

James A. Kelhoffer, “‘How Soon a Book’ Revisited: ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ as a Reference to ‘Gospel’ Materials in the First Half of the Second Century”, *ZNW* 95 (2004), p. 1-34.

## ‘How Soon a Book’ Revisited: ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ as a Reference to ‘Gospel’ Materials in the First Half of the Second Century<sup>1</sup>

by James A. Kelhoffer

(Saint Louis University, 3800 Lindell Blvd., USA–St. Louis, MO 63108–3414)

### *I. Introduction: The Metamorphosis of the Term Εὐαγγέλιον*

The subject of ‘gospel’ quotations in the ‘Apostolic Fathers’ has attracted the attention of numerous scholars of early Christianity. Since the late-1950s, scholarship has justifiably questioned the traditional supposition that ‘gospel’ materials in these assorted writings typically stem from the written ‘Gospels’ ultimately incorporated into the NT.<sup>2</sup> The extremes of a minimalist approach have rightly been disputed by more recent inquiries, however.<sup>3</sup> This article

---

<sup>1</sup> A revision of papers presented in the New Testament Textual Criticism section of the 2001 SBL Annual Meeting in Denver, Colorado and the 2002 North American Patristics Society Annual Meeting in Chicago, IL. The author’s thanks are due to Clayton N. Jefford and Larry W. Hurtado.

<sup>2</sup> Seminal studies by H. Koester (Köster), *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern* (TU 65), Berlin 1957; R. Glover, *The Didache’s Quotations and the Synoptic Gospels*, *NTS* 5 (1958) 12–29; J.-P. Audet, *La didachè: Instructions des apôtres* (Études bibliques), Paris 1958 166–86; J. Blich, *Compositio Didaches eiusque relatio ad Evangelium scriptum*, *VD* 36 (1958) 350–6; and F.E. Vokes, *The Didache and the Canon of the New Testament*, in: *Studia Evangelica III: Papers Presented to the Second International Congress on New Testament Studies* (TU 88), Berlin 1964, 427–36 have been followed more recently by J.S. Kloppenborg, *Didache 16,6–8 and Special Matthean Tradition*, *ZNW* 70 (1979) 54–67; W. Rordorf, *Does the Didache Contain Jesus Tradition Independently of the Synoptic Gospels?*, in: *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*, ed. H. Wansbrough (JSNT.SS 64), Sheffield 1991, 394–423; R.H. Gundry, *Εὐαγγέλιον: How Soon a Book?*, *JBL* 115 (1996) 321–5; A. Yoshiko Reed, *Εὐαγγέλιον: Orality, Textuality, and the Christian Truth in Irenaeus’ Adversus Haereses*, *VigChr* 56 (2002) 11–46, esp. 15–19 (following Koester). Additionally, K. Niederwimmer, *The Didache: A Commentary* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis, MN 1998, 46–52, follows Koester (*Synoptische Überlieferung* [see above], 159–60) on the use of oral ‘gospel’ materials rather than Matthew in the *Didache*: “[T]he sources of the *Didache* reveal no literary dependence on the Synoptic Gospels” (49, emphasis original).

<sup>3</sup> C.M. Tuckett, *Synoptic Tradition in the Didache*, in: *The New Testament in Early Christianity*, ed. J.-M. Sevrin, (BETHL 86), Leuven 1989, 197–230; C.N. Jefford, *The Sayings*

addresses a related, but more focused, question, namely the points at which the term εὐαγγέλιον refers to a written document of some kind, and will devote particular attention to the testimony of Marcion, *2 Clement* and, especially, the *Didache*. A main concern of the present study is to move beyond the methodological impasse of Edouard Massaux's<sup>4</sup> problematic maximalist approach and Helmut Koester's particular approach to this problem. The article takes full account of Koester's criticisms of Massaux and offers a more satisfactory solution to account for the transition of εὐαγγέλιον from consistently designating oral proclamation ('gospel') to occasionally referring to a written 'Gospel.' It will be argued that the *Didache* offers a window into the earliest point at which the term εὐαγγέλιον designates written 'Gospel' material(s), a point between the composition of Matthew and the *Didache*.

Koester has argued persuasively that the term "gospel" (εὐαγγέλιον) in the writings of the apostle Paul, along with the authors of the Deutero-Pauline letters and Acts, did not refer to an authoritative writing like, for example, any of the 'NT' Gospels. Koester also demonstrates this point for the rest of the NT literature and numerous other early Christian writings as well.<sup>5</sup>

---

of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (VigChr.S 11), Leiden 1989; C.T. Brown, *The Gospel and Ignatius of Antioch* (Studies in Biblical Literature 12), New York 2000.

<sup>4</sup> E. Massaux, *Influence de l'évangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée* (Réimpression anastatique présentée par F. Neiryneck; Suppl. bibliogr. 1950–1985, par B. Dehandschutter) (BETHL 75), Leuven 1986; ET: *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Saint Irenaeus*, ed. A.J. Bellinzoni (New Gospel Studies 5/1–3), Macon, GA 1990–93. Cf. W.-D. Köhler, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus* (WUNT 2/24), Tübingen 1987; J.M. Court, *The Didache and St. Matthew's Gospel*, SJTh 34 (1981) 109–20; J.V. Bartlet/K. Lake, *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, Oxford 1905. It is not the purpose of this discussion to defend the views of Massaux or to warrant the application of his method of inquiry to the passages discussed in this article. Cf. Ph. Perkins' review of Massaux's book in *SecCent* 8 (1991) 247–8.

<sup>5</sup> H. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, Philadelphia 1990, 1–34; on Paul, the Deutero-Paulines and Acts: 4–9. Cf. M. Hengel, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ*, Harrisburg, PA 2000, 61–5. See also, e.g., Barn. 5.9, 8.3; Ignatius, Phld. 5.1–2; cf. 1 Clem. 42.1, 42.3, 47.2 (alluding to Phil 4.15); Barn. 14.9 (citing Isa 61.1); Polycarp, Phil. 6.3. Koester's conclusion is also valid concerning uses of the verb εὐαγγελίζομαι in these writings. Koester's interest in this area began with his doctoral dissertation (Synoptische Überlieferung [see n. 2]) and has continued in subsequent studies: *Septuaginta und synoptischer Erzählungsstoff im Schriftbeweis Justins des Märtyrers*, Theol. Hab.schr. Heidelberg 1956; *Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels*, HThR 73 (1980) 105–130; *Überlieferung und Geschichte der frühchristlichen Evangelienliteratur*, ANRW II/25/2 (1984) 1463–1542; *From the Kerygma-gospel to Written Gospels*, NTS 35 (1989) 361–81; *The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century*, in: *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century*, ed. W.E. Petersen, Notre Dame 1989, 19–37; *Written Gospels or Oral Tradition?*, JBL 113 (1994) 293–7. This is not the place, however, for a complete evaluation of

Mark 16.9–20 offers an additional example in support of these arguments.<sup>6</sup>

These observations, however, do not address the possibility that some early Christian authors cited written ‘Gospel’ materials without referring to them by the name εὐαγγέλιον or, for that matter, by any other fixed designation.<sup>7</sup> Albeit correctly, the analysis of Koester only points out that εὐαγγέλιον was not a recognized designation for such written materials if they were used.

Following H. v. Campenhausen, Koester maintains that Marcion of Sinope first used εὐαγγέλιον as a reference for an authoritative document, presumably in the 130s or early-140s CE.<sup>8</sup> More recently, R.H. Gundry has offered his own analysis in support of Koester’s position.<sup>9</sup> These scholars maintain correctly that, like the authors of the NT book of Acts, the Deutero-Pauline epistles and 2 Peter, Marcion was influenced by and derived authority from the legacy of the apostle Paul.<sup>10</sup> Marcion apparently took Paul’s reference to God’s future judgment of the world “in accordance with [Paul’s] gospel” (κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου, Rom 2.16) as a Pauline recognition of a written document, a “Gospel,” which Marcion (mis)construed as a reference to a writing very similar to, if not the same as, the ‘NT’ Gospel of Luke. Removing what he regarded as the ‘Judaizing’ tendency of later Christian redac-

---

the above writings. For instructive reviews of Koester’s Ancient Christian Gospels, see J.K. Elliott, NT 34 (1992) 207–8 and U. Luz, Interp. 47 (1993) 87–8.

<sup>6</sup> The author of this appendix to Mark uses τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (Mark 16.15b) and, additionally, ὁ λόγος (16.20c) in reference to preaching rather than to one or more written sources. See J.A. Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission: The Authentication of Missionaries and Their Message in the Longer Ending of Mark* (WUNT 2/112), Tübingen 2000, 124–5.

<sup>7</sup> Note Koester’s comment concerning “Polycarp [*Philippians*], who knew the Gospels of Matthew and Luke ... [I]t is remarkable that Polycarp never uses the term ‘gospel’ for these documents and that the words of Jesus are still quoted as if they were sayings drawn from the oral tradition” (Ancient Christian Gospels [see n. 5], 20).

<sup>8</sup> Marcion (ca. 85–160 CE) was excommunicated in the summer of 144 according to Tertullian, *adv. Marc.* 1.19. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels* (see n. 5), 35; H. v. Campenhausen, *The Formation of the Christian Bible*, Philadelphia 1972, 147–63. Cf. G.N. Stanton, *The Fourfold Gospel*, NTS 43 (1997) 317–46, here: 317 (emphasis original): “More recently, particularly under the influence of Hans van Campenhausen, most scholars have accepted that the fourfold Gospel emerged in the second half of the second century and that the Muratorian Fragment and Irenaeus are our primary witnesses.”

<sup>9</sup> Gundry, *Εὐαγγέλιον* (see n. 2), 322, argues that “subapostolic literature” like the *Didache*, 2 *Clement* and Ignatius’ letters “borrows from books that became canonical but does not use εὐαγγέλιον for any of those books.”

<sup>10</sup> V. Campenhausen, *Formation* (see n. 8), 153 (“the strange construction of Marcion’s Bible is explicable solely in terms of his dogmatic Paulinism”); cf. 154–5 and B.D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*, New York 1993, 185–7.

tors of Luke and all but three of the ‘NT’ writings attributed to Paul, Marcion published his own edition of these writings.<sup>11</sup>

Koester infers, moreover, that Marcion represents the first church with its own “scripture.”<sup>12</sup> This generalization, however, overlooks the presumably earlier statement in 2 Pet 3.15b-16, which equates some collection of Pauline letters with scripture (γραφή). The pseudonymous author of 2 Peter obviously had *some* concept of scripture, which, like Marcion’s, included a collection of Paul’s letters.<sup>13</sup> Yet the author of 2 Peter differs from Marcion in two significant regards. 2 Peter does not mention ‘Gospel’ literature as belonging to αἱ γραφαί but presumably does ascribe to Paul’s writings the authority given to Jewish scripture.

The exception of 2 Peter notwithstanding, the controversy surrounding Marcion’s Lukan-Pauline canon had a profound impact on later Christian authors like Justin Martyr and on subsequent Christian understandings of scripture and canon.<sup>14</sup> Although Justin can at times use the title ‘Gospel’ as if it were *someone else’s* designation (ὃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλιον, 1.Apol. 66.3; ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ εὐαγγελίῳ, Dial. 10.2), elsewhere the apologist himself seems rather comfortable in his use of this term.<sup>15</sup> Nonetheless, in order for Koester to demonstrate this thesis concerning the novelty of Marcion’s use of the term εὐαγγέλιον to refer to a writing like the Gospel of Luke, he must argue that

<sup>11</sup> These Pauline letters correspond to the NT’s thirteen-letter Pauline corpus, minus the Pastoral Epistles. Concerning this collection of Pauline letters, G. Lüdemann, *Heretics: The Other Side of Early Christianity*, Louisville, KY 1996, 167, clarifies: “As the two letters to the Corinthians and the Thessalonians and Colossians and Philemon (because of the striking similarity of the lists of greetings in both letters) were regarded as a unity, this gave a collection of seven letters of Paul.” Additionally, Marcion’s canon contained only one ‘Gospel,’ namely his own edited version of Luke. See further: Lüdemann, *op.cit.* 164–6; v. Campenhausen, *Formation* (see n. 8), 153; Ulrich Schmid, *Marcions Evangelium und die neutestamentlichen Evangelien: Rückfragen zur Geschichte und Kanonisierung der Evangelienüberlieferung*, in: *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung – Marcion and His Impact on Church History*, ed. G. May/K. Greschat/M. Meiser (TUGAL 150), Berlin 2002, 67–77.

<sup>12</sup> Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels* (see n. 5), 36, apparently following von Campenhausen, *Formation* (see n. 8), 163.

<sup>13</sup> The author of 2 Peter indicates that he is part of an inner-Christian controversy involving the interpretation of Paul’s writings, referred to in connection with the Jewish scriptures (τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς, 2 Pet 3.15b-16). Moreover, the same claim about the authority of Paul’s letters might well apply also to the Paulinist Christians whom the author of 2 Peter accuses of ‘heresy’ (cf. 2 Pet 2). Additionally, M. Hengel, *Four Gospels* (see n. 5), 32, offers the four ‘NT’ Johannine writings and, less persuasively, Luke-Acts as additional examples of ‘canons’ of scripture that circulated before the time of Marcion.

