

RITUAL PROCESS AND RITUAL SYMBOL IN DIDACHE 7-10

BY

JONATHAN A. DRAPER

ABSTRACT: Didache 7-10 provides an integrated block of ritual material intended for the aggregation phase of the initiation of Gentiles into a Jewish Christian community. The text is examined in terms of Victor Turner's theory of ritual process and ritual symbol. The dominant ritual symbol, which connects this aggregation rite with the whole initiation process is that of life, but instrumental symbols such as water, Name of God, bread and wine, are seen to be coherently linked at the ideological pole through the concept of the kingdom of God/David/Israel and through Jesus as God's wisdom. Here we may have the eucharistic prayers of the "Q" community.

1. *Introduction*

Despite a hundred years of intensive research, there is little agreement on the nature of the community which produced the *Didache*. Historical critical tools which have been used in its interpretation have proved curiously unhelpful in this regard, perhaps because they ask primarily theological and historical questions, while the *Didache* is a ritual text. It consists of instructions on catechesis, baptism, fasting, eucharist and related questions of tithing and leadership and calls out for tools more sensitive to ritual performance.¹ While the title of the work is given as διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων,² the text itself begins with an incipit describing it as διδαχὴ κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.³ If the *Didache* is indeed intended as

¹ The lack of interest in the ritual aspects of the *Didache* may reflect a certain distaste in Western scholarship for external, sensory and emotional religious performance deriving from an Enlightenment preference for what is rational and inward (Douglas 1970:1-53; Gorman 1994:13-36).

² It is clearly marked off as a title on a line by itself with four dots on each side of it (Harris 1887 Plate I).

³ While this is not found in the various witnesses to the Two Ways tradition widely believed to derive from a prior Jewish source (Suggs 1972:60-74; Audet 1996:92-128;

“teaching of the Lord through the twelve apostles to the Gentiles (ἐθνεσιν)”, then it implies that the instructions are something given under the authority of Jews to Gentiles. This matches the strongly Jewish Christian character of the instructions and the emerging scholarly consensus that the text found its final form at least by the end of the first century of the Christian Era, or at the latest the beginning of the second.⁴ It reflects the perspective of a Jewish Christian community concerned with the preparation and socialization of Gentile converts.

This article explores the implications of taking the ritual components of the *Didache* seriously against such a background of initiation⁵ of Gentile converts (ἐθνεσιν) into a Jewish Christian community which looked to the authority of Jerusalem (διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων) rather than to Paul. For this purpose I will utilize anthropological theories of ritual for the understanding and interpretation of the central chapters 7-10. In a previous study I explored the implications of ritual theory for the study of chapters 1-6 (1997:48-67). The Two Ways teaching (1-6) is provided as teaching preparatory to baptism (ταῦτα πάντα προειπόντες βαπτίσατε 7:1; cf. Harrison 1962:118-128; Jefford 1989:104; Milavec 1989:105-110; Rordorf 1996b:216; Draper 1996c:224) and is followed by the rituals of fasting, baptism, prayer and

Rordorf 1996a:148-164), this cannot be taken as evidence for its absence from a *Christian* redaction of such a Jewish source (Draper 1996c:224-225 contra Wengst 1984:66; Niederwimmer 1989:81-82; Schöllgen 1991:25-26). Audet (1958:91-103) provides a complicated thesis that this “longer title” originally belonged to the Jewish source, while the shorter title (διδασκαί τῶν ἀποστόλων) was given by the Christian redactor to the whole work as a collection of “teachings”. Audet’s overly elaborate schema has been well critiqued by P. Nautin (1959:210-214). Rordorf (Rordorf & Tuilier 1998:13-17, 1996:213-215) rightly argues that the longer “title” was added to the Two Ways material at the same time as 1:3b-2:1 and 7-10.

⁴ For an overview of the debate see Draper 1996a:1-42. Rordorf is confident in dating the final redaction to the end of the first century (Rordorf & Tuilier 1998:96, 245-246) and sees clearly the Jewish Christian origin of most of its tradition: “Celui-ci s’adresse avec une autorité réelle ou supposée à un ensemble de fidèles qui proviennent vraisemblablement du paganisme; mais son enseignement est principalement fondé sur la tradition judéo-chrétienne, laquelle il emprunte l’essentiel de sa doctrine” (1998:21; cf. Niederwimmer 1989:66-67, Wengst 1984:63, Schöllgen 1991:82).

⁵ The word “initiation” is understood here in the sense given by Mircea Eliade: “The term initiation in the most general sense denotes a body of rites and oral teachings whose purpose is to produce a decisive alteration in the religious and social status of the person to be initiated. In philosophical terms, initiation is equivalent to a basic change in existential condition; the novice emerges from his ordeal endowed with a totally different being from that which he possessed before his initiation; he has become *another*” (1958:X).

eucharist (7-10). My hypothesis is that these rituals are also directed towards the socialization of Gentile converts into a Jewish Christian community, and are not intended to provide a universal "Church Order".⁶

2. *Ritual Process and Ritual Symbol*

Rituals express the central values and goals of the communities which practise them. Careful analysis of ancient ritual texts should thus allow us to reconstruct something of the social world of the text, while we accept that this will be limited by our inability to observe and participate in the ritual process itself. A ritual analysis can legitimately be used in the service of historical study, since it provides us with clues to the identity, culture and self-understanding of an ancient community (Hoffman 1991:22-41). A ritual analysis focuses on two aspects: ritual process and ritual symbol.

2.1 *Ritual Process*

While his theory of ritual process has been much debated (e.g. Bell 1989:31-41; 1992:20-21), Victor Turner's adaptation (1967, 1968, 1969, 1974) of Arnold van Gennep's model (1960)⁷ is still widely used and remains the starting point of most ritual analysis today. This model envisages every *rite of passage* as consisting of three stages: *separation*, which isolates the ritual subject off from normal society and activity (by manipulating time, space, food, sleep and so on); *liminality*, a state of being "betwixt and between", outside of the everyday world, neither one thing nor another, passive and subject to the remoulding of the community, suspended outside the normal rules of status, time and space etc.; and *aggregation*, the phase of re-admission and return to society with a new, transformed status.

⁶ Schöllgen (1996:43-71) also expresses reservations about the assumption that the *Didache* was designed as a comprehensive Church Order, attacking particularly arguments from silence. However, his own contention that the instructions only deal with matters which were hotly disputed at the time of writing does not seem very convincing either. Silence can indeed indicate that a practice was unknown at the time of writing, but silence can also be polemical! Since there are, it seems, no examples of the genre "Church Order" earlier than the third century and the *Didache* is a first century document, the use of this term is misleading. My own preference would be to describe it as a *community rule*, and compare it formally with the earlier *Manual of Discipline* rather than later Christian compilations.

⁷ Cf. Eliade (1958:9) who uses the terminology of separation, ordeal and regeneration.

Aggregation rites effect the re-incorporation of the ritual subject into social structure (1969:94-95, 128-129). However, in situations of social breakdown or of the emergence of new religious movements as a response to social breakdown, there may be an attempt to maintain the experience of *communitas* engendered by a ritual of status transformation indefinitely, by the creation of a new kind of fundamental human community ("normative *communitas*"). This can only be successful to the extent that it breaks down the primary (only partially possible) and secondary socialization already received by the ritual subject. Hence such a process of initiation is best understood as what Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann (1966:157-161, 169-173) describe as "alternation of social universe".

The *Didache* would seem to reflect this kind of alternation ritual, designed to remove the novices permanently from their old (Gentile) society and weld them into a new and permanent (Jewish Christian) community. The first six chapters provide ritual material for the phases of separation and liminality in the threefold structure described above (Draper 1997:48-67). They contain paraenesis which finds its characteristic *Sitz im Leben* in the liminal phase of initiation ritual (Perdue 1990:5-39). As in most initiation rituals (cf. Eliade 1958:xii, 60, 113), the fundamental organizing principal in *Didache* 1-6 is the ritual symbol of life and death, a binary opposition which enforces a radical decision. Behavioural requirements drawn from the Jesus tradition, together with traditional Jewish ethical teaching derived from the Decalogue, effect a social death (nihilation of the old social universe) for the Gentile convert and encapsulate her/him in a liminal period of instruction, in which s/he undergoes a simulated primary socialization (universe construction) in the context of fundamental human community, with new fictive parents and new fictive peers. This attempt at constructing "normative *communitas*" is simultaneously undermined by the intrusion of social structural elements from the Graeco-Roman context, which enjoin the utilization of power relations within the family (as father, husband and slave owner) to ensure the conversion of the whole household (Draper 1997:61-64; on the Roman *pater familias* see Thomas 1996:228-269). On the other hand, the strict prohibition (ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ εἰδωλοθύτου λίαν πρόσχε 6:3) on eating food offered to idols serves to cement the convert's position in the new community by the mechanisms of the market. Food and drink would have to be purchased from within the (Jewish) Christian community to ensure strict (λίαν) compliance, since most meat would have been slaughtered in temples before being sold and wine would have been offered in libation before being retailed. At least one could never be sure, hence Paul's (sensible) preference for not asking in 1 Corinthians 10:25-30.

In this paper, we will explore the aggregation phase of the initiation ritual we believe to underlie the set of rituals in *Didache* 7-10. Water baptism is obviously understood by *Didache* 7:1 as concluding the catechesis of 1-6. However fasting, prayer and sacred meal are all common in rites of aggregation and we will examine them as potential components of the overall initiation ritual, to see whether seemingly arbitrary arrangements make sense in such a context. The central aspect of aggregation rites is obviously the joining of a new community, the celebration of the incorporation into a new fictive kinship. The union may be ritually expressed in several ways, the most common being the eating of a meal (sometimes understood as eating the divinity), the formal or symbolic enactment of sexual union (as in sacred prostitution or marriage to the divinity in religious orders), putting on garments, bathing in water or blood, sealing with oil or some other substance (van Gennep 1960:10-13; 20-24; 105-107). Several of these rites may also be combined.⁸

2.2 *Ritual Symbol*

Ritual symbols lie at the heart of the ritual process, in that they condense and express the goals and values of the rite of passage. In the study of ancient texts, it is often the ritual symbols which survive, although the important elements of movement, gesture, kinship structures etc. (the illocutionary and perlocutionary elements of the text) are mostly lost. A ritual symbol can be an object, activity, relationship, event, gesture and spatial unit and forms the "smallest unit of ritual which still retains the specific properties of ritual behaviour" (1967:19-47, esp. 19). Turner suggests that a ritual symbol needs to be understood by correlating data obtained from its outward form and usage, the interpretation given by the participants (*emic*), and the analysis of their particular sociological context (*etic*). Within any given ritual there will be what he calls a "senior" or "dominant" symbol, which co-ordinates the other symbols and refers to the axiomatic values of the community (Ibid:20), as well as "instrumental" symbols which relate to the accomplishment of the goals of a particular ritual (Ibid:31-32). Symbols express meanings which cannot be exactly represented in any other way: "a symbol is always the best possible expression of a relatively

⁸ Neyrey (1991:362-363) emphasizes the role of meal as ceremony rather than ritual, but meals may be components of broader rituals concerned with "crossing the lines" precisely because of their primary location in the "inward dimension of a social body". Outsiders entering a new community cement their new status as insiders with a ritual meal.

unknown fact” (Ibid:26). A symbol obtains this condensed representational efficacy by bringing together what Turner describes as an “ideological pole” and a “sensory pole”. The sensory pole relates to the gross and imprecise sensory features of the ritual symbol, while the ideological pole attaches various positive or negative meanings to the symbol. In this way ritual “periodically converts the obligatory into the desirable” by underpinning social goals with desirable or undesirable emotional stimuli (Ibid:30). For this reason, symbols have a real power to convert the intention expressed in the performance of the ritual into something transformative, “determinable influences inclining persons and groups to actions.”

