

CHILDREN AND SLAVES IN THE COMMUNITY OF THE DIDACHE AND THE TWO WAYS TRADITION

Abstract

This paper explores the *Haustafel* in *Didache* 4:9-11 and parallel versions of the Two Ways, against the background of the 'Moral Economy' (Scott 1977, 1990, Moxnes 1988). These texts insist on "generalised reciprocity" and reject the "balanced reciprocity" practised by the elite in the Greco-Roman context and the "negative reciprocity" they meet out to the under-classes. For this reason, the intrusion of the patriarchal ethic of the *Haustafel*, with its uncompromising one-way instruction concerning children and its support for the institution of slavery are surprising, as is the absence of instructions concerning husbands and wives. Less surprising, perhaps is the absence of instructions concerning emperor. The background and implications of the instructions are examined to try and reconstruct the social situation in households in the *Didache* community.

1. Introduction

In recent years New Testament scholars have shown a renewed interest in the *Haustafel* genre of literature in the New Testament, driven by both a feminist critique since the groundbreaking work of Elizabeth Schüssler-Fiorenza's *In Memory of Her* (1983) and also a renewed interest in socio-economic location of texts in the ancient world. There has been a shift in the scholarly consensus from viewing these texts against the background of Stoic philosophy or Hellenistic Judaism towards understanding them as a topos of "household management" (Dunn 1966:243). The evolution and status of the debate has been astutely set out and critiqued in a recent paper by Margaret Y. MacDonald (2010), so that there is no need to repeat it here. Her insistence that what appears in texts is always only partly a reflection of what goes on in reality--that it stands in dialogical tension with reality so that the discussion needs to be more nuanced--is welcome.¹ My own study in this paper has been formed by the work of Carolyn Osiek, MacDonald and Halvor Moxnes, though they are not to blame for what I say. In particular, Moxnes' careful economic analysis of the embedded economic relations reflected by Luke's Gospel in the *The Economy of the Kingdom* (1988) has raised questions for me which prompted me to undertake a "moral economy" analysis of the whole text of the *Didache* as an integral reflection of an attempt to construct an alternative economy to the surrounding Graeco-Roman economic relations based on patron-client relations, an alternative economy which was only partially successful (Draper 2011). My economic analysis viewed the Household table in *Didache* 4 as having subverted and ultimately undermined this egalitarian economy, something I wish to pursue in more depth in this paper, particularly since the *Haustafel* in the Two Ways tradition has been largely ignored in the discussions of NT scholars.

A quick flip through the recent literature on the HT shows that they either do not refer to the Two Ways found in the *Didache* 1-6 and *Barnabas* 18-29 and a range of other early Christian extra-canonical texts at all, or else only occasionally refer to the Apostolic Fathers in parenthesis. The general assumption is that if material is not in the NT it is late and does not need to be taken into consideration. But from 1883 a range of scholars have considered the Two Ways (as represented by the *Doctrina apostolorum*) a pre-Christian Jewish proselyte tract incorporated into a Christian document or one of the very earliest Christian catechetical patterns (Charles Taylor 1886; A. Seeberg 1903, 1906, 1908; Gunther Klein 1909). Seeberg's over-elaborate claims for the existence of such a Jewish-Christian ur-text behind most of the

¹ She insists that "there is a need for greater nuance with respect to the function of the codes in community life to allow for more complexity and even contradiction based on the variety of actors and perspectives that shaped NT communities and texts" (2011:72).

NT epistles led to the theory being discounted (see the helpful paper of Benjamin Edsall 2011). However, this perspective has continued to be argued extensively in recent years by my own doctoral thesis (Draper 1983, cf. 2000, 2003), van de Sandt and Flusser (2002), Milavec (2003). Indeed Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser (2002) have gone as far as to provide us with a critical text of their hypothesized pre-Christian, Jewish, Greek Two Ways. Milavec (2003), on the other hand argues that the whole of the *Didache* dates to the middle of the first century CE and represents the earliest Christian life, something supported also lately by Thomas O-Loughlin (2010). Much of this discussion seems to have escaped NT scholars and social historians of early Christianity. But if it is correct that this material provides a window on first century Jewish communities or the earliest Christian communities or, as I would argue, the early Christian Jewish communities in a tension with the early Pauline communities, then it has yet to be factored into the discussion of the *Haustafel* tradition and the burgeoning discussion on early Christian households and families. I would argue that this is particularly important because the *Haustafel* in the Two Ways tradition is set in an explicit socio-economic context in the text itself, though this has not been previously recognized because of the assumption, since Dibelius, that *paraenesis* is a random collection of ethical instruction with no *Tendenz*, arising from the Form Critical approach of Martin Dibelius and adopted by Prigent and Kraft in their analyses of the Two Ways material in *Barnabas*. This was a question I raised already in the discussion of the HT material in my Cambridge doctoral thesis in 1983 when the Stoic hypothesis prevailed. The position I took there has modified, in that while I still believe that the Two Ways tradition in *Didache/Barnabas/Doctrina apostolorum/Ecclesiastical Canons/Epitome* can be shown to continue the *topos* and outlines of the *Derek Eretz* tradition, I do not think that this tradition is pre-Christian Jewish as it stands, but was developed within the early Christian Jewish communities under the pressure of the need for catechesis and socialization of Gentiles. We have no evidence for its use in its current form in pre- or post-Christian Jewish communities.

The heart of a moral economic analysis lies in the premise that the economy of pre-modern societies was/is embedded in their ethical system, the social universe which conveys meaning. The accumulation of capital was not an end in itself--rather honour/ shame; patterns of patron/ client relationships stretching up to Caesar himself and down to the lowest human being. Land and the control of its produce; control of the fertility of women and control of the product of the labour of human beings was represented by the gods and their laws. Conversely, ethical and social rules are always simultaneously representations of economic relations. These receive ideal elaborations in the texts of the elite, but these texts usually represent the "official transcript" except where the marginalized insert their "hidden transcript" into the discourse of the powerful. Here religion plays a key part in modelling the alternative social universe of the poor, powerless and marginalized. Hence the emergence of a "Christian" literature as the final product of a largely illiterate movement of Galilean peasants may provide a glimpse of their alternative social universe, the way they began to embody it in communal life before it was, in turn, taken up into the modified discourse of a new Christian elite.

2. The Variants of the Christian Two Ways Text as Socially Meaningful

Those who have written on the first six chapters of the *Didache*, with the notable exception of Aaron Milavec, have usually been more interested in tracing the "original text" of the Two Ways and settling the question of whether *Didache* or the *Epistle of Barnabas* is more original. However, if David C. Parker (1997) is correct, however, there is no original text in a society which is primarily oral in its communications, and instead we have multiple representations of a tradition which is fluid and continually subject to change to respond to

and reflect the social situation of the scribes since text and oral performance are continually interacting and reshaping each other. Looked at in this way, the variants in the representation of the Haustafel in the Two Ways take on a new meaning as reflecting social and economic development. Most scholars accept that the structure of the Two Ways tradition is best represented by that of the *Didache/ Doctrina* (e.g. van de Sandt and Flusser prefer the *Doctrina* for the structure but *Didache* for the text) rather than *Barnabas*. Beyond that it is often argued that the text of *Barnabas* represents earlier traditions closer to Jewish origins, though since that writer is frequently polemical, that needs to be interrogated. Beyond Dc there are also two related fourth century representatives of the tradition which do not have the Way of Death, namely *Canones ecclesiasticae* and *Epitome*, though its representation of the tradition is sketchy to say the least. The fifth century Arabic *Life of Shenudi* represents a Coptic Egyptian text which is also reasonably faithful to the tradition, in my opinion, though its exact Greek basis is often difficult to reconstruct since it is a Coptic text which survived only in Arabic. The *Apostolic Constitutions* contains the whole text of the *Didache* rather than the separately existing Two Ways, again reasonably faithfully but with added commentary and obvious redactions. Then two later Greek texts follow something of the structure and some of the text, paraphrased at times as the basis for an ascetic monastic lifestyle in *Fides Nicaenae* and *Syntagma* somehow associated with Athanasius, which ultimately influences the composition of the late fourth century *Rule of St. Augustine*, and the *Rule of Benedict*.