<sup>14</sup> With Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels* (see n. 5), 37–41.

<sup>15</sup> Justin, *Dial.* 11.1, introducing a citation of material similar to, or the same as, Matt 11.27: ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ δὲ γέγραπται εἰπὼν. Cf. Th.K. Heckel, *Vom Evangelium des Markus zum viergestaltigen Evangelium* (WUNT 120), Tübingen 1999, 313–5.

*all* Christian writings *prior* to the Marcionite debate *do not* use εὐαγγέλιον to designate a written document.

R. McL. Wilson notes the difficulty of postulating such a sudden transition during the mid-second century:

One major problem emerges: how was it that the canonical Gospels, which on Köster’s showing (p. 257) played in the first half of the second century ‘nur eine ganz untergeordnete Rolle’, had become by the time of Justin almost the only source (p. 267)? The picture here is, as Köster says, entirely different, yet the transition was effected in a few decades.<sup>16</sup>

This problem, mentioned decades ago by Wilson, has yet to be resolved satisfactorily. Marcion’s alleged novelty in this respect would indeed come as a surprise, because, as v. Campenhausen observes, “Marcion supplied no attribution for his corrected text of Luke, but described it simply as ‘Gospel.’”<sup>17</sup> That is to say, Marcion assumes that εὐαγγέλιον is *already* intelligible as a designation for Luke. At the very least, Marcion’s assumption bespeaks a common understanding within his own constituency that εὐαγγέλιον refers to a writing. That later Christian writers like Justin never question εὐαγγέλιον as a fitting designation for (Marcion’s edited version of) Luke or for other ‘Gospels’ also shows the need for caution in too quickly characterizing Marcion as an innovator in this regard.

Yet for Koester, the change allegedly ushered in by Marcion comes, as it were, out of the blue, and its chronological priority is to be accepted because Marcion’s innovative use of εὐαγγέλιον is said to predate all other such Christian uses of this term in the second century. It is primarily on the basis of this criterion that Koester’s larger diachronic argument is presented, and thus is also to be evaluated. The present study argues, on the contrary, that the earliest use of εὐαγγέλιον as a literary designation predates Marcion, as well as 2 *Clement* and the *Didache*.

## II. Εὐαγγέλιον in 2 *Clement* and the Implications of Dating 2 *Clement*, Mark 16.9–20 and John 21 Prior to Justin Martyr

### 1. The Witness of 2 *Clement* to ‘NT’ Gospel Materials

Concerning materials in 2 *Clement* that stem from a ‘NT’ Gospel, in four passages the author refers to what the Lord “says” (λέγω).<sup>18</sup> As Koester ob-

<sup>16</sup> R. McL. Wilson, review of Koester (Köster), *Synoptische Überlieferung* (see n. 2), in *NTS* 5 (1958–59) 144–6, here: 146; cf. Vokes, *Didache* (see n. 2), 434. Additionally, v. Campenhausen, *Formation* (see n. 8), 159–61, touches upon this problem but does not resolve it.

<sup>17</sup> V. Campenhausen, *Formation* (see n. 8), 159.

<sup>18</sup> 2 Clem. 3.2: λέγει δὲ αὐτός, before a saying much like Matt 10.32 (“The one who confesses me before human beings I will confess before my Father”); 2 Clem. 4.2: λέγει γάρ,

serves, in *2 Clement* “[t]he present tense [λέγει] is customarily employed for the introductions of quotations from Scripture or from any written document. This would suggest that the author of *2 Clement* quotes sayings of Jesus from a written work.”<sup>19</sup> Here Koester’s general point is helpful, even if the distinction he makes between the present λέγει and second aorist εἶπεν in *2 Clement* is not tenable.<sup>20</sup>

Furthermore, in *2 Clem.* 2.4 a citation of Mark 2.17/Matt 9.13 (“I did not come to call the just but sinners”) is introduced as “another [part of] scripture” (καὶ ἑτέρα δὲ γραφή λέγει ὅτι...). The adjective ἑτέρα refers back to the author’s citation and interpretation of Isa 54.1 (*2 Clem.* 2.1–3). Thus, in *2 Clem.* 2.4 the same authority is imputed to this word of Christ (cf. *2 Clem.* 2.5–7, 19.1) as is given to Jewish scripture. In addition, the reference to Christ who “became flesh” (ἐγένετο σὰρξ) in *2 Clem.* 9.5 is apparently indebted to John 1.14.<sup>21</sup> Koester notes correctly that “Several of the sayings of Jesus quoted in *2 Clement* indeed reveal features which derive from the redactional activities of the authors of Matthew and Luke.”<sup>22</sup> Although it is doubtful that the presence of such redactional marks is an absolute criterion for ascertaining use of material stemming from a ‘NT’ Gospel,<sup>23</sup> Koester is certainly correct to note that parts of *2 Clement* are ultimately indebted to at least two, if not all four, of the ‘NT’ Gospels.

The author of *2 Clement*, moreover, reflects an interest in a variety of sayings attributed to Jesus that are not preserved in the ‘NT’ Gospels. For example, *2 Clem.* 4.5 (εἶπεν ὁ κύριος), and 12.2 (ἐπερωτηθεὶς γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ... εἶπεν) introduce sayings possibly stemming from the *Gospel of Tho-*

---

before a saying much like Matt 7.21 (“Not everyone who says to me, Lord, Lord will be saved, but [only] the one who does what is just”); *2 Clem.* 6.1: λέγει δὲ ὁ κύριος, before a saying identical to Luke 16.13a (“No servant can serve two masters”); Cf. *2 Clem.* 9.11: καὶ γὰρ εἶπεν ὁ κύριος, possibly referring to Mark 3.35 par. (“My brothers are those who do the will of my Father”). Greek text: M.W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, Grand Rapids, MI 21999, 106–26.

<sup>19</sup> Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels* (see n. 5), 18.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. *2 Clem.* 9.11. The Fourth Gospel, however, offers precedents for the 2nd Aorist εἶπεν referring to the content of Jewish scripture: John 1.23 (καθὼς εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὁ προφήτης); 7.38 (καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή); 7.42 (οὐχ ἡ γραφή εἶπεν); 12.38–41 (three such occurrences of εἶπεν).

<sup>21</sup> Note the use of non-sayings material at this point. Cf. the possible reference to John 13.34 in *2 Clem.* 9.6 (ἀγαπῶμεν ὁὖν ἀλλήλους).

<sup>22</sup> Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels* (see n. 5), 18, summarizing idem, *Synoptische Überlieferung* (see n. 2), 70–99.

<sup>23</sup> For a critique of Koester on the point, see Kelhoffer, *Miracle* (see n. 6), 123–30; cf. 130–7. The presence of redactional elements in *2 Clement* demonstrates the positive case for literary dependence, but the lack of the same would not necessarily dismiss this possibility.

mas, the *Gospel of the Egyptians*, or both extracanonical ‘Gospels.’<sup>24</sup> Moreover, 2 Clem. 11.2 gives heed to a “prophetic word” (λέγει γὰρ καὶ ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος) presumably drawn from a non-‘NT’ document that is cited with authority. As in 2 Clem. 11, the (different) author of *1 Clement* also gives authority to this writing, introducing the same saying cited in 2 Clem. 11.2–4 as “this scripture” (ἡ γραφή αὕτη) in 1 Clem. 23.3.<sup>25</sup>

## 2. The Date of *2 Clement*

Of particular concern to this inquiry is the uncertainty about the date of *2 Clement*. In his *Ancient Christian Gospels*, Koester dates *2 Clement* to 150 CE or “probably even later.” This date is notably after Marcion’s collection of ‘scripture’ (130s or early-140s CE).<sup>26</sup> Elsewhere Koester offers the following argument in support of this position:

[T]here is evidence that *2 Clement* cannot have been written in the earliest period of Christianity. The sayings of Jesus that are quoted in the writing presuppose the New Testament Gospels of Matthew and Luke; they were probably drawn from a harmonizing collection of sayings that had been composed on the basis of these two gospels. 2 Clem. 8.5 refers to the written ‘gospel’ as a well-established entity ...<sup>27</sup>

The argument has some merit in that the harmonization of materials from Matthew and Luke does not occur spontaneously upon the writing of two Gospels but takes at least some time. The point to be addressed in what follows, however, concerns *how much* time can be assumed to have passed between the writing of Matthew and Luke and the emergence of harmonized Gospel quotations, such as those in *2 Clement*. In the following sections it is argued that the witnesses of Mark 16.9–20 and John 21 dismiss Koester’s placing the *terminus post quem* for this development – and thus the date of *2 Clement* – after Marcion and not earlier than Justin Martyr’s harmonized ‘Gospel’ citations.

## 3. Literary Dependence and ‘Gospel’ Materials

*Second Clement* is by no means the only early- to mid-second century Christian writing to presuppose more than one of the ‘NT’ Gospels. Elsewhere the present author has argued that the composer/compiler of the Longer Ending of Mark (Mark 16.9–20) knew and drew heavily from the four

<sup>24</sup> See further T. Baarda, *2 Clement 12 and the Sayings of Jesus*, in: *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus – The Sayings of Jesus*, ed. J. Delobel, Leuven 1982, 529–56.

<sup>25</sup> See above on the occurrence of γραφή in 2 Clem. 2.4.

<sup>26</sup> Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels* (see n. 5), 17–18.

<sup>27</sup> H. Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament II*, Berlin <sup>2</sup>1995, 241–2. Cf. idem, *Ancient Christian Gospels* (see n. 5), 18 n. 1.

Gospels that were eventually incorporated into the NT.<sup>28</sup> The work of Koester also in this area of ascertaining literary dependence is both well-known and influential. Although Koester's criticisms of E. Massaux's more traditional approach are indeed valid,<sup>29</sup> a number of Koester's own methodological starting points for ascertaining literary dependence are also questionable. For example, Koester assumes that written materials were not foundational to the earliest congregations, which instead tended to emphasize the "cult narrative" of the Eucharist and to prefer the authority of living apostles. For Koester, it follows that the use of Gospel material in congregations constituted only one of a number of ways to continue oral traditions from or about Jesus. Consequently, with regard to the question whether a particular second-century author reflects knowledge of a 'NT' text, Koester is so confident about the early church's preference for oral tradition that he shifts the burden of proof to those who would argue to the contrary: "*Unless it can be proved otherwise, it must be assumed that authors who referred to and quoted such materials were dependent on these life situations of the church and did not quote from written documents.*"<sup>30</sup>

Form and redaction criticism in turn offer Koester the negative and positive criteria for ascertaining exceptional cases in which literary dependence has clearly occurred. On the one hand, form criticism aims to reconstruct the history of a piece of tradition before a writer incorporated it into a larger work. If, for example, someone in the second century cites a saying of Jesus which reflects a *Sitz im Leben* that can be shown to be earlier than the "setting in life" reflected in Matthew, for example, literary dependence cannot be said to have occurred. On the other hand, redaction criticism, which studies how different individuals worked as editors of tradition, offers Koester the only positive means of identifying literary dependence: "Whenever one observes words or phrases that derive from the author or redactor of a gospel writing, the existence of a written source must be assumed."<sup>31</sup>

The noteworthy working hypotheses in Koester's approach are not only that those second-century authors who happened to possess texts of one or more Gospels had access to comparable, and possibly earlier and more highly-esteemed, oral traditions, but, moreover, that such authors usually preferred to cite oral traditions rather than written documents. This inference is indeed justified in the cases of Papias' stated preference for oral tradition (*apud* Euse-

<sup>28</sup> Kelhoffer, *Miracle* (see n. 6), 48–156.

<sup>29</sup> Koester, *Written Gospels* (see n. 5); Massaux, *Influence* (see n. 4).

<sup>30</sup> Koester, *Written Gospels* (see n. 5), 297, emphases added. Koester describes these "materials" as traditions "from and about Jesus in ritual, instruction, and missionary activity."

<sup>31</sup> Koester, *Written Gospels* (see n. 5), 297. Consequently, similarities in wording are not by themselves a sufficient criterion for deciding if literary dependence has occurred. One must show that a citation of Matthew or Luke, for example, reflects the editorial work of these evangelists and not just the traditions incorporated into their writings.

bios, Hist. eccl. 3.39.4) and at a later point Clement of Alexandria’s non-standard ‘gospel citations.’ Nonetheless, the proclivities of certain early Christian authors should not be taken as determinative for how others may have used ‘gospel’ materials.<sup>32</sup>

One significant implication of Koester’s approach is the resulting *smaller* pool of writings which might potentially bear witness to the text of the NT and which thus may be consulted for reconstructing a ‘NT’ passage’s original wording or development in the second century. Such methodological issues, of course, are part of a larger debate within Synoptic studies, which E.P. Sanders aptly addresses, concerning how Synoptic traditions developed in a number of later Christian writings.<sup>33</sup> Sanders argues that in numerous early extracanonical Christian writings, the Synoptic tradition does not reflect a development similar to that postulated for the Synoptics on the basis of the four-source hypothesis.<sup>34</sup> What this means for this article’s inquiry is that *no theory of the relationship of the Synoptic Gospels*, including that posed by Koester, *can necessarily predict how other Christian authors might be inclined to make use of written traditions*, including the ‘NT’ Gospels. Koester’s pioneering work of the 1950s is to be credited with the insight of applying form and redaction criticism to the study of ‘gospel’ and other ‘NT’ materials in second-century Christian literature. In the decades since Koester’s initial work in this area, however, the call from Sanders and others for circumspection concerning the limits of form and redaction criticism has resulted in a methodological impasse in this area.

