



THE EUCHARIST IN THE DIDACHE

BY

GLEN JAMES CLARY

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE, SOUTHWESTERN CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY, 2001  
MASTER OF DIVINITY, WESTMINSTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, 2005

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO  
THE FACULTY OF ERSKINE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY  
FOR THE DOCTOR OF MINISTRY DEGREE

APRIL 21, 2015

THE EUCHARIST IN THE DIDACHE

Approved for the Examining Committee

---

Advisor

---

Date

Accepted:

---

Director, Doctor of Ministry Program

---

Date

## CIRCULATION AND COPY AGREEMENT

In presenting this dissertation as required for the Doctor of Ministry degree from Erskine Theological Seminary, I agree that the McCain Library may make it available for inspection and circulation in accordance with its regulations governing materials of this type.

I agree that permission to copy from, or to publish, this dissertation may be granted by the professor under whose direction it was written or by the Director of the D.Min. program, when such copying or publication is solely for scholarly purposes and does not involved potential financial gain.

I understand that any copying from, or publication of, this dissertation which involves potential financial gain will not be allowed without written permission.

---

## ABSTRACT

### THE EUCHARIST IN THE DIDACHE

by

Glen James Clary

April 2015

147 pages

This dissertation explores the significance of the eucharistic theology and liturgy of the Didache for Reformed worship. By a careful study of Didache 9, 10 and 14, we develop a clear picture of the eucharistic customs of the church during the earliest stages of church history. The purpose of the dissertation is to propose and defend certain liturgical reforms to the worship of the church. Its aim is to continue the work that the Reformers began in the sixteenth century, namely, to reform the liturgy of the church according to Scripture and the customs of the ancient church.

DEDICATION

With loving gratitude to

Catherine Anne Clary

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am exceedingly grateful for all the support and assistance that I received while pursuing the Doctor of Ministry degree at Erskine Theological Seminary. First, I would like to thank my wife, Cathe, for her enthusiastic support and for taking care of our children whenever I was in class or at the library or locked away in my study. I would also like to thank my children: Ariel, Samuel, Gracie, Talitha, Sophia, Jesse and Josie. My studies made it necessary for me to spend time away from the family, and all of you pitched in to take care of things at home. I am also grateful to the congregations that I served during my studies at Erskine, namely, Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church in West Collingswood, NJ and Providence Presbyterian Church in Pflugerville, TX. I also wish to express thanks to my colleagues, Dr. Jim Cassidy and Mr. Bob Canode, for providing pulpit supply during my study leave in March. I am very thankful for the numerous encouraging cards from Jim and Johanna Huggans. I am also grateful to Mary Old for her assistance in editing the dissertation and to Dr. Mark Ross, my advisor, for helping me bring the project to completion. Finally, I am profoundly grateful to Dr. Hughes Oliphant Old for his pastoral counsel, unwavering support, gracious encouragement and outstanding teaching. It was from Dr. Old that I learned the foundational truth of Christian worship, namely, that worship is a work of Holy Spirit in the Body of Christ to the glory of the Father. *Soli Deo gloria.*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction		1
Chapter 1	Biblical and Theological Principles	8
Chapter 2	The Eucharist in the Didache, Part One	35
Chapter 3	The Eucharist in the Didache, Part Two	76
Chapter 4	Reforming the Worship of the Church	100
Chapter 5	The Literature Search	118
Conclusion		126
Appendix		129
Bibliography		140



## INTRODUCTION

When Ulrich Zwingli began his ministry in Zurich on 1 January 1519, he announced from the pulpit that he intended to preach “the entire Gospel of Matthew, one passage after another, rather than following the usual lectionary of chopped up Sunday Gospels.”<sup>1</sup> Throughout that year, day after day, hordes of hungry saints swarmed to Zwingli’s pulpit to feast on the spiritual banquet that God’s servant set before them from the Holy Scriptures. His sermons were electrifying, “and the excitement of revival and reform came upon the city.”<sup>2</sup> It was Zwingli’s preaching that “gave birth to the Reformation, maintained it, and carried it through to a successful conclusion.”<sup>3</sup>

Under Zwingli’s leadership, the city of Zurich began to reform its liturgical customs one by one. The Mass, the baptismal rite, the church calendar and the daily office were all reshaped according to the Word. Relics and images were removed from the churches; altars were replaced with tables; priestly vestments were discarded. The

---

<sup>1</sup>As reported by Heinrich Bullinger, cited in Hughes Oliphant Old, *The Patristic Roots of Reformed Worship*, American Edition (Black Mountain, NC: Worship Press, 2010; 1975) 195; cf. Gottfried W. Locher, *Zwingli’s Thought: New Perspectives* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981) 5–6; Glen J. Clary, “Ulrich Zwingli and the Swiss Anabaptists: Sola Scriptura and the Reformation of Christian Worship” in *The Confessional Presbyterian* 6 (2010): 108–24.

<sup>2</sup>Bard Thompson, “Reformed Liturgies in Translation Part 1: Ulrich Zwingli” in *Bulletin of the Theological Seminary of the Evangelical and Reformed Church* XXVII, 4 (October 1956) 1; hereafter Thompson, “Reformed Liturgies.”

<sup>3</sup>Locher, 1.

whole liturgy of the church was gradually and thoroughly overhauled. It was reformed according to Scripture, the only infallible standard for worship.<sup>4</sup>

At the center of the Reformers' efforts to purify Christian worship was the sacrament of holy communion. The enormous amount of attention that they gave to the doctrine and practice of the Lord's Supper is bewildering to many modern evangelicals, who tend to treat the Supper "casually, as a pleasant and cozy ceremony," which seldom inspires serious theological reflection.<sup>5</sup> For the Reformers, however, it was a matter of first importance, one that often led to vigorous controversy.<sup>6</sup> From the Colloquy of Marburg (1529) to the Colloquy of Montbéliard (1586), eucharistic doctrine was fervently debated among Protestants. Indeed, "intramural Protestant polemics focused on the Lord's Supper more than on any other single issue."<sup>7</sup>

In the century of the Reformation the Supper was the single most commonly discussed topic. Protestants and Roman Catholics alike spilled more ink over this than over justification by faith or the authority of the Bible. It was the litmus test that defined a man's religion.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>On the reformation of worship in Zurich, see Locher, 1–30; Bard Thompson, *Liturgies of the Western Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980, 1961) 141–56 (hereafter Thompson, *Liturgies*); and Thompson, "Reformed Liturgies," 1–21. One may also consult George R. Potter, *Zwingli* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976).

<sup>5</sup>Robert Letham, *The Lord's Supper: Eternal Word in Broken Bread* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, 2001) 1. Keith Mathison remarks, "One of the most interesting phenomena that one encounters when comparing the writings of the sixteenth-century Reformers with the writings of their twentieth-century heirs is the different amount of attention devoted to the Lord's Supper;" Keith A. Mathison, *Given For You: Reclaiming Calvin's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, 2002) xv.

<sup>6</sup>See Hughes Oliphant Old, "Eucharist, Reformation Controversies On," in *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*, ed. Peter E. Fink (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1990) 425–29, 425.

<sup>7</sup>Letham, 1.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*, 1.

The Reformers were zealous to recover the Biblical doctrine and practice of the Lord's Supper. Their concern was not only with eucharistic theology but with eucharistic worship. Hence, in the early 1520s, they turned their attention to revising the communion service.<sup>9</sup> Their first attempts to reform the liturgy were rather modest. They generally involved at least three things: translating the prayers into the common tongue, removing all sacrificial language and serving both elements to the whole congregation.<sup>10</sup>

In February of 1524, Diebold Schwarz, a minister in Strasbourg, “celebrated a German Mass much like the service Luther” had proposed in his *Formula missae* (1523).<sup>11</sup> Although the service “was not a Reformed communion liturgy but an expurgated Mass, it was an important step toward a truly Reformed celebration of the sacrament.”<sup>12</sup> That same year, the Strasbourg Reformers began calling for “a more radical reform of the eucharistic liturgy,” and by Easter of 1525, they had instituted a Reformed communion service.<sup>13</sup> Over the next few decades, the Reformers of Strasbourg and other cities continued to revise the liturgy, and by the time that Calvin produced the Genevan Psalter (1542), he had at his disposal a rich tradition of Reformed eucharistic customs to build upon. Indeed, the Genevan Psalter is the culmination of a widespread, communal

---

<sup>9</sup>See Old, *Patristic Roots*, 13–50.

<sup>10</sup>Hughes Oliphant Old, *Worship: Reformed According to Scripture*, Revised and Expanded Edition (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002) 126.

<sup>11</sup>Old, *Worship*, 127. On Luther's *Formula missae*, see Thompson, *Liturgies*, 95–137.

<sup>12</sup>Old, *Worship*, 127.

<sup>13</sup>See Old, *Patristic Roots*, 23, 39. Martin Bucer's *Grund und Ursach*, published at the end of 1524, offers a defense of the liturgical reforms that he and his colleagues were implementing in Strasbourg; see Ottomar Frederick Cyprus, *Basic Principles: Translation and Commentary of Martin Bucer's "Grund und Ursach," 1524* (Ph.D. Dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1971; Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 2003); cf. Old, *Patristic Roots*, 23–38.

effort to reform the liturgy. As Hughes Oliphant Old says, it is “in a very real sense the liturgy not of Calvin, not of Geneva, but the liturgy of the Reformed church.”<sup>14</sup>

It is significant that Calvin’s title for the Genevan Psalter claims that the liturgical forms contained therein are modelled after the customs of the ancient church: “*La Forme des prières et chantz ecclésiastiques avec la manière d’administrer les sacremens ... selon la coustume de l’église ancienne.*”<sup>15</sup> Calvin and his colleagues frequently claimed patristic support for their liturgical ideas, and we have every reason, says Hughes Oliphant Old, to take them seriously.<sup>16</sup> They deliberately developed their approach to worship by returning, first and foremost, to the Scriptures but also to the fathers of the church, whom they regarded as fallible, though generally reliable, interpreters of Scripture. As Calvin understood it, to worship in continuity with the “the primitive and purer church” was to align oneself with the apostolic tradition.<sup>17</sup> This, of course, was his motivation for reforming the liturgy “according to the custom of the ancient church.”<sup>18</sup>

The Reformers saw patristic literature as a window through which they might catch a glimpse at how the apostolic church worshiped. Through a careful study of the

---

<sup>14</sup>Old, *Patristic Roots*, 96.

<sup>15</sup>Wulfert de Greef, *The Writings of John Calvin*, Expanded Edition (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008) 113; cf. Old, *Patristic Roots*, 98.

<sup>16</sup>See Old, *Patristic Roots*, xiii; cf. Esther Chung-Kim, *Inventing Authority: The Use of the Church Fathers in Reformation Debates over the Eucharist* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2011); Nicholas Thompson, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and Patristic Tradition in the Theology of Martin Bucer, 1534–1546* (Leiden: Brill, 2005); Irena Backus, ed., *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2001); A. N. S. Lane, *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1999); Old, *Patristic Roots*; and Pierre Frankel, *Testimonia Patrum: The Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melancthon* (Geneva, 1961).

<sup>17</sup>J. K. S. Reid, ed., *Calvin: Theological Treatises*, Library of Christian Classics, vol. 22 (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954) 215.

<sup>18</sup>See Lee Palmer Wandel, ed., *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Reformation* (Leiden: Brill, 2014) 233; hereafter, Wandel, *Companion*.

church fathers, they aimed to draw closer to the pure fountain of Holy Scripture. As a result of the new printing press and the fastidious scholarship of Christian humanism, the works of the fathers were readily available to the Reformers. However, they did not have at their disposal one of the earliest Christian writings, namely, the Didache.<sup>19</sup>

In 1873, “Archbishop Philotheos Bryennios was browsing in the library of the Greek Convent of the Holy Sepulchre in Istanbul when, by chance, he noticed the text of the Didache hidden away within a bound collection of early church writings.”<sup>20</sup>

Almost overnight, scholars in Europe, England, and America expressed their complete astonishment that such an ancient and important work had finally surfaced. When the first English translation prepared by Hitchcock and Brown was released on 20 March 1884 in New York bookstores, five thousand copies were sold on the first day.<sup>21</sup>

If the Reformers are correct in assuming that the fountain stream of liturgical tradition is purest at its head, then the Didache may very well preserve the purest example of the celebration of the eucharist in patristic literature. Hughes Oliphant Old does not exaggerate its value when he refers to it as “the most important document we have concerning the celebration of Communion in the earliest days of church history.”<sup>22</sup> The

---

<sup>19</sup>Since many of the fathers, such as Eusebius and Athanasius, mention the Didache, the Reformers were aware that a document by that title once existed, but they were unaware of its contents.

<sup>20</sup>Aaron Milavec, *The Didache: Text, Translation, Analysis, and Commentary* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003) xii; hereafter, Milavec, *Commentary*. The scribe who made the copy of the Didache that Bryennios discovered identifies himself as “Leon, scribe and sinner” and “dates the completion of his work as 1056;” the codex “now resides in the library of the Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem where it has been catalogued as Codex Hierosolymitanus 54” (ibid., x).

<sup>21</sup>Milavec, *Commentary*, xii.

<sup>22</sup>Old, *Worship*, 121. It was through the teaching of Jean-Jacques von Allmen and especially of Willy Rordorf that Hughes Oliphant Old was introduced to the tremendous usefulness of the Didache for the study of early Christian worship. See Old, *Holy Communion in the Piety of the Reformed Church* (Powder Springs, GA: Tolle Lege Press, 2013) 856.

Didache represents the springtime of the liturgy and portrays a “picture of Christian worship in its simplest and purest form.”<sup>23</sup> As Jonathan Draper observes,

The Didache presents evidence of the utmost significance for the study of the origins of Christian liturgy and worship, since it offers the earliest picture of baptism (7–8) and eucharist (9–10) in the early Church. It differs strikingly from traditional pictures and later practice, offering a markedly Jewish emphasis. Moreover, since liturgical practice was likely to be long established in the community before it was written down and collected in the Didache, it offers witness to a practice pre-dating the text by some time.<sup>24</sup>

Therefore, the rediscovery of the Didache provides a critical resource for doing precisely what the sixteenth-century Reformers aspired to do, namely, “reform the church’s worship in light of the Biblical witness and the practice of the ancient church.”<sup>25</sup>

### Purpose, Goals, and Structure

Our aim in writing this dissertation is to continue the work that the Reformers began in the sixteenth century, namely, to reform the liturgy of the church. Specifically, the purpose of the dissertation is to propose and defend liturgical reforms to the worship of the church that I currently pastor, Providence Presbyterian Church in Pflugerville, TX. There are two goals that I hope to achieve: (1) to develop a clear picture of the eucharistic

---

<sup>23</sup>R. C. D. Jasper and G. J. Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1992) 3.

<sup>24</sup>Jonathan A. Draper, “The Apostolic Fathers: The Didache,” in *The Expository Times*, vol. 117, no. 5 (London: SAGE Publications, 2006): 177–81, 180. The majority of modern Didache scholars date the composition of the document to the first century, ca. 50–90 A. D. See discussion in Aaron Milavec, *The Didache: Faith, Hope, and Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50–70 C. E.* (Mahwah, NJ: The Newman Press, 2003); Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser, eds., *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2002); Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache*, trans. Linda M. Maloney, ed. Harold W. Attridge (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1998); Jonathan A. Draper, ed., *The Didache in Modern Research* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996); and Clayton N. Jefford, *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995).

<sup>25</sup>J. Dudley Weaver Jr, *Presbyterian Worship: A Guide for Clergy* (Louisville, KY: Geneva Press 2002) 28.

customs of the church during the earliest stages of church history by a careful study of the Didache and (2) to draft a plan for revising the worship of Providence Presbyterian Church in accordance with Scripture and the liturgical customs expressed in the Didache.

Chapter one sets forth the biblical and theological principles that form the foundation of this project. Here, we consider the relationship between theology and liturgy, the authority of Scripture in regulating worship, and the role of tradition and the church fathers in revising the liturgy. In chapter two, we examine the eucharistic prayers of Didache 9–10 in order to understand the theology that shaped those prayers and is expressed through them. We explore what the Didache teaches us about the eucharistic theology of the early Christians and how that theology was brought to expression in their liturgical customs. Chapter three examines the liturgical material in Didache 14 in order to discern the manner and context in which the eucharist was celebrated in the dominical service of the earliest Christian assemblies.

Chapter four endeavors to apply the theological and practical lessons gleaned from the study of the Didache to my current ministry context. Here, I describe the liturgical customs of Providence Presbyterian Church and set forth various proposals for reforming those customs in light of the lessons derived from the Didache. My hope is to present this plan for liturgical reform to the Session of Providence Presbyterian Church, so that the Session can consider the proposed changes and, if desired, implement them in an appropriate manner. Chapter five provides a survey of the literature that I found most helpful in my study of the eucharist in the Didache. The conclusion reflects on the significance of the Didache for Christian worship in general and for the ongoing task of reforming the church according to Scripture.

## CHAPTER ONE

### BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES

Before we examine the eucharist in the Didache, we will briefly set forth the Biblical and theological principles that guide our study. We will consider these principles under the following four headings: (1) the relationship between theology and liturgy, (2) *sola Scriptura*, (3) the role of tradition and (4) the Reformers' use of the fathers.

#### 1. The Relationship between Theology and Liturgy

As a result of growing interest in historic liturgies, the field of liturgical theology began to flourish in the second half of the twentieth century.<sup>1</sup> The term “liturgical theology” refers both to theology *of* worship and theology *from* worship: the former meaning doctrines about worship; the latter, doctrines derived from liturgical texts. More recently, however, some scholars have argued that the liturgy itself is theology, indeed, primary theology (*theologia prima*) from which is derived all secondary theology

---

<sup>1</sup>Martha L. Moore-Keish, *Do This in Remembrance of Me: A Ritual Approach to Reformed Eucharistic Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008) 62. Recent examples of liturgical theology include David W. Fagerberg, *Theologia Prima: What is Liturgical Theology?* (Chicago/Mundelein, IL: Hillenbrand Books, 2004); Kevin W. Irwin, *Context and Text: Method in Liturgical Theology* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1994); Gordon Lathrop, *Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993); David Fagerberg, *What is Liturgical Theology? A Study in Methodology* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992); Aidan Kavanagh, *On Liturgical Theology* (New York: Pueblo Publishing, 1984); and Alexander Schmemmann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003, 1966).



(*theologia secunda*), namely, subsequent theological reflection on the liturgy.<sup>2</sup> Thus, the liturgy is primary, and formulated doctrines are secondary, derivative and subordinate.<sup>3</sup> This notion “challenges the common Reformed view that liturgy follows theology.”<sup>4</sup> For several decades now, there has been a “tug-of-war” between liturgical scholars “over whether liturgy should exercise control over doctrine or doctrine should exercise control over liturgy.”<sup>5</sup>

One of the maxims of contemporary liturgical theology is *lex orandi, lex credendi*. The expression is derived from a fifth century letter ascribed to Prosper of Aquitaine.<sup>6</sup> Prosper writes, *Ut legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi*.<sup>7</sup> This saying is interpreted by Aidan Kavanagh and David Fagerberg to mean that “the law of praying (*lex supplicandi* or *lex orandi*) establishes (*statuat*) the law of believing (*legem credendi*).”<sup>8</sup> Thus, in their view, *lex orandi* exists prior to and determines *lex credendi*, and the latter, therefore, cannot be the foundation of the former. The “relationship of praying and believing is unidirectional; we do not believe and then worship, but we

---

<sup>2</sup>See Fagerberg, *Theologia Prima*, 39–69; Irwin, *Context and Text*, 44–74; Robert F. Taft, “Mass Without the Consecration? The Historic Agreement on the Eucharist between the Catholic Church and the Assyrian Church of the East,” *Worship* 77, no. 6 (Nov. 2003): 482–509, 496. Cf. Moore-Keish, 61–85; and Robert F. Taft, “Liturgy as Theology,” *Worship* 56, no. 2 (March 1982): 113–17.

<sup>3</sup>The liturgical act, says Kavanagh, is “the primary and foundational theological act from which all subsequent theological activity arises,” *Worship*, 57 (July 1983): 321–22.

<sup>4</sup>Moore-Keish, 12.

<sup>5</sup>Frank C. Senn, *The People’s Work: A Social History of the Liturgy* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2006) 227.

<sup>6</sup>Moore-Keish, 63. See also J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina* (Paris, 1844–55) 51:205–12; Irwin, *Context and Text*, 32.

<sup>7</sup>See Geoffrey Wainwright, *Doxology, The Praise of God in Worship, Doctrine and Life: A Systematic Theology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980) 225–26.

<sup>8</sup>Moore-Keish, 63.

encounter God in worship, and therefore we believe.”<sup>9</sup> The liturgy is primary and establishes theology; the order cannot be reversed. “Secondary theology, then, as a presentation of belief, follows from worship.”<sup>10</sup>

This interpretation of *lex orandi, lex credendi* has been challenged by several scholars including Geoffrey Wainwright, Kevin Irwin, and Bryan Spinks.<sup>11</sup> For example, Spinks remarks that “the idea that doctrine only flowed from liturgy and that doctrine never impacted and changed liturgical practice is pious humbug and wishful thinking.”<sup>12</sup> Likewise, according to Wainwright and Irwin, the Latin epigram does not presume liturgical fixity, nor does it mean that the church should draw on liturgical practice as the sole or chief norm for doctrine. Rather, the liturgy expresses the church’s faith and may only serve as a source for establishing theology to the degree that it is founded on Holy Scripture. Moreover, Wainwright argues,

The Latin tag *lex orandi, lex credendi* may be construed in two ways. The more usual way makes the rule of prayer a norm for belief: what is prayed indicates what may and must be believed. But from the grammatical point of view it is equally possible to reverse subject and predicate and so take the tag as meaning that the rule of faith is the norm for prayer: what must be believed governs what may and should be prayed. The linguistic ambiguity of the Latin tag corresponds to a material interplay which in fact takes place between worship and doctrine in Christian practice: worship influences doctrine, and doctrine worship.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid.

<sup>11</sup>See Kevin Irwin, *Liturgical Theology: A Primer* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1990) 46–47; Alister E. McGrath, *Christian Theology: An Introduction*, Second Edition (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000) 223. There are several helpful essays on *lex orandi, lex credendi* in *Ecumenical Theology in Worship, Doctrine and Life* edited by David S. Cunningham, et al. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).

<sup>12</sup>Bryan D. Spinks, *Do This in Remembrance of Me: The Eucharist from the Early Church to the Present Day* (London: SCM Press, 2013) xii.

<sup>13</sup>Wainwright, *Doxology*, 218; cf. Senn, 227.

Thus, the relationship between theology and liturgy is dialectical; it is a two-way relationship.<sup>14</sup> *Lex orandi, lex credendi* is a two-directional principle; theology and liturgy are mutually formative; they are “correlative norms.”<sup>15</sup>

Another theologian who has weighed in on the issue is Paul Marshall. Marshall offers a stinging critique of the interpretation of *lex orandi, lex credendi* by Kavanagh and Fagerberg.<sup>16</sup> They present, says Marshall, “the liturgy as simply a given that ‘the people’ receive passively, rather than actively participating in the formation and critique of that liturgy.”<sup>17</sup> To claim that there is “a one-way street, from the divinely given liturgy to the human response of believing” is to perpetuate “a view of the liturgy that is fixed, authoritarian, and hierarchical.”<sup>18</sup> Contrary to this interpretation, Marshall claims that Prosper “never intended to posit liturgical action as the single norm that establishes Christian believing.”<sup>19</sup> Rather, “Prosper’s overall point, arguing against semi-Pelagianism, is that believing is a gift from God, not a human achievement.”<sup>20</sup> Prosper writes,

---

<sup>14</sup>Cf. Irwin, *Context and Text*, 16; McGrath, *Christian Theology*, 222.

<sup>15</sup>See Wainwright, *Doxology*, 161, 176. Kavanagh rejects Wainwright’s interpretation of Prosper and argues that the word *statuat* in Prosper’s original saying can only mean that *lex orandi* founds or establishes *lex credendi*. “So long, I think, as the verb stays in the sentence it is not possible to reverse subject and predicate any more than one can reverse the members of the statement: the foundation supports the house,” says Kavanagh (*Worship* 57, 323); cf. Kavanagh, *On Liturgical Theology*, 92.

<sup>16</sup>Moore-Keish, 65. See Paul V. Marshall, “Reconsidering ‘Liturgical Theology’: Is There a *Lex Orandi* for All Christians?” in *Studia Liturgica* 25 (1995): 129–51.

<sup>17</sup>Moore-Keish, 65.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid.

<sup>20</sup>Moore-Keish, 65; Senn, 225.

[L]et us look at the sacred testimony of priestly intercessions which have been transmitted from the apostles and which are uniformly celebrated throughout the world and in every catholic church ... so that the law [or rule or pattern] of supplicating [not the more general *orandi*, ‘praying’] may establish [or confirm] the law [or rule or pattern] of believing [not ‘the faith’].<sup>21</sup>

Thus, Prosper appeals to the universal liturgical practice of praying for the salvation of all people, “not because it is the only source, or even the first source, for theological reflection, but because it is a reliable source that demonstrates the broad apostolic Christian faith.”<sup>22</sup>

Whatever Prosper may have intended by his maxim, it has provided the occasion for a modern debate over the relationship between theology (*lex credendi*) and liturgy (*lex orandi*). This debate has divided Protestants and Catholics since the time of the Reformation.

The Reformers’ Catholic opponents usually conceded that, while the substance of their Eucharistic theology had its foundation in Scripture, there were aspects of the Mass (such as the Roman Canon) that had developed over time. Like their medieval forebears, 16<sup>th</sup> century Catholic apologists assumed that the *lex orandi* should determine the *lex credendi*. Scripture was a source of Catholic doctrine but so were the liturgical practice of the church and testimony of the fathers. Thus the fact that many Catholic liturgical practices had no explicit Scriptural warrant was not necessarily problematic for Catholic apology.<sup>23</sup>

On the other hand, the Reformers believed that certain Biblical doctrines were incompatible with various liturgical practices in the Roman church. For example, the Roman Mass—particularly the sacrificial language of the Latin canon—was hardly compatible with the doctrines of the perfection of Christ’s atonement and of justification

---

<sup>21</sup>Marshall, 140.

<sup>22</sup>Moore-Keish, 66.

<sup>23</sup>Nicholas Thompson, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and Patristic Tradition in the Theology of Martin Bucer, 1534–1546* (Leiden: Brill, 2005) 4–5; hereafter cited as Thompson, *Bucer*.

by faith alone.<sup>24</sup> Like the gift of justification, Protestants saw the Lord's Supper as a gift (*beneficium*) received from God and not a sacrifice (*sacrificium*) offered to God.<sup>25</sup> Protestant theology, therefore, inevitably led to changes in the liturgy. Hence, the Reformers believed that *lex credendi* could exercise control over *lex orandi* "when it came to forms of existing worship that needed correction."<sup>26</sup> Theology can critique worship and improve it where necessary.

The Latin maxim *lex orandi, lex credendi* offers a helpful corrective to the common tendency in modern Protestant circles to bifurcate theology and liturgy as two independent branches of ecclesial life.<sup>27</sup> Theology and liturgy are, in fact, interrelated and mutually formative. True doctrine forms the foundation of true worship, and true worship is an expression of true doctrine. Theology shapes the church's liturgy, but over time, the worship of the church will inevitably influence its theology. Both theology and liturgy must be derived from Scripture alone, since it is the only infallible rule for faith and worship.

## 2. *Sola Scriptura*

At the time of the Reformation, "Scripture, the writings of the church fathers, ancient creeds, conciliar decrees, papal declarations, liturgical traditions, canon law and

---

<sup>24</sup>Cf. Senn, 224–28; Wainwright, *Doxology*, 268.

<sup>25</sup>Hughes Oliphant Old, "Eucharist, Reformation Controversies On," in *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*, ed. Peter E. Fink (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1990) 425–429, 425; hereafter, Old, "Eucharist."

<sup>26</sup>Irwin, *Context and Text*, 16.

<sup>27</sup>Cf. Alexander Schmemmann, "Liturgy and Theology," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 17, no. 1 (1972): 86–100.

the pronouncements of the theological faculties” were all invoked as authorities in matters of doctrine and discipline.<sup>28</sup> Scripture, however, was the final authority for Protestants. When their opponents cited ecclesial authorities to refute their doctrines, the Reformers appealed to Scripture as the highest authority and final arbiter of the truth. Thus, *sola Scriptura* became the rallying cry of the Reformation.<sup>29</sup> The Protestant position has been summarized as follows:

By and in itself, scripture was to be regarded as the decisive norm in solving both theological and religious problems. As the ultimate authority, the incontestable criterion, and the absolute rule of faith, it was above pope and council, above church and tradition. All must be based on scripture and on scripture alone. All that is in scripture must be believed, and all that must be believed is in scripture. All rests on scripture; scripture rests on God.<sup>30</sup>

First of all, *sola Scriptura* asserts the primary and absolute normative authority of Scripture. It is the highest and only infallible rule of liturgical theory and practice, and all other ecclesial authorities are derived from and subordinate to it.<sup>31</sup> Scripture, says Richard Muller, is “the *authoritas canonica sive normativa*, the canonical or normative authority.”<sup>32</sup> Canonical Scripture is the “*norma normans non normata*, the norm with no

---

<sup>28</sup>James R. Payton Jr., *Getting the Reformation Wrong: Correcting Some Misunderstandings* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2010) 132.

<sup>29</sup>On *sola Scriptura*, see Payton, 132–59; Don Kistler, ed., *Sola Scriptura: The Protestant Position on the Bible* (Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria Publications, 2000); John Whiteford, *Sola Scriptura: An Orthodox Analysis of the Cornerstone of Reformed Theology* (Conciliar Press, 1997).

<sup>30</sup>Robert E. McNally, “Tradition at the Beginning of the Reformation,” in Joseph F. Kelly, ed., *Perspectives on Scripture and Tradition* (Notre Dame, IN: Fides Publishers, Inc., 1976) 73.

<sup>31</sup>Cf. Alister E. McGrath, *Reformation Thought: An Introduction* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988) 101–15.

<sup>32</sup>Richard Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1985) 52–3.

norm over it.”<sup>33</sup> Scripture, says the Westminster Confession, is “the supreme judge by which all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined.”<sup>34</sup> Hence, Scripture is the final authority for theology and worship.

*Sola Scriptura* also affirms the sufficiency of Scripture. Scripture contains all that is necessary for establishing the theory and practice of worship. “The Lord has in his sacred oracles faithfully embraced and clearly expressed ... all aspects of the worship of his majesty;” therefore, in matters of worship, says Calvin, “the Master alone is to be heard.”<sup>35</sup> Likewise, the French Confession (1559) says that Scripture is “the rule of all truth, containing all that is necessary for the worship of God and for our salvation;” therefore, “all things should be examined, regulated, and reformed according to” Scripture.<sup>36</sup> This teaching is echoed in the Westminster Confession:

The whole counsel of God concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man’s salvation, faith and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture: unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit, or traditions of men.<sup>37</sup>

Thus, the final authority of Scripture and its sufficiency are foundational principles of Reformed worship. Reformed worship is built on the bedrock of *sola Scriptura*.

---

<sup>33</sup>John Franke, “Scripture, Tradition and Authority: Reconstructing the Evangelical Conception of *Sola Scriptura*” in *Evangelicals and Scripture: Tradition, Authority and Hermeneutics*, eds. Vincent Bacote, Lara C. Miguez and Dennis L. Okholm (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004) 192–210, 192–93.

<sup>34</sup>Westminster Confession of Faith (hereafter WCF) 1:10.

<sup>35</sup>John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Ford Lewis Battles, ed. John T. McNeill (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960) 4:10:30; cf. 4:10:8.

<sup>36</sup>Cited in Michael Allen and Scott R. Swain, *Reformed Catholicity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2015) 45.

<sup>37</sup>WCF 1:6.

Although the doctrine of *sola Scriptura* was held in common by various Protestant groups, they did not always agree on how this doctrine applied to liturgical reform. For example, Lutherans and Calvinists had different approaches to reforming the liturgy. This was partly because they had different emphases and priorities regarding ecclesial reform in general. As James Payton observes,

Luther was a theology professor who regularly preached, but Zwingli, Bucer and Oecolampadius were pastors, who ended up establishing schools. Luther worked to reform theology and the theological curriculum, but not so much parish life, while Zwingli, Bucer and Oecolampadius worked to reform preaching and liturgy—indeed as well as theology—but especially parish life. Contrasting concerns inevitably led to differences in emphases and assessments as to what was important, what must be done and how the Reformation message could best take root.<sup>38</sup>

Furthermore, Lutherans and Reformed Protestants were fighting on different battlefronts, as Gottfried Locher remarks,

Luther's Reformation was directed against the Judaistic heresy; for him, the alternative to faith is works. Zwingli's Reformation was directed against the false doctrine of pagans; to him, the alternative to faith is every kind of idolatry, ceremony or *traditio humana* (man-made tradition).<sup>39</sup>

Moreover, as Carlos Eire has noted, the primary concern of the Lutheran stream of the Reformation was justifying grace, but the primary concern of the Reformed stream was the purification of worship. The former was a war against works-righteousness; the latter, a war against idolatry.<sup>40</sup>

Lutherans and Calvinists also had different views over the regulatory nature of Scripture with regard to worship. For Calvinists, the manner in which Scripture regulates

---

<sup>38</sup>Payton, 100–101.

