

Fr. Alistair Stewart

St. Paul and the Two Ways: Pre-baptismal Catechesis in Romans 12–13

Fr. Alistair Stewart, Ph.D., University of Birmingham, Team Vicar of Upton-cum-Chalvey (Slough, England) • vicar@uptoncumchalvey.org.uk

Alistair Stewart, Fr. St. Paul and the Two Ways: Pre-baptismal Catechesis in Romans 12–13 // *The Quarterly Journal of St. Philaret's Institute*. 2021. Iss. 39. P. 32–47.
DOI: 10.25803/26587599_2021_39_32

The principal concern of New Testament scholars in turning to the paraenesis found in Romans 12–13 is the question of whether this reflects knowledge of the Jesus-tradition on the part of St. Paul. This article suggests that hunting for Pauline parallels in synoptic material, and asking whether these indicate direct knowledge of Jesus's teaching on St. Paul's part, is to miss the point that regardless of its origin, this material is transmitted through catechesis. The parallels with synoptic material are inexact, but the paraenesis of Romans 12–13 is set within a baptismal frame. As such, it provides no information of St. Paul's knowledge of Jesus traditions, but rather it indicates the nature of catechesis in the earliest Christian communities. Moreover, the number of parallels in the paraenesis of Romans 12–13 and in the two ways chapters of the *Didache* (1–5) — which are demonstrably catechetical in purpose — is striking, though there are further parallels with the catechetical tradition elsewhere (such as Pliny's report of Christian activities and in the Elchesite baptismal ritual). This leads to the further observation that this catechesis is shaped in a specifically Jewish context; Paul is thus employing a recognizably Jewish form of catechesis in the paraenesis of Romans 12–13, in order to commend his teaching to an audience which is primarily Jewish.

KEYWORDS: theology, catechetics, biblical studies, paraenesis, Romans, catechesis, *Didache*, two ways tradition, Baptismal renunciation, *Doctrina apostolorum*.

© Fr. Alistair Stewart, 2021

1. Epistolary Paraenesis as a Recollection of Catechesis

In an earlier contribution, I have argued that the sub-genre known within scholarly circles as paraenesis is most probably formed and transmitted in communities through the practice of catechesis, and further, that even in the first century a catechetical tradition was already under formation¹. In doing so, I made primary reference to Matthew and James, seen in the light of the Didache. My suggestion was that even though addressed to a baptized audience, the repetition of pre-baptismal catechesis would serve to remind the audience of their commitment².

I intend to follow up that insight with reference to the paraenetic material found in Romans 12–13. My suggestion is that Paul, like James, is recalling common material which was likely to be known to the audience through the catechetical tradition. In doing so, I am reviving — and to an extent refining — a widespread hypothesis from the mid-20th century, which appears to have been overlooked in more recent times³.

2. Epistolary Paraenesis and the “Synoptic Tradition”

The principal concern of New Testament scholars in turning to the paraenesis found in Romans, and elsewhere in the Pauline corpus, is the question of whether this reflects knowledge of the Jesus tradition on St. Paul’s part, and the extent of the conformity of the teaching of Jesus and Paul. Thus, our discussion centres on those texts which reflect the synoptic tradition, with a view to asking whether or not such conformity demonstrates St. Paul’s knowledge Jesus’s teaching, and to a lesser extent whether this tradition is reflected in a known Gospel, or whether St. Paul exhibits knowledge of the elusive Q⁴. The suggestion of this article is that hunting for Pauline parallels in synoptic material and asking whether this indicates direct knowledge of Jesus’s teaching on Paul’s part, is to miss the point that the transmission of this material happens through catechesis, regardless of its origin. As such, transmission informs us not of St. Paul’s knowledge of Jesus traditions, but is richly

1. See [Stewart 2008].

2. W. Rordorf reminds critics that the term “catechesis” should be reserved for pre-baptismal instruction [Rordorf, 159].

3. Thus see, in particular, C. H. Dodd [Dodd]. He makes particular reference to [Carrington] and [Selwyn]. See also [Moule].