Given the present state of the discussion, the burden of proof for ascertaining literary dependence should not necessarily rest with those who tend to argue either in favor or against literary dependence. If there are obvious similarities between a second-century writing and a ‘NT’ passage, scholars like Koester should have the opportunity to demonstrate the probability that comparable oral tradition(s) survived until the likely compositional dates in question. Moreover, it must also be recognized that authors may have reasons for borrowing from a written text and adapting it for their own purposes, thus possibly disguising the redactional markers of a source that, when possible, all

<sup>32</sup> On this point, see W.L. Petersen, The Genesis of the Gospels, in: *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel*, ed. A. Denaux (BETHL 161), Louvain 2002, 41–73.

<sup>33</sup> E.P. Sanders, *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition* (SNTSMS 9), London 1969, 37–9, 89 and 296 n. 1, offers certain criticisms of Koester’s approach, which need not be repeated in this discussion. In his own study, Sanders applies the categories of increasing length, increasing detail, diminishing Semitism, use of direct discourse and conflation to ‘Synoptic’ materials in other early Christian literature.

<sup>34</sup> Sanders thus concludes that some of the assumptions behind the two-source hypothesis are questionable and far from proven. This particular finding, although interesting and controversial, is not directly relevant to this article.

scholars would like to find. Even in instances where redactional features of a NT author are not readily identifiable, there may be good reason for maintaining that some literary dependence is highly probable. Given the diversity of expression in second-century Christian writings, any singular methodological approach to these authors' uses of source material(s) is by definition suspect. Thus, questions concerning possible witnesses to the text of the NT in the second century must be considered on a case-by-case basis.

#### 4. The Earliest 'Gospel' Collections and Mark's Longer Ending (Mark 16.9–20)

In the case of Mark 16.9–20, the otherwise unknown author of Mark's Longer Ending made use of the four 'NT' Gospels in order to make his addition to Mark resemble documents that had attained at least some level of popularity in certain Christian communities.<sup>35</sup> The author of this Markan ending wrote around 120–150 CE, after a collection (but not necessarily a fixed 'canon') of the 'NT' Gospels became available and – notably for the present argument concerning the date of 2 *Clement's* 'Gospel' citations – before Justin Martyr's *First Apology* (ca. 155–161 CE).<sup>36</sup> That is to say, prior to Justin's *First Apology*, the four 'NT' Gospels were available in one place for the passage composed by the author of the Longer Ending. The author of this secondary addition to Mark wanted to forge an authentic-looking passage by means of epitomizing other gospel pericopes that presumably would have been familiar to his/her audience. Thus, Mark 16.9–20 points to a *collection* of (at least) four Gospels before this passage was cited by Justin Martyr.<sup>37</sup>

#### 5. The Earliest 'Gospel' Collections and John 21

Moreover, Theo K. Heckel makes a similar argument concerning John 21, an endeavor which is of crucial importance to his study of the 'NT' Gospels in the second century. Even if, in the view of the present author, Heckel's

<sup>35</sup> Compare, e.g., Luke 8.2b with Mark 16.9b; Mark 6.12 and Luke 9.6 with Mark 16.20a, and see Kelhoffer, *Miracle* (see n. 6), 48–156. On the reason for which this Markan appendix was composed, namely to follow the narrative that ends abruptly at Mark 16.8, see *Miracle*, 157–69, 238–44.

<sup>36</sup> See Kelhoffer, *Miracle* (see n. 6), esp. 169–77. The *terminus post quem* for Mark 16.9–20 is set by this author's use of material from the four 'NT' Gospels, which presumably were not collected before ca. 110–120 CE. The *terminus ante quem* is established by Justin Martyr's knowledge of Mark 16.20a in 1.Apol. 45.5. Thus, the Longer Ending predates Justin, but the earliest possible date for its composition, namely some point after which the 'NT' Gospels had been written *and* collected, cannot be ascertained exactly. Cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* III.10.5, citing Mark 16.19.

<sup>37</sup> Th.K. Heckel came to the same conclusion independently (*Evangelium* [see n. 15], 283–5).

study of John 21 is only partially successful, his work is valuable for the additional evidence it uncovers for the existence of ‘Gospel’ collections in the period contemporary with, or possibly earlier than, Marcion and *2 Clement*.

Heckel argues persuasively that since the ‘NT’ Gospels were intended to be read individually, they cannot by themselves account for a collection of different Gospels.<sup>38</sup> Despite the secondary character of John 21 as an appendix to the Fourth Gospel, Heckel concurs with G. Strecker and U. Schnelle that its author “gehört ... des Nachtrages zur johanneischen Schule.”<sup>39</sup> More significantly, and tenuously, Heckel argues that the author of John 21 knew the four ‘NT’ Gospels and combined Johannine with ‘Synoptic’ elements in his/her appendix to the Gospel of John.<sup>40</sup> In assigning a date to this four-Gospel collection, Heckel makes the most of relative chronology, placing John 21 at 110–120 CE (against W. Schmithals’ later date of 160–180) – after both the Fourth Gospel (90–100) and 1 John (100–110) but before Papias (around 120 CE).<sup>41</sup> Heckel thus concludes that John 21 witnesses to the existence of a four-Gospel collection prior to Marcion’s canon of (edited versions of) Luke and ten Pauline letters. Heckel’s creative approach to the Gospels in the second century makes numerous contributions, but his central arguments concerning the literary dependence and chronological priority of John 21 need further examination.<sup>42</sup> Even if Heckel has not demonstrated that John 21 points to a four-Gospel collection, the use of Luke 5.1–11 at least points to a *two*-Gospel collection of Luke and John.

<sup>38</sup> Heckel, *Evangelium* (see n. 15), 32–104, 144–57.

<sup>39</sup> Heckel, *Evangelium* (see n. 15), 217; cf. John 21.24.

<sup>40</sup> Heckel, *Evangelium* (see n. 15), esp. 190–2, on βιβλία in John 21.25.

<sup>41</sup> Heckel, *Evangelium* (see n. 15), 199–207.

<sup>42</sup> Two problems and one major flaw in Heckel’s larger argument merit a brief comment. First, Heckel does not argue persuasively for the chronological priority of John 21 to other second-century witnesses to Gospel collections (e.g., *Epistula Apostolorum*, Mark 16.9–20, Papias). In particular, the grounds he offers for dating John 21 before Papias – whom Heckel connects with the Johannine school and the Fourth Gospel, including John 21 – are not compelling. Second, Heckel’s rather comprehensive study neglects the possible witness of writings like *2 Clement*, the *Didache*, and Ignatius’ letters to collections of ‘NT’ (and other) gospel materials. Finally, concerning John 21 and the Synoptics, knowledge of special Lukan material, namely Luke 5.1–11 (on the calling of Peter, James and John, which seems to be rewritten in John 21) is both clear and intriguing in that it shows at least a *two*-Gospel collection of Luke and John. More cautiously, Heckel acknowledges the use of Matt 16.17–19 (on the authority of Peter) as “nur ... wahrscheinlich” ([see n. 15], 166). Yet even this level of probability is strained in the case of both Matt 16.17–19 and Mark 9.1/Matt 16.28/Luke 9.27 (the transfiguration). At this point Heckel’s thesis is most vulnerable, for his inference of a *four*-Gospel collection stands or falls with his all too brief arguments for John 21’s literary dependence upon these Synoptic passages (or some such written collection of pre-Synoptic sources).

## 6. Implications for the Study of ‘Gospel’ Materials in the Second Century

Certain implications of these observations of literary dependence and forgery become evident when one considers Mark 16.9–20 and John 21 relative to Helmut Koester’s characterization of “differences between a second-century user of a Gospel and a fourth- or fifth-century quotation in a Church Father.” Koester lists three such distinctions:

1. Before “200 CE, the Gospels were usually transmitted separately” and not “available as part of the four-Gospel canon.”
2. “In the later period, the Gospels were usually considered holy scripture; no such respect was accorded them in the earliest period.”
3. “Beginning only with the third century can we assign quotations to certain text types ...”<sup>43</sup>

The composition of appendices to Mark and John that were dependent upon two or more of the ‘NT’ Gospels calls for caution with regard to the first two of these principles. Concerning the first, the decision by the author of Mark 16.9–20 that the end of Mark was deficient, as well as the judgment of the author of John 21 that the end of John required a narrative relating the restoration of Peter, both require a time when different Gospels had been collected *and* compared with one another. Mark’s Longer Ending and John 21 thus offer exceptions to Koester’s first generalization that these four Gospels were usually transmitted separately in the second century. As Paul Rohrbach argued on different grounds over a century ago, it also follows that Mark 16.9–20 points to the existence of a four-Gospel collection prior to the composition of Mark’s Longer Ending.<sup>44</sup> This conclusion stands in agreement with Martin Hengel’s assessment that Mark 16.9–20 “and the *Epistula Apostolorum* ... are thus probably the earliest Christian texts to presuppose all the Gospels and Acts.”<sup>45</sup>

<sup>43</sup> Koester, *Text* (see n. 5), 19. To date there exists no study of the use of the ‘NT’ Gospels in Mark 16.9–20 in terms of text types or variant MS readings. This line of inquiry would likely prove fruitful in the future.

<sup>44</sup> See P. Rohrbach, *Der Schluss des Markusevangeliums, der Vier-Evangelien-Kanon und die Kleinasiatichen Presbyter*, Berlin 1894, esp. 38–40.

<sup>45</sup> M. Hengel, *Die Evangelienüberschriften* (SHAW.PH 1984/3), Heidelberg 1984, 22: “Der sekundäre Markusschluß [16,9–20] und die ebenfalls in der 1. Hälfte des 2. Jh.s anzusetzende *epistula apostolorum* sind so die frühesten christlichen Texte, die alle Evangelien und die Apg voraussetzen.” – ET: The Titles of the Gospels and the Gospel of Mark, in: idem, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, London 1985, 64–84; here: 72. So also K. Aland, *Der Schluß des Markusevangeliums*, in: *L’Évangile selon Marc*, ed. M. Sabbe (BETHL 34), Gembloux <sup>2</sup>1988, 435–70, 573–5; esp. 453–5. Additionally, Hengel offers Mark 16.9–20 and the *Epistula Apostolorum* as exceptions to Koester’s generalization that most second-century writers, many of whom Koester dates *later* than Mark 16.9–20 and the *Epistula Apostolorum*, preferred to use one Gospel (εὐαγγέλιον) rather than materials drawn from two or more Gospels (Evangelienüberschriften, 8–13 = Titles 65–7).

Furthermore, that additions to Mark and John were made – in the case of Mark, the Longer Ending and the Shorter Ending (it\*), not to mention the interpolation following Mark 16.14 preserved in Codex Freerianus (W, 032)<sup>46</sup> – both supports and calls for a modification of Koester’s second point concerning the respect that allegedly was not in any way accorded to the ‘NT’ Gospels in the second century. On the one hand, Koester’s observation that the Gospels of Mark and John were not considered “holy scripture” has merit in the sense that they could never be changed or augmented by later authors.<sup>47</sup> On the other hand, the efforts of these authors to imitate the ‘NT’ Gospels bespeak a high respect for such writings. Such labors also suggest that these authors, like the author of Mark’s Shorter Ending, considered the Gospels of Mark and John valuable enough to be improved in order to meet the needs of their and future generations. As a result, it is inaccurate to generalize, as Koester does, that “no such respect was accorded” to the ‘NT’ Gospels “in the earliest period” before 200 CE.<sup>48</sup>

#### 7. The Date of *2 Clement* Revisited

As a result, the testimony of Mark 16.9–20 – and, to a somewhat lesser extent, that of John 21 – dismisses the criterion of Koester cited above to support the dating of *2 Clement* to the mid-second century and after Marcion. On the contrary, knowledge of a ‘NT’ Gospel is not a reliable basis for dating *2 Clement* after Marcion. Thus, although the date of *2 Clement* remains an open question, it is to be noted that the two main arguments used to support a late date for *2 Clement* are unreliable. That posed by Koester – use of written ‘Gospel’ materials – does not take into the account the witnesses of Mark 16.9–20 and John 21, which predate Justin Martyr. Additionally, because *2 Clement* is not a letter, it cannot be identified with a lost letter of Bishop Soter of Rome (166–74 CE).<sup>49</sup> Given that there were rather early second-

<sup>46</sup> On this see the recent study of J. Frey, *Zu Text und Sinn des Freer-Logion*, ZNW 93 (2002) 13–34.