<sup>39</sup>Locher, 14; cf. *ibid.*, 3.

<sup>40</sup>Carlos M. N. Eire, *War Against the Idols: The Reformation of Worship from Erasmus to Calvin* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989) 2.



worship is not merely proscriptive but prescriptive. Thus, the mere fact that Scripture does not forbid a certain practice does not justify its use. “Scripture must positively require a practice, if that practice is to be suitable for the worship of God.”<sup>41</sup> Hence, Calvinists prohibited matters of worship that are additional to Scripture, not just matters contrary to it.<sup>42</sup> This position is popularly referred to as the regulative principle of worship and is contrasted with the so-called normative principle. The two principles are often summarized as follows. Whatever is not commanded in Scripture is thereby forbidden (regulative principle) versus whatever is not forbidden in Scripture is lawful (normative principle). On the latter principle, Scripture “regulates worship in a negative way—by exercising veto power.”<sup>43</sup> The regulative principle, however, teaches that Scripture must positively require a practice for it to be lawful. This principle was clearly affirmed by Calvin, Knox, and the Westminster divines.

Calvin says that in worship “we are to follow in all simplicity what [God] has ordained by his Word, without adding anything to it at all.”<sup>44</sup> This is the universal rule that distinguishes between true and false worship, argues Calvin.<sup>45</sup> Thus, Reformed

---

<sup>41</sup>John M. Frame, *Worship in Spirit and Truth* (Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1996) 38; cf. T. David Gordon, “The Westminster Assembly’s Unworkable and Unscriptural View of Worship?” *Westminster Theological Journal* 65 (2003): 345–56, 348.

<sup>42</sup>Cf. Richard Muller and Rowland Ward, *Scripture and Worship: Biblical Interpretation and The Directory for Worship* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 2007) 98. See WCF 20:2; cf. Deut. 4:2; 12:32; Matt. 15:3–9; Mark 7:6–13; Col. 2:18–23.

<sup>43</sup>Frame, 38.

<sup>44</sup>Benjamin W. Farley, trans. and ed., *John Calvin’s Sermons on the Ten Commandments* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1980) 66.

<sup>45</sup>See Calvin’s, “The Necessity of Reforming the Church,” in John Calvin, *Tracts and Letters*, ed. and trans. Henry Beveridge (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 2009) 1:123–234, 128; cf. R. Scott Clark, “Calvin’s Principle of Worship” in David W. Hall, ed., *Tributes to John Calvin: A Celebration of His Quincentenary* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 2010) 247–69, 253.

worship is limited to what has clear warrant in Scripture. As the Westminster Confession states,

[T]he acceptable way of worshiping the true God is instituted by himself, and so limited by his own revealed will, that he may not be worshiped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representation, or any other way not prescribed in the Holy Scripture.<sup>46</sup>

Likewise, Knox argues that any act of worship not commanded in Scripture is idolatry.<sup>47</sup> “The plain and straight commandment of God is ‘Not that thing which appears good in thy eyes, shalt thou do to the Lord thy God, but what the Lord thy God has commanded thee, that do thou: add nothing to it; diminish nothing from it.’”<sup>48</sup> Again

Knox says,

Moses, in the name of God, says to the people of Israel, “All that the Lord thy God commands thee to do, that do thou to the Lord thy God; add nothing to it, diminish nothing from it” [Deuteronomy 12:32]. By this rule think I that the Kirk of God will measure God’s religion, and not by that which seems good in their own eyes.<sup>49</sup>

Knox vehemently argued that “all ceremonies devised by man for the worship of God, without express warrant of Scripture, are idolatry.”<sup>50</sup> Ceremonies that have no

---

<sup>46</sup>WCF 21:1; cf. The Westminster Shorter Catechism (hereafter SC) 51; Zacharias Ursinus, *Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1985) 517.

<sup>47</sup>See Kevin Reed, “John Knox and the Reformation of Worship in the Scottish Reformation,” in *Worship in the Presence of God*, edited by David Lachman and Frank J. Smith (Greenville, SC: Greenville Seminary Press, 1992) 295; cf. Richard G. Kyle, “John Knox and the Purification of Religion: The Intellectual Aspects of His Crusade Against Idolatry,” *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 77 (1986): 265–80.

<sup>48</sup>John Knox, *John Knox’s History of the Reformation in Scotland*, edited by William Croft Dickinson (New York: Philosophical Library, 1949) 91; hereafter cited as Dickinson.

<sup>49</sup>Peter Lorimer, *John Knox and the Church of England: His Work in Her Pulpit and His Influence Upon Her Liturgy, Articles, and Parties* (London: Henry S. King and Co., 1875) 7–8.

<sup>50</sup>Eustace Percy, *John Knox* (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1965) 56.

Biblical warrant are merely human inventions that corrupt pure worship.<sup>51</sup> Thus, any worship not expressly sanctioned by the command of God must be rejected as unlawful.<sup>52</sup> Lawful worship is established by God himself and cannot be the product of human invention.<sup>53</sup> God desires us to worship him as he commands, without mingling any inventions of our own.<sup>54</sup> Regarding this teaching, Calvin writes,

I know how difficult it is to persuade the world that God disapproves of all modes of worship not expressly sanctioned by His Word. The opposite persuasion which cleaves to them, being seated, as it were, in their very bones and marrow, is, that whatever they do has in itself a sufficient sanction, provided it exhibits some kind of zeal for the honour of God. But since God not only regards as fruitless, but also plainly abominates, whatever we undertake from zeal to His worship, if at variance with His command, what do we gain by a contrary course? ... Every addition to His word, especially in this matter, is a lie. Mere “will worship” (ἐθέλοθησκεία) is vanity.<sup>55</sup>

Therefore, the Reformers desired to abolish all liturgical traditions, rites and ceremonies that were devised by men without divine authority, for first of all, they argued that God is worshiped in vain by them, since he alone is entitled to prescribe worship.<sup>56</sup> Secondly, they noted that such inventions have not edified the church but have corrupted

---

<sup>51</sup>Cf. *Institutes* 4:10:23–24.

<sup>52</sup>Cf. Calvin, “Necessity of Reforming,” 133; W. P. Stephens, *The Theology of Huldrych Zwingli* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986) 198.

<sup>53</sup>*Institutes*, 2:8:17; cf. R. J. Gore, Jr., *Covenantal Worship: Reconsidering the Puritan Regulative Principle* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, 2002) 57.

<sup>54</sup>*Institutes*, 4:10:23.

<sup>55</sup>Calvin, “Necessity of Reforming,” 128–29. See also Calvin’s remarks on Ezek. 20:28 in his *Commentaries on the First Twenty Chapters of the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*, vol. 2, trans. Thomas Myers (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2005) 320–21; cf. Calvin’s comments on Amos 5:26 in *Commentary on the Twelve Minor Prophets*, vol. 2, trans. John Owen (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1986) 298.

<sup>56</sup>Cf. Zwingli’s comments in Samuel M. Jackson ed., *The Latin Works and the Correspondence of Huldreich Zwingli, together with Selections from his German Works*, vol. 1, 1510–1522 (New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1912) 219–21.

it with superstitious beliefs and idolatry. Thus, Calvin appends the following words to his

Form of Administering Baptism:

We know that elsewhere there are many other ceremonies which we deny not to be very ancient, but because they have been invented at pleasure, or at least on grounds which, be these what they may, must be trivial, since they have been devised without authority from the word of God, and because, on the other hand, so many superstitions have sprung from them, we have felt no hesitation in abolishing them, in order that there might be nothing to prevent the people from going directly to Jesus Christ. First, whatever is not commanded, we are not free to choose. Secondly, nothing which does not tend to edification ought to be received into the Church. If anything of the kind has been introduced, it ought to be taken away, and by much stronger reason, whatever serves only to cause scandal, and is, as it were, an instrument of idolatry and false opinion, ought on no account to be tolerated.<sup>57</sup> But it is certain that the chrism, candle and other such pomps are not of God's ordinance, but have been added by men: and finally they have come to this, that people are more attracted by them and hold them in greater esteem than the ordinances of Jesus Christ. At least we have such a baptism as Jesus Christ has ordered, as the apostles have preserved and followed, as the primitive church has used, and we cannot be criticized on any other point, save that we do not wish to be wiser than God himself.<sup>58</sup>

The regulative principle of worship is a matter of liberty of conscience. No mere human authority has the right to bind a person's conscience in matters of religion. As the Westminster Confession teaches, man's conscience is "free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are, in anything, contrary to his Word; *or beside it, if matters of faith, or worship.*"<sup>59</sup> Hence, the regulative principle limits the authority of the church to what is expressly taught in Scripture, and, therefore, it guards the Christian's conscience from being bound by human authority in matters of faith and worship.

---

<sup>57</sup>John Calvin, *Tracts and Letters*, 2:117–18.

<sup>58</sup>The English translation of the final paragraph was taken from J. D. C. Fisher, *Christian Initiation: The Reformation Period* (Chicago/Mundelein, IL: Hillenbrand Books, 2007) 116–17.

<sup>59</sup>WCF 20:2 emphasis added; cf. Article XIV of the Scottish Confession.

It is noteworthy that some of the English Reformers were uncomfortable with restricting liturgical practices to what is prescribed in Scripture. For example, in the vestments controversy that centered around John Hooper and also in the “Black Rubric” affair sparked by Knox’s sermon to the Privy Council, the archbishop Thomas Cranmer clearly rejected the regulative principle, which Hooper and Knox had used to defend their views.<sup>60</sup> Cranmer characterized the principle as “the chief foundation of the error of the Anabaptists, and of diverse other sects;” furthermore, it is a “subversion of all order as well in religion as in common policy.”<sup>61</sup> Thus, one might say that the regulative principle of worship separated Canterbury from Geneva. Thomas M’Crie observes that the adherents of the school of Canterbury “held that what was unforbidden in Scripture might be treated as indifferent,” while the adherents of the school of Geneva held that “what was unbidden in Scripture must be rejected.”<sup>62</sup> Moreover, the difference rendered the two schools irreconcilable, says M’Crie.<sup>63</sup>

As Cranmer rightly pointed out in the controversy over the “Black Rubric,” the regulative principle of worship was employed by the Anabaptists. For example, Conrad Grebel (the ringleader of the Zurich Anabaptists) cites the principle in his Programmatic Letters.<sup>64</sup> “That which is not taught by clear instruction” or example, says Grebel, we

---

<sup>60</sup>See Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996) 477–82; 525–26.

<sup>61</sup>*Ibid.*, 526.

<sup>62</sup>Thomas M’Crie, *Annals of English Presbytery* (London: James Nisbet and Co., 1872) 110.

<sup>63</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>64</sup>See John C. Wenger, *Conrad Grebel’s Programmatic Letters of 1524* (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1970); Leland Harder, *The Sources of Swiss Anabaptism: The Grebel Letters and Related Documents* (Scottsdale: Herald Press, 1985).

regard as forbidden, just as if it stood written, “Thou shalt not do this.”<sup>65</sup> This principle is applied in the Programmatic Letters to various matters of worship including infant baptism. “Nowhere do we read that the apostles baptized children with water. Consequently, in the absence of a specific Word and example, they should not be baptized.”<sup>66</sup> In a dispute over infant baptism with Zwingli, the Anabaptists argued, “Children are nowhere in Scripture commanded to be baptized, nor is it anywhere said that Christ or the apostles baptized children;” hence, it is a man-made tradition that “ought to be done away with as an abuse, as other papistical abuses have been done away with.”<sup>67</sup>

Grebel apparently discovered the regulative principle in the writings of Tertullian. When the works of Tertullian were published in 1521, Grebel was one of the first to study them.<sup>68</sup> In *De Corona*, which Tertullian wrote around the year 211, we find the story of a certain Christian soldier, who refused to wear the laurel crown on the accession of the emperor Severus.<sup>69</sup> This led to the soldier’s imprisonment. Some Christians argued that he was making a big deal out of nothing, a mere matter of dress. “After all,” they

---

<sup>65</sup>Wenger, 43.

<sup>66</sup>Harder, 308.

<sup>67</sup>Raget Christoffel, *Zwingli: The Rise of the Reformation in Switzerland*, translated by John Cochran (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1858) 269–70.

<sup>68</sup>See Harder, *Sources*, 154, 160–62. On the importance of the works of Tertullian for the Reformation, see John F. D’Amico, “Beatus Rhenanus, Tertullian, and the Reformation,” *Archive for Reformation History* 71 (1980): 37–63.

<sup>69</sup>For an English translation of *De Corona*, see Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 3 (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1903) 93–103; cf. Robert Dick Sider, ed., *Christian and Pagan in the Roman Empire: The Witness of Tertullian* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2001).

reasoned, “we are not forbidden in Scripture from wearing a crown.” Tertullian, on the other hand, wrote *De Corona* in defense of the soldier’s actions. Tertullian writes,

To be sure, it is very easy to ask: “Where in Scripture are we forbidden to wear a crown?” But, can you show me a text that says we should be crowned? If people try to say that we may be crowned because the Scriptures do not forbid it, then they leave themselves open to the retort that we may not be crowned because Scripture does not prescribe it. But “Whatever is not forbidden is, without question, allowed.” Rather do I say: “Whatever is not specifically permitted is forbidden.”<sup>70</sup>

These two opposing principles—whatever is not forbidden is allowed (on the one hand) and whatever is not commanded is forbidden (on the other)—reappear in the sixteenth century debates on worship. Both the Calvinists and the Anabaptists employed the latter principle, but the two groups had different criteria for what constituted Biblical warrant to justify liturgical practice. Specifically, the Anabaptists had a narrower understanding of Biblical warrant and, therefore, a more restrictive version of the regulative principle than the Calvinists had. “Direct biblical warrant, in the form of precept or precedent, is required to sanction every item included in the public worship of God,” claimed the Anabaptists.<sup>71</sup> Therefore, they rejected infant baptism, for instance, because of the absence in Scripture of any clear command or example to justify it.<sup>72</sup> On the other hand, Calvinists recognized that Biblical warrant could be established, not only by precept or precedent, but also by Biblical inferences or, as the Westminster

---

<sup>70</sup>Sider, 120.

<sup>71</sup>J. I. Packer makes this comment about the Puritans, but in our opinion, it is more descriptive of the Radical Reformers; see Packer, *Among God’s Giants: The Puritan Vision of the Christian Life* (Eastborne: Kingsway, 1991) 326.

<sup>72</sup>See Harder, 308; Wenger, 17–21.

Confession says, deductions by good and necessary consequence. As James Bannerman explains,

The doctrine of the Westminster Standards [WCF 1:6] and of our church is, that whatsoever is not expressly appointed in the Word, or appointed by necessary inference from the Word, it is not lawful for the Church to exercise of its own authority to enjoin; the restriction upon that authority being, that it shall announce and enforce nothing in the public worship of God, except what God himself has in explicit terms or by implication instituted.<sup>73</sup>

With the Reformers, we affirm the final authority and sufficiency of Scripture in all matters of theology and worship. Furthermore, we believe that Scripture regulates worship in a prescriptive manner—the so-called regulative principle of worship. Thus, lawful worship is limited to what God has prescribed in his Word. However, we reject the Radical Reformers’ teaching that Biblical warrant can only be satisfied by an explicit Biblical command or example. To the contrary, we agree with the Westminster Confession of Faith that the demand for Biblical warrant may be satisfied by necessary inferences from the Word of God.

### 3. The Role of Tradition

For the Reformers, the doctrine of *sola Scriptura* did not preclude the proper use of tradition in matters of theology and worship.<sup>74</sup> *Sola Scriptura* “was never meant as a denial of the usefulness of the Christian tradition as a subordinate norm in theology.”<sup>75</sup>

While Scripture served as the final authority for the Reformers, it was not their only

---

<sup>73</sup>James Bannerman, *The Church of Christ* (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1974) 1:340.

<sup>74</sup>See Franke, “Scripture, Tradition and Authority,” 192–210; Sinclair Ferguson, “Scripture and Tradition,” in Kistler, *Sola Scriptura*; Heiko Oberman, *The Dawn of the Reformation: Essays in Late Medieval and Early Reformation Thought* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1992) 280–85.

<sup>75</sup>Muller, *Dictionary*, 284.



authority; they also appealed to the traditions of the ancient church as an important secondary authority. Esther Chung-Kim explains,

While the Protestant reformers' conception of *sola Scriptura* established the Bible as the primary standard authorizing Christian theology and practice, they did not conceive of rejecting wholesale the history of the church's tradition. In fact, many reformers considered the early church fathers secondary authorities to scripture as well as important teachers of biblical interpretation.<sup>76</sup>

Tradition cannot serve as its own norm; it must have Biblical warrant or be rejected as mere human invention, claimed the Reformers.<sup>77</sup> Hence, they wanted to purify the worship of the church by stripping away man-made traditions that had no basis in Scripture, but traditions that were handed down from the apostles and preserved in the ancient church were used as reliable witnesses to the teaching of Scripture. Therefore, liturgical tradition played a significant role in revising the liturgy. For this reason, Calvin claimed that the forms of worship in the Genevan Psalter were “according to the customs of the ancient Church.”<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup>Esther Chung-Kim, *Inventing Authority: The Use of the Church Fathers in Reformation Debates over the Eucharist* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2011) 1; cf. Payton, 157. Irena Backus has characterized the Reformed position as “a tacit appropriation of patristic tradition in the service of *sola Scriptura*.” See Backus, “The Disputations of Baden, 1526 and Berne 1528: Neutralizing the Early Church,” *Studies in Reformed Theology and History*, vol. 1, no. 1 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1993) 121.

<sup>77</sup>See Hughes Oliphant Old, *Themes and Variations for a Christian Doxology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1992) 13; cf. Hughes Oliphant Old, *The Patristic Roots of Reformed Worship*, American Edition (Black Mountain, NC: Worship Press, 2010; 1975) 24; Jackson, *Latin Works*, 256.

<sup>78</sup>The title of the Genevan Psalter is “*La Forme des prières et chantz ecclésiastiques avec la manière d'administrer les sacremens ... selon la coustume de l'église ancienne*,” see Wulfert de Greef, 113; cf. Old, *Patristic Roots*, 98. For the French text, see *Calvini opera*, 6, col. 193–202; Bruno Burki, “La Sainte Cene selon l'ordre de Jean Calvin, 1542,” in *Coena Domini I. Die Abendmahlsliturgie der Reformationskirchen in 16./17. Jahrhundert* (Freiburg, Switzerland: 1983) 347–67. An English translation is available in Bard Thompson, *Liturgies of the Western Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980, 1961) 197–210 (hereafter, Thompson, *Liturgies*).

At the dawn of the Reformation, there were two dominant views of tradition, which Heiko Oberman has labeled Tradition 1 and Tradition 2.<sup>79</sup> “Tradition 1,” says John Franke, “represents the single-source understanding [of revelation], which emphasizes the sufficiency of Scripture as the exclusive and final authority in the church.”<sup>80</sup> Tradition is not a second source of revelation but is co-inherent with the content of Scripture; therefore, Scripture and tradition are identical in content. “There is no revealed truth in tradition which is not first found in Scripture.”<sup>81</sup> Tradition 1 asserts the priority of Scripture over the church and allows “tradition a derivative but important secondary role” in theology and worship.<sup>82</sup> Oberman argues that Tradition 1 is the view of the ancient church, and that the Reformers were attempting to preserve that view in their doctrine of *sola Scriptura*.<sup>83</sup> Likewise, McGrath says, “It is certainly true that the *sola Scriptura* principle was employed more radically by the early Reformed theologians than had ever been previously envisaged,” but *sola Scriptura* was not an innovation of the Reformers; it is identical to Tradition 1.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup>See Oberman, *The Dawn of the Reformation*, 269–96; Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1967) 361–422; and Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966) 53–66. Cf. Alister McGrath, *The Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc., 1987) 140–151; Yves Congar, *Tradition and Traditions* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966); George H. Tavard, *Holy Writ or Holy Church: The Crisis of the Protestant Reformation* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959).

<sup>80</sup>Franke, 195.

<sup>81</sup>McNally, 65.

<sup>82</sup>Muller, *Dictionary*, 284.

<sup>83</sup>On *sola Scriptura* in the early church, see James White, “Sola Scriptura and the Early Church” in Kistler, *Sola Scriptura*, 27–62; Hans von Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries*, trans. J. A. Baker (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1969).

<sup>84</sup>McGrath, *Intellectual Origins*, 150.

Tradition 2 presents a dual-source theory of revelation. Revelation is contained partly in Scripture and partly in tradition. Gabriel Moran explains, revelation “is divided between two sources; part of revelation is found in Scripture, but the rest is contained only in oral tradition, that is, in truths handed down from apostolic times in addition to the Scripture.”<sup>85</sup> Thus, Scripture and tradition are two equal authorities and supplementary sources; they are coequal norms.<sup>86</sup> McGrath summarizes Tradition 2 as follows:

‘Tradition’ is ... understood to be a separate and distinct source of revelation, *in addition to scripture*. Scripture, it was argued, was silent on a number of points—but God had providentially arranged for a second source of revelation to supplement this deficiency: a stream of unwritten tradition, going back to the apostles themselves. This tradition was passed down from one generation to another within the church.<sup>87</sup>

In opposition to the Reformers’ doctrine of *sola Scriptura*, the Council of Trent officially adopted Tradition 2. The Council decreed that divine revelation, which is the fountain of all saving truth and moral discipline, is contained both in the Scriptures and in unwritten traditions (*in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus*) which were received by the apostles either from the mouth of Christ or were dictated to them by the Holy Spirit, and that these traditions have come down to us “transmitted as it were from hand to hand.”<sup>88</sup> Furthermore, the Council stated that it “receives and venerates with an equal affection of piety and reverence” both the books of the Bible and also the unwritten

---

<sup>85</sup>Gabriel Moran, *Scripture and Tradition: A Survey of the Controversy* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1963) 35.

<sup>86</sup>Muller, *Dictionary*, 284.

<sup>87</sup>McGrath, *Reformation Thought*, 97.

<sup>88</sup>Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1998), 2:80; cf. H. J. Schroeder in *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (Rockford, IL: TAN Books, 1978) 17.

traditions “as having been dictated, either by Christ’s own word of mouth, or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession.”<sup>89</sup> Thus, as Oberman argues, the Council of Trent adopted the late medieval view of tradition, while the Reformers adopted the earlier view of the ancient church.

The Council of Trent ... responded to the threat of the Reformation by affirming a two-source theory. This affirmation by the Catholic Reformation of ‘Tradition 2’ declares that the Christian faith reaches every generation through two sources: scripture and an unwritten tradition. This extra-scriptural tradition is to be treated as having equal authority as scripture. In making this declaration, the Council of Trent appears to have picked up the later, and less influential, of the two main medieval understandings of ‘tradition’—leaving the more influential to the Reformers.<sup>90</sup>

We reject the view of the Council of Trent that tradition is a second source of revelation which supplements Scripture, and we side with the Reformers in affirming that Scripture is the sole source of revelation. Furthermore, in accordance with Tradition 1, we believe that the traditions of the ancient church—to the degree that they are founded on Scripture—should play a significant role in establishing the church’s theology and worship. We also affirm that tradition cannot justify itself; it must have Biblical warrant or be rejected as human invention.

---

<sup>89</sup>Schaff, 2:80.

<sup>90</sup>McGrath, *Reformation Thought*, 109. It should be noted that recent scholarship has challenged this traditional interpretation of the teaching of Trent; see J. R. Geiselman, “Scripture, Tradition, and the Church: An Ecumenical Problem,” in *Christianity Divided*, eds. D. J. Callahan, H. A. Oberman, and D. J. O’Hanlon (London, 1962) 39–72; and Ferguson, “Scripture and Tradition” in Kistler, *Sola Scriptura*, 91–110.

#### 4. The Reformers' Use of the Fathers

The Reformers frequently claimed patristic support for their liturgical ideas, and we have every reason, says Hughes Oliphant Old, to take them seriously.<sup>91</sup> Reformed worship clearly has deep roots in the liturgical traditions of the patristic age. The Calvinists sought to reform the church's worship, first and foremost, according to Scripture and, secondly, according to the custom of the ancient church. Hence, Calvin entitled his Genevan Psalter of 1542 "The Form of Church Prayers and Hymns with the Manner of Administering the Sacraments and Consecrating Marriage *According to the Custom of the Ancient Church*."<sup>92</sup> Wandel explains,

The concluding words of the title—*According to the Custom of the Ancient Church*—explicitly attested to Calvin's desire to return to the pure usages of the earliest Christians and his simultaneous campaign to eradicate what he believed to be dangerous medieval distortions.<sup>93</sup>

It has long been recognized that the Reformers were "the direct heirs of Christian humanism."<sup>94</sup> Consequently, it is no surprise that the Reformation was "characterized by the slogan *ad fontes*, 'back to the sources.'"<sup>95</sup> They developed their theology and liturgy by returning to the original sources of Holy Scripture and the writings of the early church fathers, both Greek and Latin. Thus, Philipp Melancthon claimed that Martin Luther had "done nothing else than to call us back to Scripture and also to the fathers who came the

---

<sup>91</sup>*Patristic Roots*, xiii.

<sup>92</sup>De Greef, 113; emphasis added.

<sup>93</sup>Lee Palmer Wandel, ed., *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Reformation* (Leiden: Brill, 2014) 233; hereafter, Wandel, *Companion*.

<sup>94</sup>Gordon Rupp, *Patterns of the Reformation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969) xvii.

<sup>95</sup>Franke, 198; cf. Payton, 68–71.

closest to the meaning of Scripture.”<sup>96</sup> Hence, the Reformers saw themselves as standing in the traditions of the ancient church. In their mind, “the evangelicals were ‘the true, old Church,’ which had never ceased to be, but which had been hidden, ‘like the sun behind the clouds.’”<sup>97</sup>

According to Ford Lewis Battles, “Calvin followed the tradition, common to humanists and Reformers alike, of viewing the Early Church as a golden classical period. The fathers are ‘the ancient writers of a better age of the church.’”<sup>98</sup> For example, Erasmus metaphorically described Scripture as “a fountain flowing into a golden river of patristic theology, and then degenerating into the dirty rivulets of scholasticism.”<sup>99</sup> For the Christian humanists and the Reformers, patristic theology and liturgy represented “a purer state of affairs.”<sup>100</sup> The early church was “the primitive and purer church,” says Calvin.<sup>101</sup> Therefore, patristic literature is valuable because it allows us to draw closer to the pure fountain of Holy Scripture. The earliest Christian writings—such as the works of Justin Martyr, Cyprian, and Tertullian—are like windows through which we catch a glimpse of how the apostolic church worshiped. To reform the liturgy “according to the customs of the ancient church” is to stand in continuity with the apostolic tradition.

---

<sup>96</sup>Philipp Melanchthon, *Selected Writings*, ed. Elmer Ellsworth Flack and Lowell J. Satre (MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1962) 74. Likewise, Zwingli says, “We never taught a single word that we have not taken from Holy Scripture or the Fathers;” Geoffrey W. Bromiley, ed., *Zwingli and Bullinger*, Library of Christian Classics, vol. 24 (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953) 256.

<sup>97</sup>Rupp, xxii.

<sup>98</sup>Cited in A. N. S. Lane, *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1999) 40; cf. McGrath, *Intellectual Origins*, 42.

<sup>99</sup>Thompson, *Bucer*, 28.

<sup>100</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>101</sup>Reid, 215; cf. *Institutes* 1:11:13 and 4:9:8.

On the Reformers' use of the fathers, Irena Backus states that the fathers of the church shaped the theology of the Reformers "in such a way that a tacit hierarchy of sacred texts is established with the Bible at the top broadening out into a pyramid of patristic evidence, indispensable in its turn for construction of a Biblical theology."<sup>102</sup>

The fathers were seen as fallible, though generally reliable, interpreters of Scripture, and although they were not above criticism, they were not to be lightly esteemed. Martin Bucer says,

Any works produced subsequent to the canonical Scriptures, of whatever content or origin, must be tested by the faithful and measured by the Scriptures themselves and believed and accepted only if shown to be derived from the actual Scriptures: yet nonetheless ... the writings of the early saints and the orthodox Fathers are to be received with respect.<sup>103</sup>

Thus, for the Reformers, Scripture is the *norma absoluta*; it is the touchstone by which all "other writings are to be tested."<sup>104</sup> The fathers of the church are *testes veritatis*, witnesses to the true teaching of Scripture.<sup>105</sup> The testimony of the fathers serves as "an illustration of the truth of Scripture."<sup>106</sup> Nicholas Thompson refers to this idea as the

---

<sup>102</sup>Irena Backus, ed., *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2001) 2:644.

<sup>103</sup>David F. Wright, ed., *Common Places of Martin Bucer* (Abingdon, Eng.: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1972) 260. Likewise, Calvin says, "For, although we hold that the Word of God alone lies beyond the sphere of our judgment, and that Fathers and Councils are of authority only in so far as they accord with the rule of the Word, we still give to Councils and Fathers such rank and honour as it is meet for them to hold, under Christ;" John Calvin, *Tracts and Letters*, 1:66.

<sup>104</sup>Lane, 29.

<sup>105</sup>"Only the scriptural revelation can be the norm of doctrine, but the teachers and confessions of the church are aids in interpretation insofar as they are witnesses of the truth that manifests its presence and preservation in the life of the church" (Muller, *Dictionary*, 297).

<sup>106</sup>Johannes van Oort, "John Calvin and the Church Fathers" in Backus, *Reception of the Church Fathers*, 2:661–700, 690; cf. Pierre Frankel, *Testimonia Patrum: The Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melancthon* (Geneva, 1961).

magisterial appropriation of the fathers. Commenting on Melanchthon's comparison of the fathers to witnesses in a trial, Thompson writes,

The judge could not know a story to be true unless there were witnesses to it, but it did not follow from this that the witness could change the story and continue to be witnesses to the truth. Thus the church was not greater than, or prior to, the Gospel. However in so far as the fathers and other ministers of the Word testified to the truth, they could be said to mediate between the truth and those they sought to persuade. We might call this kind of appropriation of the fathers 'magisterial' since it appeals to the authority and succession of the church's teaching ministry *alongside* the Scripture, but *under* the authority of the Word and the Spirit.<sup>107</sup>

Thus, the fathers were authenticators of the Protestant tradition. By appealing to the testimony of the fathers, the Reformers sought to establish their theological credibility and to refute the accusation of Catholic apologists that they were guilty of inventing new doctrines.<sup>108</sup> In the debates between Protestants and Catholics, both sides claimed patristic support for their views, and both groups marshaled evidence from as many patristic sources as possible, hoping to outmatch their opponents.<sup>109</sup>

The enthusiasm for the fathers, especially at the beginning of the Reformation, contributed to the sense that these ancient sources were treasures to be rediscovered. The advent of the printing press assisted in the production of an increased quantity of complete editions of patristic texts, as well as patristic anthologies.... By the middle of the century this unprecedented availability of patristic material gave a new edge to the appeal to primitive Christianity.... Since humanist scholars had taken up the work of translating the fathers with new

---

<sup>107</sup>Thompson, *Bucer*, 75; cf. Frankel, 225–35.

<sup>108</sup>For example, John Eck asserted, "No one is found in the 1490 years following the passion of Christ who has denied that the venerable Eucharist in the sacred office of the Mass is a sacrifice. The whole church spread throughout the world has always held this to be the case ... as much among those holding to the true faith as among the heretics and schismatics" (Thompson, *Bucer*, 18). Likewise, at the Baden Disputation of 1526, "Every time Oecolampadius made an attempt to argue from the Scripture, Eck challenged him to find patristic support for his interpretation and, when the Reformer failed to do so, accused him of bringing forward Biblical exegesis which was personal and arbitrary," Irena Backus, "Martin Bucer and the Patristic Tradition," in *Martin Bucer and Sixteenth Century Europe: Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (28–31 août 1991)*, ed. Christian Krieger and Marc Lienhard, 2 vols. (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993) 1:56.

<sup>109</sup>It is noteworthy that in his final edition of the *Institutes*, Calvin cites the fathers 866 times (Chung-Kim, 35).



fervor, Catholics and Protestants alike scrambled to claim the inheritance of the rediscovered ancient sources. Regardless of Catholic or Protestant views, it was a sign of the times that anyone who sought change in the church would look back to its history to reevaluate its beliefs and practices.<sup>110</sup>

In our opinion, the Reformers demonstrated the right use of the fathers by counting them as fallible, though generally reliable, interpreters of Scripture and by appealing to their testimony as an important secondary authority (subordinate to Scripture) in matters of doctrine and discipline. With the Reformers, we believe that the fathers of the church authenticate Reformed theology and worship. They bear witness to “the commandments of God and the practice of Christ and the Apostles.”<sup>111</sup> Thus, we affirm the notion that to worship according to the customs of the ancient church is, in fact, to stand in continuity with the apostolic tradition.