4. See the summary of past scholarship in [Hiestermann]. It is extraordinary that Hiestermann barely mentions the Didache.

informative regarding the nature of catechesis in the earliest Christian communities. In particular, the number of parallels in the paraenesis of Romans 12–13 and the two ways chapters of the Didache 1–5, which is demonstrably catechetical in purpose, is striking and, as such, lends support to the suggestion that this material was transmitted via catechesis.

We begin by observing these parallels, regardless of whether or not this material might be attributable to the Jesus tradition, noting further parallels between two other early examples of the two ways tradition: the *Doctrina Apostolorum*, preserved in Latin⁵, and chapters 18–21 of the *Epistle of Barnabas*.

First, we should note that Romans 12:3: μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ’ ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν, ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν is readily comparable to Didache 3:9a: οὐχ ὑψώσεις σεαυτὸν οὐδὲ δώσεις τῇ ψυχῇ σου θράσος^{*1}. St. Paul then goes on to use this material for his own reflection comparable to 1 Cor 12, which is a possible indication that St. Paul, in writing Romans from Corinth, is employing a *liber litterarum adlatarum* and redeploying this material. The following verse in Didache 3:10^{*2}, which encourages the hearer to accept all experience as positive, may, in turn, be compared to Romans 12:12 urging tribulation in adversity. Romans 12:13, ταῖς χρείαις τῶν ἀγίων κοινωνοῦντες, τὴν φιλοξενίαν διώκοντες, may readily be compared to Didache 4:8b^{*3} συγκοινωνήσεις δὲ πάντα τῷ ἀδελφῷ σοῦ. Romans 12:14 has a significant similarity to Didache 1:3, as will be discussed in detail below. Romans 12:16b τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι is readily comparable to Didache 3:9b^{*4}, μετὰ δικαίων καὶ ταπεινῶν ἀναστραφήση. Finally, we may note the significant links between Romans 13:8–9 and Didache 1:2 and 2:1, this parallel being yet clearer in *Doctrina* 1:2–2:1, which in the same way interpret the commandments of the decalogue as a demand for love of neighbour. Not only are the conceptual parallels very clear here; we should also note the concentration of these common materials in a relatively brief span within the text of Romans. All this indicates a common tradition, though not necessarily one that was circulating only in Greek. Moreover, the appearance of this material in the Didache indicates that the tradition is catechetical, rather than indicating that it was communicated as part of the Jesus tradition, since the Didache explicitly states that this material is to be imparted in catechesis prior to baptism⁶, whilst making no reference to Jesus.

*1 par.
Barnab. 19:3b,
Doctrina 3:9

*2 par.
Barnab. 19:6b,
Doctrina 3:10

*3 par. *Doctrina 4:8*

*4 par. *Doctrina 3:9*, *Barnabas 19:6b*

5. See: [Rordorf, Tuilier, 207–210]. Although preserved only in Latin in mediaeval witnesses, this is a very early work originally composed in Greek.

6. “When you have said all these things beforehand, baptize...” (Didache 7. 1).

One example of how this failure to see a catechetical tradition in play, and an anxiety to attribute these parallels to the Jesus tradition, has misled conventional *Neutestamentler* may be provided from Allison [Allison]. In his study on the Jesus tradition in the Pauline corpus, Allison observes that Gospel parallels in Romans 12–13 are concentrated particularly in material found in St. Luke’s “sermon on the plain”. Allison notes, moreover, that Didache 1 makes allusion to these same sayings, but does not further explore the citation, simply suggesting that these sayings are cited in the Didache due to their central importance to Jesus’s ethical demands [Allison, 18]. The failure to observe the significance of the Didache, presumably because there is no attribution to Jesus, or possibly because the Didache is assumed to post-date the Gospels and therefore to be dependent upon them⁷, leads to a concentration on sources where attribution to Jesus is a possibility, in turn predisposing the answer that St. Paul was conscious of these sayings deriving from the Jesus tradition.