3. The Haustafel in the Didache and its Economic Logic in the Moral Economy

In my paper, “The Moral Economy of the Didache” (2011) I have argued that there is a consistent socio-economic pattern of generalized redistribution in the Didache, which is consistent with the creation of the kind of alternative economy of the weak and marginalized, described by James Scott (1990), in the Roman Empire. It is a rejection of the unequal power relations epitomized by a patron-client system radiating out from the emperor and percolating down to the lowest level of the empire, including its conquered peoples. Central to this resistance is insistence on generalized reciprocity is the insistence that labour, goods and wealth are given to people by God with the express purpose of giving to others so that all benefit. For this reason, inside the community no one is allowed to turn away a needy person, or refuse to give, or even to call their property their own. There is a balanced reciprocity in that goods given to those in need are really given to God and he will reward the giver and remove their sins in exchange. In addition, although they are sharing perishable material goods with the poor, they are also receiving imperishable spiritual gifts from them in return. So the Hellenistic principle of *isotes* among friends is not abandoned entirely: it is deconstructed and reconstructed in a radical fashion. Moreover, there is a serious and implementable sanction against abuse of the system of generalized redistribution, namely that those taking without need are subject to judgment and punishment by the community “until they have repaid the last farthing”. Most probably this would involve exclusion from the community until they repaid in the fashion of 1 Corinthians 5-6. *Synoche* does not mean “prison” primarily but “pressure” or “distress”. Paul forbids members to go to pagan courts but to exercise judgment themselves. *Didache* 4 take the same line, as we shall see.

In my HTS paper, I note that the generalized reciprocity and egalitarian alternative economic system developed within this early Christian community should not be romanticized (as I believe it is by Milavec and O'Loughlin), but that its limitations and problems should be explored also. Chief among these internal contradictions in the system is the presence of the Household Table insisting on the subjection of children and slaves in chapter 4, and the recognition of the importance of patronage of the wealthy alongside the (probably

and you shall not come to your prayer with an evil conscience. This is the way of life.
--

TABLE 1: DIDACHE 4

In my schematic arrangement, I am suggesting five blocks of progressively ordered and related catechetical teaching which constitute the final instructions in the Way of Life. Whereas much of the previous teaching has been parenetical, generalized lists of ethical behaviour and prohibited behaviour, this chapter sets out concrete social relations in the community. It is consistent with the rest of the Didache, but forms an integrated and self-structured unit. Block 5 constitutes the conclusion of the Way of Life set out in chapters 1-4 and emphasizes the binding and unchanging nature of these social relations as commandments of the Lord. I suggest that the instruction forbidding hypocrisy (G) may well belong with Block 4 and not Block 5, although it could equally well fit with the general conclusion, since double mindedness is consistently rejected in the whole of the Two Ways. However, I suggest that its rhetorical function here relates to the behaviour of slaves and not to the general conclusion.

In **Block 1**, which concerns the relationship of community members to teachers and/or prophets, we need to note the use of the language of patronage, though the advantages being brokered are spiritual ones. S/he is to receive the τιμή which would usually be reserved for God because s/he speaks of God and hence mediates God's presence. This principle that speaking the Name or Word or Torah mediates the presence of God is widespread in Jewish thinking, as in the well known *m. Aboth* 3:3:

But if two sit together and words of the Law [are spoken] between them, the Divine Presence rests between them, as it is written, *Then they that feared the Lord spake one with another: and the Lord hearkened, and heard, and a book of remembrance was written before him, for them that feared the Lord, and that thought upon his name* [Mal 3:16]. Scripture speaks here of 'two'; whence [do we learn] that if even one sits and occupies himself in the Law, the Holy One, blessed is he, appoints him a reward? Because it is written, *Let him sit alone and keep silence, because he hath laid it upon him* [Lam 3:28] (Soncino).

It is taken up in the famous saying of Jesus in Matthew 18:20, "For where two or three are gathered together in my Name I am there amongst them" (cf. Deutsch 1987). There are signs that this way of honouring a superior in the community as if they were the Lord (τιμῆσαις ... ὡς κύριον) links to questions of patriarchal hierarchy, since the concept recurs in the instruction to the slaves at the bottom of the chain of patron-client relations that they should obey their owners/masters as if they were a "type" God (ὡς τύπῳ θεοῦ). However, in Block 1 of chapter 4, it provides the basis for the honour due to the teacher/prophet as patron, even though these figures were financially in need of support from the community--as the reservations in Did. 11 show and as the monetary and material resources made available to them in Did. 13 clearly show they were. Instead of giving material resources to the community as patrons should, they receive resources. Later versions of the Two Ways make this explicit, as we shall see. This is the cause of the conflict in Did. 15, in my opinion, since it undermines the patron-client basis on which bishops and deacons are appointed: honour in exchange for resources. In this respect, 4:1 sets out alternative economic relations in which honour is not given on the basis of material resources and patronage, but on spiritual resources of God's word. But this coheres with the thought in Block 3 that material resources and spiritual resources should be equally weighted and with the insistence of chapter 15 that prophets and teachers receive equal honour with bishops and deacons.

Block 2 provides for regular meetings of the assembled community for judgment. The "rest" which people seek to find in the assembly is, in this case, the settlement of legal disputes. The

proximity of Block 3 suggests that the majority of questions to be addressed by the community assembled for judgment would be socio-economic. The instructions here are based on Lev 19:17,-18 as also in Did. 2:6-7 and 15:3 (see Draper 2008). The block shows signs of internal and external coherence: The saying on judgment begins with coming together to seek the communal (τὰ πρόσωπα, v.2) assembly and ends with a prohibition of showing favouritism towards the individual (οὐ λήψη πρόσωπον, v.3), something repeated in verse 10 (κατὰ πρόσωπον) in the instructions to slave-masters; judgment must not be done double-mindedly (οὐ διψυχῆσεις v.4), something repeated in the instructions on giving (οὐ διστάσεις, v.7) and again in the instruction to slaves in that ὑπόκρισιν appears in tandem with other words suggesting double dealing/thinking/acting in 5:1 (ψευδομαρτηρία, ὑποκρίσεις, διπλοκαρδία, δόλος).

Block 3 is the central and principle statement around which the whole series of instruction coheres. It is also central in the structuring of this material. Giving of one's material resources is not an option but a requirement because it is actually giving to God and a pre-requisite for a “ransom for your sins” (v.6). Doubt (διστάσεις) and grumbling are excluded by recognizing that God is the one who rewards the giver. More radically, however, community members are prohibited from refusing to help the needy person because they must share everything with other members of the community. They can call nothing their own:

συγκοινωνήσεις δὲ πάντα τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου καὶ οὐκ ἔρεῖς ἴδια εἶναι·
εἰ γὰρ τῷ ἀθανάτῳ κοινωνοὶ ἐστε, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ἐν τοῖς θνητοῖς (v.8)

The argument is based “from light to heavy”, a fundamental Jewish exegetical technique (*gal wachomer*): since the community members already share in imperishable goods, how much more are they sharers in the much less important perishable goods. Indeed, their catechetical instruction in the Way of Life already has put them in debt spiritually to “the one who has spoken the things of the Lord” to them. In any case, since these goods are given to human beings by God for the express purpose of giving to all from God's own gifts, one is obligated to give to all who ask (1:5). Possessions do not belong to individuals. This radical demand is not simply an ideal, but backed up by the judicial system of the community as set out in Block 2. “Anyone who exploits the community by taking without being in need will give an account [to the community assembled in judgment] concerning what s/he took and why, and being in distress (ἐν συνοχῇ) will be examined concerning what s/he has done and will not be released from there until s/he has paid back every farthing” (1:5). As I have already indicated, debtor's prison would most likely be beyond the community's ability to impose. Nevertheless, it is hard to imagine a more express implementation of a system of Generalized Reciprocity in terms of the Moral Economy theory than the requirement that one should call nothing one's own but share everything in common with fellow members of the community. In any case, the rules of Block 3 would have severe consequences if applied rigorously in a Christian Jewish community. The first and foremost consequence of renouncing one's ownership of one's property would be the disinheritance of one's children and the manumission of any slaves one owned. This leads naturally to Block 4. Niederwimmer is quite wrong, in my opinion, in supposing that the problems occasioned by this instruction to practice community of goods is ignored in what follows: “Hereafter the Didachist gives no further attention to the problem of private property in his own remarks” (1998:109).