### Conclusion

Having considered the Biblical and theological principles that guide our study, we need to state more specifically how these principles apply to our current project. In the first place, we will examine the eucharistic liturgy (*lex orandi*) and theology (*lex credendi*) of the Didache in light of the relationship between liturgy and theology as debated in modern liturgical scholarship. More specifically, from the eucharistic prayers of the Didache, we will seek to derive the theology that shaped those prayers and is expressed through them. What does the Didache teach us about the eucharistic theology

---

<sup>110</sup>Chung-Kim, 4–5.

<sup>111</sup>Old, *Patristic Roots*, 24.

of the early Christians, and how is that theology brought to expression in their liturgical customs? These questions will be answered in chapters two and three.

Secondly, since Scripture is our final and only infallible authority, we will carefully explore the relationship between Holy Scripture and the eucharistic theology and liturgy of the Didache. Our aim is to use the Didache as a guide for establishing worship *only insofar as it agrees with Scripture*. That is, we will employ the Didache as a secondary authority (subordinate to the authority of Scripture) to design a Reformed communion liturgy. Our hope is to reform the current eucharistic practice of Providence Presbyterian Church, first and foremost, according to Scripture and, secondly, according to the customs of the ancient church. Hence, in chapters two and three, we will carefully examine the eucharistic texts of the Didache in light of the Word of God, the final rule of theology and worship.

Finally, while the Didache is not inspired and infallible, it is the best example of apostolic worship that one may find in patristic literature. We will study the Didache as an ancient witness to the liturgical customs of the New Testament church. Our conviction is that to worship in continuity with the Didache is to align oneself with the apostolic tradition. Our endeavor to design a Reformed communion liturgy is motivated by our desire to worship God according to the truth of Scripture. The Didache is only a vehicle that brings us closer to the teaching of Scripture. The liturgical reforms that we will propose in chapter four are an attempt to promote and facilitate worship at Providence Presbyterian Church that is in accordance with Holy Scripture.

## CHAPTER TWO

### THE EUCHARIST IN THE DIDACHE, PART ONE

Our translation of Didache 9–10 is based on the Greek text published by Michael Holmes, though we have deviated from that text in one place for reasons which will be explained in the notes.<sup>1</sup> The translation is followed by a brief discussion of certain textual variants in the manuscripts of the Didache. Next, we explain the literary structure of Didache 9–10 and its significance for interpreting the text. Finally, we conclude the chapter with a commentary on Didache 9–10, which explores the theological themes and motifs expressed in the eucharistic prayers recorded in the text. Our aim is to understand the eucharistic theology of the early Christian community that produced and used the Didache as a guide for Christian worship.

---

<sup>1</sup>Michael W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2005, 1992) 246–69. Our translation of the whole document is provided in the Appendix. There are many English translations available today; see e.g. Clayton N. Jefford, *Didache: The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (Salem, OR: Polebridge Press, 2013); Aaron Milavec, *The Didache: Text, Translation, Analysis, and Commentary* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003); Aaron Milavec, *The Didache: Faith, Hope and Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50–70 C.E.* (Mahwah, NJ: The Newman Press, 2003); Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache*, trans. Linda M. Maloney, ed. Harold W. Attridge (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1998); Clayton N. Jefford, *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995); Andrew Louth, *Early Christian Writings* (England: Penguin Books, 1987). The Greek text is available in Milavec; Holmes; Willy Rordorf and André Tuilier, *La doctrine des douze apôtres* (Paris, 1998).

## Translation

<sup>9:1</sup>Now concerning the eucharist, give thanks in this manner:

<sup>2</sup>First, concerning the cup:

We give thanks to you, our Father, for the holy vine of your servant David,  
which you have revealed to us through your servant Jesus.

To you be the glory forever. *Amen*

<sup>3</sup>And concerning the broken bread:

We give thanks to you, our Father, for the life and knowledge,  
which you have revealed to us through your servant Jesus.

To you be the glory forever. *Amen*

<sup>4</sup>As this broken bread was scattered upon the hills and, having been gathered  
together, became one,

so may your church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into your  
kingdom.

For yours is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ forever. *Amen*

(<sup>5</sup>But let no one eat or drink from your eucharist, except those who  
have been baptized in the name of the Lord, for concerning this,  
the Lord has likewise said, "Do not give what is holy to the dogs.")

<sup>10:1</sup>Now after being filled, give thanks in this manner:

<sup>2</sup>We give thanks to you, holy Father, for your holy name,  
which you have caused to dwell in our hearts  
and for the knowledge and faith and immortality  
which you have revealed to us through your servant Jesus.

To you be the glory forever. *Amen*

<sup>3</sup>You, almighty Master, created all things for your name's sake.

To *all* people, you have given both food and drink to enjoy,  
in order that they might give *you* thanks.

But to us, you have freely given spiritual food and drink and eternal life  
through your servant *Jesus*.

<sup>4</sup>Above all, we give you thanks because you are mighty.

To you be the glory forever. *Amen*

<sup>5</sup>Remember your church, O Lord,

to deliver her from all evil  
and to perfect her in your love

and to gather her together *as* the holy one from the four winds into your  
kingdom

which you have prepared for her.

For yours is the power and the glory forever. *Amen*

<sup>6</sup>May grace come, and may this world pass away.

Hosanna to the son of David!

If anyone is holy, let him come. If anyone is not, let him repent. Come, Lord!  
*Amen.*

(<sup>7</sup>But allow the prophets to give thanks as long as they wish.)

## Notes

9:1 We have translated ἡ εὐχαριστία as “the eucharist.” It could also be translated “the thanksgiving” or “the thanksgiving meal.” In the Didache, εὐχαριστία refers to the meal itself, which derives its name from the thanksgiving prayers that accompany it (cf. 9:5).

9:2 παῖς is translated “servant” but could also be rendered “child” or “son.” This title is used for Jesus in Matt. 12:18, Acts 3:13, 26; 4:27, 30; Did. 9:2, 3; 10:2, 3. Since παῖς could mean either “servant” or “son,” Jefford has suggested that it “may reflect a conscious play in concept on the part of the author.”<sup>2</sup>

Although ἀμήν is not in the manuscript at the end of the refrain in 9:2, 3, 4, it was likely spoken in the liturgy as indicated in the Copt text at 10:2, 4, 5.<sup>3</sup> Draper claims, “This represents the response of the congregation and it is unlikely to have been written in the original text. The later tendency would be for scribes to write in what was already the common practice.”<sup>4</sup>

9:3 “Broken bread” (κλάσμα) may be translated “broken loaf” or “fragment of bread.” The term is unusual for the tradition, and some have suggested that the more common

---

<sup>2</sup>Jefford, *Didache* (Salem, OR: Polebridge Press, 2013) 35; hereafter, Jefford, *Commentary*.

<sup>3</sup>We have chosen to use the standard abbreviations for the following documents: Copt for the Coptic text of the Didache; H for the Greek text of the Didache (H is short for Codex Hierosolymitanus), and ApCon for the *Apostolic Constitutions*. For an analysis of these documents, see Jefford, *Commentary*, 1–14.

<sup>4</sup>Jonathan A. Draper, *A Commentary on the Didache in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents* (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1983) 221; hereafter, Draper, *Commentary*.

word for bread (ἄρτος) may have originally stood here in the *vorlage*, though this is unlikely.<sup>5</sup> “The breaking of bread” (ἡ κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου) no doubt stands behind the choice of κλάσμα. As Draper notes, “the breaking of bread” has Rabbinic roots and is already a technical term for the eucharist in Acts 2:42, 46; 20:7; Did. 14:1.<sup>6</sup> Bradshaw observes that κλάσμα “seems a slightly odd choice when presumably the bread had not yet been broken,” though it could be used proleptically.<sup>7</sup> Another suggestion is that κλάσμα was inspired by the feeding of the five thousand in John 6, particularly verse 12 where Jesus instructs the disciples to gather up the “fragments,” so that nothing may be lost, which is close in thought to the prayer in Did. 9:4.<sup>8</sup>

9:4 ApCon reads “became one loaf” instead of “became one.”<sup>9</sup>

9:5 The saying, “Do not give what is holy to the dogs” (Μὴ δώτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσὶ) is the same in Matt. 7:6, though the context is very different.

The parentheses at 9:5 and also at 10:7 in our translation indicate that the instructions given are parenthetical to the flow of the text, but this does not necessarily indicate a later redactional addition as some scholars speculate.

10:1 μετὰ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι may be translated “after being filled by the meal” or “after you have had enough to eat” or “when all have partaken sufficiently.” This clearly

---

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Jefford, *Commentary*, 35.

<sup>6</sup>Draper, *Commentary*, 192.

<sup>7</sup>Paul F. Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins* (London: SPCK, 2004) 24; hereafter, Bradshaw, *Origins*.

<sup>8</sup>See C. F. D. Moule, “A Note on *Didache* ix.4,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 6 (1955): 240–43; Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), 198–200; Arthur Vööbus, *Liturgical Traditions in the Didache* (Stockholm, 1968) 35–39, 137–57.

<sup>9</sup>Cf. Jefford, *Commentary*, 35.

indicates that the eucharist was an actual meal for the satisfaction of hunger and not merely a token of a meal.

10:3 πνευματικὴν τροφήν καὶ ποτὸν is translated “spiritual food and drink.” Paul uses a similar expression in 1 Cor. 10:3–4. For this and for other reasons, Mazza argues that Paul was familiar with the eucharistic prayers of the *Didache*.<sup>10</sup>

“Through your servant *Jesus*.” Though “Jesus” is absent in H, the word is present in the Coptic text.<sup>11</sup>

10:4 Where H has “above all,” Copt has “for all things.”<sup>12</sup>

10:6 “May grace come” (ἐλθέτω χάρις): Copt reads “Let the Lord come,” which is also represented in ApCon and may be original.<sup>13</sup> χάρις appears as a title for Jesus in other ancient Christian literature.<sup>14</sup>

“The son of David.” The textual witnesses diverge here. H has “God of David;” Copt, “house of David;” ApCon, “son of David.” Scholars are divided over which is the original reading, though “God of David” seems to be the least likely of the three variants.<sup>15</sup> For this reason, we have chosen to go with “son of David” here rather than “God of David.”

---

<sup>10</sup>Enrico Mazza, *The Celebration of the Eucharist*, trans. by Matthew J. O’Connell (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999) 31, 81–86.

<sup>11</sup>Cf. Jefford, *Commentary*, 37.

<sup>12</sup>Cf. Jefford, *Commentary*, 37.

<sup>13</sup>cf. Jefford, *Commentary*, 38; Draper, *Commentary*, 221.

<sup>14</sup>See Hans Lietzmann, *Mass and Lord’s Supper: A Study in the History of the Liturgy*, trans. by Dorothea H. G. Reeve (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979) 193; Johannes Betz, “The Eucharist in the *Didache*” in Jonathan A. Draper, ed., *The Didache in Modern Research* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996) 244–75; 271.

<sup>15</sup>Cf. Jefford, *Commentary*, 38; Jonathan A. Draper, “Ritual Process and Ritual Symbol in *Didache* 7–10,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 54 (2000): 139–42, 141 (hereafter, Draper, “Ritual”).

“Let him repent.” H and Copt basically agree. ApCon offers “let them be such by repenting,” which is undoubtedly the meaning.<sup>16</sup>

“Come, Lord” translates μαρὰν ἄθα.

### Structure

The eucharistic prayers of chapters 9 and 10 “have been carefully crafted into a unified whole.”<sup>17</sup> In both chapters, there are two thanksgivings followed by a petition, and each strophe is sealed with a doxology. Both chapters also include a petition for the eschatological ingathering of the church into the kingdom. Thus, the prayers before and after the meal are parallel in structure and content. The similarity in structure is easily detected in the threefold doxological refrain:

9:2 “...to you be the glory forever”	10:2 “...to you be the glory forever”
9:3 “...to you be the glory forever”	10:4 “...to you be the glory forever”
9:4 “...for yours is the glory and the power forever”	10:5 “...for yours is the power and the glory forever”

This doxology frames the prayers much like the *chatimah* in Jewish *berakoth*; hence, we may call it the seal of the eucharistic prayers.<sup>18</sup> The tripartite structure of the

---

<sup>16</sup>Cf. Jefford, *Commentary*, 38.

<sup>17</sup>Milavec, *Didache* (Mahwah, NJ: The Newman Press, 2003) [hereafter, Milavec, *Didache*] 355; cf. Draper, “Ritual,” 139–42; Dietrich-Alex Koch, “Eucharistic Meal and Eucharistic Prayer in Didache 9 and 10,” *Studia Theologica* 64 (2010): 200–18.

<sup>18</sup>“A *chatimah* is a short *berakah* (blessing) used either to conclude an extended *berakah* or to link distinct parts of a long *berakah*. For each *chatimah*, the *Didache* substituted a simple doxology for part one and two, ‘To you be the glory forever,’ and for part three, ‘For yours is the power and the glory forever;’” Eugene LaVerdiere, *The Eucharist in the New Testament and the Early Church* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1996) 141. Jasper and Cuming add that the purpose of the *chatimah* is “to retain the framework of blessing, even though the intervening paragraph is concerned with thanksgiving or intercession;” R. C. D. Jasper and G. J. Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1992) 7–8. Cf. Hughes Oliphant Old, *Leading in Prayer* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995) 17; Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London, 1945) 87; Paul



prayers consists of three strophes, including two thanksgivings and one petition. The thanksgiving strophes end with the shorter doxology; the petitionary strophes, with the longer doxology.<sup>19</sup> “Thus, the oral refrain signaled not only the end of a strophe but the kind of strophe.”<sup>20</sup>

The two prayers are also parallel in content. The post-communion prayer recapitulates the content of the pre-communion prayer, as Draper points out,

The content of the two highly formalized thanksgiving prayers for [the cup and the bread] before the meal is recapitulated in the first thanksgiving prayer after the meal.... The second thanksgiving after the meal also takes up the theme of both bread and cup from the two thanksgivings before the meal 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 ... and conclude with the same “seal.”<sup>21</sup>

Thus, chapters 9 and 10 stand parallel to each other and “form a coherent and complementary whole.”<sup>22</sup>

Moreover, the parallel nature of chapters 9 and 10 is indicated by the recapitulation of the warning of 9:5 in 10:6. Both verses restrict participation in the eucharist to those who are holy; in 10:6, the holy ones are the penitent; in 9:5, the baptized. This recapitulation of the prohibition from chapter 9 further explains the

---

Bradshaw, *Daily Prayer in the Early Church* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2008) 16; Milavec, *Didache*, 420.

<sup>19</sup>Cf. Milavec, *Didache*, 355.

<sup>20</sup>Milavec, *Didache*, 355. The addition of ἡ δύναμις to the doxology in 10:5 is deliberate, “since it follows the parallel prayer of eschatological hope in 9:4. The same addition is made to the doxology in the Lord’s Prayer in 8:2, which has eschatological reference” (Draper, *Commentary*, 220).

<sup>21</sup>Draper, “Ritual,” 140.

<sup>22</sup>Draper, “Ritual,” 139, 141.

significance of the baptismal rite in chapter 7. Specifically, it links baptism to repentance—effectively defining baptism as a sacrament of repentance for the remission of sins.<sup>23</sup> Furthermore, the acclamation in 10:6—“Hosanna to the son of David”—forms an *inclusio* with the opening *eucharistia* over the wine for the “holy vine of David,” indicating “the symbolic importance of this expression for the understanding of the ritual as a whole.”<sup>24</sup> Again, we see that chapters 9 and 10 have been carefully constructed to form a unified and complementary pericope.

Koch has noted that these chapters contain five textual levels, with each level serving a unique purpose.<sup>25</sup> The first level includes the general heading in 9:1 and the three subheadings in 9:2, 3 and 10:1. The general heading is “Now concerning the eucharist, give thanks in this manner.” The three subheadings are as follows: (1) “First, concerning the cup,” (2) “And concerning the broken bread” and (3) “After being filled, give thanks in this manner.” The headings indicate that the didachist is teaching his readers how to pray at the eucharist. The second level consists of the actual content of the eucharistic prayers (9:2b, 3b–4; 10:2–5). Each subheading is followed by a prayer that begins with the formula: “We give thanks to you our Father” (9:2, 3; 10:2).

The third textual level consists of instructions “directed to those who are responsible for the correct course of the ritual meal.”<sup>26</sup> The instructions are, first, only allow the baptized to participate in the eucharist (9:5) and, second, allow the prophets to give thanks as long as they wish (10:7). The fourth level consists of the liturgical

---

<sup>23</sup>Cf. Acts 2:38; Draper, “Ritual,” 142.

<sup>24</sup>Draper, “Ritual,” 142.

<sup>25</sup>Koch, 203–6.

<sup>26</sup>Koch, 204.

exclamations in 10:6: (1) “May grace come, and may this world pass away;” (2) “Hosanna to the son of David;” (3) “Come, Lord” and (4) “Amen.” These “liturgical exclamations are a further step in the course of the ritual meal,” and many scholars think that “they form a liturgical dialogue between the leader of the meal and the participants.”<sup>27</sup> For example, Lietzmann divided the exclamations between the celebrant and the congregation as follows:

*Celebrant:* May grace come, and may this world pass away.

*People:* Hosanna to the son of David!

*Celebrant:* If anyone is holy, let him come. If anyone is not, let him repent. Maranatha!

*People:* Amen!<sup>28</sup>

While admitting the possibility of a liturgical dialogue, Koch has suggested a more likely scenario, namely, that the exclamations were uttered by the celebrant and then echoed by the participants.<sup>29</sup> “In any case,” says Koch, “we are here at a point where the participants are involved in the liturgical process.”<sup>30</sup>

Finally, the fifth textual level is the invitation/warning in 10:6—“If anyone is holy, let him come. If anyone is not, let him repent.” This does not appear to be an instruction for the presider (as in 9:5 and 10:7); rather, these words were to be uttered as part of the liturgy. This verse is the only saying in the liturgy directly addressed to the participants. As we will see in the comments, the meaning of the phrase is greatly disputed.

---

<sup>27</sup>Koch, 205.

<sup>28</sup>Hans Lietzmann was the first to suggest that these exclamations were used as a liturgical dialogue; Lietzmann, 192–93; cf. Owen F. Cummings, *Eucharist and Ecumenism* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2013) 7. It is also possible that the doxological refrain (9:2, 3, 4; 10:2, 4, 5) was spoken by the congregation.

<sup>29</sup>Koch, 206.

<sup>30</sup>*Ibid.*

## Commentary

Bradshaw rightly states that the prayers in Didache 9 and 10 are essentially thanksgivings for the revelation of the messianic kingdom and the salvation made known through Jesus Christ—and hence an *anamnesis* of him—together with a petition for the eschatological ingathering of the church at the consummation of the kingdom.<sup>31</sup> We will examine the theological and liturgical significance of Didache 9–10 under the following six headings: (1) prayer formulas and liturgical freedom, (2) the eucharistic elements, (3) Davidic Christology, (4) eschatological unification, (5) union with God and (6) holy things for holy people.

### 1. Prayer Formulas and Liturgical Freedom

The phrase “concerning the eucharist” (περὶ τῆς εὐχαριστίας) stands as the main heading over chapters 9–10. Though ἡ εὐχαριστία could refer to the thanksgiving prayers, it more likely refers to the meal itself as in 9:5—“let no one eat or drink from your eucharist.”<sup>32</sup> Likewise, in chapter 14, the didachist refers to the sacrament by the phrase “break bread and give thanks” (κλάσατε ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσατε)—most likely a

---

<sup>31</sup>Bradshaw, *Origins*, 36.

<sup>32</sup>It should be noted that although εὐχαριστία appears in the New Testament some fifteen times, “it is never used as a *terminus technicus* for the Eucharist or the eucharistic elements. The situation is very different [however] in the Apostolic Fathers;” Carsten Claussen, “The Eucharist in the Gospel of John and in the Didache” in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) 135–64; 142. E.g. see Ignatius Eph. 13:1; Phil. 4; Smyrn. 7:1; 8:1; and Justin Martyr *1 Apol.* 66.

hendiadys describing a single event, viz., the celebration of the eucharist.<sup>33</sup> That the meal takes its title from the cardinal act of giving thanks indicates that the prayers of thanksgiving are a constitutive element of the sacrament. Referring to the meal by this title emphasizes the eucharistic dimension of the Lord's Supper. As O'Loughlin states,

The name Christians give to their celebration is 'eucharist'—thanksgiving—and this was equivalent to 'blessing God'—which we see Jesus doing—which is declaring how great and good God is for all his wonderful gifts to us. This aspect of praising God for his goodness is often just one theme among many in later practice, but here it is clearly to the fore.<sup>34</sup>

The use of the verb εὐχαριστέω instead of εὐλογέω is immaterial, though this subject has been hotly debated in recent years. In his monumental commentary on the *Didache*, Jean-Paul Audet argued that these two verbs are virtual synonyms and, therefore, interchangeable and that both verbs are used for the Jewish *berakah*. Hence, εὐχαριστέω should be interpreted in light of the *berakah* formula.<sup>35</sup> According to Audet, “to bless God” and “to thank God” are “in effect a single reality: to say in prayer ‘blessed are you for your goodness towards us’ is to say ‘thank you for your goodness to us.’”<sup>36</sup>

Betz explains,

Like the Jewish *berakah*, the Christian eucharist is an acknowledging praise of God for his beneficent power in history, a memorial of the redemptive activity of God and praise for that; [it is] anamnesis and confession, which break out at the existential wonder of God's deed. ... It expresses on the one hand praise for God's gracious act, and on the other hand the human's wonder at it and his answer to it.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup>See Niederwimmer, 196; cf. Bradshaw, *Origins*, 39–40.

<sup>34</sup>Thomas O'Loughlin, *The Didache: A Window on the Earliest Christians* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010) 95.

<sup>35</sup>Jean-Paul Audet, *La Didache: Instructions des apôtres* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1958) 377–98.

<sup>36</sup>O'Loughlin, 85; cf. Draper, *Commentary*, 183–88.

<sup>37</sup>Betz, 259.

Some liturgical scholars, however, have challenged the interchangeability of these two verbs and, therefore, have questioned whether εὐχαριστέω may be identified with the *berakah* formula.<sup>38</sup> Betz, however, has rightly noted that in the Biblical accounts of the Last Supper, the two verbs are employed interchangeably without any hint of distinction.<sup>39</sup> We also find the same phenomenon in Philo and Josephus, who indicate that εὐχαριστέω is used for blessings at meals (i.e. *berakoth*).<sup>40</sup> This issue does not significantly impact our interpretation of Didache 9–10, though it does impact the attempt to identify the Jewish roots of the eucharistic prayers, which is beyond the scope of our current project.

It is important to note that the prayers given in Didache 9–10 “are not word-for-word records of what a prayer leader recited without fail at every eucharist.”<sup>41</sup> They are not fixed formulas designed to be read or recited verbatim during the liturgy. Rather, the celebrant is to “give thanks in this manner” (οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε); the same phrase is used in Did. 9:1 and 10:1. A similar instruction is found in 8:2 and 3, “pray in this manner” (οὕτω προσεύχεσθε), alluding to the words of Jesus in Matt. 6:9. Liturgical historians have convincingly argued that rote prayers simply “had no place in ancient

---

<sup>38</sup>Bradshaw is representative of this school of thought: “In spite of a persisting misconception among many New Testament scholars that these verbs are merely synonyms that might be employed interchangeably, they actually refer to two quite different Jewish liturgical constructions: the *berakah*, ‘blessing’, which used the passive participle of the verb *barak* ... and which eventually became normative in later Jewish prayer; and the *hodayah*, ‘thanksgiving’, which used an active form of the verb *hodeh* ...” (Bradshaw, *Origins*, 8–9).

<sup>39</sup>Betz, 258; see Matt. 26:26; Mark 14:22; Luke 24:30; 1 Cor. 10:30; 11:24; cf. Matt. 15:36; Mark 8:6; Luke 9:16; John 6:11, 23; Acts 27:35; Rom. 14:6; 1 Tim. 4:3–5. Cf. Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2002) 322; Bradshaw, *Origins*, 8–9.

<sup>40</sup>See Van de Sandt and Flusser, 322–23.

<sup>41</sup>Milavec, *Didache*, 363.

Judaism or in the early church.”<sup>42</sup> Thus, according to Milavec, “the oral giftedness of the prayer leader was always operative, interweaving familiar patterns of prayer with fluid expansions spontaneously arrived at.”<sup>43</sup> The absence of fixed prayer forms does not necessarily indicate unrestrained spontaneity, since a minister could prepare his prayers in advance and/or use the Biblical forms of prayer such as the Psalms, while at the same time allowing for an appropriate amount of spontaneity.<sup>44</sup> Regarding the eucharistic prayers in the *Didache*, Draper rightly observes,

It was in the nature of such prayers ... 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.... 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.<sup>45</sup>

Hence, what we find in the *Didache* is a discretionary liturgy much like the liturgies produced in the Reformation era by Martin Bucer, John Calvin, and John Knox. A discretionary liturgy does not prescribe the reading of set forms but provides sample forms that could, in fact, be recited verbatim, yet it also allows the minister a large

---

<sup>42</sup>See Milavec, *Didache*, 363. Prayer formulas do not appear in the tradition until the fourth century, and even these were not regarded as “fixed formulas.” In fact, prayer books were not in use “before the early medieval period;” Milavec, *Didache* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003) 67; hereafter, Milavec, *Commentary*. Even as late as the sixteenth century, there was great regional diversity in liturgical forms in both Jewish and Christian worship. In the fourteenth century, a Jewish liturgist wrote, “You will not find a single place in the world where the Eighteen Benedictions [the daily prayer] are word for word identical with the way in which the Eighteen Benedictions are recited anywhere else” (cited in Milavec, *Commentary*, 67).

<sup>43</sup>Milavec, *Commentary*, 67.

<sup>44</sup>Milavec notes, “Within the early Church one finds parallel expressions demonstrating that spontaneity was the normal expectation even when an abstract or schema was set out for guiding the prayer leader” (Milavec, *Commentary*, 67).

<sup>45</sup>Draper, “Ritual,” 153.

measure of freedom to frame his own prayers, provided that those prayers are in keeping with the liturgy.<sup>46</sup> That is, a minister could either use the prayer forms or pray “in like effect, as the Spirit of God shall move his heart.”<sup>47</sup>

This liberty in prayer is further expressed in Did. 10:7, where the church is instructed to “allow the prophets to give thanks as long as they wish”—τοῖς προφήταις ἐπιτρέπετε εὐχαριστεῖν ὅσα θέλουσιν. Didache 9 and 10, therefore, provided “the archetype for the *Berakoth* of the community,” which a prophet was at liberty to expand and elaborate.<sup>48</sup> The Didache was written for “a community in which prophets were not vague memories from a past era but persons to be honored and reckoned with in its midst.”<sup>49</sup> It gives specific instructions regarding itinerate prophets, which are, presumably, the prophets in view in 10:7. On the other hand, 10:7 may have in view the local prophets who presided at the eucharist. It is noteworthy that Did. 13:1–3 refers to settled prophets and identifies them as the “high priests” and teachers of the community. Furthermore, Did. 15:1–2 states that local bishops carry out the ministry of the prophets and teachers and should, therefore, be held in honor like them. This surely means that the liberty afforded to the prophets in Did. 10:7 would have been extended to local

---

<sup>46</sup>See Duncan Forrester and Douglas Murray, eds., *Studies in the History of Worship in Scotland* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996) 40.

<sup>47</sup>This is from Knox’s liturgy; see *The Genevan Book of Order* (Presbyterian Heritage Publications, 1993) online at [http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualNLS/GBO\\_ch04.htm](http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualNLS/GBO_ch04.htm).

<sup>48</sup>Draper, *Commentary*, 223–24.

<sup>49</sup>Milavec, *Commentary*, 69.



ministers.<sup>50</sup> Freedom in public prayer continued for the first few centuries of the church but was later restricted to prevent unorthodox bishops from using heretical expressions.

In the earliest days it is clear that the bishop was free to compose the eucharistic prayer for himself. ... Hippolytus provides a specimen prayer, but adds that a bishop need not use it, provided that his own prayer is orthodox. By the end of the fourth century, unorthodox prayers were becoming a problem in North Africa, leading to the imposition of controls; and finally in 535 the emperor Justinian insists that no one should be consecrated bishop until he can repeat the prayer by heart, which implies the existence of an accepted text for him to learn.<sup>51</sup>

All evidence from the first three centuries of the church, however, “suggests that bishops enjoyed the same liberty of improvisation” afforded to the prophets in Did. 10:7.<sup>52</sup> This accounts for why we have so few liturgical texts prior to the fourth century. Christians “generally do not seem to have written down their prayers but preferred oral transmission and improvisation.”<sup>53</sup> We conclude, therefore, that the prayer forms in Did. 9–10 provide the structure, framework and basic content for the eucharistic prayers of the community, but they were not regarded as fixed formulas that had to be recited at each celebration of the eucharist.

## 2. The Eucharistic Elements

In Didache 9, there are separate prayers over the cup and the bread, which was the common practice in early eucharistic meals. We find this, for example, in the accounts of

---

<sup>50</sup>This interpretation is confirmed by the *Apostolic Constitutions*, which substitutes the term *πρεσβύτεροι* for *προφήταις* at this place (cf. Jefford, *Commentary*, 56).

<sup>51</sup>Jasper and Cuming, 5.

<sup>52</sup>Bradshaw, *Origins*, 38.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid.; cf. Paul F. Bradshaw and Maxwell E. Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2012) 36; hereafter, Bradshaw, *Liturgies*.

the Last Supper. This practice, however, was eventually and gradually replaced by a single prayer over both elements.<sup>54</sup> We also notice that the order of the elements is cup-bread not bread-cup, which has puzzled many scholars and has even led some to question whether Did. 9–10 is referring to the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper at all.<sup>55</sup> However, there are examples of the cup-bread order in Scripture and in the ancient church. Paul uses the cup-bread order when explaining the significance of the eucharist in 1 Cor. 10:16–21.<sup>56</sup> Furthermore, McGowan has convincingly argued that there are clear examples of the cup-bread order in celebrations of the eucharist in the patristic age.<sup>57</sup> It is important to note that in ancient Judaism, there was diversity regarding the order of *berakoth* in both ritual and ordinary meals.

The Mishnah illustrates this diversity quite well: “If wine is brought [to the table] after the food and there is but one cup, the [adherents of the] School of Shammai say: ‘The benediction is said over the wine and then over the food.’ And the [adherents of the] School of Hillel say: ‘The benediction is said over the food and then over the wine.’ (m. *Berakhot* 8:8).” It is entirely possible, therefore, that the

---

<sup>54</sup>The reason for the change is unclear, though some have conjectured that it coincided with the transition from celebrating the eucharist as an actual meal to a symbolic token of a meal (see Bradshaw, *Liturgies*, 58).

<sup>55</sup>For example, Joachim Jeremias claimed, “There never was a Eucharist with the sequence wine-bread;” Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1966) 118 n. 5. It should be noted that the cup-bread order in the Didache is the order of the *berakoth* and not necessarily the order of the distribution of the elements.

<sup>56</sup>Mazza argues that 1 Cor. 10:16–21 indicates that the cup-bread order was likely used by the Corinthians (Mazza, *Celebration*, 31, 81–86). Luke’s record of the Last Supper has the order cup-bread-cup (Luke 22:17–19). There is a significant textual variant in Luke 22; the longer text has two cups making the order cup-bread-cup; the shorter text has cup-bread. Many New Testament scholars think the shorter is the original, but either way, a cup comes before the bread. See Darrell L. Bock, *Luke*, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1994) 1721–24; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1991) 337–42; cf. R. D. Richardson’s remarks in Lietzmann, *Mass and Lord’s Supper* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970) 304–10.

<sup>57</sup>See Andrew McGowan, “The Inordinate Cup: Issues of Order in Early Eucharistic Drinking,” *Studia Patristica*, Vol. XXXV (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters Publishers, 2001): 283–91; Andrew McGowan, “‘First Regarding the Cup’: Papias and the Diversity of Early Eucharistic Practice,” *Journal of Theological Studies*, n. s. 46 (1995): 551–55.

Christian Scriptures and the *Didache* together reflect the fact that local preferences existed in this matter....<sup>58</sup>

Another point regarding the elements is that “cup” and “bread” are always in the singular, suggesting that a common cup and single loaf were used in the eucharist. This appears to be the case in 1 Cor. 10:16–21 as well, especially since Paul uses the single loaf of bread to symbolize the unity of the church—“Since there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread”—expressing a sentiment similar to Did. 9:4, “As this broken bread was scattered upon the hills and, having been gathered together, became one, so may your church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into your kingdom.”<sup>59</sup>

At the same time, even though the text only refers to a single cup and loaf, it would be wrong to conclude that these were the only foodstuffs available to the participants. After all, the eucharist in the *Didache* was a full meal to satisfy hunger, which is clearly expressed in 10:1, “after being filled” (μετὰ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι); that is, after you have had enough to eat.<sup>60</sup> In Jewish meals, *berakoth* would have been spoken for the bread and wine even though these two elements may not have constituted the entire menu. The elements of bread and wine were singled out because “they stood for

---

<sup>58</sup>Milavec, *Didache*, 360.