It is true that Allison does note the possibility that “paraenesis” is the means by which this synoptic material might have been transmitted to St. Paul, but he suggests that this is not the case because the paraenetic material in non-Pauline epistles does not reflect synoptic tradition in the same way [Allison, 10–11]. This may be so, but, quite apart from the fact that the definition of paraenesis with which he is working is perhaps too generalized, it overlooks the fact other material mixed in with the “synoptic” material in the paraenetic sections of the Pauline text is indeed found in other paraenetic settings in the New Testament, as well as beyond. Thus, Didache 1–5 contains “synoptic” material, as well as ample material which is not, and Romans 12–13, alongside “synoptic” material, also has parallels with the paraenetic material from 1 Peter (such as Rom 12:10 par. 1 Peter 2:17; Rom 12:13 par. 1 Peter 4:9; Rom 12:17 par. 1 Peter 3:9). The overlap between Romans 12–13, paraenesis in 1 Peter, and the material in Matthew’s “Sermon on the Mount” with its Lucan parallels, again points us to a common paraenetic fund of wisdom, which may reflect catechesis.

The fact that the Didache parallels with the “synoptic” material are largely found in one section, i. e. Didache 1:3b–6 (the so-called *sectio evangelica*), which is absent from other versions of the same material, such as the *Doctrina Apostolorum* and *Apostolic Church Order*⁸, may

7. Such is the suggestion of A. Garrow, noting with surprise the extent to which reconstructions of Q have not employed the Didache [Garrow, 216].

8. See my [Stewart 2011a, 28], and the synoptic table at [Stewart 2011a, 85–93].

indicate the circulation of this material as a collection; but even here we may note that the material is not entirely synoptic, as well as the possibility, raised by Garrow, that the sayings comprising this section may have come from distinct points of origin [*Garrow, 77–83*], points of origin entirely distinct from the Gospels. Moreover, when we turn to Romans, we note once again that the common material found in Romans 12–13 and the Didache is not found exclusively in this section of the Didache but throughout the two ways chapters, which tends to strengthen Garrow's case. Were we to possess only Matthew and the Didache, we might posit some form of literary relationship, and were we to possess only Romans and Luke we might do the same, but the fact that the material is found across these documents in different selections makes it more probable that all are drawing upon a common fund.

The suggestion of a collection of synoptic material attributed to Jesus and containing ethical guidance leads us to the suggestion, or supposition, that this is a documentary collection. However, whereas it is evident that Romans 12:14 has a concentration of material found also in Matthew 5 and Luke 6, the degree of verbal coherence is rather less, which in turn makes any documentary hypothesis rather less probable. Let us look at one example:

Matt 5:44	Romans 12:14	Luke 6:27–28
ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν διώκόντων ὑμᾶς	εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας, εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε.	ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς, εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς, προσεύχεσθε περὶ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς.

Whereas the common ground is evident, the distinctions between the versions are equally evident. The synoptics use the word ἀγαπᾶτε, whereas St. Paul uses only εὐλογεῖτε, which we see in Luke, but not in Matthew; the forms of διώκω are found in Matthew and Paul, but not in Luke. The closest parallel with St. Paul is actually from the Didache, though even this is inexact.

Romans 12:14	Didache 1:3b
εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας, εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε.	εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμῖν καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑμῶν, νηστεύετε δὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς.