Block 4 is connected with the preceding blocks, because of the insistence on equality before God and community of goods between community members. This has important intra-communal implications for parents and slave-owners and their subordinates. Interestingly,

husband-wife relations are not mentioned here or anywhere in the document, leaving only arguments from silence. Either the problem was too big to allow it to be raised at all, or it was no issue in the community, or it was a complex mix of both. My instinct is to go with the last option: it was too big in that there were Christian Jewish and Gentile wives, concubines and slave women under the control of unbelieving Gentiles, who could use such an instruction to wives to submit as ammunition to withdraw them from the community; it was too small in that Jewish patriarchy was far stronger and more established than the rather fluid Gentile situation where elite Greek and Roman women might enjoy a considerable amount of freedom. If both circumstances obtained simultaneously, then it would be both unwise and impractical to lay down a ruling. Perhaps, in any case, the rules concerning giving over one's property to the community clearly did not extend to releasing free women from their husbands and fathers in the way it might have implied release of slaves by their masters. Slave women would have been in the same situation in terms of the legal implications as their male counterparts and are thus covered by the same instructions.

The teaching in E1 counters the objection of children to the alienation of their inheritance, drawing on the Wisdom tradition: spare the rod and spoil the child. It must be remembered that progeny remained under the authority of their male parent until the patriarch died. This was true both for Jews and for Gentiles in the Graeco-Roman world, where the right of the father to put his child to death was an accepted principle. [Male] community members were expected to exercise their rights as patriarchs to enforce on children the adoption of the new faith of their parents, including their submission to the alternative economic system. Acceptance of the system of Generalized Reciprocity advocated here would make these children dependent on the community and force them to participate in it and integrate. At one level, this promoted the principles of an alternative economic system in embryo. At another level, it undermined it fundamentally by re-affirming and enshrining in it the patriarchal authority of the male head of household. Moreover, the invocation of patriarchal authority is legitimated by the "fear of God" (τὸν φόβον τοῦ θεοῦ). It is noteworthy that there is no limitation on this authority (such as e.g. "fathers do not provoke your children"!) nor is there any reciprocal instruction to children (e.g. "children obey your parents) possibly because some of the members of the community still had living patriarchs who might seek to exercise their authority to remove their adult child from the community. The instruction would then become counter-productive in the life of the community. In any case, the inclusion of this patriarchal instruction right after the blueprint for an egalitarian economic "safety net" (Milavec) is set out introduces a radical contradiction into the heart of the ideal which ensured its ultimate failure as a genuine alternative economy--in my opinion.

Block 5 turns to the issue of slaves, an issue which would have presented itself immediately to any elite person who joined this community, who would have been expected to be a patron of the community by becoming a bishop or deacon, making his/her house, resources and influence available to the community. Gentile slaves purchased by Jews were required to be circumcised (if a man) or immersed (if a woman) and to keep the Torah to the same extent as women and immature children. They became a part of Israel, but with limited rights and responsibilities (cf. van de Sandt and Flusser 2002:137). This was necessary to preserve the ritual purity of the household (something which would have concerned the *Did.* community also, given their dedication to ritual purity (7:1-4). The principle as stated by Rab Huna (died 297 CE, A2) but seemingly everywhere applicable is, "Every precept which is obligatory on a woman is obligatory on a slave; every precept which is not obligatory on a woman is not obligatory on a slave" (*b.Chagigah* 4a). According to the *Mishnah*, while women, slaves and minors are exempt from reciting the *Shema`* and putting on the *tefillin*, they are required to perform the *tefillah*, *mezuzah* and *berakoth* after meals. So that on this basis, God hears the

prayers of slaves as he does the prayers of a woman and a child: R. Judah b. Shalom [A5, 342-443] said in the name of R. Eleazar, “Before God, however, all are equal, women, slaves, poor and rich” (*Midrash Rabbah Exodus* 21:4). God's blessings pronounced over Israel by the priests apply also to proselytes, women, and slaves (*Midrash Rabbah Numbers* 11:8). Their cries can reach the ears of God who is over both master and slave, and this places limits on the behaviour of Jewish slave owners!

A particularly germane background to the passage and the problems which the instruction that “You shall call nothing your own” would have posed to slave owners, is provided by a *halakah* in the name of Rabbi Simeon of Mizpah (T1, alive while the temple was still standing) found both in *m. Peah* 3:8 and also in *tos. Peah* 1:13, in which form we cite it here:

- A. One who consigns [all of] his property to his slave--[the slave] becomes a free-person [because the slave as part of the estate, now owns himself].
If [in his consignment of the property owner] had retained any land at all--the slave does not become a free person, [for we assume that the property retained includes the slave].
- B. R. Simeon says (T1, while temple still standing), “Lo, he who says, “Lo all of my possessions are given to so-and-so, my slave, except for one ten-thousandths part of them” (*m. Peah* 3:8) has said nothing [of binding force],
- C. “Unless he specifies [the property in] such-and-such a city or [in] such-and-such a field.
- D. “And even if he owns [only] that very field and that very city, [so that, in effect, he wishes to give the slave nothing at all], the slave acquires the property and may buy his freedom.”
- E. And when they said these words in front of R. Yosé, he said, “He who gives a right answer smacks his lips”(Prov. 24-26). (trns. Neusner and Sarason).

If a Jewish person gave away his (the masculine is used following the intention of the *halakah*, though it would probably apply in some circumstances to women and their maidservants, as in the case of Queen Berenice of Adiabene, according to the tractate *Gerim*) possessions all or part to his slave, his slave would be regarded as manumitted. In the case of common ownership of property, in which the slave was regarded as owner in common of all the wealth and property of the community, he could legitimately argue that he was now freed. The social consequences of the alternative socio-economic arrangements of this early Christian Jewish community were thus as serious for the question of masters and slaves as for fathers and children (patriarch/ kyriarchs and their subordinates), and calls for a special instruction. The instruction provided, however, also undermines the egalitarian and liberatory potential of the movement deriving from Jesus. The fundamental principles of the community are: the Spirit falls on patriarchs and subordinates alike; no favouritism with God and therefore in the community; all things shared. The solution of the community is to re-enforce the patriarchal control of slave-masters but limit their power with a strong warning.

As with the instructions on parents and children, the instructions on masters and slaves begin with a directive to the patriarch/ kyriarch, but in this case it affirms the authority of the slave-master, and hence the institution itself, only indirectly protecting the slaves by limiting their power to punish their property without restraint “in their bitterness” (ἐν πικρίᾳ σου). The word *pikria* is a metaphorical application from a word meaning “bitter taste” to “bitter feelings” or “harshness” or “violent temper” (Liddel & Scott 1940:1403b-1404a). In other words, harsh and arbitrary treatment of slaves is prohibited--the kind of treatment which often left a slave with lasting physical damage or even ended in their death. It is noteworthy that both male and female slaves are specifically mentioned, since female slaves were doubly at risk as objects of sexual exploitation by their owners (Osiek and MacDonald 2006:95-117). Their inclusion sends an important signal, especially in the context of the prohibition in the *Didache's* reformulation of the ethic of the second half of the Ten Commandments not only of anger as leading to murder but also of desire (*epithumia*) because it leads to fornication

(*porneia*) and ultimately to adultery (*moicheia*, 3:2-3). The behaviour of the slave-owner might lead a slave to cease to “fear” (φοβηθήσονται) the God who is over both of them. Two observations: the slave had no choice but to convert with her/his owner, in line with Jewish practice for slave owning. Secondly, the “fear of God” in verse 10 is rhetorically equated with “fear of the Master” in verse 11, so that the alternative socio-economic community practice is given with one hand and taken away with the other.

The basis for this instruction to the slave owner--no gender is specified, so that it must be held to refer to both male and female slave owners--is fundamental to the community's ethos, as we have seen: the same God is the hope of both parties and God has no favourites but gives the Spirit to both. The whole passage is syntactically and semantically complex (for a good discussion see Niederwimmer 1998:110-1), perhaps reflecting the complexity of the issue for the community. In the first place, the exact reference of οὐ γὰρ ἔρχεται ... καλέσαι is not clear: the Present Tense here could refer to the coming of God in judgment or to the first or the second coming of Jesus, though his name is not mentioned; the calling could refer to the call to all human beings inherent in the gospel but could also refer forward to the coming judgment. To my mind it does seem to include a certain note of eschatological warning to back up an otherwise unenforceable instruction--since although the judgment of the community might result in expulsion for the slave owner, this would remove one of its patrons. The expression ἐφ’ οὗς τὸ πνεῦμα ἠτοίμασεν is also difficult: it may indicate that the process of preparation and acceptance of the slave into God's covenant through the preparation of the Spirit is complete (Aorist), but it could also mean that God or Jesus came to prepare his people to receive the Spirit as a gift, even the slave (“upon whom” the Spirit has come) and so confers on all community members equal status before God as those who possess the Spirit. This is the interpretation I prefer, given the importance of the Spirit in this community evidenced in chapter 11 (though the Spirit seems always to be the Spirit of prophecy in the *Did.*). The same word πρόσωπον is used here as in the requirement to judge justly in Block 2, rhetorically re-enforcing the instruction concerning the equality of all members of the community. So, although the instruction affirms the institution of slavery and the rights of slave owners, these rights are, in theory, strictly circumscribed by a requirement to respect the equal humanity of a slave which is supported by a raft of religious taboos since it is unenforceable any other way.