<sup>59</sup>I. Howard Marshall writes, “The New Testament envisages the use of one loaf and a common cup. It would be good to maintain this symbolism today. ... The practice whereby each person breaks a piece off a common loaf or is handed a piece broken by the celebrant or his neighbour would helpfully symbolise the breaking of the bread and the unity of the church;” Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord’s Supper* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980) 156.

<sup>60</sup>Draper notes that ἐμπλησθῆναι “clearly implies a full meal and not merely a symbolic token meal” and adds that this expression was removed in ApCon implying that “by the Fourth Century AD, the eucharist was no longer thought of in the context of a meal” (Draper, *Commentary*, 211). On the connection between ἐμπλησθῆναι and Deut. 8:10 (the *locus classicus* of the *Birkat Ha-Mazon*), see Van de Sandt and Flusser, 312; Milavec, *Didache*, 354.

the whole meal.”<sup>61</sup> This, of course, is what we see in the Last Supper. That the eucharist was a full meal in the apostolic church is unquestioned today, and the earliest references to the Lord’s Supper in patristic literature indicate that this practice continued for some time after the first century.

The transition from full meal to symbolic rite appears to have been gradual, taking place before the middle of the second century in some places, after the middle of the third century in others, and probably chiefly related to the relative size of a congregation.<sup>62</sup>

The earliest Christians saw their religious meals as a continuation of the table fellowship that the apostles shared with Jesus during his earthly ministry; it is only natural, then, that the religious meals of the community were actual meals.<sup>63</sup> It is, indeed, ironic that the Lord’s Supper would cease to be an actual supper and be replaced with a mere token eating and drinking.<sup>64</sup> Of course, we recognize that the efficacy of the sacrament does not depend on the amount of food eaten. At the same time, however, we wonder what the theological implications are for replacing the meal with a ritual that barely resembles a meal.

### 3. Davidic Christology

In the eucharistic prayers of the *Didache*, there are two explicit references to David: first, “the holy vine of David” in 9:2; second, “the son of David” in 10:6. This Davidic emphasis matches the emphasis on the theme of the kingdom in the prayers

---

<sup>61</sup>Van de Sandt and Flusser, 305.

<sup>62</sup>Bradshaw, *Liturgies*, 58.

<sup>63</sup>Cf. O’Loughlin, 94.

<sup>64</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 104.

before and after the meal.<sup>65</sup> The language of “the vine of David” has captured the attention of several scholars, and the meaning of the phrase is variously interpreted. We will examine the most common interpretations here.

In the *eucharistia* over the cup (9:2), the celebrant gives thanks to God for the holy vine of his servant/son (παῖς) David, which the Father has revealed through his servant/son (παῖς) Jesus.<sup>66</sup> There “is an obvious parallel being drawn between David as God’s servant and Jesus as the Father’s servant.”<sup>67</sup> Jesus is identified as the new David, as it were, through whom the Father has revealed the Davidic kingdom to those participating in the eucharist including the newly baptized gentiles (Did. 1:1; 7:1).

There is a clear connection between the vine and the contents of the cup, as in the Jewish *Berakah* formula for the wine. However, the meaning of the vine goes well beyond “the natural product found in the cup,” since it draws on the rich symbolism of the vine in salvation history.<sup>68</sup> After a careful survey of the religious significance of the vine in ancient Jewish and Christian literature, Rordorf concludes that the image of the vine is a profound expression of the messianic expectations of Israel, especially concerning the eschatological fulfilment of the Davidic covenant and the reconstitution of the kingdom.<sup>69</sup> Thus, by “drinking the cup of the holy vine,” the new members of the

---

<sup>65</sup>Cf. Draper, *Commentary*, 180.

<sup>66</sup>“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” (Draper, “Ritual,” 148); cf. Draper, *Commentary*, 190; cf. Acts 3:13, 26; 4:27, 30; 1 Clem. 59:3.

<sup>67</sup>O’Loughlin, 91; cf. Mazza, *Celebration*, 76–77.

<sup>68</sup>Betz, 264.

<sup>69</sup>Willy Rordorf, “La vigne et le vin dans la tradition juive et chrétienne” in *Université de Neuchâtel, Annales 1969–1970*, 131–46; cf. Milavec, *Didache*, 361–62; Draper, *Commentary*, 189–90;

church affirm that they have been numbered among the elect and have joined in fellowship with the true Israel of God and “share its eschatological expectations.”<sup>70</sup> For the participants, sharing the eucharist was a sign of their being united to (or grafted into) the holy vine of David (cf. Rom. 11:17–21).

While the vine of David undoubtedly refers to the messianic kingdom, it also has in view the messiah himself, since the revelation of the kingdom has been made known through Jesus, God’s servant (Did. 9:2). Christ himself “reveals the vine to those initiated into the community as king of the renewed kingdom.”<sup>71</sup> Thus, the Didache uses the vine of David to refer to “the new Israel in itself, as well as the messiah Jesus.”<sup>72</sup> In the Gospels, the arrival of the kingdom coincides with the coming of Christ. When Jesus began to preach, he announced, “The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand” (Mark 1:15). The kingdom is inaugurated through the person and work of the King. “The vine of David” in Did. 9:2 has in view Jesus Christ and his saving work; it refers both to the King and his kingdom.

This dual reference is in keeping with the use of the metaphor of the vine in Scripture.<sup>73</sup> For example, in the Fourth Gospel, Jesus identifies himself as “the true vine”

---

Vööbus, 124–26. Cf. Psalm 80:8–19; Isa. 5:1–7; Jer. 2:21; 6:9; Ezek. 17:1–10; 19:10; Hos. 10:1; Amos 9:13–15; Zech. 3:10; Mark 12:1–12; John 15:1, etc.

<sup>70</sup>Milavec, *Commentary*, 68; cf. Milavec, *Didache*, 364.

<sup>71</sup>Draper, “Ritual,” 148.

<sup>72</sup>Betz, 264.

<sup>73</sup>Betz states, “In the Old Testament the vine stands as a picture for Israel, but also for the royal house (Eze. 19:10–14) and for the (royal) representative of the people of Israel (Eze. 17:6–10; Ps. 80:16, 18). ... David speaks in Psalm 80:8 of a vine which Yahweh brought out of Egypt and planted, but which now is laid low; by this Israel is meant. In conclusion to this, the Psalmist prays for Yahweh’s protection for the son (LXX Son of Man), whom this refers to (v.16, 18). This passage was messianically understood” (Betz, 264). Cf. Frederick Dale Bruner, *The Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2012) 894–95.

(John 15:1). The word “true” here should be understood in its full redemptive historical sense; that is, Jesus is the eschatological vine of which Israel was only a type.<sup>74</sup> “The holy vine of David” in *Did.* 9:2 refers to the eschatological kingdom revealed in the fullness of time through the Davidic King, the Lord’s Anointed. To be grafted into that kingdom—as these participants in the eucharist have been—is to be united to Christ, the true vine (cf. John 15:1–8) and numbered among the elect and beloved people of God.<sup>75</sup> Milavec explains,

In the prayer over the cup ... baptized gentiles joined with the chosen people in giving thanks to the Father for having revealed his choice and his cultivation of Israel. By partaking in this cup, the baptized gentile was gladdened by the fruit of this vine and nourished by Israel’s election. Thus, both Jew and gentile together boldly addressed God as “Our Father” (*Did.* 9:2). By sharing in this cup, the one who formerly worshiped “dead gods” (6:3) now found inclusion in God’s election of his chosen people and in Israel’s call to holiness (as in Rom 11:17–21).<sup>76</sup>

The symbolism of the simple phrase “holy vine of David” is quite rich.<sup>77</sup>

Ultimately, it signifies being united to Christ—the true vine and Davidic King—and being grafted into his kingdom. Furthermore, drinking the eucharistic cup is a proleptic participation in the eschatological banquet and, hence, a foretaste of the age to come. The

<sup>74</sup>See Bruner, 878, 894–95. “Most scholarly commentators,” says Bruner, “sense that there is” a eucharistic background to John 15:1–17 (*ibid.*, 894). Likewise, J. H. Bernard writes, “The main thought [in John 15] is not of the Vine as the Church, but of the Vine as representing Him who is the source of the Church’s life. We take the view that the Vine of the allegory was directly suggested here by the wine of the first Eucharist, which had just been celebrated [that night]” (cited in Bruner, 895). On John 15:7–17, Raymond Brown says, “the themes of the Last Supper are found in every line;” see Raymond Brown, *The Gospel According to John, XIII–XXI* (New York: Doubleday, 1970) 666.

<sup>75</sup>Cf. Vööbus, 125; Milavec, *Didache*, 361.

<sup>76</sup>Milavec, *Didache*, 362; cf. Draper, *Commentary*, 189.

<sup>77</sup>Some scholars have extended the metaphor of the vine of David even further to symbolize the death and resurrection of Jesus. As we have seen, the vine is connected to the contents of the cup, which is connected in the Last Supper to the shed blood of Jesus. The image of the vine, therefore, could be a metaphorical *anamnesis* of Christ’s death. Likewise, some have interpreted the vine as a metaphorical *anamnesis* of the resurrection of Jesus, though this is a bit of a stretch; cf. Isa. 11:1–12; Jer. 23:5–8; Rev. 5:5; 22:16.

image of a great feast appears frequently in Scripture as a symbol for the messianic age.<sup>78</sup> As we will see below, this eschatological dimension is the predominant orientation of the eucharist in the Didache. The petition for the eschatological ingathering of the church into the kingdom (9:4; 10:5) and the liturgical exclamations in 10:6 clearly orient the participants toward the age to come. At the same time, the eschatology of the eucharistic prayers is an inaugurated eschatology; the kingdom has already been revealed, and the communicants are already enjoying the fruits of that kingdom.

We should also note that the covenantal dimension of the eucharist is brought into view by the metaphor of “the vine of David.” The coming of the messiah is the fulfilment of the Davidic covenant in which God promised to give one of David’s descendants an everlasting kingdom.<sup>79</sup> The revelation of “the vine of David” through Jesus Christ alludes to the redemptive historical fulfilment of God’s promise to David. Furthermore, the prophets of Israel connected that promise to the new covenant, which the messiah would bring.<sup>80</sup> Hence, the *eucharistia* over the cup brings us close to the Last Supper, where Jesus identified the cup with the new covenant in his blood (Luke 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25). We see, then, that clear lines can be “drawn from the Davidic motif to the covenant thought, which the New Testament cup formula expressly and explicitly declares.”<sup>81</sup>

The *eucharistia* over the cup emphasizes the role of Jesus Christ as mediator of the blessings of the covenant. The vine of David has been revealed through Jesus, God’s

---

<sup>78</sup>E.g. Isa. 25:6–9; Matt. 8:11; Luke 14:12–24.

<sup>79</sup>Cf. 2 Sam 7:1–17; Isa. 11:1–10; Ezek. 37:24; Matt. 1:1; 9:27; 21:9; Acts 2:29–33; Rom. 1:3; 15:12; etc.

<sup>80</sup>E.g. Ezek. 34:20–31; 36:22–32.

<sup>81</sup>Betz, 267.



servant (διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου). Jesus “mediates reconciliation with God and makes known the Kingdom” to the participants; this “puts Jesus in a central role in the fellowship meal.”<sup>82</sup> Indeed, the Christocentricity of the eucharistic prayers is underscored by the repetition of the phrase “through Jesus your servant” five times in the liturgy (9:2, 3, 4; 10:2, 3). Hence, all the saving benefits of the new covenant are given to the participants by the Father through the mediation of Christ.<sup>83</sup> Jesus is “the mediator of entry into the Davidic vine, the Kingdom of God, as he is also the mediator of life and knowledge and of the Divine Name, according to the other *Berakoth* in 9–10. In the Christian fellowship meal, Jesus has become central to its meaning.”<sup>84</sup> The eucharist is an *anamnesis* of the wonderful works of God. In the prayers of thanksgiving, the communicants celebrate the salvation accomplished for them and mediated to them through Jesus Christ, God’s servant.

#### 4. Eschatological Unification

As mentioned above, the eucharistic prayers of Did. 9–10 have a decidedly eschatological orientation. This comes out most clearly in the petition for the unification of the church at the consummation of the kingdom. “As this broken bread was scattered upon the hills and, having been gathered together, became one so may your church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into your kingdom” (Did. 9:4).<sup>85</sup> The bread

---

<sup>82</sup>Draper, *Commentary*, 208.

<sup>83</sup>Cf. Matt. 11:27; John 6:40, 51, 54; 15:1–11; 17:2; Eph. 1:3–14, etc.

<sup>84</sup>Draper, *Commentary*, 190.

<sup>85</sup>This petition is recapitulated in 10:5.

of the eucharist, therefore, serves as a sacramental sign and seal of the eschatological unification of the church. The coming together of the many grains to form one loaf is a prophetic sign of the gathering of the church from the ends of the earth into the kingdom.<sup>86</sup> The eucharistic bread is a foretaste of that eschatological unification.<sup>87</sup>

When we compare the sequence of thought in Did. 9:2–4 with 1 Cor. 10:16–17, we discover a remarkable similarity. Both texts begin with a *berakah* for the cup followed by the breaking of bread and conclude with a saying about the unity of the church vis-à-vis the eucharistic bread.<sup>88</sup> For Paul, the eucharist signifies that the communicants are one new people, but for the didachist, it signifies that they have been “gathered up by the Messiah to become the new people. Scattered to the four winds, they are now gathered, transformed into a holy people, and made part of the kingdom.”<sup>89</sup> In other words, the concept in 1 Cor. 10 is ecclesiological, but in the Didache, it is ecclesiological and eschatological. The Didache has a definite future orientation. It is not just the present unity of the Body in view but the consummative ingathering and, hence, unification of the church at the end of the age.

This petition in Did. 9:4 and 10:5 is deeply rooted in the Jewish hope for “the eschatological ingathering of the Diaspora, together with the proselytes who were

---

<sup>86</sup>The meaning of the saying about the bread being scattered then gathered is not immediately obvious but may suggest the idea that “as the seed was sown and then was gathered to make the bread, etc.” (cf. Jefford, *Commentary*, 35).

<sup>87</sup>Cf. Betz, 267.

<sup>88</sup>Cf. Mazza, *Celebration*, 33.

<sup>89</sup>O’Loughlin, 98.

attached to the Diaspora.”<sup>90</sup> “The idea reaches far back into biblical tradition and is linked with the expectation in the Hebrew bible that the dispersed of Israel will be gathered in the day of salvation.”<sup>91</sup> O’Loughlin observes that the metaphorical language of the petition is

a reference to a theme in the prophets [e.g. Nahum 3:18] that the people have been scattered on the mountains and will be gathered back together by the Christ—and now it is realized in the people gathered at the Lord’s table. ... It was with the messianic images from the Scriptures that the first Christians sought to understand the person and work of Jesus, and hence their use of the prophetic image of the great gatherer of Israel for Jesus.<sup>92</sup>

In the *Didache*, the church sees itself as the true Israel of God scattered in all the earth, and it longs for the day when Christ, the true Shepherd of Israel, will appear and gather the saints from the four winds to unite them as one people. In their celebrations of the eucharist, the early Christians—having assembled at the Lord’s Table and having shared the eucharistic bread—received a foretaste of the final gathering of the saints at the consummation of the ages. It is only natural, then, that they cried out for the return of Christ, “May grace come, and may this world pass away. Come Lord!” (*Did.* 10:6).

---

<sup>90</sup>Draper, *Commentary*, 208. The hope expressed in this prayer echoes the tenth of the Eighteen Benedictions, which, in the *Seder* of Amram, reads, “Proclaim our deliverance so that we may gather together from the four corners of the earth. Blessed art thou, Lord, who gathers the exiles of his people Israel” (Mazza, *Celebration*, 83). “The summation in the *Ahabhah Rabbah* is even more specific: ‘Our Father ... Bring us back to peace from the four corners (or winds) of the earth and enable us to enter freely into our land. For you are the God who works salvation, and you have chosen us among all peoples and languages, and have led us to your great and holy Name’” (*ibid.*). Cf. Draper, *Commentary*, 195; van de Sandt and Flusser, 311.

<sup>91</sup>Van de Sandt and Flusser, 311. See Deut. 30:1–10; Psalm 106:47; Isa. 11:12; 27:13; 43:5–7; 56:8; Jer. 31:8–10; Ezek. 11:17; 28:25; 34:11–16; 37:21; Matt. 24:31; Mark 13:27; etc. Betz observes that Isaiah “says of the sprout of Jesse, that is of the Davidic messianic Son of David, that he will gather the scattered of Israel and bring together the dispersed of Judah (Is. 11:10–12). So there is a connection between the thought of the benediction of the cup and the prayer for gathering” (Betz, 273).

<sup>92</sup>O’Loughlin, 24–25.

It is important to remember, however, that the eschatological dimension of the eucharist in the Didache is an inaugurated eschatology. That is, it is not only future but present. The communicants at the table have already been made partakers of life and knowledge and the kingdom through Jesus Christ. Hence, while the coming of *χάρις* in 10:6 is primarily future, it also has a secondary and present meaning. “May grace come” is both eschatological and eucharistic. Betz explains,

These prayers/cries relate primarily to the future event of the fulfillment of salvation, but nevertheless still have a second dimension of meaning, which even though it is not overt should still not be mistaken: they indicate that the future Parousia event, the future coming of Jesus, experiences a foretaste and anticipation here and now in the event of the Lord’s Supper. The coming of grace implored for in 10:6 has in mind the eschatological fulfillment of salvation. It should not be overlooked, however, that *χάρις* in the ancient church could be on the one hand a title of Christ and on the other hand also an equivalent for eucharist [cf. Heb. 10:29; 12:15; 13:9]. The word is perhaps already chosen with respect to the latter. If we take all of this into account and further add the fact that the prayer for the coming of grace happens in the context of the Lord’s Supper, then it can be concluded concerning the conviction of faith that the coming of the fulfillment of salvation, and more precisely the future coming of Christ, is experienced beforehand in this sacramental meal.<sup>93</sup>

Thus, the eucharist is a proleptic experience of the *parousia* in sacramental form; that is, in the form of signs and seals of the promise of the coming of Christ and his kingdom. The Lord’s Supper is an eschatological event. It is a prophetic sign that the Lord who will come has already come to inaugurate his kingdom—a sign that the great feast at the end of the age is already being served. The eucharist is “a bridge between the first and second coming of Christ.”<sup>94</sup>

In our day, the future orientation of the eucharist (so prevalent in the Didache) has been eclipsed by a contemplative memorial of a past event, the death of Christ. This is

---

<sup>93</sup>Betz, 271.

<sup>94</sup>Betz, 272; cf. Draper, *Commentary*, 222.

primarily due to an emphasis on the anamnestic nature of the sacrament. The Lord's Supper is indeed an *anamnesis* of a past event, but it is also designed to "proclaim the Lord's death until he comes" (1 Cor. 11:26). The term *anamnesis* comes from the Lord's instruction to "Do this in remembrance (ἀνάμνησις) of me" (1 Cor. 11:25). This *anamnesis* certainly includes remembering an act performed by Christ, but it is noteworthy that we are instructed to remember Christ himself and not only an event in his life. Moreover, it is important to note that *anamnesis* does not merely signify a mental recollection but an act of worship. "Do this in remembrance of me" prescribes a liturgical act, along the lines of Psalm 105:5, "Remember the wondrous works that he has done." This is more than a mental recollection; it is a liturgical recounting of God's wondrous works in praise and thanksgiving.<sup>95</sup> The *Didache* clearly expresses this kind of *anamnesis* in its eucharistic prayers, but the primary orientation is not toward past events but future expectations.

Above all, the Eucharist of the *Didache* was profoundly forward looking: Those whose lives were nourished on the broken loaf were earmarked for the final ingathering—for just as the grains forming the loaf were once "scattered over the hills" (9:4) and only later were kneaded and baked into one loaf, so those who ate the fragments of this loaf were also assured that the Father would one day harvest them "from the ends of the earth" so as to gather them into his Kingdom. Those who ate, therefore, tasted the future and collective promise the "one loaf" signified.<sup>96</sup>

In the New Testament, we find several parallels to the petition in *Did.* 9:4 and 10:5. For example, Jesus said that when the Son of Man comes "in clouds with great

---

<sup>95</sup>See Frank C. Senn, "Anamnesis" in *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*, ed. Peter E. Fink (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1990) 45–46.

<sup>96</sup>Milavec, *Commentary*, 68–69. Milavec adds, "...the Eucharist of the *Didache* perpetuated the proleptic foretaste of the Kingdom that marked the table fellowship of Jesus. Fed on the Eucharist, therefore, those who shared the Way of Life of the Father were nourished in their altered social reality. They were not of this world. Each day of the week they thought and acted in anticipation of the world to come" (*ibid.*, 69).

power and glory,” he will “send out the angels and gather his elect from the four winds, from the ends of the earth to the ends of heaven” (Mark 13:26–27; cf. Matt. 24:31). The closest parallel to the *Didache*, however, is John 11:51–52, where the high priest unwittingly prophesied that “Jesus would die for the nation, and not for the nation only, but also to gather into one the children of God who are scattered abroad.” The death of Jesus, therefore, was designed to achieve the unification of the church, which, of course, includes the incorporation of the elect among the nations. The *Didache* recognizes that this process of gathering has already begun. Christ has already started bringing the gentiles into his kingdom (*Did.* 1:1). Indeed, in the very act of the eucharist, those who once were far off have been brought near by the blood of Christ (Eph. 2:13) and have taken their seat at the table, in order to share in the fruits of the messianic feast. The loaf of bread they shared was a symbol of the gathering and unification of the children of God for which Christ died (John 11:51–52). “It started off as seeds that were scattered, then they were gathered and transformed into the unity that is the loaf—and now each is sharing in that unity at the meal that anticipates the heavenly banquet.”<sup>97</sup>

Jesus had spoken of “a universal festal meal uniting all the elect,” a meal at which many would “come from east and west and recline at table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven.”<sup>98</sup> At the Lord’s Table, the gentiles now sit as welcome guests anticipating the day when they will “eat bread in the kingdom of God” (Luke 14:15). The eucharist is a seal of Christ’s promise to gather the elect at his feast; it serves as a pledge of their inheritance and is a foretaste of it. While the *Didache* recognizes that

---

<sup>97</sup>O’Loughlin, 97–98.

<sup>98</sup>Betz, 272; Matt. 8:11; cf. Matt. 22:1–14; Luke 14:1–24.

this festal meal has already begun, the eschatological orientation of the book is predominantly future. The focus is on the “not yet” of the kingdom rather than “the already.”<sup>99</sup> However, the kingdom has, in fact, already been made known through Jesus Christ. Thus, the kingdom has been inaugurated but has yet to be consummated.<sup>100</sup> Betz strikes a good balance between the present and future aspects of the eucharist in the *Didache*. The “eucharistic bread is already the foretaste and anticipation of the end time unification of Christians. It is however still also a representation of their already existing unity, inasmuch as the community prepares and shares in this bread.”<sup>101</sup>

It is noteworthy that the kingdom eschatology of Jesus is featured prominently in the Last Supper narrative. In Luke’s account of the Last Supper, Jesus began the meal with the words,

I have earnestly desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer. For I tell you I will not eat it until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God.” And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he said, “Take this, and divide it among yourselves. For I tell you that from now on I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes (Luke 22:15–18).

The eschatological joy that we will experience at the consummation of the kingdom when we feast with Christ has its commencement and foretaste in the Lord’s Supper.<sup>102</sup> “The relationship between the Eucharist and eating and drinking in the coming kingdom of God is not merely that between symbol and reality, but that between

---

<sup>99</sup>Cf. Geerhardus Vos, *The Pauline Eschatology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986).

<sup>100</sup>Cf. Herman Ridderbos, *The Coming of the Kingdom* (Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1962).

<sup>101</sup>Betz, 273.

<sup>102</sup>Cf. Ridderbos, 412.

commencement and fulfillment.”<sup>103</sup> Finally, the Last Supper ended much like it began—with a definite reference to the consummation of the kingdom, “Truly, I say to you, I will not drink again of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in the kingdom of God” (Mark 14:25; cf. Matt. 26:29). “There can be no doubt,” says Ridderbos, that the eschatological perspective “disclosed by Jesus repeatedly at the Last Supper” determined the nature of “the table-fellowship ordained by him for the church.”<sup>104</sup> The eucharistic prayers of the Didache bear eloquent testimony to this eschatological perspective.

## 5. Union with God

The coming of the Lord in Did. 10:6 is not only future but present; it is eschatological and eucharistic. The Lord’s coming is “anticipated in the elements of the meal.”<sup>105</sup> In the Lord’s Supper, Christ himself is present, presented and received, and since the eucharistic elements are the means through which Christ is communicated, the elements are referred to as “spiritual food and drink”—πνευματικὴν τροφήν καὶ ποτὸν.<sup>106</sup> In the Didache, as in 1 Cor. 10:3–4, the adjective “spiritual” (πνευματικός) does not signify the nonmaterial but the eschatological. πνευματικός is used in the same way in 1 Cor. 15:44–49, where Paul contrasts the “natural body” of the first Adam with the “spiritual body” (σῶμα πνευματικόν) of the last Adam. The contrast here is between the

---

<sup>103</sup>Ibid.

<sup>104</sup>Ridderbos, 413.

<sup>105</sup>Betz, 272.

<sup>106</sup>Cf. Paul’s language in 1 Cor. 10:3–4.



first creation (represented by Adam) and the new creation (represented by Christ).<sup>107</sup> The contrast is synonymous with the distinction between earthly and heavenly in 1 Cor. 15:47, “The first man was from the earth, a man of dust; the second man is from heaven.” Hence, the distinction in 1 Cor. 15:44–49 is between the pre-eschatological age and the eschatological age,<sup>108</sup> which is essentially the same distinction in Did. 10:3, where the didachist contrasts the earthly/pre-eschatological with the heavenly/eschatological:

You, almighty Master, created all things for your name’s sake. To *all* people, you have given both food and drink to enjoy, in order that they might give *you* thanks. But to us, you have freely given spiritual food and drink and eternal life through your servant *Jesus* (Did. 10:3).

The thanksgiving for creation—especially as enjoyed by humanity in the gifts of food and drink—is followed by a thanksgiving for the eschatological gift of eternal life in Jesus Christ, freely given to the communicants and received by them in the form of “spiritual food and drink.” The food is “spiritual” because “it is related to that sphere in which the resurrected One lives.”<sup>109</sup> The resurrected body of Christ is spiritual because of its heavenly origin; the eucharistic food is called spiritual for the same reason. It is not surprising, therefore, that eternal life (i.e. the life of the new *aeon*) is “ascribed to it as its consequence.”<sup>110</sup> Witherington explains,

The term “spiritual” here [1 Cor. 10:3–4; cf Did. 10:3] has the very same significance it does in 1 Corinthians 15:44. There the contrast is between a natural body and a spiritual body. The contrast has to do with the source of the body. God’s Spirit provided the food and drink in the wilderness, and God’s Spirit will provide the resurrection body as well. The food, like the body, is a real and

---

<sup>107</sup>Cf. Richard B. Gaffin, Jr., *Resurrection and Redemption* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1987) 83.

<sup>108</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>109</sup>Betz, 272.

<sup>110</sup>*Ibid.*

material substance, but its origins are different from ordinary food or bodies. A spiritual body, then, means a body given by, and perhaps entirely empowered by, the Spirit. It does not refer to a nonmaterial body. Similarly, spiritual food and drink here refer to real food and drink, but spiritually or miraculously provided.<sup>111</sup>

In this regard, we might say that “spiritual food and drink” means “Spirit-sent food and drink.” God has freely given us Spiritual food and drink and, by means of it, eternal life through Jesus Christ (Did. 10:3).<sup>112</sup> Thus, the eucharist does not merely supply perishable food for the body but the spiritual food that nourishes us to eternal life.<sup>113</sup> This is one of the main tenets of Reformed eucharistic theology. As Hughes Oliphant Old states,

To the eyes of faith, the Supper is a sign of the heavenly banquet, and through faith, those who participate in the sacred meal receive a foretaste of the heavenly reality. The bread and the wine of Communion are a spiritual food which nourishes us unto eternal life.<sup>114</sup>

The Didache brings us close to the teaching of the Fourth Gospel, where Jesus contrasts “the food that perishes” with “the food that endures to eternal life, which the Son of Man will give” (John 6:27). Christ himself is this spiritual food; he is “the bread of life” (or “the living bread”) who came down from heaven and “gives life to the world” (John 6:33, 51). Eating this bread results in eternal life for the recipients; “if anyone eats

---

<sup>111</sup>Ben Witherington, III, *Making a Meal of It: Rethinking the Theology of the Lord's Supper* (Baylor, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007) 41–42.

<sup>112</sup>“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” (Draper, “Ritual,” 147).

<sup>113</sup>Betz adds, “the eucharistic bread is the renewed gift of paradise and so the partial and preliminary outworking of the end time salvation. The beginning however calls for fulfillment, the partial for the total realization of the eschatological salvation, the sign for the genuine thing” (Betz, 273).

<sup>114</sup>Hughes Oliphant Old, *Holy Communion in the Piety of the Reformed Church* (Powder Springs, GA: Tolle Lege Press, 2013) 176.

of” the bread that Christ will give, “he will live forever” (John 6:51). The language of the Bread of Life discourse is echoed in the eucharistic prayers of the Didache:

Whoever feeds on my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life [“to us, you have given eternal life through your servant”], and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is true food, and my blood is true drink [“to us, you have given spiritual food and drink”]. Whoever feeds on my flesh and drinks my blood dwells in me, and I in him [“you have caused your holy name to dwell in our hearts”] (John 6:54–56; Did. 10:2, 3).

In the eucharist, the communicants receive eternal life and a foretaste of the resurrection at the last day by means of sharing the spiritual food and drink. The eucharist is a means of grace; it is a means of giving and receiving Christ himself and the benefits of salvation found in him. The Didache further teaches that the benefits received through the eucharist are given in virtue of our union to Christ. This concept is most clearly expressed in Did. 10:2.

We give thanks to you, holy Father, for your holy name, which you have caused to dwell (κατεσκήνωσας) in our hearts and for the knowledge and faith and immortality which you have revealed to us through your servant Jesus.

Hence, God’s holy name dwells in our hearts through his Son. The name of God here stands for God himself and is inseparable from the one through whom the name is revealed, namely, Jesus Christ. Thus, “the name” of God is best interpreted as a circumlocution for Christ.<sup>115</sup> The term κατεσκήνωσας points us in the same direction, for in the Fourth Gospel, the term is used in connection with the incarnation of Christ and is further linked with the revelation of God through him. “The Word became flesh and

---

<sup>115</sup>Betz convincingly argues that “the holy name” of the Father relates to the person who reveals him, “in whom he is recognizable and visible in the sense of the Johannine Jesus: ‘He who sees me, sees the Father’ (John 14:9)” (Betz, 270); cf. Draper, *Commentary*, 212; and J. Danielou, *A History of Early Christian Doctrine Before the Council of Nicaea I: The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964) 155–56.

dwelt (ἐσκήνωσεν) among us,” and he has revealed the Father whom no one has ever seen (John 1:14, 18). The connection between the *Didache* and the Fourth Gospel on this point is summarized quite well by Betz:

On the basis of *Didache* 10:2, the eucharist is recognizable as the sacramental descent and indwelling of Jesus in the heart of human beings, and indeed—since the saying serves as thanks for the meal—by means of the food. That is exactly the position of the Gospel of John, which also speaks more clearly than the *Didache*: “This is the bread which has come down from heaven” (John 6:58). “As the Father who sent me is living and I live through the Father, so everyone who eats me lives through me” (John 6:57). This verse proclaims the eucharist as the sacramental realization of the previous incarnation of Jesus. In the *Didache* the present eucharistic indwelling of Jesus is fairly clearly expressed (10:2); the reminder of his previous coming recedes but is echoed in a veiled way in the reference to the “vine of David” (9:2) and in the hosanna cry of 10:6 at least.<sup>116</sup>

Therefore, by means of participating in the eucharist, the holy name of God is made to dwell in our hearts; that is, to tabernacle in our hearts as in a temple. The theological meaning of the phrase “your holy name, which you have caused to dwell in our hearts” is undoubtedly linked to the Biblical teaching that God’s temple is the place where he caused his name to dwell.<sup>117</sup> Just as the name of God dwelt in the temple of Solomon, so too the name of God—meaning nothing less than God’s shekinah glory—dwells in the eschatological temple that is being built by the new Davidic King.<sup>118</sup> This teaching frequently appears in the Pauline epistles, except Paul has substituted “the theology of the Name with a theology of the Spirit.”<sup>119</sup>

---

<sup>116</sup>Betz, 270–71.

<sup>117</sup>Cf. Deut. 12:11; 1 Kings 8:27–30.