Although both use εὐλογεῖτε, the Didache also uses προσεύχεσθε, which is in Luke (though presumably not Q, as is not found in Matthew) and νηστεύετε (found nowhere else), which is attached to διώκω, (a form of which is found in Matthew, but not in Luke) Luke and the Didache each turn this into a threefold instruction, whereas St. Paul is simplest, using a single imperative. We may also observe that 1 Peter 3:9, already noted as a parallel to Romans 12:17, goes on to say: τοῦναντίον δὲ εὐλογοῦντες, thus suggesting some further connection between the source of 1 Peter and those of St. Paul and the Didachist, through the common use of the verb εὐλογῶ. What is particularly significant about the Romans/Didache parallel, however, is the common appearance of a form of διώκω. Tuckett had taken its appearance in Matthew as a sign of Matthaean redactional influence, and thus concluded that the Didache is indebted to Matthew [Tuckett, 116]. Widening the *Traditionskreis* by observing the appearance of the term in Romans in this context allows us to see that dealing with persecution was part of catechesis, which in turn indicates the sectarian consciousness of the Christian groups and allows us, once again, to see the sayings as catechetical, rather than as the product of a sayings-source such as Q⁹; this also keeps us from making unwarranted assertions here regarding Matthew’s redactional interest.

We may also note a further appearance of this item of teaching found in distinct form, namely a passage from Justin, who states: “Pray for your enemies, and love those who hate you, bless those who curse you, and pray for those who abuse you”¹⁰. Again, the similarity is manifest; the closest to Justin among the other forms of the saying is Luke:

1 Apol. 15:14	Luke 6:27–28
εὐχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑμῶν, καὶ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς, εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμῖν, καὶ εὐχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπιρραζόντων ὑμᾶς	ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς, εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς, προσεύχεσθε περὶ τῶν ἐπιρραζόντων ὑμᾶς.

But even here there is some verbal distinction, such as ἀγαπᾶτε... καλῶς ποιεῖτε instead of εὐχεσθε... ἀγαπᾶτε. In his discussion of this verse, Bellinzoni concludes that it results from a harmonized version

9. Thus cf. [Draper 1984, 273–279], who rejects Matthaean dependence but suggests Q as the common source.

10. 1 Apol. 15:14, part of a section extending from 1 Apol. 15 to 1 Apol. 17.

of Matthew and Luke, either undertaken by Justin himself, or which had come to him in this form [*Bellinzoni*, 14–17]. This is the only parallel between these chapters of the *Apologia* and Romans, though there is ample parallel material between these chapters and the Sermon on the Mount (and its parallel Lucan material) which also parallels various statements found in Didache 1. After a detailed study of all these parallels, Bellinzoni concludes that Justin has derived them from catechesis [*Bellinzoni* 54–57, 99–100], a position with which Skarsaune agrees [*Skarsaune*, 66–67]. Although the catechetical purpose is less than obvious here, Bellinzoni persuasively suggests that this material has been excerpted from catechesis but, because it is not being employed here in a catechetical but in an apologetic context, it has been edited for that purpose [*Bellinzoni*, 55]. Although Bellinzoni does not say this, it is even possible that the attribution to Jesus may have been undertaken on the part of Justin himself, having encountered sayings familiar from the catechetical tradition in documents which would become the canonical gospels.

Thus Wilson, after examining the various appearances of the saying in Romans 12:14, and others like it, concludes that, “the parallels adduced by some scholars... hardly constitute any real verbal or formal connections, just the expression of similar ideas and motives” [*Walter*, 171]. We must agree. The same might be said of Allison’s suggestion that there is a paraenetic collection in circulation which attributes sayings to Jesus — quite apart from Q — on grounds of similarities between 1 Clement 13:2 and Luke 6 [*Allison*, 19]¹¹. Not only are the parallels between Luke and Clement here somewhat inexact (thus, for instance, Luke states “Judge not, and you will not be judged”^{*1} whereas Clement, in fact, says “Judge (as you would be judged)”), there is no connection between the material in 1 Clement and that found in Romans 12–13 (though there is an echo of this saying in Romans 14:10). By contrast, were we to suggest that all are drawing on a common fund of orally transmitted material employed in catechesis then such issues are less significant.

The inevitable conclusion from all this is that the distinction between “synoptic” and “non-synoptic” material in Pauline paraenesis is entirely artificial and anachronistic; the “synoptic” material has not been transmitted, as such. For Wilson, the common elements derive

11. Andrew F. Gregory comes to a similar conclusion, though he does not discuss Romans [*Gregory* 131–134].

*1 Lk 6:37

from a sapiential tradition, a conclusion which derives not simply from his consideration of the Romans 12:14 parallel, but from the inexactitude of all the proposed parallels¹². As such they are unlikely to have been considered as dominical.

