives), whereas Did. 3.9 provides a prohibition of vices (οὐχ/οὐ + future verb).

Did. 3.8–9: γίνου μακρόθυμος καὶ ἐλεήμων καὶ ἄκακος καὶ ἡσύχιος καὶ ἀγαθὸς καὶ τρέμων τοὺς λόγους διὰ παντός, οὓς ἤκουσας. οὐχ ὑψώσεις σεαυτὸν οὐδὲ δώσεις τῇ ψυχῇ σου θράσος. οὐ κολληθήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ σου μετὰ ὑψηλῶν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ δικαίων καὶ ταπεινῶν ἀναστραφήσῃ.

Trans: “become patient, and merciful, and innocent, and well-ordered, and good, and revering the words through all things which you have heard. Do not exalt yourself, nor admit arrogance to your soul. Let not your soul become united with the proud, rather associate with the righteous and the humble.”

Alan Garrow identifies the importance of such ethic and observes the consequences of vices.

The promise that ‘the meek shall inherit the earth’ (cf. Ps. 36.11 LXX) provides a positive consequence to endorsed behaviour to balance the negative consequences of the proscribed behaviours (murderous acts, adultery, idolatry, theft, slander), all of which wickedness leads to disinheritance and banishment (cf. Ps. 36.9, 18, 20, etc.).¹⁰

⁹Steven E. Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010), 28–29. “The use of δὲ represents the writer’s choice to explicitly signal that what follows is a new, distinct development in the story or argument, based on how the writer conceived of it.” (Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 31).

¹⁰Alan J. P. Garrow, *The Gospel of Matthew’s Dependence on the Didache*, LNTS 254 (New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), 84.

Whereas the chief vice is the gateway for subsequent vices, *πραῦς* becomes the lead virtue to secure an eternal reward (*κληρονομήσουσι τὴν γῆν*) as well as to produce other virtues (Did. 3.8–9).

Some have suggested that Did. 3.7, especially Did. 3.7–10 or through 4.11, is thought to reflect *anawim* piety. Niederwimmer identified Did. 3.7–10 as “the *anawim* sayings” because 3.7–10 “express[es] an attitude that recalls the Old Testament and Jewish piety of the *anawim*.”¹¹ Jean-Paul Audet titled this section through 4.11 as the “instruction *aux pauvres*.”¹² John Kloppenborg counters these arguments and suggests, “it seems very unlikely that 3:7–4:4 or the Two Ways in general intends to address the ‘poor’.”¹³ Rather, the prior section (Did. 3.1–6), Kloppenborg continues, “is concerned to articulate an aetiology and genealogy of vices, arguing that there is a direct and necessary connection between lesser vices.”¹⁴ Regardless of the social status of *πραῦς*, the command is reflective of a virtue rather than a mark of a social construct. In this way, meekness rather than social poverty marks the transition from vices to virtues and “inheritance of the earth” functions as the reward.

Didache 3.7 and its Relationship to Psalm 36:11 LXX and Matthew 5:5

Both Psalm 37:11 (36:11 LXX) and Matthew 5:5 are generally connected to this Didache tradition. Clayton Jefford has helpfully documented this difficulty by

¹¹Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 100.

¹²Jean-Paul Audet, *La Didachè: Instructions des Apôtres, EBib* (Paris: Gabalda, 1958), 311.

¹³John S. Kloppenborg, “Poverty and Piety in Matthew, James, and the Didache,” in *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*, ed. Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, SBLSS 45 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 219.

¹⁴Kloppenborg, “Poverty and Piety in Matthew, James, and the Didache,” 219.

listing the source relations of Did. 3.7 alongside of Psalm 36:11 LXX and Matthew 5:5.¹⁵

Ps 36:11 LXX:	Did. 3.7:	Matt 5:5:
		μακάριοι
	Ἴσθι δὲ	
	πραῦς	οἱ πραεῖς
	ἐπεὶ	ὅτι
οἱ	οἱ	
δὲ		
πραεῖς	πραεῖς	αὐτοὶ
κληρονομήσουσιν	κληρονομήσουσι	κληρονομήσουσιν
	τὴν	τὴν
γῆν	γῆν	γῆν

My purpose here is not to comment on source relations. Rather, my interests concern the symmetry of “inheritance” and “meekness” expressions. Do these three traditions offer a unified reading of a similar expression? In this way, can we observe whether or not the Didachist is showing signs of continuing the interpretive tradition or showing modifications to the tradition?

Briefly, the textual coherence of Did. 3.7 is more aligned with Psalm 36 LXX than with Matthew 5. Didache 3.7 removes any form of macarism as expressed in Matthew 5, yet Did. 3.7 inserts a stative imperative—this change could be an interpretive modification to a macarism tradition. Also, *πραεῖς κληρονομήσουσι* in Did. 3.7 coheres more with Psalm 36 LXX than with Matthew 5. Furthermore, the broader contextual concerns of Psalm 36 LXX pit the wicked in contrast with the meek/oppressed. The contrasts of dual people groups may correspond to the

¹⁵Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 73–77.

oppression of some in the Didache's community (cf. note the social oppression in Did. 5.1–2).¹⁶

However, some Sermon on the Mount motifs permit paucity regarding this previous textual correlation: meek (Did. 3.7//Matt 5:5); patience (Did. 3.8); merciful (Did. 3.8//Matt 5:7); innocent (Did. 3.8); gentleness (Did. 3.8//Matt 5:9); good (Did. 3.8//Matt 5:48); listeners (Did. 3.8//Matt 7:24); non-personal exaltation (Did. 3.9//Matt 6:1); and associate with upright and humble (Did. 3.9; cf. Matt 6:1–18).

So, textually, Did. 3.7 is connected to Psalm 36:11 LXX. Yet, thematically, Did. 3.7 corresponds to both traditions in different ways: broader contextual concerns of Psalm 36 LXX and shared lexeme and virtue concerns of Matthew 5–7.¹⁷ For Davies and Allison, the author of the Didache “knew Matthew or . . . he knew Q^{mt} (as opposed to Q^{lk}).”¹⁸ If Matthew is a formative tradition, it is *via* reflection on the Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5–7)—oral or textual traditions. Yet, as Draper suggests, Did. 3.7 “forms part of the *Tugendkatalog* from the earliest stratum of the Way of Life (cf. 1QS 4:3) which has been embellished from Psalm 36:11.”¹⁹

Reading Psalm 36 LXX. It is rather striking to note the broader thematic symmetry between Psalm 36 LXX and Did. 1–6. For instance, Psalm 36:1 opens with two forms of people groups: the wicked and oppressors (ἐν πονηρευομένους Ps 36:1; ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ ποιοῦντι παρανομίας 36:7; ὁ ἁμαρτωλὸς 36:13, 16, 17, 20, 32; ἀσηβῆ

¹⁶Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 100.

¹⁷Garrow, *Matthew's Dependence on the Didache*, 84–85. According to Alan Garrow, the *teknon* teachings of Did. 3.1–6 may be an exposition of Ps 36 LXX. As Did. 3.7 appears in the tail-end of the *teknon* unit, Did. 3.7 operates as a sapiential exposition of Ps 36 LXX.

¹⁸W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew: Introduction and Commentary on Matthew I–VII*, vol. 1, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 451.

¹⁹Jonathan Draper, “The Jesus Tradition in the Didache,” in *The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels*, ed. David Wenham, vol. 5, Gospel Perspectives (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 272; Jonathan A. Draper, “The Jesus Tradition in the *Didache*,” in *The Didache in Modern Research*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper, AGJU 37 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 77.

ὑπερυψούμενον 36:35), and the righteous and oppressed (τόν δικαίον 36:12, 17, 21, 29; πτωχόν καί πένητα 36:14; τοὺς ὀσίους 36:28).²⁰ Also, the motif of “way” is also present (ἀποκάλυψον πρὸς κύριον τὴν ὁδὸν σου 36:5; φύλαξον τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ 36:34; Cf. 36:7).

The overall message of this Psalm reflects the oppression of the wicked, their pending retribution, and the inheritance of the land by the righteous.²¹ Thus, the wicked plot (παρατηρέω) against the righteous and gnash (βρύκω) their teeth at them (Ps 36:12). The wicked draw their swords (ρόμφαίαν ἐσπάσαντο) and their bow (ἐνέτειναν τόξον) so as to oppress the poor and needy (Ps 36:14). Their success is limited in that they will soon fade (36:2), eventually be cut off (36:9), and the Lord has determined their days (36:13).

Yet, the oppressed will find their hope in the Abrahamic promises (cf. 36:22) and will inherit the earth. Their character is often noted as trusting in the Lord (ἐλπισον ἐπὶ κύριον Ps 36:3), doing good (ποιεῖ χρηστότητα 36:3), and treasuring riches in the land (ποιμανθήσῃ ἐπὶ τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτῆς; נְיֻמָּס הַיְדֵי “tending to faithfulness” Ps 37:3 MT). Yet, it is those who await the Lord (οἱ ὑπομένοντες τὸν κύριον 36:9), exhibit meekness (οἱ πραεῖς 36:11), bless God (οἱ εὐλογοῦντες αὐτον 36:22), who are righteous (δίκαιοι 36:29) and exalted (ὑψώσει σε 36:34) that will inherit the earth.

Thus, according to Psalm 36 LXX, to inherit the land is the eschatological reward for enduring the oppression of the wicked and exhibiting particular virtues. Perpetual life in the land will be a form of reward (cf. 36:29). To inherit the land is a motivational concept to promote endurance of social oppression.

²⁰Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 74.

²¹Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 74. According to Jefford, the Psalmist attempts to address this crisis in two ways: (1) First, divine retribution is joined to the concept of disaster as the outcome of chastising YHWH; (2) Second, “the author offers a renewed eschatological hope that is derived from the promise of a homeland for the wandering/homeless Israel.”

Reading Matthew 5:5. When it comes to Matthew 5:5, it is relatively debated among Didache scholars to assert Matthean textual influence upon the composition of Did. 3.7. Even Matthew 5:5 seems to offer some form of source influence from Psalm 36:11 LXX and the thematic aphorism that the “meek/poor shall inherit the earth.”²² Although Psalm 36:11 LXX conveys the “poor” and “meek” of Israel, Matthew 5:5 adjusts the meekness tradition by making it a macarism. According to Christopher Tuckett, “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.”²³ The general condition and reward of the meek inheriting the earth (Ps 36:11) now offers a particular welcome to such meekness. Those who are meek will be blessed (*μακάριοι οἱ πραεῖς*; Matt 5:5).

Conceptually, however, there does not appear to be drastic distinctions between the three traditions. The recipients of the macarisms are oppressed with persecutions (Matt 5:11–12). Also, by following the virtues of the macarism, there will be some form of rewards offered. So, motifs of oppression and reward appear in both readings of Psalm 36 and Matthew 5.

Matthew 5:5 is imbedded within a list of eight other macarisms (Matt 5:3–12). Besides the final beatitude, they all have a similar literary structure.

Matthean Macarism Structure:

μακάριοι + virtue X

ὅτι + personal reward

The list of virtues range from poor in spirit (*οἱ πτωχοί*; Matt 5:3), to mourning (*οἱ*

²²Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 78.

²³Christopher M. Tuckett, “The *Didache* and the Writings That Later Formed the New Testament,” in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 101.

πεινθοῦντες; Matt 5:4), to hungering and thirsting for righteousness (οἱ πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην; Matt 5:6), and, finally, to persecution (οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης; Matt 5:10, cf. 5:11–12). Μακάριοι modifies each of these virtuous qualities.

Subsequently, some form of reward or outcome is then granted to such persons who qualify. These outcomes range from possessing the kingdom of heaven (αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν; Matt 5:3, 10), being comforted (αὐτοὶ παρακληθήσονται; Matt 5:4), seeing God (αὐτοὶ τὸν θεὸν ὄψονται; Matt 5:8), and receiving filial status (αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσονται; Matt 5:9).

This structure is important for reading Matthew 5:5 and the meekness aphorism. The virtue expressed is πραῦς and the outcome of such quality is αὐτοὶ κληρονομήσουσιν τὴν γῆν. The outcomes or rewards within the beatitudes reflect a form of eschatological outcome—especially notable is the inheritance motif, filial status, and ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. Thus, for meekness to be the head virtue, inheritance will be the subsequent reward. Furthermore, Hans Dieter Betz observes, “The implication for 5:5b is that at present the faithful do not possess or have dominion over the earth, but they have reason to hope that God will hand it over to them in the end.”²⁴ Davies and Allison reflect on the similar ideas between Matthew 5:5 and 5:3: “Hence 5.3 and 5.5 are in synonymous parallelism. No real difference in meaning between the two is to be discerned.”²⁵

If this relationship is so, then “poverty”²⁶ and “meekness” correspond to one another and “the kingdom of heaven” corresponds to “inheriting the earth.”

²⁴Hans Dieter Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain (Matthew 5:3–7:27 and Luke 6:20–49)*, ed. Adela Yarbro Collins, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 128.

²⁵Davies and Allison, *Matthew 1–7*, 1:449.

²⁶Betz rightly inquires as to whether or not πτωχός refers to economic poverty or is a spiritualized metaphor. Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 111.

Even if the μακάριοι expression reflects a “current condition” or an invitation to modify one’s condition,²⁷ the quality of meekness, as defined in Matthew 5:5, corresponds to an eschatological reward. Meekness is found elsewhere as a quality of Jesus (Matt 11:29; 21:5) and this beatitude, then, is a form of *imitatio Christi* motif. “Inheritance,” on the other hand, regularly conveys eschatological inheritance within the Gospel of Matthew: “. . . will inherit eternal life” (Matt 19:29) and “inherit the kingdom prepared for you” (Matt 25:34).

Yet, this concept of poverty and inheritance is found in the combined use of Matthew 5:3 along with Matthew 5:5.

Matt 5:3: μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.

Matt 5:5: μακάριοι οἱ πραεῖς, ὅτι αὐτοὶ κληρονομήσουσιν τὴν γῆν.

Here, Matthew 5:3a conveys the poverty motif, but is not matched with the inheritance motif (cf. Isa 61:7). It has a reward of ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. So, poverty in Matthew 5:3a is matched with a kingdom motif. According to Davies and Allison, Matthew 5:3 is attributed to Q material (i.e., Q 6:20b) because of its affinity with Luke 6:20, and Matthew 5:5 does “not display typical Matthean vocabulary or interests” and attributed to Q^{mt}.²⁸ To bless the poor, as the Jesus tradition expresses in Matthew 5:3, “is that of eschatological reversal.”²⁹ For Matthew 5:3, an extra expression is added to the poverty motif to localize it τῷ πνεύματι. Davies and Allison argue that this phrase connotes a religious meaning that does not exclude an

²⁷According to Davies and Allison, they make note of the two possibilities. “The πραεῖς are not so much actively seeking to avoid hubris (an attitude) as they are, as a matter of fact, powerless in the eyes of the world (a condition).” Davies and Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 1:449.

²⁸Davies and Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 434. Later in Davies and Allison’s argument, they compare Matt 5:3–12 to Isa 61. They identify Matt 5:3 and 4 as having close allusions to Isa 61:1. Yet, Matt 5:5 is comparatively weaker and “assigned not to Q^{mt} but to an earlier stage of Q.” Davies and Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 438.

²⁹Davies and Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 435.

economic implication.³⁰ The phrase is likewise found in 1QM XIV, 7 (עני רוח) whereby the “sons of light” are described as those who are poor in spirit (cf. 1QH VI, 3)—poverty appears alongside a macarism.

This combination of poverty and kingdom is likewise found in Luke 6:20, Gos. Thom. 54, and Pol. *Phil.* 2.3.

Luke 6:20: Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί, ὅτι ὑμετέρα ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

Gos. Thom. 54: πεχε ις δε ρῆμακαριος νε ρηκε δε τωτῆ τε τηῆτερο νῆπηγε`

Pol. *Phil.* 2.3: μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί καὶ οἱ διωκόμενοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

Polycarp’s tradition joins together both poverty and persecution to the kingdom motif, probably through shared oral Jesus tradition.³¹ What these few traditions do demonstrate, especially when compared with Did. 3.7, is how the Didachist utilizes an early Christian tradition that deescalates the kingdom and eschatological motif.³²

Some Didache scholars are unclear as to what type of influences that Matthew and Didache share. “Some commentators,” as suggested by Kloppenborg, “seem desperate to retain a strong economic perspective for Matthew’s beatitudes. Yet Matthew has relatively little to say about the poor or poverty generally.”³³ According to Jefford, this tradition, as offered by the Historical Jesus, may in fact offer “little deviation here from the primary emphasis that is found in Ps 37.”³⁴ Thus,

³⁰Davies and Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 443; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, ed. Helmut Koester, trans. James E. Crouch, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 192.

³¹Paul Hartog, ed., *Polycarp’s Epistle to the Philippians and the Martyrdom of Polycarp: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*, OAF (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 109–10; Stephen E. Young, *Jesus Tradition in the Apostolic Fathers: Their Explicit Appeals to the Words of Jesus in Light of Orality Studies*, WUNT 2/311 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 165–66.

³²Contra Joseph Verheyden, “Eschatology in the Didache and the Gospel of Matthew,” in *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?*, ed. Huub van de Sandt (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2005), 193.

³³Kloppenborg, “Poverty and Piety in Matthew, James, and the Didache,” 224. Kloppenborg cites as example, W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), 213.

³⁴Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 76.

the poverty notion “symbolizes a new self-consciousness within the early Christian community.”³⁵ And quoting Hans Dieter Betz, Jefford proceeds to suggest that the Matthean conclusion emphasizes “the eschatological promise, which dominates the core of the beatitudes through this characterization of the beatitudes as a ‘greatly abbreviated apocalyptic vision of the world to come.’”³⁶

So, what are these interpretive connections to Did. 3.7, if any? If composition of Did. 3.7 is textually dependent upon Psalm 36:11 LXX and/or Matthew 5:5, it remains difficult to dismiss the eschatological notion of a meekness aphorism attached to an eschatological inheritance.³⁷ Psalm 36 LXX conveys an oppressed group that will eventually find relief by inheriting the land as reward. Matthew 5:5 resides within a list of beatitudes. The thematic links along with the reward elements in Matthew 5:3–10 help influence an eschatological outcome especially within the Matthean tradition. Moreover, “inheritance” throughout Matthew is tied to eschatological inheritance.

Thus, even if the Didache tradition is not textually dependent upon either Psalm 36:11 or Matthew 5:5—which is difficult not to find some form of relationship—the Didache continues the notion of meekness and inheritance. Yet, I suggest the eschatological reward is not the focal point in Did. 3 due to the vice and virtue lists.

³⁵Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 76.

³⁶Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 76; Hans Dieter Betz, *Essays on the Sermon on the Mount* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1985), 24.

³⁷Aaron Milavec, *The Didache: Faith, Hope, & Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50–70 C.E.* (New York: Newman Press, 2003), 346. Milavec joins the inheritance reward “only when God returns to set things right.” Though noting the connection to the eschatological concept, Milavec may proceed too far with this argument to connect it with the Lord’s return. Nothing is found in Did. 3.7 or the literary context to suggest this reading.

Didache 3.7 and Related Two Ways Metaphors

Another, albeit slightly related, question asks about the relationship of the “meek” and “inheritance” motif in other Two Ways texts. If Psalm 36 LXX and Matthew 5:5 convey a form of eschatological ideas and if this concept enters into the Two Ways metaphor, how do other Two Ways texts maintain and continue such traditions, if at all?

Of the multiple Two Ways texts, this tradition is reflected only in early Christian versions of the Two Ways. For example, 1QS IV, 4 offers a list of virtues and neglects to mention meekness. Even the nuanced Two Ways version in T. Ash. 1–7 refrains from offering the community a full list of virtues. Rather, this version provides a long list of vices to avoid.

It is not until the second-century versions of the Two Ways that *πραῦς* merges into the larger tradition. In Herm. Mand. 6.2.3 (36.3), *πραῦς* is a characteristic of the angel of righteousness that can rise up within a person’s heart. Meekness appears in a list of virtues that also incorporates many others, including sensitivity (*τρυφερός*), modesty (*αἰσχυντηρός*), and mildness/well-ordered (*ἡσύχιος*).

Often, Barn. 19.4 is joined with Did. 3.7, and rightly so.³⁸ Rather than framing this expression in a macarism, as is the case in Matthew 5:5, Barn. 19.4 merely reads *ἔση πραῦς*. Although containing no inheritance theme, Barn. 19.4 joins this meekness virtue along with *ἡσύχιος*. These two terms join the Barnabas tradition together with Herm. Mand. 6.2.3 (36.3) along with other Jewish and Christian traditions. The themes of *πραῦς* and *ἡσύχιος* appear in Pss. Sol. 12.5, 1 Peter 3:4, and again in Herm. Mand. 5.2.6 (34.6). Yet, 1 Clem. 13.4 offers the most unique tradition. It joins *πραῦς* and *ἡσύχιος* together but frames these terms within a

³⁸Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 77–78.

quotation formula of Isaiah 66:2: φησιν γὰρ ὁ ἅγιος λόγος ἐπὶ τίνα ἐπιβλέψω ἀλλ' ἢ ἐπὶ τὸν πραῦν καὶ ἡσύχιον καὶ τρέμοντά μου τὰ λόγια. This quotation from Isaiah 66:2 LXX exchanges ἐπὶ τὸν ταπεινὸν for ἐπὶ τὸν πραῦν in 1 Clem. 13.4.

Moreover, returning to the Didache's tradition to assess 3.7–8, these two traditions of πραῦς and ἡσύχιος merge together. As πραῦς appears in Did. 3.7 as the head of a virtue list, including ἡσύχιος, Did. 3.8 also incorporates the expression τρέμων τοὺς λόγους (“trembling at the words”). It may be that Did. 3.8 assumes its textual referent from Isaiah 66:2 or it may be that Barn. 19.4 finds textual dependency from a few interrelated traditions (Isa 66:2; cf. 1 Clem. 13.4) and redacts unique terminology. Either way, Did. 3.7–8 parallels Barn. 19.4, and yet Barnabas does not maintain any form of inheritance or eschatological motifs.

Subsequent Two Ways texts cohere with the Didache's version of meekness inheriting the earth. In *Doctr.* 3.7, meekness is maintained as the prime virtue to inherit the earth. To become meek (*esto autem mansuetus*) is the prerequisite to inherit the “sacred earth” (*sanctam terram*). Apostolic Constitutions 7.7.3 combines a few traditions together: ἴσθι δὲ πρᾶος ὡς Μωϋσῆς καὶ Δαυὶδ ἐπεὶ οἱ πραεῖς κληρονομήσουσιν τὴν γῆν. By using ἴσθι and ἐπεὶ, it corresponds to the expressions in Did. 3.7; however, the Apostolic Constitutions highlights two Hebrew Bible figures: Moses (cf. Num 12:3 LXX ὁ ἄνθρωπος Μωϋσῆς πραῦς σφόδρα) and David (cf. Ps 131:1 LXX μνήσθητι κύριε τοῦ Δαυιδ καὶ πάσης τῆς πραῦτητος αὐτοῦ). Moreover, Apos. Const. 7.8.1 mentions mercy (γίνου ἐλεήμων) and connects it to the corresponding macarism: μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες. The Latin counterpart, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, likewise maintains meek and inheritance of the earth aphorism: *sis vero mitis ut Moses et David quandoquidem mites possidebunt terram* (Did. Apos. 7.7.3).

Two additional Two Ways texts are worth mentioning briefly. Both third-century traditions,³⁹ *Canons of the Holy Apostles* and *Epitome of the Apostolic Commands*, offer a nuanced rendition of this Didache tradition. Rather than meekness as the primary virtue, both traditions offer the virtue of generosity instead. Also, rather than inheriting the earth, both traditions change “the earth” to “the kingdom.” So, *Canons*, in Nathanael’s expression, reads the generous will inherit τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ; *Epitome* 11.4 reads similarly but exchanges τοῦ θεοῦ with τῶν οὐρανῶν.

What this brief portion demonstrates is the continuation of the meekness motif, matched with inheritance, occurs in other early Christian versions of the Two Ways. Each text has a unique version, but maintains variations of the same aphorism. Moreover, the idea of inheriting τὴν γῆν is either maintained (*Apos. Const.* 7.7.3; *Did. Apos.* 7.7.3), or accentuated to be sacred earth (*Doctr.* 3.7) or to the kingdom (*Canons*; *Epitome*).

History of Interpretation of Psalm 36:11 LXX and Matthew 5:5

Beyond assessing the text relations of Psalm 36 LXX and Matthew 5:5, and other Two Ways texts, the following section will assess ancient Jewish and early Christian traditions that convey “meekness” and “inheritance” motifs in relation to one another. Methodologically, I am not necessarily arguing for textual influence of previous traditions—except that of some traditions receiving Psalm 36:11 LXX or Matthew 5:5. Rather, I remain more interested in tracing the myriad of interpretive options of this continuing tradition. Thus, history of interpretation—which may or

³⁹Alistair Stewart-Sykes, ed., *On the Two Ways: Life or Death, Light or Darkness: Foundational Texts in the Tradition*, PPS 41 (Yonkers, NY: St. Vladimirs Seminary Press, 2011), 95.

may not include text quotations—observes the *afterlife* of a given text.⁴⁰ For our purposes, the following will offer interpretive possibilities, potential trajectories of texts (Ps 36:11 LXX and Matt 5:5), and observe traditions that continue “meekness” and “inheritance” ideas.

In the Septuagint and OT Pseudepigrapha, meekness is rarely a prerequisite virtue for inheritance. Often, meekness is a social condition (Job 24:4; 36:15; Pss 36:11; 75:10; 146:6 LXX; Isa 26:6; Joel 4:11; Zech 9:9; Sir 10.15) rather than a virtue (Pss 24:9; 33:3; 149:4 LXX). Only Psalm 36:11 ties together meekness and inheritance motifs. Inheriting land is often reward for covenant obedience (Deut 4:1; Ps 43:4 LXX; Isa 49:8; Tob 4.12; 2 Esd 9.11; Jub. 32.18–19), endurance in exile (cf. Sir 45.22; 46.8; Bar 1.8)—although the two concepts of covenant obedience are not mutually exclusive—or a future reward (cf. Ps 24:13 LXX; Isa 54:3; 57:13; 60:21; 65:9; Pss. Sol. 12.6; 14.10). In 1 En. 5.7, virtue and vice qualities are ascribed to both the elect and to the wicked. For the elect, “they shall inherit the earth.” Thus, the concept of meekness and inheritance are rarely joined together, although inheritance of land/earth motifs are predominately eschatological and future-oriented.

In Qumranic literature, the meek (ענויים) can refer to an oppressed social group whereby “inheritance of the land” extends to the earth.⁴¹ 4Q171⁴² is a commentary on Psalm 37. The social group of the poor (cf. 1QpHab XII, 1–9) will be

⁴⁰Mark Knight, “*Wirkungsgeschichte*, Reception History, Reception Theory,” *JSNT* 33, no. 2 (2010): 137–46.

⁴¹According to Benjamin Wright, “The terms meaning ‘poor’ or ‘poverty,’ however, are quite diverse. . . . The only occurrence of עני in extant fragments comes in 4Q417 2 I 14 (overlapped by 4Q418a 22). . . . There is no indication that the term as it is used here (4QInstruction) connotes poor economic status as it can in other wisdom texts.” Benjamin G. Wright III, “The Categories of Rich and Poor in the Qumran Sapiential Literature,” in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May, 2001*, ed. John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling, and Ruth A. Clements, STDJ 51 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 110.

⁴²Prior to more standardized forms of cataloguing Qumran texts, 4Q171 commentary on Ps 37 was also recorded as 4QPs37.

delivered from the snares of Belial and subsequently inherit the earth (cf. 4Q171 II, 9–11). They are in a time of “exile.” These “poor ones” will endure a season of payment and then eventually be released to possess the earth (4Q171 II, 11–12). Also, the wicked and blessed persons are compared to one another as interpretive comments on the poor inheriting the earth (4Q171 III, 8–11).⁴³ Furthermore, it is the poor, as opposed to the wicked, that will possess the entire world as an inheritance (4Q171 3.10). Thus, the land can reflect two images (4Q171 III, 10–11): (1) “Land” is expanded to refer to the whole world; and (2) To inherit the “land” is to inherit space that is described as sacred and cultic space—“high mountain” and “sanctuary”.⁴⁴

Prior to introducing Christian literature, a function of *πραῦς* in Graeco-Roman literature conveys a quality of meekness that is contrasted to the Hebrew Bible. That is, *πραῦς* is not portrayed solely as a socially oppressed group, but rather, as a virtuous quality. *Πραῦς* and *πράως* are used in contrast to anger (cf. Epictetus, *Ench.*, 42; *Diatr.*, III.20.9; Plato, *Euthyd.* 303d). Plato likens it to a quality in symmetry with *ἴλαος* (“propitious,” “gracious”; *Resp.* 8.566e). In contrast to acting *χαλεπός* (“cruelly,” “miserably,” “harshly”; *Resp.* 2.375c) to one’s enemy, *πραῦς* is the virtuous counterpart to act towards one’s own antagonist (*Resp.*, 2.375c). Of the Greek deities, *πραῦς* is a disposition towards humanity (Xenophon, *Oec.*, 15.4). As a lexical derivation of *πραῦς*, *πραότης* is contrasted with *ὀργιλότης* (“irascibility”;

⁴³4Q171 II, 8–11: “The wicked borrow but does not pay back, while the just man is sympathetic and gives. For those who are blessed [by him shall possess] the land, but those who are cursed by him [shall be cut] off. Its interpretation concerns the congregation of the poor [to whom is] the inheritance of the whole [. . .] They will inherit the high mountain of Isra[el and] delight [in his] holy mountain.” Translation from García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998), 1:345.