Nevertheless, Turner allows for norm conflict and inconsistency in the use of the dominant symbol in rituals of a given society, since real life does not allow consistency in practice, given the variety of human experience. Any given ritual operates by emphasizing a single norm and blocking others. The dominant symbol in any society will be both a source of unity, in that it is held to signify the whole universe of meaning, and a source of contradiction in the way it is used (Ibid:38-46):

I believe that discrepancy between *significata* is a quintessential property of the great symbolic dominants in all religions. Such symbols come in the process of time to absorb into their meaning-content most of the major aspects of human social life, so that, in a sense, they come to represent “human society” itself.” (Ibid:43-44)

This paper will operate largely with Turner’s model of ritual symbol as communication, aware of the objection of others that,

Ritual consists of activity and is not necessarily, and certainly not by definition, a means of symbolic communication of ideas, thoughts, or mental states (Gorman 1994:24).

My interest is admittedly in reconstructing the social universe of the *Didache*, and is therefore interested in symbols for what they communicate.

3. *Ritual Process in Didache 7-10*

Studies of the *Didache* usually examine its instructions on baptism, fasting, prayer and eucharist in isolation from each other. Ritual theory, however, would see a fundamental continuity between all the rituals of a community in terms of process, goals and axiomatic values:

Dominant symbols appear in many different ritual contexts, sometimes presiding over the whole procedure, sometimes over particular phases. The meaning-

content of certain dominant symbols possesses a high degree of constancy and consistency throughout the total symbolic system. (Turner 1967:31)

Thus a ritual analysis of the whole section of *Didache* 7-10, taken together, should cast light on the social universe of the community which produced the text, even if our contention that chapters 7-10 belong together as the conclusion of the initiation process initiated by 1-6 is not sustained. It would still be true from an analytical point of view that all the rituals found in the *Didache* were valued and appropriated by the same community, and would thus reflect the same dominant symbols and understandings. For this reason, the central ritual section will be studied together to determine its ritual coherence.⁹ My hypothesis is that *Didache* 7-10 constitutes a (much redacted) sequence of aggregation rites within a broader rite of passage, that it represents the final phase of an extended ritual process of initiation. These aggregation rites, which conclude the initiation of Gentiles into the community of the *Didache*, begin with a compulsory fast by the novices who are to be baptized, together with the one who is to baptize them and any others able to join them, for one or two days. This is followed by washing in ritually pure (living/running) water, whose quality is carefully specified, and the solemn pronouncement of the Name of God over each person. Baptism is followed by recitation of a special prayer, which is to be repeated thrice daily thereafter as a sign of community membership. This is then concluded by a ritual meal.

Information on baptismal practise in Christian communities in the first and second centuries, which might conclusively confirm or refute my suggestion, is sparse. Nevertheless there are indications which support it. In Justin Martyr, *Apology* I.65-66 instruction remarkably similar to the Two Ways paraenesis of the *Didache* is followed by baptism, prayer and eucharist, where the eucharist is specifically reserved to the baptized. Again, Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition* 21-23 has baptism followed by prayer, peace and a

⁹ Rordorf has already argued that 6:3-7:1 belong together as a literary unit with 9-10, which has been disturbed by the interpolation of the material in 7:2-8:3 (1996:212-222, esp. 214). I regard 6:2-3 as an expansion and clarification of 6:1, specifying the nature of the threat of apostasy (πλάνησι) as the community perceives it. The danger is that some people are teaching that converts must not try to "bear the whole yoke of the Lord" (i.e. keep the Torah in full, including circumcision). The *Didache* sets this as the desirable goal for converts, while allowing that they may be limited at this stage to doing what they can and setting avoidance of food offered to idols as the minimum legal observance (Draper 1996d:340-363). It is likely that this material was inserted at the same time as that found in 7:2-3, since the casuistic spirit underlies both sections.

special baptismal eucharist. In his treatise *De baptismo* written 198-200 C.E., Tertullian provides only tantalizing glimpses of the actual practise of his community. He mentions the pre-baptismal fast (20) and, as in the *Didache*, the discussion of this specific baptismal fast leads to recommendations about post-baptismal fasting. Tertullian also requires the candidate to pray when s/he comes up out of the water of baptism:

Therefore, blessed *ones*, whom the grace of God awaits, when you ascend from that most sacred font of your new birth, and spread your hands for the first time in the house of your mother, together with your brethren, ask from the Father, ask from the Lord, that His own specialties of grace *and* distributions of gifts may be supplied you. "Ask," saith He, "and ye shall receive." (20, text from Ante-Nicene Fathers I)

Tertullian does not provide us with the prayer to be used by the initiates, but refers us to the words of Jesus which follow the Lord's Prayer in Luke 11:1-13, suggesting that it may have been the prayer used by his community. Although Tertullian does not mention the post-baptismal eucharist in *De baptismo*, he does tell us in *De corona* 3 that initiates receive a mixture of milk and honey after baptism and then partake of the eucharist before daybreak at the end of the fast (and, presumably, the all-night vigil). Two further suggestions of continuity with the practice of the *Didache* are found in *De baptismo*. Firstly, the expression *μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσί* appears in a baptismal context in Tertullian (18, though in the wording of Mt 7:6), and in *Didache* 9:5 is used to justify the exclusion of the non-baptised from the eucharist. Secondly, Tertullian advocates baptism at Passover with a citation of Jeremiah LXX 31.8 (*καὶ συνάξω αὐτοὺς ἀπ' ἐσχάτου ἡς γῆς ἐν ἑορτῇ φασέκ*), language which occurs in the eucharistic prayers in *Didache* 9:4, 10:5.

This basic structure of instruction, fasting, baptism, prayer, eucharist has been partially obscured in the *Didache* by the redactional insertion of new material, especially in the section on prayer and fasting, to refer to the ongoing post-baptismal practise of the community, but also at the end of the eucharistic prayer to affirm the right of the prophet to preside. Nevertheless, striking continuities in structure and symbolism remain, linking the different rites. This can be seen when the texts are set out side by side. In the text which follows, we accept the witness of the Coptic version, which is the oldest available text, against the later Jerusalem manuscript, with the exception of the repeated Amen and the thanksgiving for the incense/myrrh:¹⁰

¹⁰ While the claims of Jefford and Patterson (1989-1990:65-75; cf. Patterson 1995:313-329), that the Coptic represents an earlier redaction of the *Didache*, have been largely

Chapters 7-8

[Baptism]

Περὶ δὲ τοῦ βαπτίσματος,
οὕτω βαπτίζετε·

ταῦτα πάντα προειπόντες,
βαπτίζετε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα
τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ
καὶ τοῦ
ἁγίου πνεύματος
ἐν ὕδατι ζῶντι.

Ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἔχῃς ὕδωρ ζῶν,
εἰς ἄλλο ὕδωρ βάπτισον·
εἰ δ' οὐ δύνασαι ἐν
ψυχρῷ ἐν θερμῷ.

Ἐὰν δὲ ἀμφοτέρω μὴ ἔχῃς,
ἔκχεον εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν
τρὶς ὕδωρ
εἰς ὄνομα πατρὸς καὶ
υἱοῦ καὶ
ἁγίου πνεύματος.

[Fasting Before Baptism]

Πρὸ δὲ τοῦ βαπτίσματος

προνηστευσάτω ὁ
βαπτίζων
καὶ ὁ βαπτιζόμενος καὶ
εἴ τινας ἄλλοι δύνανται·
κελεύεις δὲ νηστεῦσαι τὸν
βαπτιζόμενον πρὸ μιᾶς ἢ
δύο.

Αἱ δὲ νηστεῖαι ὑμῶν μὴ
ἔστωσαν
μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν·
νηστεύουσι γὰρ δευτέρᾳ
σαββάτων καὶ πέμπτῃ·
ὑμεῖς δὲ νηστεύσατε
τετράδα καὶ παρασκευήν.

Chapter 9

[Prayer Before Meal]

περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας,
οὕτω εὐχαριστήσατε·

[First Stroph: Thanksgiving 1]

πρῶτον περὶ τοῦ

ποτηρίου·

Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι,
πάτερ ἡμῶν,
ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας ἀμπέλου
Δαυὶδ τοῦ παιδός σου,
ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ
Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου·
σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

[Second Stroph:

Thanksgiving 2]

περὶ δὲ τοῦ κλάσματος·

Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι,
πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ
τῆς ζωῆς καὶ γνώσεως,

ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ
Ἰησοῦ
τοῦ παιδός σου.
σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶ-
νας.

Chapter 10

[Prayer After Meal]

μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι
οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε·

[First Stroph: Thanksgiving 1]

Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πά-
τερ ἅγιε,
ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁγίου ὀνόματός
σου, οὐ κατεσκήνωσας ἐν
ταῖς καρδίαις
ἡμῶν,

καὶ
ὑπὲρ
τῆς γνώσεως καὶ πίστεως
καὶ ἀθανασίας,
ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ
Ἰησοῦ
τοῦ παιδός σου·
σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

[Second Stroph:

Thanksgiving 2]

σύ, δέσποτα παντοκράτορ,
ἔκτισας τὰ πάντα
ἔνεκεν τοῦ
ὀνόματός σου, τροφήν
τε καὶ ποτὸν ἔδωκας τοῖς
υἱοῖς τῶν
ἀνθρώπων εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν,
ἡμῖν δὲ
ἐχαρίσω πνευματικὴν
τροφὴν καὶ
ποτὸν καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον
διὰ Ἰησοῦ

disproved by Jones and Mirecki (1995:47-87), I agree with J. W. Riggs (1984:86-91) that the Coptic text is generally to be preferred as the oldest witness, though this needs to be defended in each case. The Amen probably forced its way in as a result of liturgical practise. The prayer over the incense is a more complex problem, which would demand a paper in itself. Rordorf (1997:229-233) is more cautious about the value of the Coptic text.

(table cont.)

[Prayer After Baptism]

Μηδὲ προσεύχεσθε ὡς οἱ
ὑποκριταί, ἀλλ' ὡς
ἐκέλευσεν ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ
εὐαγγελίῳ αὐτοῦ,

οὕτω προσεύχεσθε·

Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τῷ
οὐρανῷ, Ἁγιασθήτω τὸ
ὄνομά
σου, Ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία
σου,
Γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου
ὡς ἐν
οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς·
Τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν
ἐπιούσιον δὸς
ἡμῖν σήμερον,
Καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὴν
ὀφειλὴν
ἡμῶν, Ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίε-
μεν τοῖς
ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν,
Καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς
εἰς
πειρασμόν. Ἀλλὰ ῥύσαι
ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ
τοῦ πονηροῦ·

**Ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ δύναμις
καὶ ἡ
δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.**
Τρεῖς τῆς ἡμέρας οὕτω
προσεύχεσθε.