3. Romans 12–13 as Baptismal Catechesis

Whereas we may agree with Wilson regarding the lack of “real verbal or formal connections” between the proposed parallels, we may observe again that the Didache, whilst indebted to what Wilson calls a sapiential tradition, sets this material into a catechetical framework, making this teaching the precursor to the baptismal rite. We would do well to wonder whether St. Paul has received this material from the same, pre-baptismal context, rather than from a more generalized “sapiential tradition”. In support of this suggestion, we may observe that St. Paul uses extensive baptismal imagery in the opening of Romans 12 and in conclusion in Romans 13.

Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ τῶν οἰκτειρμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ, παραστήσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν ἁγίαν εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν. καὶ μὴ συνηματιζέσθε τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ μεταμορφοῦσθε τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοῦς εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ εὐάρεστον καὶ τέλειον *¹.

*¹ Rom 12:1–2

Here, in the statement regarding the hearers’ renewal, we have echoes of the discussion of baptism in Romans 6:4, by which Paul states that people might conduct themselves (περιπατήσωμεν) ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς; indeed we might suggest that the reason why the sacrifice is said to be “living” is that the bodies of the hearers are given this new life through baptism, the life by which they undergo the renewal of their minds, thus echoing the language of Romans 6:11 (ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἐν Χριστῷ), which in turn refers back to the baptismal statement in 6:3–4 regarding baptism into Jesus’s death.

In the conclusion the hearers are told ἐνδύσασθε τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν *²; we may hear this as recalling the baptismal language of Galatians 3:27: ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε. The reference to clothing is, as Harrill persuasively suggests, a reference to the *toga virilis*¹³, a possibility strengthened through the

*² Rom 13:14

12. See [Wilson, 200–212] in conclusion.

13. See [Harrill]. See also the discussion in [Sam Tsang, 125].

probability that such a rite of clothing in the white toga after baptism was known in late second-century Africa¹⁴. In addition to reflecting baptismal language, the conclusion is also infused with eschatological meaning:

*1 Rom 13:11–12
καὶ τοῦτο εἰδότες τὸν καιρὸν, ὅτι ὥρα ἤδη ὑμᾶς ἐξ ὕπνου ἐγερθῆναι· νῦν γὰρ ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν ἡ σωτηρία ἢ ὅτε ἐπιστεύσαμεν· ἢ νῦν προέκοψεν ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἡγγικεν...^{*1}

Although the two ways of the Didache does not conclude with eschatological warnings, it is at least possible that the eschatological Didache 16 originally concluded the two ways section; more to the point is the fact that *Doctrina Apostolorum* and the *Epistle of Barnabas* each conclude their two ways teaching with an eschatological conclusion, a conclusion also reflected in the adaptation of the two ways teaching found in the later *Apostolic Church Order*. Thus, this eschatological warning in conclusion may well be a further indication that the material here reflects catechetical tradition.

Thus, there is at least a case for seeing the provisions of Romans 12–13, in the light of the Didache, as reflecting baptismal catechesis. Such catechesis may itself have drawn upon a wider sapiential tradition¹⁵, though the eschatological conclusion to Romans 12–13 and the baptismal opening indicate that there is a deliberate echo of pre-baptismal instruction here.

The Didache employs the two ways schema to transmit its catechesis. This schema is less apparent in Romans, though Draper has suggested that Paul is conscious of the two ways tradition as found in the Didache and elsewhere, by observing that the paraenesis of Galatians 5 employs “way imagery” and the language of contrast, as well as having specific parallels to the contents of the two ways [Draper 2011, 222–230]. The same “way imagery” is found in Romans 13:13: ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ εὐσχημόνως περιπατήσωμεν, as, indeed, in Romans 6:4. The language of contrast may also be found in Romans 13:12, particularly in the contrast between the works of darkness and the armour of light; this is of particular relevance because the characterization of the two ways as ways of light and darkness is that found in the versions of the tradition found in *Barnabas* 18–21 and the *Doctrina Apostolorum*, as

14. See the discussion in [Dekkers, 210–212]. Also my [Stewart 2001, 139, 145]; here the toga is seen as a sign of adoption, after release from slavery to the devil.