<sup>47</sup> One could also note that ‘scripture’ was modified precisely *because* it was important/esteemed. The idea of ‘scripture’ as textually sacrosanct is an anachronism even for copies of the NT made in the fourth century or later. See, e.g., Ehrman, *Corruption* (see n. 10), 7–25.

<sup>48</sup> Koester, *Text* (see n. 5), 19, emphasis added. In a sense, Koester sets up his argument so that it is beyond refutation: Because no second-century Christian author reflects a view of scripture like those represented in later centuries, there thus must have been no such concept in the second century.

<sup>49</sup> With C.N. Jefford, *Reading the Apostolic Fathers*, Peabody, MA 1996, 119: “Traditionally *2 Clement* has been called a letter or epistle. Yet, unlike the letters of *1 Clement* and *Ignatius*, those elements typical of the ancient letter structure – such as a greeting, words of thanksgiving, closing concerns – are absent. ... In many respects the structure of *2 Clement* resembles that of *Barnabas*, though it [*2 Clement*] never assumed the form of a

century collections – but, again, not necessarily fixed ‘canons’ – of ‘Gospels,’ what can be learned from a writing like *2 Clement*, whose author cites a variety of ‘gospel’ materials, once in conjunction with the term εὐαγγέλιον (2 Clem. 8.2)?

#### 8. Analysis of 2 Clem. 8.5

The last remaining, and perhaps the most intriguing for the present study, passage of *2 Clement* to be discussed here is 2 Clem. 8.5, the only place this author uses εὐαγγέλιον. As noted above, Koester acknowledges correctly that there is “some proof for the use of the term ‘gospel’ as a designation of written documents.”<sup>50</sup> Significantly, this singular occurrence does refer to *written* ‘gospel’ material. As in 2 Clem. 4.5, 11.2 and 12.2, *extracanoncial* material is cited in 2 Clem. 8.5: λέγει γὰρ ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. Such an attribution is significant for at least three reasons. First, despite the myriad of gospel traditions cited in *2 Clement* (both ‘canonical’ and ‘extracanoncial’), 2 Clem. 8.5 uses the *singular* for the term ‘Gospel.’ Although acknowledging the possibility, Koester thinks it “highly unlikely that ‘a sayings collection’” drawing upon Matthew, Luke and “some non-canonical materials ... was called a ‘gospel’” by the author of *2 Clement*.<sup>51</sup> Koester offers no argument for this position, which can plausibly be construed as special pleading for the originality of Marcion’s use of this term.

A second issue pertaining to 2 Clem. 8.5 concerns a point of similarity with Marcion’s ‘Gospel.’ As with Marcion’s use of εὐαγγέλιον, the lack of explanation in 2 Clem. 8.5 about the use of this term to refer to a writing is noteworthy, for the author of *2 Clement* also presumes that his use of this term is intelligible. Indeed, these two authors’ uses of εὐαγγέλιον designating a writing of some kind are *assumed* to be perspicuous. Thus, the lack of specificity by both Marcion and the author of *2 Clement* suggests the likelihood that

---

letter and, presumably, was never intended to circulate widely.” Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers* (see n. 18), 103, likewise observes that “this ingenious suggestion faces the difficulty that the document in question [*2 Clement*] is certainly not a letter.” See further V. Bartlett, *The Origin and Date of 2 Clement*, ZNW 7 (1906) 123–35, following J.B. Lightfoot (*The Apostolic Fathers: Clement, Ignatius and Polycarp* [Reprint: Peabody, MA 1989 = London 1889–90] I, 2.201–4), in arguing for a date of 120–140 CE, primarily on the basis of an early ‘pneumatic’ Christianity attested in 2 Clem. 14. Bartlett also dismisses Adolf von Harnack’s argument (*Zum Ursprung des sog. 2. Clemensbriefs*, ZNW 6 [1905] 67–71) for *2 Clement*’s Roman origin and later authorship by Soter (cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 2.25.8, 4.23.11).

<sup>50</sup> With Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels* (see n. 5), 17, although Koester suggests that in *2 Clement* “the evidence is somewhat ambiguous” (18). See the discussion in the following section of 2 Clem. 8.5 (λέγει γὰρ ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ) and other passages in *2 Clement*.

<sup>51</sup> Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels* (see n. 5), 18.

*neither* author was an innovator in using εὐαγγέλιον to designate a writing. Since neither Marcion nor the author of *2 Clement* gives any indication of trying to *re-define* the meaning of εὐαγγέλιον, it is plausible that the writing cited in 2 Clem. 8.5 had *already* received this title by an earlier author, redactor or copyist of this extracanoncial 'gospel' material. The same explanation could apply equally to the version of Luke known to Marcion.<sup>52</sup> If this were the case for both documents, Marcion's Luke and *2 Clement's* (sayings) source, then εὐαγγέλιον would not necessarily be an indication of specific contents – and certainly not of 'proto-orthodoxy' – but would only designate *some written collection of teachings of, or about, Jesus*. Such a designation would likely have arisen from the need of an author or copyist to distinguish one useful, and only possibly authoritative, writing from other pieces of esteemed literature (for example, the LXX or perhaps one or more of Paul's letters; cf. 2 Pet 3.15b-16).

Third, the argument concerning the temporal priority of *2 Clement* to Marcion could perhaps be pressed a step further. In 2 Clem. 8.5, εὐαγγέλιον is used in a context devoid of debate about authoritative writings or canon. That is to say, there is no influence of the Marcionite debate in *2 Clement*. Rather, *2 Clement* reveals an author who drew freely from a variety of sources without concern for canon, authority, or inappropriate editing by later 'Judaizing' Christians, all of which came to receive greater attention in much Christian literature *after* Marcion.<sup>53</sup>

#### 9. Summary: The Assumed Referent for Εὐαγγέλιον in Marcion and *2 Clement*

The thesis argued heretofore in this article, that approximately the same time in the second quarter of the second century both Marcion and *2 Clement*

<sup>52</sup> So Hengel, *Titles* (see n. 45), 72. Koester, however, is appropriately cautious on this point, although he grants that the *names* of the evangelists may well have circulated earlier (Ancient Christian Gospels [see n. 5], 26–7). It is not clear, however, why Hengel takes the knowledge of "all the [NT] Gospels and Acts" in Mark 16.9–20 to indicate that Mark's Longer Ending "must be dated to the first decades of the second century," while the *Epistula Apostolorum* belongs to the middle of the second century (Evangelienüberschriften [see n. 44], 21 n. 47 = *Titles* 167–8 n. 47).

<sup>53</sup> If *2 Clement* is indeed later than Marcion, this is not what one would expect from an author concerned with the unity of Christians who need to heed the warnings of the presbyters against false teachings (cf. 2 Clem. 17.2–3). Given this author's eclectic use of gospel materials – or use of a written 'Gospel' comprising eclectic traditions – it follows that the author of *2 Clement* would have had objections to the narrower Marcionite canon if he had known about it. The silence of *2 Clement* on this point thus offers a supporting argument for the chronological priority of this writing to Marcion's 'Gospel.' Although *2 Clement* does not point to a four-Gospel 'canon,' its author, like Marcion, assumes that his/her audience will recognize εὐαγγέλιον as a reference to written 'Gospel' material.

assume εὐαγγέλιον as a referent for written Gospel materials, casts doubt upon Koester's characterization of Marcion as an innovator. It has also been noted that in 2 Clem. 8.5 εὐαγγέλιον refers not to a 'NT' Gospel but to some other writing, which may well have been called a 'Gospel' by its author, compiler, redactor or copyist before at least one part of it was cited in 2 *Clement*. The following section will argue that similar uses of εὐαγγέλιον are also to be found in the materials incorporated into the *Didache*.<sup>54</sup>

### III. Εὐαγγέλιον in the *Didache*

As C.M. Tuckett rightly observes, since the *Didache* is a composite document – comprising Wisdom teaching about the Two Ways (Did. 1.1 – 6.2), instructions for community leaders (6.3 – 15.4) and a brief section of eschatological and ethical warnings (16.1–8) – source-critical questions pertaining to each part of this writing must be studied independently of the other parts, and the conclusions pertaining to the use of 'gospel' materials in one section of the *Didache* may not necessarily hold for the others.<sup>55</sup> The analysis to follow is concerned primarily with the four occurrences of εὐαγγέλιον in three parts of Did. 6.3 – 15.4, namely Did. 8.2, 11.3–4 and 15.3–4.

The first of these passages (Did. 8.2) contains materials about hypocrisy, prayer and fasting that parallel parts of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount (Matt 6.1–18, esp. vv. 9–13). Did. 11.3–4 and 15.3–4, however, use εὐαγγέλιον in contexts that do not parallel any 'NT' material as strikingly. These other passages refer to proper treatment of apostles and prophets (11.3–4), to correcting one another (15.3) and to prayers and almsgiving (15.4). The goal of the following analysis is to ascertain to what this author referred in these sundry passages. Contrary to K. Niederwimmer's conclusion that "[t]he jury is still out" on whether the *Didache* "refers to a gospel in written form (*evangelium scriptum*)," the present study will side with C.N. Jefford<sup>56</sup> in arguing that

<sup>54</sup> See further, Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels* (see n. 5), 149–60. The Greek text cited for the *Didache* appears in Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers* (see n. 18), 250–68.

<sup>55</sup> Tuckett, *Synoptic Tradition* (see n. 3), 198: "[A]ny theories about the origins of synoptic tradition in one part of the *Didache* will not necessarily apply to the *Didache* as a whole." Tuckett's essay concentrates on Did. 1–2, 11, 16, "arguing that the *Didache* presupposes the finished form of the synoptic gospels, or at least that of Matthew" (197–8). The following analysis of Did. 8.2, 11.3–4 and 15.3–4 comes to a similar conclusion and thus complements Tuckett's study. Cf. Stanton, *Fourfold Gospel* (see n. 8), 334; Jefford, *Sayings* (see n. 3), 18, who rightly questions whether "the *Didache* ... must represent a single community within Christian history whose ideas and approaches quickly disappeared before the encroachment of developing orthodoxy."

<sup>56</sup> Niederwimmer, *Didache* (see n. 2), 50–2; here: 51; so also H. van de Sandt/D. Flusser, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity* (CRINT 3/5), Assen 2002, 293–6; W.L. Petersen, *The Genesis of the Gospels* (see n. 32), 51–3; with Jefford, *Sayings* (see n. 3), 143.

the Didachist does designate a written document in these passages, and as such is the earliest surviving witness to the use of εὐαγγέλιον to designate a written ‘Gospel’ of some kind.

### 1. Analysis of Did. 8.2

With regard to the first passage, in Did. 8.2 the author substantiates his message about prayer by an appeal to Jesus’ teaching. One is to give credence to this rather brief passage on prayer, because it contains instruction “as the Lord has commanded in his Gospel” (ὡς ἐκέλευσεν ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ αὐτοῦ). The Didachist offers this introduction to some traditional material, which coincides, with minor variations, with the vast majority of the Matthean Lord’s Prayer. The five points at which the two prayers differ may be summarized as follows:

- 1) The presence of οὖν ... ὑμεῖς in Matthew’s introduction.
- 2) Matthew’s plural (ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς) and the *Didache*’s singular (ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ) for “heaven.”
- 3) Again, Matthew’s plural (τὰ ὀφειλήματα, “debts, obligations”) and the *Didache*’s singular of a related term (τὴν ὀφειλήν, “debt, obligation, duty”).
- 4) Matthew’s perfect (ἄφήκαμεν) and the *Didache*’s present (ἀφίμεν) tense for ἀφίημι, “forgive.”
- 5) The doxology concluding the Lord’s Prayer in the *Didache*: “for yours is the power and the glory forever.”

Clearly the *Didache*’s prayer cannot be traced to either Luke or Q<sup>Lk</sup> (= Luke 11.2–4). Given the notably high amount of verbal overlap between the versions of the prayer in Matthew and the *Didache*, there is almost certainly *some* relationship – quite possibly a literary one – between them. If the Didachist did not know Matthew, then he perhaps made use of Q<sup>Mt</sup> or possibly some even earlier version of what came to be the Sermon on the Mount.<sup>57</sup>

Yet Koester, in his discussion of Did. 8.2, conflates two different questions, namely whether the NT Gospel of Matthew is cited in Did. 8.2 and whether *some* writing is cited as εὐαγγέλιον in Did. 8.2.<sup>58</sup> Whatever their

<sup>57</sup> Cf. H.D. 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)* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis 1995, 5–10.