[Third Stroph: Petition]

ὥσπερ ἦν τοῦτο [τὸ]
κλάσμα
διεσκορπισμένον ἐπάνω
τῶν ὁρέων
καὶ συναχθὲν ἐγένετο ἓν,
οὕτω
**συναχθήτω σου ἡ
ἐκκλησία ἀπὸ
τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς
εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν.**

**ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ
δύναμις εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.**

[Exclusion of Unbaptized]

μηδεὶς δὲ φαγέτω μηδὲ
πιέτω ἀπὸ
τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὑμῶν,
ἀλλ' οἱ
βαπτισθέντες εἰς ὄνομα
κυρίου·
καὶ γὰρ περὶ τούτου
εἶρηκεν ὁ
κύριος· Μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον
τοῖς κυσί.

τοῦ παιδός σου.

περὶ πάντων
**εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι,
ὅτι δυνατὸς εἶ·
σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.**

[Third Stroph: Petition]

μνήσθητι, κύριε, τῆς
ἐκκλησίας
σου, τοῦ ῥύσασθαι αὐτὴν
ἀπὸ
παντὸς πονηροῦ καὶ
τελειῶσαι
αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ σου, καὶ
σύναξον αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τῶν
τεσσάρων
ἀνέμων **εἰς τὴν σὴν**
βασιλείαν,
ἢν ἡτοίμασας αὐτῇ·
ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ δύναμις
καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.
[Acclamation]
ἐλθέτω ὁ Κύριος καὶ
παρελθέτω ὁ
κόσμος οὗτος. ὡσαννὰ τῷ
οἴκῳ
Δαυίδ.

[Exclusion of Sinners]

εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέ-
σθω· εἴ τις
οὐκ ἔστι, μετανοεῖτω.
μαρὰν ἀθά· ἀμήν.
τοῖς δὲ προφήταις
ἐπιτρέπετε
εὐχαριστεῖν ὅσα θέλ-
ουσιν.

I have underlined the “rubrics” of the ritual text and highlighted the important parallels across the different phases of the ritual. My understanding of the structure is provided in English in square brackets. The text shows signs of editing, which is not surprising or unusual in a “manual of discipline” which continues in use over an extended period. Rituals are inherently contextual and change with the context in which they are utilized, albeit in the nature of things “one step behind” because of their reference to the sacred. Archaic elements remain unless they directly contradict new social imperatives. This dynamic has been aptly summarized by P. F. Bradshaw’s seventh principle for interpreting liturgical evidence: “Liturgical manuscripts are more prone to emendation than literary manuscripts” (1992:73-74). R. Kraft has appropriately described this kind of writing, in which the focus is on the tradition rather than the author, as “evolved literature” (1965:2), or as S. Giet (1966:118-132; 1967:223-236; 1970) describes the same phenomenon, it is “living literature” which unfolds progressively in response to external circumstances rather than being the work of one author. This is more obvious in oral contexts, where the change happens imperceptibly, but it is true also of textual manuals which provide the guidelines for oral performances. The manuals will gradually be modified to take account of changed practice. The survival of a manuscript of the full text of the *Didache* is to some extent accidental, since it presents us with a frozen tableaux of the rituals of a community long after its practice had changed (cf. Bradshaw’s Eighth Principle for interpreting liturgical texts, 1992:75-76). It is no accident that the text was taken up in modified form and made to conform with later practice by its inclusion in Book VII of the *Apostolic Constitutions* and in the *Ethiopic Church Order* (just as “Q” is taken up in Matthew and Luke and lost as a separate text or tradition).

There seems to be a clear shape to the sequence of the ritual actions in 7-10, which would be suitable for an aggregation ritual: fasting, ritual lustration in the Name of God, a special prayer to be uttered by the initiands and a sacred meal. Subsequent redactions (note, for example, the switching between second person singular and plural; cf. Audet 1958:104-115; Niederwimmer 1995:29-32) have added material to define the nature of pure water, the length of the fast and the days on which post-baptismal fasting is to be practised (Wednesday and Friday as opposed to the Tuesday and Thursday fasting of the “hypocrites”), the people (“hypocrites”) whose prayers must be avoided in favour of a thrice daily recital of the Lord’s Prayer. It is also likely that the baptismal formula *εἰς ὄνομα κυρίου* found

in 9:5 is an earlier form which has survived unobtrusively in the eucharistic text, whereas it has been replaced by the Trinitarian formula in two different forms in 7:1, 3, to harmonize it with the changing praxis of the community (cf. Vööbus 1968:35-39; Rordorf 1996b:217-218).

The formula of introduction for each section of the aggregation ritual is the same in each case (περὶ [πρὸ, μετὰ] δὲ τοῦ [τῆς, τὸ], οὕτω[ς] σατε [. εσθε]). In the introduction to prayer in 8:2, the formula has been redacted by a reference to the authority of the “gospel”, as in 11:3, 15:3 which I regard as the latest phase in the composition of the text (Draper 1995:284-312; 1996b:85-86; 1996d:340-363). The *apodosis* survives in οὕτω προσεύχεσθε, so that it may originally have read either μετὰ δὲ τὸ βαπτισθῆναι, οὕτω προσεύχεσθε or περὶ δὲ τῆς προσεύχης οὕτω προσεύχεσθε.

I also regard the instruction to allow the prophets to offer the thanksgiving prayers as they wish to be a later redaction, made at the same time as the insertion of instructions on prophets into earlier instructions on apostles (Draper 1996d:340-363), but it is not out of keeping with the nature of the ritual process. As in Jewish *berakoth*, the formula is only offered as the guideline and not the fixed immutable text. It would be varied as the occasion demands. The emphasis is not on ὅσα θέλουσιν but on τοῖς δὲ προφήταις! At issue is the denotation of the ritual elder and not the text of the eucharist. This instruction would, however, inevitably be a cause of tension in a society dominated by patron-client relationships, since the head of the household in which the meal was celebrated would expect to lead the formalities and receive honour (Osiek 1996:16-17; cf. Riggs 1995:278-281). I have argued elsewhere that it would be precisely such heads of relatively affluent households who would be appointed ἐπισκόποι καὶ διακόνοι (15:1-2), and to whose status the prophets (social marginals) would represent a threat (Draper 1995:291-302). This instruction would then signal an intrusion of social-structural conflict into the *communitas* of the ritual.

4. *Baptism and Holiness*

Turner speaks of “force fields” (a concept drawn from the theory of the behaviourist psychologist, Kurt Lewin) which act on the participants of the ritual because it is “occurring in, and being interpenetrated by, a totality of coexisting social entities such as various kinds of groups, sub-groups, categories, or personalities, and also barriers between them, and modes of interconnexion” (1967:26). Barriers and conflict in this ritual are emphasized in the *Didache* between those being initiated and those outside the

new community. It is appropriate for this aggregation ritual, which is attempting to maintain *communitas* while rigorously separating the new community from the surrounding social structures. The initiated are to remain permanent liminals with respect to the wider Graeco-Roman society, from which they come, in their new status as members of a society of liminals ("normative *communitas*"). It is significant that, whereas in the separation and liminal phases of the initiation ritual, re-emphasized in 9:5 (τοῖς κυσί), the novices were required to die to the Gentile society from which they originate, here in 8:1-3 they are strictly separated from a rival group within the Jewish community to which they are now attaching themselves. This is understandable in the sphere of contested power relations within the Jewish community after the destruction of the Temple and nation in 70 C.E. (Draper 1996c:223-243; cf. Overman 1990:3; Saldarini 1994:7-9). This material seems to represent a redactional development for the purpose of self-definition and strengthening community boundaries.

The importance of separation is reflected in the use of ἅγιος, ἁγιασθῆναι eight times in chapters 7-10 (7:1, 3; 8:2; 9:2, 5; 10:2 (twice), 5,¹¹ 6), whereas it is only used twice elsewhere, the second of which is a quotation from Scripture (4:2, 16:7). This is not accidental but marks out strong boundaries to limit participation in the ritual to the members of the new community. The root understanding of what is holy comes from the Jewish thought world which is operative here, and is well expressed by K. G. Kuhn (1964:100): "Particular emphasis always falls on the negative side of the concept of holiness. To be holy is to be separated". It is further enforced by the insistence on the ritual purity of the water used in baptism. It must be fresh running water, or else at least a sufficient quantity of warm or salt water to avoid polluting those touching it. If there is insufficient flowing or standing water to maintain ritual purity, then baptism cannot be done by immersion but must be done by pouring (ritually pure) water over the head three times. Since there is no contact between the source of the water and the person being baptized, it cannot become a "father of impurity" and ritual purity is maintained (cf. m.Toh 4:11). Separation is also enforced by the exclusion of any but the baptized from the sacred meal which concludes the ritual (9:5), and is given a re-inforcement from Scripture rare in the *Didache* and reserved for especial emphasis (καὶ γὰρ περὶ τούτου εἶρηκεν ὁ κύριος, though the reference is obscure, perhaps Lev 22:10 (see Draper

¹¹ Though this is probably redactional as it is not in the Coptic version.

1983:196-207).¹² Holiness is a state of ritual separation from the surrounding society, which is marked out on the human body by washing: "The body is a model which can stand for any bounded system. Its boundaries can represent any boundaries which are threatened or precarious . . . What is being carved in human flesh is an image of society" (Douglas 1966: 115-116).

While washing establishes a state of separate ritual community or holiness, it is above all eating and drinking together which expresses it. The importance attached to holiness is obvious in 9:5, as it is implicit throughout: "But let no-one eat or drink from your thanksgiving meal, except those who have been baptized in the Name of the Lord: for indeed the Lord has said concerning this, "do not give what is holy (*τὸ ἅγιον*) to the dogs"." The meal concludes with a further challenge, re-inforcing the exclusion of those who are not "holy", and issues a call to them to repent (10:6). This is both a warning to those already in the community and a call to further conversions of the unbaptized. I do not see it as in conflict with 9:5, since I do not see it as introducing a "eucharist proper" as many scholars have speculated (Audet, Dibelius, Rordorf, Betz. See Draper 1996:26-31). The exclusiveness of the ritual meal would be striking in the Graeco-Roman context, since sacrificial and cult meals were relatively public affairs (MacMullen 1981:34-42), where even beggars might hope for scraps (though there were occult ritual meals). Even family meals were probably more public than has traditionally been allowed, so that people might wander in off the streets into the public areas of the house (Osiek 1996:17).

We are here embedded in the Jewish thought world, where dogs archetypally represent the heathen in their uncleanness and ferocity. Ritually clean food is described simply as *τὸ ἅγιον*, just as it is described as *טהרה* in the Mishnaic tractate *m.Tohoroth*, and admission of Gentiles is an occasion for worry about the purity of food just as in *Gerim* I.9, III.2. The *Manual of Discipline* from Qumran also expresses this clearly, this time in excluding even fellow Jews who refuse to repent and join the community from their ritual bath and ritual meal (*tohoroth*): "They shall not go into the water to touch the *טהרה* (pure meal) of the men of holiness" *אל יבואו במים לנעת בטהרה אנשי הקודש*. Those who did join were first required to

¹² The question of the Didache's supposed knowledge and use of the New Testament and especially of Matthew's Gospel is much disputed (see e.g. Draper 1996b:72-91; *contra* Tuckett 1996:92-128). I do not agree that this is a quotation of Mt 7:6, or that the *κύριος* is a reference to Jesus.

surrender their property (provisionally) and complete one year satisfactorily in the Covenant life before being permitted to eat *tohoroth* and a further year before being permitted to drink with the rest of the community and have their property merged with that of the community (1QS 6:13-23, since liquids are more susceptible to convey impurity).