15. As demonstrated by [Sandt].

opposed to the Didache's characterization of the ways as ways of life and death. Thus, we see no *literary* relationship between Paul and the Didache, though we see strong evidence that they are both aware of the same circle of tradition. And, as we have already partially shown, there are clear conceptual coherences between the paraenesis of Romans 12–13 and the two ways section of the Didache and of the other ancient Christian manifestations of this tradition, namely Barnabas 18–21 and the *Doctrina Apostolorum*, even though all of these are verbally distinct.

We have already noted parallels between St. Paul and elements of the two ways tradition. We may now further conclude that, like the Didache, Paul has received these directions as part of pre-baptismal catechesis, and has very likely received them within a two ways schema.

4. Developments in Catechesis beyond Jewish Christianity

In this light, we now return to mid-20th century scholarship, and in particular to the work of Dodd [*Dodd*]. He notes the manner in which the content of early Christian catechesis might be found within the New Testament and suggests in particular that this may be found in 1 Thessalonians:

The following topics are either expressly stated or necessarily implied to have formed part of this fundamental instruction: i) theological dogmas: monotheism and the repudiation of idolatry; Jesus the Son of God; His resurrection and second advent; salvation from the Wrath (1:9–10); the calling of the church into the kingdom and glory of God (2:12); (ii) ethical precepts... (4:2, 11)... the holiness of the Christian calling; repudiation of pagan vices; the law of charity (4:3–9); eschatological motives (5:2)... [*Dodd, 107–108*].

He then notes the possibility that, as we suggest here, Romans 12–13 may be derived from or otherwise reflect this teaching, and further notes the appearance of some of this material in the Didache. Dodd, however, is still primarily concerned with the question of the extent to which catechesis might inform the development of the Jesus tradition, rather than with the catechetical tradition as such (the content of which is assumed). Moreover, although he briefly notes that the contents of the Didache as reflecting some of this he goes on to say that, “the *Didache* is of course not a ‘catechism’ in the proper sense [*Dodd, 109*]”. The Didache is indeed not a catechism, but the first five (or six) chapters undoubtedly are, since, as already noted, the document

*¹ *Didache* 7:1

states that the foregoing teaching contained in its opening chapters is to be imparted prior to baptism *¹. Thus it is the explicit statement of the *Didache* that this material is to be employed in catechesis prior to baptism, rather than any scholarly suspicion that such teaching might be appropriate, that allows us to recognize the catechetical character of the same teaching when it is found elsewhere, such as in this passage of *Romans*. Similarly, it is the appearance of an eschatological conclusion in the two ways material in *Barnabas* and *Doctrina*, which permits us to agree with Dodd that an eschatological climax might conclude the instruction, and so to see the same eschatological climax as marking off these two chapters in *Romans*.

It is, nonetheless, a statement of the obvious that the content of this catechesis is almost entirely ethical. There is nothing here of the repudiation of idolatry, part of the instruction which Dodd deduced must have taken place on the basis of 1 Thess 1:9–10. This may seem an odd omission in *Romans* and the *Didache*, given the possibility that the phrase in 1 Thessalonians indeed either reflects catechesis or, yet more probably, the act of renunciation prior to baptism¹⁶.