<sup>118</sup>Cf. Philipp Schaff, *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (New York, 1885) 195. Though the indwelling of God’s name is said to be in the hearts of the communicants, this should not be interpreted in an individualistic sense, for it is the community as a whole that constitutes the new temple (cf. Draper, “Ritual,” 147).

<sup>119</sup>Mazza, *Celebration*, 78. Cf. 1 Cor. 3:16; 2 Cor. 6:16; Eph. 2:21–22.

The temple metaphor in the Didache brings into view the liturgical nature of the church. The temple is a place of worship—a house of prayer. Sacrifices and prayers were offered in the temple every morning and evening, and the annual, liturgical festivals of Israel were celebrated there.<sup>120</sup> Hence, there is an inseparable link between the temple metaphor and worship. As we will see later, it is this temple metaphor that stands behind the characterization of the church’s worship as a sacrifice in Did. 14:1–3. Indeed, it stands behind the concern for the purity of the eucharist in Did. 9–10.

## 6. Holy Things for Holy People

The theme of holiness appears four times in Didache 9–10. First, God is addressed as “the holy Father,” who has caused his “holy name” to dwell in us (10:2). Next, in Did. 9:5, those who are responsible for the lawful administration of the eucharist are instructed to let no one eat or drink from the meal, “except those who have been baptized in the name of the Lord” for the Lord has said, “Do not give what is holy to the dogs.”<sup>121</sup> This instruction is recapitulated in Did. 10:6, “If anyone is holy, let him come.”<sup>122</sup> If anyone is not, let him repent. Come, Lord!”<sup>123</sup> The parallelism of the saying

---

<sup>120</sup>Exod. 29:38–39; 1 Kings 8:30–53; Isa. 56:7; Mark 11:17; Luke 1:10; 24:52; Acts 3:1; cf. Exod. 23:14–17; 34:18–23; Deut. 16:1–16. 1 Pet. 2:5–10.

<sup>121</sup>The saying of the Lord in Did. 9:5 is identical to the words of Jesus in Matt. 7:6, though the context is very different. The two texts appear to be independent of each other (cf. Draper, *Commentary*, 206).

<sup>122</sup>Some commentators (e.g. Audet, Rordorf, Betz, Niederwimmer) have interpreted this saying as the transition from an ordinary meal (*agape*) to the eucharist proper. Thus, they interpret the words “let him come” to mean “let him come forward and receive the Eucharist.” While it is true that processions to the altar/table in order to receive the elements became a common practice in later celebrations of the eucharist, it would be anachronistic to read such practice back into the Didache (cf. Bradshaw, *Origins*, 37). In the Didache, “The cup and bread are more likely to have been passed around the assembly” (ibid.). “Let him come” is probably “another eschatological ejaculation, inviting the holy to join the community of the redeemed and those who were not to repent” (ibid.; cf. Rev. 22:14–20). Concerning this speculation,

in 10:6 indicates two things: (1) those who are holy are the penitent and (2) those who are unholy may become holy by repenting. Furthermore, the link between 10:6 and 9:5 connects baptism to repentance—effectively defining baptism as sign of forgiveness and cleansing from sin (cf. Acts 2:38; 22:16). This is undoubtedly the significance of baptism in the Didache since, in the one case, only the baptized are allowed to participate in the eucharist and, in the other case, only the holy ones are allowed to do so. Baptism is, therefore, a sign of forgiveness, cleansing and purification, such that those who are unbaptized are regarded as impure.<sup>124</sup> We must not forget, however, that in 10:6, the hearers are exhorted to repent in order to become holy. Therefore, it is not merely the external ceremony of baptism that renders one holy but baptism with repentance. In other words, baptism without repentance does not cleanse from defilement, but baptism with

---

Draper rightly said, “this 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” (Draper, “Ritual,” 143).

<sup>123</sup>The  $\mu\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\theta\alpha$  formula seems to come from Zech. 9:9 and may be “a kind of curse to reinforce the demand for repentance by summoning the presence of God as witness;” C. F. D. Moule, “A Reconsideration of the Context of Maranatha” in *Essays in New Testament Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982) 222–26; cf. Draper, *Commentary*, 222. It is noteworthy that this phrase is used to enforce a warning in Did. 10:6, just as it is in 1 Cor. 16:22 and Rev. 22:20 (see Draper, *Commentary*, 222).

<sup>124</sup>Cf. Draper, *Commentary*, 209. Some commentators, like Draper, distinguish between cultic purity and moral purity and claim that baptism accomplishes the former while repentance results in the latter. Though warrant for such a distinction may be found in the Old Testament, we are not convinced that the Didache makes such a clear distinction. The Didache appears to teach that cultic defilement is a direct result of moral defilement and that repentance removes moral defilement and, hence, secures cultic purity (cf. Did. 14:1–3; Draper, *Commentary*, 198). Therefore, the distinction between the two kinds of purity/defilement is effectively removed. Van de Sandt observes, “The line between “outer” (= ritual) and “inner” (= moral) impurity is reasonably distinct in the Hebrew Bible and definitely distinct in Rabbinic literature, but in the Dead Sea Scrolls there is at times a blurring of the difference between the two types of impurity;” Van de Sandt, “Why Does the Didache Conceive of the Eucharist as a Holy Meal?,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 65 (2011): 1–20, 16. In our opinion, this “blurring of the difference” between outer and inner impurity is what we find in the Didache as well.

repentance does. Since baptism is a sign of forgiveness and cleansing from sin, it is the precondition for admission to the holy eucharist.<sup>125</sup>

The “fencing of the Table” in Did. 9:5 and 10:6 excludes all the unbaptized, but it may also be intended to exclude the impenitent members of the community, which is certainly the case in Did. 14:1–2. The invitation/warning of 10:6, therefore, may serve the same purpose as Paul’s instructions regarding self-examination before eating and drinking in 1 Cor. 11:27–32. In other words, 10:6 may require “the ethical holiness of the already baptized” as a prerequisite for participating in the meal.<sup>126</sup> In any case, what is clear in the text is that the holiness of the eucharist requires holiness on the part of the communicants. The eucharistic elements are holy things for holy people. The purity of the meal necessitates the exclusion of the impure—those who are outside of Christ and his church.

The didachist justifies the exclusion of the unbaptized with the words of the Lord, “Do not give what is holy to the dogs” (9:5). This saying has deep roots in ancient Judaism where “dogs represent the heathen in their uncleanness.”<sup>127</sup>

In Jewish sources the expression, “holy things are not to be redeemed to be fed to dogs,” was used as a standard reason for prohibiting the sacrificial temple food belonging exclusively to God from coming into contact with the most forbidden impurity. The maxim is undoubtedly quoted here [in Did. 9:5] as the authoritative word of the Lord in order to emphasize that all those who have not been baptized are excluded from the Eucharist.<sup>128</sup>

---

<sup>125</sup>The exclusion of the unbaptized is widely attested in ancient Christian literature and is “clearly evidenced in second and third century sources” (Bradshaw, *Origins*, 38; cf. Draper, *Commentary*, 197–200).

<sup>126</sup>Betz, 268; cf. Draper, “Ritual,” 134; Jonathan A. Draper, “Pure Sacrifice in Didache 14 as Jewish Christian Exegesis,” *Neotestamentica* 42.2 (2008): 223–52, 225; hereafter, Draper, “Sacrifice.”

<sup>127</sup>Draper, “Ritual,” 134.

<sup>128</sup>Van de Sandt, 2.

The expression “what is holy” (τὸ ἅγιον) in Did. 9:5 clearly stands for the elements of the eucharist. Since the elements are holy, they must not be given to unholy people. The theological background for this teaching is surely the cultic requirements of purity and holiness in the temple worship of ancient Israel. The temple motif in Did. 14:1–3 points us in the same direction. In the Didache, the community sees itself as the true temple of God and its worship as the eschatological fulfilment of old covenant temple worship (cf. 14:3). The members of the community have been consecrated to a priestly service of prayer and praise. The priesthood belongs to all who are baptized. Baptism is a sign that our ritual uncleanness has been removed and that we are now fit to enter God’s holy presence (Heb. 10:19–22). In Ezekiel, it is the sign of the new covenant appended to the promise of purification (Ezek. 36:25–27). This further explains the reason for excluding the unbaptized from the eucharist, namely, because they have not been cleansed from defilement.

The exclusion of the unbaptized also highlights the covenantal dimension of the sacraments. The logic behind Did. 9:5 might be stated as follows: (1) The Lord’s Supper is a covenant meal that may only be eaten by members of the covenant; (2) baptism is the sacrament that marks off those who belong to the covenant people of God; (3) therefore, only those who are baptized may eat the eucharist.<sup>129</sup> In the Didache, baptism and the eucharist are regarded as covenant rites. Likewise, Did. 9:5 highlights the priestly nature of the sacraments. The Old Testament rites of purification and consecration were types of

---

<sup>129</sup>The covenantal nature of the eucharist is emphasized in the words of Jesus at the Last Supper, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood” (Luke 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25; cf. Matt. 26:28; Mark 14:24).



Christian baptism.<sup>130</sup> The significance of baptism is that we are both cleansed from defilement and consecrated to a priestly ministry. As the sprinkling of the blood at Mt. Sinai separated the Israelites from the world marking them as God's holy people, so too the sprinkling with water identifies us as the people of the new covenant.<sup>131</sup> It identifies us as the disciples of Christ (Matt. 28:19–20; Did. 7:1–4). Baptism in the name of the triune God is a seal of the new covenant signifying that he is our God, and we are his people. Moreover, every member of the covenant is consecrated to the priestly service of praise and prayer. They are set apart to worship and serve the living and true God and may, therefore, participate in the sacred meal of the community.<sup>132</sup>

In the Didache, the eucharist is characterized as “holy,” much like the sacred meals that belonged exclusively to the priests of the old covenant.<sup>133</sup> “Once such food had been set apart it could not be tampered with or, even worse, be given to scavenging creatures like dogs that polluted themselves with unclean fare.”<sup>134</sup> Leviticus 22:6–10 is particularly close to the thought of Did. 9:5.

---

<sup>130</sup>Cf. Psalm 51:1–7; John 3:23–26; Heb. 10:19–22.

<sup>131</sup>Exod. 24:8. Though sprinkling is not mentioned as a mode of baptism in the Didache, its use is well attested in the ancient church. See Benjamin B. Warfield, “The Archaeology of the Mode of Baptism,” in *Works*, vol. 9 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2003) 345–85; Benjamin B. Warfield, “How Shall We Baptize,” in *Selected Shorter Writings*, vol. 2., edited by John E. Meeter (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 2001) 329–50.

<sup>132</sup>It should be noted that this teaching does not necessarily lead to the practice of paedocommunion. Likewise, it would be erroneous to conclude that the Didache limits baptism to believers only. In my opinion, the Didache teaches infant baptism in the same manner that it is taught in the New Testament, namely, by good and necessary consequence. Likewise, I think one can make an argument from good and necessary consequence that the Didache does not permit the practice of paedocommunion. Both issues, however, are beyond the scope of the current project.

<sup>133</sup>Cf. Van de Sandt, 3; Exod. 29:33; Lev. 2:3; 22:6–16; Num. 18:8–19; Ezra 2:63; Neh. 7:65.

<sup>134</sup>Van de Sandt, 3.

[An unclean priest] shall not eat of the holy things (ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων) unless he has bathed his body in water. When the sun goes down he shall be clean, and afterward he may eat of the holy things (φάγεται τῶν ἁγίων) because they are his bread (ἄρτος). ... No outsider (ἄλλογενῆς) shall eat the holy thing; no foreign guest (πάρουκος) of the priest or hired worker shall eat of a holy thing.”<sup>135</sup>

The authors of the New Testament frequently use Old Testament types to explain the significance of the sacraments.<sup>136</sup> It is not hard to imagine, therefore, that the didachist is using the purification rites and the sacred meals of the Levitical priesthood as types of Christian baptism and the Lord’s Supper—especially when we consider the prevalence of the temple motif in Did. 14:1–3. Likewise, as we have already seen, the same motif stands behind the language of God’s holy name dwelling in our hearts in Did. 10:2. The eucharist is regarded as holy because it is a means through which God dwells in the midst of his people; it is holy like the sanctuary of old because it is linked to the presence of God. Hence, like the temple and its worship, the Lord’s Supper must be guarded from defilement. The connection between purity and God’s presence is well summarized by Draper:

In ancient Israel, the concept of purity or *tohorah* relates primarily to the condition for the presence of God with his people and hence primarily to the temple. God’s holiness requires that Israel approach him in purity, as defined by the ritual law, and also by obeying the moral law associated with his covenant and set out in the Torah.<sup>137</sup>

---

<sup>135</sup>Lev. 22:6–10; Greek from LXX. “The *qodashim* (the parts of the sacrifices eaten by the priests) called for prior purification rituals which served to maintain the separation between this holy sacrifice and polluting, profane activities. Ritual impurity or cultic uncleanness (discussed in Lev 12–15, Num 19 and Deut 23) was a state disqualifying a person from certain ritual acts relating to sacred foods and entry into the temple area. It applied to priests and to those who were going to enter the temple and eat holy things” (Van de Sandt, 4). τὸ ἅγιον (in Did. 9:5) “refers to the condition of cultic holiness as in LXX, where it is used for food offered in sacrifice which only the priests may eat” (Draper, *Commentary*, 198). See Exod. 29:33; Lev. 2:2–3; 22:6–16; Num. 18:8–19.

<sup>136</sup>E.g. 1 Cor. 10:1–6; Col. 2:12; Heb. 10:22; 1 Pet. 3:21.

<sup>137</sup>Draper, “Sacrifice,” 225. The link to the Torah, mentioned by Draper here, is especially relevant given the important role that the Torah plays in Did. 1–6.

It is this concern for the purity of Christian worship that underlies the instructions in Did. 9:5; 10:6 and 14:1–3. The unbaptized, the unrepentant and the unreconciled must not participate in the eucharist lest the worship of the community become defiled. The sanctity of the old covenant temple and its worship is now applied to the sanctity of the eschatological temple and its worship, and the eucharist, in particular, serves “as the locus for purity and sanctity.”<sup>138</sup>

### Conclusion

The prayers of Did. 9–10 teach us a great deal about the eucharistic theology of the early church and give us a clear picture of how that theology was brought to expression in its liturgy. If these were the only two chapters in the Didache that dealt with the subject of the eucharist, they would be enough to enable us to catch a glimpse at how the earliest Christians worshiped. However, there is a whole other chapter in the Didache that addresses the subject of the eucharist, and to this, we now turn our attention.

---

<sup>138</sup>Van de Sandt, 20.

## CHAPTER THREE

### THE EUCHARIST IN THE DIDACHE, PART TWO

Many scholars are puzzled over why the Didache treats the eucharist in two separate places: chapters 9–10 and chapter 14. Various theories have been proposed to explain this anomaly.<sup>1</sup> Our concern here, however, is not to explain why the didachist addresses the subject in different places but to focus on what the text teaches us about the eucharistic theology and worship of the early church. The central theme of Didache 14 is the purity of the church's worship. In order to maintain this purity, the members of the community must (1) deal with their transgressions of the Torah and (2) deal with intra-communal strife and reconciliation.<sup>2</sup> Their worship is characterized as a sacrifice (θυσία) that must be pure and undefiled in order to meet the divine standard of acceptable worship: "In every place and time, offer me a pure sacrifice ... says the Lord" (Did. 14:3). Hence, this chapter provides directives as prerequisites for celebrating the eucharist with a view toward guarding the purity of the church's worship. Our translation of Did. 14 is based on the Greek text published by Michael Holmes.<sup>3</sup> The translation is followed by a brief set of notes that explain various exegetical matters that are significant for the

---

<sup>1</sup>See Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache*, trans. Linda M. Maloney, ed. Harold W. Attridge (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1998) 194; Aaron Milavec, *The Didache: Faith, Hope and Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50–70 C.E.* (Mahwah, NJ: The Newman Press, 2003) 574–75; hereafter cited as Milavec, *Didache*; Jonathan A. Draper, "Pure Sacrifice in Didache 14 as Jewish Christian Exegesis," *Neotestamentica* 42.2 (2008): 223–52, 223; hereafter, Draper, "Sacrifice."

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Van de Sandt, 19.

<sup>3</sup>Michael W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2005, 1992) 266.

interpretation of the text. After examining the literary structure of chapter 14, we focus our attention on the theological and practical lessons that may be gleaned from the chapter with regard to Christian worship.

### Translation

- <sup>1</sup>Now according to *the Lord's Day of the Lord*, when you have been gathered together,  
 break bread and give thanks,  
 after you have confessed your sins,  
 so that your sacrifice may be pure.
- <sup>2</sup>But do not allow anyone who has a quarrel with his companion to assemble with you  
 until they have been reconciled,  
 so that your sacrifice may not be defiled.
- <sup>3</sup>For this is *the thing* mentioned by the Lord,  
 "In every place and time,  
 offer me a pure sacrifice, for I am a great King, says the Lord,  
 and my name *will be* marvelous among the nations."

### Notes

14:1 "According to *the Lord's Day of the Lord*" (κατὰ κυριακὴν κυρίου) is difficult to translate; various proposals include "on the divinely instituted day of the Lord" and "on the Lord's own day." ApCon reads "on the day of the resurrection of the Lord, called the Lord's day;" thus, it defines the meaning of the phrase as "the day of resurrection" and

interchanges it with “the Lord’s Day.”<sup>4</sup> There can be little doubt that the expression refers to Sunday, though some have unconvincingly challenged this interpretation.<sup>5</sup>

“Break bread and give thanks” (κλάσατε ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσατε) is most likely a hendiadys, describing a single event (the eucharist) and not two distinct events.<sup>6</sup> An abbreviated form of the phrase is used in Luke 24:35; Acts 2:42, 46; 20:7, 11; cf. 1 Cor. 10:16.

“After you have confessed” (προεξομολογησάμενοι) is a *hapax legomenon*. The word may be translated “having first confessed” or “having confessed beforehand.” The sequence of thought in verse 1 indicates that the confession takes place after the saints have assembled for worship but prior to the eucharist. Jefford’s translation makes the sequence clear, “When you come together on the Lord’s day, and after having acknowledged your offenses so that your sacrifice may be pure, break bread and give thanks.”<sup>7</sup>

14:3 The citation is from Malachi 1:11 and 14. The didachist may be loosely citing the Septuagint or citing it from memory. Draper has suggested an independent translation of

---

<sup>4</sup>Lawrence Johnson, *Worship in the Early Church: An Anthology of Historical Sources*, vol. 1 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2009) 240.

<sup>5</sup>See C. W. Dugmore, “Lord’s Day and Eucharist,” in *Neotestamentica et Patristica* (Leiden: 1962): 272–81; cf. Clayton N. Jefford, *Didache: The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (Salem, OR: Polebridge Press, 2013) 59; hereafter cited as Jefford, *Commentary*; Thomas O’Loughlin, *The Didache: A Window on the Earliest Christians* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010) 99; Draper, “Sacrifice,” 228–29; Willy Rordorf and André Tuilier, *La doctrine des douze apôtres* (Paris, 1998) 64–65; Jonathan A. Draper, *A Commentary on the Didache in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents* (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1983) 270, 279; hereafter, Draper, *Commentary*; Jean-Paul Audet, *La Didache: Instructions des apôtres* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1958) 24–78; Willy Rordorf, *Sunday: The History of the Day of Rest and Worship in the Earliest Centuries of the Christian Church* (Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press, 1968) 212–13.

<sup>6</sup>Cf. Niederwimmer, 196.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. Jefford, *Commentary*, 44–45.

the Hebrew original.<sup>8</sup> It is noteworthy that the didachist turns the prophecy into a command in order to use it as the grounds for his instructions in verses 1 and 2.

### Structure

As stated above, the two imperative verbs in verse 1—“break bread and give thanks”—form a hendiadys describing a single event, the celebration of the eucharist. This is the primary action prescribed in the text; the other clauses give additional directives relative to it. The text has three distinct parts. The first two give instructions for maintaining the purity of worship; the third supplies the scriptural grounds for the instructions. The chief theme of the text is the purity of the church’s sacrifice, which is maintained, first, by confessing sins (v. 1) and, second, by excluding quarrelling members (v. 2). The theme of purity is stated in all three parts, including two positive statements in verses 1 and 3 and a negative statement in verse 2.

### Commentary

We will examine the theological and liturgical significance of Did. 14 under the following headings: (1) Lord’s Day worship, (2) the confession of sin, (3) excommunication and reconciliation and (4) pure sacrifice.

---

<sup>8</sup>Draper, *Commentary*, 280.

## 1. Lord's Day Worship

In Didache 14, we discover that the celebration of the eucharist took place in the context of a public assembly of worship on the Lord's Day. We notice here that the didachist does not direct his readers to assemble on Sunday but assumes that this was their regular practice. The term "Lord's Day"—an abbreviated form of the expression in Did. 14:1—is a technical term that was in widespread use in the ancient church to designate "the first day of the week as the Christian day of regular corporate worship."<sup>9</sup> Although the expression κυριακή ἡμέρα occurs only once in the New Testament (Rev. 1:10), there is solid evidence that worship on Sunday was the custom of the apostolic church and, perhaps, originated with the various post-resurrection appearances of Jesus on the first day of the week.<sup>10</sup> Acts 20:7 is particularly relevant to Did. 14:1, since both texts mention an assembly on Sunday for the purpose of breaking bread. According to Rordorf, the phrase in Acts 20:7a—συνηγμένων ἡμῶν κλάσαι ἄρτον—has "the mark of a fixed formula."<sup>11</sup>

Not only is the verb συνάγειν or συνάγεσθαι (cf. the parallel συνέρχεσθαι) a technical term for the Christians' assembling for worship but κλᾶν (τὸ) ἄρτον also repeatedly occurs as a description of their common meal which was clearly of particular significance for them: in fact, these expressions often stand side by side (*Did.* 14.1; *Ign. Eph.* 20.2; cf. 1 Cor. 11.20). Verse 7a is, therefore, self-explanatory within its own terms: one has the impression that it conveys to every reader and hearer the setting of the assembly for the breaking of bread which was known to each one of them.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>Richard Bauckham, "The Lord's Day," in *From Sabbath to the Lord's Day*, ed. by D. A. Carson (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2000) 221–50, 231; cf. Draper, *Commentary*, 270–71. E.g. see Ignatius *Magn.* 9:1; Justin, *Dial.* 15:8–9; 24:1; 41:4; 138:1.

<sup>10</sup>Cf. Paul F. Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins* (London: SPCK, 2004) 39; hereafter, Bradshaw, *Origins*; Rordorf, *Sunday*, 215–37.

<sup>11</sup>Rordorf, *Sunday*, 199.

<sup>12</sup>Rordorf, *Sunday*, 199.



Moreover, the grammar of Acts 20:7a indicates that the breaking of bread was “the basis and goal” of the assembly.<sup>13</sup> The disciples had gathered together “in order to break bread” (κλάσαι ἄρτον), with κλάσαι being an infinitive of purpose. Thus, the stated purpose of the meeting is described from the perspective of this particular act, though other activities, such as Paul’s preaching, also occurred in the assembly. If Rordorf is correct that Acts 20:7a is “a fixed formula,” then the purpose of every Christian assembly on the Lord’s Day was “to break bread.”<sup>14</sup> This is evidently the teaching of Did. 14:1. Moreover, the kind of meal in view in chapter 14 is eucharistic in nature, indicated by the dual phrase, “break bread and give thanks” (14:1). This expression echoes the language employed by Luke in the book of Acts to describe the communal meal of early Christian assemblies. As Witherington explains,

Acts 2:42 and 46 and 20:7 and 11 all suggest that this sort of breaking of bread took place in the context of an act of communal gathering and worship. ... Such times together involved praying, teaching, singing, and eating in homes. On the whole then, a good case can be made that “the breaking of bread” was Luke’s shorthand for the special Christian meal that came to be called the Lord’s Supper by the time Paul wrote 1 Corinthians.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup>Oscar Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship*, trans. by A. Stewart Todd and James B. Torrance (London, SCM Press, 1969) 29.

<sup>14</sup>Cf. Cullmann, 29.

<sup>15</sup>Ben Witherington, III, *Making a Meal of It: Rethinking the Theology of the Lord’s Supper* (Baylor, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007) 30. This interpretation is the standard Reformed understanding of “the breaking of bread;” e.g. see John Murray, *Collected Writings* (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 2001) 2:380; Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1994) 3:445–46; John Owen, *Works* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1862) 15:512; Zacharius Ursinus, *Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism* (Cincinnati, OH: Elm Street Printing Co., 1888) 586; Calvin, *Institutes*, 4:17:44. It is by far the most popular view among New Testament scholars today; see the long list of examples provided in Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012) 1003–4.

In Protestant circles, “the Lord’s Supper” has become the primary term used for the sacrament, but it is noteworthy that the term occurs only once in the New Testament (1 Cor. 11:20) and does not appear to be widely used in the earliest Christian centuries.<sup>16</sup> In the New Testament, the most common term for the sacred meal instituted by Christ is “the breaking of bread.” Though this expression only mentions bread, it does not exclude other foodstuffs (such as wine) that may have been on the menu. As we have already seen, the eucharist in the earliest centuries of the church was an actual meal for the satisfaction of hunger, and thus, “the breaking of bread” is a metonym that stands for the entire meal.<sup>17</sup> There is virtually no evidence in the New Testament or the earliest patristic sources to support the notion that there were two kinds of meals involved in the Christian meetings of the first few centuries: a sacramental meal and an ordinary meal. Indeed, the evidence points in the opposite direction and leads to the conclusion that in the earliest Christian assemblies, there was only one kind of communal meal, which is referred to by various titles such as “the breaking of bread,” “the eucharist,” “the *agape*,” and “the Lord’s Supper.”<sup>18</sup> Moreover, this communal meal of the early church is one and the same with the sacrament instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup>Bradshaw remarks, “The Pauline term ‘Lord’s Supper’ (1 Cor 11:20) is rare in early Christian usage, but not completely unknown: Tertullian, for instance, speaks of the *dominicum convivium* (*Ad uxorem* 2.4);” see Paul F. Bradshaw, Maxwell E. Johnson and L. Edward Phillips, *The Apostolic Tradition* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2002) 144. It is not until the *Apostolic Tradition* (which dates from the fourth century or later) that the term “Lord’s Supper” begins to be commonly used for the sacrament (cf. *ibid.*).

<sup>17</sup>Keener, 1003.

<sup>18</sup>Andrew McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists: Food and Drink in Early Christian Ritual Meals* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999) 22; cf. Richard J. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter* (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983) 84–85; M. J. Townsend, “Exit the Agape?” *Expository Times* 90 (1978–79): 356–61; O’Loughlin, 8–9; 86–87; Bradshaw, *Origins*, 30; cf. Paul F. Bradshaw and Maxwell E. Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2012) 24; hereafter Bradshaw, *Liturgies*.

<sup>19</sup>Cf. Keener, 1004.

It is also noteworthy that the Didache provides the earliest extra-Biblical witness to the practice of celebrating the eucharist each Lord's Day. It is significant that the didachist does not direct his readers to observe the sacrament in their assemblies every Sunday; rather, he assumes that this was their regular practice. Hence in Did. 14:1, celebrating the eucharist each Lord's Day is a given. Weekly communion was apparently the universal practice of the church in the first few centuries, and it is well attested in patristic sources.<sup>20</sup> It also appears to be the practice of the apostolic church. Acts 2:42 and 20:7 point us in this direction and so does 1 Cor. 11:17–34. Paul writes,

*When you come together*, it is not for the better but for the worse. For ... *when you come together as a church*, I hear that there are divisions among you. ... [Therefore] *when you come together, it is not the Lord's Supper that you eat*. For in eating, each one goes ahead with his own meal. One goes hungry, another gets drunk. ... Whoever, therefore, *eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord* in an unworthy manner will be guilty concerning the body and blood of the Lord. ... So then, my brothers, *when you come together to eat, wait for one another* (1 Cor. 11:17–33, emphasis added).

From these words, we may draw the following conclusions. First, in their Christian assemblies, the Corinthians shared a communal meal.<sup>21</sup> Second, that meal is sacramental in nature and is called “the Lord's Supper.” Third, the Corinthians were abusing the meal by leaving some members with nothing to eat or drink.<sup>22</sup> Finally, to correct this abuse, they are instructed to wait for one another, so that all may have a share in the meal. Though this text does not explicitly state that the Corinthians celebrated the

---

<sup>20</sup>Cf. Did. 14:1; Justin Martyr's *First Apology* 67 (c. 155 AD); Tertullian's *Apology* 39 (197 AD).

<sup>21</sup>The phrase “when you come together” is used several times in 1 Corinthians to refer to their assemblies for worship, e.g. 11:17, 18, 20; 14:23, 26.

<sup>22</sup>The “unworthy manner” in which they were eating and drinking is related to the divisions that they had created among themselves, which left some members with nothing to eat while others were full (indeed, drunk!).

Lord's Supper every Sunday, it tacitly infers it, since eating the Lord's Supper was the purpose for which they assembled. Moreover, 1 Cor. 16:2 informs us that their assemblies were held on the first day of the week. From this, we may reasonably deduce that they celebrated the eucharist as a regular part of Lord's Day worship.

It is important to note that the Reformers recognized the Biblical and patristic roots of weekly communion and desired to see it implemented in their churches. It is well known that Calvin was unsuccessful at doing so in Geneva and that he went on record with his disappointment over the matter.<sup>23</sup> His thoughts on the subject are expressed in several of his writings. The Lord's Supper, he says, should be celebrated "very often, and at least once a week."<sup>24</sup> According to Acts 2:42, says Calvin, "no meeting of the church should take place without the Word, prayers, partaking of the Supper, and almsgiving."<sup>25</sup> Elsewhere, he argues that for the church to be properly ordered, it "would be well to require that Communion of the Holy Supper of Jesus Christ to be held every Sunday at least as a rule."<sup>26</sup> Calvin's desire to have communion each Lord's Day, however, was never fulfilled, and he hoped that future generations would be more successful at restoring the practice. "I have taken care," writes Calvin, "to record publicly that our

---

<sup>23</sup>The city counselors of Geneva insisted on quarterly communion because this was the practice of Bern; see Scott M. Manetsch, *Calvin's Company of Pastors: Pastoral Care and the Emerging Reformed Church, 1536–1609* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013) 19, 24.

<sup>24</sup>John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Ford Lewis Battles, ed. John T. McNeill (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960) 4:17:39; cf. 4:17:44.

<sup>25</sup>*Ibid.*, 4:17:44.

<sup>26</sup>William Baum, Edward Cunitz, and Edward Reuss, eds., *Ioannis Calvini opera omnia quae supersunt*, 59 vols. (Brunsvigae: C. A. Schwetschke, 1863–1900) 10:213.

custom [in Geneva] is defective, so that those who come after me may be able to correct it the more freely and easily.”<sup>27</sup>

## 2. The Confession of Sin

The chief concern of Didache 14 is the purity of Christian worship. The didachist characterizes the worship of the community as a sacrifice that needs to be guarded from defilement in order to be pure and, therefore, acceptable to God. Two specific directives are given in order to achieve this cultic purity. In the first place, 14:1 says that after the saints have assembled for worship on the Lord’s Day, they are to confess their sins (τὰ παραπτώματα) prior to the eucharist. Secondly, 14:2 adds, “But do not allow anyone who has a quarrel with his companion to assemble with you until they have been reconciled.” A failure to carry out either directive would result in the defilement of the community’s worship.

The confession of sin in verse 1 is “the penitential prayer of the whole community gathered on the Lord’s Day to offer a pure sacrifice to the Lord.”<sup>28</sup> This confession of sin is not private but public, since it occurs after the saints have already assembled.<sup>29</sup> Furthermore, it appears to be a corporate confession rather than a confession of individual persons before the community.<sup>30</sup> This is suggested by the corporate nature of the

---

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., 38:I:213.

<sup>28</sup>Draper, *Commentary*, 280. On the importance of confession in the Didache, see Carsten Claussen, “The Eucharist in the Gospel of John and in the Didache” in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) 135–164, 157.

<sup>29</sup>Cf. Draper, “Sacrifice,” 231–32; Rordorf and Tuilier, 68.

<sup>30</sup>Cf. Draper, “Sacrifice,” 232.

sacrifice. In other words, if the sacrifice is corporate, then the confession that maintains its purity is corporate as well.

Moreover, the confession in Did. 14:1 is a public and corporate confession of the community's transgressions against the Torah. Though the Torah is not mentioned in chapter 14, it is undoubtedly in view, since it constituted the moral instructions that every member of the community had received prior to being admitted into membership through baptism (Did. 1:1–7:1). The key to understanding the connection between chapters 1–6 and the worship of the community is stated at the opening of chapter seven.

Now concerning baptism, baptize as follows: *Having said all these things beforehand* [to the candidate(s)], baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit with living water (Did. 7:1, emphasis added).