Mary Douglas (1975:271) has argued that the Jewish concern with food reflects concern for the integrity of territorial boundaries. In the diaspora, it seems, this concern with spatial boundaries is retained, but in a spiritualized form: holiness is ritualized space. A holy community is one which excludes outsiders at its meal and maintains a strict watch over what is eaten and by whom (Did 6:3, 9:5). This seems to be the understanding underlying the ritual process in the *Didache*.

5. *The Pre-Baptismal Fast*

The practice of fasting creates ritual time by defamiliarization. Even if the fast is in secret, the unfamiliar feeling of hunger and bodily restraint marks off the period of fasting as holy/set apart. As Catherine Bell correctly observes, "intrinsic to ritualization are strategies for differentiating itself—to various degrees and in various ways—from other ways of acting within any particular culture" (1992:90). Removal of food is a ritual symbol, one way of creating what Bell calls the "ritualized body," where the goals and values of the community (as "social body") are marked out on the body of participants. Fasting creates a break between the food of the old life and the life-giving food of the new community; it symbolizes a hunger which will be satisfied. The length of the fast is set at "one or two days" (later practice of baptism at Easter, as reflected in Tertullian, set Good Friday and Holy Saturday as preparatory fast days, but this is not specified here).

In this case the ritual elder¹³ is not specified, but is closely identified with the ritual subject by the requirement that s/he fast together with her/him. The fast is communal and not private (shared by as many of the community as are able) and is probably held together with the group of novices preparing for baptism; it fosters *communitas* by the common experience of a "ritual ordeal". The situation is similar to what is envisaged in 4:1-8, where the teacher who provides the catechesis is to be respected as

¹³ "Ritual elder" is used in a technical sense here to indicate the one leading the ritual performance of baptism, without any presupposition about her/his identity or status within the community.

if s/he were the Lord, and the catechumens are urged to meet daily. Perhaps the ritual elder who baptizes would have been the same person as the one who instructs, as Benoit suggests (1953:10; cf. Rordorf 1996b:215 note 15). In any case, the absence of a designated ritual elder indicates that this is not a matter of concern or controversy (in contrast to 10:7 for example).

The redaction of the instructions on the pre-baptismal fast extends its reference to the post-baptismal life: the initiate is to fast every week on Wednesday and Friday, not with the “hypocrites” on Monday and Thursday. This relates to the goal of the initiation ritual, which is to establish “normative *communitas*”, a permanent and separate community in opposition to the rules and order of the *status quo*. It is not only the gentile society, from which the initiates come, which is now off limits, but also other rival Jewish communities. The *ὑποκριτῶν* would seem to be a polemical way of referring to the followers of the Pharisaic party who keep these days (*m.Meg* 3:6; 4:1; cf. *b.Taann* 12a).¹⁴ The fast was a very public gesture, initiated and concluded by a blast of the *shofar*, a cessation of work and gathering in the market place. The Christian observance of different days would be a public creation of separate ritual space and time, which defined them as a community set apart (Draper 1996c:233-235).

6. The “Lord’s Prayer”

At first sight, it seems that chapter 8 has been inappropriately interpolated between material on baptism and eucharist in a later redaction, and that it interrupts the flow of the ritual. I have argued elsewhere that this was an insertion made at a time of increasing tension between Christian Judaism and Pharisaic Judaism, which fostered a growing need for self-definition (Draper 1996c:227-231). However, there is a remarkable unity of structure and symbolism between the Lord’s Prayer (8:2) and the eucharistic prayers, which indicates that the Lord’s Prayer itself is not an insertion and may even have been first formulated in the context of initiation. Polemical additions and revisions of the framework made in the service of Christian self-definition have obscured the underlying unity perhaps, but the prayer itself belongs with the earlier material. Niederwimmer provides a rather different source and redactional critical analysis of this section (1995:29-30), which discerns an underlying source consisting of a series of liturgical traditions (oral or written), which have been integrated by the “Didachist” into a

¹⁴ For a discussion of the meaning of the term *ὑποκριτῶν*, see Draper 1996c: 232-233.

“rule book” by means of redactional touches and additions. Thus he attributes connective material to the redactor (e.g. *ταῦτα πάντα προειπόντες, βαπτίσσατε* in 7:1; *ὡς ἐκέλευσεν ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ αὐτοῦ* in 8:2), minimizing the coherence of the underlying tradition. However, even if his analysis is correct, the Didachist would be discerning and promoting a coherence in the traditional material he redacts which is acceptable to his own community. A ritual analysis of Niederwimmer’s “rule book” in its final redaction would still be appropriate.

Thus, the prayer begins by affirming the holiness of the Name into which the novices have been baptized. The prayers for the gathering into the kingdom in 9:4, 10:5 are echoed by the prayer for the kingdom to come in 8:2. There is a prayer for the eschatological gift of “the bread of the age of salvation”, ‘bread of life’, ‘heavenly manna’” as Jeremias interprets *ἐπιούσιος*, drawing on St. Jerome, so that 8:2 stands parallel to 9:3-4 (1967:100-102). The release from debts and slavery is also related to ritual immersion for initiation of Gentiles in the Rabbinic tradition (*Gerim* I.10, II.4). Thus initiation into the community requires literally both giving and receiving debt release (at least within the community itself, since the community would have no power to enforce this on non-members). This requirement of emancipation may well be what lies behind Paul’s dilemma in Philemon (Elliott 1994:32-52). It may also have evoked the instructions to slave-owners and slaves in the Two Ways in *Didache* 4:10-11, which shows signs of embarrassment. In the Lord’s Prayer, this mutual release from debt also symbolizes the release of the novice from her/his prior offences against God during her/his Gentile life. Finally, the petition not to be subjected to trial but to be snatched from the evil (one) is echoed again in the concluding prayer of the meal (10:5). There, *ἡμᾶς* becomes *τῆς ἐκκλησίας σου*, which is to be snatched from all evil, perfected in God’s love and gathered into his kingdom.

In other words, most of the ritual symbols of the eucharistic prayers are found also in the Lord’s Prayer. Jeremias (1967:82-85), following Manson (1955-1956), has demonstrated that from early times, the Lord’s Prayer formed part of the service reserved for the baptized (*missa fidelium*), was utilized in catechetical instruction, memorized by novices and prayed by them for the first time at their baptism.¹⁵ According to the Apostolic Constitutions VII.4.44, the newly baptized person stands up in the water and recites the

¹⁵ Note that the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus (xxii.5) forbids catechumens to pray with the congregation until after their baptism. Hence the formal recitation of the Lord’s

Lord's Prayer facing the east. The Lord's Prayer was not added to the *Didache* at a later stage, but forms an integrated part of its structure. The earlier material has been redacted by the addition of a framework referring to the "hypocrites", just as the baptismal fast has been redacted by the addition of instructions on fasting which distinguish members of the community from the "hypocrites".

In the redactional framework, the prayer first uttered by the initiated person after baptism is now enjoined three times a day, as a continuing confirmation of their new status. Again, the intention is to re-enforce the experience of "normative *communitas*" by enforcing separation from the surrounding society, other Jews (*ὑποκρίται*) as well as gentiles. Prayer was not a private matter, since it had to be said aloud at the right time, wherever a person happened to be. The Lord's Prayer is to be said and not the *Shema*^a or the *Shemoneh 'Esreh* (*m.Ber* 2:1-2; *b.Ber* 26b; *t.Ber* 3:6), so that everyone would know that the person reciting it at the prescribed time of prayer was a member of the new community (Draper 1996c:235-238).

7. The Structure of the Eucharistic Prayers

7.1 The Pre-history

The form and structure of the eucharistic prayers, and their relation to the eucharist depicted in chapter 14, has been at the heart of the debate over chapters 9 and 10. The similarity of these prayers to Jewish Berakoth was observed already by C. Taylor (1886) and C. H. Turner (1887). G. Klein (1909:214-219) pointed to the influence of the Sabbath Kiddush prayers on chapter 9 and of the *Birkath Ha-Mazon* on chapter 10. Subsequent critics have become increasingly technical in their attempts to relate these prayers to the Jewish background, in particular on the assumption that there were strict rules about the formulation of berakoth. Audet (1959:643-662), attempted to formulate the structure of the berakah with some exactness (exclamation, historical content and final benediction) but his thesis has not carried conviction (Talley 1976:116-118; Draper 1983:182-188).

Most recent attempts to analyze the eucharistic prayers in the *Didache* have been overly influenced by consideration of Rabbinic rules. Definitions deriving from the third century Mishnah tractate *Berakoth* are used to determine the theological intention of the *Didache*, and the ninth century *Birkath*

Prayer by the newly baptized, together with all the congregation, would be a potent symbol of aggregation.

*Ha-Mazon*¹⁶ is held to be a source which it has redacted (Talley 1976:126-127; Riggs 1984:91-101; cf. 1995:256-283; for a telling critique of this position see Rordorf 1997:239-241). This use of source and redaction critical methods is, however, clearly invalid here. The Rabbinic rules began to be formulated at the earliest after Jabneh at the end of the first century, in the aftermath of the destruction of the temple, and perhaps as late as the mid-second century (Bradshaw 1997:4; Zahavy 1990:14-16, 1991:42-68) or even the fourth century (Reiff 1991:110). The *Didache*, however, reached its final form by the end of the first century¹⁷ and most scholars agree that the eucharistic prayers were incorporated from very early tradition, whatever the date of the final redaction of the whole. While the parallels are helpful and instructive, the use of late Jewish rules for a *redaction critical* analysis of a much earlier Christian prayer cannot be justified (cf. Mazza 1986:193-223). The eucharistic prayers of the *Didache* are not literary compositions but oral tradition, which has been reduced to text (cf. Bradshaw 1997:15). The written text would provide the template for oral performance in the *Didache* as also in the Rabbinic instructions (Safrai & Stern 1987:922-923). Many recent Jewish scholars (e.g. Heinemann 1977; Hoffman 1979; Reiff 1991:109-136) have emphasized the fluidity and plurality of the Jewish liturgy in the first few centuries C.E. In view of this fluidity and uncertainty concerning the existence of any "original" Jewish form, the wisest procedure in analyzing the eucharistic prayers in the *Didache* would seem to be to examine its internal logic and not seek immediately to relate it to external "rules", which probably never existed.

7.2 *The Structure*

An examination of the text of *Didache* 9-10 shows quickly that it has a parallel structure before and after the meal, as one would expect from orally formulated material, where stereotypical patterning, parallelism, repetition, dense metonymic reference and redundancy form an important part of composition (Foley 1995:60-98; cf. Niederwimmer 1989:174-175; Clerici 1966:5-6). In other words, the prayers before and after the meal form a coherent and complementary whole.

¹⁶ The form itself may well be early, since it may lie behind Jubilees 22:6-9 (Bradshaw 1992:24-26).

¹⁷ Rigg's (1995:281) placement of this text in the mid-second century is based on quite erroneous speculative "developmental" criteria concerning "Christian leadership", which are not attested in the text at all.