⁴⁴As Kloppenborg identifies, “It is crucial to note that neither Did. 3:7 nor Matt 5:5 follows this interpretation.” Van de Sandt and Flusser, likewise, regard a similar position. Kloppenborg, “Poverty and Piety in Matthew, James, and the Didache,” 221; van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 134.

Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 1125b.26) and ὀργή (“anger”; Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1380a.6).

When assessing the Greek New Testament, the use of *πραῦς* is more reminiscent of Graeco-Roman virtue concepts than an ancient Jewish concept that conveys socially oppressed groups of people. Besides Matthew 5:5, *πραῦς* is a characteristic of Jesus (Matt 11:29; 21:5) or of a household code virtue list (1 Pet 3:3). Πτωχός, joined closely to Matthew 5:3 and 5:5, “came to be self-designation for meek, humiliated, and oppressed people of God (Isa 10.2; 26.6; Pss. Sol 5.2, 11; 10.6; 15.1; 18.2; 5 Apoc. Syr. Pss. 2.18; 1QpHab. 12.3; 1QM 14.7; 1QH 5.13–14; 4QpPsa 2.9–10.”⁴⁵ As Davies and Allison interpret Matthew 5:3, “This is the sense in which *πτωχός* is used in the beatitudes”⁴⁶ and no real discernable difference resides between Matthew 5:3 and 5:5.⁴⁷ *Πραῦτης* is contrasted to vices (1 Cor 4:21; Gal 6:1; 2 Tim 2:25; Tit 3:2; Jas 1:21; 3:13; 1 Pet 3:16), appears in virtue lists (Gal 5:23; Eph 4:2; Col 3:12), or emblematic of the character of Jesus (2 Cor 10:1). Yet, in all these lists, not one mention of “inheritance” is linked with *πραῦς* outside of Matthew 5:5. The Graeco-Roman tradition matched with the Greek New Testament offers a holistically distinct idea from early Judaism. Meekness more often functions as a virtue, as opposed to a socially oppressed group.

As interpretive traditions continue into the second and third centuries, NT Pseudepigrapha, Apostolic Fathers, and the Early Christian literature continue to offer helpful insight. Inheritance and meekness concepts are not joined together—except Did. 3.7. For example, *πραῦς* and *πραῦτης* are considered a general virtue (1 Clem. 13.4; 21.7; 30.8; 61.2; Ign. *Eph.* 10.2; Ign. *Trall.* 4.2; Ign. *Pol.* 2.1; 6.2; Barn. 19.4; Herm. Mand. 5.2.6 [34.6]; 6.2.3 [36.3]; 11.8 [43.8]; 12.3.1 [46.1]; Diogn. 7.4),

⁴⁵Davies and Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 443. 4QpPsa is updated to newer DSS categorization: 4Q171.

⁴⁶Davies and Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 443.

⁴⁷Davies and Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 449.

virtue of ecclesial figures (Ign. *Trall.* 3.2; Did. 15.1), or a quality lacking from certain persons (Did. 5.2; Barn. 20.2). Thus, in some of early Christian literature, *πραῦς* reflects a virtuous quality and is generally unrelated to inheritance motifs. Therefore, if these traditions of “meekness” and “inheritance” correspond to some ideas in Psalm 36:11 LXX, then the implications of earliest Christianity are reorganized around virtue qualities as opposed to oppressive situations.

The interpretation of Matthew 5:5 within other second-century traditions reflect a virtuous prerequisite to the eschatological inheritance of the world—i.e., an eschatological kingdom in some Christian traditions. Often, Matthew 5:5 is used to evoke the virtue of meekness for the Christian life (cf. Cyprian, *Test.* 3.5; Tertullian, *Pat.* 11.8; Clement, *Strom.* IV.6). According to Origen of Alexandria, the question is raised as to whether or not the present earth is full of curses as a result of the work of Adam. Offering a brief exposition of Psalm 36 LXX—whereby he quotes Psalm 36:9, 11, 22, 29, 34 LXX—he concludes “and is not the existence of the pure earth in the pure heaven indicated to those able to understand?”⁴⁸ Furthermore, explaining “this heaven and earth” as the supreme blessedness, it will be the “meek and gentle [who have been] received for an inheritance.”⁴⁹ Even using expressions from Psalm 36:11 LXX and Matthew 5:5, “to inherit the earth” accentuates the concept to inherit the kingdom of heaven (cf. *Princ.* III.6.8).⁵⁰

Some New Testament Apocrypha convey a clearer referent to the apocalyptic or eschatological premise of meekness and inheritance motifs. In Apoc. Paul 21, an angel is an apocalyptic mediator to Paul the apostle. They are recording

⁴⁸Origen, *Cels.* VII.29. (Origen, *Contra Celsum*, trans. Henry Chadwick (London: Cambridge University Press, 1953), 418.)

⁴⁹Origen, *Princ.* II.iii.7. (Origen, *On First Principles*, trans. G. W. Butterworth (Notre Dame, IN: Ave Maria Press, 2013), 114.)

⁵⁰Origen, *Princ.* II.iii.7.

his journeys to the multiple heavens (cf. 2 Cor 12). Moving from the third to the second heaven, this heavenly position will become the land of the promise (Apoc. Paul 21). It is the “meek” who will inherit this earth. Then the earth is relegated to a chiliastic rule of God over his kingdom (Apoc. Paul 21). Reminiscent of the humble and merciful in Matthew 5:3 and 5:7, these qualities will characterize the ones who will inherit the kingdom of God (Acts Thom. 66). “Meekness” is later considered a virtue in Acts Thom. 94. Yet, earthly rewards are given to the poor, who are blessed (Ps.-Clem. I.61).

Section Conclusion: Value of History of Interpretation and Didache 3.7

So, do any of the aforementioned traditions help offer interpretive trajectories for Did. 3.7? The prevalent aphorism of meek inheriting the earth/kingdom of God is fundamentally an eschatological reward or blessing. Meekness within the present life confirms a subsequent inheritance as reward. Although some traditions differ from this given premise, they are the exception and not the rule.

Furthermore, the concept of “meek” within Jewish tradition differs from a Graeco-Roman and subsequent early Christian framework. The “meek” are often seen as an oppressed group and, through their endurance, they will receive their inheritance. Yet, in Graeco-Roman texts, *πραῦς* is a virtuous quality that the early Christian tradition assumes.

Yet, for the Didachist, how do these traditions function? Does the Didachist draw from Psalm 36:11 LXX or Matthew 5:5 in terms of source composition? Given the vice and virtue lists in Did. 3.1–10, Did. 3.7 finds more continuity with the Graeco-Roman and New Testament thematic influences. In concert with Kloppenborg, “rather than expressing beliefs about the redemption of

the poor, Did. 3:7–8 strings together virtues associated with moral instruction.”⁵¹ Rather than expressing the Jewish piety of *anawim* or a socially oppressed group,⁵² the Didache is concerned with the moral and virtuous instruction of τέκνον μου.⁵³

Given these traditions, how is Did. 3.7 related to the apocalyptic or eschatological concerns of this tradition? Furthermore, if πραῦς develops more as a prized virtue how does the uniqueness of “inheritance” motifs affect this reading? In other words, does the previous evidence counter an eschatological tradition? Because “meekness” as it relates to “inheritance” is relatively minimal, does this relationship serve to strengthen a connection to Jewish tradition for both Matthew 5:5 and Did. 3.7? Given the evidence in early Christian tradition, it remains quite difficult not to see some form of eschatological tradition of the meek inheriting the earth.

However, given the proclivity to vice and virtue qualities in Did. 3, I do perceive the weight of evidence to favor concern for virtue as opposed to eschatological motifs. Because the majority of traditions regard this aphorism as eschatological in nature, does the Didachist truly have a choice to redact it? Even if virtue is the prevalent focus, the Didachist must explicitly counter the eschatological concerns to suggest something other than the base tradition. Nothing in Did. 3 seems to suggest an eschatological element—except Did. 3.7. Yet, a natural reading of the meek inheriting the earth is fundamentally eschatological that it would be difficult to imagine early readers of Did. 3.7 concluding anything different.

⁵¹Kloppenborg, “Poverty and Piety in Matthew, James, and the Didache,” 222.

⁵²Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 78.

⁵³Kloppenborg, “Poverty and Piety in Matthew, James, and the Didache,” 222.

“Remember the One Who Speaks the Word of God to You” (Did. 4.1–2)

A brief textual comparison between Did. 4.1–2 and Barn. 19.9–10 may reveal a different apocalyptic rendering of a similar group of expressions. The Didachist gives a final τέκνον μου instruction, which harkens for the “child” to remember those teaching them and to seek out the company of the saints. As one compares the similar tradition with Barn. 19.9–10, a number of notable differences appear.

Did. 4.1–2:

(1) Τέκνον μου, τοῦ λαλοῦντός σοι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ μνησθήσῃ νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, τιμήσεις δὲ αὐτὸν ὡς κύριον· ὅθεν γὰρ ἡ κυριότης λαλεῖται, ἐκεῖ κύριός ἐστιν. (2) ἐκζητήσεις δὲ καθ’ ἡμέραν τὰ πρόσωπα τῶν ἁγίων, ἵνα ἐπαναπαῆς τοῖς λόγοις αὐτῶν.

Trans: “My child, remember night and day the one speaking the word of God. You shall honor him as Lord. For whenever the Lord’s nature is spoken, there the Lord is. You shall seek each day the presence of the saints so that you may find comfort in their words.”

Barn. 19.9b–10:

(9b) ἀγαπήσεις ὡς κόρην τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου πάντα τὸν λαλοῦντά σοι τὸν λόγον κυρίου. (10) μνησθήσῃ ἡμέραν κρίσεως νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, καὶ ἐκζητήσεις καθ’ ἐκάστην ἡμέραν τὰ πρόσωπα τῶν ἁγίων, ἢ διὰ λόγου κοπιῶν καὶ πορευόμενος εἰς τὸ παρακαλέσαι καὶ μελετῶν εἰς τὸ σῶσαι ψυχὴν τῷ λόγῳ, ἢ διὰ τῶν χειρῶν σου ἐργάσῃ εἰς λύτρον ἁμαρτιῶν σου

Trans: “You shall love, as the apple of your eye, all those speaking to you the word of the Lord. Remember the day of judgment night and day and you shall seek the presence of the saints according to each day, either laboring through the word and going out to comfort and endeavoring to save the soul by the word, or you shall work with your hands so as *to provide* a ransom for your sins.”

When comparing these texts, the differences are readily noticeable. These traditions remain closely related because of similar themes and location in the way of life instruction: honor those who speak the word of the Lord; remember them daily; and seek out the presence of the saints. But it still raises a question, where is the apocalyptic feature in this Didache tradition?

The loose apocalyptic tradition is not found in the Didache’s instruction, but in the Barnabas tradition. According to Did. 4.1, τέκνον μου remembers those

speaking the word of the Lord. Similar to Did. 4.1–2, Barn. 19.9b offers an initial admonition to love those speaking the word and to remember. Rather than remembering the teachers, Barn. 19.10a records *ἡμέραν κρίσεως* (“day of judgment”) as the object of their remembrance. As Ferdinand Prostmeier reflects, “Durch den Gegenstand des *μιμνήσκειν*, nämlich die *ἡμέρα κρίσεως*, ist dieses tägliche (*καθ’ ἐκάστην ἡμέραν*) Nachsinnen auf das Eschaton ausgerichtet.”⁵⁴ Prostmeier continues to suggest that this reflection “Weil dieses Nachsinnen soteriologische Folge des Christusereignisses ist, sind *μνησθήση* and *ἐκζητήσεις* Mahnungen für die Zeit der Kirche.”⁵⁵

Barnabas may evoke the final judgment in Barn. 19.10 as a means to cohere with the second of three doctrines in Barn. 1.6.⁵⁶

Barn. 1.6: Τρία οὖν δόγματα ἐστὶν κυρίου· ζωῆς ἐλπίς, ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος πίστεως ἡμῶν· καὶ δικαιοσύνη, κρίσεως ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος· ἀγάπη εὐφροσύνης καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσεως, ἔργων ἐν δικαιοσύνη μαρτυρία.

Trans: Then, there are three doctrines of the Lord: (1) hope of life, the beginning and completion of our faith; (2) righteousness, the beginning and end of judgment; (3) love of gladness and rejoicing, the testimony of works in righteousness.

Matti Myllykoski also notes that Barn. 19.10 is formulated without reference to Jesus (i.e., *ὡς κύριον*) and also adds the command to love the teacher “as the apple of your eye.”⁵⁷ He subsequently suggests that the differences between Did. 4.1 and Barn. 19.9–10 is “because the author [i.e., Barnabas] has moved the reader’s attention toward responsibility in the day of the eschatological judgment.”⁵⁸ Niederwimmer,

⁵⁴“Through the object of the *μιμνήσκειν*, namely the *ἡμέρα κρίσεως*, this daily (*καθ’ ἐκάστην ἡμέραν*) contemplation of the eschaton is oriented.” Ferdinand R. Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief*, KAV 8 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), 552–53.

⁵⁵“Is a soteriological consequence of the Christ event” and *μνησθήση* and *ἐκζητήσεις* “are reminders for the time of the Church.” Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 553.

⁵⁶Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 553.

⁵⁷Myllykoski, “Without Decree,” 437.

⁵⁸Myllykoski, “Without Decree,” 445.

likewise, suggests the gathering motif of Barn. 19.10 is framed within an eschatological context.⁵⁹ Even as Pardee comments, the timing of such command proves to be quite difficult.

Exactly when does the context change from immediate action to a future time? Is the command to “remember [μνησθήσῃ] night and the day the one who preaches God’s word to you and honor [τιμήσεις] him as though he were Lord” (4.1) or to “seek out [ἐκζητήσεις] daily the presence of the saints, so that you may find support in their words” (4.2) to apply only after admission to the community?⁶⁰

According to Jefford, the Didachist demonstrates a propensity to incorporate some redactional comments.⁶¹ He contends, “The Didachist feels a certain freedom to manipulate the Two Ways source as needed, which thereby suggests that the source has entered the construction of the Didache as an authoritative text whose value is derived from its framework.”⁶² However, in this case, the opposite has ensued. The Didachist has refrained from including these comments and represents a stabilized form of the Two Ways, and Barnabas adds these redactional comments that are unique to the Two Ways.

Within Jewish and Christian tradition, the day of judgment is the final eschatological judgment and retribution. In Jewish tradition, the *ἡμέραν κρίσεως* consists of the Lord taking vengeance, sending worms and fire upon God’s enemies (Jdt 16.17) and the death of sinners (Pss. Sol. 15.12). It is a day of recompense on behalf of Zion (Isa 34:8).

In this regard, early Christian tradition finds much in common with this Jewish teaching. The *ἡμέραν κρίσεως* may not be bearable for some (Matt 10:15; 11:22,

⁵⁹Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 215.

⁶⁰Nancy Pardee, “The Didache and Oral Theory,” in *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, ECL 14 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 320.

⁶¹Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 83.

⁶²Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 83.

24). People will be required to give an account for careless words (Matt 12:36). In Hebrews 13:7, people are to remember one's ecclesial leaders, similar to that of Did. 4.1, yet Hebrews 13 is framed without a day of judgment concept. This *ἡμέραν κρίσεως* is looming in the future (2 Pet 2:9; 3:7). The cosmos will dissolve and the sins of people will be exposed (2 Clem. 16.3). For those who acted impiously and pervert the commandments of Jesus will be put on display where the worm does not die and the fire is not extinguished (2 Clem. 17.6–7). Even among the final admonitions in Barn. 21, the community members are to practice God's instruction so that "you may be found in the day of instruction" (Barn. 21.6).

Thus, we ask, if *ἡμέραν κρίσεως* is broadly defined as an apocalyptic form of judgment in the final eschaton, why is the instruction lacking in Did. 4.1–2? Rather than scrutinizing the Didache tradition, it may prove more helpful to inquire more critically of the Barnabas tradition. In this case, is it possible to identify which text provides a more stable version of the Two Ways? That is, if other early Christian Two Ways incorporate this apocalyptic phrase, then we may conclude that the Didache has redacted a previous tradition. But if the inverse is shown, then it may communicate that Barnabas has redacted the Two Ways instruction.

No other early Christian Two Ways text includes such apocalyptic phrase as it coordinates with the "remembrance" tradition. *De Doctrina* 4.1–2 generally maintains coherence with the Didache's version. "Those who speak to you the words of the Lord God, you shall remember night and day" (*Doctr.* 4.1–2; *qui loquitur tibi verbum domini dei, memineris die ac nocte*). As compared to Did. 4.1, the tradition maintains the same word order with the addition of *deus*.

Traditions in the second and third centuries utilize this similar tradition. The Ecclesiastical Canons of the Apostles and Epitome of the Apostolic Commands sound reminiscent of the Barnabas tradition because they retain the "apple of the eye" expression, but both lack the "day of judgment" referent (cf. 1 En. 100.5).

Canons reads, “Child, you shall love as the apple of your eye the one who speaks to you the word of God . . . you shall remember him night and day, you shall honour him as master.”⁶³ Epitome 12 reads verbatim with the exception of the final clause: “you shall honour him as the Lord.”⁶⁴

In addition, other fourth-century Two Ways lack this apocalyptic expression. This pattern demonstrates, that, even if the apocalyptic form was the more stable tradition, then it falls out of use well before these versions. In Apos. Con. 7.9, the instruction, likewise, is to honor (δοξάσεις) and be mindful (μνησθήση αὐτοῦ) of the one teaching both day and night: τὸν λαλοῦντά σοι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ δοξάσεις μνησθήση δὲ αὐτοῦ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς (“you shall honor the one speaking the word of God to you and you shall remember her/him day and night”). The Apostolic Constitutions redacts the Didache’s τιμήσεις δὲ αὐτὸν ὡς κύριον tradition. Apostolic Constitution 7.9 evokes an honor tradition, yet “not as the author of your birth” but as the one who is providing their well-being. The tradition in Didascalia too maintains a similar Latin tradition: *glorificabis, eiusque eris memor die ac nocte* (Did. Apos. 7.9).

The *Life of Shenoute*, fifth-century monastic tradition, slightly modifies this tradition. Rather than remembering the “one who teaches,” this tradition evokes a memory for “the word of God within your heart, night and day.”⁶⁵ But even still, the modified reception of this tradition neglects to include any apocalyptic imagery.

In the variety of these Two Ways texts, the remembrance tradition generally coheres with one another. Yet, all unanimously neglect to incorporate any concept of eschatological judgment. Thus, Did. 4.1–2 could be an occasion for an

⁶³Stewart-Sykes, *On the Two Ways*, 105.

⁶⁴Stewart-Sykes, *On the Two Ways*, 109.

⁶⁵Stewart-Sykes, *On the Two Ways*, 123.

apocalyptic insertion, yet the Didachist refrains from doing so. This argument is especially notable if one agrees with Niederwimmer’s observations. “The change in the object of *μιμνήσκεισθαι* (in Barnabas it is the *ἡμέρα κρίσεως*, and in the other versions it is the teacher) is still older than the filiation that led to *Doctrina* and *Didache*.”⁶⁶ Because the apocalyptic insertions are not in subsequent traditions, Barnabas may reflect an older recension of the Two Ways or amends the text to cohere with Barn. 1.6.

In terms of this tradition in Did. 4.1–2 and Barn. 19.9b–10, it may be that the *Didache* maintains a more stable version of the Two Ways tractate—as attested in the *De Doctrina* and the discernable literary structure of Did. 4.⁶⁷ According to van de Sandt and Flusser,

The phrase to be mindful of the proclaimer of God’s word (cf. Doctr./Did 4:1) is modified in Barnabas, where the day of judgment is introduced. Because this reference interrupts the line of thought in this particular place in Barnabas, it is likely that Doctr., Did, ACO [Apostolic Church Order] and E [Epitome of the Canons of the Holy Apostles] represent the source here on which Barnabas drew.⁶⁸

If these assessments bear upon the source traditions, then it is Barnabas who demonstrates a redactional insertion of the judgment tradition, and not the *Didache*, in veering from a Two Ways tractate.

**“Bear the Entire Yoke of the Lord . . . and You
Shall be ΤΕΛΕΙΟΣ” (Did. 6.2)**

Although Did. 6.2 is part of the literary frame of the Two Ways and could possibly have been explained in the previous chapter, the implications for my overall argument necessitate a portion devoted to this section.

⁶⁶Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 105n12.

⁶⁷Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 103. Furthermore, as Niederwimmer discerns, “this would have been the more original [*Didache*’s version], while Barnabas has destroyed the structure.”

⁶⁸van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 76–77.

Did. 6.2: εἰ μὲν γὰρ δύνασαι βαστάσαι ὅλον τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου τέλειος ἔσῃ εἰ δ' οὐ δύνασαι ὁ δύνῃ τοῦτο ποίει

Trans: “For if you are able to bear the whole yoke of the Lord, you shall be complete. But if you are not able [to do so], what you are able, do this.”

According to Niederwimmer, the interpretation of ζύγος influences particular readings of τέλειος as a *crux interpretum* issue.⁶⁹ A number of interpretive elements exist in these short expressions. First, two conditional clauses govern the entire premise. Second, what does the “yoke of the Lord” refer to? Third, in the case of an obedience–reward paradigm, what is the outcome of bearing the “whole yoke of the Lord?” Finally, the rigors of the ways of life and death are polarized opposites, why does the Didachist offer permission for partial obedience? In the following section, I will offer a literary reading of Did. 6.2 and consult pertinent traditions for ζύγος and τέλειος in selected ancient literature.

Literary Analysis of Didache 6.2

Didache 6.2 appears as the final expression for the Didache’s Two Ways. It is situated as part of the literary frame for the Two Ways and the final expression of the conclusion to the Two Ways frame.

The literary conclusion to the Two Ways begins with a prohibition. Rather than an exhortation to maintain one’s way of life in a positive command, a prohibition is given to be mindful of deceivers: “see to it that no one may cause you to wander away” (Did. 6.1). The Two Ways functions as the standardized ethical commitment for the Didache’s community. However, this prohibition refers to both ways of life as not veering ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς ὁδοῦ τῆς διδαχῆς. Both the way of life and the way of death are subsumed under the expression of “this way of teaching.”

While maintaining strict adherence to the overall instruction of the

⁶⁹Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 121.

Didache's Two Ways, deception is the primary motivator.

Did. 6.1: "Ὅρα μή τις σε πλανήσῃ ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς ὁδοῦ τῆς διδαχῆς, ἐπεὶ παρεκτός θεοῦ σε διδάσκει

Trans: "See to it that no one may cause you to wander from this way of teaching, since that one teaches you apart from God."

The motivation to adhere to the overall teaching is based upon (ἐπεὶ) the source of deception. The idea being, don't be deceived *since* those teaching other than the expressed Two Ways teaches apart from God (παρεκτός θεοῦ σε διδάσκει). The basis of the rigorist ethic is not that teaching itself, *per se*, but it's the source of the one teaching. Παρεκτός conveys the notion of "apart from" or "leading away from."⁷⁰

This concern for the teacher may imply at least two items. First, the teacher-pupil sapiential instruction appears a few times in the Two Ways. The readers and community members of the Didache are referred to as τέκνον μου "my child" (Did. 3.1, 3, 4, 5; 4.1; cf. Did. 5.2). Concern for the teacher's identity is not necessarily over and against the instruction, but the source of instruction informs the purity for the community. Second, the teacher is revered as the Lord (τιμήσεις δὲ αὐτὸν ὡς κύριον; Did. 4.1). If the Two Ways instructors for the Didache are honored ὡς κύριον (Did. 4.1), then it remains logically consistent to avoid the aberrant teacher because they teach in disregard of God (παρεκτός θεοῦ σε διδάσκει; Did. 6.1).

Then comes the instruction of Did. 6.2. Prior to evaluating the individual elements, the Greek structure is worth noting. This text comprises two elements, as divided by a μέν . . . δέ relationship. The μέν . . . δέ structure creates an anticipatory element to the tradition.⁷¹ That is, the μέν clause is constrained and anticipates the resolve in the δέ clause. As Stephen Levinsohn observes,

⁷⁰BDAG s.v. παρεκτός; LSJ s.v. παρεκτός.

⁷¹Steven Runge observes the following, "In spite of the multiplicity of sense claimed, μέν signals the presence of one common constraint: anticipation of a related sentence that follows . . . I view μέν as always prospective, even in instances where δέ does not follow." Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 75–76.

The term *prospective* is used in connection with μέν to mean that it anticipates, or at least implies, a corresponding sentence containing δέ. . . . In particular, the information introduced with μέν is often a secondary importance in comparison with that introduced with δέ.⁷²

So, in this case, the frontal clause—μέν clause—anticipates the subsequent clause—δέ clause.⁷³ These occurrences are listed in table 5 for comparison.

Table 5. Μέν . . . δέ clause structure in the Didache's Two Ways

	Μέν Clause	Δέ Clause
μέν . . . δέ Clause #1	ἢ μὲν οὖν ὁδὸς τῆς ζωῆς ἐστὶν αὕτη (Did. 1.2a)	ἢ δὲ τοῦ θανάτου ὁδὸς ἐστὶν αὕτη (Did. 5.1a)
μέν . . . δέ Clause #2	εἰ μὲν γὰρ χρεῖαν ἔχων λαμβάνει τις ἀθῶος ἔσται (Did. 1.5e)	ὁ δὲ μὴ χρεῖαν ἔχων δώσει δίκην (Did. 1.5f)
μέν . . . δέ Clause #3	ἀλλὰ οὓς μὲν ἐλέγξεις (Did. 2.7b)	περὶ ὧν δὲ προσεύξῃ (Did. 2.7c)
μέν . . . δέ Clause #4	μὴ γίνου πρὸς μὲν τὸ λαβαῖν ἐκτείνων τὰς χεῖρας (Did. 4.5a)	[γίνου] πρὸς δὲ τὸ δοῦναι συσπῶν (Did. 4.5b)
μέν . . . δέ Clause #5	εἰ μὲν γὰρ δύνασαι βαστάσαι ὅλον τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου τέλειος ἔσῃ (Did. 6.2a)	εἰ δ' οὐ δύνασαι ὁ δύνῃ τοῦτο ποιεῖ (Did. 6.2b)

Regarding the μέν . . . δέ Clause #1 structure, Did. 1.2 does not contain a corresponding δέ in the immediate context—the δέ in Did. 1.2b and 1.3 do not correspond to the μέν in 1.2. Rather, these two additional uses of δέ in Did. 1.2b and 1.3 function as a discourse marker to progress the argument. The symmetrical structure and the inclusion of δέ in Did. 5.1 is the anticipatory clause of Did. 1.2.

⁷²Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*, 2nd ed. (Dallas: SIL International, 2000), 170.

⁷³According to BDF, “The including of μέν throws the emphasis on the second member (indicated by δέ).” BDF §447.5. Also consult Smyth §2904.

Pertaining to the μέν . . . δέ Clause #2 structure, the conditional structure parallels Did. 6.2. In this case, the positive ethic is offered first and is followed by the negative ethic. Because of the anticipatory clause, the central resolve focuses upon the one who receives recompense (Did. 1.5g–e). The brief expressions in the μέν . . . δέ Clause #3 are also influenced by ἀλλά. So, the δέ clause offers the better ethical solution to the μέν clause. The μέν . . . δέ Clause #4 is similar to the structure of Clause #3—the negative element in the μέν clause is surpassed by the contents in the δέ clause.

Yet, how does this affect one’s reading of Did. 6.2? If the meanings of the μέν . . . δέ structure holds sway in the Didache’s Two Ways, then permissive elements of bearing the “yoke of the Lord” is the anticipated conclusion to the rigorist Two Way ethics.

In Did. 6.2a, the Didachist offers a conditional phrase whereby when one bears the “yoke of the Lord,” then, they will receive a reward. In this initial phrase, a potential apocalyptic tradition is presented. If some are able to bear under ὄλον τόν ζυγόν τοῦ κυρίου, they will receive some form of reward. This conditional clause does raise an interpretive question: what is the τόν ζυγόν τοῦ κυρίου in the Didache?