The instruction to slaves appears to apply to both male and female slaves, although no differentiation is provided this time, perhaps because it is rhetorically unnecessary. Nevertheless, the inclusion of slaves in an anonymous plural group reduces their humanity. It requires them as a group to submit to their *kyriois*. The plural could be taken as inclusive of both male and female owners, but may have only the male patriarch in mind, since the owner is to be a type of God, and one wonders whether the gender neutrality of God was even on the horizon. Clearly the reciprocal instruction to the slave is necessary because their equal humanity before God and equal right to share in the community of goods of the community would undermine the right of the slave owner to continue to own them and to command them to obey. This would then result in elite members of the community ceasing to be able to function as patrons offering their status and their resources to protect and promote the community's interests with the outside world. The sanction the instruction receives is severe: the slave owner (male ?) is a “type” or image of God, like the image of the emperor struck on an imperial coin. While slaves and women, for that matter, are instructed to respect and submit to their patriarchs as “to the Lord” elsewhere (Col 3:22-23; Eph 6:5), the language here could be regarded as more extreme. The slave owner is to be the image of God to the slave, and as such, the “fear” which is due to God by both slave-owner and slave, since God

is over them both, is now due to the slave-owner by the slave (ἐν αἰσχύνῃ καὶ φόβῳ)--since he stands as the image of God. This instruction to slave-owners and slaves is reinforced by an instruction, appealing to a general principle that community members should “hate all hypocrisy and all which is pleasing to the Lord” (v.12), which I read as the conclusion to the instructions to slave owners and slaves. Against this is the fact that the preceding instruction is in the second person plural, since slaves are addressed as a group--certainly not suggestive of equal status. However, the instructions as a whole are couched in the second person singular, and the return to a key ethical understanding of the community would require a return to the generalized pattern. A repeated refrain in the *Didache* is a prohibition of “double-mindedness” in various forms and expressions. Hypocrisy is set alongside these expressions of “double-mindedness” and so reinforces the expression to slave-owners not to oppress or ill-treat their slaves and to slaves to submit to slave owners without reservation or their own kind of bitterness--so standing parallel to the prohibition of “bitterness” in the conduct of their masters. They should do everything which is pleasing to the Lord, which would coincide with doing what is pleasing to the slave owner, since he stands as a “type” of God. This is an uneasy compromise to be sure, but it is directed, in my opinion, towards keeping the ideal of generalized reciprocity in place.

Block 5 provides a conclusion to the Way of Life as a whole. It presents the instructions of the Way of Life as “commandments of the Lord” (v.3) which must not be tampered with, either by adding or subtracting--a common device in writing to re-enforce its authority (cf. e.g. Rev 22:18-19). However, they would be particularly poignant to children and more particularly to slaves, who might spend much time “confessing their transgressions” of “hypocrisy” in their attitudes to their slave-owners.

4. The HT in the *Doctrina apostolorum*

The Latin *Doctrina apostolorum* follows *Didache* 1-6 very closely--so much so that there has long been a debate over whether it is an extract from it or whether it is a source for it. Besides smaller variations, the main difference is the absence from the *Doctrina* of the 'Q' tradition in *Didache* 1:3-6, and a different ending in the *Doctrina* 6:2-3. This has led to speculation as to whether it represents a pre-Christian Jewish source for an originally Jewish “Two Ways” teaching. Therefore the differences between the texts, though small, may often be highly significant. Set out in the same structured way as we have noted for the *Didache*, it appears as follows (dotted line indicates omissions while italics represent additions or variations):

1. THE TEACHER/PROPHET

A	4:1 Qui loquitur tibi uerbum domini dei memineris die ac nocte reuerberis eum quasi dominum unde enim dominica procedunt ibi et dominus est.
----------	---

2. REGULAR COMMUNAL ASSEMBLIES FOR JUDGMENT

B	2. Require autem facies sanctorum ute te reficias uerbis illorum. 3. Non facies dissensiones pacifica litigantes iudica iuste <i>sciens quod tu iudicaberis.</i> Non deprimes quemquam in casu suo 4. Nec dubitabis * <i>uerum [cj. utrum]</i> erit ac non erit.
----------	--

3. REQUIREMENT FOR GENERALIZED RECIPROCIDITY

C	5. Noli esse ad accipiendum extendens manum
----------	--

	et ad reddendum subtrahens.
	6. Si habes per manus tuas redemptionem peccatorum.
	7. Non dubitabis dare nec dans murmuraueris sciens quis sit huius mercedis bonus redditor.
D	8. Non auertes te ab egente communicabis autem omnia cum fratribus tuis nec dices tua esse si enim [.....] mortalibus socii sumus quanto magis hinc initiantes esse debemus? <i>Omnibus enim dominus dare uult de donis suis. (cf. Didache 1:5)</i>
4. HOUSEHOLD MANAGEMENT	
E	9. Non tolles manum tuam a filiis sed a iuuentute docebis eos timorem <i>domini</i> .
F1	10. Seruo tuo uel ancillae qui in eundem sperant dominum in ira tua non imperabis <i>timeat utrumque dominum et te;</i> non enim uenit ut personas inuitaret sed <i>in</i> quibus spiritum <i>inuenit</i> .
F2	11. Vos autem serui subiecti dominis uestris estote tamquam formae dei cum pudore et <i>tremore</i> . 12. Oderis omnem affectationem et quod deo non placet <i>non facies</i> .
5. CONCLUSION OF WAY OF LIFE: BINDING NATURE OF ITS TEACHING	
G	13. Custodi ergo, <i>fili</i> , quae <i>audisti</i> neque appones <i>illis contraria</i> neque diminues 14.Non accedas ad orationem cum consientia mala. Haec est uia uitae.

TABLE 2: DOCTRINA APOSTOLORUM

For the most part, the *Doctrina* follows the text of the *Didache* 4:1-8 with little variation, but the variations are significant. In the first place καθ' ἡμέραν is omitted, as in the *Epitome*, so that it is unlikely that a daily “church meeting” rather than regular occurrence was ever in mind in the earliest tradition. Secondly, and more importantly, a note of eschatological warning is introduced into the requirement to judge justly and avoid favouritism, thus strengthening its urgency: “You shall judge justly, knowing that you will be judged. You shall not oppress anyone in his case”. Thirdly, in the requirement “to give the fruit of your labour for the redemption of your sins,” the word “give” appears to have been accidentally omitted, so that it reads literally, “If you have through your hands redemption of sins” (v.6) and then runs on “you shall not doubt to give etc.” (v.7). Fourthly, there is another seeming omission in v.8, so that it would read, “If we are sharers *in mortal* things, how much more ought we to do this being initiated?” (leipography from “si en[imim]mortalibus”). The textual variant could make reasonable sense in that the Two Ways teaching was intended as preparation for initiation (cf. *Didache* 7:1), so that the ordinary sharing of all human beings in mortal things is contrasted with the sharing in imperishable things of those who have been initiated into the community. That wording does, however, weaken the sense of material sharing being a natural consequence of sharing in immortality. Fifthly, *Doctrina* adds here the saying found in the Jesus Tradition section in *Didache* 1:5b, “Indeed the Lord wishes to give to all from his gifts”. This in return strengthens the emphasis on community of goods still further, since the material goods belonging to members are in any case God's gifts and remain his own property to dispose of to others in the community through his people. One

wonders whether the insertion of this material from 1:5 here in the Latin text was made later to compensate for the leipography above.

In **Block 4** of the House Table:

E2 You shall not hold back your hand from *your sons*, but from their youth you shall teach them the fear of *the Lord*.

F1 You shall not command your male slave or your female slave, who hope in the same *Lord*, in your anger. *Let him or her fear both the Lord and you*. For he did not come to invite according to person but *those in whom he has found the Spirit [v.l. a humble spirit]*.

F2 And you slaves be subject to your masters as types of God with shame *and trembling*. You shall hate all hypocrisy, and you shall not do what does not please God.