In explaining this omission in the *Didache*, we would refer to further evidence of the use of the two ways tradition in forming Judaism; as Draper notes it is found in intertestamental Jewish literature, in rabbinic material, and most especially in the Qumran *Community rule* (1QS). From this he deduces that the schema was employed in generalized instruction, but most particularly in the sectarian formation of newcomers in Jewish circles (such as the *yahad* of the Dead Sea sect) [Draper 2011, 223–224]. Beyond the first century we may observe that the two ways tradition continued to be employed within Jewish Christian circles by noting its appearance in the Pseudo-Clementine homilies, in the preaching of Peter in Sidon¹⁷. If the schema is employed in this way *within* Judaism, then the renunciation of idolatry is scarcely necessary; we may perhaps surmise that it is for this purpose that the *Didache* adopts the schema, namely as a means of socializing Jews into the Christian version of Judaism, in which assent to the significance of the commandments, and indeed monotheism, might be taken for granted. For all that the *incipit* of the *Didache* refers to the nations, the mind-set of the *Didachist* is one of forming other Jews into

16. So my [Stewart 2011b, 5–6] recognizing the possibility of a non-Pauline formula which has been awkwardly fitted to its context, here following [Best, 85–87]. The particular awkwardness of the addition of Jesus coming to rescue us results from the phrase

being inserted into the familiar liturgical element in order to emphasize the eschatological mystery of Christ's return, the central concern of 1 Thessalonians.

17. Ps Clem. *Hom.* 7:7: ταῦτας... πράξεις... προμήνυω ὑμῖν ὡς ὁδοῦς δυό.

the version of Jewish practice practised in the Didachistic Christ-confessing Jewish sect¹⁸. Thus the two ways catechesis presented in the Didache would lead us to expect not a repudiation of idolatry as such, but a repudiation of behaviour that is not in keeping with the way of Christ; this is in conformity with the report of catechesis received by Pliny, which tells us that the oath (*sacramento*) made by Christians was that they should commit no fraud, theft, or adultery^{*1, 19}. Further evidence for such Jewish-Christian ethical *apotaxeis* may be found in the report of the Elchesites found in the *Refutatio*:

*1 Pliny Ep.
10. 96. 7

...I testify that I shall sin no more, nor commit adultery (οὐ μοιχεύσω, cf. Didache 2. 2), nor steal (οὐ κλέψω, cf. Didache 2. 2), nor do injustice, nor be covetous (οὐ πλεονεκτήσω, cf. Didache 2. 6), nor be actuated by hatred, nor be scornful, nor shall I delight in any evil deeds (cf. Didache 5. 2)^{*2}.

*2 Ref. 9. 15. 6. Cf.
also, to all of this,
Matt 19:18

Thus, when Draper senses a certain tension between St. Paul and the two ways tradition²⁰, he is perhaps being over-sensitive; St. Paul is evangelizing gentiles rather than reforming Jews and bringing them into the Jesus movement. As such, rather more than the content of the two ways is needed.

And so, in turning to Romans, we note that the critical text bearing witness to the *apotaxis* and *syntaxis* in the Pauline writings (1 Thess 1:9–10²¹) is distinct from the two ways pattern in that the *apotaxis* specifically concerns the avoidance of idolatry. In explaining its absence in Romans 12–13, we may then suggest that the issue of idolatry has already been discussed in the opening chapter. As such, Paul does not need to repeat the gentile renunciation of idols, but simply moves on to the next part of the catechesis, which is the adoption of Christian behaviour. Although Rordorf speaks of the *apotaxis* being attached to the two ways as though there were only one form [Rordorf, 158], we must ask whether it is not possible that the renunciation of Satan — which in time becomes standard in both east and west — was originally developed for use in gentile baptisms requiring the renunciation of idolatry, whereas in Jewish-Christian circles a more rigorous keeping of the demands of the law, as laid out in the two ways, was in use. The primary audience of Romans, as the *propositio* of the letter^{*3}

*3 Rom 1:16–17

18. This in turn lends support to the conclusion of [Pardee, 155] that the term *didache* refers to the ethical interpretation of Jewish law.

19. This interpretation, followed in “Christological form”, is originally that of [Lietzmann].

20. See [Draper 2011].

21. So [Stewart 2011b, 5–6].

might indicate, is Jew first, then Greek; and thus, we find a Jewish approach to catechesis to be more prominent.