Next, the reward for bearing ὄλον τόν ζυγόν τοῦ κυρίου is τέλειος. Thus, religious observance of τόν ζυγόν τοῦ κυρίου results in a personal state of τέλειος. The Didachist refrains from elaboration or any other form of explanation regarding the implications of τέλειος in Did. 6.2. Didache 1.4 also inserts the term τέλειος in a list of ethical virtues. Yet, Didache scholarship regularly regards this appearance in Did. 1.4 as part of a later interpolation⁷⁴—with competing positions.⁷⁵ If this argument is so,

⁷⁴Audet, *La Didachè*, 261–80; Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 20–21, 52–53; Draper, “Jesus Tradition,” 76; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 79, 94; van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 40–41; Garrow, *Matthew’s Dependence on the Didache*, 81, 142–43; Kari Syreeni, “The Sermon on the Mount and the Two Ways Teaching of the Didache,” in *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?*, ed. Huub van de Sandt (Philadelphia: Fortress, 2005), 90–91; Tuckett, “*Didache* and the Writings,” 199–25.

are we able to ascertain a similar redactional hand in the composition of both Did. 1.4 and 6.2? This tradition in Did. 1.4 is rearranged material from Jesus tradition in the Sermon on the Mount (cf. Matt 5:39, 48).

Matt 5:39	Matt 5:48	Did. 1.4
ὅστις σε ῥαπίζει εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα σου, στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην.	ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειός ἐστιν.	ἀπέχου τῶν σαρκικῶν καὶ σωματικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν. εἴαν τις σοι δῶ ῥάπισμα εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα, στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην, καὶ ἔσῃ τέλειος.
Trans: Whoever slaps you upon your right cheek; turn to them also the other.	Trans: Therefore, you shall be perfect as your heavenly father is perfect.	Trans: Abstain from fleshly and bodily passions. If someone gives you a slap upon the right cheek, turn to them also the other; and you shall be perfect.

So, the redacted and rearranged Matthean traditions portray τέλειος as the result of adhering to the *lex talionis* instruction in Did. 1.4; whereas, the Jesus tradition in Matthew 5:48 connects τέλειος to the result of *imitatio dei* and loving one's enemy.⁷⁶ Much in a similar way, the bearers of τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου in Did. 1.4 will result in τέλειος for the person.

However, this strict observance of the whole yoke is then undermined by the permissive nature of the Didachist. Rather than maintaining a rigorist ethic, Did. 6.2b softens the tradition with the δέ clause. If the μέν . . . δέ relationship holds sway,

⁷⁵Draper suggests that Did. depends upon Q. Draper, "Jesus Tradition"; Aaron Milavec, "Synoptic Tradition in the Didache Revisited," *JCS* 11, no. 4 (2003): 443–80.

⁷⁶Tuckett, "*Didache* and the Writings," 102. According to Tuckett, these connections show signs of Matthean redaction. "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)."

then this δέ clause will receive the focal attention as the anticipatory clause. Now the community members will only bear what they are able (ὃ δύνῃ τοῦτο ποίει) from τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου.

This permissive element raises another question about the reward structure. If τέλειος is the reward for complete obedience to τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου, what is the reward for those now permitted to partial obedience? By implication, bearing what they are able does not necessitate laxity in terms of adherence to either the way of life or way of death. In other words, to lessen obedience to the whole yoke (ὅλον τὸν ζυγόν) does not necessarily mean adherence to a *different* yoke; rather, it conveys permission to obey partially the *same* yoke. Whatever the referent of τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου, to bear partially underneath it is not the same as replacing the yoke with something different. So, however one interprets Did. 6.2a, it will subsequently influence one's reading of Did. 6.2b.

We will now turn to the interpretations of τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου and τέλειος. For, on the basis of these two elements, one is able to interpret Did. 6.2b and discern whether or not Did. 6.2 is part of an apocalyptic tradition.

ZΥΓΟΣ and Didache 6.2

A few methodological observations are needed in order to elucidate the meaning of τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου in Did. 6.2. Because ζυγός can be used in a variety of ways, it will be helpful to distinguish between non-religious and religious contexts. Second, only minimal texts will be supplied that correspond to a broader tradition of ζυγός to elucidate Did. 6.2—thus neglecting to offer an exhaustive lexical analysis.

ζυγός in LXX. Within Jewish literature, ζυγός is used in several ways.⁷⁷ First, ζυγός can refer to a general weight or scale (cf. Ezek 5:1 LXX). It is used to measure (Isa 46:6 LXX) and to weigh gold (Jer 39:10 LXX). In religious contexts, it conveys the idea of having a good and just scale. For, evil men use the weights (ζυγός) to serve their unrighteousness (cf. Ps 61:10 LXX). A scale (ζυγός) and weight (σταθμός) are to measure one's words (Sir 28.25).

Second, ζυγός is used to join animals together in mutual cooperation. In legal code, an animal who has never been in a ζυγός may be brought forward for cultic practices (Deut 21:3 LXX). A yoke would join oxen together (Josephus, *Ant.* 12.194). A non-yoked heifer may be used for cultic practices (Num 19:2 LXX).

Third, ζυγός may refer to the eschatological portrayal and destiny of humanity. For example, humanity is likened to air placed on a scale and thus it flees away on the balances (ζυγός; Ps 61:10 LXX). The nations are considered like a drop from a jar (ὡς σταγῶν ἀπὸ κάδου) on the scales (ζυγός; Isa 40:15 LXX). The scales are likewise used in apocalyptic settings to weigh the actions of humanity (cf. 4 Ezra 3.34; 2 En. 41.1; 61.8).

In other traditions, ζυγός may refer to a form of covenantal relationships, obedience, oppression,⁷⁸ or religious subordination. For example, the Lord broke the yoke of Egyptian oppression (Lev 26:13 LXX). The Assyrian yoke will be removed from Israel (Isa 14:5 LXX; cf. Isa 47:6). A yoke jointly connects brothers together (Gen 27:40 LXX). A yoke is joined to the concept of service (2 Chr 10:4, 9, 10, 11, 14 LXX). Humanity desires to break the yoke of God (Jer 2:20 LXX; 5:5) or cast it off

⁷⁷Rengstorf, “ζυγός, ἑτεροζυγέω,” *TDNT* 2:896–98.

⁷⁸According to Goff, yoke will typically represent forms of oppression in the Hebrew Bible. Matthew J. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, VTSup 116 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 165.

entirely (Ps 2:3 LXX). However, there will be a time when ζυγός will be a pleasing act of service (Zeph 3:9 LXX).

ζυγός in Graeco-Roman literature. In ancient Graeco-Roman literature, a number of meanings emerge that correspond to LXX uses as well as others. It can refer to a beam that animals bear (Homer, *Il.*, 5.799 “. . . goddess laid her hand on the yoke of his horses”; Homer, 24.576; *Od.*, 3.383 “a heifer . . . which no man has laid under a yoke”; Hesiod, *Op.* 3.383; Babrius, *Fab.* 37.10 “an axe . . . will bruise your [steer] neck, not a yoke”). As it relates to persons, it conveys the notion that unlike persons may be joined to one another (Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* VI.40 “. . . there is neither union [ζυγός] nor love.”) or an emblem of marriage (Achilles Tatius, *Leuc. Clit.* V.6.4 “yoke of marriage that hangs over our heads”).

As used in a religious sense, persons are yoked to the Greek deities (Aristaenetus, *Er. Ep.* 2.7 “you and I are labouring under the same yoke”). Corresponding to a similar exile motif in Jewish literature, one may be freed from the yoke of tyranny (Libanius, *Or.* 17 “the yoke upon you has been broken and your necks are free”) or under a yoke of slavery (Herodotus, *Hist.* VII.8; Aeschylus, *Sept.* 75). Furthermore, ζυγός or ζυγόν may refer to a scale or a weighing system (Sextus Empiricus, *Ag. Prof.* V.14 “the scale is under the earth”; Empiricus, V.11, 35, 36; Empiricus, *Ag. Log.* If.36; Epictetus, *Diatr.* I.17.8 “as in the measuring of grain”; Archimedes, “Let ΓΘ be imagined to be a balance”⁷⁹).

Particularly unique to Graeco-Roman literature, some uses reflect military or nautical items. For example, soldiers will line up in a ζυγόν (Aristophanes, *Fragments* 81b⁸⁰ “a row”). This term reflects a fleet of soldiers equal in rank

⁷⁹Archimedes, *Greek Mathematical Works*, vol. 2 of *Aristarchus to Pappus*, trans. Ivor Thomas, LCL 362 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1941), 222–23.

⁸⁰Aristophanes, *Fragments*, trans. Jeffrey Henderson, LCL 502 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard

(Polybius, *Hist.* I.45.9 “engaged man to man and company [ζυγόν] to company”) or a ranking position (Euripides, *Ion* 595 “aspiring to the city’s helm”). In terms of nautical features, it may refer to a deck or bench (Homer, *Od.* 9.99 “bound them to the ship’s hallow”; Homer, 13.21; Herodotus, *Hist.* II.96.2; Sophocles, *Aj.* 249 “the swiftly rowers bench”), the ships mast (Pindar, *Nem.* 5.51 “host the sails the topmost yard”), or one who governs the deck of a ship (Aeschylus, *Ag.* 1618 “You speak like that, you who sit at the lower oar when those on the higher bench control the ship”).

ζυγός in Christian tradition. In Christian literature, ζυγός contains more focused lexical meanings than what the previous Jewish and Graeco-Roman traditions offer. For the most part, ζυγός conveys forms of religious connotations—with an exception of Revelation 6:5 as a balance for weighing wheat, barley, oil, and wine. Of the other uses in the Greek New Testament, ζυγός generally portrays a negative religious disposition. Peter questions why the Pharisees are putting an unbearable ζυγός upon the disciples that even the Jewish forefathers were unable to bear under (Acts 15:10). Paul likens ζυγός to slavery under the Mosaic Law (Gal 5:1) or a social condition of slavery to one’s master (1 Tim 6:1). Twice, Jesus offers a gentle and easy ζυγός, possibly assuming that a religious yoke is necessary and Jesus offers an exchange of yokes (Matt 11:29–30).⁸¹

The Christian traditions in the second-century, likewise, continue religious connotations for ζυγός. *Imitatio christi* motifs are borne out in 1 Clem. 16.17. If the Lord showed humility through his death (1 Clem. 16.8–17), Clement offers a rhetorical question of “what shall we do?” to those who have assumed the yoke of his

University Press, 2008), 152–53.

⁸¹Celia Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke: Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11.25–30*, JSNTSup 18 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1987). Deutsch elsewhere suggests that “yoke” more often refers to Law in Jewish sources (Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom*, 42–43).

grace (οἱ ὑπὸ τὸν ζυγὸν τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ δι' αὐτοῦ ἐλθόντες). Barnabas likens ζυγός to the new law of Jesus, which is without regard for the yoke of compulsion (Barn. 2.6; ἄνευ ζυγοῦ ἀνάγκης ὄν). Justin Martyr likens ζυγός to the message of Christ being proclaimed by the disciples to the Gentiles. “For the Gentiles, like a foal, had never been harnessed or felt a yoke upon their neck, until our Christ arrived and sent His disciples to convert them. They have borne the yoke of His word” (Justin, *Dial.* 53.1).⁸² Even when ζυγός refers to a yoke that relates to animals and agriculture, Justin follows with a virtuous allegorical reading, “thereby giving us symbolic lessons of the necessity of leading a just and active life” (Justin, *Dial.* 88.8).⁸³

ζυγός in Didache. These lists of examples still raise the following question: what is the use and meaning of ζυγός in Did. 6.2? Ultimately, the obedience-reward structure is predicated on this use of ζυγός. The reward paradigm in Did. 6.2 is structured around bearing the whole ζυγός or partially bearing the ζυγός of the Lord.

Within Didache scholarship numerous options emerge as to what ζυγός may mean in Did. 6.2. First, some early Didache scholars argued, though receiving no serious consideration within more recent Didache scholarship, for sexual asceticism.⁸⁴ Others have argued that ζυγός refers to Torah as interpreted by the

⁸²Justin Martyr, *The First Apology, the Second Apology, Dialogue with Trypho, Exhortation to the Greeks, Discourse to the Greeks, The Monarchy or the Rule of God*, trans. Thomas B. Falls, FC 6 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1948), 228.

⁸³Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*, trans. Thomas B. Falls, 290.

⁸⁴Adolf von Harnack, *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel nebst Untersuchungen zur ältesten Geschichte der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts*, TUGAL 2 1–2 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1884), 19–21; D. Rudolf Knopf, *Die Lehre Der Zwölf Apostel Dei Zwei Clemensbriefe*, DAV 1 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1920), 21; Georg Bertram and Karl Heinrich Rengstorff, “Ζυγός, Ἐτεροζυγέω,” *TDNT* 2:901.

Lord.⁸⁵ Draper suggests that “I am still in two minds about the possibility that this form (Did. 6.2–3) forms part of the Jewish substructure, written or oral, but have moved towards the conviction that the underlying structure is a Christian composition utilizing Jewish oral tradition.”⁸⁶ Another scholar has argued that the Didache reflects its own use of ζυγός, and has not sought “to replace the ‘yoke of the Torah’ with the ‘yoke of Jesus’.”⁸⁷ A fourth interpretive option is that ζυγός refers to the Law of Christ, as revealed in the *sectio christiana sive evangelica*.⁸⁸ Some have suggested that this phrase, as it relates to Did. 6.2, conveys interest in the Noahide Laws.⁸⁹ Sixth, Aaron Milavec suggest that the “yoke of the Lord” in Did. 6.2 is joined tightly to Did. 6.1 and thus reflective of the way of life for covenantal living.⁹⁰

⁸⁵Huub W. M. van de Sandt, “Bearing the Entire Yoke of the Lord’: An Explanation of *Didache* 6:2 in the Light of Matthew 11:28–30,” in *The Scriptures of Israel in Jewish and Christian Tradition: Essays in Honour of Maarten J.J. Menken*, ed. Bart J. Koet, Steve Moyise, and Joseph Verheyden, NovTSup 148 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 331–44; Jonathan A. Draper, “Apostles, Teachers, and Evangelists: Stability and Movement of Functionaries in Matthew, James, and the Didache,” in *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*, ed. Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, SBLSS 45 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 170.

⁸⁶Jonathan A. Draper, “A Continuing Enigma: the ‘Yoke of the Lord’ in Didache 6.2–3 and early Jewish-Christian Relations,” in *The Image of the Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, ed. Peter J. Tomson and Doris Lambers-Petry, WUNT 158 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 112; Elsewhere, Draper suggests that the early Jewish and Christian source utilize the word “yoke” primarily to refer to Torah. Jonathan A. Draper, “Do the Didache and Matthew Reflect an ‘Irrevocable Parting of the Ways’ with Judaism?,” in *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?*, ed. Huub van de Sandt (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 227–30.

⁸⁷Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 94–95, 102.

⁸⁸Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 122; Willy Rordorf and André Tuilier, *La Doctrine Des Douze Apôtres (Didachè): Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction, Notes, Appendice, Annexe et Index*, 2nd ed., SC 248 (Paris: Les Éditions Du Cerf, 1978), 32–33; Jens Schröter, “Jesus Tradition in Matthew, James, and the Didache: Searching for Characteristic Emphases,” in *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*, ed. Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, SBLSS 45 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 238; van de Sandt, “Bearing the Entire Yoke of the Lord,” 340.

⁸⁹van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 243–53; van de Sandt, “Bearing the Entire Yoke of the Lord,” 343.

⁹⁰Milavec, *Didache: Faith, Hope & Life*, 779,781–82.

In my reading of Did. 6.2 and the use of ζυγός, I foresee three potential interpretive options that generally cohere with Didache scholarship.⁹¹ Generally, ζυγός helps form the religious and ethical identity of those in the Didache community. Carrying this particular yoke marks their identity. The yoke is both the religious and ethical identity of the Didache’s community.

Now I offer three internal options of what the yoke could refer to. First, the yoke refers only to the *sectio evangelica* (Did. 1.3b–2.1). It is generally assumed by those in Didache scholarship that the *sectio evangelica* is part of the imbedded redaction and insertion on part of the Didache redactor.⁹² Within the embedded Jesus tradition that also appears with the phrase ἔσθι τέλειος (Did. 1.4), the literary frame, including the reference to ζυγός, could have been used to match this insertion of Jesus tradition. Also, the use of κύριος can refer to Jesus (cf. Did. 8.2; 9.5; 14.1; 15.4; 16.1, 7–8), but no use of κύριος refers to Jesus in the Two Ways section (cf. (Did. 4.11, 12, 13) with the possible exception of Did. 4.1. For this reading, then, the ὁ ζυγὸς τοῦ κυρίου is a referent to the new Torah of Jesus, as reflected in the *sectio evangelica*.⁹³

Second, to bear the “yoke of the Lord” may refer to the ethical and religious obedience only reflected in the way of life (Did. 1.2–4.14). With the concentrated use of κύριος in Did. 4.11–13, this occurrence brings to a close the way

⁹¹Due to my predilection to read Did. 6.2 as a backward referent to something within the Two Ways, I also documented some positions that read Did. 6.2 as a forward pointing referent to include Did. 7ff. For example, see Draper, “A Continuing Enigma,” 115. Draper suggests, “To my mind, it makes more sense to assume that the Jewish Christian tradition concerning the yoke of the Lord and the kinds of water able to purify were part of an earlier redactional layer, which is subsequently made orthodox by the insertion of the correct baptismal formula, in the threefold name—which is nowhere else attested in the Didache.”

⁹²Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 162–84.

⁹³Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 122.

of life for the Didachist. With the Jesus tradition in Did. 1 and the many uses of κύριος in Did. 4, to bear the “yoke of the Lord” could refer exclusively to the way of life.

The final option that I deem plausible is a reference to the whole Two Ways (Did. 1–5). This is made plausible given the literary structure of the Two Ways in the Didache. With Did. 1.1 forming the initial frame, Did. 6.1–2 forms the conclusion to the Two Ways frame. Thus, the use of ζυγός could encapsulate the entire Two Ways. Furthermore, even the way of death (Did. 5.1–2) addresses the community members: “Be delivered, oh children, from all these things” (Did. 5.2). Consequently, to bear the “yoke of the Lord” would also mean to “be delivered” from the ethics of this prohibition.

So, ζυγός in Did. 6.2 most likely has a few potential and plausible meanings. Given the general use of ζυγός in Jewish, Graeco-Roman, and Christian traditions, the Didache’s use more likely corresponds to religious and ethical obedience. In this sense, to be bound to a ζυγός is to join to the ethical and religious stipulations of the yoke.

ΤΕΛΕΙΟΣ and Didache 6.2

It is to τέλειος that we turn to next. If ζυγός forms the rigorist religious stipulations in Did. 6.2, then τέλειος forms part of the reward system for the Didachist. According to Niederwimmer, “the very first section in 6.2 is the *crux interpretum*.”⁹⁴ The following section contains lexical considerations of τέλειος and then joins this consideration to a reading within the structure of Did. 6.2. As will be distinguished within the subsequent lexical considerations, τέλειος bears nuanced

⁹⁴Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 121.

readings when applying to personal and impersonal objects. David Peterson distinguishes lexical possibilities in his study so that personal and impersonal, religious and non-religious connotations, and more all have differing nuances. “In such contexts it is important to determine the particular writer’s measure of τέλειος, whether it is a physical, moral, philosophical, or religious concept.”⁹⁵ The following assessment works from the findings of Peterson,⁹⁶ Delling,⁹⁷ and Greek lexicons.⁹⁸ Also, the specific use in Did. 6.2 qualifies as a person in the community, so special attention will consider the application of τέλειος to personal subjects.

In addition to this inanimate and personal distinction, a few more methodological observations are needed. Because τέλειος can be used in a variety of ways, I will give special attention to its use in religious and virtue contexts. Also, selected texts will be supplied that elucidate a broader lexical domain for τέλειος in Did. 6.2, thereby neglecting to offer an exhaustive analysis for this lexeme.

τέλειος in LXX and Jewish literature. Within the LXX, τέλειος appears 19x. Comparatively, it is used for two Hebrew terms: מְלֵא and תָּמִים.⁹⁹ The majority of uses of τέλειος refer to persons—with the exception of unblemished animals (Exod 12:5), burnt offerings (Judg 20:26; 21:4), “complete hatred” (Ps 138:22 LXX), and everyone taken into exile (Jer 13:19).

⁹⁵David Peterson, *Hebrews and Perfection: An Examination of the Concept of Perfection in the “Epistle to the Hebrews,”* SNTSMS 47 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 46; Peterson builds upon and expands the works of: Paul Johannes Du Plessis, “TEΛΕΙΟΣ: The Idea of Perfection in the New Testament” (ThD diss., Theologische Hogeschool, 1959). Gerhard Delling, “τέλος, τελέω, κτλ,” *TDNT* 8:49–87.

⁹⁶Peterson, *Hebrews and Perfection*, 21–48.

⁹⁷Delling, “τέλος, τελέω, κτλ,” *TDNT* 8:49–87.

⁹⁸LSJ s.v. τέλειος; GE s.v. τέλειος.

⁹⁹Of its 19 uses: מְלֵא (cf. Judg 20:26; 21:4; 1 Kgs 8:61; 11:4; 15:3, 14; Jer 13:19) and תָּמִים (cf. Gen 6:9; Exod 12:5; Deut 18:13; 2 Sam 22:26; Song 5:2; 6:9).

When referring to persons, τέλειος conveys the sense of internal wholeness that is undivided. It is a characteristic of blamelessness before God and joined with righteousness (Gen 6:9; Νωε ἄνθρωπος δίκαιος τέλειος ὢν; cf. Sir 44.17; cf. Deut 18:13) and mercy (2 Sam 22:26). As the term is applied to the female figure in Song of Songs, τέλειος is likened to a dove lacking nothing (Song 5:2; 6:9). Also, the term is used to convey complete devotion to God. The success of Solomon is because of his complete and undivided devotion (cf. 1 Kgs 8:61; 1 Chr 28:9). Yet, the demise of Solomon and Asa were on the basis of their hearts not being τέλειος to the Lord (οὐκ ἦν ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ τελεία μετὰ κυρίου θεοῦ; cf. 1 Kgs 11:4; 15:3, 14).

Within the Dead Sea Scrolls, מלש and ממת correspond to ethical patterns and Torah observance. Each person who enters the council of holiness will walk in the way of perfection (ממת), not neglecting Torah (1QS XIII, 20–21). The council, likewise, will be a house of perfection (ממת) that establishes covenant ethics (1QS XIII, 10). Furthermore, one is to walk perfectly in all the ways of Torah (1QS III, 9–11; cf. II, 2, 20). To walk and to observe Torah often occurs with ממת (1QH I, 36; 1QSB I, 2; V, 22; 1QS I, 8; III, 9; IX, 19; XI, 17). In other places in Qumran literature, מלש may convey wholeness or without division (1QH XVI, 7, 17).

By the first-century CE, Philo joins τέλειος with virtue and a religious value system. It is difficult to list the majority of uses in Philo, for there are over 400 uses of τέλειος in his literature. In *De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*, Philo joins together both τέλειος with ἀρετή, and in opposition to imperfectly learned items (*Sacr.* 43). Furthermore, virtues such as φρόνησις, ἀνδρεία, and δικαιοσύνη can be deemed “wholly noble and perfectly good” (*Sacr.* 37; καλαὶ πᾶσαι καὶ τέλεια ἀγαθά). Also, σοφία is likened to the τελείαν ὁδόν, which will lead to God (*Deus* 142–43). For Noah, moreover, was τέλειος (*Deus* 117, 118), which was part of the zenith of happiness (*Deus* 118; ἦν καὶ ὄρος τῆς ἄκρας εὐδαιμονίας). It is the Father of perfect nature (τῆς τελείας φύσεως) that sows and begets happiness (σπείρων . . . καὶ γεννῶν τὸ

εὐδαιμονεῖν) into the hearts of humanity (*Leg.* 3 219). With God having a perfect nature (τέλειος φύσις) and humanity pursuing a perfect nature for themselves (cf. *Cher.* 9), a perfect nature in humanity will be free from all passions (cf. *Ebr.* 135). Moreover, it is the perfect human that is pure in all their words and life (*Mos.* 2 150; δεῖ τὸν τέλειον καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ καὶ βίῳ παντὶ καθαρεύειν) and may be considered a teacher and instructor of the law (*Spec.* 4 140). Τέλος, τέλεος, and τέλειος are used in relation to happiness, virtue, and a road metaphor (*Plant.* 37).

Allegorically reading Genesis 2:8, Philo conveys how roads correlate to the trees of knowledge and evil. Of the good road, he describes it as ὅς ὁ μὲν πρὸς ἀρετὴν ὁδὸς οὗτος ζωὴ καὶ ἀθανασία ἔχω ὁ τέλος (“which this pathway leads unto virtue, [and] has complete life and immortality”). In this paradise, God, as a gardner, plants virtues and deeds within the souls that lead to complete happiness (πρὸς τέλειος τέλεος εὐδαιμονία). And, finally, the perfect human is someone being neither God nor human, but standing between the uncreated and the perishable nature (*Somn.* 2 234). Thus, for Philo, τέλειος is a characteristic that can be found solely in God’s character and can be found in certain humans. When it applies to humanity, the features of perfection and virtue are present, while all evil passions are absent. This status can be attained by humans in their current life.¹⁰⁰

τέλειος in Graeco-Roman literature. The term can be a characteristic of persons or animals to denote growth of moral perfection. In Aelian, *De natura animalium*, the term is used to convey the idea of “full-growth” of various animals. (Aelian, *Nat. an.* II.6; II.33 “. . . a full-grown crocodile . . .”; II.42 “. . . a full-grown falcon”; III.23 “. . . when the full-grown bird is in want . . .”; VII.47 “. . . a fully-

¹⁰⁰See the following for a fuller treatment of τέλειος in Philo: Delling, “τέλος, τελέω, κτλ.,” *TDNT* 8:70–72.

grown wolf . . . and a fully-grown hare”; XII.44 “. . . in India, if a full grown elephant . . .”). Τέλειος is paired with ἡ γυνή so as to convey the object of dear items: a fully grown-child and a wife (Appian, *Bell. civ.* XI.10.61). Also, it may refer to the unblemished or perfected nature of animals (Homer, *Il.* I.66 “unblemished goats”; Homer, VII.247 “an eagle, the surest of omens among winged birds”).

Beyond this previous meaning of “without blemish” or “maturation,” τέλειος relates to humanity and virtuous characteristics. A moral and virtue value-system is created within Greek philosophy. As Gerhard Delling notes, “τέλειος takes on special significance for the Gk. understanding of man; the point is that total humanity and the full ἀρετή which are to be achieved.”¹⁰¹ The τέλειος person in Plato and Aristotle—further developed in stoicism—often joins together τέλειος with ἀρετή. So, virtue plays an integral part in the wholeness of a person. A mere selection of readings will suffice, since the term is used in other references beyond the human nature (e.g., Plato, *Tim.* 30d; 41c; 92c). Τέλειος is altogether good and ought to be sought after by all persons (Plato, *Phileb.* 61a; cf. *Leg.* 647d). When the philosopher is able to turn one’s full memory to divine things, “thusly they shall become perfect” (Plato, *Phaedr.* 249c; τέλειος ὄντως μόνος γίγνεται). Both noble and ignoble men can be perfectly devoted to virtue and vice, respectively (Plato, *Leg.* 678b).

For Aristotle, τέλειος and ἀρετή are closely connected. Justice is perfect virtue, because it is the practice of virtue to others (Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 1129b.30)¹⁰² and friendship (Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 1156b.34). Nobility is perfect virtue (Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 1149a.11; ἀρετή τέλειος). In his *Metaphysics*, he seeks to define τέλειος. To be τέλειος is to have no insufficiency outside of oneself or possessing any deficiency

¹⁰¹Delling, “τέλος, τελέω, κτλ,” *TDNT* 8:69.

¹⁰²Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 1129b.30. τελεία μάλιστα ἀρετή, ὅτι τῆς τελείας ἀρετῆς χρήσις ἐστίν. τελεία δ’ ἐστίν, ὅτι ὁ ἔχων αὐτὴν καὶ πρὸς ἕτερον δύναται τῇ ἀρετῇ χρῆσθαι, ἀλλ’ οὐ μόνον καθ’ αὐτόν.

(*Metaph.* V.XVI.1, 5). With respect to goodness or excellence, a doctor and musician may be τέλειος when they have no deficiency in their trade (*Metaph.* V.XVI.2). Thus, goodness (ἀγαθόν) is a perfect virtue (*Metaph.* V.XVI.3; ἡ ἀρετὴ τελείωσις). Perfection in virtue is attained when an object or person attains their end—no more room for advancements (*Metaph.* V.XVI.4). Thus, as Aristotle concludes, “All other things are so called in virtue of these, because they either produce or possess something of this kind, or conform to it, or are referred in some way or other to things which are perfect in the primary sense.”¹⁰³

τέλειος in Christian tradition. In first and second-century Christian literature, τέλειος continues to refer to humanity and ethics, and plays a unique role in Jesus tradition. Within the New Testament, τέλειος appears 19x.¹⁰⁴ Pauline tradition associates this term with the will, the thought patterns of Christians, instruction, and law of God. It is used in a list of qualities about the will of God (Rom 12:2; τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ εὐάρεστον καὶ τέλειον). People persist in thinking in a way that reflect τέλειος (cf. 1 Cor 14:20; Phil 3:15). The remainder of uses correspond to human nature. For example, wisdom (σοφία) is only taught to the τέλειος (1 Cor 2:6) and to remain τέλειος is to be persuaded of the whole will of God (Col 4:15). Pauline tradition, likewise, continues to reflect a similar expression of the τέλειος person (Eph 4:13; Col 1:28). For the multiple use of the τελ- root in Hebrews, give consideration to the works of Peterson¹⁰⁵ and Matthew Easter.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰³Aristotle, *Metaph.* V.XVI.5. Translation from Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, trans. Hugh Tredennick, LCL 271 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933), 268–69.