It is noteworthy in E1 is first that *Doctrina* has the plural *filiis* and lacks the express inclusion of daughters, even if they could be understood to be included within the masculine plural. This difference is significant, in terms of the “invisibility” of women, their inclusion within the male, and their treatment as property to be disposed of in patriarchal society. Secondly, *theos* is often represented by *kyrios* in *Doctrina*, a signal that the Lord Jesus may be in mind, at least in the later redactions, since in the same places the tradition is divided. *Doctrina* is often regarded as the earliest form of the TW, but even if it is, its wording may in places be later. In the NT House Tables, *en kyrio* is an important aspect of the rhetoric, but not in the Two Ways, except the *Doctrina*.

In the instructions on slaves and masters, there is a noteworthy variant containing in “Let him or her fear both the Lord and you” after “Lest he or she should no longer fear the Lord who is over you both”. The inclusion of this reduces the strength of the injunction to the slave-owner by placing the fear of the Lord alongside that of the slave-owner, thus revealing an elite perspective rather than that of the embryonic alternative socio-economic community we are exploring here. It shows itself to be a later development. Finally, the text has a variant reading in the difficult passage, concerning whom the Lord has come to call: the *Doctrina* has “those in whom he has found the Spirit”. The idea that God's Holy Spirit indwells slaves who fear God is a radical one: so radical that a variant reading is inserted above the line of the Latin manuscript replacing “Holy Spirit” with “humble spirit” (*humilum*)! There are a few variations in the conclusion Block H, but these have no bearing on the HT tradition and can be ignored here.

5. Other Versions of the Independent TW Tradition following the Order in the *Didache*

In addition to the *Doctrina apostolorum*'s close parallel to the *Didache*, there are a range of other versions of the independent Two Ways tradition. They highlight the role of the teacher in ch. 4, so that it intrudes from block A into Block B. Here we follow the *Ecclesiastical Canons* and the *Epitome*:

1. THE TEACHER/ PROPHET

A	4.1 Thomas said, the one who speaks to you the word of God, And who is the cause of your life And who gives you the seal in the Lord You shall love him [male?] as the apple of your eye Remember him [male?] night and day and honour him [male?] as the Lord.
----------	---

For where the things concerning the Lord are spoken,
there is the Lord.

2. REGULAR COMMUNAL ASSEMBLIES FOR JUDGMENT

- B** 2. And you shall seek out **his** presence daily
and that of the rest of the saints,
so that you can find rest in their words.
3. **Cephas said**, You shall not make a schism,
but you shall reconcile the warring factions.
You shall judge justly;
you shall not show favoritism leading to transgression;
4. **In your prayer** you shall not doubt whether it should be or not.

3. REQUIREMENT FOR GENERALIZED RECIPROCITY

- C** 5. [Do not be one who stretches out your hands to receive,
but one who shuts them up when it comes to giving. Ce : Ep *omit.*]
6. If you have [earned anything] through [the work of] your hands,
you shall give a ransom [for the forgiveness of ἄφεσιν Ep] for your sins.
7. [You shall not doubt whether to give,
and you shall not grumble when you give,
for you shall know who is the good giver of the reward. Ce : Ep *omit.*]
- D** 8. You shall not turn away the needy person [male?],
but you shall share [συγκοινωνήσεις Ep] *all* things with your brother [and sister?],
and you shall not say they are your own.
For if you are sharers in [death θανάτω Ep] what is immortal,
how much more in perishable things [mortal things θνητοῖς Ep]?

4. HOUSEHOLD MANAGEMENT

- E1** 9. [You shall not hold back your hand
from your son or from your daughter,
but from their youth you shall teach the fear of God. Ep : Ce *omit*]
12. [You shall hate all hypocrisy,
and everything which is not pleasing [ἀρέσκει] to the Lord. Ep : Ce *omit.*]

5. CONCLUSION OF WAY OF LIFE: BINDING NATURE OF ITS TEACHING

- [H** 14a. You shall confess your transgressions,
G 13a. You shall not abandon any commandments of the Lord,
H 14b. and you shall not come to your prayer with an evil conscience.
G 13b. You shall keep what you have received
neither adding nor taking away [ὑφαίρων Ep]
This is the way of life. Ep : Ce *omit.*]

TABLE 4 ECCLESIASTICAL CANONS/EPITOME

This version of the material is followed closely in the teaching of the famous Coptic monk, Bishop Shenudi, though with many additions. The text is found in Arabic, so that some of the variants may be attributed to that:

1. THE TEACHER/ PROPHET

- A. 4.1 O my son**, remember night and day the word of God **in your heart**
For the Lord is present where **his Name** is spoken,
and he is eternally worthy of honour and praise.

2. REGULAR COMMUNITY ASSEMBLIES FOR JUDGMENT

- B. 2. O my son**, walk on the way of purity at each moment:
you will become strong and powerful in the best way
so that you can **rejoice** in their **sweet words and their delightful sayings**
3. **O my son**, do not seek to quarrel with your brothers
but rather strive to reconcile the warring factions

Then you shall judge justly
and you shall not **be ashamed of reprimanding the offender for his offence
or the sinner for his sin.**

3. REQUIREMENT FOR GENERALIZED RECIPROCITY

C. 5. O my son, do not stretch out your hand to receive,
but shut it when it comes to giving
Beware of acting thus.

6. As far as you are able, you shall give **to the poor**
in order to cover your **many** sins;

7. but you shall not doubt **in your gifts** whether to give
moreover, you shall not be sad when you give
and you shall not regret it if you act mercifully:
you know well who recompenses one **honestly and faithfully**
it is Jesus the Messiah who pardons sins.

D. 8. O my son, you shall not turn away the poor
but give **according to your ability**
sharing with everyone who is troubled
and everyone who is in need **of you**
for if **we share with those who do not have anything** in perishable things,
we share with them in imperishable **and lasting** things.

5. CONCLUSION OF THE WAY OF LIFE: BINDING NATURE OF ITS TEACHING

G. 13a. And if **we** keep these commandments

H. 14b we walk on the way of life
in the path blessed for eternity
which is to the unique king, the Lord Jesus the Messiah,
who gives life to those who love him.

TABLE 5: THE VITA SHENUDI (5th Century)

All of the HT is omitted from the *Ecclesiastical Canons* and the *Vita Shenudi*, probably signaling the monastic orientation of those documents and its use in initiation into the religious life, so that neither children nor slaves were a concern. Certainly, the explicit narrative of the *Vita Shenudi* is an oral performance of the Two Ways to the neophytes and monks by the much venerated Coptic ascetic Bishop Shenudi. However, the *Epitome apostolorum* does indicate knowledge of the HT material in this independent Two Ways tradition also, since it has the instruction on children, “Bartholomew said, “You shall not hold back your hand from your son or from your daughter but from their youth you shall teach them the fear of the Lord”” (11). Perhaps this signals that children remained an issue for some ascetics, even if they had renounced their slaves along with the rest of their property. It is an important indication of such a vestigial interest in the HT that the later TW tradition found in Egypt, the *Syntagma* and *Fides Nicanae*, which are really versions of the same text, contain a prohibition on striking anyone except in order to discipline a small child and even then with a strong reserve:

γίνου ταπεινός και ἡσυχός τρέμων διὰ παντός τὰ λόγια κυρίου μὴ γίνου μάχιμος
μὴ τύπτει ἄνθρωπον [ἦ.] εἰ μὴ μόνον παιδίον σου μικρὸν πρὸς παιδείας και αὐτὸ παρατετηρημένως
σκόπει μὴ πως διὰ σου φόνος γίνηται πολλαὶ γὰρ εἰσιν αἱ ἄφορμαι. τοῦ θανάτου (*Syntagma* VIII (4.1-2)/
Fides Nicanae).

4.1 Be humble and quiet fearing always the words of the Lord. 4.2 Do not be aggressive.

Do not strike anyone, except only **your small child** for instruction, but observing it closely, watching carefully, lest through you murder is born, for many are the means of death.

The wording shows clearly that this instruction comes from the TW tradition, with its reminiscence of *Did.* 3:1-6 as well as 4:9-10. Incidentally, these texts also provides evidence

that “not holding back one's hand” from disciplining one's child might lead to injury or death, and that commanding one's slave in one's anger might have the same consequences. In any case, this version of the saying clearly limits it to small children and would not apply to adults, which could be the case in the *Didache*.