Therefore, prior to being baptized, each candidate had been carefully instructed in “all these things;” that is, in “the way of life” described in Did. 1–6, which is the moral path that members of the community were to follow. Indeed, Did. 6:1 directs them to take care that no one leads them astray from “this way of the teaching (διδαχή).” It is only natural, then, that when the community assembled for worship on the Lord’s Day and confessed its sins, it had in view its transgressions of the moral teachings passed on to them before they had become members. Christ has revealed the “way of life” to the gentiles (1:1), so that his name may be “marvelous among the nations” when they offer him a pure sacrifice “in every place and time” (14:3). Hence, chapter 14 reveals the purpose for which Christ has made known his teaching (διδαχή) to the nations.

The clearest connection between chapter 14 and “the way of life” in 1–6 is found in Did. 4:13–14, where the candidates are warned not to “forsake the commandments of

---

the Lord” but to guard what they have received, “neither adding to them nor taking away” (4:13).<sup>31</sup> The didachist immediately adds, “In church, confess your sins (τὰ παραπτώματα), and do not go to your prayer with an evil conscience. This is the way of life” (4:14). These instructions in 4:13–14 are clearly parallel to the directive in 14:1, which requires the community to confess its sins (τὰ παραπτώματα) prior to offering the eucharistic prayers. Though the grounds given in support of the instructions are different in 4:14 and 14:1, they are not incompatible. In chapter 14, the ground is the demand for a pure sacrifice; in chapter 4, it is the conscience of the worshiper. These two ideas are closely linked in Scripture. For example, Hebrews 10:19–22 says,

Therefore, brothers, since we have boldness to enter the holy place by the blood of Jesus ... let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our *hearts sprinkled clean from an evil conscience* and our *bodies washed with pure water* (emphasis added).

As in Did. 14, the temple motif in Heb. 10 is dominant, and the concept of moral/cultic purity as a prerequisite for worship is evident in both passages. In light of the connection between the cleansing of an evil conscience and the purity of Christian worship, one may reasonably argue that Did. 4:14 and 14:1 are parallel and complimentary. Draper writes,

The underlying thought in 4:14 is ... related to 14:1. How could the individual believer approach God in prayer if his or her conscience is polluted by transgressions? ... [I]t is the gathered community which constitutes the spiritual temple in which prayers provide a spiritual sacrifice.... When individuals come together to the communal assembly to break bread and give thanks, they must come with a clear conscience so as not to defile this spiritual sacrifice offered by the community.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup>Cf. Rordorf and Tuilier, 68; Draper, “Sacrifice,” 232.

<sup>32</sup>Draper, “Sacrifice,” 233–34.

Since Did. 4:14 and 14:1 are parallel to each other, we may conclude that when the saints assembled for worship on the Lord's Day and confessed their sins, the corporate, penitential prayer of the community included a confession of transgressions against the Torah as interpreted in Did. 1–6. It is not hard to imagine, then, that the service of worship began with the assembled believers being summoned to confess their transgressions to the Lord. Perhaps, the call to confession sounded something like this:

Through Jesus Christ, our God and Father has revealed to us the way of life, which is this: first, you shall love God who made you; second, *you shall love* your neighbor as yourself. And whatever you do not wish to happen to you, do not do to another [1:2]. These are the commandments of the Lord, and we must take care that no one leads us astray from this way of life [4:13; 6:1]. Let us now make confession of our sins to the Lord our God, so that our hearts might be sprinkled clean from an evil conscience [4:14] and that we might offer him a pure sacrifice [14:3] through Jesus Christ our Lord. Let us pray, etc.

In chapter 14, it is clear that the service of worship on the Lord's Day began with a corporate confession of sin and was followed by the celebration of the eucharist. There is no indication in the chapter that other elements of worship were included in the service. However, from other parts of the Didache, we can reasonably infer that the service also included preaching/teaching (1:1–7:1; 4:1–2; 10:7–13:7; 15:1–2), a collection of material goods (4:5–8; 13:1–7; 15:4), the Lord's Prayer (8:2–3), and baptism (7:1–4). Furthermore, from the flow of the document as a whole, we can deduce what the order of worship might have looked like:

1. Preaching/teaching
2. Confession of Sin [Baptism?]<sup>33</sup>
3. Lord's Prayer
4. Eucharist
5. Collection

---

<sup>33</sup>If candidates were baptized in the dominical service, then that baptism may have taken place prior to the Lord's Prayer; at least, that is the order suggested by the sequence of thought in chapters 7 and 8.



Though this presumed order of worship is purely hypothetical, it seems to be in keeping with the theology and progression of the document as a whole. In 7:1, we discover that the act of teaching preceded the administration of baptism. In 9:5 and 10:6, we see that the sacrament of baptism was accompanied by repentance and signified cleansing from defilement; hence, it served the same purpose as the confession of sin. Perhaps, these two elements were connected in the order of service.<sup>34</sup> Furthermore, the themes of chapters 7–10 are arranged as follows: baptism (ch. 7), the Lord’s Prayer (ch. 8), and the eucharist (chs. 9–10). Finally, after giving directions for the eucharist, the author turns his attention to the appropriate manner in providing for the prophets (both itinerant and local) in chapters 11–13. Thus, we see that there are several hints in the *Didache* regarding the liturgical acts that may have been included in the dominical service and what sequence those acts may have taken. It is noteworthy that the hypothetical order of worship given above is essentially the same order that we find in Justin Martyr’s *First Apology*:

[O]n the day that is called Sunday all who live in the cities or in rural areas gather together in one place, and the memoirs of the apostles and the writings of the prophets are read for as long as time allows. Then after the lector concludes, the president verbally instructs and exhorts us to imitate all these excellent things. Then all stand up together and offer prayers.... [W]hen we have concluded our prayer, bread is brought forward together with the wine and water. And the presider in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings according to his ability. The people give their consent, saying “Amen”; there is a distribution, and all share in the Eucharist. To those who are absent a portion is brought by the deacons. And those who are well-to-do and willing give as they choose, as each one so desires. The collection is then deposited with the presider who uses it on behalf of orphans, widows, those who are needy due to sickness or any other

---

<sup>34</sup>Of course, baptism signifies more than cleansing from sin, but it does have this meaning. Therefore, to some extent, it serves the same purpose as the confession of sin. “Confession of sins to preserve the purity of the spiritual sacrifice offered by the community in 14:1 reflects the same kind of approach to purity as 9:5” (Draper, *Commentary*, 280).

cause, prisoners, strangers who are traveling; in short, he assists all who are in need.<sup>35</sup>

Justin is describing what the service of worship on the Lord's Day consisted of in Rome in the middle of the second century. His description yields the following order:

1. Reading of Scripture
2. Preaching/teaching
3. Prayers<sup>36</sup>
4. Eucharist
5. Collection

In our opinion, it is unreasonable to conclude that because chapter 14 of the Didache only mentions a confession of sin and the eucharist that these were the only two acts of worship included in the service on the Lord's Day. After all, the purpose of the chapter is not to provide an order of worship but to provide guidance for maintaining the purity of worship. It seems reasonable, therefore, to posit that the dominical service in Didache 14 followed an order of worship along the lines of what we suggested above.

### 3. Excommunication and Reconciliation

If the transgressions confessed in the penitential prayer were violations of “the way of life,” then the prayer included a confession of offences committed against other members of the community as well as offenses against God. After all, in Did. 1:2, “the way of life” is defined by the first and second greatest commandments—to love God and to love your neighbor. Furthermore, the subject of avoiding and/or resolving

---

<sup>35</sup>Johnson, *Worship in the Early Church*, 1:68–69; cf. Bard Thompson, *Liturgies of the Western Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1961) 3–9.

<sup>36</sup>In this paragraph from the *First Apology*, we do not have any information concerning the kinds of prayers that were included between the sermon and the eucharist. However, Justin does provide some details in an earlier section of the book; see *First Apology* 65, 66 in Johnson, 68; cf. Thompson, *Liturgies*, 3–9.

interpersonal conflicts is addressed on occasion in chapters 1–6. For example, Did. 3:2 says, “Do not become angry, for anger leads to murder. *Do not be* envious or quarrelsome or hot-tempered, for from all these things, murders are begotten.” Likewise, Did. 4:3 states, “Do not cause division, but make peace between those who quarrel. Judge justly; do not show favoritism when reproofing sins (παραπτώμασιν).”<sup>37</sup> This verse is particularly relevant to Did. 14:2 because it addresses the necessity of reconciling quarreling members and also of reproofing sins (παραπτώμασιν). It is significant that Did. 4:3 alludes to a judicial process of dealing with sins, particularly, in the context of settling disputes. Specifically, it states that in the act of settling disputes between members of the community, those who adjudicate the case are instructed to judge without showing partiality or favoritism. Didache 4:3, therefore, provides the background for the directive in Did. 14:2, “Do not allow anyone who has a quarrel with his companion to assemble with you until they have been reconciled, so that your sacrifice may not be defiled.”<sup>38</sup>

If a member of the community is found to be guilty of committing an offense against another member, the offender is to be excluded from the assembly until he has been reconciled to his brother. In other words, he is to be excommunicated and must not be permitted to participate in the holy eucharist. On the other hand, excommunication is reversible if the offender repents and is reconciled to his brother. On the judicial process involved in excommunication, Draper writes,

---

<sup>37</sup>Similar instructions are given in the *Epistle of Barnabas* 19:12; cf. Bradshaw, *Origins*, 40.

<sup>38</sup>Milavec rightly notes that the reference is in the singular, so that only one person is excluded (Milavec, *Didache*, 533). Draper adds, “If only one person is excluded, this must mean that the person excluded has somehow injured another by something said or done... All in all, therefore rendering the text as ‘having a conflict’ ... leaves open the result that the community would embrace the offended party and exclude the offender” (Draper, “Sacrifice,” 231).

[T]he consequences of the reproof [in Did. 4:3; 15:3] could be exclusion from the community, which implies a judicial process. After all, some community process is implied in the decision as to whether someone is guilty and must be excluded and whether the person has satisfied the requirement of repentance leading to re-admission. Clearly the community attributes great significance to resolution of quarrels between its members and presupposes some quasi-legal process whereby disputes can be adjudicated—hence the need to “judge justly” [Did. 4:3].<sup>39</sup>

The ground given for excommunication in Did. 14:2 is cultic purity. As sins against God endanger the purity of worship, so too sins committed against members of the community result not only in intra-communal strife but in cultic defilement, if the church fails to excommunicate the offenders. For this reason, the impenitent are excluded from the eucharist until they are reconciled to those whom they have wronged.<sup>40</sup> As we have noted, the temple motif provides the theological background for cultic purity in the *Didache*. It is reasonable, therefore, to draw a parallel between the exclusion of non-Israelites from temple worship and the exclusion of excommunicated persons from the eucharist. In both cases, there is an objective distinction between those who are in fellowship with God in virtue of their inclusion in the covenant and, on the other hand, those who are outside of the covenant and, therefore, excluded from communion with God. Unclean persons must not be allowed to enter the temple courts and eat the sacred food reserved for the priests. Likewise, the eucharist is a holy meal reserved for holy people who constitute the eschatological temple and who worship before the Lord as a kingdom of priests.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup>Draper, “Sacrifice,” 237.

<sup>40</sup>Cf. Draper, *Commentary*, 280.

<sup>41</sup>“The exclusion of offenders from the eucharistic meal of the *Didache* is based on a spiritualized understanding of temple purity as extended to the whole community in a fashion comparable to the Qumran *yahad* and the Pharisaic *haburah*” (Draper, “Sacrifice,” 223).

We should also point out that excommunication in the Didache not only prevents offenders from taking the Lord's Supper, it removes them from the fellowship of the community altogether. Didache 14:2 says, "Do not allow [them] to assemble with you." Furthermore, Did. 15:3 states, "Reprove one another, not in anger but in peace, as you have it in the gospel. And if anyone wrongs his neighbor, let no one speak to him nor hear from you until he repents." Thus, "one who has committed a sin against his neighbor is to be shunned until he repents."<sup>42</sup> While excommunication may appear harsh to many Christians today, it is not foreign to the teaching of the New Testament. In fact, Jesus clearly taught that the church may excommunicate impenitent members for their offenses against other Christians.

If your brother sins against you, go and tell him his fault, between you and him alone. If he listens to you, you have gained your brother. But if he does not listen, take one or two others along with you, that every charge may be established by the evidence of two or three witnesses. If he refuses to listen to them, tell it to the church. And if he refuses to listen even to the church, let him be to you as a Gentile and a tax collector. Truly, I say to you, whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Again I say to you, if two of you agree on earth about anything they ask, it will be done for them by my Father in heaven. For where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I among them (Matt 18:15–20).

This passage envisions a judicial process that parallels the instructions in Did. 4:3. When disputes between quarrelling members cannot be resolved, the church may adjudicate the case. Furthermore, Matt. 18:17 and Did. 14:2 teach that if offenders are excommunicated from the church, then they are to be regarded as outsiders and, therefore, ritually impure. Consequently, they would not be permitted to eat the eucharist, since it is a covenant meal that belongs exclusively to covenant members.

---

<sup>42</sup>Claussen, "Eucharist," 157.

In addition to the saying of Jesus in Matt. 18:15–20, Christ also affirms the necessity of reconciliation for cultic purity. In other words, if someone has wronged his brother, he must not participate in worship until he has first been reconciled to the injured party.

So if you are offering your gift at the altar and there remember that your brother has something against you, leave your gift there before the altar and go. First be reconciled to your brother, and then come and offer your gift (Matt. 5:23–24).

In our estimation, the current practice of “fencing the Lord’s Table” in many Reformed churches is inadequate, since it does not do justice to the demand for reconciliation. In many communion services, the impression that is given is that all one needs to do in order to partake of the Lord’s Supper is to deal with one’s offenses against God. But what about offenses committed against other members of the church? What about the need for restitution and reconciliation? If one has sinned against his brother, it is not enough for him to confess that sin to God. He must also make amends and pursue reconciliation before he has adequately dealt with that offense. Draper rightly says,

[O]ffences against companions in the community could not be settled in the assembly, since they would involve restitution, public apology and the acceptance of the apology. The presence of quarreling members in the assembly thus implied the presence of unresolved guilt, which would profane the purity of the worship.<sup>43</sup>

The General Confession in most Reformed churches, however, gives the impression that we have done all that is necessary to worthily partake of the Lord’s Supper if we have sincerely confessed our sins to God. The General Confession says nothing about restitution and reconciliation with regard to sins committed against others, yet this is clearly taught in Scripture.

---

<sup>43</sup>Draper, “Sacrifice,” 245; cf. *ibid.*, 247–48.

Modern Christian liturgies understand the General Confession to refer to “sin” in the most general sense, including both the knowledge of or feeling of having wronged God and also knowledge of or feeling of having wronged the neighbour. Both are merged, for instance, in the words of the English Book of Common Prayer and its more recent successors. The result is often a sense that a person can apologize to God for some wrong done to another person and let it rest there. However, the *Didache* indicates that the early Jewish Christian church kept a separate focus on sin against God and sin against the neighbour, so that ordinary worshippers would have been aware of their need to abstain from the eucharist if they were in an unresolved quarrel with their friends, family or neighbours. They were aware that such a quarrel was not a private matter, but defiled the purity of the whole community and its sacrifice of thanksgiving.<sup>44</sup>

While it is appropriate to include in the penitential prayer of the church a confession of all transgressions of the Law (both sins against God and against neighbor), it is equally appropriate to inform the congregation that reconciliation is mandated by Scripture. Likewise, it is important to instruct each member to examine himself regarding sins against God and also regarding interpersonal conflicts with other members. After all, the problem at Corinth that evoked Paul’s instructions regarding self-examination was disunity in the church (1 Cor. 11:17–34).

#### 4. Pure Sacrifice

*Didache* 14 characterizes the worship of the church as a sacrifice presented to God. This is clear in the two directives that safeguard the purity of the sacrifice (14:1, 2) and in the citation from Malachi that provides the divine warrant for the directives (14:3).

Milavec explains,

---

<sup>44</sup>Draper, “Sacrifice,” 248. Draper adds that this public expression of reconciliation is the meaning of the Kiss of Peace that we find in Scripture and in early Christian liturgy. “It seems likely that the widespread practice of the Kiss of Peace prior to the eucharist was the outward liturgical symbol of the requirement to be reconciled to the companion, already in Paul (Rom. 16:16; 1 Cor. 16:20; 2 Cor. 13:12; 1 Thess. 5:26), in 1 Pet. 5:14, and certainly in Justin’s *I Apol.* 65 (which shows other links with *Didache*);” *ibid.*, 248–49.

The positive activity of confessing has the positive effect of producing a pure sacrifice; the negation or absence of conflict has the effect of avoiding the negation of the pure sacrifice, namely, defilement. In both instances the motivation is clearly drawn in the direction of assuring the community that its sacrifice is “pure.” The citation from the Lord nails down the requirement that a “pure sacrifice” (14:3) was an absolute requirement, for the Lord is a great king whose name must be “wondrous among the gentiles” (14:3c).<sup>45</sup>

Draper points out that Malachi’s prophecy, cited in Did. 14:3, was “widely used in the first century AD to refer to spiritual worship as a replacement for sacrifice.”<sup>46</sup>

Likewise, the fathers of the church regularly cite this prophecy as a description of Christian worship. The saying appears in Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and the Liturgy of St. Mark.<sup>47</sup> The fathers, “regard it as foretelling the Christian eucharist, which is the only pure sacrifice.”<sup>48</sup> That is, the eucharist is the salvation historical fulfillment of Malachi 1:11–14. This is obviously the theological teaching behind Did. 14:3.

It is important to recognize that the eucharist is not being described as an atoning sacrifice for sin. Indeed, according to Did. 14:1–3, the worshipers must first be cleansed from sin and defilement before participating in the eucharist. Hence, the kind of sacrifice in view is not a propitiatory sacrifice but a spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup>Aaron Milavec, *The Didache: Text, Translation, Analysis, and Commentary* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003) 78; hereafter, Milavec, *Commentary*.

<sup>46</sup>Draper, *Commentary*, 278. Draper also provides examples from Qumran literature and Rabbinic sources to support this claim. “The sacrifice of which Mal. prophesies,” he adds, “is seen in these texts as a sacrifice of prayer and good works. It is seen especially as referring to the prayer of praise, the εὐχαριστία or Berakah, but the association of the word θυσία more and more with the Christian celebration of the Lord’s Supper led to its more particular association with the meal itself, as in Justin. In Did. there is no evidence of such an application of the text to the meal itself, and it should be taken as a reference to the thanksgiving prayers of the community” (Draper, *Commentary*, 279; cf. *ibid.*, 276).

<sup>47</sup>See Justin, *Dial.* II 7:2; 28:5; 41:2–3; Irenaeus, *Heresies*, IV 17:5; 18:1; Tertullian, *Adv. Jud.* 5; *Adv. Marc.* III 22; Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* V 14.

<sup>48</sup>R. C. D. Jasper and G. J. Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1992) 22.

<sup>49</sup>Cf. Milavec, *Commentary*, 78.



The meal itself is a *eucharistia* (thanksgiving). It derives its title from the prayers that accompany it. The eucharist, therefore, may be called a sacrifice because the prayers of thanksgiving (which are a constitutive element of the rite) are a spiritual sacrifice presented to God. The meal may only be called θυσία by its association with the eucharistic prayers. One might say that as the meal takes its name from the prayers, it may also borrow the status of “sacrifice” (θυσία) from the prayers that belong to it. Therefore, it is “the meal in its totality” that is “a sacrifice of praise to the Father.”<sup>50</sup> Certainly, any interpretation of Didache 14 that reads into the text the notion of the eucharist as a propitiatory sacrifice would be anachronistic and contrary to the plain meaning of the text. As Draper explains,

The use of Mal. 1:11 in this context cannot properly be used to justify an understanding of the eucharist [in the Didache] as a sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ. ... Such theological development is nowhere evident [in the Didache], which does no more here than spiritualize the Temple sacrifice in terms of prayer.<sup>51</sup>

In both the Old and New Testaments, we find examples of the temple sacrifices being “spiritualized” and associated with prayer and praise. Psalm 141:2 says, “Let my prayer be counted as incense before you, and the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice.” Likewise, the apostle Peter characterizes the church as the eschatological temple and as a kingdom of priests who offer spiritual sacrifices through Jesus Christ.

You yourselves like living stones are being built up as a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ ... you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for his own possession, that you may proclaim the excellencies of him who called you

---

<sup>50</sup>O’Loughlin, 98.

<sup>51</sup>Draper, *Commentary*, 278, 280; cf. Draper, “Sacrifice,” 224, 241.

out of darkness into his marvelous light. Once you were not a people, but now you are God's people ... (1 Pet. 2:5–10).

Perhaps the most relevant text with regard to the Didache is Hebrews 13:12–16, which contrasts the old covenant sacrifices with those of the new covenant. On the one hand, Christ himself has provided the final sacrifice to make full atonement for sin, and there is, therefore, no need for further sacrifices of this kind. On the other hand, the church is called to continually offer spiritual sacrifices of praise and good works.

We have an altar from which those who serve the tent have no right to eat. For the bodies of those animals whose blood is brought into the holy places by the high priest as a sacrifice for sin are burned outside the camp. So Jesus also suffered outside the gate in order to sanctify the people through his own blood. Therefore let us go to him outside the camp and bear the reproach he endured. For here we have no lasting city, but we seek the city that is to come. Through him then let us continually offer up a sacrifice of praise to God, that is, the fruit of lips that acknowledge his name. Do not neglect to do good and to share what you have, for such sacrifices are pleasing to God (Heb. 13:10–16).

The word “altar” here may be a metonym for “table” as it is in Malachi 1:6–14. If so, then the author of Hebrews may have the prophecy of Malachi in mind. Furthermore, if Malachi's prophecy is the background of Hebrews 13, then it is reasonable to interpret the food of the altar/table in this verse as a reference to the eucharist. The unbelieving Jews, of course, would have “no right to eat” from that table.

### Conclusion

As we have seen, the Didache gives us a clear picture of what the celebration of the eucharist was like in the early church. The eucharistic theology and liturgy that is expressed in the book is quite rich and yields many important lessons for the church

today. In the following chapter, I will apply some of these lessons to my current ministry context.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### REFORMING THE WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH

Before I endeavor to apply the lessons gleaned from this study of the Didache, I will briefly describe my current ministry context at Providence Presbyterian Church (PPC) in Pflugerville, TX. In December 2012, I started working at PPC as an Assistant Pastor. In January 2015, the Senior Pastor retired, leaving me as the solo Pastor of the church. Before coming to PPC, I served as the Pastor of Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church in West Collingswood, NJ. Both churches belong to the same denomination, but they are very different from each other, especially regarding matters of worship.

Even though the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (OPC) has a Directory for the Public Worship of God, there is considerable diversity in worship within the denomination. As a confessional church, we are guided by a set of doctrinal and practical standards that form our constitution, which consists of the Westminster Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter Catechisms, Form of Government, Book of Discipline and Directory for the Public Worship of God.<sup>1</sup> The particular standard that is most relevant to our current project is the Directory for the Public Worship of God (DPW). The purpose of the DPW is to express the OPC's "common understanding of the principles and practice of public worship that is Reformed according to the Scriptures and,

---

<sup>1</sup>The last three documents are published in a single volume called the Book of Church Order (BCO). The latest edition of the BCO is available online at <http://opc.org/order.html>.

subordinately, to the Confession and Catechisms.”<sup>2</sup> The DPW falls short of providing a discretionary liturgy like the liturgies of Martin Bucer, John Calvin, and John Knox.<sup>3</sup> A discretionary liturgy includes prayer formulas that can be read in worship, yet it gives ministers freedom to amend the formulas at their own discretion, provided that such amendments are in keeping with the liturgy. The DPW, however, does not provide a single specimen prayer. Rather, it states the basic principles of public worship as well as how and by whom that worship should be conducted.

With regard to the eucharist, the DPW provides forms for explaining the meaning of the sacrament and also for fencing the Table, but no forms are given for the eucharistic prayers. Regarding these prayers, the DPW says,

The distribution of the elements shall be preceded by prayer. It is well in such prayer to praise God for his mighty power and grace in bringing salvation; confess our unworthiness to come to the Table because of our own utter lack of righteousness; reaffirm our trust in God’s grace and in Christ’s righteousness and mediation; plead for the Lord to grant the gracious, effectual working of his Spirit in us; thank God for the elements, request him to use them for their intended purpose; and ask him to grant that by faith his people may feed upon Jesus Christ, crucified and raised for them, so that, being strengthened by grace, they might live in him and for him.<sup>4</sup>

When all have partaken, prayer should be offered. It is well in such prayer to give thanks for the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, through whom we have the forgiveness of sins; recommit God’s people to Christ and to each other; present them as a living sacrifice to God; and plead that the Holy Spirit will make the sacrament effectual to the edifying and strengthening of God’s people.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>From the Preface of the DPW, which is available online at <http://opc.org/BCO/DPW.html>.

<sup>3</sup>For an English translation of these Reformed liturgies, see Bard Thompson, *Liturgies of the Western Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980, 1961).

<sup>4</sup>DPW III.C.5.

<sup>5</sup>DPW III.C.7.

The communion service in the DPW begins with a reading of the institution narrative from one of the Gospels or from Paul’s first letter to the Corinthians. The service underscores “the words of institution” by repeating them during the distribution of the elements. After the institution narrative is read, the celebrant summarizes the teaching of Scripture “as to the meaning and nature of the sacrament.”<sup>6</sup> Next, the minister declares “who may come to, and who are excluded from, the Lord’s Table according to the Word of God.”<sup>7</sup> The form for this invitation/fencing says nothing about the need for reconciling with those whom we have wronged (cf. Matt. 5:23–24; Did. 14:2). In fact, the form teaches that any penitent member of the church may worthily participate in the eucharist without making any distinction between sins committed against God and sins committed against other members of the church.

We come [to the Lord’s Table] in a worthy manner if we recognize that we are unworthy sinners who need our Savior, if we consciously discern his body given for our sins, if we hunger and thirst after Christ, giving thanks for his grace, trusting in his merits, feeding on him by faith, renewing our covenant with him and his people. Let us examine our minds and hearts to determine whether such discernment is ours, to the end that we may partake to the glory of God and to our growth in the grace of Christ. Come then with joy and thankfulness to the Lord’s Table.<sup>8</sup>

Although reconciliation may be implied in the DPW’s call to repentance, it is not explicitly stated. In our opinion, this gives the worshiper the impression that a general confession of sin is sufficient to deal with transgressions against his neighbor.

With regard to communion frequency, the OPC leaves the decision to the Session of each local church. The Larger Catechism says that “the Lord’s Supper is to be

---

<sup>6</sup>DPW III.C.2.

<sup>7</sup>DPW III.C.3.

<sup>8</sup>DPW III.C.3.

administered often,” and the Westminster Directory states that it should be observed frequently.<sup>9</sup> However, the Westminster Assembly added that the frequency of the Lord’s Supper, “may be considered and determined by the ministers and other church governors of each congregation, as they shall find most convenient for the comfort and edification of the people committed to their charge.”<sup>10</sup> Leaving the decision to the local Session has led to great diversity in communion frequency within the OPC. Most congregations in the OPC have monthly communion. Some of our churches observe communion quarterly or bi-monthly (i.e. once every two months), and a growing number of our churches are adopting the practice of weekly communion. The church I pastored in New Jersey had monthly communion for the first six years of my pastorate. The Session increased the frequency to twice a month, which continued for the last two years of my service there. At PPC, we celebrate the eucharist bi-monthly. The previous Pastor wanted to have communion quarterly; the Session wanted it monthly, so they compromised and adopted a bi-monthly observance. Since communion is observed infrequently at PPC, the previous Pastor preached a sermon on the Lord’s Supper every communion Sunday.

The worship services at PPC bear little resemblance to the historic liturgies of the Reformation. Unlike the services of Bucer, Calvin, and Knox, the service at PPC does not include a reading of the Ten Commandments, the Lord’s Prayer or the Apostles’ Creed. There is also no Confession of Sin or Assurance of Pardon, and no printed guidance—either in the form of a discretionary liturgy or a service book—is used for conducting worship. Every prayer in the service is left entirely to the impulse of the minister. Hence,

---

<sup>9</sup>LC 177.

<sup>10</sup>Richard A. Muller and Rowland S. Ward, *Scripture and Worship: Biblical Interpretation and the Directory for Worship* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 2007) 159; cf. *ibid.*, 130.

the worship of PPC is significantly out of step with the Reformed tradition and even with the liturgical customs of our own denomination.

No major changes have been made to the worship at PPC since the previous Pastor's retirement. My desire is to bring our worship practices more in line with the liturgical customs of the Reformed church, which are according to Scripture. This chapter proposes a few steps toward fulfilling that desire. For the remainder of the chapter, I will attempt to apply some of the lessons I have gleaned from my study of the Didache to the worship of PPC. My hope is to present this plan for liturgical reform to the Session of PPC, so that the Session can consider these proposed changes and, if desired, implement them in an appropriate manner. The proposed changes will be considered under the following six headings: (1) the eucharistic elements, (2) communion frequency, (3) communion as a festive celebration, (4) the confession of sin, (5) the necessity of reconciliation and (6) the order of worship.

### 1. The Eucharistic Elements

As we noted in chapter two, the apostolic church used a single cup and a single loaf of bread for the elements of the eucharist. The apostle Paul also highlights the theological significance of the loaf of bread: "Since there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread" (1 Cor. 10:17; cf. Did. 9:3–4). Given our current practice of administering the elements at PPC (namely, by distributing them to a seated congregation), a single communion cup is probably unworkable. First of all, the size of the congregation is too large for a single cup to be passed around. Secondly,



since we have some members who do not drink alcohol, we offer both wine and grape juice. Hence, a single cup does not seem practicable.

On the other hand, using a single loaf of bread for the eucharist at PPC is doable. At least, it would be easy for us to have a loaf in each of the communion trays. When the trays are distributed to the congregation, each member could break off a piece of the loaf and pass the tray to his neighbor. Some members of PPC have a need for gluten free bread, so we could either have one tray of this kind of bread for them, or we could use gluten free bread for everyone. This seems to be a reasonable step toward recovering the apostolic tradition of using a single loaf of bread, and it would be an improvement over our current practice of using small pieces of crackers. A single loaf in each tray would help the congregation to see the symbolism of the bread as a sign of the unity of the church and of its eschatological unification at the end of the age (cf. 1 Cor. 10:17; Did. 9:4).

Furthermore, I think using a loaf of bread instead of bits of crackers is a small step toward recovering the practice of celebrating the eucharist as an actual meal and not a mere token of a meal.<sup>11</sup> It is ironic that the Lord's Supper has ceased to be an actual supper and has been replaced by a ritual that barely resembles a supper. We recognize that the efficacy of the sacrament does not depend on the amount of food eaten, and it is possible, therefore, to observe the eucharist with small amounts of bread and wine. However, as we noted in chapter one, there is an inseparable relationship between theology and worship. The two are mutually formative. Over time, our liturgical customs will inevitably influence our theology. Replacing the eucharistic meal with a ritual that

---

<sup>11</sup>See comments on Did. 10:1 in chapter three.

barely resembles a meal has, in our opinion, had a profound effect on the sacramental theology of the church, but this issue is beyond the scope of our current project. For now, it is enough to say that we think celebrating the eucharist as an actual meal is desirable, and using loaves of bread instead of bits of crackers is a step in that direction.

## 2. Communion Frequency

As we have seen, the Didache confirms the teaching of the Reformers that weekly communion was the practice of the apostolic church. While Scripture contains no explicit command regarding communion frequency, it does, in fact, commend the practice of celebrating the eucharist frequently.<sup>12</sup> In my opinion, PPC is not ready for weekly communion, but monthly communion would probably be acceptable to the congregation. There are many reasons why a more frequent celebration of the eucharist is desirable and beneficial for the church, and we want to briefly state some of those reasons here.

First of all, the Lord Jesus Christ and, in him, all the saving benefits of the new covenant are represented, sealed and applied to believers by means of the sacraments.<sup>13</sup> The sacraments are not bare, empty signs but true means or instruments of saving grace. They are, in fact, “effectual means of salvation for the elect.”<sup>14</sup> They truly communicate and confer what they signify to those who receive them in faith. The “grace promised” by God is “not only offered but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Spirit” through

---

<sup>12</sup>Cf. Acts 2:42; 20:7; 1 Cor. 11:17–34.

<sup>13</sup>See Westminster Shorter Catechism (WSC) 92.

<sup>14</sup>WSC 88, 91.

the sacraments.<sup>15</sup> A frequent observance of the Lord's Supper is desirable and beneficial for the elect because it is an effectual means of their salvation.

Secondly, the benefits that are offered, given and conferred in the Lord's Supper are all the benefits of the new covenant. Worthy receivers do "really and indeed" feed "upon Christ crucified and all the benefits of his death."<sup>16</sup> Christ himself is given to us in the sacrament as nourishment for our souls. By the agency of the Holy Spirit, the body and blood of Christ are no less truly and really "present to the faith of the receiver" than the "elements themselves are to their outward senses."<sup>17</sup> Through the mouth of faith, we "truly and really" feed on Christ as the bread of life given by the Father through the Spirit to our "spiritual nourishment and growth in grace."<sup>18</sup> By faith, we "receive and apply" to ourselves "Christ crucified and all the benefits of his death."<sup>19</sup> A frequent observance of the eucharist is desirable and beneficial for the saints because of all the glorious benefits received by means of it.