¹⁰⁴Also, cf. 1 Cor 13:10; Heb 5:14; 9:11; 1 John 4:18.

¹⁰⁵Peterson, *Hebrews and Perfection*, 49–187 (chs. 3–7).

¹⁰⁶Matthew C. Easter, *Faith and the Faithfulness of Jesus in Hebrews*, SNTSMS 160 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 94–99.

Matthean and Jacobean tradition appear to have a similar and unique symmetry when using τέλειος. The concept relates both to Torah and to persons. If one is able to love one's enemy, then ἔσεσθε ὑμεῖς τέλειοι like the Father in heaven (Matt 5:48). As it pertains to the rich young ruler, τέλειος joins itself to Torah obedience and to the giving of alms (Matt 19:21). This Jesus tradition is harmonious with the Jacobean tradition. For, the law is τέλειος (Jas 1:25) and the Father gives good and τέλειος gifts (Jas 1:17). When applied to humanity, as perseverance reaches its end, ἤτε τέλειοι καὶ δλόκληροὶ ἐν μηδενὶ λειπόμενοι (Jas 1:4). Also, a τέλειος ἀνὴρ is able to control his whole body (Jas 3:2; ὅλον τὸ σῶμα). These traditions in Matthean and Jacobean present τέλειος in relation to Torah, ethics, and the stability of a person.

Outside the Didache's two uses, τέλειος is used 22x in the Apostolic Fathers corpus. Its use has a variety of meanings. For example, it corresponds to having complete knowledge (1 Clem. 1.2; 44.2; Barn. 1.5; 13.7), "the final stumbling block" (Barn. 4.3), death of a person (1 Clem. 44.5), relates to the death of Jesus or sin (Barn. 5.11; 8.1; Herm. Vis. 1.2.1 [2.1]), or generally corresponds to ethics (1 Clem. 55.6; 56.1; Herm. Sim. 5.3.6 [56.6]).

However, much like the Matthean and Jacobean tradition, the Letters of Ignatius present closer symmetry with the Didache. Those who possess the word of Jesus are able to hear his silence, and in turn, τέλειος ἤ (Ign. *Eph.* 15.2). The musical metaphor in Ign. *Phld.* 1.2 joins the commandments of God with a virtue list. Ignatius reflects upon his soul and blesses his mind fixed in God, knowing these actions to be virtuous and wholesome (Ign. *Phld.* 1.2; ἐπιγνοὺς ἐνάρετον καὶ τέλειον οὔσαν). In Ign. *Smyrn.* 10-11, τέλειος appears four times in four consecutive verses. Jesus is likened as the τέλειος hope (Ign. *Smyrn.* 10.2; cf. Ign. *Smyrn.* 4.2). Ignatius asks for the prayers of the Smyrneans and that the gracious gift of God may be given to him completely (Ign. *Smyrn.* 11.1), so that the work of the Smyrneans may be

perfect in the entire heaven and earth (Ign. *Smyrn.* 11.2). Finally, and similar to Philippians 3:15, those being perfect (τέλειοι ὄντες) ought to think upon perfect things (Ign. *Smyrn.* 11.3). So, for some books in the Apostolic Fathers corpus, τέλειος continues to reflect a virtuous paradigm for Christian identity that is attainable in the present life. As some of the early Christian literature displays, the τέλειος ἀνὴρ offers a portrait of a person that is wholly committed to a Christian version of Torah observance and the expression of virtuous qualities.

τέλειος in Didache. Now we will assess τέλειος in the Didache. Within the Two Ways section, two uses of τέλειος emerge (Did. 1.4; 6.2), while the two verbal forms appear in the liturgical section (Did. 10.5) and in the final section of the Didache (Did. 16.2). As we begin to assess the Didache's tradition, it will be helpful to reorient our research question once more. Given that ζυγός and τέλειος are interpretive problems in Did. 6.2, does the use of τέλειος throughout early Christian literature, and notably in the Didache, help address this interpretive problem? More specifically, if τέλειος is the reward of a person bearing ὅλον τόν ζυγόν τοῦ κυρίου, does Did. 6.2 and the use of τέλειος maintain an apocalyptic framework as an option?

The first use of τέλειος appears in Did. 1.4: ἔση τέλειος. This use appears in the *sectio evangelica* (Did. 1.3b–2.1a) and presents massive problems to Didache scholars.¹⁰⁷ For example, van de Sandt and Flusser observe how this section “interrupts the connection between Did 1:3a and 2:2” and “there is a good possibility that the section was inserted into Did 1–6 at the time when the earlier Two Ways form was incorporated into the Didache as a whole.”¹⁰⁸ This section also contains

¹⁰⁷van de Sandt, “Bearing the Entire Yoke of the Lord,” 340.

¹⁰⁸van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 40; So, Wim J. C. Weren, “The Ideal Community According to Matthew, James, and the Didache,” in *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*, ed. Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, SBLSS 45 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 196.

increased expressions of Jesus tradition, unlike the rest of the Two Ways (Did. 1–6). As a potential cue for later redaction, this brief section does not follow one particular strand of Gospel tradition: Matthean or Lukan tradition. Rather, Did. 1.3b–5 is more textually symmetrical with the Matthean tradition; yet, Did. 1.2b–5 is oriented to the order of the Lukan Sermon on the Mount tradition. Kurt Niederwimmer has already provided a helpful synopsis for comparison, of which I will only utilize select portions.¹⁰⁹ In addition to Sermon on the Mount traditions, Did. 1.3b–2.1 uses selected traditions that also appear in Herm. Mand. 2.4–6 (27.4–6).¹¹⁰

Didache 1.4 and the use of τέλειος correspond with the non-retaliation Jesus tradition (Matt 5:39–42; Luke 6:29–30).¹¹¹ “If anyone might slap your right cheek, turn to them also the other” (Did. 1.4a). For the most part, Did. 1.4 agrees mostly with Matthew 5:39b. However, the Didachist inserts the τέλειος clause after this anti-retaliation Jesus tradition. In Matthew, this term does not appear until Matthew 5:48 in relation to loving one’s enemy: ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι. So, the ethical situation of inheriting the quality of τέλειος has been redacted from the Matthean tradition. Yet, the Didache’s use of τέλειος seems to be a reward or

¹⁰⁹Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 69–71.

¹¹⁰Niederwimmer observes the following relationships, as marked by the underlines:

Did. 1.5a–b	Herm. Mand. 2.4c–6a
<p>παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε <u>δίδου</u>, καὶ μὴ ἀπαίτει· <u>πᾶσι γὰρ θέλει δίδοσθαι ὁ πατὴρ ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων χαρισμάτων</u>. μακάριος ὁ <u>διδούς</u> κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν, <u>ἀθῶος γὰρ ἔστιν</u>. οὐαὶ τῷ λαμβάνοντι· εἰ μὲν γὰρ <u>χρείαν ἔχων λαμβάνει</u> τις, ἀθῶος ἔσται· ὁ δὲ μὴ <u>χρείαν ἔχων δώσει δίκην</u>, ἵνα τί <u>ἔλαβε καὶ εἰς τί</u>.</p>	<p>πᾶσιν <u>δίδου</u>· <u>πᾶσιν γὰρ ὁ θεὸς δίδοσθαι θέλει ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων δωρημάτων</u>. οἱ οὖν λαμβάνοντες ἀποδώσουσιν λόγον τῷ θεῷ, διατί <u>ἔλαβον καὶ εἰς τί</u>· οἱ μὲν γὰρ λαμβάνοντες θλιβόμενοι οὐ δικασθήσονται, οἱ δὲ ἐν ὑποκρίσει λαμβάνοντες <u>τίσουσιν δίκην</u>. ὁ οὖν <u>διδούς ἀθῶός ἔστιν</u>.</p>

¹¹¹Patrick J. Hartin, “Ethics in the Letter of James, the Gospel of Matthew, and the Didache: Their Place in Early Christian Literature,” in *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*, ed. Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, SBLSS 45 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 300.

outcome when one is able to refrain from retaliation. So, to act in such a way enables one to receive the quality of τέλειος or reveals their given character as τέλειος. But either way, the person's quality of τέλειος corresponds to human-to-human ethics. Wim Weren is willing to extend the outcome of τέλειος to the adherence of the previous series of ethical imperatives.¹¹²

Second, Did. 10.5 and 16.2 have a verbal form of τέλειος that need to be under consideration. Structurally, it has been placed under considerable debate whether or not Did. 16 can inform Did. 1–6 due to the composite nature of the Didache. However, in the final form of the Didache, it remains largely difficult to harbor such connections. The final ethical instructions, prior to the mini-apocalypse (Did. 16.3–8), demand vigilance. Ending the ethical instruction, Did. 16.2 reads, “For the entire time of your faith will be of no use” (ἐὰν μὴ ἐν τῷ ἐσχάτῳ καιρῷ τελειωθῆτε). To be τέλειος is not needed *in the last time*. Rather, τέλειος appears to be achieved *by the last time*. In this case, ἐν denotes the telic point by which something must occur.¹¹³ Also, in Did. 10.5, “perfection” is in concert with the current evils in the world, and is a needed condition prior to entering the prepared kingdom. So, even in an apocalyptic-like setting, τέλειος is the ethical and virtuous quality of a person prior to undergoing the final end.

τέλειος in Didache 6.2 and interpretive possibilities. And now we turn to consider Did. 6.2. Given this broad background in LXX and Jewish, Graeco-Roman, and early Christian literature, we may now assess the meaning of τέλειος in Did. 6.2.

Among Didache scholars, there remain some interpretive options for the

¹¹²Weren, “Ideal Community,” 196.

¹¹³BDAG, s.v. ἐν (§10); LSJ, s.v. ἐν (§IV).

meaning of Did. 6.2. First, some suggest Torah observance, even partial observance, are prerequisites for participation in the community.¹¹⁴ So, in this way, ζυγός conveys Torah observance and τέλειος identifies the pre-requisite for communal activity. According to Weren, two options are possible.¹¹⁵ Either, this expression refers to the entire Two Ways doctrine, an elaboration of Torah, and “Lord” refers to God (cf. Did. 6.1). Or, “Lord” refers to Jesus, ζυγός is then associated with Matthew 11:29, and the yoke corresponds to Torah as interpreted and lived by Jesus. Second, according to Milavec, these traditions reflect eschatological completion.¹¹⁶

Another interpretive possibility is that Did. 6.2 is part of the Christian interpolation. Didache 6.2 can still function as a summary of Did. 1–5, while καὶ ἔση τέλειος refers to the *sectio evangelica*.¹¹⁷ Since καὶ ἔση τέλειος also appears in Did. 1.5, these two sections in the Two Ways reflect the same redactional perspective.¹¹⁸ According to van de Sandt and Flusser, Did. 6.2–3 is amended to the Didache’s Two Ways conclusion.¹¹⁹ Though debated whether or not the phrase contributes to the entirety of the Didache or specifically to this respective clause,¹²⁰ the “yoke of the Lord” refers to the “yoke of Christ” and is understood to be part of the Christian

¹¹⁴Weren, “Ideal Community,” 196–97.

¹¹⁵Weren, “Ideal Community,” 197.

¹¹⁶Milavec, *Didache: Faith, Hope & Life*, 475.

¹¹⁷Schröter, “Jesus Tradition,” 249.

¹¹⁸Schröter, “Jesus Tradition,” 249. Schröter continues to suggest that these similarities offer a “clear indication that the Didache expects Gentiles to become part of the Christian community. The Two Ways doctrine constitutes the pre-baptismal instruction for them, including the ‘way to perfection’ in the evangelical section.”

¹¹⁹van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 238–39.

¹²⁰van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 240.

duties in general¹²¹—especially given the correspondence between Did. 1.3–5 and the Sermon on the Mount tradition.¹²²

Draper observes a similar interpretative tradition but evokes the “parting of ways” between Matthew and Didache as a solution. The “yoke” is directed towards the Gentiles, unlike Matthew’s use, which refers to Torah.¹²³ Rather than functioning as an obligation, yoke/Torah is now a “goal towards which one should strive.”¹²⁴ Thus, the concept of “perfection” in both Did. 1.4 and 6.2 “refers to doing righteousness over and above what is required by the Torah.”¹²⁵ As opposed to van de Sandt and Flusser’s position of Did. 6.2 reflecting an “anti-Jewish” redaction that represents “a two tier ethic of perfection and mediocrity,”¹²⁶ Draper argues “to be perfect” one must “do more than necessary to perform righteousness over and above

¹²¹Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 94–95; Syreeni, “Sermon on the Mount and the Two Ways,” 97. According to Jefford, it remains possible that the conclusion of the Did.’s Two Ways ends at 6.1 whereas 6.2–3 are redacted material. He joins this Did. tradition with Johannine (1 John 5:3) and Matthean (Matt 11:28–30) material. As the Didachist reflects upon the “yoke of the Lord,” these are stipulations that “‘good’ Christians will attempt to bear its burden as they are able.”

¹²²van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 241; van de Sandt also suggests that “the τέλειος in Did. 6.2 referring to the bearing of the entire ‘yoke of the Lord’ involves the fulfillment of the radical ethical demands as summarized in Did. 1.3–6 and 3.1–6.” Huub van de Sandt, “Essentials of Ethics in Matthew and the *Didache*: A Comparison at a Conceptual and Practical Level,” in *Early Christian Ethics in Interaction with Jewish and Greco-Roman Contexts*, ed. Jan Willem van Henten and Joseph Verheyden, STR 17 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 255; Huub van de Sandt, “Matthew and the *Didache*,” in *Matthew and His Christian Contemporaries*, ed. David C. Sim and Boris Repschinski, LNTS 333 (London: T&T Clark International, 2008), 134.

¹²³Draper, “Irrevocable Parting of the Ways,” 229; According to Keri Syreeni, the “yoke of the Lord recalls Matt 11:28–30 and is the image of a Jewish Torah applied to a Christian understanding of the Law. Furthermore, Did. 6.2–3 “is only more explicit in stating the practical, indispensable purity requirement for entering and staying in the community, viz., abstaining from idol food.” Syreeni, “Sermon on the Mount and the Two Ways,” 97.

¹²⁴Draper, “Irrevocable Parting of the Ways,” 229.

¹²⁵Draper, “Irrevocable Parting of the Ways,” 228.

¹²⁶van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 240.

the minimum which is required by the letter of the Torah.”¹²⁷

Summary of Findings for Didache 6.2

Based on the previous evidence, Did. 6.2 does not refer to an apocalyptic or eschatological type of framework. Rather, Did. 6.2 provides a “way of being” for community members to obtain personal wholeness and *shalom*. First, the concept of τέλειος is predicated upon the concept of ζυγός. As previously argued, the Didachist employs this term in a religious sense, either to refer to Christian Torah, the *sectio evangelica*, or to the entire Two Ways (Did. 1–6). According to Hartin, “‘being perfect’ (τέλειος) act[s] like bookends to the first section containing the two ways: they frame all the teachings contained within it.”¹²⁸ Therefore, when one successfully bears the whole Two Ways, τέλειος shall become a quality of the person.

Second, the ethics within the Two Ways correspond to current ethical dispositions. That is, community members are to express this particular set of ethics *now*, as opposed to a future time period. The ethics reflect current expectations for human-to-human relations and human-to-divine relations. Thus, to bear the yoke of the Two Ways affects the condition of community members so that τέλειος is the necessary prerequisite.

Third, by combining a list of virtues and vices with the outcome of τέλειος, the Didache links part of its tradition with the Graeco-Roman context of wholeness and the Jewish background of inner-*shalom*. Τέλειος corresponds with the virtue formative elements similar to a non-Jewish referent, though obtained through a Christianized Torah.

¹²⁷Draper, “Irrevocable Parting of the Ways,” 230.

¹²⁸Hartin, “Ethics in James, Matthew, and Didache,” 300.

Fourth, the combination of Matthean and Jacobean traditions corresponds with the Didache's attempt at a Jewish-Christian form of *τέλειος ἀνὴρ*. The Didache reshapes the Torah and Jesus Tradition that appear in the Sermon on the Mount tradition, which reflect the whole person (*ὁλόκληροι*) similar to James 1:4.

Thus, if the “yoke of the Lord” is a reference to the Two Ways ethics and a restructured Christian Torah,¹²⁹ and if *τέλειος* refers to the inward disposition of the community, then Did. 6.2 does not offer an apocalyptic tradition. The obedience–reward paradigm does imply some form of subsequent reward. Yet, no timeframe of the reward is offered. Even in other sections of the Didache, *τέλειος* is a personal quality prior to apocalyptic and eschatological events (Did. 10.5; 16.2). Because of the prevalent ethical implications in the Two Ways, the human-to-human ethical dispositions and *τέλειος* refer to the person's life presently within the community.

Yet, what shall we make of the partial obedience? As previously argued, “to do what they are able” does not mean to embrace a different yoke altogether. It now conveys that *τέλειος* can still be achieved even if every ethical instruction is not observed. For, their situation may not require them to practice each expressions found in this specific Two Ways.

Didache's Two Ways and the Mini-Apocalypse in Didache 16

One important problem still needs to be raised. If Did. 1–6 demonstrates a particular apocalyptic softening, as I have argued, how do we assess the mini-apocalypse in Did. 16? It is not as though the Didache lacks eschatological instruction. To further convolute this matter, some have even suggested that the original form of the Didache's Two Ways instruction included Did. 16 as a former

¹²⁹van de Sandt, “Bearing the Entire Yoke of the Lord,” 344.

ending to the tractate.¹³⁰ According to Kari Syreeni, “Composition-historically, the Two Ways section, possibly together with Chap. 16, would be the starting-point of the literary evolution.”¹³¹

State of Discussion of Didache 1–6 and 16

Within Didache scholarship, at least three probable solutions appear. First, Did. 1–6 along with Did. 16 formed a Jewish prototype *Vorlage*.¹³² Second, Did. 1–6 formed the complete edition of the Didache’s Two Ways—though it remains debated whether or not Did. 6.1, 2, or 3 functioned as the specific conclusion.¹³³ Third, according to Hans Seeliger, Did. 16 functions as a polemic directed against the false prophets within Did. 11–15.¹³⁴

Because the position as advanced by Seeliger is far beyond the scope of my present argument, I will only develop the other two positions. For Marcello Del Verme, Did. 16 functions as the final section to an initial Two Ways treatise.¹³⁵

¹³⁰Bammel, “Schema und Vorlage von *Didache* 16”; Kamlah, *Form der katalogischen Paränese*, 210–14; Kraft, *Barnabas and the Didache*, 12–16; Margaret Mary McKenna, “The Two Ways’ in Jewish and Christian Writings of the Greco-Roman Period: A Study of the Form of Repentance Parenesis” (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1981), 185–86; Marcello Del Verme, *Didache and Judaism: Jewish Roots of an Ancient Christian-Jewish Work* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 243–51; Syreeni, “Sermon on the Mount and the Two Ways,” 88; Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 164n85.

¹³¹Syreeni, “Sermon on the Mount and the Two Ways,” 88.

¹³²Tuckett, “*Didache* and the Writings,” 84.

¹³³See van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 128, 130, 138–39, 238–70.

¹³⁴Hans Reinhard Seeliger, “Considerations on the Background and Purpose of the Apocalyptic Conclusion of the *Didache*,” in *The Didache in Modern Research*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper, AGJU 37 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 381–82; Contra Vicky Balabanski, *Eschatology in the Making: Mark, Matthew, and the Didache*, SNTSMS 97 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 200–1.

¹³⁵Del Verme, *Didache and Judaism*, 243. Del Verme articulates three essential retorts to Rordorf and Tuilier’s arguments. (1) It is implausible to separate Did. 1–6 and 16 on the basis of

Others, such as Bammel, Kamlah, Kraft, and McKenna, likewise appeal to Did. 16 as the ending of the Two Ways for the Didache.¹³⁶ Bammel suggests that Jewish eschatology undergoes a “double development” in the first-century, national eschatology over individual eschatology.¹³⁷ It is this two-fold stage, as Bammel continues, that reshaped Christianity too—potentially visible within the elements of Did. 16 and the Two Ways.¹³⁸ For Matti Myllykoski, a literary seam exists between Did. 5.1 and 6.1, a change from plural verb forms (Did. 5.2) to singular (Did. 6.1), and the brevity of the apocalypse (Did. 16) suggests that “it is possible that the salutation in the plural once had a natural connection to the beginning of the apocalypse. Also, the shortness of the apocalypse is best explained with its original connection to the Two Ways treatise.”¹³⁹

Yet, there remains another position that is worth considering. That is, Did. 16 is unrelated to the conclusion of the Didache’s Two Ways. In this manner, Did. 1–6 stands as a whole unit and contains the Didache’s Two Ways without the apocalyptic ending of Did. 16.¹⁴⁰ According to Rordorf and Tuilier, the beginning

presumed eschatological traits; (2) A close connection exists between apocalyptic and sapiential literature in antiquity. Thus, Did. 16.1 and 1.1 link sapiential and apocalyptic traditions together; (3) Did. 16 and Did. 1–6 may continue to represent the community. In this way, the Didachist’s composition of Did. 1–6 may fuse together the similar concerns in Did. 16. By connecting the Two Ways and the Apocalyptic sections, this joint relationship may corroborate an “Enochic matrix.”

¹³⁶Bammel, “Schema und Vorlage von *Didache* 16”; Bammel, “Pattern and Prototype”; Kamlah, *Form der katalogischen Paränese*, 210–14; Kraft, *Barnabas and the Didache*, 12–16; McKenna, “‘Two Ways’ in Jewish and Christian Writings,” 185–86; Draper, “A Continuing Enigma,” 108.

¹³⁷Bammel, “Pattern and Prototype,” 371.

¹³⁸Bammel, “Pattern and Prototype,” 372.

¹³⁹Myllykoski, “Without Decree,” 447.

¹⁴⁰John S. Kloppenborg, “The Transformation of Moral Exhortation in *Didache* 1–5,” in *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History, and Transmission*, ed. Clayton N. Jefford, NovTSup 77 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 90–92.

chapters of the Didache already contain some eschatological passages and do not require a new conclusion to the Two Ways.¹⁴¹ Although γρηγορεῖτε ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς ὑμῶν (Did. 16.1) alludes to Did. 1–6, Rordorf and Tuilier argue that Did. 16 not only finds no extension to Did. 1–6, but also the form and content neglects any correspondence.¹⁴²

Van de Sandt and Flusser, likewise, continue constructing an argument against a Did. 1–6 and 16 *Vorlage*. They offer two arguments to suggest that Did. 1–6 maintains the conclusion to the Two Ways and that Did. 16 is not displaced from its original position at the conclusion of the Didache’s Two Ways. First, they argue for a genealogical relation to other Two Ways sources.¹⁴³ For van de Sandt and Flusser, a Greek Two Ways source is the “best represented” source underlying Did. 1.1–6.1 and the Latin *De Doctrina*.¹⁴⁴ Kloppenborg argues, also, for a kind of genealogical structure of the Two Ways source.¹⁴⁵ Second, van de Sandt and Flusser suggest that other extant Two Ways in early Christianity were dependent upon moral Jewish instruction, which is no longer extant.¹⁴⁶ Thus, the original ending “cannot have contained more than an eschatological tinge at most, since the conclusion of the Two Ways as represented in *Doctrina* 6:4–5 just faintly echoes some allusion to the End while the Didache’s rendering of the Two Way’s conclusion

¹⁴¹Rordorf and Tuilier, *Didachè*, 82.

¹⁴²Rordorf and Tuilier, *Didachè*, 82.

¹⁴³van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 37.

¹⁴⁴van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 37–38.

¹⁴⁵Kloppenborg, “Transformation of Moral Exhortation,” 92; Also see John S. Kloppenborg, “The Use of the Synoptics or Q in *Did.* 1:3b–2:1,” in *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?*, ed. Huub van de Sandt (Philadelphia: Fortress, 2005), 108–9.

¹⁴⁶van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 38.

lacks any eschatological preoccupation.”¹⁴⁷

Despite these differences in positions, some agreements do emerge. These agreements help push towards a general consensus. Most scholars do agree that the original conclusion to the Two Ways in the Didache is missing.¹⁴⁸ According to Kloppenborg, Niederwimmer, and van de Sandt and Flusser, a more original ending, without the final doxology, is preserved in the Latin *De Doctrina*.¹⁴⁹ Often, notions of eschatology or paraenetic eschatology are affirmed as part of the end of the Two Ways. For example, Jonathan Draper observes, “There are suggestions that Jewish Tractates of the kind represented by 1–5 would originally have ended with eschatological exhortation, as found in 16 or part of it.”¹⁵⁰ Likewise, Jefford detects,

There is a clearly a return to the “two ways” motif found at the beginning of the section (Barn 18.1–2; cf. Did 1.1), which includes an eschatological element not otherwise found in H or Doct. There may be some reason to think that a similar focus was originally associated with the “two ways” of the Didache if chapter 16 once served as the conclusion to these materials before the insertion of chapters 7–15.¹⁵¹

Is Didache 1–6 and 16 a Former Literary Unity?

Given these concerns, observations, and reflective positions, I want to integrate my current research into this discussion. Based upon the Two Ways texts and traditions typology and distinctions that I offered in chapter 2, and selected

¹⁴⁷van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 38; cf. Myllykoski, “Without Decree,” 451.

¹⁴⁸Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 164.

¹⁴⁹Kloppenborg, “Transformation of Moral Exhortation,” 96–97; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 120–21; van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 119–20, 138.

¹⁵⁰Draper, “A Continuing Enigma,” 108.

¹⁵¹Clayton N. Jefford, *Didache: The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, ECA 5 (Salem, OR: Polebridge Press, 2013), 54.

internal readings of Did. 1–6, my argument builds upon the position that Did. 16 did not function as an original eschatological and apocalyptic ending to the Didache's Two Ways. Moreover, I aim to advance the arguments offered by Rordorf, Tuilier, Kloppenborg, and van de Sandt and Flusser.

First, the vast majority of Two Ways texts have both an apocalyptic conclusion as well as a literary frame that incorporates various apocalyptic motifs. That is, if a tradition has both Two Ways instruction and a Two Ways literary structure, it will, more often than not, have apocalyptic connotations. For example, 1 En. 91.1 frames the Two Ways with angelic presence. Barnabas 18.1–2 utilized cosmological dualisms. The conclusion, likewise, frames obedience with a reward of the kingdom (Barn. 21.1). Testament of Benjamin 6.1 has the evil way under the auspice of Beliar. Even if other Two Ways texts contain an extended apocalyptic or eschatological instruction as some form of conclusion, this glaring absence accentuates the lack of apocalyptic instruction within the Didache's Two Ways. This position and evidence, then, desires to modify Del Verme's argument:

Connected with the 'Two Ways', chap. 16 appears as eschatological advice coming from an Enochic matrix. The section of the 'Two Ways', in fact, expounds ideas treasured by both the Enochic and Qumran movement, in particular dualism, as is shown by a series of parallels with the *Community Rule* (1QS) and by other writings.¹⁵²

Yes, the Two Ways share this eschatological and apocalyptic outlook as found in Enoch and Qumran, and possibly others, but Did. 16 and not Did. 1–6 is used to construct this connection. Thus, it may not be Did. 16 that softens such apocalypticism in Did. 1–6; rather, the Didachist is breaking from a stable content structure of ancient Two Ways texts.¹⁵³

¹⁵²Del Verme, *Didache and Judaism*, 246.

¹⁵³Contra Del Verme, *Didache and Judaism*, 261. According to Del Verme, "The connection of Did. 16 with the section of the 'Two Ways' (chaps. 1–6) better allows one to clarify the ideological context of the apocalypse in question: the importance of dualistic conceptions, which

Second, even if a composite addition or original text of Did. 6 contained eschatological and apocalyptic concepts, it still does not answer *how* and *why* these features are nearly entirely absent within the Didache's Two Ways teaching as a whole. That is, even if Did. 16 was part of the Didache's version of the Two Ways, it does not provide adequate answers for the missing apocalyptic features within the contents of the Two Ways. Similarly, even if redaction and composite additions to the Didache's literary text observes a coherent or non-coherent connection between Did. 1–6 and 16, why do the internal teachings on meekness and inheritance break from reception history and are not apocalyptically oriented (Did. 3.7); why does the Didachist reduce the judgment clause in Did. 4.1; and, why is τέλειος joined to virtue and not an apocalyptic orientation (Did. 6.2)? When compared to other Two Ways texts that have a more clear apocalyptic orientation, the apocalyptic components are not solely relegated to the conclusion.