<sup>58</sup> Against Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels* (see n. 5), 16, who begs the question of the popularity of a particular version of the Lord’s Prayer in the early church: “It is also most unlikely that a Christian writer would have to copy from any written source in order to quote the Lord’s Prayer.” Cf. idem, *Synoptische Überlieferung* (see n. 2), 103–9. Similarly, J.A. Draper, *The Jesus Tradition in the Didache*, in: *The Didache in Modern Research*, ed. idem, Leiden 1996, 72–91, here: 85, regards such similarities and differences as pointing to the use of “a written or oral gospel close to the present text of Matthew,” but not necessarily the same as Matthew, in Did. 8. There is no evidence that the asserted

merit, Koester's arguments concerning the former question do not speak directly to the latter. The following examination of the five differences in wording between Matt 6.9–13 and Did. 8.2 serves both to clarify the relationship between these two witnesses to the Lord's Prayer and to elucidate to what the author of the *Didache* referred as 'the Lord's Gospel' (...ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ αὐτοῦ).

a) *The Presence of οὖν ... ὑμεῖς in Matthew's Introduction to the Prayer*

Concerning the opening command to pray, the longer introduction of Matt 6.9a (οὕτως οὖν προσεύχεσθε ὑμεῖς) could perhaps be regarded as a redactional expansion of the earlier and shorter tradition preserved in the *Didache* (οὕτως προσεύχεσθε). Conversely, the *Didache's* introduction to the prayer is better understood as a conflation of Matt 6.5a and 6.9a. The similar language of Matt 6.5 (before the Lord's Prayer in Matthew), and the beginning of Did. 8.2 suggests that the latter explanation offers a more plausible reason for the Didachist's brevity.<sup>59</sup> If the *Didache's* introduction to the prayer is taken as a conflation of Matt 6.5a and 6.9a, then the *Didache's* lack of οὖν ... ὑμεῖς would not eliminate the possibility that this author made use of Matthew. In both Matt 6.9a and Did. 8.2, the subject of the imperative (ὑμεῖς) is unnecessary. Moreover, if the *Didache's* μηδὲ προσεύχεσθε reflects a shortening of Matthew's somewhat obtuse καὶ ὅταν προσεύχησθε οὐκ ἔσεσθε (Matt 6.5a), there would be two consistent examples of shortening Matt 6.5a and 6.9a into a single statement in Did. 8.2. Finally, unlike in Matt 6.9a, οὖν would be awkward in Did. 8.2 following μηδὲ ... ἀλλ' ὡς ...

Therefore, the *Didache's* shorter introduction to the prayer does not weaken but actually strengthens the argument for this writing's use of either Matthew or some written tradition in which some teaching on how hypocrites pray (cf. Matt 6.5–8) preceded the Lord's Prayer (Matt 6.9–13).<sup>60</sup> Additionally,

---

moral exhortations of Matthew 5–7 or of the Didachist were actually put into practice by many in the early church. On the contrary, the instruction of Did. 8.2 is given because of the Didachist's view of how the faithful should be – but apparently are not – praying. It is precisely for this reason that the Lord's 'commandment' in 'the Gospel' is cited at length, because the Didachist's audience – unlike so many Christians today – need this information.

<sup>59</sup> Matt 6.5a: καὶ ὅταν προσεύχησθε οὐκ ἔσεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταί, ὅτι φιλοῦσιν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ ἐν ταῖς γωνίαις τῶν πλατειῶν ἑστῶτες προσεύχεσθαι, ὅπως φανῶσιν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. Did. 8.2: μηδὲ προσεύχεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταί, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκέλευσεν ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ αὐτοῦ, οὕτως προσεύχεσθε:.

<sup>60</sup> With Köhler, *Rezeption* (see n. 4) 30–6; and Massaux, *Influence* (see n. 4), 3.154: "Christ directs his disciples not to pray like the hypocrites; he gives them the exemplary prayer, and he then prohibits them from fasting like the hypocrites. The context of Did. 8 is, therefore, that of Mt. 5:5–18." This conclusion is valid even if the author of Matthew and the Didachist may have somewhat different groups in mind; e.g., Matthew may intend ultra pious Jews while the Didachist may intend Jews of a more specifically Pharisaic bent.

this same conclusion might also be suggested for not fasting like the hypocrites in Matt 6.16–18 and Did. 8.1, although the order of the pericopes in Matthew (after the Lord’s Prayer) and the *Didache* (before the Lord’s Prayer) is different. Given that Matthew’s Sermon on the Mount itself reflects a combination of “Q” (including those preserved in the Lukan Sermon on the Plain), Markan and other materials, some written document is most likely cited at the beginning of Did. 8.2. If this document was not Matthew, then it was a document that had undergone the same type of expansions as did Luke’s Sermon on the Plain, perhaps Q<sup>Mt</sup> or some source used by Matthew.

b) *Matthew’s Plural and the Didache’s Singular for “Heaven”*

Second, the plural (Matt 6.9b) or singular (Did. 8.2) for “heaven(s)” does not dismiss the case for direct dependence or the use of a common source. The plethora of occurrences of οὐρανός in Matthew reveals certain tendencies in this author’s preferred uses of this term. Most frequently, Matthew uses the plural for “heaven” to designate “the kingdom of heaven” (ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν)<sup>61</sup> or “[your] Father who is in heaven” (ὁ πᾶτερ ἰμῶν) ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς). The latter expression occurs repeatedly in Matthew’s Sermon on the Mount in contexts not paralleled in Luke’s Sermon on the Plain (Luke 6.20–49) or other common “Q” materials used by these two evangelists.<sup>62</sup>

By contrast, numerous singular occurrences of οὐρανός in Matthew – for example, Matt 6.10c (ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς) – reflect a parallel construction with another singular noun like, for example, the ‘earth’ (γῆ).<sup>63</sup> Matthew also refers to the birds of the sky (τὰ πετεινά τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, Matt 6.26, 8.20, 13.32) and occasionally retains the singular for ‘heaven’ in his source material, whether Mark or the Jewish scriptures.<sup>64</sup> These tendencies governing Matthew’s uses of οὐρανός/οὐρανοί, although not covering every occurrence

<sup>61</sup> See Matt 3.2: ἤγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν (modifying Mark 1.15: ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ); Matt 4.17, 5.3, 5.10, 5.19 (two occurrences), 5.20, 7.21 (first occurrence), 8.11, 10.7, 11.11, 11.12, 13.11, 13.24, 13.31, 13.33, 13.44, 13.45, 13.47, 13.52, 16.19 (first occurrence), 18.1, 18.3, 18.4, 18.23, 19.12, 19.14, 19.23, 20.1, 22.1, 23.13.

<sup>62</sup> Matt 5.16, 5.45, 6.1, 6.9, 7.21; 7.11: ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (cf. Luke 11.13: ὁ πατήρ [ὁ] ἐξ οὐρανοῦ). See further Matt 10.32: ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν [τοῖς] οὐρανοῖς (cf. Luke 12.8: ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ); Matt 10.33, 12.50, 16.17, 18.10, 18.14, 18.19; cf. Matt 3.17.

<sup>63</sup> Singular form of ‘heaven’ used with ‘earth’: Matt 5.18, 6.10c (ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς), 6.19, 11.25, 18.18 (two occurrences), 24.35, 28.18; used with God’s throne: Matt 5.34b (μήτε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὅτι θρόνος ἐστὶν τοῦ θεοῦ), 23.22; used with Hades: Matt 11.23.

<sup>64</sup> Matt 14.19/Mark 6.41; Matt 16.1/Mark 8.11; Matt 24.49 (reflecting a combination of Isa 13.10 and 34.4); Matt 24.30 (τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν οὐρανῷ) assimilated to, and then citing, Dan 7.13 (ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ).

of this term in Matthew,<sup>65</sup> illustrate that both Matt 6.9b and Matt 6.10c reflect formulations commonly associated with Matthean redaction, whether Matthew's preferred designation for "the kingdom of [the] heaven[s]" (Matt 6.9b) or tendency to use the singular for 'heaven' to parallel 'earth' (6.10c).

These observations would support either of two hypotheses. First, and less likely for reasons to be given below, the author of Matthew could have changed a common source (Q<sup>M?</sup>) to the plural. Or, more likely, the author of the *Didache* could well have changed Matthew's plural (ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς) to the singular (ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ), in order for there to be *consistency with the prayer's later petition* that God's will be done ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ [Sg.] καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς [Sg.]. Such a redactional move toward uniformity within the prayer would make sense from an author like the Didachist, who may not have appreciated Matthew's rather nuanced and consistent uses of οὐρανός, as evidenced in Matt 6.9b and 6.10c. This editorial approach of the Didachist is also consistent with the explanation offered above for the improved syntax, shortening and combination of Matt 6.5a and 6.9a at the beginning of Did. 8.2.

*Excursus: Matt 24.30 as the Referent of Οὐρανός in Did. 16.8*

The preceding argument concerning Matthew's plural and the *Didache's* singular for "heaven" is strengthened, moreover, by considering the *Didache's* only other occurrence of οὐρανός (Did. 16.8) with Matt 24.30. In many respects, Did. 16.8 (καὶ ὄψεται ὁ κόσμος τὸν ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) parallels Matt 24.30, which is a partial citation of Dan 7.13 informed by Mark 13.26. A comparison of these passages illustrates this point. Of the three Synoptic Gospels, only Matthew follows the LXX of Dan 7.13 in placing the Son of man "upon (ἐπὶ) the clouds of heaven." These two Matthean modifications of Mark 13.26, which are not attested in Luke 21.27, are reproduced exactly in Did. 16.8.

Albeit possible, it is unlikely that the authors of Matthew and the *Didache* have independently modified this material (whether from Mark or some other source) in light of the LXX in the same way with the addition of ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Once again, the evidence points to the dual possibilities of some common written source, or the use of Matthew by the author of the *Didache*. In either scenario, the *Didache's* distinctive points – having "the world" see "the Lord" – reflect a generalizing tendency away from the Son of man as a christological title and from the specific context of Mark 13 par.

Thus, of the three occurrences of οὐρανός in the *Didache*, two reflect distinctively Matthean uses of οὐρανός (Did. 8.2, with Matt 6.10c [ἐν οὐρανῷ]; Did. 16.8 with Matt 24.30 [ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ]). One other deviates from typical Matthean style once (Did. 8.2 [ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ], Matt 6.9b [ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς]), most likely for the reason of using the singular for 'heaven' consistently within the Lord's Prayer.

<sup>65</sup> See Matt 21.25 and 22.30. Cf. the three occurrences in Matt 16.2b-3, a text whose authenticity is dubious on text-critical grounds because of its absence in **8**, **B** and other important witnesses. In addition, note the stylistic peculiarity of using οὐρανός in the singular three times in two verses.

c) *Matthew’s ‘Debts’ and the Didache’s ‘Debt’*

The third difference between the Lord’s Prayer in Matthew and the *Didache* concerns the forgiveness of “our debts” (τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, Matt 6.12a) or “our debt” (τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἡμῶν, Did. 8.2). Stemming from the same root (ὀφειλ-), these two terms (ὀφείλημα and ὀφειλή) belong to a closely related group of words<sup>66</sup> and are, furthermore, to be distinguished from the expression in Luke 11.4a (τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν).<sup>67</sup> Although the motivation for such a change may be difficult to ascertain, such a small difference in wording does not speak against either a common written source or another switch from Matthew’s plural to the singular by the author of the *Didache* (cf. above on οὐρανός).

d) *Matthew’s Perfect and the Didache’s Present Tense for Αφίημι*

With regard to the petitioner’s forgiving others in the Lord’s Prayer, Matthew, the Didachist and Luke all use different forms of the verb ἀφίημι. The use of the present tense in both Luke 11.4b (ἀφίόμεν) and Did. 8.2 (with alternate spelling, ἀφίεμεν) is noteworthy as the only agreement of Luke and the *Didache* against Matthew. Yet the different spellings of this individual correspondence suggest the independence of each author.

In Matt 6.12b, the perfect tense (ἀφῆκαμεν) is attested by **Σ\***, **B**, the Peshitta and Harclean Syriac and other witnesses, and is preferable to both ἀφίόμεν (probably reflecting assimilation to Luke 11.4b) and ἀφίεμεν (perhaps due to the influence of Did. 8.2). Moreover, in Matthew the choice of the perfect tense appears to be intentional because it refers to a completed act, the necessary prerequisite for receiving God’s forgiveness according to Matt 6.14–15.<sup>68</sup> If the Didachist did know Matthew, this author may indeed have objected to such a conditional understanding of forgiveness in Matthew and simply changed to the present tense (ἀφίεμεν), deliberately omitting the redactional expansion of Matt 6.14–15 as well.<sup>69</sup> Thus, the case for some literary connection between Matthew and the *Didache* continues to remain strong.

<sup>66</sup> According to BDAG (743), the two words are nearly synonymous. Cf. Matthew’s Parable of the Unforgiving Servant (Matt 18.21–35): εἷς ὀφειλέτης (18.24); τὸ ὀφειλόμενον (18.30); τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἐκείνην (18.32).

<sup>67</sup> The terms are also to be differentiated from Origen’s text for Matt 6.12a (τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν), which likely reflects secondary assimilation to Matt 6.14–15.

<sup>68</sup> Matt 6.14–15: ἐὰν γὰρ ἀφῆτε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, ἀφήσει καὶ ὑμῖν ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀφῆτε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, οὐδὲ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἀφήσει τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν.