Thirdly, the eucharist is also designed to strengthen the unity of the saints and nourish their Christian love for one another. In the Lord's Supper, says John Knox, Christ himself gathers us "unto one visible body" and knits us together so that we become "members one of another."<sup>20</sup> Paul teaches that although we are many in number, we

---

<sup>15</sup>WCF 28:6.

<sup>16</sup>WCF 29:7.

<sup>17</sup>Westminster Larger Catechism (WLC) 170; cf. 1 Cor. 10:16.

<sup>18</sup>WLC 168, 170.

<sup>19</sup>WLC 170.

<sup>20</sup>Kevin Reed, ed., *The Selected Works of John Knox* (Dallas, TX: Presbyterian Heritage Publications, 1995) 67–68.

become one body when we all share in the one bread of the Lord's Supper (cf. 1 Cor. 10:17). A frequent observance of the eucharist is desirable and beneficial because the sacrament nourishes and strengthens the unity of the church and establishes a bond of mutual and fraternal love among the saints. Likewise, the Lord's Supper calls us to live in peace with one another. It incites us to reconcile with our brothers if there is enmity between us. Since it is a sign that we are one body, it calls us to pursue the restoration of broken relationships among believers (cf. Matt. 5:21–26; Did. 14:2).

Finally, as we noted in chapter three, the Lord's Supper calls the saints to repent of their daily failings and to look to Christ alone for forgiveness, assurance and strength to obey. It calls us to love the Lord with all our being and to love our neighbor as ourselves (cf. Did. 1:2; 14:1). Paul's instruction that we examine ourselves before participating in the Supper teaches us to inspect our faith, repentance, love and obedience—all of which are essential and constitutive elements of the Christian life.<sup>21</sup> Hence, we should examine ourselves in these areas frequently not occasionally. Furthermore, if a member of the church has been suspended from the Lord's Table or excommunicated, these censures lose much of their impact on that member if the Lord's Supper is celebrated infrequently. Every celebration of the eucharist reminds those who are excluded from the Table of their need to pursue repentance and restoration. A frequent observance of the Lord's Supper enables the censure to have a more significant impact on them. For these reasons and for many others, a frequent celebration of the eucharist is desirable and beneficial for the church.

---

<sup>21</sup>1 Cor. 11:17–34; WSC 97.

### 3. Communion as a Festive Celebration

Unlike the joyful tone of the eucharist that we see in the Didache, the atmosphere at PPC during communion tends to be somber and gloomy. Instead of celebrating the eucharist as a feast of praise and thanksgiving, we use the sacrament as an occasion for contemplative meditation, solemn reflection and rigorous self-examination.

Consequently, the tone of the communion service is grave, penitential and funereal.

Likewise, in contrast to the future orientation of the eucharist in the Didache, the communion services at PPC have focused primarily, if not exclusively, on commemorating a past event, namely, the death of Christ. The members of the church do not see the eucharist as a foretaste of the eschaton but only as a memorial of Christ's death. Our eucharistic theology is essentially derived from the saying, "Do this in remembrance of me" (1 Cor. 11:24). Moreover, we interpret these words to mean that in the act of eating and drinking the Lord's Supper, we are supposed to mentally recall Christ's death and contemplate its significance for us. Therefore, we focus our thoughts on a past event rather than on the eschatological joy of the great feast at the end of the age (cf. Isa. 25:6-9). Certainly, the Lord's Supper is a thankful memorial of Christ's death, but it is also a joyful celebration and a foretaste of the heavenly banquet in the world to come. We tend to focus on the former aspect of the Lord's Supper and to forget the latter.

Even the manner of administering the elements at PPC creates a somber atmosphere. When the Elders distribute the bread and wine, the whole congregation sits in total silence, which can be quite lengthy, since it takes a fair amount of time for everyone to be served. Perhaps, one of the ways to change the atmosphere would be to

read a psalm of praise or thanksgiving (e.g. Psalm 103; 104; 105; 136; 150) while the elements are being distributed. Another possibility would be for the congregation to sing a joyful hymn or psalm during the distribution. Of course, the communion exhortation and prayers that accompany the eucharist are chiefly responsible for setting the tone of the service. In recent celebrations of the Lord's Supper, I have intentionally focused on the eucharistic and eschatological dimensions of the sacrament in the communion sermons and prayers. My hope is that the communion piety of the congregation will increasingly reflect a robust and well-rounded doctrine of the Lord's Supper as we continue to blossom in our understanding of the sacrament.

#### 4. The Confession of Sin

As we noted in chapter three, the Didache tells us that at the beginning of the dominical service, the congregation confessed its sins to the Lord, so that its sacrifice may be pure. At PPC, there is currently no Confession of Sin in the worship service. I would like to add a corporate Confession of Sin to the beginning of the service followed by a Declaration of Pardon in the tradition of the classic Reformed liturgies of the sixteenth century. Moreover, since this prayer is a corporate confession of the congregation's transgressions of the Law of God, it would be fitting to read the Law prior to the Confession of Sin.

In Calvin's Strasbourg service, after the Confession of Sin, Calvin would deliver "some word of Scripture to console the conscience;" then, he would pronounce "the Absolution in this manner:"<sup>22</sup>

Let each of you truly acknowledge that he is a sinner, humbling himself before God, and believe that the heavenly Father wills to be gracious unto him in Jesus Christ. To all those that repent in this wise, and look to Jesus Christ for their salvation, I declare that the absolution of sins is effected, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.<sup>23</sup>

Calvin's Strasbourg service follows the pattern of Bucer's liturgy, which begins with a Confession of Sin followed by a "Word of Comfort" from Holy Scripture (1 Tim. 1:15; or John 3:16; 3:35–36; Acts 10:43; 1 John 2:1–2; etc.) and the "Absolution."

This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners. Let everyone, with St. Paul, truly acknowledge this in his heart and believe in Christ. Thus, in His name, I proclaim unto you the forgiveness of all your sins, and declare you to be loosed of them on earth, that you be loosed of them also in heaven, in eternity. Amen.<sup>24</sup>

Bucer's liturgy makes it clear that the Absolution is an exercise of the keys of the kingdom of heaven (Matt. 16:19; 18:18). As excommunication declares that the impenitent are bound by sins, absolution declares that the penitent are loosed from them. If one follows the example of Did. 14:1–3, the Absolution or Declaration of Pardon can highlight the fact that the blood of Jesus Christ has cleansed us from all sin and defilement so that we can offer a pure sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving to God through Christ (cf. Heb. 10:10–22; 13:15).

---

<sup>22</sup>Thompson, *Liturgies*, 198.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., 170.

## 5. The Necessity of Reconciliation

As we noted in chapter three, sins committed against members of the church cannot be adequately dealt with in a General Confession. While I think it is appropriate to include in the penitential prayer of the church a confession of all transgressions (both sins against God and against neighbor), I also think it is important to make it clear to the congregation that if anyone has committed an offense against another member, then the offender must make amends and pursue reconciliation (cf. Matt. 5:23–24). Perhaps the best way to do this would be to exhort members of the church who are in an unresolved conflict with other members to be reconciled. Likewise, the minister can state from the pulpit that if anyone is guilty of a sin against his brother, then he should abstain from taking the eucharist until he has been reconciled. This could be done after the Prayer of Confession and before the Assurance of Pardon. At least, this seems to be the logical place for it in the order of worship.

## 6. The Order of Worship

As we noted in chapter two, the *Didache* is a discretionary liturgy much like the liturgies of Bucer, Calvin, and Knox. In our opinion, the liturgy of John Knox represents the best of the classical Reformed liturgies of the sixteenth century. Even though Knox was not a pioneer in the area of liturgical reform, he played a significant role in shaping the service of worship among English-speaking Protestants. Knox followed the liturgical paths cut out before him by other Reformers, especially Martin Bucer and John Calvin.



However, he was no mere carbon copy of these men. Knox took their pioneering work and considerably improved it.

When Knox settled in Geneva, he became the pastor of the English-speaking refugees who were permitted to worship in what is now known as the *Auditoire de Calvin*. For their services of worship, Knox used an order that was drawn from Calvin's liturgy. This order was published in 1556 under the title *The Form of Prayers and Ministration of the Sacraments, etc. used in the English Congregation at Geneva: and approved by the famous and godly learned man, John Calvin.*<sup>25</sup> Today, it is often referred to as the *Genevan Book of Order* or simply as Knox's liturgy. Knox served this congregation until his return to Scotland in 1559. By the time that Knox returned, the *Genevan Book of Order* was already known in Scotland. In 1564, it was officially adopted as the standard of worship by an act of the General Assembly, which required every minister to "use the order contained therein, in prayers, marriage, and the administration of the sacraments."<sup>26</sup> The *Book of Common Order*, as it came to be called, continued to be used in Scotland until it was superseded by the *Westminster Directory for Public Worship* in 1645.

One of Knox's greatest contributions to Reformed worship was his development of public prayer. At the beginning of his liturgy, we find a prayer of confession of sin and supplication for God's mercy. Knox gives two sample forms for the Prayer of Confession. The liturgy instructs the minister to use one of the forms or to pray "like in effect" and to exhort "the people diligently to examine themselves, following in their

---

<sup>25</sup>Thompson, *Liturgies*, 295.

<sup>26</sup>William D. Maxwell, *The Liturgical Portions of the Genevan Service Book* (Great Britain: The Faith Press, 1965) 8.

hearts the tenor of his words.”<sup>27</sup> For Knox, prayer was not a matter of human creativity but of speaking to God in God’s own words. For this reason, the forms of prayer that Knox produced were drawn from the Holy Scriptures. Knox’s Prayer of Confession is based on Daniel’s confession of sin on behalf of the nation of Israel in Daniel 9:1–19. This was a particularly appropriate confession to use for a congregation of exiles, such as the congregation that Knox pastored in Geneva. Knox had a profound sense of Biblical typology that shaped his understanding of ministry and often colored his prayers.

In Reformed liturgies, the Prayer of Confession was often followed by an Assurance of Pardon spoken by the minister and a Psalm of Thanksgiving sung by the congregation, after which came the reading and preaching of Holy Scripture. The ministry of the Word was also prefaced by a Prayer for Illumination. In Knox’s liturgy, no form is provided for this prayer, but “the minister prays for the assistance of God’s Holy Spirit, as the same shall move his heart.” Here, Knox is again following the example of Calvin’s Genevan liturgy, which provides no form for this prayer but leaves it up to the discretion of the minister.

The longest prayer in the service came after the sermon. The exposition of Scripture quite naturally led the congregation into prayer. This was a Prayer of Intercession, or, as it is called in Knox’s liturgy, “a prayer for the whole estate of Christ’s church.” Here the church prays for the ministry of the Word, for the faithfulness of church officers, for the perfection of the saints, for the salvation of all people, for the deliverance of the afflicted and, as Paul instructed Timothy, for all civil authorities (1

---

<sup>27</sup>*The Genevan Book of Order* (Presbyterian Heritage Publications, 1993) online at [http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualNLS/GBO\\_ch04.htm](http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualNLS/GBO_ch04.htm).

Tim. 2:1–8). This long Prayer of Intercession was concluded by the Lord’s Prayer, which, in turn, was followed by a Confession of Faith using the Apostles’ Creed.

When the eucharist was celebrated, the Creed was followed by the reading of the Words of Institution from 1 Corinthians 11, in order to establish the Biblical warrant for the sacrament. This was followed by a Communion Exhortation and a Prayer of Thanksgiving (or Eucharistic Prayer). The form for this prayer in Knox’s liturgy is one of the most beautiful liturgical texts produced in the Reformation. It sounds more like a hymn of praise and thanksgiving than what one typically hears in communion prayers today. It is a thanksgiving for creation and redemption that resembles the great Eucharistic Prayers of the ancient church.

The Eucharistic Prayer recounts with thanksgiving the incarnation of Christ, his death to satisfy divine justice, and his resurrection to destroy the author of death and bring life again to the world. The prayer also gives thanks for all the benefits of the new covenant (explicitly naming many of them), which are given in Christ and sealed in the sacrament of Christ’s body and blood. Knox concludes the prayer with a Trinitarian doxology. Here is Knox’s sample form for the Eucharistic Prayer:

O Father of mercy and God of all consolation, seeing all creatures do acknowledge and confess thee as Governor and Lord, it becometh us, the workmanship of thine own hands, at all times to reverence and magnify thy Godly Majesty; first, for that thou hast created us to thine own image and similitude, but chiefly because thou hast delivered us from that everlasting death and damnation into the which Satan drew mankind, by the means of sin, from the bondage whereof neither man nor angel was able to make us free, but thou, O Lord, rich in mercy and infinite in goodness, hast provided our redemption to stand in thine only and well beloved Son, whom of very love thou didst give to be made Man like unto us, in all things, sin except, that in his body he might receive the punishment of our transgression, by his death to make satisfaction to thy justice, and by his resurrection to destroy him that was author of death, and so to bring again to life to the world, from which the whole offspring of Adam most justly was exiled.

O Lord, we acknowledge that no creature is able to comprehend the length and breadth, the deepness and height of that thy most excellent love, which moved thee to show mercy where none was deserved, to promise and give life where death had gotten the victory, to receive us into thy grace when we could do nothing but rebel against thy justice.

O Lord, the blind dullness of our corrupt nature will not suffer us sufficiently to weigh those thy most ample benefits: yet, nevertheless, at the commandment of Jesus Christ our Lord, we present ourselves to this his Table, which he hath left to be used in remembrance of his death, until his coming again, to declare and witness before the world, that by him alone we have received liberty and life, that by him alone thou dost acknowledge us thy children and heirs, that by him alone we have entrance to the throne of thy grace, that by him alone we are possessed in our spiritual kingdom, to eat and drink at his Table, with whom we have our conversation presently in Heaven, and by whom our bodies shall be raised up again from the dust, and shall be placed with him in that endless joy, which thou, O Father of mercy, hast prepared for thine Elect before the foundation of the world was laid. And these most inestimable benefits we acknowledge and confess to have received of thy free mercy and grace, by thine only beloved Son Jesus Christ, for the which therefore, we thy Congregation, moved by thy Holy Spirit, render thee all thanks, praise, and glory, for ever and ever. Amen.<sup>28</sup>

Concerning this prayer, William Maxwell rightly observes that it is “truly eucharistic and follows the order of the primitive liturgies: Adoration and Thanksgiving for Creation and Redemption, Commemoration of the Incarnation, Death, Resurrection, and the Last Supper, concluding with a Doxology.”<sup>29</sup> Though Knox was unfamiliar with the eucharistic prayers of the *Didache*, his pre-communion prayer covers essentially the same territory.

In the liturgy of John Knox, we see an attempt to give the congregation a full diet of prayer. The various Biblical genres of prayer are represented in the service in one manner or another. The three main prayers are the Prayer of Confession at the beginning

---

<sup>28</sup>Stephen A. Hurlbut, ed., *The Liturgy of the Church of Scotland Since the Reformation: Part II, the Book of Common Order, Commonly Known as Knox's Liturgy* (Washington, D.C.: The St. Albans Press, 1945) 49–50.

<sup>29</sup>Maxwell, *The Liturgical Portions*, 58; cf. *ibid.*, 134.

of the service, the Prayer of Intercession following the sermon, and the Eucharistic Prayer at the Lord's Table. Complimenting these public prayers was a full course of Psalm singing, another prominent feature of Reformed worship.

The order of worship below is essentially the order that one finds in Knox's liturgy. This is the order that I would like to use at PPC. It has been slightly modified to reflect the insights gleaned from my study of the Didache. All items that are currently not included in the worship of PPC are underlined.

1. Call to Worship
2. Doxology
3. Invocation
4. The Ten Commandments
5. Exhortation to Repentance
6. Prayer of Confession and Supplication
7. Exhortation to Pursue Reconciliation
8. Words of Comfort
9. Declaration of Pardon
10. Psalm/Hymn
11. Prayer for Illumination
12. Reading of Holy Scripture
13. Sermon
14. Prayer of Intercession
15. The Lord's Prayer
16. Psalm/Hymn
17. The Apostles' Creed
18. Communion Exhortation and Invitation
19. Eucharistic Prayer
20. The Lord's Supper
21. Prayer of Thanksgiving
22. General Collection and/or Deacons' Collection
23. Psalm/Hymn
24. Benediction

## CHAPTER FIVE

### THE LITERATURE SEARCH

In recent years, several volumes have appeared on the subject of the eucharist in the early church. Biblical scholars, historians, theologians and liturgiologists have considerably advanced academia's proliferative knowledge of the origins the eucharist and the development of the various eucharistic rites of the patristic age. One liturgical historian who has made a considerable contribution to the field is Enrico Mazza. Mazza's book, *The Celebration of the Eucharist: The Origin of the Rite and the Development of Its Interpretation*, is an indispensable resource for understanding the Biblical, historical, theological and liturgical facets of the Lord's Supper.<sup>1</sup> Mazza begins his study with the Last Supper and traces the historical development of the rite down to the second Vatican Council. This book not only presents detailed analyses of numerous eucharistic texts; it also offers a sweeping overview of the evolution of the eucharist from the Upper Room to Vatican II.

Another liturgical historian who has made significant contributions to the field is Paul Bradshaw. Bradshaw has focused much of his attention on the origins of Christian worship.<sup>2</sup> Two recent volumes have focused more narrowly on the origins of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Enrico Mazza, *The Celebration of the Eucharist: The Origin of the Rite and the Development of Its Interpretation*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1999).

<sup>2</sup>Paul Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship* (Oxford University Press, 2002).

eucharist.<sup>3</sup> Like Mazza, Bradshaw is interested in tracing the historical evolution of the rite, but unlike Mazza, he typically limits his scope to the first five centuries of the church.<sup>4</sup> Bradshaw strongly challenges the assumptions of many previous liturgical scholars (e.g. Gregory Dix) concerning the origins and development of the eucharist.<sup>5</sup> Bradshaw's work on the eucharist in the Didache was critical to our research. His books have proven to be invaluable resources for understanding the eucharistic customs of the early church.

Willy Rordorf was one of the earliest scholars to recognize the significance of the liturgical portions of the Didache, and he has written several articles on the subject. His work on the eucharist in the Didache has been published in a collection of articles entitled, *The Eucharist of the Early Christians*.<sup>6</sup> This volume is an essential resource for a study of the eucharistic material in patristic documents including the writings of Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus of Lyons, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian and Origen. Although we disagree with Rordorf's view that the meal in Didache 9–10 is not the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, we, nevertheless, found his commentary to be an excellent resource for the study of early Christian worship.

---

<sup>3</sup>Paul F. Bradshaw and Maxwell E. Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies: Their Evolution and Interpretation* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012); and Paul F. Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins* (Great Britain: SPCK, 2004).

<sup>4</sup>His most recent work, which he co-authored with Maxwell Johnson, however, extends beyond the early church into the modern era.

<sup>5</sup>In the twentieth century, the groundbreaking study on the evolution of the eucharist was Gregory Dix's *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London, 1945).

<sup>6</sup>Willy Rordorf, et al., *The Eucharist of the Early Christians*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1978).

Aaron Milavec is the current chair of the new program unit of the Society of Biblical Literature called The Didache in Context: 50–90 C. E. Milavec's recent, comprehensive commentary on the Didache is a landmark study that offers fresh insights on the purpose and design of the Didache.<sup>7</sup> He convincingly argues for an early date of composition (prior to 70 AD), and in opposition to many church historians, he firmly defends the unity of the text. For Milavec, the Didache is the great pastoral manual of the first century. It records the instructional material that would have been memorized and used by early Christians to prepare Gentile converts for membership in the church. Milavec has personally studied with Willy Rordorf as well as Rabbi Jacob Neusner (which accounts for his familiarity with the latest Jewish scholarship on the worship of ancient Israel). Contrary to Rordorf, however, he persuasively argues that the meal in Didache 9–10 is, in fact, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. In addition to his massive commentary, Milavec has written a short volume on the Didache, which includes essentially all of the main insights contained in the larger work but without all of the supporting arguments.<sup>8</sup> Both volumes have been very informative and have greatly shaped my understanding of the Didache.

Like Milavec, Kurt Niederwimmer has also produced a comprehensive commentary on the Didache, which is now available in English translation in the *Hermeneia* commentary series.<sup>9</sup> This commentary presents the most recent critical

---

<sup>7</sup>Aaron Milavec, *The Didache: Faith, Hope, and Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50–70 C. E.* (Mahwah, NJ: The Newman Press, 2003).

<sup>8</sup>Aaron Milavec, *The Didache: Text, Translation, Analysis, and Commentary* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003).

<sup>9</sup>Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache*, trans. Linda M. Maloney, ed. Harold W. Attridge (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1998).



scholarship on the Didache. Unlike Milavec, Niederwimmer approaches the document from the standpoint of a church historian. His analysis of the Didache is, therefore, similar to that of Willy Rordorf. Both Rordorf and Niederwimmer base their interpretation of the Didache on the assumption that it is a composite document that shows clear signs of scribal editing and redaction. Thus, they attempt to unfold the redactional layers of the text and to explain the *Sitz-im-Leben der Kirche* that might account for those redactions. Niederwimmer's atomistic approach to the text provides a challenging contrast to Milavec's holistic approach.

Arthur Vööbus's *Liturgical Traditions in the Didache* focuses on the contribution that "the *Didache* makes to the elucidation of the liturgical traditions of primitive Christianity."<sup>10</sup> It includes over one hundred pages on the eucharist in the Didache. Vööbus (like Rordorf and Niederwimmer) is interested in the redactional history of the text, but he gives most of his attention to the actual celebration of the eucharist and the eucharistic imagery found in the text as we have it today. Vööbus also carefully examines the affinities of Didache 9–10 with the Gospel of John.

Thomas O'Loughlin's *The Didache: A Window on the Earliest Christians* follows the example of Milavec in accepting the text of the Didache as a unified and coherent document. O'Loughlin does not offer much in the way of new scholarship, but he does an excellent job of summarizing and interacting with the insights of others. His volume on the Didache is perhaps the best place to start if one is looking for a clear and brief

---

<sup>10</sup>Arthur Vööbus, *Liturgical Traditions in the Didache* (Stockholm: Estonian Theological Society in Exile, 1968) 7.

introduction to the book.<sup>11</sup> His observations on the social implications of the liturgical portions of the *Didache* were especially helpful.

Jonathan Draper's works on the *Didache* have proven to be indispensable for our project. His *The Didache in Modern Research* provides a representative selection of "the key essays on the *Didache* published in recent decades."<sup>12</sup> Draper's opening essay, "The *Didache* in Modern Research: An Overview," is a virtual *Forschungsbericht* of previous studies on the *Didache*; it presents an incredible wealth of information on *Didache* scholarship in recent years. The two most important essays in this volume for our research were "The Eucharist in the *Didache*" by Johannes Betz and "Didache 9–10: Elements of a Eucharistic Interpretation" by Enrico Mazza. In our opinion, Betz offers the best theological analysis of the eucharistic prayers of *Didache* 9–10, and we have incorporated many of his wonderful insights into our commentary on the *Didache* in chapters two and three of the dissertation.

Draper's doctoral thesis at Cambridge presents a running commentary on each verse of the *Didache* in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls and other second temple literature.<sup>13</sup> This was a profitable resource for understanding the Jewish religious setting of the first century, which sheds light on the theological and liturgical ideas of the Christian community that produced and used the *Didache*. Draper has written several articles on the *Didache*, two of which were especially useful for my project. One is entitled "Ritual

---

<sup>11</sup>Thomas O'Loughlin, *The Didache: A Window on the Earliest Christians* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010).

<sup>12</sup>Jonathan A. Draper, ed., *The Didache in Modern Research* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996) ix.

<sup>13</sup>Jonathan A. Draper, *A Commentary on the Didache in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents* (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1983) 221; hereafter, Draper, *Commentary*.

Process and Ritual Symbol in Didache 7–10,” and the other is “Pure Sacrifice in Didache 14 as Jewish Christian Exegesis.”<sup>14</sup> The former article explores the process of Christian initiation in the Didache, which included a celebration of the eucharist, and the latter article focuses on the concern for moral and cultic purity in Didache 14. Draper’s articles are essential reading for understanding the theology and practice of worship in the Didache.

Hughes Oliphant Old’s landmark study *The Patristic Roots of Reformed Worship* convincingly argues that the Reformers self-consciously modeled their liturgical reforms after the patristic church.<sup>15</sup> Old carefully investigates the Reformers’ knowledge of the fathers in order to determine which patristic sources were most influential on their liturgical reforms.<sup>16</sup> *Patristic Roots* is a veritable treasure house of vital information for the study of Reformed eucharistic theology and liturgy, particularly with regard to Calvin’s claim that Reformed worship is in accordance with the customs of the ancient church.

Nicholas Thompson’s *Eucharistic Sacrifice and Patristic Tradition in the Theology of Martin Bucer* was another useful tool for understanding the role of the church fathers in shaping Reformed liturgy.<sup>17</sup> It has long been recognized that Bucer had a significant influence on Calvin’s liturgical theory and practice, and that Calvin, in turn,

---

<sup>14</sup>Jonathan A. Draper, “Ritual Process and Ritual Symbol in Didache 7–10,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 54 (2000): 139–42; Draper, “Pure Sacrifice in Didache 14 as Jewish Christian Exegesis,” *Neotestamentica* 42.2 (2008): 223–52.

<sup>15</sup>Hughes Oliphant Old, *The Patristic Roots of Reformed Worship*, American Edition (Black Mountain, NC: Worship Press, 2004).

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid.*, xiii.

<sup>17</sup>Nicholas Thompson, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and Patristic Tradition in the Theology of Martin Bucer, 1534–1546* (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

influenced the liturgical traditions of the Reformed church more broadly, especially those of the Scottish Presbyterian church. Thompson's volume gave me a clearer picture of how the Reformers appropriated the fathers in developing their liturgical ideas and practices.

Another resource on the patristic background of Reformed worship that has been recently published is *Inventing Authority: The Use of the Church Fathers in Reformation Debates over the Eucharist* by Esther Chung-Kim.<sup>18</sup> This book closely examines how the Reformers used the fathers to support and defend their eucharistic theology. It begins with the colloquy of Marburg (1529) and ends with the colloquy of Montbéliard (1586). Chung-Kim carefully defines the traditional Protestant use of the fathers and demonstrates its significance for Reformed theology in general. For the Reformers, the fathers became "authenticators of the Protestant tradition."<sup>19</sup> Thus, Protestants claimed to be the "legitimate heirs of the early church."<sup>20</sup> As we have seen in chapters two and three of the dissertation, the Didache vindicates that claim.

Bard Thompson's *Liturgies of the Western Church* is a vital resource for the study of Reformed liturgy.<sup>21</sup> While many works on Reformed worship focus on the Reformers' theology of worship, this work focuses on the actual liturgical forms produced by the Reformers. Thompson provides an English translation of several liturgical forms

---

<sup>18</sup>Esther Chung-Kim, *Inventing Authority: The Use of the Church Fathers in Reformation Debates over the Eucharist* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2011).

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., 143.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid.

<sup>21</sup>Bard Thompson, *Liturgies of the Western Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980, 1961).

(including those written by Luther, Zwingli, Bucer, Calvin, Cranmer, Knox, and Baxter) and an informative introduction to each form.

Finally, a book that helped us to understanding recent trends in liturgical theology is *Do This in Remembrance of Me: A Ritual Approach to Reformed Eucharistic Theology* by Martha Moore-Keish.<sup>22</sup> Moore-Keish desires to reinterpret and revise the Reformed tradition in terms of the modern liturgical renewal movement. More specifically, she desires to place the Reformed tradition in conversation with liturgical theology (particularly the *theologia prima* perspective of Kavanagh, Schmemmann, and Fagerberg) and with contemporary ritual theory, in order to lead the church to a fuller appreciation of the ritual nature of the eucharist. This book has caused us to think very carefully about the relationship between liturgy and theology. Moore-Keish has also helped us to understand the ramifications of modern trends in liturgical theology vis-à-vis Reformed worship.

---

<sup>22</sup>Martha L. Moore-Keish, *Do This in Remembrance of Me: A Ritual Approach to Reformed Eucharistic Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008).

## CONCLUSION

As we have seen, the Reformers of the sixteenth century wanted to return to the sources of Holy Scripture and the earliest non-canonical Christian writings, which they used as a means of drawing near to the pure fountain of Holy Scripture. Unfortunately, however, one source that was not available to them was the Didache. The fortuitous rediscovery of the Didache at the end of the nineteenth century considerably advances our knowledge of the liturgical customs of the patristic age. The Didache, therefore, supplies us with the critical data needed to carry on the work of the Reformers in revising the liturgy according to the customs of the ancient church. The reformation of the church is a work in progress—*semper reformanda*. The Reformed church is always in need of being reformed according to the Word of God. As a vehicle that brings us closer to the Word of God, the Didache facilitates the ongoing task of reforming the church according to Scripture.

The Didache paints a portrait of “Christian worship in its simplest and purest form.”<sup>1</sup> It preserves the oldest and arguably the purest example of the celebration of the Lord’s Supper in ancient Christian literature. It bears eloquent testimony to the doctrine and practice of communion in the earliest stages of church history, but like all other non-

---

<sup>1</sup>R. C. D. Jasper and G. J. Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1992) 3.

canonical sources, the Didache contains both truth and error. We dare not appropriate the Didache indiscriminately, but to appeal to it under the authority and scrutiny of Scripture is thoroughly in step with Reformed practice. In this dissertation, I have endeavored to follow the example of the Reformers in appealing to patristic customs in revising the liturgy insofar as those customs are in keeping with Scripture, the only infallible rule for faith and worship.

The liturgical theology and practices of the Didache ought not to be adopted unconditionally but within strict limits, the restriction being that God will only accept such worship as he himself has prescribed in his inspired Word. Thus, as Martin Bucer observed, any non-canonical work, “of whatever content or origin, must be tested by the faithful and measured by the Scriptures themselves and believed and accepted only if shown to be derived from the actual Scriptures.”<sup>2</sup> Hence, before any patristic source, such as the Didache, can be appropriated as a subordinate authority in matters of faith and worship, it must be meticulously examined and tested by the touchstone of Scripture in order to distinguish what is in keeping with divine truth from what is not.

When it comes to the Didache, the necessity for such an examination is heightened because the text does not merely describe liturgical customs, it prescribes them. Its instructions regarding catechesis, baptism, prayer, fasting, the eucharist, hospitality, and church discipline are enjoined as apostolic teaching, indeed, “the teaching of the Lord through the twelve Apostles for the Gentiles” (Did. 1:1).<sup>3</sup> Although the

---

<sup>2</sup>David F. Wright, ed., *Common Places of Martin Bucer* (Abingdon, Eng.: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1972) 260.

<sup>3</sup>The manuscript discovered by Bryennios contains two titles. The longer title is “The Teaching of the Lord through the Twelve Apostles to the Gentiles;” the shorter title, “The Teaching of the Twelve

fathers of the church generally did not recognize the Didache as inspired, they did commend it as a reliable guide for training new converts.<sup>4</sup> For example, in his famous Easter Letter in the year 367, Athanasius included the Didache in a list of books which were “not recognized as canonical, but recommended by our ancestors for reading by those who have recently entered and wish to learn the word of faith.”<sup>5</sup> As a document that was popularly used as a training manual for new believers, the Didache played a significant role in shaping the liturgical customs of the church throughout the Roman Empire. Because of its antiquity and influence on the shape of early Christian liturgy, the Didache is an ideal place to begin a study of patristic worship.

This dissertation barely scratches the surface of the significance of the Didache for Christian worship. I have endeavored to draw out the rich, biblical insights of the Didache on the subject of the Lord’s Supper and have offered a few proposed revisions to Reformed worship in light of those insights. Having come to the end of the current project and having had an opportunity to reflect critically on my work, I am glad that I chose this topic for my dissertation and am convinced that it was a beneficial study, but there is still much work to be done. As I continue to study what the Didache teaches about Christian worship—particularly what it says about catechesis, baptism, prayer, fasting, and church discipline—I hope, by God’s grace, to continue the unceasing work of examining and evaluating the theology and worship of the Reformed church in light of Holy Scripture and the customs of the ancient church.

---

Disciples.” Eusebius refers to the document as “the so-called Teachings of the Apostles,” perhaps, expressing doubt about its apostolic authorship; see Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache*, trans. Linda M. Maloney, ed. Harold W. Attridge (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1998) 4.

<sup>4</sup>See Niederwimmer, 4–17.

<sup>5</sup>Cited in Niederwimmer, 4.



## APPENDIX

The teaching of *the* Lord through the twelve apostles to the Gentiles:<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1:1</sup>There are two ways, one of life and one of death. And *there is* a great difference between the two ways.

<sup>2</sup>On the one hand, then, the way of life is this. First, you shall love God who made you; second, *you shall love* your neighbor as yourself. And whatever you do not wish to happen to you, do not do to another.

<sup>3</sup>And from these words, the teaching is this. Bless those who curse you, and pray for your enemies, and fast for those who persecute you. For what credit *is it* if you love those who love you? Do not even the Gentiles do the same? But you must love those who hate you, and you will not have an enemy.