Third, even if Did. 16 can function as the conclusion to the Didache's Two Ways, it still lacks the prevalent apocalyptic features found in ancient Two Ways texts. The presence of angels (cf. Did. 16.7), light-darkness dualism, and explicit cosmological differences are all lacking in Did. 16. Thus, even if Did. 16 is an earlier ending to Did. 1–6, signs of redaction are readily visible due to its break from other ancient Two Ways texts. To accentuate this matter, Jefford notes that “the situation of Did. 16 also differs slightly from that of Did. 1–5 in that there does not appear to be any dependence upon the framework of the Two Ways source in this concluding chapter.”¹⁵⁴

probably derived from Enochic-Essene and Qumranic *milieux*, is a tangible sign indicating where to situate the (ideological) *Sitz im Leben* of the tradition found in the Didache.” This argument is my primary contention. Even if these features were true, it still does not answer why the explicit two spirits scheme and dualistic categories are absent in Did. 1–6. I agree with Del Verme's Enochic-Essene and Qumranic comments but he neglects to mention the angelic and dualistic categories.

¹⁵⁴Jefford, *Sayings of Jesus*, 92.

Finally, although Two Ways texts frequently include an eschatological paraenetic as a conclusion, they are individualized. If Did. 16 qualifies as a conclusion to the Didache's Two Ways, then the Didache would still be something of an anomaly by offering a corporate eschatological conclusion. Pardee rightly notes,

Chapter 16, however, differs from the conclusions in Barnabas and the *Doctrina*, particularly in its presentation of a systematic, apocalyptic description of the events of the end-time rather than simply a description of eschatological rewards and punishments as one would expect based on the other Two Ways texts.¹⁵⁵

Thus, Two Ways texts convey individualized eschatological implications frequently based upon a rewards system connected to the Two Ways, whereas Did. 16 explores concepts that are more corporate and global in scope.¹⁵⁶

Summary: Apocalypticism and Internal Readings of Didache 1–6

In the previous two chapters, I have argued how the Didache lacks apocalyptic motifs in Did. 1–6 in order to give primacy to ethics. Even in particular instances where apocalyptic or a two-angel scheme is quite ubiquitous in an ancient Two Ways genre, the Didache does not include these apocalyptic features so that they are nearly altogether absent in Did. 1–6.

In both chapters 5 and 6 I have sought to inquire how the Didachist addresses the apocalyptic features that are often prevalent within other ancient Two Ways texts. In the present chapter this question was inquired in order to assess individual readings within the Didache's Two Ways. Because of this focus, I raised relevant questions that pertained to interpretation of Didache, the value and function

¹⁵⁵Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*, 165.

¹⁵⁶For a consideration on the lost ending of the Did., consult Robert E. Aldridge, "The Lost Ending of the Didache," *VC* 53, no. 1 (1999): 1–15.

of the history of interpretation, and whether or not Did. 16 functioned as a potential ending to Did. 1–6 as a former *Vorlage*.

In order to demonstrate that apocalypticism is missing in the Didache's Two Ways, I built a four-fold argument. I offered a reading of Did. 3.7 and argued that the intersection of “meekness” and “inheritance” motifs, while highly probable to communicate some form of apocalyptic or eschatological concepts, does not have an overly explicit eschatological component in Did. 3. Second, I offered a text comparison between Did. 4.1–2 with Barn. 19.9–10 and suggested that Barnabas shows signs of amending the Two Ways instruction with an eschatological judgment tradition. Third, I constructed an argument around the intersection of τέλειος, ζυγός, and Did. 6.2. Even though an obedience-reward paradigm is present, the Greek and Roman concept of virtue and wholeness meet together with obedience as it relates to a restructured version of Christian Torah (cf. Did. 1.3–5)—thus lacking apocalyptic components. Τέλειος is the reward of Torah obedience and thus inclusion into the community. Last, I addressed an issue that emerges in Didache scholarship regarding the possible Didache *Vorlage*. If this former textual reconstruction is so, it may offer reasons for *why* the Didachist redacts the apocalyptic instruction. Yet, I argued the Two Ways forms a literary genre that does not include an apocalyptic and eschatological theology that is continuous with Did. 16. So, Did. 16 does not create a former Didache *Vorlage* along with Did. 1–6.

For subsequent research, scholars may now further seek to inquire as to as *why* the Didachist redacts such apocalyptic features. In the conclusion I will turn to summarize my entire argument and research findings, as well as offer suggested avenues as to proceed along these lines of inquiry.

CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION

The principle aim in this study has been to assess the relationship between the apocalyptic worldview that often accompanies a Two Ways genre and that of the *Didache*. The guiding question found its origins in Niederwimmer's observation. On *Did.* 1.1, he makes the following observations:

Hence the quotation of the *Didache*'s source begins immediately at *Did.* 1.1. It is a citation from one version of the Two Ways tractate. It can no longer be said with certainty whether this source spoke not only of the two ways but also of the two angels or spirits who are placed over those ways. . . . The *Didachist* would have omitted the motif of the *angeli duo*, perhaps because it plays no part in the exposition that follows.¹

This observation was followed by a brief comparison of 1QS III–IV, Barn. 18–21, *Did.* 1–6, and *Doctr.* 1–6. Building from the Two Ways lists in Margaret McKenna's,² Niederwimmer's,³ and Matthew Larsen and Michael Svigel's⁴ works, cosmological dualisms and binary angelic beings readily frame the Two Ways.⁵ If

¹Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache: A Commentary*, trans. Linda M. Maloney, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 63.

²Margaret Mary McKenna, "The Two Ways' in Jewish and Christian Writings of the Greco-Roman Period: A Study of the Form of Repentance Parenesis" (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1981), 261–73.

³Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 59–63.

⁴Matthew Larsen and Michael Svigel, "The First Century Two Ways Catechesis and Hebrews 6:1–6," in *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, ECL 14 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 481.

⁵In 2000, Robert Kraft offers four ways in which Two Ways scholarship might advance discussions. My thesis, in my estimation, adds to a foundational base for his fourth area of contribution. Kraft's research questions inquire about the social conditions of such apocalyptic changes where as my thesis provides a broader literary and text comparison assessment. Kraft inquires, "What considerations are significant, if not persuasive, for determining when and under what conditions transitions or transformations relating to Jewish and/or early Christian two-ways

these concepts are rather pervasive in antiquity and form a Two Ways genre, then how does the Didache differ from this ancient genre?

Thus, I argued the Didache's Two Ways coheres with an ancient apocalyptic Two Ways genre in terms of its literary form, yet the Didachist does not incorporate the apocalyptic features, dualistic connotations, and the two spirits scheme to maintain a purely ethical version of the Two Ways.

Summary of Argument

Essentially, my argument revolved around three broad concepts and developments. First, I placed apocalyptic historical critical scholarship in concert with early Christian scholarship on the Two Ways. In chapter 2, I documented and evaluated the contributions of John J. Collins and his extensive treatment of the apocalyptic genre. As apocalyptic generic studies continue to be refined, I aimed to connect these discussions with Two Ways generic questions. Consequently, I documented numerous Two Ways in antiquity and made an essential distinction between Two Ways texts and Two Ways traditions (see table A1 in appendix). The former is considered a Two Ways and contains a specific literary structure whereby the latter is also considered part of the Two Ways but lacks a structured form. By doing so, a typology of Two Ways texts reveals a number of reoccurring apocalyptic motifs:

1. angelic or otherworldly figures
2. angelic or otherworldly ethical influence
3. dualistic cosmological structures

traditions might have taken place? For example, what led to the establishment of (an) instructional framework(s) or to the introduction (or removal) of eschatological ideas?" Robert A. Kraft, "Early Developments of the 'Two-Ways Tradition(s),' in Retrospect," in *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*, ed. Randal A. Argall, Beverly A. Bow, and Rodney A. Werline (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000), 143.

4. divine determinism
5. anthropological telic ends

I argued that, in addition to McKenna's Two Ways description, ancient Two Ways texts will generally incorporate the following structure and content:

1. Dualistic Literary Introduction⁶
2. Sapiential Invitation to Consider Dualized Ethical Path⁷
3. Virtue and Vice Lists⁸
4. Eschatological Paraenetic Addressing Wayfarer⁹
5. Literary Redaction and Individuality of Two Ways Texts¹⁰

Next, I evaluated specific Two Ways texts that are often placed in association to the Didache's Two Ways. By taking the heuristic typology from chapter 2, I evaluated the apocalyptic motifs in 1QS III, 13–IV, 26; Testament of Asher; Galatians 5:16–24; Barn. 18–21; *De Doctrina*; and Herm. Mand. 6.1–2 (35–36). Many in Didache scholarship place these texts in relation to the Didache.¹¹

⁶Within this leading theme, the following are also included. See chapter 2 for an extended argument: (a) Angelic or Otherworldly Guides; (b) Optical Dualisms (Light and Darkness); (c) Anthropological Dualisms (Life and Death); (d) Cosmological Dualisms (Heavenly/Earthly, Spiritual/Physical); (e) Divine ordination of angelic and cosmological order.

⁷Within this leading theme, the following are also included. See chapter 2 for an extended argument: (a) Description of different pathways; (b) Invitation to consider right path.

⁸Within this leading theme, the following are also included. See chapter 2 for an extended argument: (a) Intermixed Virtue and Vice qualities; (b) Virtue Lists followed by Vice Lists; (c) Vice Lists followed by Virtue Lists.

⁹Within this leading theme, the following are also included. See chapter 2 for an extended argument: (a) Rewards System for Wayfarer; (b) Rhetorical Negative Consequences; (c) Deterministic outcome for humanity.

¹⁰Within this leading theme, the following are also included. See chapter 2 for an extended argument: (a) Introduction reflects individual concerns of redactor (i.e., no Two Ways introductions are same); (b) Transitional cues between virtue and vice lists; (c) Conclusion reflects individual concerns of redactor (i.e., no Two Ways conclusions are same).

¹¹See Jean-Paul Audet, *La Didachè: Instructions des Apôtres, EBib* (Paris: Gabalda, 1958), 121–66; M. Jack Suggs, "The Christian Two Ways Tradition: Its Antiquity, Form, and Function," in *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren*, ed. David Edward Aune, NovTSup 33 (Leiden: Brill, 1972), 60–74; Willy Rordorf and André Tuilier, *La Doctrine Des Douze Apôtres (Didachè): Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction, Notes, Appendice, Annexe et Index*, 2nd ed., Sources Chrétiennes 248 (Paris: Les Éditions Du Cerf, 1978), 22–34; Clayton N. Jefford, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, VCSup 11 (Leiden:

Chapter 3 evaluated these specific texts and their unique outlook regarding an apocalyptic worldview and the Two Ways. Each of these texts took some liberty in their unique contribution, but they generally communicated the five apocalyptic motifs.

Finally, the Didache took central stage for the final three chapters. In chapter 4 I built upon Nancy Pardee's discourse analysis of the whole Didache.¹² I argued that the Didache's literary frame of the Two Ways is highly structured. It begins in Did. 1.1 and concludes in 6.1–2. Furthermore, embedded in this Two Ways literary frame are two additional sub-texts that both have an introduction and conclusion: 1.2–4.14 and 5.1–2.

Chapters 5 and 6 built from the text divisions and identification of the Two Ways in the Didache. In both chapters I inquired how the Didachist integrates an apocalyptic worldview into its version of the Two Ways. In chapter 5, I applied this question to the literary frame of the Didache's Two Ways; whereas in chapter 6, I applied this question to individual readings within the Didache's Two Ways. In both chapters, apocalyptic themes do not appear in the Didache's Two Ways (Did. 1–6). Thus, the Didache is seen as making a unique contribution to early Christianity because of the near ubiquitous nature of the apocalyptic worldview in the Two Ways genre.

Brill, 1989), 27n17; Kurt Niederwimmer, *Die Didache*, KAV 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 48–54, 61n72; Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 30–34, 40n73; Bart D. Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers I*, LCL 24 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 408; Marcello Del Verme, *Didache and Judaism: Jewish Roots of an Ancient Christian-Jewish Work* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 246–47; Alan J. P. Garro, *The Gospel of Matthew's Dependence on the Didache*, LNTS 254 (New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), 67–92; John S. Kloppenborg, "Didache 1.1—6.1, James, Matthew, and the Torah," in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew Gregory and Christopher Tuckett, NTAf (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 195; Nancy Pardee, *The Genre and Development of the Didache*, WUNT 2/339 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 50, 77–80, 126, 167.

¹²Pardee, *Genre and Development of the Didache*.

Hypotheses and Further Areas of Research

A number of additional questions readily emerged during the course of this study. These additional insights could be theses and individual projects in their own right. I offer selected hypotheses or questions to advance the current research. First, what is the relationship of early Jewish apocalypticism, the presence of angels, and Gnostic teachings? In other words, if the Didache is viewed as a Jewish-Christian text, is the lack of angelic beings reminiscent of distancing from second-century Gnosticism? For example, angels within the Gnostic tradition accompany persons within one's spiritual piety (e.g., the bridegroom motif in Gospel of Philip). Irenaeus of Lyon's recitation of Marcus's material presents an angelic representative for humanity: ". . . since the Father of all continues to behold your angel before his face. Now the place of your angel is among us . . ." (*Haer.* 1.13.3). It may be argued that Barnabas is a Gnostic text (cf. Barn. 1), which eventually ties this *gnosis* to the Two Ways (Barn. 18.1). According to Christopher Rowland, "Concentration on the eschatological characteristics of apocalyptic has not prevented commentators from noting the similarities which exist between the apocalyptic literature and gnostic texts."¹³ If these connections prove valuable, then it may begin to give historical reasons *why* the Didache offers a different version of the Two Ways.

Second, I focused more on the *how* than I did on the *why* of apocalyptic redactions. As I build upon the first question above, this second, related question will begin to inquire and expand further upon *why* the Didachist makes such

¹³Christopher C. Rowland, "Apocalyptic: The Disclosure of Heavenly Knowledge," in *The Early Roman Period Part Two*, ed. William Horbury, W. D. Davies, and John Sturdy, CHJ 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 790. Trevor Curnow notes the following: "It is not surprising that there is much in common between apocalypticism and Gnosticism, since both are concerned with the human predicament and the way out of it. . . . For Gnosticism the whole of the history of the world might be regarded as one big mistake, but apocalypticism eagerly looks out for the signs that are omens of its imminent end." Trevor Curnow, *Wisdom in the Ancient World* (London: Duckworth, 2010), 165.

redactional choices. Some of the following questions and hypotheses come to mind. If Did. 16 contains apocalyptic concepts, how did this influence the composition of Did. 1–6? Even if the Two Ways apocalyptic worldview is not manifest in Did. 16, are there enough salient features to remove these apocalyptic concepts in Did. 1–6? Furthermore, what is the historical placement and influence of the Didache upon the reception of Two Ways material into early Christian monastic and catechesis settings? In other words, what texts are available to the Didachist during the composition of a non-apocalyptic Two Ways text and, subsequently, what texts are affected by the Didache's source recension? If these critical questions can be proven with historical criteria, then we may begin to answer *why* the Didachist redacts the apocalyptic elements. To embark upon these sets of questions will answer some of the source recension questions, a possible Didache *Vorlage*, and what traditions are available to the Didachist in a given time and region.

Third, although I focused predominantly upon ancient Jewish and early Christian (second-century) Two Ways material, what is the contribution of other non-Jewish forms of the Two Ways and late Christian antique forms of the Two Ways? For example, Two Ways material appears in Iranian, ancient Greek and Roman, Egyptian, and Islamic contexts. In addition, the Two Ways appear in church manuals and catechesis instructions from the third-century onward. Within these respective contexts and cultural settings, how does the Two Ways function and what is its relationship to apocalypticism? In other words, these sets of related questions would extend the focused research of the present study and extend the focus of *kinds* of texts placed under evaluation.

APPENDIX

TWO WAYS TEXTS AND TRADITIONS: A
TAXONOMY OF APOCALYPTIC MOTIFS

The following table and summary of primary source material functions as the base by which I assert a Two Ways apocalyptic genre.

A Heuristic Taxonomy of Two Ways Texts and Traditions

Table A1 lists ancient traditions and whether or not they qualify as a Two Ways text. They are additionally accompanied with six apocalyptic categories.

Table A1. Apocalyptic motifs in Two Ways texts and traditions

	Two Ways Text	Cosmology	Divine Determinism	Angelic Beings	Angelic Ethical Influence	Anthropological Destiny	Ethics: Virtue and Vice List
<i>Hebrew Bible</i>							
Deut 11:26–28	X					X	
Deut 30:15–20	X	X				X	X
1 Kgs 9:4–9						X	X
Isa 35:1–10		X				X	
Isa 59:8–15		X					X
Jer 6:16–20	X		X	X		X	
Jer 7:21–8:3		X	X			X	

Table A1—continued

	Two Ways Text	Cosmology	Divine Determinism	Angelic Beings	Angelic Ethical Influence	Anthropological Destiny	Ethics: Virtue and Vice List
Jer 21:8–10	X		X			X	X
Ezek 18:1–29							X
Ps 1:1–6	X	X	X			X	X
Ps 37:1–40		X	X			X	X
Ps 119(118):29–32						X	X
Prov 2:1–22	X		X		X	X	X
Prov 4:10–27	X	X				X	X
Prov 11:19–20							X
Prov 12:28–14:2						X	X
<i>Ancient Jewish and Rabbinic Literature</i> ¹							
Tob 4.1–21			X			X	X
2 Esd 7.1–140 (4 Ezra 7.1–140)	X	X	X	X		X	X
Sir 15.15–20						X	
Sir 33.14–15						X	X
1 En. 91–107 (cf. 94.1–5)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

¹A helpful list of Rabbinic Two Ways readings appear in Str-B 1.461–62; 4.1080.

Table A1—continued

	Two Ways Text	Cosmology	Divine Determinism	Angelic Beings	Angelic Ethical Influence	Anthropological Destiny	Ethics: Virtue and Vice List
2 En. 30.14–15 (longer recension)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
2 En. 42.10		X				X	X
T. Ash. 1.1–8.2	X		X	X	X	X	X
T. Levi 19.1–5		X	X		X	X	X
T. Jud. 20.1–5				X	X	X	
T. Benj. 6.1–7	X		X	X	X	X	X
Pss. Sol. 14			X			X	X
1QS III, 13–IV, 26	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
1QS IX, 22–XI, 24		X	X	X	X	X	X
1QH VI, 1–30			X	X	X	X	X
CD						X	X
4Q548 (4QVisions of Amram)		X	X	X	X	X	X
4Q473			X			X	X
Philo <i>Spec.</i> , IV.108						X	
Philo <i>Leg.</i> , II.97–98					X	X	X
Philo <i>Abr.</i> 204						X	X

Table A1—continued

	Two Ways Text	Cosmology	Divine Determinism	Angelic Beings	Angelic Ethical Influence	Anthropological Destiny	Ethics: Virtue and Vice List
Philo <i>Sacr.</i> 20–40	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
m. Avot 2:1							X
b. Avot 2:9							X
b. Hag. 3b							X
b. Menah. 99b							X
Tg.Ps.-J. on Deut 30:15		X				X	X
Tg.Neof. on Deut 30:15		X				X	X
Avot R.Nat. 14							X
Rab. Exod. 30:20							X
<i>Persian and Near Eastern Literature</i>							
Yas. 30.1–11	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Yas. 45.1–11		X	X	X	X	X	X
The “Book of the Two Ways” of the Egyptians		X	X	X	X	X	X

Table A1—continued

	Two Ways Text	Cosmology	Divine Determinism	Angelic Beings	Angelic Ethical Influence	Anthropological Destiny	Ethics: Virtue and Vice List
<i>Graeco-Roman Literature</i>							
Hesiod, <i>Op.</i> 213–274						X	X
Hesiod, <i>Op.</i> 287–292						X	X
Theognis, <i>Eleg.</i> 911–14						X	X
Xenophon, <i>Mem.</i> 2.21–34				X	X	X	X
Plato, <i>Gorg.</i> 524A			X			X	X
Plato, <i>Resp.</i> 10.614C			X			X	X
Diphilus ² the Comic Poet			X			X	X
Virgil, <i>Aen.</i> 6.539–43						X	X
Silius Italicus, <i>Pun.</i> 15.20–140	X			X	X	X	X
Plutarch, <i>Dem.</i> 26.7						X	X
Cebetis Tabula		X	X	X	X	X	X

²Diphilus is quoted by Clement of Alexandria in *Strom.* V.14 and Eusebius *Dem. ev.* XIII.13. Portions of this quotation is also found in Ps.-Justin, *De Monarchia* III, but is partially ascribed to both Philemon and Euripides.

Table A1—continued

	Two Ways Text	Cosmology	Divine Determinism	Angelic Beings	Angelic Ethical Influence	Anthropological Destiny	Ethics: Virtue and Vice List
<i>New Testament and Early Christian Literature</i>							
Matt 7:13–14 ³						X	X
Matt 7:15–27						X	X
Matt 25:31–46	X	X	X	X		X	X
Luke 6:20–26						X	X
Luke 13:23–30		X	X			X	X
Rom 6:12–23						X	X
Gal 5:16–24	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Eph 2:1–10		X	X	X	X	X	X
Eph 4:17–24				X		X	X
Jas 1:1–5:20						X	X
1 John 1:6–7		X				X	X
1 John 3:4–10						X	X
1 John 5:16–20		X	X	X	X	X	X
Did. 1.1–6.2	X					X	X

³Hans Dieter Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain (Matthew 5:3–7:27 and Luke 6:20–49)*, ed. Adela Yarbro Collins, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 522–23; Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity*, CRINT: Section III Jewish Traditions in Early Christian Literature 5 (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 81–111.

Table A1—continued

	Two Ways Text	Cosmology	Divine Determinism	Angelic Beings	Angelic Ethical Influence	Anthropological Destiny	Ethics: Virtue and Vice List
Barn. 18.1–21.1	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Ign. <i>Magn.</i> 5						X	X
Herm. Mand. 6.1–2 (35–36)	X		X	X	X	X	X
Herm. Mand. 7–9 (37–39)						X	X
2 Clem. 6.1–9	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
2 Clem. 17.7–18.2				X	X	X	X
Sib. Or. 8.399–401			X		X	X	
Ps.-Clem. <i>Rec.</i> VII.7.1–2					X	X	X
Ps.-Clem. <i>Rec.</i> VIII.54–55		X	X	X	X	X	X
Ps.-Clem. <i>H.</i> XX.2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Ep. Apos. 39–40		X				X	X
Justin, 2 <i>Apol.</i> 9				X		X	
Justin, 2 <i>Apol.</i> 11				X	X	X	X
Theophilus, <i>Autol.</i> 1.2						X	X
Irenaeus, <i>Epid.</i> 1–2		X				X	X

Table A1—continued

	Two Ways Text	Cosmology	Divine Determinism	Angelic Beings	Angelic Ethical Influence	Anthropological Destiny	Ethics: Virtue and Vice List
Irenaeus, <i>Epid.</i> 98–100						X	X
Clement of Alexandria <i>Strom.</i> V.5						X	X
Origen, <i>Hom. Luc.</i> 35.3–6		X	X	X	X	X	X
Basil, <i>Hom. Ps. 1</i> (<i>Hom.</i> 10.5)	X		X	X	X ⁴	X	X
<i>Doctr.</i> 1–6	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Eccl. Can.</i>	X					X	X
Epitome	X					X	X
Apos. Con. 7.1–19	X					X	X
<i>Vita Shenoute</i>	X					X	X
<i>Syntagma doctrinae</i>	X					X	X
<i>Fides patrum</i>	X					X	X
Gos. Truth (NHC I 3.30–33)			X	X	X		

⁴Basil, *Hom.* 10.5: “And there are guides, each attempting to turn the traveler to himself. Now, the smooth and downward sloping way has a deceptive guide, a wicked demon, who drags his followers through the pleasure to destruction, but the rough and steep way has a good angel, who leads his followers through the toils of virtue to a blessed end.” Basil of Caesarea, *Exegetical Homilies*, trans. Sister Agnes Clare Way, FC 46 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1963).

Table A1—continued

	Two Ways Text	Cosmology	Divine Determinism	Angelic Beings	Angelic Ethical Influence	Anthropological Destiny	Ethics: Virtue and Vice List
2 Apoc. Jas. (NHC V 4.55–59)				X	X	X	X
Paraph. Shem (NHC VII 1.1–3)		X	X	X	X		
Teach. Silv. (NHC VII 4.103–107)	X	X		X	X	X	X

**Comments on Specific Texts:
Hebrew Bible**

Deuteronomy 11:26–28. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways text and briefly portrays antithetical options. The two antithetical options are blessings and cursings that are based upon obedience. It lacks divine determinism and does offer, vaguely, anthropological ends.

Deuteronomy 30:15–20. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways text. The dual antithetical options are “life and good” and “death and evil.” Thus, these metaphors convey both ethical dispositions as well as anthropological appointments. Cosmology is loosely tied to “heaven and earth” and they function as witnesses of the stipulations. Although brief, both dual options contain a virtue and vice list.

First Kings 9:4–9. This instruction to Solomon is loosely identified as a Two Ways text but lacks explicit Two Ways introduction. Yet, nonetheless, two antithetical options are placed before Solomon that have governing ethics and stipulations that will determine his end. Rather than addressing an eschatological

outcome for both ways, the traditions convey a perpetual throne or a proverb of failure.

Isaiah 35:1–10. This tradition is a weak attestation to the Two Ways tradition because the two dualistic ethics are scattered and do not adhere closely to a particular structure. Yet, it does use a road metaphor, on which some will walk and some will not walk. Though lacking cosmology, the tradition is set within an eschatological setting by noting the return of YHWH (Isa 35:10).

Isaiah 59:8–15. This tradition is another weak attestation to the Two Ways tradition because of a scattered ethical description. It does evoke a road metaphor: a way of peace and a crooked road. Cosmology is presented in the form of a temporal metaphor that uses noon and twilight images. If the Two Ways tradition includes 59:16–20, then a virtue list may accompany the vice list in 59:8–15.

Jeremiah 6:16–20. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways text. It presents a road metaphor whereby some inquire about the good way that will provide rest for their souls. YHWH has set watchmen to stand over the wayfarers. Those that do not pay attention will undergo disaster.

Jeremiah 7:21–8:3. Due to the length of this tradition, a clear Two Ways structure is lacking. By evoking the Deuteronomic traditions of obedience and cursings, Jeremiah predominantly gives attention to the vice qualities and outcome of this way of being.

Jeremiah 21:8–10. This Two Ways text is set within the framework of Nebuchadnezzar besieging Jerusalem. Thus, the way of life and way of death reflect a particular ethic: surrender and live, or remain in the city and die. Divine

determinism is prefaced with the expression of YHWH “setting his face against” the city.

Ezekiel 18:1–29. This tradition vaguely corresponds to a Two Ways tradition. The righteous and wicked ethics are portrayed in a hypothetical person.

Psalms 1:1–6. Although lacking the road metaphor, Psalm 1 qualifies as a Two Ways text. It contains an introductory line that introduces two kinds of dispositions, while predominantly focusing on “the blessed one.” The virtue of the blessed person is accentuated by the avoidance of particular vices. This Psalm ends with YHWH knowing the way of the righteous and the way of the wicked, and their individual outcome.

Psalms 37:1–40 (36 LXX). This tradition is broadly considered a Two Ways tradition because of the antithetical ethics and outcomes. It lacks a specific Two Ways structure, yet conveys a back and forth ethical and action description between the one who commits their ways to YHWH and the wicked.

Psalms 119:29–32 (118 LXX). This tradition broadly identifies as a Two Ways tradition, yet only focuses on positive ethics and virtue categories. This ethical form of the Two Ways tradition is similarly found in other portions of Psalm 119 (118 LXX).

Proverbs 2:1–22. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways text with an extended introduction. Wisdom, rather than an angelic being, is personified to influence humanity. The pathway metaphor extends to both those who are righteous and who are wicked. Rather than listing vices, sexual deviance (Prov 2:16–19) is considered the way of the wicked. This Two Ways text, moreover, is framed within wisdom tradition.

Proverbs 4:10–27. Much like Proverbs 2, this tradition qualifies as a Two Ways text and is framed within wisdom tradition. Rather than wisdom functioning as a personified figure, wisdom functions as the pathway (4:11). Cosmological terms are expressed in terms of metaphors. The ethics for both the righteous and wicked are delineated (4:14–19).

Proverbs 11:19–20. Albeit brief, this tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition due to its road metaphor and dualistic ethics. The virtue and vice lists are limited to a steadfast pursuit of righteousness or a pursuit of evil.

Proverbs 12:28–14:2. Framed within a wisdom tradition, it would be difficult to make a firm case that 12:28–14:2 comprise a literary unit. Yet, the metaphor of a road, life and death, and particular outcomes could function as an *inclusio* (12:28; 14:2). If so, then, this tradition would qualify as a Two Ways tradition, and possibly a Two Ways text. It predominantly centers upon ethics and wisdom tradition.

Comments on Specific Texts: Ancient Jewish and Rabbinic Literature

Tobit 4.1–21. This tradition lacks the literary structure of Two Ways texts, but has enough antithetical ethical concepts to qualify as a Two Ways tradition. The setting is framed around Tobit, prior to death, instructing Tobias about the money he left in trust with Gabael (Tob 4.1–4). Thus, virtuous living corresponds to almsgiving (4.6–7, 10, 16).