<sup>69</sup> Albeit less likely, it is also possible that the Didachist knew a later copy of Matthew with the reading ἀφίεμεν, which is attested in **Σ**<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> and the Textus Receptus. In addition, a common source, reading ἀφίεμεν and used by both authors, could, hypothetically, have been consistently modified and expanded by the author of Matthew.

e) *The Doxology Concluding the Lord's Prayer in the Didache*

The final difference between these two prayers concerns the doxology at the end of Did. 8.2. This doxology is probably a redactional addition penned by the Didachist, who is fond of other such doxologies.<sup>70</sup> Indeed, the doxologies of Did. 8.2 and 10.5 are identical. That of Did. 9.4 is also quite similar, with the order of 'power' and 'glory' reversed and the addition of διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Appearing at the end of the Lord's Prayer, the doxology in Did. 8.2 could well function as a substitute for the theology of God's conditional forgiveness in Matt 6.14–15.<sup>71</sup> At any rate, the addition of a redactional conclusion in the *Didache* does not speak against the possibility of some literary connection between the two prayers.

f) *Conclusion: Εὐαγγέλιον as a Reference to a Writing of Some Kind in Did. 8.2*

To summarize, the rather minor differences between Matt 6.9–13 and Did. 8.2 concern a small omission (Matthew's οὖν ... ὑμεῖς) in light of Matt 6.5a; two instances of different forms of the same word ('heaven,' 'forgive'); and a single example of a different form of a similar word (ὀφειλήματα: 'debts, obligations'; ὀφειλή: 'debt, obligation, duty'). Moreover, the presence of a doxology at the end of Did. 8.2 neither supports nor discounts a possible literary relationship between the two prayers. At every point, this analysis has confirmed the likelihood that the Didachist used either Matthew or a pre-Matthean source. Such use of written material supports the conclusion that in *Did. 8.2* the term εὐαγγέλιον designates a writing of some kind. This conclusion must, however, be examined in light of three other occurrences of εὐαγγέλιον in Did. 11.3–4 and 15.3–4.

## 2. Analysis of Did. 11.3–4

The second of four occurrences of εὐαγγέλιον in the *Didache* is in Did. 11.3–4. This passage mentions "the rule of the gospel" within a series of short pericopes on the welcoming of itinerant teachers, apostles and prophets (Did. 11.1 – 13.7). After urging the shunning of heterodox teachers (Did. 11.1–2), the author adds:

And concerning the apostles and prophets, act as in accordance with the rule of the gospel (κατὰ τὸ δόγμα τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὕτως ποιήσατε). Let every apostle who comes to you be received as the Lord (δεχθήτω ὡς κύριος). (Did. 11.3–4)

<sup>70</sup> With Niederwimmer, *Didache* (see n. 2), 170–3. See Did. 8.2, ending the Lord's Prayer; 9.2, 9.3, 9.4, 10.2, 10.4, 10.5.

<sup>71</sup> That various witnesses to Matthew (k, sa, sy<sup>c</sup>) also reflect doxologies could suggest the influence of the *Didache* on later copies of Matthew.

Having alluded to this traditional/‘gospel’ material, the Didachist adds a prohibition against such visitors’ staying long or asking for money (Did. 11.5–6).

Although Did. 11.3 is not particularly specific about what the faithful are to ‘do’ (ποιέω) for apostles and prophets, Did. 11.4 offers some clarification concerning instructions for ‘receiving’ (δέχομαι) them. Six occurrences of the verb δέχομαι in a single – and, as is observed in the following Excursus, distinctively – Matthean saying (Matt 10.40–41) match the type of instruction given in Did. 11.4.<sup>72</sup> The following chart highlights these points of comparison:

Matt 10.40–41	Did. 11.3–4
1. Mentions the reception of the Twelve (cf. Matt 10.5), of prophets and of a just person.	1. Mentions the reception of apostles and prophets.
2. Receiving such people is likened to receiving both Jesus and the One who sent him (that is, God).	2. Receiving such people is likened to receiving “the Lord.”

The instruction of Matt 10.41b is distinctive for mentioning also the reception of a righteous individual (δίκαιος), a concept the Didachist may not have understood (at least in Matthean terms) or may have chosen to omit. Likewise, there is a difference in the meanings of προφήτης, whether referring to one of the Hebrew prophets (Matt 10.41a) or a contemporary Christian prophet (Did. 11.3). The important point concerns the similarity of *terminology* and the Didachist’s attempt to incorporate ‘gospel’ material in his section on church order. In addition, Did. 11.4 may be intentionally vague in not specifying whether κύριος refers to Jesus or God, since both are mentioned in Matt 10.40.

These observations concerning Matt 10.40–41 and Did. 11.3–4 could support, but do not by themselves constitute, a compelling argument for the Didachist’s literary dependence on Matthew. The verbal correspondence of the two passages does, however, plausibly support that the ‘Gospel’ mentioned in Did. 11.3 was *evangelium scriptum* containing some form of Matt 10.40–41.

*Excursus: The Matthean Redaction of Mark 6.11 and 9.37 (Matt 10.40–41)*

The argument that the Didachist made use of distinctively Matthean, rather than Markan or Lukan, material in Did. 11.3–4 receives additional support from consideration of the verb δέχομαι in two other Synoptic sayings. In the Synoptic Gospels, when Jesus first sends out the Twelve on a mission (Mark 6.11 par.), he warns them to depart from whatever place

<sup>72</sup> Matt 10.40–41: ὁ δεχόμενος ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ δέχεται, καὶ ὁ ἐμὲ δεχόμενος δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με. ὁ δεχόμενος προφήτην εἰς ὄνομα προφήτου μισθὸν προφήτου λήμψεται, καὶ ὁ δεχόμενος δίκαιον εἰς ὄνομα δικαίου μισθὸν δικαίου λήμψεται.

(Mark 6.11) or from whomever (Matt 10.14, Luke 9.5) does not receive (δέχομαι) them.<sup>73</sup> Another saying attested in the Synoptics (Mark 9.37/Matt 18.5/Luke 9.48) concerns the receiving (δέχομαι) of a little child, which is likened to the receiving of Jesus and ultimately the One who sent him.<sup>74</sup> Of the Synoptic evangelists, only Matthew seems to have noticed (or cared) that Jesus' saying about receiving a little child (Mark 9.37 par.) carries a greater implication than his warning about the consequences of ignoring Jesus' apostolic emissaries (Mark 6.11 par.). Matthew is thus distinctive for taking the corrective measure of combining elements of *both* sayings in Matt 10.40–42.

The second of these Matthean doublets, Matt 10.42, like Mark 9.37 par., is concerned with little ones.<sup>75</sup> But instead of 'receiving' them (δέχομαι), Matt 10.42 highlights giving them a drink (ποτίζω) of cold water. Perhaps after mentioning the Twelve (Matt 10.40–41), it would not make sense in the same passage to speak of 'receiving' a little child in the same way one would welcome an apostle (10.42). In Matt 10.40–41, Matthew thus takes from the children (Mark 9.37 par.) and gives to the Twelve the concept 'receiving' those whom Jesus sent out (Mark 6.11/Matt 10.14) as one would 'receive' Jesus himself. Within the history of the Synoptic tradition, the developments evident in Matt 10.40–42 would most likely *not* have been incorporated into in the earliest gospel materials. On the contrary, such redactional tendencies assume two different sayings taken from Mark and, moreover, reflect a development of the instructions given to the Markan disciples attested *only* in Matthew. The tradition alluded to in Did. 11.3–4 would have existed only subsequent to the advanced type of redactional activity that underlies Matt 10.40–41.

As compared with two similar Synoptic sayings (Mark 6.11 par.; Mark 9.37 par.), the correspondence of Did. 11.3–4 to Matt 10.40–41 offers an additional indication that the Didachist most likely did refer to a 'Gospel' that either was Matthew or a subsequent 'Gospel' writing dependent upon Matthew. Those persuaded by the above analysis of Did. 8.2 on the Lord's Prayer that the Didachist did know either Matthew or a pre-Matthean source for the Lord's Prayer may agree that the balance now tips toward the former hypothesis, since Matt 10.40–41 stems from an entirely different section of this Gospel than the Sermon on the Mount, namely the Matthean Mission Discourse (Matt 9.35 – 11.1).

### 3. Analysis of Did. 15.4

The other two occurrences of εὐαγγέλιον in the *Didache* appear in Did. 15.3–4, which follows a short pericope about appointing bishops and deacons (15.1–2) and a different section (and genre) concerning readiness for the Lord's coming (16.1–8). The *Didache* thus does not offer a context for interpreting the following admonitions in 15.3–4:

<sup>73</sup> E.g., Matt 10.14: καὶ ὅς ἂν μὴ δέξηται ὑμᾶς μηδὲ ἀκούσῃ τοὺς λόγους ὑμῶν, ἐξερχόμενοι ἔξω τῆς οἰκίας ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης ἐκτινάξατε τὸν κονιορτὸν τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν.

<sup>74</sup> E.g., Matt 18.5: καὶ ὅς ἂν δέξηται ἐν παιδίον τοιοῦτο ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐμὲ δέχεται.

<sup>75</sup> Matt 10.42: καὶ ὅς ἂν ποτίσῃ ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ποτήριον ψυχροῦ ἕνεκα εἰς ὄνομα μαθητοῦ, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ.

Furthermore, correct one another, not in anger but in peace;<sup>76</sup> as you have [it] in the gospel (ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ), let no one speak with anyone who should wrong another. Nor let him hear from you until he repents. 4 Concerning your prayers and acts of charity (τὰς δὲ εὐχὰς ὑμῶν καὶ τὰς ἐλεημοσύνας) and all your deeds, do [them] as you have [it] in the gospel of our Lord (οὕτως ποιήσατε ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν).

As in Did. 11.3, twice in 15.3–4 the Didachist assumes a common knowledge with his audience concerning the content of the ‘gospel.’ With regard to the latter of these two occurrences of εὐαγγέλιον, the imperative in Did. 15.4 that they ‘act’ or ‘do’ (ποιέω) in accordance with the ‘gospel’ is reminiscent of the written Gospel similarly alluded to in Did. 11.3 (κατὰ τὸ δόγμα τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὕτως ποιήσατε).<sup>77</sup>

For his part, Koester posits the possibility that the ascriptions in Did. 15.3–4 suggest “that there was a document in which the respective instructions were written down.” Yet, continuing the previous statement, he dismisses this possibility: “But nothing in the context of these references indicates the presence of materials which were derived from any known gospel writing.”<sup>78</sup> Although this position does not exclude the use of *some* sort of writing, it overlooks that both Did. 8.2 and 15.4 are concerned with prayer, and that the former passage has numerous similarities to Matt 6.5–13.<sup>79</sup>

The other action specified in Did. 15.4 concerns acts of charity (ἐλεημοσύνη), which in the Sermon on the Mount is the subject of the pericope preceding the Lord’s Prayer (Matt 6.2–4). Significantly, Matt 6.2–4 contains this Gospel’s only three occurrences of ἐλεημοσύνη, a term used elsewhere in the NT only in Luke–Acts (Luke 11.41, 12.33; Acts 3.2–3, 3.10, 9.36, 10.2, 10.4, 10.31, 24.17) in contexts different from Matt 6.2–4 and Did. 15.4. These observations are offered not (necessarily) as an argument for the Didachist’s direct dependence on this Matthean passage, but to rebut Koester’s contention that “nothing in the context of these references [Did. 15.3–4] indicates the presence of materials which were derived from any known gospel writing.”<sup>80</sup> On the contrary, Matt 6.2–4/Did. 15.4 (and Matt 10.40–41/Did. 11.3–4) answers precisely Koester’s objection in that Matt 6.2–4 (and Matt 10.40–41) contains phrases and terminology that are peculiar to Matthew.

As is argued above, the introduction to the *Didache*’s Lord’s Prayer combines elements of Matt 6.5a and 6.9a. In the Sermon on the Mount, concern

<sup>76</sup> On the punctuation of Did. 15.3 – first with a semicolon, and then with a comma – see the discussion below.

<sup>77</sup> Contrast Did. 8.2, in which the ‘gospel’ material is cited explicitly (cf. Matt 6.5–13 and the discussion above).

<sup>78</sup> Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels* (see n. 5), 17.

<sup>79</sup> See the discussion above on the concerns about prayer and hypocrisy expressed in these two passages. Did. 15.3 is to be discussed below.

<sup>80</sup> Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels* (see n. 5), 17, alluding also to Did. 11.3 (discussed above).

about hypocrisy in prayer (οὐκ ἔσεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταί, Matt 6.5a; cf. Did. 8.2, 15.4) is closely related to the problem of hypocrisy in giving alms (μὴ σαλπίσσης ἔμπροσθέν σου, ὥσπερ οἱ ὑποκριταὶ ποιοῦσιν, Matt 6.2a; cf. Did. 15.4). It is thus not at all implausible that, in addition to Matt 6.5–13, the Didachist knew a written version of Matt 6.2–4.