6. The House Table Tradition in the *Epistle of Barnabas*

While the HT in the Independent Two Ways tradition, whether it is earlier or later than the *Didache* follows substantially the same pattern, the *Epistle of Barnabas* in this as in other material follows a different logic--indeed some have argued (e.g. Prigent and Kraft 1971) that it has no logic. This was still following Dibelius' *Traditionsgeschichtlich* approach to the Pastoral Epistles in which he described Parenesis as a Form which had no central thrust or *Tendenz* but was a loose and incoherent collection of traditional material. As I have argued elsewhere (Draper 1995), this cannot be said of *Barn.*, which expressly changes the social location of the TW material from catechesis for initiation into the community (*Didache* 7:1) into a secondary *Gnosis*. In the first place, it is expressly *written*--whereas the Two Ways in *Didache* existing in writing as it does represents the outline for an oral performance of catechesis (Draper in Thatcher 2007)--and by an *individual* (“I have written to you ...” *Barn.* 17:2); “I hasten to write...” 4:9)--whereas the *Didache* nowhere signals the contribution of an individual, utilizing the imperative of communal decisions. It is written in the form of an *epistle*--whereas the Two Ways in the *Didache* provides generalized “teaching of the twelve apostles to the Gentiles”. In other words without making any claims about its author, it has adopted the Pauline epistolary mode in order to issue directions to one or more communities. It adopts the same polemical tone as Paul against doctrinal positions it considers wrong, whereas when the *Didache* polemicizes against false teaching it is concerned with wrong *praxis* (“keep the commandments which you have received neither adding nor subtracting”) or *anomia*, failure to observe the Law according to its understanding. This switch in *Barnabas* is neither accidental nor innocent. In ch. 17 he explains that in what precedes he has “not omitted anything of the matters relating to salvation”, while in ch. 18:1 he begins his version of TW with, “But now let us pass on to another *gnosis* and teaching”. It is possible, but not probable, that he simply came across new material and inserted it without reflecting on the matter. Whether or not I am right in my argument that this is part of his attack on Christian Judaism, it is certainly a deliberate and conscious “editorial decision” with consequences. I would argue that his seemingly haphazard arrangement of the units of material from the TW tradition is equally a deliberate and conscious deconstruction, in much the same way that I would argue that the *Gospel of Thomas* is a deliberate deconstruction of the “Q” tradition and for the same reasons, namely to de-familiarize and re-socialize the initiand.

Even a cursory read through of *Barnabas* shows a clear *Tendenz* running through it, which affects his presentation of the HT also. Firstly, he has a problem with the office of “teacher”, since he both denies the title for himself in 1:8, 4:9, even as he is giving “teaching”. Secondly, he makes a radical rejection of the Torah and denies the status of covenant people to the Jews, and sees his task as being to prevent Christians becoming “proselytes to their law” and thereby getting “shipwrecked” (3:6, 4:6). Thirdly, he takes the Hebrew Scriptures allegorically and eschatologically, so that the ritual provisions of the Torah are either turned into ethics for Christians or into signs of the imminent arrival of the Parousia. In the case of the block of rules governing the community life in *Did.* 4, certain patterns do also emerge. It will be our contention that these are not accidental, due to a faulty memory or a faulty source,

but represent an attempt to “spike” the Two Ways teaching at points where *Barn.* disagrees with its teaching. We shall focus on this block, set out in Table 2 below.

BLOCK 2 MATERIAL MOVED TO BLOCK 3 AND INTERPOLATED FROM CHAPTERS 2-3

19:4	<i>You shall not commit fornication, 2:2 You shall not commit adultery, 2:2 You shall not corrupt children. 2:2 The word of God shall not go out from you in impurity of any others. 2:3</i>
B	<i>You shall not show favouritism to reprove any leading to transgression. 4:3 You shall be meek 3:7 You shall be quiet. 3:8 You shall be trembling at the words which you hear. 3:8 You shall not remember evil against your brother. 2:3</i>
B	<i>You shall not doubt whether a thing shall be or not. 4:4 You shall not take the name of the Lord in vain. You shall love your neighbour more than your own soul. 2:7</i>

BLOCK 4 INVERTED AND INTERPOLATED WITH MATERIAL FROM OUTSIDE THE HT

E	<i>You shall not kill a child in the womb; 2:2 and moreover you shall not put to death what has been born. 2:2 You shall not hold back your hand from your son or from your daughter, 4:9 but from their infancy you shall teach them the fear of the Lord. 4:9 You shall not covet your neighbour's goods, 2:2 You shall not be avaricious. 3:5 You shall not be joined in soul with the haughty, 3:9 but you shall conduct yourself with the righteous and lowly. 3:9 You shall receive as good things the things which happen to you. 3:10 You shall not be double-minded or double-tongued, 2:4 for a double tongue is a snare of death. 2:4</i>
F2	<i>You shall be subject to masters (κυρίως) 4:11 as the image of God, with shame and fear. 4:11</i>
F1	<i>You shall not command with bitterness your male slave or your female slave, 4:10 who hope in the same God, 4:10 lest they cease to fear the God who is over both of you; 4:10 For he did not come to call men according to their outward appearance, 4:10 but upon those whom the Spirit has prepared. 4:10</i>

BLOCK 3 INVERTED AND INTERPOLATED WITH MATERIAL FROM BLOCKS 1 AND 2

D.	<i>You shall share in all things with your neighbour; 4:8 You shall not call anything your own; 4:8 for if you are sharers of things which are incorruptible, 4:8 how much more should you be of those things which are corruptible! 4:8 You shall not be hasty with your tongue, for the mouth is a snare of death. 2:4 As far as possible, you shall be pure in your soul.</i>
C1	<i>Do not be ready to stretch forth your hands to take, 4:5 whilst you hold them back to give. 4:5</i>
A	<i>You shall love, as the apple of your eye, 4:1 every one that speaks to you the word of the Lord. 4:1 remember the day of judgment night and day 4:1</i>
B	<i>And you shall seek out daily the presence of the saints, 4:2 either labouring in word and going out to encourage, and endeavoring to save a soul by the word, or with your hands working for a ransom for your sins. 4:6</i>
C2	<i>You shall not hesitate to give 4:7</i>
C 3	<i>Nor shall you grumble when giving, 4:7 but you shall yet come to know who is the good paymaster of the reward.4:7</i>

BLOCK 5 WITH PART OF BLOCK 2

G	You shall guard what you have received, neither adding nor subtracting anything. 4:13 You shall utterly hate <i>the evil one</i> .
B	You shall judge righteously. 4:3 You shall not cause division 4:3 but shall make peace between those who quarrel 4:3 <i>by bringing them together</i> .
H	You shall confess your sins. 4:14 You shall not come to prayer with an evil conscience. 4:14 This is the way of light. 4:14

TABLE 2: BARNABAS 19:4-12

The clear and logical structure found in *Didache* and *Doctrina 4* has been severely compromised in this rendering of the same material. Little of it is absent outright, but its restructuring changes the meaning and impact. Firstly, as one would expect given *Barnabas'* aversion to teachers (?Rabbis?), Block 1 is removed and neutralized by redaction and inserted into material concerning giving in Block 3, which is restructured to contain all the financial material on giving. The teacher is no longer honoured as mediating the Lord's presence, but instead “loved as the apple of your eye” and placed under the threat of judgment: “remember the day of judgment day and night”.

Secondly, the material on sharing financial resources and calling nothing one's own from Block 3 is placed *after* the teaching on the submission of children and slaves from Block 4. The rhetorical and probably legal force of this would be that patriarchal authority and legal jurisdiction over children and slaves is affirmed as preceding and overruling the sharing of material things with the community. The rules for the admission of proselytes in the Rabbinic tractate *Gerim* specify that everything depends on the order in which people are circumcised and baptised: if the slave goes first, they are regarded as manumitted; if the slave-owner goes first and then holds his hand on the head of his slaves as they are baptized, then they remain his slaves. In *Barnabas*, then, sharing is limited by and bounded by the prior obligation to unconditional obedience to social superiors. This suspicion is confirmed by the insertion of a block of material drawn from *Didache 2* and *3* concerning envy, covetousness, greed, seeking to rise above one's station, acceptance of one's fate as God's will, and duplicity. This disarms in advance the suggestion of equality and manumission, in case slaves might expect it.

Thirdly, it is interesting also, that the instruction to discipline one's son or daughter is linked to instruction against abortion and exposure of children. This has a double effect: first to suggest that the children in question are small children and not adults; second to warn the parent against violence towards their children--since there are many ways to put a male or female child to death besides exposure and it would be permitted in Roman law in certain circumstances. The effect might be to minimize the right of (unbelieving) parents to control their (adult) children and prevent them from joining the community.