The first striking structural detail is that there are three formal units before and three after the meal, each concluded by a doxology (cf. *m.Ber* 6:8). As Mazza has observed (1994:5-40), this tripartate structure consists of two thanksgivings and one petition in each case. Indeed, Mazza (1995) makes this the fundamental structure out of which all the later eucharistic prayers have developed by interpolating smaller units of tradition at various points. C. Giraudo (1981, see esp. 249-260) has scrupulously examined the Old Testament (*todah*) evidence and argues for a bipartate structure of anamnesis/epiclesis current in the earliest Christian anaphora prior to the development of rabbinic categories. It is clear that the eucharist of the *Didache* has three strophs in each prayer, before and after the meal, though they consist of two categories corresponding roughly to Giraudo's schema: (two) thanksgivings and (one) petition. The content of the two highly formalized thanksgiving prayers for the cup ("the holy vine of David your son/child/servant") and the bread ("life and knowledge") before the meal is recapitulated in the first thanksgiving prayer after the meal ("for your holy Name, which you made to tabernacle in our hearts and for knowledge and faith and immortality"). The second thanksgiving after the meal also takes up the theme of both bread and cup from the two thanksgivings before the meal ("you have given food and drink") in a thanksgiving for the power of God in creation and redemption. The petition for the gathering of the church into the kingdom before the meal stands parallel to the petition for the snatching of the church from evil, its sanctification and gathering into the kingdom, after the meal. These three prayers each begin with the same opening benediction ("We give thanks to you, our/holy Father, for . . .") and conclude with the same "seal" ("... which you have made known to us [omitted in the second thanksgiving after the meal] through Jesus your servant: to you be glory for ever"). Interestingly, ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ γνώσεως is chiastically parallel to ὑπὲρ τῆς γνώσεως καὶ πίστεως καὶ ἀθανασίας. The addition of a further element "and faith" intensifies the formula in a way common in oral/liturgical composition, and is consistent with the greater emphasis on the "spiritual" in the thanksgiving prayers after the meal (in the same way life is further spiritualized as "immortality"), but the parallel remains.

The second blessing after the meal is a prayer of thanksgiving for the goodness of creation given to all human beings and the special gift of spiritual food and drink "and eternal life" given only to members of the community. The reference to "immortality" in 10:2 and "eternal life" in 10:3 heighten and connect this second thanksgiving after the meal with the ref-

erence to "life" in the second blessing before the meal in 9:3. Mazza is right to emphasize the importance of this "significant development as a result of which the Christian meal can no longer be reduced to its Jewish ancestor" (1996:297). In the second thanksgiving after the meal there is no opening benediction. Instead there is a closing benediction before the "seal" or doxology. There are thus two thanksgiving prayers and a petition, each concluded by the "seal" of a doxology, before the meal, and two thanksgivings and a petition after the meal.

The petition after the meal is formally parallel to the petition before the meal. Both consist of a prayer for the gathering of the scattered people of God from the diaspora into the kingdom. Both conclude with a longer doxology (again with internal *chiasm*: ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ δύναμις (9:4), ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα (10:5)), as befits the concluding prayer in a series of three. The prayer after the meal has a second petition, which is really an acclamation of praise to the God of David, who has made the kingdom known to the community in Jesus. The acclamation expresses the hope of the community for a swift realization of the promised change in the world order, the coming of the kingdom on earth in accordance with God's will, as in the prayer of 8:2 (cf. the much later Jewish practice of inserting poetic *piyyutim* at the end of the *berakoth*).

Finally, the prohibition of the unbaptized sharing in the meal in 9:5, because what is holy should not be given to the dogs, stands parallel to the warning in chapter 10:6, "If anyone is holy let her/him come. If anyone is not, let her/him repent!" What is significant about these parallel verses (9:5 and 10:6) is the centrality given to baptism as the precondition for admission to the meal, and the maintenance of holiness after baptism (i.e. sanctification) as the precondition for continuing participation. This would be very appropriate in the context of an initiation ritual culminating with an aggregatory eucharistic meal. It is an exhortation of a general kind to continuing sanctification addressed to the participants in the meal.

The warning in the second petition is heightened by the double invocation of the coming of the Lord in the acclamation and prohibition. The acclamation for the coming of the Lord and the passing away of the world concludes with "Hosanna to the house of David!"¹⁸ This forms an inclusio with the opening eucharistia over the wine for the "holy vine of David"

¹⁸ The textual witnesses diverge here, with the Jerusalem Manuscript having θεῶ and the *Apostolic Constitutions* having υἱῶ. The Coptic text οἰκῶ, which is the *lectio difficilior* and the oldest witness, should probably be adopted here.

(9:2), indicating the symbolic importance of this expression for the understanding of the ritual as a whole. The prohibition also contains a prayer for the coming of the Lord, following the call to the unbaptized to repent, which retains its Aramaic form and concludes the whole rite with an Amen. It is possible that the solemn invocation of the *Maranatha* formula at the end of the ritual is designed to have the force of an anathema, an oral full stop or exclamation mark, a kind of curse to re-inforce the demand for repentance by summoning the presence of God as witness (Moule 1982:222-226; cf. Lake 1905:27). The assembled community binds itself to the blessings and curses of the covenant with the Amen, as in the ritual at Qumran (1QS 2:10).

The common interpretation of 10:6 as providing a transition (“*un rituel de passage*”) to “the sacrament proper”, as Audet argues (1958:372-433; cf. Betz 1996:246-253; Rordorf & Tuilier 1998:8, 38-48 and restated in 1997:233-244; Niederwimmer 1989:179-180; Schöllgen 1991:50-54), seems to be misplaced and based solely on the presupposition that a eucharist must contain the Words of Institution found in the Western eucharistic tradition. The second prohibition in 10:6 is a recapitulation and further development of the first in 9:5. It is inappropriate, as Mazza (1996:276-299) has rightly argued, to use the term “sacrament” in the church of the first century. Indeed, what Edward J. Kilmartin (Daly 1997:88) critiques as an overemphasis on the “moment of consecration” and on the “Christological to the neglect of the ecclesiological”, leaves the Western Catholic tradition unable to take full account of the Jewish heritage or of a eucharist without an institution narrative in the “correct” place. This seems to have distorted Western interpretations of the eucharist in the *Didache*.

Recent attempts to open up this issue again are not any more convincing than the previous ones. Felmy (1993:1-15) argues that the eucharistic prayer of *Didache* is for a real eucharist, constructed on the lines of a Jewish paschal *haggada*, in which the people only come forward to receive communion after 10:6. Wehr (1987:333-356) argues that the words of Institution were said after 9:5, which has displaced 10:6 from this context to the end of the eucharistic prayers, because of its eschatological content. Gamber (1987:3-32) attempts to address the problem by separating the words of Institution, so that the prayer over the bread and reception of the bread took place after 9:4, and the prayer over the cup and reception of the cup took place after 10:6. There is little to commend any of these speculative reconstructions. The simplest solution is that the words of Institution were not known or not in use in the community of the *Didache*.

(Dibelius 1938:261-283; Wengst 1984:43-57; Kollman 1990:79-101). There is, indeed, absolutely no evidence for the existence of any further ritual act here. The anathema concludes the baptismal ritual with a solemn warning to maintain holiness, in which the Aramaic formula would heighten the solemnity of the warning for Greek speaking Gentile initiates. The scholarly chimera of a further ritual, essentially an argument from silence, should be laid to rest, together with speculation about what such a rite might contain.¹⁹

In any case, nothing in our analysis suggests a haphazard or patchwork structure. On the contrary, it suggests that the eucharistic prayers of the *Didache* have a natural coherence and structure. It remains now to examine the content of the prayers and how this relates to the structure we have identified.

8. *Ritual Symbol in Washing and Meal*

8.1 *Life as Dominant Ritual Symbol*

We have already observed that the emphasis on ritual washing in the baptism of the *Didache* is oriented towards ritual purity and therefore separation from the surrounding society (holiness). However, this is only one of the possible referents of water as ritual symbol. Water washes clean, it also provides the fundamental drink by which life is sustained. Water cools and refreshes; it also drowns. If we follow Turner's model, all these are possible associations of the symbol at its gross, imprecise, sensory pole. While ὕδωρ ζῶν can indeed be an expression referring to running water, this is far from a commonplace usage. The only examples given in Liddell and Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon* and, indeed, the only examples generated by a computer search of Greek literature, are from the Jewish and Christian tradition.²⁰ God miraculously provides life-giving water to Hagar in the wilderness (Gen 21:19). Ritually pure water used in the temple and cleansing rituals is also called ὕδωρ ζῶν (Lev 14:5, 6, 50, 51; Num 5:17, 19:17). Even here, the epithet "living" with reference to water is ambiguous. For

¹⁹ M. Klinghardt (1996) has provided an extensive examination of *eucharistia* and *berakoth*, which I have not been able to take account of in this paper.

²⁰ With the exception of *Epigrammata sepulcralia* 773.6 καὶ ζῶν ὕδωρ, καὶ κόσμος εἰς θεῖον γάμον. Τοῦτῳ γένου τὰ πάντα, φῶς, σωτηρία, Ἐδέμ, τρυφῆς χωρίον, ἡ χλόης τόπος, καὶ ζῶν ὕδωρ, καὶ κόσμος εἰς θεῖον γάμον. Ἡ τοῦ πεσόντος ταῦτά σοι μήτηρ, κόρη, τὸν σοι τόπον κοσμοῦσα, κόσμε τοῦ γένους.

instance, in Lev 14:5-6 a living bird (τὸ ὀρνίθιον τὸ ζῶν) is ritually slaughtered so that its living blood flows into living water (καὶ βάψει αὐτὰ καὶ τὸ ὀρνίθιον τὸ ζῶν εἰς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ὀρνιθίου τοῦ σφαγέντος ἐφ' ὕδατι ζῶντι). The life is in the blood and conveys life in the ritual. To translate ὕδωρ ζῶν simply with "running water" does not do justice to the richness of its symbolic potential in ancient Near Eastern culture. As Goppelt says, "The work of water in mediating natural life is sublimated in myths, cultic traditions and sagas" (1972:316, cf. 332). Canticles 4:15 refers to a well set in a garden as a "well of living water" (φρέαρ ὕδατος ζῶντος). Significantly, Zechariah 14:8 uses the expression to describe the water which flows out from Jerusalem to renew the land in the last days (καὶ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐξελεύσεται ὕδωρ ζῶν ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ). To summarize: ὕδωρ ζῶν carries with it a rich legacy in Hebrew tradition and comes to be understood as an expression of eschatological cleansing, renewal and fertility.

The account of the Samaritan Woman at the Well in John's Gospel takes up this tradition in 4:10, a metaphorical use in which there is a deliberate ironical reference to Jesus providing the water which brings life in fulfilment of the promises. This is an understanding close to that of the *Didache*, one of many parallels between John's Gospel and this central liturgical section of the text (cf. Betz 1996:255-256). Virtually all of the uses of ὕδωρ ζῶν in subsequent Greek texts consist of references to Zechariah and John in commentaries and sermons.²¹

What this means is that ritual purity is not the only referent of water at the ideological pole of the symbol, nor even its most prominent symbolic meaning. The separateness of the ἐκκλησία gathered into the eschatological kingdom, does not exhaust its significance. It also draws from the role of the water in providing and sustaining life, to suggest that the baptismal ritual mediates spiritual new life. This is important in the overall context of the initiation ritual, in that the dominant symbol for the separation and liminal stages of the ritual is that of life, as contrasted in a binary fashion with death. This dominant symbol is taken up again with bread as a ritual symbol (9:3). Life thus has a double reference as a symbol, since redeemed life (spiritual) as the reference at the ideological pole in water and bread draws on life (biological) at the sensory pole in the

²¹ E.g. Eusebius points to the fulfilment of the prophecy of Zechariah in Jesus' words to the Samaritan Woman in the *Demonstratio evangelica* 6.18.3.3; 6.18.48.2, 6; 10.7.1.5; 10.7.8.4. Origen sees a reference to the gift of the Spirit in his commentary (e.g. *Commentarii in evangelium Joannis* 13.31.187.5; *Fragmenta* 36.14).