In addition, Did. 8.3 (“Pray in this way three times per day.”) offers an analogy for the use of material like, or the same as, Matt 6.2–4 in Did. 15.4. The teaching on prayer in Did. 8.1–2 appears in a series of directives about baptism (Did. 7.1–4), fasting (8.1), the Eucharist (9.1 – 10.7), and welcoming itinerant teachers, apostles and prophets (11.1 – 13.7). The Matthean Lord’s Prayer is thus offered as an (the?) example of ‘the right’ way to pray. Likewise, in Did. 15.4, *the same hermeneutical principle is applied to Matt 6.2–4: Jesus’ teaching “as [they] have it in the Gospel”* establishes the norm for the giving of alms (without hypocrisy). These analogous uses and interpretations of Matt 6.2–13, as elaborated partially in Did. 8.2–3 and referenced in Did. 15.4, thus strengthen the argument that, if not Matthew itself, some pre- or post-Matthean εὐαγγέλιον is cited as an authoritative writing of church order in both Did. 8.2–3 and 15.4.

#### 4. Analysis of Did. 15.3

With regard to Did. 15.3,<sup>81</sup> the evidence for the use of a written ‘Gospel’ is not as compelling as in Did. 8.2, 11.3–4 and 15.4. The first instruction (15.3a) concerns correcting one another in peace rather than with anger (cf. 1 Tim 2.8). The statement is consistent with, but does not necessarily stem from, Matt 5.22, a warning about not becoming angry with one’s “brother.”<sup>82</sup>

The second admonition (Did. 15.3c) involves shunning anyone (presumably, any believer; Gk.: ἐλέγχετε δὲ ἀλλήλους) who has wronged another and not repented. There are obvious similarities with Jesus’ teaching in Matt 18.15–17 about the unrepentant brother, especially with regard to the occurrence of the verb ἐλέγχω.<sup>83</sup> In addition, not speaking with such a person is

<sup>81</sup> This discussion will refer to the three parts of Did. 15.3 as follows: ἐλέγχετε δὲ ἀλλήλους μὴ ἐν ὀργῇ, ἀλλ’ ἐν εἰρήνῃ (15.3a); ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ (15.3b); καὶ παντὶ ἀστοχοῦντι κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου, μηδεὶς λαλεῖτω μηδὲ παρ’ ὑμῶν ἀκούετω, ἕως οὗ μετανοήσῃ (15.3c).

<sup>82</sup> Cf. Matt 5.21–26. Matt 5.22a: ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ ἔσται τῇ κρίσει·

<sup>83</sup> Matt 18.15–17: ἐὰν δὲ ἁμαρτήσῃ εἰς σὲ ὁ ἀδελφός σου, ὕπαγε ἔλεγχον αὐτὸν μεταξύ σοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦ μόνου, ἐὰν σου ἀκούσῃ, ἐκέρδησας τὸν ἀδελφόν σου· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀκούσῃ, παράλαβε μετὰ σοῦ ἓτι ἓνα ἢ δύο, ἵνα ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων ἢ τριῶν σταθῇ πᾶν ῥῆμα· ἐὰν δὲ παρακούσῃ αὐτῶν, εἰπέ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· ἐὰν δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας παρακούσῃ, ἔστω σοι ὥσπερ ὁ ἐθνικός καὶ ὁ τελώνης.

consonant with treating a (former) brother or sister as “a pagan or a tax collector” (Matt 18.17b). Although there are more points of contact between Did. 15.3c and Matt 18.15–17 than between Did. 15.3a and Matt 5.22a, neither passage by itself demonstrates a literary relationship between Did. 15.3 and the Gospel of Matthew. Nonetheless, the similarities are consistent with the hypothesis that the Didachist used a ‘Gospel’ source either like Matthew or the same as Matthew.

An additional point of ambiguity in Did. 15.3 concerns whether 15.3b (“as you have [it] in the gospel” [ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ]), refers to the first (15.3a) or the second (15.3c) point of instruction. If it refers back to the first admonition, Did. 15.3ab would constitute a possible exception to the uses of the term εὐαγγέλιον in Did. 8.2, 11.3–4 and 15.4, since 15.3a cannot be traced with confidence to any surviving gospel material. Yet, as is equally possible, ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ could refer to the following second instruction if punctuated with a semicolon after 15.3a and a comma after 15.3b:

ἐλέγχετε δὲ ἀλλήλους μὴ ἐν ὀργῇ, ἀλλ’ ἐν εἰρήνῃ·  
ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, καὶ παντὶ ἄστοχοῦντι κατὰ τοῦ ἐτέρου, μηδεὶς  
λαλείτω· μηδὲ παρ’ ὑμῶν ἀκουέτω, ἕως οὗ μετανοήσῃ.<sup>84</sup>

Punctuated thus, Did. 15.3bc (“As you have [it] in the gospel, let no one speak with anyone who should wrong another. Nor let him hear from you until he repents.”) is compatible with the argument offered heretofore that the Didachist’s four uses of this term in directions given to community leaders (Did. 6.3 – 15.4) refer consistently to some written εὐαγγέλιον.<sup>85</sup> Indeed, the other three occurrences of εὐαγγέλιον in the *Didache* support this punctuation of Did. 15.3 to indicate the author’s probable allusion to Matt 18.15–17.

##### 5. Summary: Εὐαγγέλιον in the *Didache*

In finding compelling evidence for use of a written source in Did. 8.2, 11.3–4 and 15.4, this investigation of the four occurrences of εὐαγγέλιον in the *Didache* offers additional evidence for the thesis articulated by Jefford.<sup>86</sup> In

<sup>84</sup> Thus differing from the punctuation reflected in W. Rordorf/A. Tuilier, *La Doctrine des Douze Apôtres (Didachè): Introduction, texte critique, traduction, notes, appendice, annexe et index (SC 248)*, Paris 1998, 194; A. Lindemann et al. (eds.), *Die Apostolischen Väter: Griechisch-deutsche Parallelausgabe*, Tübingen 1992, 18; Holmes (ed.), *Apostolic Fathers* (see n. 18), 266; K. Lake (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers*, 2 Vols. (LCL), reprinted ed., Cambridge, MA/London 1980 [= 1912], 1.330.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. U. Schnelle, *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings*, Minneapolis, MN 1998, 222, who regards the attestation of Matthew in Did. 7.1, 7.8, 10.5, 10.16 as grounds for dating this Gospel to around 90 CE. Schnelle (222) offers a similar argument in the case of Ignatius’ (Smyr. 1.1, Phld. 3.1) knowledge of Matthew.

<sup>86</sup> Against Niederwimmer, *Didache* (see n. 2), 50–2, and with Jefford, *Sayings* (see n. 3), 143: “Because the general nature of the texts in chaps. 7–15 [of the *Didache*] is consistent

the case of Did. 15.3bc, the evidence is not nearly as strong, but is consistent with this thesis. Thus, the conclusion follows that the *Didache* – not Marcion or the author of *2 Clement* – points to the earliest surviving uses of εὐαγγέλιον to designate written gospel materials.

With regard to the nature of the ‘Gospel’ used by the Didachist, similarities to distinctive Matthean materials from various parts of this Gospel are consistently evident. The combination of Matt 6.5a and 6.9a to introduce the Lord’s prayer (Did. 8.2) and the use of Matt 10.40–42, which reflects a distinctive harmonization of Mark 6.11/Matt 10.5 and Mark 9.37/Matt 18.5 (Did. 11.3–4), demonstrate that this author knew either Matthew or some ‘Gospel’ based upon various sections of this evangelist’s writing. The use in the *Didache* of pre-Matthean written sources that may have survived well into the second century is less probable because of the Matthean redactional elements that are combined in Did. 8.2 and 11.3–4.<sup>87</sup> The likely use of Matt 6.2–4 in Did. 15.4 further supports this conclusion, and the plausible allusion to Matt 18.15–17 in Did. 15.3bc corroborates it.

At this point one may ask whether it is simpler to infer the Didachist’s use, with small modifications, of Matthew (a known entity) than to hypothesize another otherwise unknown source/writing so markedly like Matthew but not Matthew. That is, one logically needs to show that the citations in *Didache* cannot be explained on the hypothesis of using Matthew, before one can credibly postulate the existence and use of another source. In the case of Did. 8.2, 11.3–4 and 15.3–4, there is no good reason to multiply hypothetical sources unless known sources cannot explain the data. As a result, it is more likely that the Didachist made use of Matthew than a pre-Matthean source or later writing based upon the first ‘NT’ Gospel.

---

with parallels that occur throughout the Synoptic Gospels (and are consistent especially with the parallels that are preserved in the Matthean Gospel), it must be assumed that the majority of these materials were influenced by the written form of those Gospels or, at least, that these materials were introduced into the *Didache* after the composition of the Gospels.” Jefford’s study focuses primarily on Did. 1–5 and 16. He argues that Did. 7–15 was written around 80–100 CE and after the Gospel of Matthew.

<sup>87</sup> G.N. Stanton, *The Early Reception of Matthew’s Gospel: New Evidence from Papyri?*, in: *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Study: Studies in Memory of William G. Thompson*, S.J., Grand Rapids, MI 2001, 42–61; here: 60 (emphasis original), calls attention to this third (hypothetical) possibility: “If Christian missionaries and teachers continued to use papyrus or parchment notebooks with Jesus traditions (and Old Testament passages) alongside copies of the Gospels and oral traditions, we should not be surprised at the varied ways Matthean traditions are cited or alluded to in the Apostolic Fathers and in Justin Martyr.” In connection with his thoughtful discussion of the ‘Matthean’ Oxyrhynchus papyri, Stanton does not argue that Justin or any of the ‘Apostolic Fathers’ did, in fact, make use of such a papyrus or parchment notebook.

## 6. The *Didache* as a Witness to the Prior Recognition of ‘Matthew’ as Εὐαγγέλιον

As was evaluated in the cases of Marcion and *2 Clement*’s uses of εὐαγγέλιον, it now remains to consider the possible novelty of the occurrences of this term in the *Didache*. At no point in Did. 8.2, 11.3–4, 15.3–4 does this author suggest that any of his uses of εὐαγγέλιον represents an innovation. Rather, the Didachist assumes that his audience can verify the contents of the Lord’s Prayer, cited in Did. 8.2. More significantly, the allusions to gospel material in Did. 11.3–4 and 15.4 (possibly also 15.3bc) are predicated upon a common understanding of teachings elucidated in Matt 10.40–41 and 6.2–13 (cf. 18.15–17), respectively. Accordingly, the metamorphosis of the term εὐαγγέλιον is not to be found within the *Didache* either. Since the Didachist used a written ‘Gospel,’ probably Matthew, and assumed that εὐαγγέλιον was a recognizable term for this document, it follows that Matthew had *already* received this designation before Matthew was known to the Didachist and the Didachist’s audience.<sup>88</sup> That numerous other Christian writers before Marcion and Justin Martyr *did not* use εὐαγγέλιον in this way suggests that the *Didache* may attest a local phenomenon in which this particular Gospel had gained popularity.

### IV. The *Didache* as a Window to the Origin of Εὐαγγέλιον as a Literary Designation

#### 1. Εὐαγγέλιον in Mark and the Other ‘NT’ Gospels

Perhaps, then, it is necessary to look at writings that were eventually called ‘Gospels’ for a clue about the term by which these writings were to be known. In the Gospel of Mark, εὐαγγέλιον occurs seven times in six passages. Mark uses εὐαγγέλιον in the title of his work (1.1), with reference to the preaching by Jesus (1.14, 1.15) and others (13.10, 14.9), and as a cause for the persecution of Jesus’ followers (10.29–30a, 13.10).<sup>89</sup> Udo Schnelle takes

<sup>88</sup> A similar argument is offered above for Marcion’s copy of Luke.

<sup>89</sup> Mark 1.1: Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ θεοῦ. Mark 1.14–15: μετὰ δὲ τὸ παραδοθῆναι τὸν Ἰωάννην ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ <sup>15</sup> καὶ λέγων ὅτι Πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ· μετανοεῖτε καὶ πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. Mark 8.35: ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλη τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δ’ ἂν ἀπολέσει τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου σώσει αὐτήν. Mark 10.29–30a: ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν ὃς ἀφῆκεν οἰκίαν ἢ ἀδελφούς ἢ ἀδελφὰς ἢ πατέρα ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀγρούς ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ ἕνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, <sup>30</sup> ἐὰν μὴ λάβῃ ἑκατονταπλασίονα νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ. Mark 13.10: καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη πρῶτον δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. Mark 14.9: ἀμὴν δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅπου ἐὰν κηρυχθῆ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ὃ ἐποίησεν αὕτη λαληθήσεται εἰς μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς.

the distinctiveness of these Markan passages to indicate that “Mark created this new genre” of Gospel literature.<sup>90</sup> Against connecting the term εὐαγγέλιον with this allegedly new genre is the observation that four of the seven occurrences of εὐαγγέλιον in Mark refer to oral proclamation (Mark 1.14, 1.15, 13.10, 14.9). At two other points (10.29–30a, 13.10) the content of ‘the gospel’ is not specified, but it is doubtful that those enduring hardship ‘because of Jesus and the gospel’ are persecuted for their possession of a ‘book’ or scroll. The remaining passage, Mark 1.1, introduces Mark’s work but does not make an explicit claim about (a new!) literary genre.<sup>91</sup>

Furthermore, the author of Luke incorporated roughly one-third of Mark into his first volume, but either did not recognize Mark’s redactional uses of εὐαγγέλιον or did not consider this alleged Markan innovation to be worthy of imitation. ‘Gospel’ never occurs in Luke (thus presumably also “L”) or, for that matter, in the Fourth Gospel.<sup>92</sup> In the case of Matthew, the term occurs four times, always with the sense of oral proclamation and in connection with the verb κηρύσσω.<sup>93</sup> A similar kerygmatic context is to be noted for the

<sup>90</sup> Schnelle, *History* (see n. 85), 153; cf. 161.