Second Esdras 7.1–140 (4 Ezra 7.1–140). This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways text. An angelic mediator conveys two parables of a sea and a city to communicate the necessities of first undergoing trials. The sea, both vast and deep, has an entrance in a narrow place (7.3–4). The city is built upon a plain but its

entrance is narrow and set in a dangerous place so that only one person may travel on it at a given time (7.6–8). Throughout 7.10–74, two ways ethics are expressed with no literary structure within an apocalyptic setting. Yet, 7.75–99 convey the way of death and then those who have kept the way of the Most High.

Sirach 15.15–20. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition that is within a wisdom genre. Lacking any form of divine determinism, persons choose life and death and their outcome is based upon their choice.

Sirach 33.14–15. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition and fits within wisdom tradition. The anthropological ends and ethics of this tradition are matched in terms of parallel expressions: good and life are the opposite of evil and death.

First Enoch 91–107 (cf. 94.1–5). This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways text that both has an imbedded two ways structure and an apocalyptic and wisdom setting. The angelic influence manifests in 91.1 when the spirit is poured into Enoch to give instruction. He shows his sons the ways of righteousness and the ways of wickedness (91.18–19; 91.4). The majority of instruction is framed within an apocalyptic end of humanity: judgment for the sinners (100.7; 103.5), and suffering and preservation for the righteous (97.1; 100.1, 4–5; 102.2–7). Explicit two ways instruction is situated in 1 En. 94. Instruction is given to love righteousness but the ways of perdition will perish.

Second Enoch 30.14–15 (longer recension). This tradition, albeit overly brief, qualifies as a Two Ways text because of its adherence to the Two Ways literary structure. Framed within an apocalyptic setting, four stars are given to Adam, most likely angels (cf. 2 En. 31.11). Two ways instruction is manifest in terms of light and darkness categories (30.14).

Second Enoch 42.10. This brief tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Cosmology is briefly expressed through the road metaphor. One path resembles the present world, whereas the right path will bring eschatological life.

Testament of Asher 1.1–8.2. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways text due to its adherence to a particular Two Ways literary structure. The two ways are categorized in two polarized antitheses: two ways of thinking, actions, models, and goals (T. Ash. 1.3). Each of these pairs are good or evil and reside within the heart of humanity (T. Ash. 1.5–6). With respect to angelic influence, those who are mastered by the evil ways are over-powered by Beliar (T. Ash. 1.9). Even the example of Sodom presents the complexity of a failure to recognize the good set of angels (T. Ash. 7.1–2).

Testament of Levi 19.1–5. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition due to its brevity and to a lack of a Two Ways literary structure. The Two Ways are structured in terms of cosmological light and darkness dualism (T. Lev. 19.1). Following the light and darkness categories, the law of God is contrasted with the works of Beliar so as to suggest a reciprocal relationship between light and the law of God, and darkness with the works of Beliar (T. Lev. 19.2).

Testament of Judah 20.1–5. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Two spirits await humanity: a spirit of truth and a spirit of error (T. Jud. 20.1). Between these two spirits resides the conscience of a person. What the person desires determines what spirit has consumed them. In other portions of the Testaments, it is Beliar that influences the evil ways (T. Dan. 1.7; 3.6).

Testament of Benjamin 6.1–7. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways text because it generally adheres to a particular literary structure, though the introduction focuses on the good person (T. Benj. 6.1). This Two Ways text

introduces the good person, who is not in control of the deceitful spirit, Beliar, but who is under the influence of the angel of peace (T. Benj. 6.1). The following set of ethics describes the wicked person. Yet, it is the Lord who dwells in the good person and produces a particular set of righteous ethics. Beliar does not produce integrity and offers the sword to those who follow him (T. Benj. 6.7; 7.1).

Psalms of Solomon 14. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition because of the basic division of faithful ones and sinners and the loose idea of the road metaphor (Pss. Sol. 14.8). Both sets of figures have a particular set of ethical dispositions and features. Their outcome will either be Hades with death and destruction, or they will inherit life in happiness (Pss. Sol. 14.9–10).

1QS III, 13–IV, 26. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways text because of the literary structure of the Two Ways in 1QS IV, 2–14. The preamble highlights this instruction as part of wisdom and apocalyptic traditions. A master instructs a pupil about what kind of spirit the sons of man possess (1QS III, 13–14). God appoints two spirits to rule over humanity and angelic being battle one another for the ethical dispositions of humanity.

1QS IX, 22–XI, 24. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition even though the ethical dualism is less explicit. Hatred and the zealous person are qualified with certain characteristics (1QS IX, 22, 24). Particular angelic figures function as a kind of assembly (1QS XI, 7–8). The wicked and the righteous possess particular ethics and have a destined outcome (1QS XI, 9–15).

1QH VI, 1–30. This tradition loosely qualifies as a Two Ways tradition because it lacks a Two Ways literary structure yet contains an angelic ethical component. The instruction given by God casts the good and evil lot for humanity

according to the spirits (1QH VI, 10–11). Those of the non-elect and wicked will be blot out forever (1QH VI, 15–16).

CD. It is difficult not to include the Damascus Document as part of the larger Two Ways tradition. Though lacking the normal and more stabilized Two Ways structure, it vaguely corresponds to a form of Two Ways structure. This tradition evokes the history of Israel, Torah, and other ethical concepts to describe the righteousness of God and humanity.

4Q548. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition though the text is poorly preserved and quite fragmented. If a more stable document is found, this text could be re-categorized. An announcement is given about the pathway. On this pathway include sons of light and sons of darkness. The sons of light will go to light and the sons of darkness will go to death. In 4Q544 fr. 2, the Watcher rules over the darkness and is given the three names: Belial, Prince of Darkness, and Melkiresha.

4Q473. This fragmented text qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. If a more stable document is found, this text could be re-categorized. In this tradition, Two Ways are set before humanity; they are both reflective of good and evil ways. Divine blessings will be bestowed upon the wayfarers on the good way; yet, cursings and destruction will be bestowed upon travelers on the evil way.

Philo, *De specialibus legibus* IV.108. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. As a brief exhortation, Philo depicts life as two roads, appealing to the hoof as a symbol (*Spec.* 4.108). One road leads to wickedness while the other leads to virtue. He exhorts that one road must be renounced while the other must never be forsaken.

Philo, *Legum allegoriae* II.97–98. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Philo is offering an explanation to the phrase, “Therefore let Dan be a serpent in the path” (*Leg.* 2.97). One path, as Philo explains, is a soul. A list of virtues can accompany this soul. The principle of temperance is a serpent, rather than an angel, within the soul that serves to make advances throughout life (*Leg.* 2.98).

Philo, *De Abrahamo* 204. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Its brevity offers a minimal ethical depiction of a road that is accompanied with virtues and vices.

Philo, *De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini* 20–40. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways text. Though lacking a light and darkness metaphor, each person has two women living inside each soul (*Sacr.* 20–21). These two women take the common role of an angelic being. They are hostile and inimical to one another and thus manifest their virtue and vice. The virtues and vices of the women determine the outcome of the individual (*Sacr.* 39) within hints of determinism (*Sacr.* 40).

Mishnah Avot 2:1. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. The Rabbi asks a rhetorical question about the straight way for a person. Prior to setting out on the journey, the person considers the reward and punishment system that follows.

Babylonian Avot 2:9. This tradition could qualify either as a Two Ways text or Two Ways tradition. It conveys two segmented discussions of the good way and the evil way but is not structured in a particular way reminiscent of other Two Ways texts. In terms of the anthropological ends, human actions on either way have particular consequences—though unnamed.

Babylonian Hagigah 3b. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Torah is likened to a goad. An analogy is offered whereby a goad serves to direct a heifer. Thus, Torah is the necessary guide to direct away from the paths of death and lead to the paths of life.

Babylonian Menahot 99b. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. The Two Ways metaphor is communicated through the images of two different tables in the sanctuary: one of marble and one of gold. Subsequent instruction is given to portray showbread as it rests on both tables and its relation to the Day of Atonement. But the overall metaphor conveys the importance of having Torah both night and day proceeding from the individual.

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Deut 30:15. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. This brief exhortation likens the Two Ways in terms of “life” and “death.” The virtue of life is the Law. Following the way of life results with one living in the world to come.

Targum Neofiti on Deut 30:15. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. The Targum comments both on the text and in the margin.⁵ Life and goodness are polarized concepts to that of pestilence. The cosmological concepts reflect the world to come that contains the blessings of Eden. The wicked, however, will experience the state of Gehinnom.

⁵Sebastian Brock, “The Two Ways and the Palestinian Targum,” in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History*, ed. Philip R. Davies and Richard T. White, JSOTSup 100 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 140.

Avot of Rabbi Nathan 14. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. It lacks any form of a Two Ways structure. Virtues and vices accompany a road metaphor.⁶

Exodus Rabbah 30.20. This brief Jewish tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Obedience is framed with two roads. One is covered in thorns, accompanied with punishments; the other includes spices, probably the reward for such obedience.

**Comments on Specific Texts:
Ancient Persian and Near
Eastern Literature**

Yasna 30.1–11. This ancient Zoroastrian tradition qualifies as a Two Ways text. It adheres to the general Two Ways literary structure. There emerge two primal spirits that are twins: the better and bad (Yas. 30.3). These two spirits sought to please Ahura Mazda as manifest through their polarized ethics. They infiltrated humanity, which brought about judgment and life.

Yasna 45.1–11. This ancient Zoroastrian tradition contains all the required features of other Two Ways texts, but lacks the literary structure; and, thus, qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. The two spirits come to life prior to the formation of the cosmos, and they neither agree in thought, teachings, will, beliefs, words, deeds, selves, nor souls (Yas. 45.2). Through the ordination of Mazda Ahura, humanity possesses these two souls that determine the outcome of their own soul (Yas. 45.7).

⁶Jacob Neusner, *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan: An Analytical Translation and Explanation*, BJS 114 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 103.

Egyptian Book of Two Ways. This ancient Egyptian tradition contains all the features to qualify as a Two Ways text, except an identifiable structure—thus, I categorize this literature as a Two Ways tradition. Its lengthy exposé of the Two Ways incorporates the identities and roles of Egyptian deities. For example, Nun is deemed the “lord of darkness” and resides upon the two shoulders of a given person (II, CT 1132).⁷ In Section VIII, two kinds of otherworldly “keepers” reflect polarized groups that oppose one another. These seven keepers determine the afterlife of the individual. According to Leonard Lesko, all the versions of *Book of Two Ways* are situated in Hermopolis on *Coffin Texts* and “were ‘guides to the beyond’ that were supposed to provide the deceased with the means of obtaining a desirable afterlife.”⁸

Comments on Specific Texts: Graeco-Roman Literature

Hesiod, *Opera et dies* 213–74. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Justice is paired with outrageousness (ὄβρις) and polarized ethical options (*Op.* 213–14). Those dispensing adequate judgments will be attended by Peace, the nurse of the young (*Op.* 225–29). A maiden, Justice, who is born of Zeus, will go out to all who commit injustice and punish them (*Op.* 252–63).

Hesiod, *Opera et dies* 287–92. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. This brief tradition provides two roads that are given qualifiers. Misery is a smooth road and resides nearby (*Op.* 287). Excellence (τῆς Ἀρτῆς) is long and steep, and the gods have set sweat over it (*Op.* 289–91).

⁷Leonard H. Lesko, *The Ancient Egyptian Book of Two Ways*, NES 17 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), 25.

⁸Lesko, *Egyptian Book of Two Ways*, 134, 137.

Theognis, *Elegiac Poems* 911–14. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Prior to passing into Hades, Theognis ponders the two paths of life. Either, he will walk down the road of misery or the road of pleasure.

Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 2.21–24. This tradition of the training of Heracles qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. As Prodicus expresses the training of Heracles, he utilizes a Two Ways metaphor to convey the path of virtue and vice (*Mem.* 2.21). As Heracles is pondering what pathway to travel down, two women approach him. The first woman attempting to influence him is called “Vice” (*Mem.* 2.26), whereas the second is “Virtue.” “Vice” attempts to persuade Heracles down the easy pathway (*Mem.* 2.29), yet “Virtue” ultimately persuades him (*Mem.* 2.34).

Plato, *Gorgias* 524 A. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. In this brief account, Socrates offers Two Ways instruction to Chalcicles. Prometheus appoints his sons as judge. When a life ends, the sons will be standing in a meadow, at a division in the road, to cast judgment. Either, persons will go down one road leading one to the Isles of the Blest or another road leading to Tartarus.

Plato, *Respublica* 614c. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Once a soul leaves a body, it comes to a sacred spot along with other souls. In this spot, two openings reside in the ground next to one another. Between the holes sit judges that pass sentences. Either the souls are ordered to pass through the hole on the right that ascend up through the sky or the unjust pass through the leftward hole that is a downward leading path.

Diphilus, the comic poet. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. This tradition on the judgment of man is preserved in Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* V.14 and Eusebius *Dem. ev.* XIII.13. Commenting upon the judgment of humanity, there are two ways that lead to Hades: one for the good and

one for the bad. For the remainder of the quotation, it focuses on the judgments and outcomes of the bad way.

Virgil, *Aeneid* 6.539–43. This brief tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Two roads present two distinct outcomes. Either one will lead past the fortress of Great Dis and lead straight to Elysium (*Aen.* 6.541–42), or the evil way will lead to Tartarus (*Aen.* 6.542–43).

Silius Italicus, *Punicus* 15.20–140. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways text because of its adherence to a Two Ways literary structure. The young Scipio is distraught over attending war and thus two figures, exceeding mortal stature, flew down to attend to him. One was named “Virtue” and the other, an enemy, was named “Pleasure” (*Pun.* 15.24–25). Both figures had two different appearances. “Pleasure” speaks first to dissuade Scipio from war (*Pun.* 15.36–69). “Virtue” speaks next to persuade faithfulness to Rome (*Pun.* 15.70–123). Being persuaded by “Virtue,” Scipio is then heralded for years to come.

Plutarch, *Demosthenes* 26.7. This brief tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Here, Plutarch reflects on the manner in which Demosthenes instructs young men aspiring to public office. If two paths were laid before him, one leading to the bema and the assembly or one leading straight to death, Demosthenes would have chosen the pathway leading to death.

Cebetis *Tabula*. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways text. The tradition is framed as an allegory from an older man instructing a crowd of onlookers (1) and begins with the faulty way first. Life and death are polarized concepts, whereas life is personified as “True Education” (15) and countered by “False Education” (12–13). The faulty way is depicted by the personification of vices

that are constantly at odds with the individual (5–10). The allegory has an intended effect for their present outcome (31–33).

Comments on Specific Texts: New Testament and Early Christian Literature

Matthew 7:13–14. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. The Two Ways are described in terms of a gate. As Hans Dieter Betz rightly identifies, two essential problems emerge with this metaphor. Do the gates mark the origins of one's journey or do the gates mark the telic consumption of one's journey?⁹ One gate is wide and leads to destruction whereas the other is narrow and leads to life (Matt 7:14).

Matthew 7:15–27. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Two metaphors are utilized to describe Two Ways tradition. The first is that of a tree (Matt 7:15–23) and the second is that of a house foundation (Matt 7:24–27). In both cases, the ethics and outcome are reflective of one's disposition to the right and wrong way.

Matthew 25:31–46. This tradition may loosely qualify as a Two Ways text because of its general adherence to the literary structure: Introduction (Matt 25:33); Virtues and Vices of Two Ways (Matt 25:34–44); Telic outcome of two options (Matt 25:45–46). The Son of Man comes with angels to separate persons into two categories, lists their vices and virtues, and then casts judgment upon them to enter into eternal punishment or eternal life.

⁹Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 521.

Luke 6:20–26. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. The two antithetical roles are qualified in terms of blessings and woes. Attached to each blessing and woe is an anthropological result.

Luke 13:23–30. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Rather than presenting two doors, this tradition offers comments on a narrow door. Some will find it and enter, whereas others will be left outside. Those that remain outside the door will be cast out.

Romans 6:12–23. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Two options are offered that will lead to death or to righteousness (Rom 6:16).

Galatians 5:16–24. Though not using a pathway metaphor, this tradition qualifies as a Two Ways text. Dualism emerges between a Flesh and Spirit dichotomy. The Spirit assumes an angelic role that seeks to influence humanity with one particular set of ethics (Gal 5:18). For those in error, they will not inherit the kingdom of God (Gal 5:21)— implying those who do live by the Spirit will inherit the kingdom.

Ephesians 2:1–10. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition solely because it lacks the literary structure of a Two Ways text. The pathway metaphor is only evoked for the way of death. It is only on this pathway that angels and angelic influence are manifested. Persons on this pathway follow the prince of the air and the spirit that is at work in them (Eph 2:2). The antithesis to this literary pattern is not a pathway, but a seat next to God in the heavenlies (Eph 2:5–6).

Ephesians 4:17–24. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. The pathway metaphor is only evoked for those on a negative way (Eph 4:17). The antithetical options are the new self, old self, and Gentiles (Eph 4:22, 24). It is

possible that some form of angelic being may be involved in the phrase τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοῦς ὑμῶν (Eph 4:23).

James 1:1–5:20. I remain rather reticent to place the entire book as a Two Ways tradition. Yet, James is a wisdom text that is replete with polarized opposites. For James, much of his message is framed within a right and wrong way of being:¹⁰ faith and doubt (1:5–7); poor and rich (1:9–11); temptation by God and temptation through desire (1:12–15); quick to hear and slowness to speak and anger (1:19); anger of man and righteousness of God (1:20); doers of the word and hearers of the word (1:22–25); worthless religion and pure religion (1:26–27); partiality to rich and partiality to poor (2:1–7); obedience to law and breaking the law (2:8–13); justification through faith and justification through obedience (2:14–26); blessing God and cursing humans (3:9–10); fresh water and salt water (3:11); fig trees and olive trees (3:12); heavenly wisdom and earthly wisdom (3:13–17); friendship with the world and enmity with God (4:4);¹¹ divine disposition towards the exalted and the humble (4:6); submission to God and resistance of the Devil (4:7–8); rich person and righteous person (5:1–6); swearing by heaven and yes, yes and no, no (5:12). These antitheses help qualify the entire book of James as a Two Ways tradition.

First John 1:6–7. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. The two polarized opposites are framed in terms of light and darkness. To walk in darkness or to walk in light manifests a particular outcome in terms of one's relationship to the community.

¹⁰Dale C. Allison Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of James*, ICC (New York: Bloomsbury, 2013), 85.

¹¹According to van de Sandt, Jas 4:1–4 closely relates to the Jewish Two Ways tradition, especially that of Did. 3.1–6. Huub van de Sandt, "James 4, 1–4 in the Light of the Jewish Two Ways Tradition 3, 1–6," *Bib* 88 (2007): 38–63.

First John 3:4–10. This brief tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Two different practices determine a person’s religious identity: sons of the devil or sons of God. Either a person practices sinning or a person practices righteousness.

First John 5:16–20. This tradition lacks a specific Two Ways literary structure and thus qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Sin leads to death but God may grant them life (1 John 5:16). God protects those that do not practice sin and keeps the evil one from touching them (1 John 5:18). So, in this way, the evil one is prohibited from laying hold of those born of God.

Didache 1.1–6.2. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways text because of its clear literary Two Ways structure. It lacks a number of the prominent features found in other Two Ways texts. The way of life is contained in a long list of ethics and prohibitions, often reflective of Jesus tradition and Torah (Did. 1.2–4.14); whereas the way of death is accompanied by a list of vices (Did. 5.1–2).

Barnabas 18.1–21.1. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways text. The description of the two pathways is described in terms of light and darkness. Many light-bearing angels of God (φωταγωγοὶ ἄγγελοι) oversee the pathway of light; whereas angels of Satan oversee the pathway of darkness (Barn. 18.1). The pathway of light is accompanied with a list of virtues and prohibitions (Barn. 19.1–12) and the pathway of darkness is crooked, filled with curses, and a list of vices (Barn. 20.1–2). Those who maintain the pathway of light will be glorified in the kingdom of heaven (Barn. 21.1) and those who follow the darkened and crooked path will proceed to eternal death (Barn. 20.1).

Ignatius, *To the Magnesians* 5.1-2. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Each person has their own designated end: either to death or to life

(Ign. *Magn.* 5.1). The two destinations are also likened to a coin. There are two kinds of coins; one that is from God and another from the world, each with their own stamp on them. The stamp on the coin is either this world for the way of death or the stamp of the God the Father through Jesus Christ (Ign. *Magn.* 5.2). Only the ethics of the way of life are mentioned: voluntary martyrdom (Ign. *Magn.* 5.2).

Shepherd of Hermas Mandates 6.1–2 (35–36). This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways text. There exist two different paths that contain a particular set of ethics (Mand. 6.1.2–3 [35.2–3]). Each person has two angels that reside within them: one of righteousness and one of wickedness (Mand. 6.2.1 [36.1]). Both angels are at odds with the other and attempt to influence the person, as manifest through the expression of the person’s ethics (Mand. 6.2.3–9 [36.3–9]).

Shepherd of Hermas Mandates 7–9 (37–39). These three traditions qualify as a Two Ways tradition. The literary structure is not as explicit as other traditions. In Mand. 7 (37), two different fears emerge: fearing the works of the devil and fearing the Lord (Mand. 7.3 [37.3]). In Mand. 8.1 (38.1), self-restraint is two-fold: refraining from vices (Mand. 8.3–6 [38.3–6]) and not refraining from doing well (Mand. 8.7–11 [38.7–11]). In Mand. 9 (39), double-mindedness (*διψυχία*) is discussed at great length.

Second Clement 6.1–9. This tradition loosely qualifies as a Two Ways text. It begins with Jesus tradition (cf. Luke 16:13; Matt 6:24) about the inability to serve two masters. The present age and the age to come are at odds with one another (2 Clem. 6.3); it is the current age that encourages adultery, depravity, and deceit (2 Clem. 6.4). A person will either perform the will of Christ and find a place of rest, or they will enter into eternal punishment (2 Clem. 6.7). In 2 Clem. 6.8, a loose quotation of Ezekiel 14:14 may take the place of the presence of angels. Even if

Noah, Job, and Daniel were to arise, they would not be able to deliver those from the present age (2 Clem. 6.8). Thus, Noah, Job, and Daniel replace the angelic beings.

Second Clement 17.7–18.2. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. By focusing on the upright, they have acted well and have not deviated from the right path (2 Clem. 17.7). The author places themselves among those who serve God, not among the impious, even though they are surrounded by the “tools of the devil” (2 Clem. 18.2; “ὡν ἐν μέσοις τοῖς ὀργάνοις τοῦ διαβόλου”).

Sibylline Oracles VIII.399–401. This brief tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition merely because of its brevity. It contains divine deterministic elements in that “I set” forth both the two ways and placed these two ways inside the mind of humanity. Rather than having an angelic presence, God is the direct influence of these two ways (cf. Sib. Or. VIII.377). He established two ways and he placed them in their mind so as to choose the good life.

Pseudo-Clementines, *Recognitions* VII.7.1–2. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Peter mentions two ways. The first way is how a person fall into misfortune. The second way, though not angelic influence, is under God’s guidance and it will lead to salvation. Belief and unbelief stand prior to these two pathways.

Pseudo-Clementines, *Recognitions* VIII.54–55. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Two kings are present that delight in good and delight in evil. God, who foresaw how persons would conduct themselves, appoints humans under the rule and auspices of each king. Those who are under the evil king are subject to evil angels.

Pseudo-Clementines *Homilies XX.2*. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways text due to its adherence to the Two Ways literary structure. In this tradition, Peter gives instruction about the divinely appointed two kingdoms and two ages. The present age is small and temporary whereas the coming kingdom is good and eternal. Though these ages are divinely determined, humans have been given free will to choose one over the other. Male and female genders then are used to depict these two ways: from the female gender comes lust, anger, and grief; from the male gender comes cognitive abilities, knowledge, and fear. Two kings are set over the ages to rule and direct humanity.

Epistle to the Apostles 39–40. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. The disciples inquire of the Lord how the judgment will come about. The Lord responds with two categories of persons: either they pursued righteousness, light, and goodness, or they pursued unrighteousness, darkness, and evil. Persons have the ability to choose light and life. Their outcome is dependent upon their choice of light or darkness.

Justin, 2 *Apology* 9. This tradition vaguely corresponds to a Two Ways tradition. Justin depicts the contrast of good and bad human laws. At times, angels have offered bad laws to suit their own iniquity.

Justin, 2 *Apology* 11. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Justin rehearses Xenophon, *Mem.* 2.21–24. The presence of virtue and vice, then for Justin, is intended for Christians to pursue virtue. The angelic presence appears prior to Justin introducing Hercules in that Christians should not have evil men or demons prevailing over them.

Theophilus, *Ad Autolyicum* 1.2. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Rather than utilizing a way/road metaphor, Theophilus evokes an

optical and audible metaphor. The righteous are able to see and discern between white and black, light and darkness, and sharp and sweet sounds. Thus, those that cannot see the difference between these items fail to see God.

Irenaeus, *Epideixis tou apostolikou kērygmatos* 1–2. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Irenaeus offers initial comments for those who can see. Optical abilities replace travel motifs. Either, persons will see, having been illumined by a heavenly light, or they are unable to see due to darkness. One leads to the kingdom of heaven whereas the other leads to death and separation from God.

Irenaeus, *Epideixis tou apostolikou kērygmatos* 98–100. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Irenaeus offers closing comments to this treatise because this conclusion consists of preaching truth and the way of life. To veer from this way of life is to deny certain doctrinal expositions.

Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* V.5. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. In a few brief expressions, Clement notes how the Gospel of Matthew presupposes the two ways: one being narrow and the other leading to perdition. He then quotes Psalm 1:1 and mentions the fable of Prodicus of Ceus regarding Virtue and Vice.

Origen of Alexandria, *Homily on Luke* 35.3–6. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Origen introduces the Two Ways through the story of Abraham and the angel of justice and angel of iniquity that argued over Abraham's salvation.¹² Origen then mentions "The Shepherd," most likely a

¹²J. T. Milik, "4 Q Visions de 'Amram et une citation d'Origène," *Biblique* 79 (1972): 77–97. For more on this tradition in Origen, consider Milik's argument. Milik suggests "Amram" is a more correct rendition, in lieu of "Abraham," thus making the tradition from Qumran.

reference to the Shepherd of Hermas (*Hom. Luc. 35.3*). Two angels are present within each person: a wicked angel and a good angel who encourage them to manifest a particular ethic. Matthew 18:10 is referenced to find a biblical precedent that those who are part of the Church have angels overseeing their lives. Yet, if someone sins, this angel is disgraced; but, if someone progresses, the angel is credited with glory (*Hom. Luc. 35.3*).

Basil of Caesarea, *Homily on Psalm 1* (*Hom. 10.5*). This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways text due to its adherence to a Two Ways literary structure. Basil's Homily on Psalm 1 places the blessed person in opposition to the way of sinners. These two ways are either wide and broad, or narrow. Two guides attempt to influence the wayfarer according to their own ways. Thus, a wicked demon takes his followers through pleasure and destruction, or the good angel leads their followers to virtue and a blessed end.

***De Doctrina Apostolorum 1–6*.** This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways text. Two ways are structured with competing and polarized sets of ethics. One road is that of life and light whereas the other is of death and darkness. Two angels reign over the cosmos: one of equity and the other of sin.

Ecclesiastical Canons of the Apostles. This tradition may qualify as a Two Ways text. Canons contains the literary structure but neglects to offer any form of anthropological ends. The Two Ways are presented in terms of life and death, much like *Did. 1.1–2* but neglect to offer the ethics of the way of death. It is possible that inheritance of the kingdom could function as an anthropological end (Canons, Nathanael's expression).

Epitome of the Apostolic Commands. This tradition loosely qualifies as a Two Ways text. In Epitome 4, the Two Ways are framed in terms of life and death. Essentially, the remainder of the Epitome is an exposition of the way of life.

Apostolic Constitutions 7.1–19. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways text. Modeling its structure and contents after Did. 1–6, *Constitutions* adheres to the Two Ways literary structure. This Two Ways instruction is framed purely in ethical features that demonstrate the ways of life and death. It is not until Apos. Con. 7.38.7 that righteous angels are set over the righteous for protection.

Vita Shenoute. This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways text. The tradition is part of wisdom tradition with Shenoute giving instruction. The way of life is double and leads to life or death. Those that follow the pathway of life are blessed, belong to the king, and are headed towards eternity. Those on the pathway of death will die.

Syntagma doctrinae. This tradition loosely qualifies as a Two Ways text because it lacks the way of death instruction. The pathway of life is monastic and for the sons of the catholic church (1.1). Adherence to the instruction of life will lead to perfection in the pathway of faith, holiness, and conduct, and a good ascent (7.1).