Fourthly, slaves are no longer directly addressed at all: instead, the instruction to submit to slave owners and the instruction to slave owners not to mistreat their slaves are inverted. What was an instruction to slaves submit to slave owners now begins the couplet and becomes a general instruction to the individual to submit to his/her “lords/ masters” as types of God in shame and fear. Addressing slaves directly would already make them social equals in a certain sense. In other words, the same “you” (singular) is addressed in both instructions: submit to your superiors in the patriarchal hierarchy as types of God and don't mistreat your slaves in case they cease to hope in God.

7. The Apostolic Constitutions VII.12-14

The *Apostolic Constitutions* VII contains the whole of the *Didache*, but edited in a distinctive way, which mostly respects the underlying text, but tends to add supporting and illustrative material to it from the Hebrew Scriptures. It also removes material which it flat disagrees with (e.g. the injunction to keep as much of the food law as possible and the prohibition on eating meat offered to idols in *Didache* 6:2-3). It clearly continues to regard *Didache* as an ancient and authoritative source for Christian living, which it places alongside other such sources in its collection. Its version of the House Table is therefore of considerable interest, since it indicates how it was understood in the third or fourth century (no exact date is possible). In the table below, it can be seen that it preserves the structure and most of the material intact, but with varying emphases:

1. THE TEACHER/ PROPHET

A You shall *glorify* the one who speaks the word of God to you,
and you shall remember him day and night
and you shall honour him [male?] *not as the cause of your birth*
but as the one who has become a good patron to you
(ὡς τοῦ εἶ εἶναί σοι πρόξενον γινόμενον).
For where the *teaching* (διδασκαλία) concerning *God* is
there is *God*.

2. REGULAR COMMUNAL ASSEMBLIES FOR JUDGMENT

B You shall seek out daily the face of the saints
In order that you may rest in their words.
You shall not make schisms *among the saints*
You shall remember the Koraites
You shall make peace among those who are fighting
As Moses reconciling them to become friends.
You shall judge justly
“For judgment is the Lord's” (Deut 1:17).
You shall not show favouritism *to reprove* leading to transgressions
as Elijah and Micaiah did to Ahab
and Ebedmelech the Ethiopian to Zedekiah
and Nathan to David
and John to Herod.
You shall not be double-minded *in your prayer* whether it shall be or not.
For the Lord said to Peter upon the sea:
“O you of little faith, why are you doubting?” (Matt 4:31).

3. REQUIREMENT FOR GENERALIZED RECIPROCITY

C Do not be one who stretches out the hand to receive
but shuts it up when it comes to give.
If you have anything through the work of your hands give
in order that you have work for the redemption of your sins.
For “by alms and acts of faith sins are purged away” (Prov 15:27; 16:6)
You shall not be in two minds to give *to the poor*
and you shall not grumble when you give
for you shall know who is the repayer of your wage/reward.
For he says, “He that has mercy on the poor man lends to the Lord;
according to his gift so shall it be repaid to him again” (Prov. 19:17).
D You shall not turn away the needy
For he says, “He that stops his ears,
so that he does not hear the cry of the needy
himself shall also call
and there shall be no one to hear him” (Prov 21:13).
You shall share in all things with your brother
and you shall not say anything to be your own

*for sharing in common has been provided by God for all human beings
(κοινή γὰρ ἡ μετάληψις παρὰ θεοῦ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις παρεσκευάσθη).*

4. HOUSEHOLD MANAGEMENT

- E1** You shall not thold back [οὐκ ἀρείς] your hand from your son or from your daughter but you shall teach them the fear of God from their youth;
*For he says, “Correct your son,
so that he shall afterwards be a source of hope for you” [Prov. 19:18].*
- F1** You shall not command [οὐκ ἐπιτάξεις] your male slave or your female slave who *trust* [πεποιθουσιν] in the same God in bitterness of soul, in case they may groan against you and wrath will come upon you from God.
- F2** And you, slaves, be subject [ὑποτάγητε] to your masters as images [τύποις] of God with *attention* [προσοχή] and fear, as to the Lord and not to men [cf. Eph 6:7].
You shall hate all hypocrisy;
and whatever is pleasing to the Lord, you shall do.

5. CONCLUSION OF WAY OF LIFE: BINDING NATURE OF TEACHING+HT ADDITIONS

- G** Do not at all depart from the commandments of the Lord, but you shall keep the things which you have received from Him, neither adding to them nor taking away from them.
*“For you shall not add to his words, in case he convicts you,
and you become a liar” (Prov. 30:6).*
- H** You shall confess your sins to the Lord your God
*And you shall not add to them,
so that it will go well for you with the Lord your God,
who does not desire the death of a sinner, but his repentance.*
- [E+] You shall care for (θεραπεύσεις) your father and mother as causes of your birth,
*“in order that you may live long on the earth which the Lord your God gives you”
(Exod 20:12).*
- Do not despise your brothers or your kinsfolk;
because “you shall not overlook the household of your seed” (Isa 58:7).*
- [F+] You shall fear the king (τὸν βασιλέα),
*knowing that his election is of the Lord.
You shall honour his rulers(τοὺς ἄρχοντας) as ministers of God,
for they are judges of all unrighteousness,
to whom pay taxes, tribute and every obligation with a willing mind.*
- H** You shall not proceed to your prayer in the day of your wickedness,
before you have realeased your bitterness (πρὶν ἂ λύσης τὴν πικρίαν σου).
This is the way of life
in which may you be found through Jesus Christ our Lord.

In the first place, the CA emphasizes the importance of the teacher, not merely as the one who mediates the word of God and so facilitates the new birth of a person as a Christian, but as having a continuing role in a patron-client relationship (*proxenon*). In other words, the intrusion of Graeco-Roman patriarchy is now advanced. Block 2 remains largely intact, with added re-enforcement of examples and texts from the Hebrew Scriptures. Double-mindedness, however, is now referred to prayer to God, rather than judgment in community assemblies, and is given the example of the Lord's command to Peter to walk on the water. Block 3 likewise heightens the importance of giving to the needy with four quotations from Proverbs (15:27; 16:6; 19:17; 21:13) and an unidentified saying at the conclusion, which is not unlike the addition given by Dc from 1:5, “For sharing in common has been provided by God for all human beings”. The House Table in Block 4 again remains largely unchanged with the addition of supporting material at the end of each of its three sections: from Proverbs

(19:18), an allusion to the groaning of the people of Israel in Egypt and an insistence that the respect is “to the Lord and not to men” similar in tone to Ephesians 6:7, moving it towards the “in Christ” terminology of NT House Tables.

Most interesting is the way in which CA inserts additional House Table material in Block 5. In the first place, the second half of the parent child reciprocal instruction: “Care for your father and mother” based on the Ten Commandments in Exod 20:12 and also Isa 58:7. In the second place, the requirement to fear and honour the king as “elected by God” and other rulers who are “ministers of God”. No supporting texts are provided here. However, the instruction not to proceed to prayer “with an evil conscience” in *Didache* refers instead to “in the day of your wickedness, before you have released your bitterness (*ten pikrian sou*)”, which refers back to the bitterness of the slavemaster, broadened now to the bitterness displayed by and reflected back towards all one's social and political superiors, one's *kurioi*. Thus it echoes in a certain respect the concern of the *Epistle of Barnabas*, which turns a requirement to obey the slave master to a requirement to obey the government or indeed any higher authority (in my opinion). Finally CA subordinates the whole Two Ways teaching to Jesus Christ our Lord, something found also in the conclusion to the *Vita Shenudi* (is this a surviving trace of recognition of a Jewish origin of the Ways material?).

Conclusion

The first thing to emerge from this preliminary study is the consistent and indeed largely verbatim continuity in the central block of teaching concerning the community's socio-economic relations: the obligation to share all material things with the community, to call nothing their own and to give especially freely to the poor and needy. This remains true from the earliest layers of the text in *Didache*, *Barnabas* and *Doctrina apostolorum* to the latest layers of the text in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, *Vita Shenudi*, *Ecclesiastical Canons*, *Epitome* as well as the later monastic rules.

Secondly, the structural analysis suggests that this insistence on calling nothing one's own and sharing all things in common is directly linked to the instruction concerning children and slaves. Children stood to lose their patrimony, while slaves might expect it implied manumission. The instructions on socio-economic relations directly and unequivocally re-instate patriarchal authority and control in this context.