<sup>91</sup> With Hengel, *Four Gospels* (see n. 5), 93–6; and Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels* (see n. 5), 14: “Mark 1:1 says that the proclamation of Christ’s death and resurrection began with the preaching of John the Baptist and with Jesus’ own call for repentance. Thus there is no indication whatsoever that ... Mark ... thought that ‘gospel’ would be an appropriate title for the literature they produced.” Cf. Schnelle, *History* (see n. 85), 153, who plausibly suggests that Mark 1.1 makes Jesus “at one and the same time both the proclaimer and content of the Gospel, with the genitive Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ expressing both the subject and the object of the Gospel.”

<sup>92</sup> Furthermore, the only two occurrences of εὐαγγέλιον in Acts also support this point about the author of Luke. The speech attributed to Peter in Acts 15.7 designates hearing “the word of the gospel” (τὸν λόγον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου). Moreover, in Acts 20.24 Paul’s bearing witness to “the gospel of God’s grace” (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ) also suggests an oral context rather than the presentation of a document by this itinerant evangelist.

<sup>93</sup> Two of the four occurrences of εὐαγγέλιον in Matthew are drawn from Mark, and the other two are expansions of Markan material. Matt 24.14 (κηρυχθήσεται τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας; cf. Mark 13.10) and Matt 26.13 (ὅπου ἐὰν κηρυχθῆ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦτο; cf. Mark 14.9) are drawn from Mark. Matt 4.23 (κηρύσσω τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας; cf. Mark 1.39) and Matt 9.35b (κηρύσσω τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας; cf. Mark 6.6b) are redactional expansions of Mark. Thus, the term εὐαγγέλιον most probably did not occur in “M” or, given its absence in Luke, in “Q.” This analysis stands in counterpoint to G.N. Stanton, *Matthew: Βίβλος, Εὐαγγέλιον, or Βίος?*, in: *The Four Gospels 1992*. FS Frans Neirynck (BETHL 100), Leuven 1992, 2.1187–2001, esp. 1188–95; here: 1188, who argues “that the evidence ... points more clearly to Matthew than either to Marcion or to Mark as the innovator in the use of εὐαγγέλιον for a written account of the story and significance of Jesus.” Stanton does not argue persuasively that the author of Matthew uses εὐαγγέλιον as a literary designation or that this author assumes his audience’s familiarity with such a use of εὐαγγέλιον.

occurrence of εὐαγγέλιον in the secondary ‘Longer Ending’ of Mark.<sup>94</sup> Thus neither Mark nor the first-known interpreters of Mark (Matthew, Luke and the author of Mark 16.9–20) can be credited with forging a definition of εὐαγγέλιον to designate a writing. Accordingly, this examination of the ‘NT’ Gospels and Acts points to a numinous period between the composition of at least two of the Synoptics (Mark and, later, Matthew) and the writing of the *Didache* for the *terminus a quo* this article has been seeking to identify.

## 2. John 21 as the Key to the Solution?

Within this period, one might seek, as Th.K. Heckel does, to place John 21 as a witness to the four ‘NT’ Gospels. Above it was noted that Heckel correctly demonstrates the use of Luke 5.1–11 (on the calling of Peter, James and John) in John 21 and thus the existence of a *two*-Gospel collection comprising the Gospels of Luke and John (chaps. 1–20). Building on the thesis, questioned above, that John 21 assumes a *four*-Gospel collection, Heckel follows closely M. Hengel’s work on the titles of the Gospels in the second century and adds the suggestion that *the author of John 21* was responsible for adding these ascriptions.<sup>95</sup> Heckel’s explanation collapses from an unpersuasive argument for literary dependence on all three Synoptic Gospels. It also does not account for why the author of John 21, who (like the author of the Fourth Gospel) does not use the term εὐαγγέλιον, would add this ascription to John and other ‘Gospels.’

## 3. A New Proposal: The *Didache*, Mark and Matthew

The *Didache*’s witness to Matthew assumes, of course, the prior existence of Mark. The most likely explanation for the findings offered heretofore is that *a reader or copyist of Mark and Matthew (mis)interpreted Mark’s ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου* (1.1) as a literary title and applied the designation εὐαγγέλιον *also to Matthew*. This reader of two early ‘Gospels’ is most probably to be distinguished from the authors of the *Didache*’s sundry parts, since there is no compelling evidence for the use of Mark in the *Didache*.

Although an exact date cannot be ascertained for this development, it must have occurred rather shortly after the composition of Matthew, given its early attestation in the *Didache*. Since the date of Matthew itself can only be placed between the times of Mark and the *Didache*, the development of εὐαγγέλιον designating a writing must too be placed roughly within this

<sup>94</sup> Mark 16.15b: κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει. Cf. Kelhoffer, *Miracle* (see n. 6), 97–100.

<sup>95</sup> Heckel, *Evangelium* (see n. 15), 207–17. Cf. M. Hengel’s work, cited above (Titles [see n. 45]).

range. Furthermore, neither the anonymous reader of Mark and Matthew nor the Didachist seems to have associated the name “Matthew” with what came to be the First NT Gospel.<sup>96</sup>

*V. Conclusions: Εὐαγγέλιον as a Reference to ‘Gospel’ Materials  
in the First Half of the Second Century*

This article has addressed the questions of when and how εὐαγγέλιον came to be a literary designation in the first half of the second century and observed that the Didachist, the author of *2 Clement* and Marcion all assume the term εὐαγγέλιον as a reference to written ‘Gospel’ materials. Because none of these second-century Christian authors clarifies an allegedly novel use of εὐαγγέλιον as a literary designation (‘Gospel’) rather than a reference to oral proclamation (‘gospel’), none of them should be construed as an innovator in this regard. Rather, since none of these authors defines what they mean by εὐαγγέλιον when clearly referring to written materials, the innovation in the use of this term is better traced to the *documents known to them* – Marcion’s copy of Luke, *2 Clement*’s eclectic collection of ‘Gospel’ materials, and/or the edition of Matthew used in the *Didache*. Accordingly, the earliest use of εὐαγγέλιον to designate a written ‘Gospel’ must have arisen before the *Didache*, *2 Clement* and Marcion’s ‘Gospel.’

The main point at issue in this article concerns H. Koester and R.H. Gundry’s thesis for the *novelty* of Marcion’s role in redefining the term εὐαγγέλιον as *evangelium scriptum*. It is primarily on the basis of the criterion of chronological priority that Koester’s larger diachronic argument is presented, and has been called into question in this article. Nonetheless, there is much to be said for aspects of the work of H. v. Campenhausen, Koester and Gundry. In particular, these scholars are correct to highlight the incalculable influence of Marcion’s canon on subsequent (proto-)orthodox conceptions of canon. At this point one may agree with v. Campenhausen that “the idea and the reality of the Christian Bible were the work of Marcion, and the Church which rejected his work, so far from being ahead of him in this field, from a

---

<sup>96</sup> The naming of this Gospel’s supposedly apostolic author thus appears to have been a subsequent development, although it could have stemmed from Matt 9.9, 10.3. This *terminus ante quem* might perhaps be assigned to Papias’ testimony (ca. 110–120 CE) concerning an originally ‘Hebrew’ Gospel of Matthew (*apud* Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.16), although Papias refers to the sayings (τὰ λόγια) and not a written ‘Gospel’ by the author of ‘Matthew.’ Cf. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels* (see n. 5), 33; Schnelle, *History* (see n. 85), 219. *Pace* Koester, 26–7, who criticizes M. Hengel’s argument that the Gospel titles were as early as the early second century; Koester considers it possible that the names may well have circulated at this early point.

formal point of view simply followed his example.”<sup>97</sup> Yet questions about canon, on the one hand, and εὐαγγέλιον designating either an esteemed document or (part of a) canon, on the other hand, need to be distinguished insofar as it is possible. In light of A.J. Bellinzoni’s observation, that “[m]odern studies of the development of the New Testament canon tend to divide the second century into two parts: the period before Marcion, and the period between Marcion and Irenaeus (or the Muratorian Canon),”<sup>98</sup> this article calls for a nuancing of this distinction and for a fresh assessment of Christian literature before and roughly contemporary with Marcion.

However much scholars may wish to pursue a diachronic analysis, the search for definitive points of change may not always be met with exacting success. This article has shown that the eventual naming of documents about Jesus’ life and teachings as ‘Gospels’ did not follow a linear process of development from the 70s to the 140s CE. Nor did a uniform shift in the meaning of εὐαγγέλιον occur either during this period, or, as A.Y. Reed notes in the case of Irenaeus, later in the second century.<sup>99</sup>

Organized diachronically, the arguments offered heretofore may be summarized as follows:

1. Mark 1.1 (ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) offers a title, but not a designation of literary genre, for this ‘Gospel.’ The authors of Luke and John never use the term εὐαγγέλιον in their works, and in Matthew (4.23, 9.35b, 24.14, 26.13) the term is only used in connection with preaching (κηρύσσω).

2. At some point between the composition of Matthew and the *Didache*, the term εὐαγγέλιον came to be associated with Matthew’s writing. Likewise, during this same period, or shortly afterward, the title εὐαγγέλιον was added to the collection of ‘Gospel’ materials later used by the author of *2 Clement* and to a (prototype of a) copy of Luke that Marcion eventually edited.

2’. Mark 16.9–20 and John 21 point to the existence of collections of written ‘Gospel’ materials in the first half of the second century (that is, before Justin Martyr) but do not use εὐαγγέλιον to refer to these materials. Accordingly, the harmonized ‘Gospel’ citations in *2 Clement* do not support dating *2 Clement* after Marcion.<sup>100</sup>

<sup>97</sup> V. Campenhausen, *Formation* (see n. 8), 148, summarizing arguments presented in idem, *Marcion et les origines du Canon Néotestamentaire*, RHRP 46 (1966) 213–26.

<sup>98</sup> Bellinzoni, *Preface to E. Massaux, Influence* (see n. 4), ix.

<sup>99</sup> As Reed, *Εὐαγγέλιον* (see n. 2), 11–46, notes, Irenaeus occasionally employs εὐαγγέλιον as a literary designation, but the majority of his uses of this term include a kerygmatic element and thus reflect the influences of both the Pauline and Marcionite traditions.

<sup>100</sup> It has not been argued (or disputed) that the *Didachist* made use of Matthew as part of a larger Gospel collection. Moreover, the dates of John 21, *2 Clement* and of the *Didache* remain areas requiring further examination.

3. The Didachist assumes (and thus did not invent) εὐαγγέλιον as an appropriate term for citing and referring to written ‘Gospel’ materials that reflect Matthean redaction (Did. 8.2, 11.3–4, 15.3–4).

4. The author of *2 Clement*, like the Didachist, assumes that his audience knows to what εὐαγγέλιον refers. *2 Clement* cites a variety of (probably written) ‘Gospel’ materials, only some of which are preserved in the ‘NT’ Gospels, and reflects no knowledge of the Marcionite controversy.

4'. As v. Campenhausen, Koester and Gundry rightly observe, Marcion represents an important turning point in the second century. Marcion did not create εὐαγγέλιον as a literary designation. Yet his calling *one* writing, Luke, by this term implicitly excludes this term and status for other ‘Gospels,’ and as a result ignited a debate that resulted in responses that would prove formative for the later church.

5. Justin Martyr offers the first surviving reference to written ‘Gospels’ in the plural (ἅ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, 1.Apol. 66.3), thus denoting a *collection* of writings, each meriting the name ‘Gospel’ and a place within an emerging body of esteemed literature.

6. Only later in the second century does Irenaeus reject ‘Gospels’ other than Matthew, Mark, Luke and John and claim that Christ the Word gave to the Church “the gospel in four parts.”<sup>101</sup>

The series of developments outlined above was by no means an organized or sequential progression that had an immediate or pervasive effect throughout second-century Christian communities. Nor were these developments the subject of wide discussion or interest, let alone unanimity, in the first half of the second century. Such a development belongs to the legacy of Marcion, subsequent to the musings of an unknown reader or copyist of Mark and Matthew and foreshadowed in the meditations of the Didachist and the author of *2 Clement*.

<sup>101</sup> Greek: τετράμορφον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον; Haer. 3.11.8. In this passage, τετράμορφον is a predicate, not an attributive, adjective. The phrase is thus not to be translated as “the four-formed Gospel” (so Reed, *Εὐαγγέλιον* [see n. 2], 11). Reed’s fine study (cf. 19) notes correctly, however, Irenaeus’ reticence to refer to εὐαγγέλια in the plural: “Irenaeus uses εὐαγγέλιον ... 101 times in the five books of *Adversus haereses*. Of these, only seven occurrences are plural (2.22.3, 3.11.7, 11.8 [twice], 11.9 [thrice]).”