Two Ways (1-6). Life also occurs twice again in the thanksgiving prayers after the meal in the heightened sense of immortality or eternal life (*ἀθανασίας* 10:2; *ζωὴν αἰώνιον* 10:3). In other words, “life” is the dominant symbol for the whole initiation ritual, governing and integrating the other ritual symbols.

8.2 *Knowledge as Ritual Symbol*

The separation and liminal phases of the initiation ritual set out a body of knowledge, namely the teaching of the Two Ways, which must be taught and learnt before baptism (*ταῦτα πάντα προειπόντες* 7:1). Thus knowledge also becomes a ritual symbol bridging different ritual phases of the initiation ritual. It is taken up again as one of the significations of bread as a ritual symbol (9:3), and again in the thanksgiving after the meal (10:3). Knowledge is ingested in catechesis and is symbolized by the ingestion of bread. The recital of the Lord’s Prayer immediately after the baptism may well serve as a concrete symbol of this ritually imparted knowledge, intended for the re-socialization of the neophyte. It is intended as a continual summary and re-inforcement of the initiation process through its daily recital, a continual “eating” of the knowledge imparted in initiation, like the daily bread for which it petitions God.

8.3 *Name as Ritual Symbol*

At the sensory pole, a name is a vocalization which identifies a person within a particular family and kinship structure. It is conferred by parents and/or kin, and thus symbolizes belonging within a primary socialization process. By extension it is also identified with power: initially the power of the parent over the child, but subsequently the power of the community over the individual and ultimately the numinous power of the whole social universe represented by its God over each member of the society. The utterance of a name is thus conceived of as having the power to effect change for good or ill. A name also controls a person by separating this one from that one and so making her/him responsible and answerable for what s/he has done.

It is clearly an important ritual symbol in the aggregatory rite of the *Didache* in that it occurs six times in 7-10 (7:1, 3; 8:2; 9:5; 10:2, 3) and only twice elsewhere (12:1, 14:3). Of the latter, one is the greeting by which community members recognize each other, and which is thus related to initiation into the Name of the Lord in 9:5 (*πᾶς δὲ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι*

κυρίου δεχθήτω, 12:1), and the other is a direct quotation from Scripture (14:3).

The solemn utterance of the Name of God over the candidate in baptism (7:1, 3; 9:5) symbolizes at its ideological pole, the conferring of a new identity and a new kin at the conclusion of the process of resocialization. It also symbolizes the placing of the baptized person under the numinous power and protection of a new social universe with a new God. Speaking the Name has the power to effect the transformation of the Gentile believer into a member of the renewed kingdom. It is envisaged as a permanent possession of the new members of the community, tabernacling within their hearts (10:2), just as the Name of God was understood to tabernacle within his temple in Jerusalem, displayed for instance in 1 Kings 8:27-30. The new community is holy/separate and enjoys the continued presence of the Name of God in its midst, like the temple. All human beings have an obligation to praise God's Name, for whose sake the bountiful world was created (10:3), but the members of the new community have a special obligation to praise him for the spiritual food and drink and eternal life they have received by their baptism, symbolized by the continued indwelling of the Name in their hearts. Hence they respond with joy: *περὶ πάντων εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, ὅτι δυνατός εἶ· σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας* (10:4).²²

8.4 *Meal (food and drink) as Ritual Symbol*

Food and drink at the sensory pole of ritual symbol refer to the provision of basic human needs for sustenance. Denial of food and drink in the pre-baptismal fast is related symbolically to provision of food after baptism in the eucharist. The system is purged of the old life by withdrawal of sustenance for one or two days, and prepared to receive the new life-giving holy sustenance of the community. What is eaten and drunk becomes an integral and inalienable part of the person, and hence symbolizes irreversible union. It nourishes and enables life and growth, it mixes and disappears into the person, since "we are what we eat" (cf. Neyrey 1996:168). In the case of a sacred communal meal, this may indicate at the ideological pole that the participant is "eating God," attaining union with the divine. It also indicates that the participants are joined to each other, since they share the same bread and wine: if we are what we eat then "we are one because we eat the same food" (cf. 1 Cor 10:17). Both of these sen-

²² The Jerusalem text has *πρὸ πάντων*, but we here follow the Coptic text as the oldest version.

sory referents of sharing food and drink are taken up at the ideological pole of the eucharistic ritual. The vine is a symbol of a shared identity, belonging to the Israel of which David is king, as we shall see. It seems that "family meals" (in the sense of daily common meals in a nuclear family) were not a feature of first century mediterranean culture (Osiek 1996:11-12). Instead, most people only experienced formal communal meals presided over by the *pater familias* as patron at a banquet. In this meal Jesus, the new David, is perceived, at the ideological pole of the meal symbolism, as the patron of the banquet of a renewed kingdom.

The bread in 9:4 symbolizes both an ingesting of new life (provided by God in the ritual) and new knowledge (provided by the ritual elder who mediates the presence of God through his/her teaching: *ὁθεν γὰρ ἡ κυριότης λαλεῖται, ἐκεῖ κύριός ἐστιν* 4:2). The bread is also a symbol of the unity of the eschatological community of Israel gathered into the kingdom of God/David (9:4) as is the meal in general (10:5).

However, the meal is also understood as ingesting God in some sense. Thus the thanks after the meal bless the Father for "your holy Name, which you have made to tabernacle (as in a temple) in our hearts" (10:1). While the provision of food by God turns all human beings in thankfulness to the Creator, the participants in this ritual meal receive the gracious gift of spiritual food and drink, effecting eternal life, through Jesus the son/child/servant of God (*ἡμῖν δὲ ἐχαρίσω πνευματικὴν τροφήν καὶ ποτὸν καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον* 10:3). The world was created so that its creatures would glorify God's Name, but this same Name is now dwelling inside the participant in the meal. Since the presence of God is mediated in the temple by his holy Name, this ideological construction of the Name living inside the individual/community draws on the understanding of the ingestion of holy food as eating God. It is not, however, in essence an individualistic image, but draws on the idea of the community as the new temple in which God's Name dwells (1 Cor 3:16; cf. Draper 1987:57-65).

According to Mary Douglas, there is an observable taxonomy to any meal, which also reflects the fundamental values of a particular society (Douglas 1975:249-275). Sadly, we are not provided with much information about the fuller meal which is taken between the thanks over the cup and bread, and the thanks after the meal (perhaps followed by the burning of incense as in the Coptic version and the *Apostolic Constitutions*). Nevertheless, the order cup-bread (cf. Lk 22:17-20 in most witnesses, including P⁷⁵, Ⲙ A B C; 1 Cor 10:16-17), partaken before the full meal, is ritually significant, particularly since the more usual sequence recorded in the

Christian tradition is bread-cup (in which the cup is taken after the meal, as in the accounts of the Last Supper in Mk 14:22-25 = Mt 26:26-29, 1 Cor 11:23-26). It highlights the significance of the cup as “vine of David”.

8.5 *Cup/Wine/Vine as Ritual Symbol*

The cup of wine over which a blessing is spoken represents what Turner calls an instrumental symbol, found in this part of the ritual only. At the gross, imprecise, sensory pole, wine is associated with party, celebration, joy, intoxication and even loss of control over the body. However, by extension, it is associated with the vine which produced the grapes as its fruit. In this further sensory aspect, it represents integral, organic growth and continuity, a oneness which branches out into many to produce fruit yet remains one. It is in the combination of oneness and branching out that fruit is produced and wine drunk. Since vines die back and are pruned in the winter and sprout vigorously in the spring, it may represent death to the old and the renewal of life and fertility. Wine is usually red in Palestine and hence its colour may suggest blood, slaughter and hence sacrifice.

Just which of the sensory associations is being activated in this ritual can only be gauged by the ideological pole of the symbol. Here the cup of wine is associated with “the holy vine of David your child” (τῆς ἁγίας ἀμπέλου Δαυιδ τοῦ παιδός σου 9:2). David is the founder of the royal house of Israel, king of the kingdom of Israel. As king of an ancient Near Eastern monarchy, he is understood to be the descendant of the divinity and hence the “child/son/servant of God” (παῖς has all these significations and it is best to keep them all in play). The vine which belongs to David is both his own house and also Israel, as his extended house (cf. Rordorf 1971:131-146; Betz 1996:265-268). As a reference to David’s own house (his failed and now renewed lineage), the vine clearly takes up the sensory aspect of the dry vine which sends out new shoots in the spring. Blood and sacrifice are nowhere in evidence, despite attempts to link this ritual symbol to the crucifixion. The *Didache* nowhere refers to the death or resurrection of Jesus. Renewed fertility and growth are signalled instead. With reference to Israel, the image takes up the sensory aspect of unity and fruitfulness. It is not only the lineage of David which is renewed, but Israel, the kingdom over which he rules. Hence the further sensory aspects of joy and celebration are also taken up in rejoicing over the renewal of both lineage and kingdom through Jesus, who is also God’s child/son/servant. He reveals the vine to those initiated into the community as king of the renewed kingdom.

Harnack (1884:29) declares himself unable to elucidate the expression “holy vine of David” and most critics have followed him in seeing here a “dark” expression (Niederwimmer 1989:183-184; Schöllgen 1991:121). However, a way forward is suggested by the fifteenth benediction of the *Shemoneh Esreh*: *אֲחֻצְמַח דָּוִד עֲבֹדֵן מְהֵרָה חֲצִמִּיחַ וְקִרְנוּ תְרוּמָה בִּישׁוּעָתְךָ כִּי לִישׁוּעָתְךָ קִיּוֹנוֹ כְּלִדְהוּם* (“Let the sprout of your servant David sprout quickly, and raise up his horn with your salvation, because we wait for your salvation all day long” [my translation]).²³ The Hebrew word *צִמַּח* refers to a sprout or shoot in general and can be used for a grape-vine, as in Ezekiel 17:9-10, where it stands parallel to *נֶפֶן* (which is usually translated *ἄμπελος* in the LXX) in 17:6. Here the image is deliberately ambiguous as a riddling *maschal*, and seems to refer alternately to the king and people of Israel. Harnack tentatively, but I believe appropriately, pointed to Isaiah 11:1 as the background to the text:

There shall come forth a shoot (חֹטֶר) from the stump of Jesse and a branch (נֶזֶר) shall grow out of his roots.