Fides partum. This tradition loosely qualifies as a Two Ways text because it lacks way of death instruction. *Fides* begins with an extended Trinitarian confession. Much like *Syntagma*, *Fides* offers the pathway of life for monastic and clerical life in the catholic church (1.1). These instructions are saving instruction for the 318 fathers that lead to eternal life with God (7).

Gospel Truth (NHC I 3.30–33). Although the antitheses are rather weak, this tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. The good way is marked by a

particular quality. Having a spirit run after them, they will have knowledge of the Father and revelation of the Son.

Paraphrase of Shem (NHC VII 1.1–3). This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. In the opening of the Paraphrase to Shem, three great powers are present prior to the formation of the world. Light and darkness are contrasted with a spirit residing between them. Light belongs to hearing and word (1.32–36), whereas darkness belongs to restless fire (1.36–2.4).

Second Revelation of James (NHC V 4.55–59). This tradition qualifies as a Two Ways tradition. Although the two ethical opposites are scattered in this section, it is the Spirit of Power that will reveal the good way. This Spirit escorts persons to a door, opens the door, and escorts them inside (4.55). A call to move away from the difficult way is paralleled with positive ethics (4.59).

Teachings of Silvanus (NHC VII 4.103–107). This tradition loosely qualifies as a Two Ways text. It contains introductory statements regarding the two polarized notions. Rather than a road metaphor, Teach. Silv. 4.103 structures the polarized concepts in terms of an optical metaphor: look upwards, not downwards. This section is strikingly non-deterministic in that the person must look upwards, they must kindle the light within themselves (4.106). A wicked and downward gaze is under the influence of the Spirit of wickedness, who will cast persons down into the Abyss (4.104).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, and Johannes Karavidopoulos, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 28th ed. Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.
- Aristophanes. *Fragments*. Translated by Jeffrey Henderson. Loeb Classical Library 502. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008.
- Aristotle. *Metaphysics*. Translated by Hugh Tredennick. Loeb Classical Library 271. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1933.
- Archimedes. *Greek Mathematical Works*. Vol. 2 of *Aristarchus to Pappus*. Translated by Ivor Thomas. Loeb Classical Library 362. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1941.
- Basil of Caesarea. *Exegetical Homilies*. Translated by Sister Agnes Clare Way. The Fathers of the Church 46. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1963.
- Black, Matthew. *The Book of Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes*. *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha* 7. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Blumell, Lincoln H., and Thomas A. Wayment, eds. *Christian Oxyrhynchus: Texts, Documents, and Sources*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2015.
- Brooke, George, John Collins, Torleif Elgvin, and Peter Flint, eds. *Qumran Cave 4: XVII Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*. *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* 22. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Vol. 1. The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1983.
- , ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Rule of the Community and Related Documents (Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations)*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.
- , ed. *Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*. Vol. 2. The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1983.
- Coogan, Michael D., ed. *The New Oxford Annotated Apocrypha: New Revised Standard Version*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

- de Jonge, M. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Ehrman, Bart D. *The Apostolic Fathers I*. Loeb Classical Library 24. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- . *The Apostolic Fathers II*. Loeb Classical Library 25. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Elgvin, Torleif, ed. *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1*. Discoveries in the Judean Desert 20. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Eusebius. *The Ecclesiastical History*. Translated by Kirsopp Lake. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library 153. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949.
- Funk, Franciscus Xaverius, ed. *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*. 2 vols. Paderbornae: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1906.
- Hesiod. *Theogony. Works and Days. Testimonia*. Edited and translated by Glenn W. Most. Loeb Classical Library 57. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Holmes, Michael W., ed. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Hunt, A. S. *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Vol. 15. London: Oxford University Press, 1922.
- Justin Martyr. *The First Apology, the Second Apology, Dialogue with Trypho, Exhortation to the Greeks, Discourse to the Greeks, The Monarchy or the Rule of God*. Translated by Thomas B. Falls. The Fathers of the Church 6. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1948.
- Lesko, Leonard H. *The Ancient Egyptian Book of Two Ways*. Near Eastern Studies 17. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.
- Metzger, Marcel, ed. *Les Constitutions Apostoliques: Livres VII et VIII*. Sources Chrétiennes 336. Paris: Les Éditions Du Cerf, 1987.
- Minns, Denis, and Paul Parvis, eds. *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies*. Oxford Early Christian Texts. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Nanavutty, Piloo, trans. *The Gathas of Zarathushtra: Hymns in Praise of Wisdom*. Ahmedabad, India: Mapin Publishing, 1999.
- Origen. *Contra Celsum*. Translated by Henry Chadwick. London: Cambridge University Press, 1953.
- . *Homilies on Luke: Fragments on Luke*. Translated by Joseph T. Lienhard S.J. The Fathers of the Church 94. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1996.
- Palmer, David Robert. "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles: A Critical Greek Edition with Footnotes Covering Textual Variants." Accessed January 5 2017. <http://www.bibletranslation.ws/trans/didache.pdf>.

- Philo. *On the Creation. Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis 2 and 3*. Translated by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. Loeb Classical Library 226. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.
- . *Volume II*. Translated by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. Loeb Classical Library 227. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.
- Plato. *Lysis. Symposium, Gorgias*. Edited and translated by W. R. M. Lamb. Loeb Classical Library 166. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.
- Rordorf, Willy, and André Tuilier. *La Doctrine Des Douze Apôtres (Didachè): Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction, Notes, Appendice, Annexe et Index*. 2nd ed. Sources Chrétiennes 248. Paris: Les Éditions Du Cerf, 1978.
- Seddon, Keith. *Epictetus' Handbook and the Tablet of Cebe: Guides to Stoic Living*. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Silius Italicus. *Punica*. Vol. 2, Books 9–17. Translated by J. D. Duff. Loeb Classical Library 278. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1934.
- Stewart-Sykes, Alistair. *The Apostolic Church Order: The Greek Text with Introduction, Translation and Annotation*. ECS 10. Strathfield AU: St Pauls Publications, 2006.
- Strugnell, J., D. Harrington, and Torleif Elgvin, eds. *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 34. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. Rev. ed. Penguin Classics. London: Penguin Books, 2011.
- Wengst, Klaus. *Didache (Apostellehre), Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Klemensbrief, Schrift an Diognet: Eingeleitet, herausgegeben, übertragen und erläutert*. Schriften des Urchristentums 2. München: Kösel-Verlag, 1984.
- West, M. L. *The Hymns of Zoroaster: A New Translation of the Most Ancient Sacred Texts of Iran*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2010.
- Wilson, J. Christian. *Five Problems in the Interpretation of the Shepherd of Hermas: Authorship, Genre, Canonicity, Apocalyptic, and the Absence of the Name "Jesus Christ."* Mellen Biblical Press Series 24. Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1995.
- . *Toward a Reassessment of the Shepherd of Hermas: Its Date and Its Pneumatology*. Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1993.
- Xenophon. *Memorabilia. Oeconomicus. Symposium. Apology*. Edited by Jeffrey Henderson. Translated by E. C. Marchant and O. J. Todd. Loeb Classical Library 168. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013.

Secondary Sources

Books and Monographs

- Albertz, Rainer. *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period*. Vol. 2. From the Exile to the Maccabees. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.
- Allison, Dale C., Jr. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of James*. International Critical Commentary. New York: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Baasland, Ernst. *Parables and Rhetoric in the Sermon on the Mount: New Approaches to a Classical Text*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 351. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.
- Balabanski, Vicky. *Eschatology in the Making: Mark, Matthew, and the Didache*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 97. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Baltzer, Klaus. *The Covenant Formulary*. Translated by David E. Green. Oxford: Blackwell, 1971.
- Bar-Asher Siegal, Michal. *Early Christian Monastic Literature and the Babylonian Talmud*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Barclay, John M. G. *Obedying the Truth: A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988.
- Barnard, L. W. *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background*. New York: Schocken Books, 1966.
- Bauckham, Richard. *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 93. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Beekman, John, and John C. Callow. *Translating the Word of God*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. *Essays on the Sermon on the Mount*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1985.
- . *Galatians*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- . *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain (Matthew 5:3–7:27 and Luke 6:20–49)*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.
- Bligh, John. *Galatians: A Discussion of St Paul's Epistle*. Housholder Commentaries 1. London: St Paul Publications, 1970.
- Boer, Martinus C. de. *Galatians: A Commentary*. The New Testament Library. Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 2011.
- Brox, Norbert. *Der Hirt des Hermas*. Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.

- Bruin, Tom de. *The Great Controversy: The Individual's Struggle Between Good and Evil in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and in Their Jewish and Christian Contexts*. Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 106. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.
- Bucur, Bogdan Gabriel. *Angelomorphic Pneumatology: Clement of Alexandria and Other Early Christian Witnesses*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 95. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Carey, Greg. *Apocalyptic Literature in the New Testament*. Core Biblical Studies. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2016.
- Charlesworth, James H. *The Good and Evil Serpent: How a Universal Symbol Became Christianized*. The Anchor Bible Reference Library. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010.
- Charlesworth, James H., and James R. Mueller. *The New Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Guide to Publications, with Excursuses on Apocalypses*. ATLA Bibliography Series 17. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1987.
- Collins, John J., ed. *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*. Semeia 14. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1979.
- . *Apocalypse, Prophecy, and Pseudepigraphy: On Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.
- . *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- . *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Routledge, 1997.
- . *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- . *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. Old Testament Library. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.
- , ed. *The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*. Vol. 1. 3 vols. The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism. New York: Continuum, 1999.
- . *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Cook, Stephen L. *Prophecy and Apocalypticism: The Postexilic Setting*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.
- Crawford, Sidnie White, and Cecilia Wassen, eds. *Apocalyptic Thinking in Judaism: Engaging with John Collins' The Apocalyptic Imagination* Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 182. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- Crenshaw, James L. *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction*. 3rd ed. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010.

- Curnow, Trevor. *Wisdom in the Ancient World*. London: Duckworth, 2010.
- Das, A. Andrew. *Galatians*. Concordia Commentary. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2014.
- Davies, W. D., and Dale C. Allison. *Matthew 1-7*. Vol. 1. International Critical Commentary. New York: T&T Clark, 1988.
- de Jonge, M. *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature: The Case of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 18. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Del Verme, Marcello. *Didache and Judaism: Jewish Roots of an Ancient Christian-Jewish Work*. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Deutsch, Celia. *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke: Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11.25-30*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 18. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1987.
- Draper, Jonathan A., ed. *The Didache in Modern Research*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 37. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Draper, Jonathan A., and Clayton N. Jefford. *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*. Early Christianity and Its Literature 14. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Dunn, James D. G. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*. Black's New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1993.
- Easter, Matthew C. *Faith and the Faithfulness of Jesus in Hebrews*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 160. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Elliott, Susan. *Cutting Too Close for Comfort: Paul's Letter to the Galatians in Its Anatolian Cultic Context*. Library of New Testament Studies 248. London: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Flusser, David. *Qumran and Apocalypticism*. Translated by Azzan Yadin. Vol. 1. Judaism of the Second Temple Period. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Frow, John. *Genre*. 2nd ed. The New Critical Idiom. London: Routledge, 2015.
- Garrow, Alan J. P. *The Gospel of Matthew's Dependence on the Didache*. Library of New Testament Studies 254. New York: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- Giet, Stanislas. *L'enigme de La Didache*. Publications de La Faculté Des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg. Paris: University of Strasbourg, 1970.
- Goff, Matthew J. *Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 116. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Gottwald, Normann K. *The Hebrew Bible: A Socio-Literary Introduction*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2002.

- Greenough, J. B., A. A. Howard, G. L. Kittredge, and Benjamin L. D'Ooge, eds. *Allen and Greenough's New Latin Grammar for Schools and Colleges*. Newburyport, MA: Focus Publishing, 2000.
- Grundeken, Mark. *Community Building in the Shepherd of Hermas: A Critical Study of Some Key Aspects*. Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 131. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Gunkel, Hermann. *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit: eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12. Mit Beiträgen von Heinrich Zimmern*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1895.
- Hanson, P.D. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology*. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Harnack, Adolf. *Die Apostellehre und die jüdischen bei den Wege*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1886.
- Harnack, Adolf von. *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel nebst Untersuchungen zur ältesten Geschichte der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts*. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der alterchristlichen Literatur 2 1–2. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1884.
- Harris, J. Rendel. *The Teaching of the Apostle: Newly Edited, with Facsimile Text and a Commentary*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1887.
- . *Three Pages of the Bryennios Manuscript*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1885.
- Hartog, Paul, ed. *Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians and the Martyrdom of Polycarp: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Oxford Apostolic Fathers. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Hellholm, David, ed. *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism Uppsala, August 12–17, 1978*. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989.
- . *Das Visionenbuch des Hermas als Apokalypse: Formgeschichtliche und texttheoretische Studien zu einer literarischen Gattung. Methodologische Vorüberlegungen und makrostrukturelle Textanalyse*. Vol. 1. Coniectanea Biblica: New Testament Series, 13.1. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1980.
- Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. Translated by John Bowden. Vol. 1. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
- Hilgenfeld, A. *Messias Judaeorum, libris eorum Paulo ante et Paulo post Christum natum conscriptis illustratus*. Lipsiae: Fues, 1869.
- Hilgenfeld, Adolf. *Evangeliorum secundum Hebraeos, secundum Petrum, secundum Aegyptios, Matthiae traditionum, Petri et Pauli praedicationis et actuum, Petri apocalypseos, Didascaliae apostolorum antiquioris quae supersunt*. 2nd ed. Novum Testamentum extra canonem receptum, Part 4. Leipzig: Weigel, 1884.

- Hillel, Vered. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Structure, Source, and Composition*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2013.
- Hitchcock, Roswell D., and Francis Brown. *Διδαχὴ Τῶν Δωδέκα Ἀποστόλων: Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. 2nd ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1885.
- Hollander, H. W., and M. de Jonge. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha* 8. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Horsley, Richard A., and Patrick A. Tiller. *After Apocalyptic and Wisdom: Rethinking Texts in Context*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2012.
- Hvalvik, Reidar. *The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant: The Purpose of the Epistle of Barnabas and Jewish-Christian Competition in the Second Century*. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 2/82. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.
- Jefford, Clayton N. *Didache: The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. *Early Christian Apocrypha* 5. Salem, OR: Polebridge Press, 2013.
- . *The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. *Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae* 11. Leiden: Brill, 1989.
- Johanson, Bruce C. *To All the Brethren: A Text-Linguistic and Rhetorical Approach to 1 Thessalonians*. *Coniectanea Biblica: New Testament Series* 16. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1987.
- Kamlah, Ehrhard. *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament*. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 7. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1964.
- Kampen, John. *Wisdom Literature*. *Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Knopf, D. Rudolf. *Die Lehre Der Zwölf Apostel Dei Zwei Clemensbriefe*. *Die Apostolischen Väter* 1. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1920.
- Kraft, Robert A. *Barnabas and the Didache*. Edited by R. M. Grant. *The Apostolic Fathers* 3. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1965.
- Kugler, Robert A. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. *Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.
- Levinsohn, Stephen H. *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. Dallas: SIL International, 2000.
- Lindemann, Andreas, and Henning Paulsen, eds. *Die Apostolischen Väter: Griechisch-deutsche Parallelausgabe*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1992.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. *Word Biblical Commentary* 41. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1990.

- Loopik, Marcus van. *The Ways of the Sages and the Way of the World: The Minor Tractates of the Babylonian Talmud: Derekh 'Eretz Rabbah, Derekh 'Eretz Zuta, Pereq ha-Shalom*. Text und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 26. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991.
- Lücke, F. *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes: oder allgemeine Untersuchungen über die apokalyptische Litteratur überhaupt und die Apokalypse des Johannes insbesondere*. Bonn: Weber, 1852.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 1–7*. Translated by James E. Crouch. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
- Macaskill, Grant. *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 115. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Martínez, F. García. *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Traditions*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 168. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- Martyn, J. Louis. *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Yale Bible 33A. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Matera, Frank J. *Galatians*. Sacra Pagina Series 9. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992.
- McGinn, Bernard, ed. *Apocalypticism in Western History and Culture*. Vol. 2. The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism. New York: Continuum, 2000.
- Metso, Sarianna. *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 21. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Milavec, Aaron. *The Didache: Faith, Hope, & Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50–70 C.E.* New York: Newman Press, 2003.
- . *The Didache: Text, Translation, Analysis, and Commentary*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003.
- Mowinckel, S. *The Spirit and the Word: Prophecy and Tradition in Ancient Israel*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 2002.
- Murphy, Frederick J. *Apocalypticism in the Bible and Its World: A Comprehensive Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Neusner, Jacob. *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan: An Analytical Translation and Explanation*. Brown Judaic Studies 114. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- . *Introduction to Rabbinic Literature*. The Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Double Day, 1994.
- Niederwimmer, Kurt. *Die Didache*. Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.

- . *The Didache: A Commentary*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.
- Oegema, Gerbern S. *Apocalyptic Interpretation of the Bible: Apocalypticism and Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism, the Apostle Paul, the Historical Jesus, and Their Reception History*. Jewish and Christian Texts in Context and Related Studies Series. London: Bloomsbury, 2012.
- O’Loughlin, Thomas. *The Didache: A Window on the Earliest Christians*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.
- Osiek, Carolyn. *Shepherd of Hermas*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999.
- Pardee, Nancy. *The Genre and Development of the Didache*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/339. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Parry, Donald W., and Emanuel Tov, eds. *Texts Concerned with Religious Law, Exegetical Texts and Parabiblical Texts*. 2nd ed. Vol. 1. The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Pate, C. Marvin. *The Reverse of the Curse: Paul, Wisdom, and the Law*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament 2/114. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Pennington, Jonathan T. *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 126. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Pernveden, Lage. *The Concept of the Church in the Shepherd of Hermas*. Studia Theologica Lundensia: Skrifter Utgivna av Teologiska Fakulteten I Lund 27. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1966.
- Peterson, David. *Hebrews and Perfection: An Examination of the Concept of Perfection in the “Epistle to the Hebrews.”* Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 47. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Pitre, Brant. *Jesus and the Last Supper*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.
- Prostmeier, Ferdinand R. *Der Barnabasbrief*. Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Old Testament Theology*. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. 2 vols. Peabody, MA: Prince Press, 2005.
- Reuss, E. *Die Propheten*. Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1892.
- Reynolds, Bennie H., III. *Between Symbolism and Realism: The Use of Symbolic and Non-Symbolic Language in Ancient Jewish Apocalypses 333–63 B.C.E.* Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- Rhodes, James N. *The Epistle of Barnabas and the Deuteronomistic Tradition: Polemics, Paraenesis, and the Legacy of the Golden-Calf Incident*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament 2/188. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

- Robinson, J. Armitage. *Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache*. New York: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1920.
- Rowland, Christopher. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- Runge, Steven E. *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010.
- Sabatier, Paul. *Διδαχὴ τῶν δωδέκα ἀποστόλων: La Didache ou l'Enseignement des douze apôtres*. Paris: Fischbacher, 1885.
- Savi, P. *La dottrina degli apostoli. Ricerche critiche sull'origine del testo con una nota intorno all'eucaristia*. Rome: Begani, 1893.
- Schaff, Philip. *The Oldest Church Manual Called the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1885.
- Schmidt, J. M. *Die jüdische Apokalyptik: die Geschichte ihrer Erforschung von den Anfängen bis zu den Textfunden von Qumran*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verl. d. Erziehungsvereins, 1969.
- Schofield, Alison. *From Qumran to the Yahad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for The Community Rule*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 77. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Slee, Michelle. *The Church in Antioch in the First Century CE: Communion and Conflict*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 244. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2003.
- Slingerland, H. Dixon. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 21. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Smyth, Herbert Weir. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- Spence-Jones, H. D. M. *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. London: James Nisbet & Co., 1885.
- Stein, Stephen J., ed. *Apocalypticism in the Modern Period and the Contemporary Age*. Vol. 3. 3 vols. The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism. New York: Continuum, 2000.
- Stewart-Sykes, Alistair, ed. *On the Two Ways: Life or Death, Light or Darkness: Foundational Texts in the Tradition*. Popular Patristics Series 41. Yonkers, NY: St. Vladimirs Seminary Press, 2011.
- Stowers, Stanley K. *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. Library of Early Christianity. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. *The Myth of Rebellious Angels: Studies in Second Temple Judaism and New Testament Texts*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 335. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

- Taylor, Charles. *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles with Illustrations from the Talmud*. Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1886.
- Tuckett, Christopher, ed. *2 Clement: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Oxford Apostolic Fathers. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- VanderKam, James C., and William Adler, eds. *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*. *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum: Section III Jewish Traditions in Early Christian Literature* 4. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1996.
- van de Sandt, Huub, and David Flusser. *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity*. *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum: Section III Jewish Traditions in Early Christian Literature* 5. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.
- Varner, William. *The Way of the Didache: The First Christian Handbook*. New York: University Press of America, 2007.
- Vokes, F. E. *The Riddle of the Didache*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1938.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Philosophical Investigations*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1958.
- Wright, Archie T. *The Origin of Evil Spirits: The Reception of Genesis 6. 1–4 in Early Jewish Literature*. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament* 2/198. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Yarbro Collins, Adela. *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- , ed. *Early Christian Apocalypticism: Genre and Social Setting*. *Semeia* 36. Decatur, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1986.
- Young, Stephen E. *Jesus Tradition in the Apostolic Fathers: Their Explicit Appeals to the Words of Jesus in Light of Orality Studies*. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament* 2/311. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Articles

- Adler, William. "Introduction." In *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*, edited by James C. VanderKam and William Adler, 1–31. *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum: Section III Jewish Traditions in Early Christian Literature* 4. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1996.
- Aldridge, Robert E. "The Lost Ending of the Didache." *Vigiliae Christianae* 53, no. 1 (1999): 1–15.
- . "Peter and the 'Two Ways.'" *Vigiliae Christianae* 53 (1999): 233–64.
- Allison, Dale C., Jr. "Apocalyptic Ethics and Behavior." In *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*, edited by John J. Collins, 295–311. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

- Audet, Jean-Paul. "Affinités Littéraires et Doctrinales du 'Manuel de Discipline.'" *Review Biblique* 59 (1952): 219–38.
- . "Literary and Doctrinal Relationships of the 'Manual of Discipline.'" In *The Didache in Modern Research*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper, 129–47. *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 37. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Aune, David E. "The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre." In *Early Christian Apocalypticism: Genre and Social Setting*, edited by Adela Yarbro Collins, 65–96. *Semeia* 36. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1986.
- . "Understanding Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic." *Word & World* 25, no. 3 (2005): 233–45.
- Aune, David E., Timothy J. Geddert, and Craig A. Evans. "Apocalypticism." In *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, edited by Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter, 45–58. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000.
- Bammel, Ernst. "Pattern and Prototype of *Didache* 16." In *The Didache in Modern Research*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper, 364–72. *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 37. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- . "Schema und Vorlage von *Didache* 16." *Studia Patristica* 4, no. 2 (1961): 253–62.
- Barton, John. "Ethics in Apocalyptic." In *Revealed Wisdom: Studies in Apocalyptic in Honour of Christopher Rowland*, edited by John Ashton, 37–51. *Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* 88. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Bergman, Jan. "Zum Zwei-Weg Motiv: Religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Bemerkungen." *Svensk exegetisk årsbok* 41–42 (1977 1976): 27–56.
- Bertram, Georg, and Karl Heinrich Rengstorf. "Ζυγός, Ἐπεροζυγέω." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, II: Δ–H:896–901. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Bianchi, Ugo. "The Category of Dualism in the Historical Study of Religion." *Temenos* 16 (1980): 10–25.
- Boer, Martinus C. de. "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology." In *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*, edited by Joel Marcus and Marion L. Soards, 169–90. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 24. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Brock, Sebastian. "The Two Ways and the Palestinian Targum." In *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History*, edited by Philip R. Davies and Richard T. White, 139–52. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series* 100. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.
- Brooks, E. Bruce. "Before and after Matthew." In *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, 247–86. *Early Christianity and Its Literature* 14. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.

- Bruce, F. F. "Eschatology in the Apostolic Fathers." In *The Heritage of the Early Church: Essays in Honor of the Very Reverend Georges Vasilievich Florovsky*, edited by David Neiman and Margaret Schatkin, 77–89. *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 195. Rome: Pontificiae Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1973.
- Bucur, Bogdan G. "The Angelic Spirit in Early Christianity: Justin, the Martyr and Philosopher." *The Journal of Religion* 88, no. 2 (2008): 190–208.
- . "The Son of God and the Angelomorphic Holy Spirit: A Rereading of the *Shepherd's* Christology." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 98, no. 1–2 (2007): 120–42.
- Butler, B. C. "The Literary Relations of Didache, Ch. XVI." *Journal of Theological Studies* 11 (1960): 265–83.
- . "The 'Two Ways' in the Didache." *Journal of Theological Studies* 12, no. 1 (1961): 27–38.
- Carlston, Charles E. "Wisdom and Eschatology." In *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus — The Sayings of Jesus: Mémoial Joseph Coppens*, edited by Joël Delobel, 101–19. *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium*, 59. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1982.
- Collins, John J. "Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, edited by P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam, 2:403–30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . "Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre." In *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*, edited by John J. Collins, 1–20. *Semeia* 14. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1979.
- . "What Is Apocalyptic Literature?" In *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*, edited by John J. Collins, 1–16. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- . "Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility." In *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie*, edited by Leo G. Perdue, Bernard Brandon Scott, and William Johnston Wiseman, 165–85. Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1993.
- Creed, J. M. "The Didache." *Journal of Theological Studies* 39 (1938): 370–87.
- Daniélou, Jean. "Une Source de la Spiritualité Chrétienne dans les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte: La Doctrine des Deux Esprits." *Dieu Vivant* 25 (1955): 127–36.
- Davies, P. R. "Eschatology at Qumran." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (1985): 39–55.
- de Jonge, M. "Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *Novum Testamentum* 4 (1960): 182–235.
- . "Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." In *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation*,

edited by M. de Jonge, 193–246. *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha* 3. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

- . “Once More: Christian Influence on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.” *Novum Testamentum* 5 (1962): 311–19.
- de Jonge, Marinus. “The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and Related Qumran Fragments.” In *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*, edited by Randal A. Argall, Beverly A. Bow, and Rodney A. Werline, 63–77. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000.
- . “The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the ‘Two Ways.’” In *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*, edited by Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 111. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Delling, Gerhard. “τέλος, Τελέω, Ἐπιτελέω, Συντελέω, Συντέλεια, Παντελής, Τέλειος, Τελειότης, Τελειόω, Τελείωσις, Τελειωτής.” In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, VIII: T–Υ:49–87. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.
- Derrida, Jacques. “The Law of Genre.” Translated by Avital Ronell. *Critical Inquiry* 7, no. 1 (1980): 55–81.
- DiTommaso, Lorenzo. “Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity (Part I).” *Currents in Biblical Research* 5, no. 2 (2007): 235–86.
- Draper, Jonathan A. “Apostles, Teachers, and Evangelists: Stability and Movement of Functionaries in Matthew, James, and the Didache.” In *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*, edited by Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, 139–76. Society of Biblical Literature: Symposium Series 45. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- . “Barnabas and the Riddle of the Didache Revisited.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 58 (1995): 89–113.
- . “Children and Slaves in the Community of the Didache and the Two Ways Tradition.” In *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, 85–121. *Early Christianity and Its Literature* 14. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- . “Conclusion: Missing Pieces in the Puzzle or Wild Goose Chase? A Retrospect and Prospect.” In *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, 529–43. *Early Christianity and Its Literature* 14. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014.
- . “A Continuing Enigma: the ‘Yoke of the Lord’ in Didache 6.2–3 and early Jewish-Christian Relations.” In *The Image of the Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, edited by Peter J. Tomson and Doris Lambers-Petry, 106–23. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 158. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

- . “The Development of ‘the Sign of the Son of Man’ in the Jesus Tradition.” *New Testament Studies* 39, no. 1 (1993): 1–21.
- . “The *Didache* in Modern Research: An Overview.” In *The Didache in Modern Research*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper, 1–42. *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 37. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- . “Do the *Didache* and Matthew Reflect an ‘Irrevocable Parting of the Ways’ with Judaism?” In *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?*, edited by Huub van de Sandt, 217–41. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.
- . “Eschatology in the *Didache*.” In *Eschatology of the New Testament and Some Related Documents*, edited by Jan G. Van Der Watt, 567–82. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 2/315. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- . “The Jesus Tradition in the *Didache*.” In *The Didache in Modern Research*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper, 72–91. *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 37. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- . “The Jesus Tradition in the *Didache*.” In *The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels*, edited by David Wenham, 5:269–87. *Gospel Perspectives*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984.
- . “Performing the Cosmic Mystery of the Church in the Communities of the *Didache*.” In *The Open Mind: Essays in Honour of Christopher Rowland*, edited by Jonathan Knight and Kevin Sullivan, 37–57. *Library of New Testament Studies* 522. London: T&T Clark, 2015.
- . “Resurrection and Zechariah 14.5 in the *Didache* Apocalypse.” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 5, no. 2 (1997): 155–79.
- . “Torah and Troublesome Apostles in the *Didache* Community.” In *The Didache in Modern Research*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper, 340–63. *Arbeiten Zur Geschichte Des Antiken Judentums Und Des Urchristentums* 37. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- . “The Two Ways and Eschatological Hope: A Contested Terrain in Galatians 5 and the *Didache*.” *Neotestamentica: Journal of the New Testament Society of South Africa* 45, no. 2 (2011): 221–51.
- . “Vice Catalogues as Oral-Mnemonic Cues: A Comparative Study of the Two-Ways Tradition in the *Didache* and Parallels from the Perspective of Oral Tradition.” In *Jesus, the Voice, and the Text: Beyond the Oral and the Written Gospel*, edited by Tom Thatcher, 111–33. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008.
- . “Walking the Way of Life or the Way of Death in the Present Existence as the Beginning of Eschatological Life or Death in the Renewed Earthly Kingdom: The Rationale for the Limitation of the Resurrection to the Righteous Departed in *Didache* 16,6–8.” In *Resurrection of the Dead: Biblical Traditions in Dialogue*, edited by Geert van Oyen and Tom Shepherd, 383–401. *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium*, 249. Leuven: Peeters, 2012.