<sup>4</sup>Abstain from fleshly and bodily desires. If someone strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also, and you will be perfect. If someone forces you to go one mile, go with him two. If someone takes away your cloak, give him your tunic also. If someone takes from you what belongs to you, do not demand it back, for you cannot *do so*.

<sup>5</sup>Give to everyone who asks you, and do not demand it back, for the Father wants to give *something* to all from his own free gifts. Blessed is the one who gives according to this

---

<sup>1</sup>Our translation of the Didache is based on the Greek text published by Michael W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2005, 1992) 246–69. An italicized word indicates that no corresponding word exists in the original. We have added the italicized words to clarify the meaning of the text.

rule, for he is blameless. Woe to the one who receives! For if anyone who is in need receives, he is blameless, but the one who does not have need will stand trial {on the day of judgment} *as to* why and for what purpose he received. And being imprisoned, he will be examined concerning what he has done, and he will not get out until he has repaid every last cent.

<sup>6</sup>But also, concerning this, it has been said, “Let your alms sweat in your hands until you know to whom to give *it*.”

<sup>2:1</sup>And the second commandment of the teaching *is this*.

<sup>2</sup>Do not kill. Do not commit adultery. Do not corrupt boys. Do not commit fornication. Do not steal. Do not practice magic. Do not engage in sorcery. Do not abort a child or kill a child that is born. Do not covet *your* neighbor’s possessions.

<sup>3</sup>Do not swear falsely. Do not bear false witness. Do not speak insults. Do not hold a grudge.

<sup>4</sup>Do not be double-minded or double-tongued, for the double-tongue is a deadly snare.

<sup>5</sup>Your word shall not be false or empty but confirmed by action.

<sup>6</sup>Do not be covetous or greedy or a hypocrite or malicious or arrogant. Do not entertain a wicked plot against your neighbor.

<sup>7</sup>Do not hate any person, but some you shall reprove, others pray for, and still others love more than yourself.

<sup>3:1</sup>My child, flee from every evil and everything like it.

<sup>2</sup>Do not become angry, for anger leads to murder. *Do not be* envious or quarrelsome or hot-tempered, for from all these things, murders are begotten.

<sup>3</sup>My child, do not become lustful, for lust leads to fornication. *Do not be* foul-mouthed or let your eyes roam, for from all these things, adulteries are begotten.

<sup>4</sup>My child, do not become a diviner, since this leads to idolatry. *Do not be* an enchanter or an astrologer or a purifier or *even* wish to see these things, for from all these things, idolatry is begotten.

<sup>5</sup>My child, do not be a liar, for lying leads to theft. *Do not be* a lover of money or conceited, for from all these things, thefts are begotten.

<sup>6</sup>My child, do not become a complainer, since this leads to blasphemy. *Do not be* self-pleasing or evil-minded, for from all these things, blasphemies are begotten.

<sup>7</sup>But be meek, since the meek will inherit the earth.

<sup>8</sup>Be patient and merciful and harmless and calm and good, and always tremble at the words that you have heard.

<sup>9</sup>Do not exalt yourself or become arrogant. Do not join yourself to the proud, but dwell with the righteous and humble.

<sup>10</sup>Welcome the things that happen to you as good, knowing that, apart from God, nothing happens.

<sup>4:1</sup>My child, night and day, remember the one who speaks the word of God to you, and honor him as *the* Lord, for wherever *the* dominion of the Lord is spoken of, there *the* Lord is.

<sup>2</sup>And every day, seek out the presence of the saints, that you may find support in their words.

<sup>3</sup>Do not cause division, but make peace between those who quarrel. Judge justly; do not show favoritism when reproving sins.

<sup>4</sup>Do not doubt whether it will be or not.

<sup>5</sup>Do not be *someone who* stretches out his hands to receive but who withdraws *them* when it comes to giving.

<sup>6</sup>If you acquire *something* with your hands, give a ransom for your sins.

<sup>7</sup>Do not hesitate to give or complain when giving, for you shall *yet* come to know who is the good paymaster of the reward.

<sup>8</sup>Do not turn from someone in need, but share all things with your brother, and do not claim that anything is your own. For if you are partners in what is imperishable, how much more in what is perishable.

<sup>9</sup>Do not withhold your hand from your son or daughter, but from *their* youth, teach *them* the fear of God.

<sup>10</sup>Do not give orders in your anger to your male slave and female slave who hope in the same God *as you*, lest they stop fearing the God *who is over you* both. For he does not call with partiality, but those whom the Spirit has prepared.

<sup>11</sup>And you slaves must be submissive to your masters with respect and fear, as to a type of God.

<sup>12</sup>Hate all hypocrisy and everything that is not pleasing to the Lord.

<sup>13</sup>Do not forsake *the* commandments of *the* Lord but guard what you have received, neither adding *to them* nor taking away.

<sup>14</sup>In church, confess your sins, and do not go to your prayer with an evil conscience. This is the way of life.

<sup>5:1</sup>Now, the way of death is this. First of all, it is evil and completely cursed: murders, adulteries, lusts, fornications, thefts, idolatries, witchcraft, sorceries, robberies, perjuries,

hypocrisies, double-heartedness, deceit, arrogance, malice, stubbornness, greed, foul-speech, jealousy, audacity, haughtiness, boastfulness.

<sup>2</sup>*It is the way of* persecutors of the good, haters of the truth, lovers of the lie, those who do not know the reward of the righteous, nor adhere to what is good, nor to just judgment, those who are alert not to do good but to do evil, who are far from being gentle and patient, who love vain things, who pursue reward, who show no mercy to the poor, who do not work for the oppressed, who do not know him who made them, murderers of children, corrupters of God's creation, who turn away from the needy, who oppress the afflicted, advocates of the wealthy, lawless judges of the poor, those who are utterly sinful. May you be saved, children, from all these things!

<sup>6:1</sup>Take care that no one leads you astray from this way of the teaching, for *such a person* teaches you apart from God.

<sup>2</sup>For if you are able to bear the whole yoke of the Lord, you will be perfect. But if you are not able, do what you can.

<sup>3</sup>Now concerning food, bear what you are able, but keep strictly away from food sacrificed to idols, for this is the worship of dead gods.

<sup>7:1</sup>Now concerning baptism, baptize as follows: Having said all these things beforehand, baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit with living water.

<sup>2</sup>But if you do not have living water, then baptize with other water. And if you are not able *to baptize with cold water, then baptize with warm water.*

<sup>3</sup>But if you have neither, then pour water on the head three times in *the* name of *the* Father and of *the* Son and of *the* Holy Spirit.

<sup>4</sup>And prior to the baptism, let the one baptizing and the one being baptized fast, as well as any others who are able. And order the one being baptized to fast for one or two days beforehand.

<sup>8:1</sup>And do not let your fasts coincide with *those of* the hypocrites, for they fast on Mondays and Thursdays, but you must fast on Wednesdays and Fridays.

<sup>2</sup>And do not pray like the hypocrites, but as the Lord commanded in his gospel, pray in this manner: Our Father in heaven, hallowed be your name. Your kingdom come; your will be done, as in heaven, *so* also on earth. Give us today our bread for the day. And forgive us our debt, as we also forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one, for yours is the power and the glory forever.

<sup>3</sup>Pray in this manner three times a day.

<sup>9:1</sup>Now concerning the eucharist, give thanks in this manner:

<sup>2</sup>First, concerning the cup: We give thanks to you, our Father, for the holy vine of your servant David, which you have revealed to us through your servant Jesus. To you be the glory forever.

<sup>3</sup>And concerning the broken bread: We give thanks to you, our Father, for the life and knowledge that you have revealed to us through your servant Jesus. To you be the glory forever.

<sup>4</sup>As this broken bread was scattered upon the hills and, having been gathered together, became one, so may your church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into your kingdom. For yours is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ forever.

<sup>5</sup>But let no one eat or drink from your eucharist, except those who have been baptized in the name of the Lord, for concerning this, the Lord has likewise said, “Do not give what is holy to the dogs.”

<sup>10:1</sup>Now after being filled, give thanks in this manner:

<sup>2</sup>We give thanks to you, holy Father, for your holy name, which you have caused to dwell in our hearts and for the knowledge and faith and immortality which you have revealed to us through your servant Jesus. To you be the glory forever.

<sup>3</sup>You, almighty Master, created all things for your name’s sake. To *all* people, you have given both food and drink to enjoy, in order that they might give *you* thanks. But to us, you have freely given spiritual food and drink and eternal life through your servant *Jesus*.

<sup>4</sup>Above all, we give you thanks because you are mighty. To you be the glory forever.

<sup>5</sup>Remember your church, O Lord, to deliver her from all evil and to perfect her in your love and to gather her together *as* the holy one from the four winds into your kingdom which you have prepared for her. For yours is the power and the glory forever.

<sup>6</sup>May grace come, and may this world pass away. Hosanna to the son of David!<sup>2</sup> If anyone is holy, let him come. If anyone is not, let him repent. Come, Lord! Amen!

<sup>7</sup>But allow the prophets to give thanks as long as they wish.

<sup>11:1</sup>Whoever, therefore, should come and teach you all these things mentioned above, welcome him.

<sup>2</sup>But if the teacher should himself go astray and teach a different teaching to undermine *these things*, do not listen to him. But *if his teaching* brings righteousness and knowledge of *the* Lord, welcome him as *the* Lord.

---

<sup>2</sup>Codex Hierosolymitanus has “God of David,” though “son of David” is probably original. See comments on Did. 10:6 in chapter two.

<sup>3</sup>Now concerning the apostles and prophets, according to the decree of the gospel, act in this manner:

<sup>4</sup>Let every apostle who comes to you be welcomed as *the* Lord.

<sup>5</sup>But he shall not stay more than one day, and if there is a need, also another *day*, but if he stays three *days*, he is a false prophet.

<sup>6</sup>And when the apostle leaves, let him take nothing except bread *to sustain him* until he finds lodging *elsewhere*. But if he asks for money, he is a false prophet.

<sup>7</sup>And you shall not test or condemn any prophet who speaks in the Spirit, for every sin will be forgiven, but this sin will not be forgiven.

<sup>8</sup>And not everyone who speaks in the Spirit is a prophet, but *only* if he has the ways of *the* Lord. Therefore, the false prophet and the *true* prophet will be known by their conduct.

<sup>9</sup>And every prophet who orders a meal in *the* Spirit shall not eat from it, and if *he does* otherwise, he is a false prophet.

<sup>10</sup>And every prophet who teaches the truth, if he does not practice what he teaches, he is a false prophet.

<sup>11</sup>And every prophet proven *to be* true, who acts with a view to the earthly mystery of *the* church but who does not teach *you* to do what he himself does, shall not be judged by you, since he has *his* judgment with God. For even the ancient prophets behaved in this way.

<sup>12</sup>And whoever says in the Spirit, "Give me money" or something else, do not listen to him, but if he says to give to others who are in need, let no one judge him.

<sup>12:1</sup>And let everyone who comes in the name of *the* Lord be welcomed. But then, examine him, *and* you will know, for you will have insight *of* right and left.



<sup>2</sup>If the one who comes is a traveler, help him as much as you can. But he shall not stay with you *for* more than two or, if need be, three days.

<sup>3</sup>But if he wants to settle down among you *and* is a craftsman, let him work and eat.

<sup>4</sup>But if he does not have a craft, decide, according to your *own* discretion, how, as a Christian, he shall live among you without *being* idle.

<sup>5</sup>But if he does not want to behave like this, he is trading on Christ. Beware of such people!

<sup>13:1</sup>And every true prophet who wants to settle down among you is worthy of his food.

<sup>2</sup>Likewise, a true teacher is worthy of his food, like the worker.

<sup>3</sup>Therefore, all the firstfruits of the produce of the wine press and threshing floor, of both the cattle and sheep, you shall give *these* firstfruits to the prophets, for they are your high priests.

<sup>4</sup>But if you have no prophet, then give *them* to the poor.

<sup>5</sup>If you make bread, take the firstfruit *and* give *it* according to the commandment.

<sup>6</sup>Likewise, when you open a jar of wine or oil take the firstfruit *and* give *it* to the prophets.

<sup>7</sup>And of money and clothes and every possession, take the firstfruits, as seems good to you, *and* give *them* according to the commandment.

<sup>14:1</sup>Now according to *the* Lord's *Day* of *the* Lord, when you have been gathered together, break bread and give thanks, after you have confessed your sins, so that your sacrifice may be pure.

<sup>2</sup>But do not allow anyone who has a quarrel with his companion to assemble with you until they have been reconciled, so that your sacrifice may not be defiled.

<sup>3</sup>For this is *the thing* mentioned by the Lord, “In every place and time, offer me a pure sacrifice, for I am a great King, says the Lord, and my name *will be* marvelous among the nations.

<sup>15:1</sup>Therefore, appoint for yourselves bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord, men *who are* humble and not lovers of money, and *who are* true and approved, for to you, they themselves also minister the ministry of the prophets and teachers.

<sup>2</sup>Therefore, do not disregard them, for they themselves are your honored men along with the prophets and teachers.

<sup>3</sup>And reprove one another, not in anger but in peace, as you have *it* in the gospel. And if anyone wrongs his neighbor, let no one speak *to him* nor hear from you until he repents.

<sup>4</sup>And your prayers and alms and all *your* actions do *them* thus as you have *it* in the gospel of our Lord.

<sup>16:1</sup>Keep watch over your life. Do not let your lamps be extinguished, and do not let your loins be loosed, but be prepared. For you do not know the hour when our Lord is coming.

<sup>2</sup>And be gathered together frequently, seeking what is appropriate for your souls, for the whole time of your faith will not profit you if you are not found perfect in the last time.

<sup>3</sup>For in the last days, the false prophets and corrupters will be multiplied, and the sheep will be turned into wolves, and love will be turned into hate.

<sup>4</sup>For as lawlessness increases, they will hate and persecute and betray one another. And then, the deceiver of the world will appear as a son of God and will perform signs and wonders, and the earth will be delivered into his hands, and he will do unlawful things that have never been known since time began.

<sup>5</sup>Then, *all* human creation will come into the fiery trial, and many will fall away and perish, but those who endure in their faith will be saved by the accursed one himself.

<sup>6</sup>And then, the signs of truth will appear: first, *the* sign of an opening in heaven; next, *the* sign of *the* sound of a trumpet, and third, *the* resurrection of *the* dead—

<sup>7</sup>but not *the resurrection* of all; rather, as it has been said, “The Lord will come and all *his* saints with him.”

<sup>8</sup>Then, the world will see the Lord coming on the clouds of heaven.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, Michael and Scott R. Swain. *Reformed Catholicity*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2015.
- Audet, Jean-Paul. *La Didache: Instructions des apôtres*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1958.
- Backus, Irena, ed. *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, 2 volumes. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Backus, Irena. "Martin Bucer and the Patristic Tradition." *Martin Bucer and Sixteenth Century Europe: Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (28–31 août 1991)*. Edited by Christian Krieger and Marc Lienhard, volume 1. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993.
- Backus, Irena. "The Disputations of Baden, 1526 and Berne 1528: Neutralizing the Early Church." *Studies in Reformed Theology and History*, vol. 1, no. 1. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1993.
- Bannerman, James. *The Church of Christ*. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1974.
- Bauckham, Richard J. "The Lord's Day." *From Sabbath to the Lord's Day*. Edited by D. A. Carson. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2000.
- Bauckham, Richard J. *Jude, 2 Peter*. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983.
- Betz, Johannes. "The Eucharist in the Didache." *The Didache in Modern Research*. Edited by Jonathan A. Draper. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Luke*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1994.
- Bradshaw, Paul F. and Maxwell E. Johnson. *The Eucharistic Liturgies: Their Evolution and Interpretation*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012.
- Bradshaw, Paul F. *Daily Prayer in the Early Church*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2008.
- Bradshaw, Paul F. *Eucharistic Origins*. London: SPCK, 2004.
- Bradshaw, Paul F. *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*. London/New York, 2002.
- Bradshaw, Paul F., Maxwell E. Johnson and L. Edward Phillips. *The Apostolic Tradition*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2002.
- Bromiley, G. W., ed. *Zwingli and Bullinger*, Library of Christian Classics, vol. 24. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953.
- Brown, Raymond. *The Gospel According to John, XIII–XXI*. New York: Doubleday, 1970.
- Bruner, Frederick Dale. *The Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2012.
- Bucer, Martin. *Common Places of Martin Bucer*. Edited by David F. Wright. Abingdon, Eng.: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1972.

- Burki, Bruno. "La Sainte Cene selon l'ordre de Jean Calvin, 1542." *Coena Domini I. Die Abendmahlsliturgie der Reformationskirchen in 16./17. Jahrhundert*. Freiburg, Switzerland: 1983.
- Calvin, John. *Commentaries on the First Twenty Chapters of the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*. Translated by Thomas Myers. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2005.
- Calvin, John. *Commentary on the Twelve Minor Prophets*. Translated by John Owen. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1986.
- Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Translated by Ford Lewis Battles; edited by John T. McNeill. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960.
- Calvin, John. *Ioannis Calvini opera omnia quae supersunt*, 59 vols. Edited by G. Baum, E. Cunitz, and E. Reuss. Brunsvigae: C. A. Schwetschke, 1863–1900.
- Calvin, John. *John Calvin's Sermons on the Ten Commandments*. Translated and edited by Benjamin W. Farley. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1980.
- Calvin, John. *Tracts and Letters*. Translated and edited by Henry Beveridge. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 2009.
- Christoffel, Raget. *Zwingli: The Rise of the Reformation in Switzerland*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1858.
- Chung-Kim, Esther. *Inventing Authority: The Use of the Church Fathers in the Reformation Debates over the Eucharist*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2011.
- Clary, Glen J. "Ulrich Zwingli and the Swiss Anabaptists: Sola Scriptura and the Reformation of Christian Worship." *The Confessional Presbyterian* 6 (2010): 108–24.
- Claussen, Carsten. "The Eucharist in the Gospel of John and in the Didache." *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Congar, Yves. *Tradition and Traditions*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.
- Cullmann, Oscar. *Early Christian Worship*. Translated by A. Stewart Todd and James B. Torrance. London, SCM Press, 1969.
- Cummings, Owen F. *Eucharist and Ecumenism*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2013.
- Cunningham, David S., ed. *Ecumenical Theology in Worship, Doctrine and Life*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Cyprus, Ottomar Frederick. *Basic Principles: Translation and Commentary of Martin Bucer's "Grund und Ursach," 1524*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1971; Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 2003.
- D'Amico, John F. "Beatus Rhenanus, Tertullian, and the Reformation." *Archive for Reformation History* 71 (1980): 37–63.
- Danielou, Jean. *A History of Early Christian Doctrine Before the Council of Nicaea*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964.
- De Greef, Wulfert. *The Writings of John Calvin*, Expanded Edition. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.
- Dix, Gregory. *The Shape of the Liturgy*. London, 1945.
- Draper, Jonathan A. "Pure Sacrifice in Didache 14 as Jewish Christian Exegesis." *Neotestamentica* 42.2 (2008): 223–52.

- Draper, Jonathan A. "Ritual Process and Ritual Symbol in Didache 7–10." *Vigiliae Christianae* 54 (2000): 121–58.
- Draper, Jonathan A. "The Apostolic Fathers: The Didache." *The Expository Times*, vol. 117, no. 5 (2006): 177–81.
- Draper, Jonathan A. *A Commentary on the Didache in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1983.
- Draper, Jonathan A., ed. *The Didache in Modern Research*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996.
- Dugmore, C. W. "Lord's Day and Eucharist." *Neotestamentica et Patristica* (1962): 272–81.
- Eire, Carlos M. N. *War Against the Idols: The Reformation of Worship from Erasmus to Calvin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Fagerberg, David W. *Theologia Prima: What is Liturgical Theology?* Chicago/Mundelein, IL: Hillenbrand Books, 2004.
- Fagerberg, David W. *What is Liturgical Theology? A Study in Methodology*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1992.
- Ferguson, Sinclair, "Scripture and Tradition: The Bible and Tradition in Roman Catholicism." *Sola Scriptura: The Protestant Position on the Bible*. Edited by Don Kistler. Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria Publications, 2000.
- Fisher, J. D. C. *Christian Initiation: The Reformation Period*. Chicago/Mundelein, IL: Hillenbrand Books, 2007.
- Forrester, Duncan and Douglas Murray, eds. *Studies in the History of Worship in Scotland*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996.
- Frame, John M. *Worship in Spirit and Truth*. Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1996.
- Franke, John R., "Scripture, Tradition and Authority: Reconstructing the Evangelical Conception of Sola Scriptura." *Evangelicals and Scripture: Tradition, Authority and Hermeneutics*. Edited by Vincent Bacote, Lara C. Miguez, and Dennis L. Okholm. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004.
- Frankel, Pierre. *Testimonia Patrum: the Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melancthon*. Geneva: Droz, 1961.
- Gaffin, Richard B. Jr. *Resurrection and Redemption*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1987.
- Geiselman, J. R. "Scripture, Tradition, and the Church: An Ecumenical Problem." *Christianity Divided*. Edited by D. J. Callahan, H. A. Oberman, and D. J. O'Hanlon. London, 1962.
- Gordon, T. David. "The Westminster Assembly's Unworkable and Unscriptural View of Worship?" *Westminster Theological Journal* 65 (2003): 345–56.
- Gore, R. J. Jr. *Covenantal Worship: Reconsidering the Puritan Regulative Principle*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, 2002.
- Hall, David W., ed. *Tributes to John Calvin: A Celebration of His Quincentenary*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 2010.
- Harder, Leland. *The Sources of Swiss Anabaptism: The Grebel Letters and Related Documents*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1985.
- Holmes, Michael W. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2005.

- Hurlbut, Stephen A. ed. *The Liturgy of the Church of Scotland Since the Reformation: Part II, the Book of Common Order, Commonly Known as Knox's Liturgy*. Washington, D.C.: The St. Albans Press, 1945.
- Irwin, Kevin W. *Context and Text: Method in Liturgical Theology*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1994.
- Irwin, Kevin W. *Liturgical Theology: A Primer*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1990.
- Jackson, Samuel M., ed. *The Latin Works and the Correspondence of Huldreich Zwingli, together with Selections from his German Works*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1912.
- Jasper, R. C. D. and G. J. Cuming. *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1992.
- Jefford, Clayton N. *Didache: The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. Salem, OR: Polebridge Press, 2013.
- Jefford, Clayton N., ed. *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History, and Transmission*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. London: SCM, 1966.
- Johnson, Lawrence. *Worship in the Early Church: An Anthology of Historical Sources*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2009.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Gospel of Luke*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Kavanagh, Aidan. *On Liturgical Theology*. Collegeville; New York: Pueblo Publishing, 1984.
- Keener, Craig S. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*, volume 1. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Kistler, Don, ed. *Sola Scriptura: The Protestant Position on the Bible*. Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria, 2000.
- Knox, John. *John Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland*. Edited by William Croft Dickinson. New York: Philosophical Library, 1949.
- Knox, John. *The Genevan Book of Order*. Edited by Kevin Reed. Dallas, TX: Presbyterian Heritage Publications, 1993.
- Koch, Dietrich-Alex. "Eucharistic Meal and Eucharistic Prayer in Didache 9 and 10." *Studia Theologica* 64 (2010): 200–18.
- Kyle, Richard G. "John Knox and the Purification of Religion: The Intellectual Aspects of His Crusade Against Idolatry." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 77 (1986): 265–80.
- Lane, A. N. S. *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1999.
- Lathrop, Gordon. *Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993.
- LaVerdiere, Eugene. *The Eucharist in the New Testament and the Early Church*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1996.
- Letham, Robert. *The Lord's Supper: Eternal Word in Broken Bread*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 2001.
- Lietzmann, Hans. *Mass and Lord's Supper: A Study in the History of the Liturgy*. Translated by Dorothea H. G. Reeve. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979.

- Locher, Gottfried W. *Zwingli's Thought: New Perspectives*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981.
- Lorimer, Peter. *John Knox and the Church of England: His Work in Her Pulpit and His Influence Upon Her Liturgy, Articles, and Parties*. London: Henry S. King and Co., 1875.
- Louth, Andrew. *Early Christian Writings*. England: Penguin Books, 1987.
- M'Crie, Thomas. *Annals of English Presbytery*. London: James Nisbet and Co., 1872.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *Thomas Cranmer: A Life*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Manetsch, Scott M. *Calvin's Company of Pastors: Pastoral Care and the Emerging Reformed Church, 1536–1609*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Marshall, Paul V. "Reconsidering 'Liturgical Theology': Is There a Lex Orandi for all Christians?" *Studia Liturgica* 25 (1995): 129–51.
- Mathison, Keith A. *Given For You: Reclaiming Calvin's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 2002.
- Maxwell, William D. *The Liturgical Portions of the Genevan Service Book*. Great Britain: The Faith Press Ltd., 1965.
- Mazza, Enrico. *The Celebration of the Eucharist: The Origin of the Rite and the Development of Its Interpretation*. Translated by Matthew J. O'Connell. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1999.
- McGowan, Andrew. "'First Regarding the Cup': Papias and the Diversity of Early Eucharistic Practice." *Journal of Theological Studies*, n. s. 46 (1995): 551–55.
- McGowan, Andrew. "The Inordinate Cup: Issues of Order in Early Eucharistic Drinking." *Studia Patristica*, Vol. XXXV (2001): 283–91.
- McGowan, Andrew. *Ascetic Eucharists: Food and Drink in Early Christian Ritual Meals*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- McGrath, Alister E. *Christian Theology: An Introduction*, Second Edition. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.
- McGrath, Alister E. *Reformation Thought: An Introduction*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988.
- McGrath, Alister E. *The Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc., 1987.
- McNally, Robert E. "Tradition at the Beginning of the Reformation." *Perspectives on Scripture and Tradition*. Edited by Joseph F. Kelly. Notre Dame, IN: Fides Publishers, Inc., 1976.
- Melanchthon, Philipp. *Selected Writings*. Edited by Elmer Ellsworth Flack and Lowell J. Satre. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1962.
- Migne, J.-P. *Patrologia Latina*. Paris, 1844–55.
- Milavec, Aaron. *The Didache: Faith, Hope, and Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50-70 C.E.* Mahwah, NJ: The Newman Press, 2003.
- Milavec, Aaron. *The Didache: Text, Translation, Analysis, and Commentary*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003.
- Moloney, Francis J. *The Gospel of John*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998.
- Moore-Keish, Martha L. *Do This in Remembrance of Me: A Ritual Approach to Reformed Eucharistic Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.



- Moran, Gabriel. *Scripture and Tradition: A Survey of the Controversy*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1963.
- Moule, C. F. D. "A Note on *Didache* ix.4." *Journal of Theological Studies* 6 (1955): 240–43.
- Moule, C. F. D. "A Reconsideration of the Context of Maranatha." *Essays in New Testament Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Muller, Richard A. and Rowland S. Ward. *Scripture and Worship: Biblical Interpretation and the Directory for Public Worship*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 2007.
- Muller, Richard A. *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1985.
- Murray, John. *Collected Writings*. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 2001.
- Niederwimmer, Kurt. *Didache*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney; edited by Harold W. Attridge. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1998.
- O'Loughlin, Thomas. *The Didache: A Window on the Earliest Christians*. Baker Academic, 2010.
- Oberman, Heiko. *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.
- Oberman, Heiko. *The Dawn of the Reformation: Essays in Late Medieval and Early Reformation Thought*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Oberman, Heiko. *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1967.
- Old, Hughes Oliphant. *Themes and Variations for a Christian Doxology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Old, Hughes Oliphant. "Eucharist, Reformation Controversies On." *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*. Edited by Peter E. Fink. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1990.
- Old, Hughes Oliphant. *Holy Communion in the Piety of the Reformed Church*. Powder Springs, GA: Tolle Lege Press, 2013.
- Old, Hughes Oliphant. *Leading in Prayer*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Old, Hughes Oliphant. *The Patristic Roots of Reformed Worship*. American Edition, Black Mountain, NC: Worship Press, 2010; 1975.
- Old, Hughes Oliphant. *Worship: Reformed According to Scripture*, Revised and Expanded Edition. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.
- Owen, John. *Works*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1862.
- Packer, James I. *Among God's Giants: The Puritan Vision of the Christian Life*. Eastborne: Kingsway, 1991.
- Payton, James R. Jr. *Getting the Reformation Wrong: Correcting Some Misunderstandings*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2010.
- Percy, Eustace. *John Knox*. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1965.
- Potter, George R. *Zwingli*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Reed, Kevin, ed. *The Selected Works of John Knox*. Dallas, TX: Presbyterian Heritage Publications, 1995.
- Reed, Kevin. "John Knox and the Reformation of Worship in the Scottish Reformation." *Worship in the Presence of God*. Edited by David Lachman and Frank J. Smith. Greenville, SC: Greenville Seminary Press, 1992.

- Reid, J. K. S., ed. *Calvin: Theological Treatises*, Library of Christian Classics, volume 22. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954.
- Ridderbos, Herman. *The Coming of the Kingdom*. Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1962.
- Roberts, Alexander and James Donaldson, eds. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903.
- Rordorf, Willy and André Tuilier. *La Doctrine des douze apôtres : Didachè*. Paris, 1998.
- Rordorf, Willy, ed. *The Eucharist of the Early Christians*. Translated by Matthew J. O'Connell. New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1978.
- Rordorf, Willy. "La vigne et le vin dans la tradition juive et chrétienne." *Université de Neuchâtel, Annales 1969–1970*.
- Rordorf, Willy. *Sunday: The History of the Day of Rest and Worship in the Earliest Centuries of the Christian Church*. Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press, 1968.
- Rupp, Gordon. *Patterns of the Reformation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.
- Schaff, Philip. *The Creeds of Christendom*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1998.
- Schaff, Philip. *The Oldest Church Manual Called the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles: The Didache and Kindred Documents in the Original, with Translations*. Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2008.
- Schmemmann, Alexander. "Liturgy and Theology." *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 17, no. 1 (1972): 86–100.
- Schmemmann, Alexander. *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*. Crestwood, NJ: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003.
- Schroeder, H. J. *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*. Rockford, IL: TAN Books, 1978.
- Senn, Frank C. *The People's Work: A Social History of the Liturgy*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2006.
- Sider, Robert Dick., ed. *Christian and Pagan in the Roman Empire: The Witness of Tertullian*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2001.
- Spinks, Bryan D. *Do This in Remembrance of Me: The Eucharist from the Early Church to the Present Day*. London: SCM, 2013.
- Stephens, W. P. *The Theology of Huldrych Zwingli*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Taft, Robert F. "Liturgy as Theology." *Worship* 56, no. 2 (March 1982): 113–17.
- Taft, Robert F. "Mass Without the Consecration? The Historic Agreement on the Eucharist between the Catholic Church and the Assyrian Church of the East." *Worship* 77, no. 6 (Nov. 2003): 482–509.
- Tavard, George H. *Holy Writ or Holy Church: The Crisis of the Protestant Reformation*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.
- Thompson, Bard. "Reformed Liturgies in Translation Part 1: Ulrich Zwingli." *Bulletin of the Theological Seminary of the Evangelical and Reformed Church* XXVII, 4 (1956): 1–10.
- Thompson, Bard. *Liturgies of the Western Church*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980; 1961.
- Thompson, Nicholas. *Eucharistic Sacrifice and Patristic Tradition in the Theology of Martin Bucer, 1534–1546*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Townsend, M. J. "Exit the Agape?" *Expository Times* 90 (1978–79): 356–61.

- Turretin, Francis. *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1994.
- Ursinus, Zacharias. *Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1985.
- Van de Sandt, Huub and David Flusser, eds. *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2002.
- Van de Sandt, Huub. "Why Does the Didache Conceive of the Eucharist as a Holy Meal?" *Vigiliae Christianae* 65 (2011): 1–20.
- Von Campenhausen, Hans. *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries*. Translated by J. A. Baker. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1969.
- Vööbus, Arthur. *Liturgical Traditions in the Didache*. Stockholm, 1968.
- Vos, Geerhardus. *The Pauline Eschatology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Wainwright, Geoffrey. "Primary Theology and Liturgical Action" *Worship* 57 (July 1983): 309–24.
- Wainwright, Geoffrey. *Doxology, The Praise of God in Worship, Doctrine and Life: A Systematic Theology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Wandel, Lee Palmer, ed. *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Reformation*. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Warfield, Benjamin B. *Selected Shorter Writings*. Edited by John E. Meeter. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 2001.
- Warfield, Benjamin B. *Works*. Volume 9. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2003.
- Weaver, J. Dudley Jr. *Presbyterian Worship: A Guide for Clergy*. Louisville, KY: Geneva Press 2002.
- Wenger, John C. *Conrad Grebel's Programmatic Letters of 1524*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1970.
- Whiteford, John. *Sola Scriptura: An Orthodox Analysis of the Cornerstone of Reformed Theology*. Conciliar Press, 1997.
- Witherington, Ben. *Making a Meal of It: Rethinking the Theology of the Lord's Supper*. Baylor, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007.