This reference to the shoot is followed by a reference to the ingathering of the dispersion of Israel in 11:11-12, just as in the *Didache* the “vine of David” symbolism is followed by ingathering symbolism in 9:4, 10:5. Harnack’s proposition is followed by Klein (1909:216-218), who adds a reference to Jeremiah 33:15: “I will raise a righteous sprout for David (אֲחֻצְמִיחַ) לְדָוִד צִמַּח צְדִיק [my translation]”. This text has a doublet in Jeremiah 23:5-8, which is even more apposite, since it follows the reference to the “sprout of David” with a reference to the ingathering of Israel to their own land in the last days which is similar to what is found in *Didache* 9:4, 10:5. Here the symbolism of the sprout is clearly a reference to the Davidic dynasty in 23:5 but there is a corporate reference to Israel in 23:6-8. Psalm 80:8-16 clearly refers the vine symbolism to Israel and not the dynasty of David (נֶפֶן מִמְצָרִים חֲסִיעַ; LXX Ps 79:9 *ἄμπελον ἐξ Αἰγύπτου μετήρας*).²⁴ The fragmentary evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls is inconclusive. 6Q 11 connects the messianic birth pangs (usually referred in the *Hodayoth* to the

²³ The translation “sprout” stresses the idea of vegetative growth appropriate to an agricultural society quite deliberately and provocatively, however quaint it sounds to urbanized academics (Trevett 1998:819-820). It could be translated “Let your shoot . . . shoot”, which would be even more amusing and ambiguous to English ears.

²⁴ The rabbis in bHull 92a debate the reference of the “vine” in this passage, but the question is whether it refers to the Torah or Jerusalem or Israel. David’s dynasty is nowhere mentioned. The debate is concluded by R. Simeon b. Lakish (A2), who pronounces that the vine refers to the people of Israel.

birth of the community, but seemingly here envisaging a Davidic figure) with the planting of a vine (הנפץ הנטעת). 4QFlor 1:11 relates the “sprout of David” to building the house (dynasty) of David promised in 2 Samuel 7. On the other hand, 1QH 6:15-16 clearly refers to Israel as a great vine reaching up to the sky and covering the earth with its shade. The *Damascus Document* 1:7 understands the “sprout” to refer to the community (ויצמח מישראל ומאחרן שרש).

In other words, “sprout of David” is an imprecise and ambiguous ritual expression in the eucharistic prayer of the *Didache*, which draws on a rich symbolic tradition in the culture of Israel. Its field of reference is not limited to the grape vine, although that is the immediate connection since it refers to the wine in the cup. Instead it draws on the wider symbolic tradition of the “sprout of David” (צמח דוד). It has both dynastic-messianic significance and also communal covenant dimensions. This symbol has had a continuing influence on Christian iconography, e.g. in the “Jesse tree” in stain glass windows, but this would be the subject of a further study.

The importance of this understanding of the connection between Jesus and David is highlighted in its repetition at the end of the meal: “Let the Lord come and let this world pass away. Hosanna to the house of David!” (10:6).²⁵ House in the ancient world could refer to either the broader family, including both slaves and goods, or the building in which the extended family lived, or to the ancestral lineage (Osiek 1996:9-11). In this case the reference in the *Didache* must be primarily to the lineage of David, since Jesus is referred to in parallel constructions. So the *Didache* community considered its members to be a new fictive kin, members of the new royal household (a kind of alternative *familia caesaris*, cf. Mk 3:31-35). Such an extended fictive family would also have provided a “means of social incorporation in a wider context” for those from a poor background without family support (Osiek 1996:21).

The centrality of the reference to David is highlighted by the frequent reference to the kingdom throughout the aggregation ritual, though understood now as the kingdom of God (ἡ βασιλεία σου). This is not a different kingdom to the kingdom of David, but the same thing in another form, since David is God’s child/son/servant. The Lord’s Prayer entreats the

²⁵ The Jerusalem manuscript of the text has τῷ θεῷ Δαυίδ, but the Coptic manuscript has τῷ οἴκῳ Δαυίδ and is by far the oldest and best witness at this point, especially since the text of the Apostolic Constitutions has τῷ υἱῷ Δαυίδ. Both H54 and CA attempt to remove the problematic reference of the text to the royal pretensions of the Christian movement, probably after the Jewish War.

coming of the kingdom (8:2); the prayer after the breaking of the bread also prays for the gathering of the ἐκκλησία from the corners of the earth into the kingdom (9:4). This prayer for the gathering of the church/assembly of Israel into the kingdom is repeated after the meal in the concluding prayer (10:5). Thus the cluster of referents to David/Jesus as child/son/servant in renewing the kingdom of David/God serves to integrate the whole aggregation rite.

It is likely that wine/vine had connotations of wisdom also (e.g. Sirach 24:17; Prov 9:1-6; Is 55:1), as is argued strongly by Betz (1996:264). This would link the sensory pole with the provision of knowledge in the liminal stage of the ritual and it connects with the ideological symbolism of the bread as knowledge. As we will see, there does seem to be an implicit reference to Wisdom underlying the symbolism. However, in the cup symbolism it is the reference to David which dominates. It is unlikely that David is understood primarily as the writer of Psalms, as argued by various scholars (Lietzmann 1964:190; Eisler 1926:6-12; Audet 1958:425-426). Taken in connection with the bread, life, David and Gentile initiation, the wisdom symbolism receives more weight, as we shall see.

8.6 *Loaf of Bread/Broken Bread as Ritual Symbol*

The bread over which a blessing is spoken is also an instrumental symbol in Turner's model. At its sensory pole, bread in the cultural context of the ancient Near East signifies basic food, the stuff of life, what sustains and nourishes at the most fundamental level. It is baked and served at a meal in the form of a single loaf which is broken and shared by everyone at the table. Thus it also signifies sharing at its most basic and everyday level. It calls to mind both the uniting of grains of wheat into flour and the uniting of the community by eating what is broken. At an extended level, bread calls to mind the process of sowing wheat, harvesting it, grinding and baking it into one loaf. Thus not only scattering in sowing but also gathering in harvest. All of these significata are taken up here.

At the ideological pole, the life and knowledge provided by God to the new member of the community by her/his baptism is understood as ingested, becoming an indivisible part of the new member of the community by eating. However, the bread is also referred to the gathering of the scattered people of Israel into the eschatological assembly which will be summoned from the four corners of the earth into the kingdom of God/David. By baptism the new member becomes a part of this ingathered people, whereas as Gentiles they had been alien to it.

Bread is a common cultural symbol of knowledge/wisdom in Jewish culture, often in conjunction with wine (Betz 1996:261-266; Neyrey 1991:366). A particularly significant reference point in the Old Testament would be Isaiah 55:1-5, where bread and wine and David come together in a promise that the Gentiles will seek out Israel in the eschatological time:

“Ho, every one who thirsts,
 come to the waters;
 and he who has no money,
 come, buy and eat!
 Come, buy wine and milk
 without money and without price.
 Why do you spend your money for that which is not bread,
 and your labor for that which does not satisfy?
 Harken diligently to me, and eat what is good,
 and delight yourselves in fatness.
 Incline your ear, and come to me;
 hear, that your soul may live;
 and I will make with you an everlasting covenant,
 my steadfast, sure love for David.
 Behold, I made him a witness to the peoples,
 a leader and commander for the peoples.
 Behold, you shall call nations that you know not,
 and nations that knew you not shall run to you,
 because of the LORD your God, and of the Holy One of Israel,
 for he has glorified you. (RSV)

This important text draws together many of the key themes we have noted in the *Didache*: bread, wine, David and life. Similar configurations of these symbols with the implied text of Isaiah 55 can be seen in John 4:1-42 (bread, water, life, the Christ, a Gentile/Samaritan woman) and John 6:26-68 (bread, drinking, life, Son of God, word/knowledge). Wisdom pronounces David to be a witness to the peoples and mediator of the covenant. The *Didache* community would have seen the fulfilment of this prophecy in the Gentiles who came to seek to join their community through Jesus, the descendant of David. Their coming in turn was understood to be a sign that the eschatological gathering of Israel into a new kingdom was imminent. It is likely that the wisdom tradition underpins the eucharistic symbolism here.

9. Conclusion

Our analysis of *Didache* 7-10 has shown that there is an internal coherence in the ritual symbolism of the whole. This supports our contention that

there is also a coherent ritual process lying behind the whole of 1-10 as an initiation ritual for Gentile converts. Life is the dominant symbol, indicating the successful adoption of the Way of Life by those baptized by the community. However, the instrumental symbols of the prayer and the meal cluster around the concept of incorporation into a new community, an assembly of a renewed kingdom of David/God made known in Jesus the successor of David, the son/child/servant of God. This new identity is signified by the utterance and continued indwelling of the Name of God in the baptized, symbolized by the eating of a holy meal. The community which used the eucharistic prayers of the *Didache* placed no emphasis on the death and resurrection of Jesus, but understood him in terms of Davidic succession and wisdom. This should not surprise us. The Jesus tradition as it is found in this text consists of what New Testament scholars have labelled "Q", and in a form independent of and perhaps earlier than that of Matthew and Luke (Rordorf 1991:394-423; Draper 1996b:72-91). From its relationship with Matthew in particular, it could be described as the community rule of the "Q" community (Draper 1996d:363 1999:25-48). It is well known that the "Q" account contains no Passion narrative and exhibits a wisdom christology (Kloppenborg 1987). It is unlikely that the eucharistic prayers of such a community would contain an anamnesis of the institution, with its emphasis on the sacrificial paschal death of Jesus. This community gives thanks (or "eucharistizes") for knowledge, life and reunion in the restored Israel of which Jesus as a new David is God's son/child/servant and makes it known to his own. It awaits gathering into God's eschatological kingdom and the coming of the Lord. The eucharistic prayer is complete in itself, and an insistence that the words of institution must have followed is anachronistic. Here, indeed, we may have the eucharistic prayers of the "Q" community in their simplicity and coherence.

Having said this, it must also be noted that these eucharistic prayers are found in the context of initiation into the community. It was in the nature of such prayers, we have argued, that they were flexible and were adapted to each situation in which they were uttered. Thus it should be recognized that the structure and framework of the eucharistic prayers would have been the same at each community celebration, but the specific content would have varied with context (as Audet rightly maintained in his otherwise problematic formal analysis). We cannot assume that the weekly eucharist of the community of the *Didache* on the "Lord's day of the Lord" (14:1) would have used exactly the same words each time, but the basic structure and outline of the prayers would have followed the form of the baptismal eucharist which has been preserved for us in *Didache* 9-10.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Audet, J.-P. 1958. *La Didachè: Instructions des Apôtres*. Paris: Gabalda.
- 1996. "Literary and Doctrinal Relationships of the 'Manual of Discipline'" in Draper (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research*, 129-147.
- Bell, C. 1989. "Ritual, Change and Changing Rituals." *Worship* 63, 31-41.
- 1992. *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*. New York: Oxford.
- Benoît, A. 1953. *Le Baptême Chrétien au Second Siècle*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Berger, P. & Luckmann, T. 1966. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Doubleday.
- Betz, J. 1996. "The Eucharist in the *Didache*" in Draper (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research*, 244-275.
- Bradshaw, P. F. 1992. *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 1997. "Introduction: The Evolution of Early Anaphoras" in P. F. Bradshaw (ed.), *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 1-18.
- Clerici, L. *Einsammlung der Zerstreuten. Liturgiegeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Vor- und Nachgeschichte der Fürbitte für die Kirche in Did. 9:4 und 10:5*. Münster: Westfalen [LQF 44].
- Daly, R. J. 1997. "The Eucharistic Theology of Edward J. Kilmartin, S. J.". *Proceedings of the NAAL/1997*.
- Dibelius, M. 1938. "Die Mahl-Gebete der *Didache*", *ZnW* 37, 261-283.
- Douglas, M. 1966. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- 1975. "Deciphering a Meal" in *Implicit Meanings: Essays in Anthropology*, 249-275. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- 1982. *Natural Symbols*. New York: Pantheon.
- Draper, J. A. 1983. *A Commentary on the Didache in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Cambridge.
- 1987. "The Tip of an Ice-Berg: The Temple of the Holy Spirit". *JTSA* 59, 57-65.
- 1995. "Social Ambiguity and the Production of Text: Prophets, Teachers, Bishops, and Deacons and the Development of the Jesus Tradition in the Community of the *Didache*" in C. N. Jefford (ed.), *The Didache in Context: Essays in its Text, History and Transmission*, 284-312. Leiden: Brill [SupNovT 77].
- (ed.) 1996. *The Didache in Modern Research*. Leiden: Brill [AGAJU 37].
- 1996a. "The *Didache* in Modern Research: An Overview" in Draper (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research*, 1-42.
- 1996b. "The Jesus Tradition in the *Didache*" in Draper (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research*, 72-91.
- 1996c. "Christian Self-Definition against the 'Hypocrites' in *Didache* 8" in Draper (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research*, 223-243.
- 1996d. "Torah and Troublesome Apostles in the *Didache* community" in Draper (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research*, 340-363.
- 1997. "The Role of Ritual in the Alternation of Social Universe: Jewish-Christian Initiation of Gentiles in the *Didache*". *Listening: Journal of Religion and Culture* 32, 48-67.
- 1999. "The Genesis and Narrative Thrust of the Paraenesis in the Sermon on the Mount." *JSTNT* 75, 25-48.