Thirdly, there is no moderation or counter to the absolute authority of a parent over a child nor any explicit requirement of a reciprocal relationship, beyond what would be required of all members in the general love command (e.g. 1:2). It is a one-way command to parents to enforce membership of the community on their children by physical punishment if necessary. Slaves and slave-owners, on the other hand, clearly were more problematic, since as property slaves pose a contradiction to the idea of common ownership of all things and calling nothing one's own. Moreover, some *halakic* interpretations of property law might regard slaves as legally free if their masters renounce their property or put it into common ownership in a community of which slaves are members. This calls forth extensive argumentation in the earliest representatives of the tradition (*Did.* and *Doctr.*). God views all human beings

without favouritism; God calls all human beings to fear him and gives the Holy Spirit to those who do respond to his call. This imposes an obligation on the slave owner to recognize their equality before God and to treat them appropriately--without bitterness at this social reversal. On the other hand, their slaves remain slaves and are required to be subject to their masters as a type of God. They are not even allowed to dissemble hypocritically and give only lip service to their masters.

Fourthly, the absence of an instruction concerning moderation in the exercise of parental discipline is partially addressed by *Barnabas* by attaching it to material drawn from elsewhere in the Two Ways: "You shall not kill a child in the womb and moreover you shall not put to death what has been born". In this case, not only infanticide might be implied but also the patriarchal right to harm or kill his child. This is certainly suggested by the interpretation of the Way of Life given in *Syntagma* 4.2: "Do not be aggressive. Do not strike anyone, except your small child for instruction, but observing it closely, watching lest through you murder is born, for many are the means of death".

Fifthly, this difficult and even contradictory position with regard to slaves has impacted the transmission of the tradition. *Barnabas* takes great pains in re-organizing the tradition on socio-economic relations so as to remove what seems to have been a continuing cause of tension. Firstly, the Two Ways in chapters 18-20 is an advanced gnosis following on from what appears in chapters 1-17 concerning which the author says, "To the extent that it is possible clearly to explain these things to you, I hope, in accordance with my desire, that I have not omitted anything of the matters pertaining to salvation" (17:1). He relocates the instructions concerning community of goods and calling nothing one's own until after the instructions concerning children and slaves. Further the author removes the reciprocity of master-slave instructions, since the instruction to slaves is transposed to appear before instructions to slave owners, and transformed into an instruction to obey one's superiors in general, so that slaves are not addressed at all. Instead, the same person is addressed by implication in both sections of the Haustafel: "Submit to your superiors and don't abuse your slaves". This re-arranged block is prefaced with material from elsewhere in the Two Ways enjoining obedience in general and warning against coveting: "You must not covet your neighbour's possessions; you must not become greedy. Do not be intimately associated with the lofty, but live with the humble and righteous. Accept as good the things that happen to you, knowing that nothing transpires apart from God. You shall not be double-minded or double-tongued. Be submissive to masters...." (19:6-7). Slaves become objects and not subjects again, silent and not the addressees of the instruction.

Sixthly, the absence of husband-wife instruction altogether is noteworthy and puzzling in a general instruction concerning social and economic relations in the community. Perhaps it can be explained on the basis of the Rabbinical principle mentioned above, that everything that applies to a woman applies to a slave and vice versa. So the continued subjection of the woman to her male patriarch was implied in the instruction on the continued subjection of slaves.

Finally, I suggest that the *Haustafel* in the Two Ways tradition should not be passed over as quickly and silently as it has been in previous discussions of the *Haustafel* tradition in the NT. Firstly because it comes with its own socio-economic relations, namely community of goods, and secondly because the tradition as it develops provides clear evidence of initial tension and then evolution from being the fundamental rule for all who joined the community to become an advanced gnosis for ascetics which is not required of all Christians. Despite this, or perhaps even because of this, the instruction to practice *koinonia* of goods and to call nothing one's own survived as a continuing provocation and inspiration in the life of the church, as it has done until today.

Bibliography

- Balch, David L. and Carolyn Osiek (eds.). *Early Christian Families in Context: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue*. Grand Rapids/ Cambridge: Eerdmans [Religion, Marriage and Family].
- Crouch, J. E. 1972. *The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht [FRALNT 109].
- Danby, Herbert. 1980. *The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Deutsch, C. 1987. *Hidden wisdom and the easy yoke: wisdom, Torah and discipleship in Matthew 11.25-30*. Sheffield: JSOT.
- Draper, J. A. 1988. The Social Milieu and Motivation of Community of Goods in the Jerusalem Church of Acts. Pages 79-90 in *Church in Context*. Edited by C. Breitenbach. Pretoria: NGK Boekhandelaar.
- Draper, J. A. 1995. Barnabas and the Riddle of the Didache. *JSNT* 58:89-113.
- Draper, J. A. (ed.). 1996. *The Didache in Modern Research*. Leiden: Brill [AGAJU 37].
- Draper, J. A. 1996. The Jesus Tradition in the *Didache*. Pages 72-91 in Draper (ed.), *Didache in Context*.
- Draper, J. A. 2011. The Moral Economy of the *Didache*. *HTS Teologiese Studies/ Theological Studies* 67.1, Art. #907, 10 pages DOI: 10.4102/hts.v67i1.907.
- Edsall, B. A. 2011. Tracing Alfred Seeberg's *Katechismus*: Where did it go and why? Unpublished SBL Paper: International Meeting of the SBL, King's College, London, 4-7 July 2011.
- Garrow, Alan. 2004. *The Gospel of Matthew's Dependence on the Didache*. London/ New York: T&T Clark [JSNTSup 254].
- Klein, G. 1909. *Der Älteste Christliche Katechismus und die Jüdische Propaganda-Literatur*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Lillie, W. 1974. The Pauline House-Tables. *ExT* 86: 179-183.
- MacDonald, Margaret Y. 2011. Beyond Identification of the Topos of Household Management: Reading the Household Codes in Light of Recent Methodologies and Theoretical Perspectives in the Study of the New Testament. *NTS* 57:65-90.
- Milavec, Aaron. 2003. *The Didache: Faith, Hope, and Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50-70 C.E.* New York/ Mahway, N.J.: Newman.
- Moxnes, Halvor. 1988. *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke's Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Moxnes, Halvor (ed.). 1997. *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*. London/ New York: Routledge.
- Neusner, Jacob and Richard R. Sarason. 1977. *The Tosefta 1: Zeraim*. New York: Hebrew Union College/ Jewish Institute of Religion.

- Niederwimmer, Kurt. 1998. *The Didache*. Minneapolis: Fortress [Hermeneia].
- O'Loughlin, Thomas. 2010. *A Window on the Earliest Christians*. Grand Rapids/ London: Baker/ SPCK.
- Osiek, Carolyn and Margaret Y. MacDonald; with Janet H. Tulloch. 2006. *A Woman's Place: House Churches in Earliest Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Parker, David C. 1997. *The Living Text of the Gospels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Prigent, P. and R.A. Kraft. 1971. *Epître de Barnabé*. Paris: Cerf [SC 172].
- Schrage, Wolfgang. 1979. Zur Ethik der neutestamentlichen Haustafeln. *NTS* 21:1-22.
- Scott, James C. 1977. *The Moral Economy of the Peasant: Rebellion and Subsistence in Southeast Asia*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Scott, James C. 1990. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Seeberg, A. 1903. *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit*. Leipzig: A. Deichert.
- Seeberg, A. 1906. *Die beiden Wege und das Aposteldekret*. Leipzig: A. Deichert.
- Seeberg, A. *Die Didache des Judentums und der Urchristenheit*. Leipzig: A. Deichert.
- Strack, H. L. and G. Stemberger. 1982. *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch*. Seventh Edition. Munich: Beck'sche.
- The Soncino Classics Collection: The Soncino Talmud, the Soncino Midrash Rabbah, The Soncino Zohar, The Bible, in Hebrew and English*. Electronic Text of the Judaic Classics Library. New York: Davka.
- Taylor, C. 1886. *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, with Illustrations from the Talmud*. Cambridge: Deighton Bell.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. 1996. Pages 92-128 in Draper (ed.), *Didache in Context*.
- Van de Sandt, Huub. (ed.) 2005. *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?* Assen/ Minneapolis: van Gorcum/ Fortress.
- Van de Sandt, Huub. and David. Flusser. 2002. *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Assen/ Minneapolis: van Gorcum/ Fortress [CRINT 5].
- Wengst, Klaus. 1984. *Didache (Apostellehre) Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Klemensbrief, Schrift an Diognet*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft [SUC 2].