- . “You Shall Not Give What Is Holy to the Dogs’ (*Didache* 9.5): The Attitude of the *Didache* to the Gentiles.” In *Attitudes to Gentiles in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, edited by David C. Sim and James S. McLaren. Library of New Testament Studies 499. New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013.
- Duhaime, Jean. “Cohérence structurelle et tensions internes dans l’Instruction sur les Deux Esprits (1QS III 13 – IV 26).” In *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*, edited by F. García Martínez, 103–31. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 168. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- . “Dualism.” In *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam, 1:215–20. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Finlan, Stephen. “Identity in the Didache Community.” In *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, 17–32. Early Christianity and Its Literature 14. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Foster, Paul. “The Text of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers.” In *The Early Text of the New Testament*, edited by Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger, 282–301. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Frankfurter, David. “The Legacy of Jewish Apocalypses in Early Christianity: Regional Trajectories.” In *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*, edited by James C. VanderKam and William Adler, 129–200. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum: Section III Jewish Traditions in Early Christian Literature 4. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1996.
- Frey, Jörg. “Apocalyptic Dualism.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*, edited by John J. Collins, 271–94. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- . “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library: Reflections on Their Background and History.” In *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Cambridge 1995*, edited by Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen, 275–335. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Freyne, Sean. “Apocalypticism as the Rejected Other: Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Early Judaism and Early Christianity.” In *The “Other” in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins*, edited by Daniel C. Harlow, Karina Martin Hogan, Matthew Goff, and Joel S. Kaminsky, 247–61. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Garrow, Alan J. P. “The Didache and Revelation.” In *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, 497–514. Early Christianity and Its Literature 14. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.

- . “The Eschatological Tradition Behind 1 Thessalonians: *Didache* 16.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 32, no. 2 (2009): 191–215.
- Glover, Richard. “The *Didache*’s Quotations and the Synoptic Gospels.” *New Testament Studies* 5 (1959): 12–29.
- Goff, Matthew. “Wisdom and Apocalypticism.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*, edited by John J. Collins, 52–68. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Goodspeed, Edgar J. “The *Didache*, Barnabas, and the Doctrina.” *Anglican Theological Review* 27 (1945): 228–47.
- Grosvenor, Edwin A. “An Interview with Bishop Bryennios — The Discovery of the Teaching.” *Andover Review* 2 (1884): 515–16.
- Hanson, Paul D. “Apocalypse, Genre; Apocalypticism.” In *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible Supplement Volume*, edited by Keith Crim, 27–34. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1976.
- Harrington, Daniel J. “Wisdom and Apocalyptic in 4QInstruction and 4 Ezra.” In *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*, edited by F. García Martínez, 343–55. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 168. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- Hartin, Patrick J. “Ethics in the Letter of James, the Gospel of Matthew, and the *Didache*: Their Place in Early Christian Literature.” In *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*, edited by Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, 289–314. Society of Biblical Literature: Symposium Series 45. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- . “‘Who Is Wise and Understanding Among You?’ (James 3:13): An Analysis of Wisdom, Eschatology, and Apocalypticism in the Letter of James.” In *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism*, edited by Benjamin G. Wright III and Lawrence M. Wills, 149–68. Society of Biblical Literature: Symposium Series 35. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Hartman, Lars. “Survey of the Problem of Apocalyptic Genre.” In *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium of Apocalypticism Uppsala, August 12–17, 1979*, edited by David Hellholm, 2nd ed., 329–43. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989.
- Hellholm, David. “Introduction.” In *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium of Apocalypticism Uppsala, August 12–17, 1979*, edited by David Hellholm, 2nd ed., 1–6. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989.
- . “The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre and the Apocalypse of John.” In *Early Christian Apocalypticism: Genre and Social Setting*, edited by Adela Yarbro Collins, 13–64. *Semeia* 36. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1986.
- Horner, G. “A New Papyrus Fragment of the *Didache* in Coptic.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 25 (April 1924): 225–31.

- Hunt, Stephen A. "Light and Darkness." In *Dictionary of the Later New Testament & Its Developments*, edited by Ralph P. Martin and Peter H. Davids, 657–59. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1997.
- Jefford, Clayton N. "Authority and Perspective in the Didache." In *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, 33–58. Early Christianity and Its Literature 14. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- . "Introduction: Dynamics, Methodologies, and Progress in Didache Studies." In *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, 1–13. Early Christianity and Its Literature 14. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- . "Tradition and Witness in Antioch: Acts 15 and Didache 6." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 19, no. 4 (1992): 409–19.
- . "Tradition and Witness in Antioch: Acts 15 and Didache 6." In *Perspectives on Contemporary New Testament Questions: Essays in Honor of T.C. Smith*, edited by Edgar V. McKnight, 75–89. Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1992.
- . "The Wisdom of Sirach and the Glue of the Matthew-Didache Tradition." In *Intertextuality in the Second Century*, edited by E. Jeffrey Bingham and Clayton N. Jefford, 8–23. Bible in Ancient Christianity 11. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Jones, F. Stanley, and Paul A. Mirecki. "Considerations of the Coptic Papyrus of the *Didache* (British Library Oriental Manuscript 9271)." In *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History, and Transmission*, edited by Clayton N. Jefford, 37–46. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 77. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Khomych, Taras. "The Admonition to Assemble Together in *Didache* 16.2 Reappraised." *Vigiliae Christianae* 61 (2007): 121–41.
- . "Another Gospel: Exploring Early Christian Diversity with Paul and the *Didache*." In *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, 455–76. Early Christianity and Its Literature 14. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Kloppenborg, John S. "*Didache* 1.1–6.1, James, Matthew, and the Torah." In *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, edited by Andrew Gregory and Christopher Tuckett, 193–221. The New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- . "Didache 16 6–8 and Special Matthaean Tradition." *Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 70, no. 1–2 (1979): 54–67.
- . "Poverty and Piety in Matthew, James, and the *Didache*." In *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*, edited by Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, 201–32. Society of Biblical Literature: Symposium Series 45. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.

- . “The Transformation of Moral Exhortation in *Didache* 1–5.” In *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History, and Transmission*, edited by Clayton N. Jefford, 88–109. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 77. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Knibb, Michael A. “Apocalypticism and Messianism.” In *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins, 403–32. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Kolarcik, Michael, S.J. “Sapiential Values and Apocalyptic Imagery in the Wisdom of Solomon.” In *Studies in the Gook of Wisdom*, edited by Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér, 23–36. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 142. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Kraft, Robert A. “Early Developments of the ‘Two-Ways Tradition(s),’ in Retrospect.” In *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*, edited by Randal A. Argall, Beverly A. Bow, and Rodney A. Werline, 136–43. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000.
- Lange, Armin. “Wisdom Literature and Thought in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” In *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins, 455–78. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Larsen, Matthew, and Michael Svigel. “The First Century Two Ways Catechesis and Hebrews 6:1–6.” In *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, 477–96. Early Christianity and Its Literature 14. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Lehtipuu, Outi. “Eschatology and the Fate of the Dead in Early Christian Apocrypha.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Apocrypha*, edited by Andrew Gregory and Christopher Tuckett, 343–60. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Leonhardt-Balzer, Jutta. “A Case of Psychological Dualism: Philo of Alexandria and the Instruction on the Two Spirits.” In *Early Christian Literature and Intertextuality*. Vol. 2 of *Exegetical Studies*, edited by Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias, 27–45. Library of New Testament Studies 392. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Lim, Timothy H., and John J. Collins. “Introduction: Current Issues in Dead Sea Scrolls Research.” In *The Oxford Handbook of The Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins, 1–18. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Lindemann, Andreas. “Die Endzeitrede in *Didache* 16 und die Jesus-Apokalypse in Matthäus 24–25.” In *Sayings of Jesus: Canonical and Non-Canonical: Essays in Honour of Tjitze Baarda*, edited by William L. Petersen, Johan S. Vos, and Henk J. De Jonge, 155–74. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 89. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Longenecker, Bruce W. “‘Until Christ Is Formed in You’: Suprahuman Forces and Moral Character in Galatians.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 61, no. 1 (1999): 92–108.

- Marcus, Joel. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Didascalia Apostolorum: A Common Jewish Christian Milieu?" *Journal of Theological Studies* 61, no. 2 (2010): 596–626.
- Martínez, F. García. "Introduction." In *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*, edited by F. García Martínez, xiii–xxxiv. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 168. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- . "Wisdom at Qumran: Wordly or Heavenly?" In *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*, edited by F. García Martínez, 1–15. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 168. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- Martyn, J. Louis. "Apocalyptic Antinomies in Paul's Letter to the Galatians." *New Testament Studies* 31 (1985): 410–24.
- May, Herbert G. "Cosmological Reference in the Qumran Doctrine of the Two Spirits and Old Testament Imagery." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 82, no. 1 (1963): 1–14.
- Michaelis, Wilhelm. "ὁδός." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, V: Ε–Πα:42–96. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.
- Milavec, Aaron. "The Birth of Purgatory: Evidence of the *Didache*." *Proceedings: Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Studies* 12 (1992): 91–104.
- . "The Distress Signals of Didache Research: Quest for a Viable Future." In *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, 59–83. *Early Christianity and Its Literature* 14. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- . "The Saving Efficacy of the Burning Process in *Didache* 16.5." In *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History, and Transmission*, edited by Clayton N. Jefford, 131–55. *Supplements to Novum Testamentum* 77. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Mitchell, Margaret. "Concerning ΠΕΠΙ ΔΕ in 1 Corinthians." *Novum Testamentum* 31, no. 3 (1989): 229–56.
- Mylykoski, Matti. "Without Decree: Pagan Sacrificial Meat and the Early History of the *Didache*." In *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, 429–53. *Early Christianity and Its Literature* 14. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Najman, Hindy. "The Inheritance of Prophecy in Apocalypse." In *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*, edited by John J. Collins, 36–51. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Nautin, P. "La composition de la 'Didachê'." *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 78 (1959): 191–214.

- Newsom, Carol A. "Spying Out the Land: A Report from Genology." In *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays Offered to Honor Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, edited by Ronald L. Troxel, Kelvin G. Friebel, and Dennis R. Magary, 437–50. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. "Seeking the Origins of the Two-Ways Tradition in Jewish and Christian Ethical Texts." In *A Multiform Heritage: Studies on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Robert A. Kraft*, edited by Benjamin G. Wright, 95–108. *Homage Series 24*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999.
- . "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Early Judaism: Some Points for Discussion." In *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism*, edited by Benjamin G. Wright III and Lawrence M. Wills, 17–37. *Society of Biblical Literature: Symposium Series 35*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Niederwimmer, Kurt. "Der Didachist und Seine Quellen." In *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission*, edited by Clayton N. Jefford, 15–36. *Supplements to Novum Testamentum 77*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . "Der Didachist und seine Quellen." In *Quaestiones theologicae: Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 243–66. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 90*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1998.
- . "Doctrina apostolorum (Cod. Mellic. 597)." In *Quaestiones theologicae: Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 88–94. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 90*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1998.
- Nikander, Perttu. "The Sectio Evangelica (Didache 1.3b–2.1) and Performance." In *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, 287–310. *Early Christianity and Its Literature 14*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Oegema, Gerbern S. "From Prophecy to Apocalypticism in Second Temple Judaism." Paper presented at the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies, Vancouver, Canada, June 1, 2008.
- Osiek, Carolyn. "The Genre and Function of the Shepherd of Hermas." In *Early Christian Apocalypticism: Genre and Social Setting*, edited by Adela Yarbro Collins, 113–22. *Semeia 36*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1986.
- Pardee, Nancy. "The Curse That Saves (*Didache* 16.5)." In *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History, and Transmission*, edited by Clayton N. Jefford, 156–76. *Supplements to Novum Testamentum 77*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . "The Didache and Oral Theory." In *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, 311–33. *Early Christianity and Its Literature 14*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- . "Visualizing the Christian Community at Antioch: The Window of the *Didache*." *Forum* 3, no. 1 (2014): 69–90.

- Pardee, Nancy D. "Didache." Edited by Dale C. Allison Jr., Hans-Josef Klauck, Volker Leppin, and Choon-Leong Seow, 791–95. *Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception*. 6. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013.
- Paretsky, Albert, O.P. "The Two Ways and *Dipsychia* in Early Christian Literature: An Interesting Dead End in Moral Discourse." *Angelicum* 74 (1997): 305–34.
- Perdue, Leo G. "Wisdom and Apocalyptic: The Case of Qoheleth." In *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*, edited by F. García Martínez, 231–58. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 168. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- Piovanelli, Pierluigi. "Much to Say and Hard to Explain': Melchizedek in Early Christian Literature, Theology, and Controversy." In *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*, edited by Andrei Orlov, Gabriele Boccaccini, and Jason Zurawski, 411–29. *Studia Judaeoslavica* 4. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Popović, Mladen. "Apocalyptic Determinism." In *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*, edited by John J. Collins, 255–70. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Procksch, Otto. "ἀγιος." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, I: A–Γ:88–97, 100–10. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.
- Puech, É. "Apports des textes apocalyptiques et sapientiels de Qumrân à l'eschatologie du judaïsme ancien." In *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*, edited by F. García Martínez, 133–70. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 168. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. "Beyond Revealed Wisdom and Apocalyptic Epistemology: Early Christian Transformations of Enochic Traditions about Knowledge." In *Early Christian Literature and Intertextuality*. Vol. 1 of *Thematic Studies*, edited by Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias, 138–64. Library of New Testament Studies 391. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Rhodes, James N. "The Two Ways Tradition in the *Epistle of Barnabas*: Revisiting an Old Question." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 73 (2011): 797–816.
- Robinson, J. A. "The Epistle of Barnabas and the Didache." *Journal of Theological Studies* 35 (1934): 113–46.
- Rordorf, Willy. "An Aspect of the Judeo-Christian Ethic: the Two Ways." In *The Didache in Modern Research*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper, 148–64. *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 37. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- . "Une Chapitre d'éthique Judéo-Chrétienne: les deux voies." *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 60 (1972): 109–28.
- . "Does the Didache Contain Jesus Tradition Independently of the Synoptic Gospels?" In *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*, edited by Henry

- Wansbrough, 394–423. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 64. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991.
- . “La *Didachè* en 1999.” In *Studia Patristica* 36:293–99. Leuven: Peeters, 2001.
- Rowland, Christopher C. “Apocalyptic: The Disclosure of Heavenly Knowledge.” In *The Early Roman Period Part Two*, edited by William Horbury, W. D. Davies, and John Sturdy, 3:776–97. *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Rüpke, Jörg. “Two Cities and One Self: Transformations of Jerusalem and Reflexive Individuality in the Shepherd of Hermas.” In *Religious Dimensions of the Self in the Second Century CE*, edited by Jörg Rüpke and Greg Woolf, 49–65. *Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum* 76. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H., and James C. VanderKam. “Preface.” In *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam, 1:vii–xiv. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Schneider, Athanasius. “*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.
- Schöllgen, Georg. “The Didache as Church Order: An Examination of the Purpose for the Composition of the Didache and its Consequences for Interpretation.” In *The Didache in Modern Research*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper, 43–71. *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 37. New York: Brill, 1996.
- Schröter, Jens. “Jesus Tradition in Matthew, James, and the Didache: Searching for Characteristic Emphases.” In *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*, edited by Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, 233–55. *Society of Biblical Literature: Symposium Series* 45. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- Schwiebert, Jonathan. “Pray ‘In This Way’: Formalized Speech in Didache 9–10.” In *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, 189–207. *Early Christianity and Its Literature* 14. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Seeliger, Hans Reinhard. “Considerations on the Background and Purpose of the Apocalyptic Conclusion of the Didache.” In *The Didache in Modern Research*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper, 373–82. *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 37. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Seitz, Oscar J. F. “Antecedents and Signification of the Term ΔΙΨΥΧΟΣ.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 66, no. 2 (1947): 211–19.
- Slingerland, Dixon. “The Nature of *Nomos* (Law) within the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 105, no. 1 (1986): 39–48.

- Smith, Julien C. H. "The *Epistle of Barnabas* and the Two Ways of Teaching Authority." *Vigiliae Christianae* 68 (2014): 465–97.
- Smith, Michael B. "Cataphoric Pronouns as Mental Space Designators: Their Conceptual Import and Discourse Function." In *Cognitive and Communicative Approaches to Linguistic Analysis*, edited by Ellen Contini-Morava, Robert S. Kirsner, and Betsy Rodríguez-Bachiller, 61–90. Studies in Functional and Structural Linguistics 51. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2004.
- Smith, Murray J. "The Lord Jesus and His Coming in the *Didache*." In *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, 363–407. Early Christianity and Its Literature 14. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Stendahl, Krister. "Hate, Non-Retaliatio, and Love 1 QS X, 17–20 and Rom. 12:19–21." *Harvard Theological Review* 55, no. 4 (1962): 343–55.
- Streeter, Burnett H. "The Much Belaboured *Didache*." *Journal of Theological Studies* 37 (1936): 369–74.
- Suggs, M. Jack. "The Christian Two Ways Tradition: Its Antiquity, Form, and Function." In *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren*, edited by David Edward Aune, 60–74. Novum Testamentum Supplements 33. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- Syreeni, Kari. "The Sermon on the Mount and the Two Ways Teaching of the *Didache*." In *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?*, edited by Huub van de Sandt, 87–103. Philadelphia: Fortress, 2005.
- Tanzer, Sarah J. "Response to George Nickelsburg, 'Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Early Judaism.'" In *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism*, edited by Benjamin G. Wright III and Lawrence M. Wills, 39–49. Society of Biblical Literature: Symposium Series 35. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Taylor, C. "The Two Ways in *Hermas* and *Xenophon*." *Journal of Philology* 21 (1893): 243–58.
- Thomas, Johannes. "The Paraenesis of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*: Between Torah and Jewish Wisdom." In *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context*, edited by James Starr and Engberg-Pedersen, Troels, 157–90. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. "The *Didache* and the Writings That Later Formed the New Testament." In *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett, 83–127. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- . "Synoptic Tradition in the *Didache*." In *The New Testament in Early Christianity: La Réception Des Écrits Néotestamentaires Dans Le Christianisme Primitif*, edited by Jean-Marie Sevrin, 197–230. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 86. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989.

- . “Synoptic Tradition in the Didache.” In *The Didache in Modern Research*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper, 92–128. *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 37. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Twelftree, Graham H. “Exorcism and the Defeat of Beliar in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 65 (2011): 170–88.
- van de Sandt, Huub. “Essentials of Ethics in Matthew and the *Didache*: A Comparison at a Conceptual and Practical Level.” In *Early Christian Ethics in Interaction with Jewish and Greco-Roman Contexts*, edited by Jan Willem van Henten and Joseph Verheyden, 243–61. *Studies in Theology and Religion* 17. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- . “James 4, 1–4 in the Light of the Jewish Two Ways Tradition 3, 1–6.” *Biblica* 88 (2007): 38–63.
- . “Law and Ethics in Matthew’s Antitheses and James’s Letter: A Reorientation of Halakah in Line with the Jewish Two Ways 3:1–6.” In *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*, edited by Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, 315–38. *Society of Biblical Literature: Symposium Series* 45. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- . “Matthew and the *Didache*.” In *Matthew and His Christian Contemporaries*, edited by David C. Sim and Boris Repschinski, 123–38. *Library of New Testament Studies* 333. London: T&T Clark International, 2008.
- van de Sandt, Huub W. M. “‘Bearing the Entire Yoke of the Lord’: An Explanation of *Didache* 6:2 in the Light of Matthew 11:28–30.” In *The Scriptures of Israel in Jewish and Christian Tradition: Essays in Honour of Maarten J.J. Menken*, edited by Bart J. Koet, Steve Moyise, and Joseph Verheyden, 331–44. *Supplements to Novum Testamentum* 148. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Varner, William. “The Didache as a Christian Enchiridion.” In *Christian Origins and Greco-Roman Culture: Social and Literary Contexts for the New Testament*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts, 651–61. *Early Christianity in Its Hellenistic Context* 1. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- . “The Didache’s Use of the Old and New Testaments.” *Master’s Seminary Journal* 16, no. 1 (2005): 127–51.
- Varner, William C. “The Didache ‘Apocalypse’ and Matthew 24.” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 165 (2008): 309–22.
- Verheyden, Joseph. “Eschatology in the Didache and the Gospel of Matthew.” In *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?*, edited by Huub van de Sandt, 193–215. Assen: Van Gorcum, 2005.
- . “The Fate of the Righteous and the Cursed at Qumran and in the Gospel of Matthew.” In *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*, edited by F. García Martínez, 427–49. *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologiarum Lovaniensium*, 168. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.

- Vielhauer, P. "Die Didache." In *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur. Einleitung in das Neue Testament, die Apokryphen und die apostolischen Väter*. New York: De Gruyter, 1985.
- Vielhauer, Philipp, and Georg Strecker. "Apocalypses and Related Subjects." In *Writings Relating to the Apostles; Apocalypses and Related Subjects*, edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher, translated by R. McL. Wilson, 2:542–68. New Testament Apocrypha. Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1992.
- . "Apocalyptic in Early Christianity." In *Writings Relating to the Apostles; Apocalypses and Related Subjects*, edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher, translated by R. McL. Wilson, 2:569–602. New Testament Apocrypha. Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1992.
- Welch, John W. "From the Sermon on the Mount to the Didache." In *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford, 335–61. Early Christianity and Its Literature 14. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Weren, Wim J. C. "The Ideal Community According to Matthew, James, and the Didache." In *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*, edited by Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, 177–200. Society of Biblical Literature: Symposium Series 45. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- Wernberg-Møller, P. "A Reconsideration of the Two Spirits in the Rule of the Community (1QSerek III, 13–IV, 26)." *Review de Qumran* 3 (1961): 413–41.
- Wilhite, Shawn J. "The Didache—Critical Issues." In *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*, edited by John D. Barry and Lazarus Wentz. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2015.
- Winter, Paul. "Ben Sira and the Teaching of 'Two Ways.'" *Vetus Testamentum* 5, no. 3 (1955): 315–18.
- Wright, Benjamin G., III. "The Categories of Rich and Poor in the Qumran Sapiential Literature." In *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May, 2001*, edited by John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling, and Ruth A. Clements, 101–23. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 51. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Wright, Benjamin G., III, and Lawrence M. Wills. "Introduction." In *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism*, edited by Benjamin G. Wright III and Lawrence M. Wills, 1–14. Society of Biblical Literature: Symposium Series 35. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Yarbro Collins, Adela. "Apocalypticism and Christian Origins." In *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*, edited by John J. Collins, 326–39. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

- . “The Early Christian Apocalypses.” In *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*, edited by John J. Collins, 61–121. Semeia 14. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1979.
- . “Introduction: Early Christian Apocalypticism.” In *Early Christian Apocalypticism: Genre and Social Setting*, edited by Adela Yarbro Collins, 1–11. Semeia 36. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1986.

Dissertations and Theses

- Draper, Jonathan Alfred. “A Commentary on the Didache in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents.” PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 1983.
- Du Plessis, Paul Johannes. “TEΛΕΙΟΣ: The Idea of Perfection in the New Testament.” ThD diss., Theologische Hogeschool, 1959.
- Kloppenborg, John S. “The Sayings of Jesus in the Didache.” MA thesis, University of St. Michael’s College, 1976.
- Ladd, George Eldon. “The Eschatology of the *Didache*.” PhD diss., Harvard University, 1949.
- McKenna, Margaret Mary. “‘The Two Ways’ in Jewish and Christian Writings of the Greco-Roman Period: A Study of the Form of Repentance Parenthesis.” PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1981.
- Tolley, Harry W., Jr. “The Two Ways in the *Didache* and the *Epistle of Barnabas*: Is the Origin of the Two Ways Still an Open Question?” MA thesis, University of Georgia, 1998.

ABSTRACT

“ONE OF LIFE AND ONE OF DEATH”: A CRITICAL ASSESSMENT OF APOCALYPTICISM IN THE DIDACHE’S TWO WAYS

Shawn Joseph Wilhite, Ph.D.
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2017
Faculty Supervisor: Dr. Brian J. Vickers

This dissertation seeks to answer the following question: If ancient Jewish and Christian Two Ways texts have a common literary structure and reoccurring apocalyptic dualisms, how and why does the Didache neglect to frame the Two Ways with an apocalyptic worldview? The thesis argued that the Didache’s Two Ways coheres with an ancient apocalyptic Two Ways genre, yet the Didachist does not incorporate the apocalyptic features, dualistic connotations, and the two spirits scheme to maintain a purely ethical version of the Two Ways.

Chapter 1 summarizes the history of scholarship and generational Didache studies as they have inquired about the apocalyptic undercurrents of the Didache’s Two Ways.

Chapter 2 examines historical scholarship and reception of John J. Collins’s work on apocalypticism and joins this work to the study of the Two Ways. Lists of texts, a typology of salient apocalyptic features, and summaries of the ancient Two Ways reveal the undercurrents of an apocalyptic worldview beyond a two angels scheme.

Chapter 3 offers a close critical reading of ancient Two Ways texts that are often compared with the Didache’s Two Ways. The argument focuses upon the apocalyptic features of the Treatise of the Two Spirits (1QS III, 13–IV, 26);

Testament of Asher; Galatians 5:16–24; Barn. 18.1–21.1; *De Doctrina*; and Herm. Mand. 6.1–2 (35–36).

Chapter 4 builds upon the work of Nancy Pardee’s delimitation of the Didache and argues for the Didache’s Two Ways to comprise of material in Did. 1.1–6.2. Textual cohesion, discourse boundaries, and comparison with other ancient Two Ways reveals that Did. 1.1–6.2 is uniquely structured and assimilates unique material into the Two Ways literary frame.

Chapters 5 and 6 collectively argue that the Didache’s Two Ways lack an apocalyptic worldview that is often associated with a Two Ways genre. Assessing the literary frame and selected readings within the Didache’s Two Ways, I demonstrate how the Didache does not include common apocalyptic undercurrents of an ancient Two Ways genre.

VITA

Shawn Joseph Wilhite

EDUCATION:

B.A., California Baptist University, 2006
M.Div., The Master's Seminary, 2010
Th.M., The Master's Seminary, 2012

ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT:

Teaching Assistant, Master's Seminary, Sun Valley, California, 2011–2013
Latin Lead Faculty and Sr. Thesis Instructor, Sayers Classical Academy,
Louisville, Kentucky, 2013–2015
Research Expert, James P. Boyce Centennial Library, Louisville, Kentucky,
2013–2015
Adjunct Professor, California Baptist University OPS, Riverside, California,
2014–2015
Assistant Professor of Christian Studies, California Baptist University,
Riverside, California, 2015–

MINISTERIAL EMPLOYMENT:

Pastoral Intern for First Baptist Church of Sun City, Sun City, California,
2006–2007
Associate Pastor for First Baptist Church of Sun City, Sun City, California,
2008–2010
Associate Pastor for Las Brisas Bible Fellowship, Murrieta, California,
2010–2012
Ministry Intern for Cedar Grove Baptist Church, Cedar Grove, Kentucky,
2013–2014

ORGANIZATIONAL:

Evangelical Theological Society
North American Patristics Society
Society of Biblical Literature

PUBLICATIONS:

“I am Patrick”: The Life and Theology of Patrick of Ireland. Coauthored
with Michael A. G. Haykin and Aaron Matherly. Fearn, Scotland:
Christian Focus, 2014.
“Apostolic Constitutions and Canons,” “Didache–Critical Issues,” and
“Papias.” In *Lexham Bible Dictionary*, edited by John D. Barry.
Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2015.
Apostolic Fathers Greek Reader. Edited with Brian Renshaw. Wilmore,
KY: Glossa House, 2015.

- “That We Too Might Be Imitators of Him’: The Martyrdom of Polycarp as *Imitatio Christi*.” *Churchman* 129, no. 4 (Winter 2015): 319–36.
- “Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Hebrews, and Revelation.” In *Vulgate Interlinear Project*. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software. 2016.
- “Revisiting the Historical Present: John 13 as a Test Case for the Prominence of Discourse Features.” *Trinity Journal* 37, no. 2 (Fall 2016): 195–211.