- Eisler, R. 1926. "Das letzte Abendmahl". *ZNW* 25, 6-12.
- Eliade, M. 1958. *Rites and Symbols of Initiation: The Mysteries of Birth and Rebirth*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Elliott, N. 1994. *Liberating Paul: The Justice of God and the Politics of the Apostle*. Maryknoll: Orbis.
- Felmy, K. C. 1993. "'Was unterscheidet dies Nacht von allen anderen Nächten?' Die Funktion des Stiftungsberichtes in der urchristlichen Eucharistiefeier nach *Didache* 9f und dem Zeugnis Justins." *Jahrbuch für Liturgie und Hymnologie* 27, 1-15.
- Foley, J. M. 1995. *The Singer of Tales in Performance*. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Gamber, K. 1987. "Die 'Eucharistie' der *Didache*," *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 101, 3-32.
- Gennep, A. van 1960. *The Rites of Passage*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Giet, S. 1967. "La *Didachè*, enseignement des douze apôtres?," *Melito* 3, 223-236.
- 1970. *L'énigme de la Didachè*. Paris: Ophrys [PFLUS 149].
- Giraud, C. 1981. *La Struttura Letteraria della Preghiera Eucaristica: Saggio sulla genesi letteraria di una forma*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press [Analecta Biblica 92].
- Goppelt, L. 1972. 'ΥΔΩΡ in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* VIII, 314-333. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Gorman, F. H. 1994. "Ritual Studies and Biblical Studies; Assessment of the Past, Prospects for the Future". *Semeia* 67, 13-36.
- Harnack, A. 1884. *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel nebst Untersuchungen zur ältesten Geschichte der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts*. Leipzig: Hinrich's [TU 2,1/2].
- Harris, J. R. 1887. *The Teaching of the Apostles*. London: Clay/Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Harrison, E. F. "Some Patterns of New Testament *Didachè*", *Biblia Sacra* 119, 118-128.
- Heinemann, J. 1977. *Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns*. New York: Ktav.
- Hoffman, L. A. 1987. *Beyond the Text: A Holistic Approach to Liturgy*. Bloomington, IN.: Jewish Literature and Culture.
- 1991. "Reconstructing Ritual as Identity and Culture" in P. F. Bradshaw & L. A. Hoffman, *The Making of Jewish and Christian Worship*, 22-41. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Jefford, C. N. 1989. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. Leiden: Brill [VigChr.E 11].
- Patterson, S. J. 1989-1990. "A Note on *Didache* 12.2a (Coptic)". *Second Century* 7, 65-75.
- Jeremias, J. 1967. *The Prayers of Jesus*. London: SCM [SBTh 6].
- Jones, F. S. & Mirecki, P. A. 1995. "Considerations on the Coptic Papyrus of the *Didache* (British Library Oriental Manuscript 9271)" in C. N. Jefford, *The Didache in Context: Essays on its Text, History and Transmission*, 47-87. Leiden: Brill.
- Klein, G. 1909. *Der älteste Christliche Katechismus und die Jüdische Propaganda-Literatur*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Klinghardt, M. 1996. *Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgesellschaft*. Tübingen: Francke Verlag.
- Kloppenborg, J. 1987. *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Kollmann, B. 1990. *Ursprung und Gestalten der frühchristlichen Mahlfeier*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht [Göttingen Theologische Arbeiten 43].
- Kraft, R. A. 1965. *The Apostolic Fathers. III. Barnabas and the Didache*. London: Nelson.

- Kuhn, K. G. & Procksch, O. J. 1964. ΑΓΙΟΣ in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* I, 88-115. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Lake, K. 1905. *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lietzmann, H. 1964. *Mass and Lord's Supper: A Study in the History of the Liturgy*, trns. D. H. G. Reeve. Leiden: Brill.
- Manson, T. W. 1955-6. "The Lord's Prayer". BJRL 38, 99-113, 436-448.
- Mazza, E. 1986. L'Eucaristia di 1 Corinzi 10:16-17 in rapporto a *Didache* 9-10. *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 100, 193-223.
- 1994. "La structure des anaphores alexandrine et antiochienne." *Irénikon* 67/1, 5-40.
- 1995. *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.
- 1996. "Didache 9-10: Elements of a Eucharistic Interpretation" in Draper (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research*, 276-299.
- Milavec, A. 1989. "The Pastoral Genius of the *Didache*: An Analytical Translation and Commentary" in J. Neusner, E. S. Frerichs & A. J. Levine (eds.), *Religious Writings and Religious Systems* II, 105-110. Atlanta: Scholars Press [BStR].
- Moule, C. F. D. 1982. "A Reconsideration of the Context of *Maranatha*" in *Essays in New Testament Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 222-226.
- Nautin, P. 1959. "La composition de la 'Didachê' et son titre". RHR 78, 191-214.
- Neyrey, J. H. 1991. "Ceremonies in Luke-Acts: The Case of Meals and Table Fellowship" in J. H. Neyrey (ed.), *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, 361-387. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.
- 1996. "Meals, Food, and Table Fellowship" in R. Rohrbaugh, *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*, 159-182. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.
- Niederwimmer, K. 1989. *Die Didache*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht [KAV I].
- Osiek, C. 1996. "The Family in Early Christianity: 'Family Values' Revisited". CBQ 38, 1-24.
- Overman, J. A. 1990. *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Patterson, S. J. 1995. "Didache 11-13: The Legacy of Radical Itinerancy in Early Christianity" in C. N. Jefford, *The Didache in Context: Essays on its Text, History and Transmission*, 313-329. Leiden: Brill.
- Reiff, S. C. 1991. "The Early History of Jewish Worship" in P. F. Bradshaw & L. A. Hoffman, *The Making of Jewish and Christian Worship*, 109-136. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- 1993. *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer: New Perspectives on Jewish Liturgical History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Riggs, J. W. 1984. "From Gracious Table to Sacramental Elements: The Tradition-History of *Didache* 9 and 10". *Second Century* 4, 83-102.
- 1995. "The Sacred Food of *Didache* 9-10 and Second Century Ecclesiologies." in C. N. Jefford, *The Didache in Context: Essays on its Text, History and Transmission*, 257-283.
- Rordorf, W. 1971. "La vigne et le vin dans la tradition Juive et Chrétienne". *Annales d'Université de Neuchâtel* 1969-1970, 131-146.
- 1978. "The *Didache*" in Rordorf et al. (eds.), *The Eucharist of the Early Christians*, trns. M. J. O'Connell, 1-23. New York: Pueblo.

- 1991. "Does the *Didache* Contain the Jesus Tradition Independently of the Synoptic Gospels?" in H. Wansbrough (ed.), *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*, 394-423. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- 1996a. "An Aspect of the Judeo-Christian Ethic: the Two Ways" in Draper (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research*, 148-164.
- 1996b. "Baptism according to the *Didache*" in Draper (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research*, 212-222.
- 1997. "Die Mahlgebete in *Didache* Kap. 9-10: Ein neuer *Status Quaestionis*". *Vigiliae Christianae* 51, 229-246.
- Rordorf, W. & Tuillier, A. 1988². *La Doctrine des Douze Apôtres (Didache)*. Paris: Les éditions du Cerf (SC 248).
- Safrai, S. & Stern, M. 1974. *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions I-II*. Assen: van Gorcum.
- Saldarini, A. J. 1994. *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Schöllgen, G. 1991. *Didache—Zwölf-Apostel-Lehre. Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Freiburg: Herder [FC 1].
- Suggs, M. J. "The Christian Two Ways Tradition: Its Antiquity, Form, and Function" in D. E. Aune (ed.), *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honour of Allen P. Wikgren*, 60-74. Leiden: Brill [NovTestSupp 33].
- Talley, T. J. 1976. "From Berakah to Eucharistia." *Worship* 50, 115-137.
- Taylor, C. 1886. *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, with Illustrations from the Talmud*. Cambridge: Deighton Bell.
- Thomas, Y. 1996. "Fathers as Citizens of Rome, Rome as a City of Fathers (Second Century BC-Second Century AD)" in A. Burguière, C. Klapisch-Zuber, M. Segalen & F. Zonabend, *A History of the Family I*, 228-269. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Trevett, C. 1998. Review of J. A. Draper, *The Didache in Modern Research* in JTS 49/2, 818-820.
- Tuckett, C. M. 1996. "Synoptic Tradition in the *Didache*" in Draper (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research*, 92-128.
- Turner, C. H. 1912. "The Early Christian Ministry and the *Didache*" in *Studies in Early Church History*, 1-31. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Turner, V. 1967. *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- 1968. *The Drums of Affliction: A Study of Religious Processes among the Ndembu of Zambia*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- 1969. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- 1974. *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Turner, V. & Turner, E. L. B. (ed.) 1985. *On the Edge of the Bush: Anthropology as Experience*. Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Press.
- Vööbus, A. 1968. *Liturgical Traditions in the Didache*. Stockholm: ETSE.
- Wehr, L. 1987. *Arznei der Unsterblichkeit. Die Eucharistie bei Ignatius von Antiochen und im Johannesevangelium*. Münster: Aschendorff [Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen n.f. 18]
- Wengst, K. 1984. *Didache (Apostellehre), Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Klemensbrief, Schrift an Diognet*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft [SUC 2].

Zahavy, T. 1990. *Studies in Jewish Prayer*. Lanham, MD.

——— 1991. "The Politics of Piety: Social Conflict and the Emergence of Rabbinic Liturgy" in P. F. Bradshaw & L. A. Hoffman, *The Making of Jewish and Christian Worship*, 42-68. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

University of Natal, School of Theology,
P/Bag X01 Scottsville 3209, South Africa

.