The emergence of the *regula fidei* in the second century, and the development of a baptismal creed by the turn of the third century, in Rome and Africa at least, indicates that the abjuration of idolatry and the use of the two ways as the sole basis of catechesis did indeed not continue but that the confession of Jesus as Son of God, together with faith in God as Creator, became part of the substance of catechesis as well as part of the baptismal liturgy. The witness of *Traditio Apostolica* to the selection of catechumens for baptism on the basis of their conduct in the catechumenate ^{*1,22}, as well as to the careful initial selection of catechumens ^{*2}, indicates that although these “doctrinal” elements were added to the catechumenal programme, the development of a *habitus* to which the two ways tradition bears witness remained fundamental to the catechumenate. It is indeed possible that the statement in *Traditio apostolica* 20:2 that those set apart (who would in time be known as the *electi*) hear the Gospel at this stage of the catechumenate means that doctrinal instruction, i. e. formation in the *regula fidei*, was given at this point.

*1 *Trad. Ap.* 20

*2 *Trad. Ap.* 15–17

5. Concluding Observations on Romans 12–13 in the Context of St Paul’s Communicative Strategy

We may finally pause to ask why St. Paul repeats this baptismal teaching at this point in his letter. Given that his letter serves as his introduction of both himself and his teaching to the Roman Christians, we would suggest that he is citing common material because he believes it will be familiar to his hearers and thus, by establishing common ground between them, commend him and the further content of his message. We cannot be sure which particular message he wishes to commend.

Possibly it is that which has preceded, though in this case finding common ground with the audience might be deemed to be eleven chapters too late. The οὐν of Romans 12:1 establishes a connection between what has preceded and what follows ²³, but if the repetition of catechesis is intended to find common ground, then it is prepare the way for what is to follow, rather than to validate what has already been said.

22. Here it is assumed that the chapters in *Traditio apostolica* regarding the catechumenate are part of an early (second-century) strand within the document. For discussion see my [Stewart 2015].

23. So [Cranfield, 595–597].

Possibly it is the paraenetic material within these chapters which is not demonstrably part of the two ways instruction, in particular the discussion of obedience to civic authorities, though the appearance of teaching to this same effect in Justin *1 Apologia* *¹ as part of a passage already seen as catechetical, as well as the appearance of this *topos* in the paraenesis of 1 Peter 2:13, might indicate that this direction might also have had a place in catechesis, and thus be part of what St. Paul considered to be common ground.

*¹ *1 Apol.* 17

The greater likelihood is therefore that this is preparation of the audience for the following discussion of food; in this instance he might anticipate difference between himself and his audience. Thus, the initial exhortation of these chapters serves rhetorically to put himself in the position of one announcing further directions — as a Jewish catechist giving *paraklēsis* — and thus he designates himself with authority, as someone who has already given teaching recognized as authoritative.

The author thanks Fr Fergus King for his comments on a draft of this essay.

References

1. Allison = Allison D. C. (1982). “The Pauline Epistles and the synoptic Gospels: the pattern of the parallels”. *New Testament Studies*, 1982, v. 28, pp. 1–32.
2. Bellinzoni = Bellinzoni A. J. (1967). *The sayings of Jesus in the writings of Justin Martyr*. Leiden : Brill.
3. Best = Best E. (1977). *A commentary on the first and second Epistles to the Thessalonians*. London : Black.
4. Carrington = Carrington P. (1940). *The primitive Christian catechism: a study in the epistles*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
5. Cranfield = Cranfield C. E. B. (1979). *A critical and exegetical commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Edinburgh : T&T Clark.
6. Dekkers = Dekkers E. (1947). *Tertullianus en de Geschiedenis der Liturgie*. Brussels : Desclée de Brouwer.
7. Dodd = Dodd C. H. (1959). “The primitive catechism and the sayings of Jesus”, in A. J. B. Higgins (ed.). *New Testament Essays*, Manchester : Manchester University Press, pp. 106–118.
8. Draper 1984 = Draper J. (1984). “The Jesus tradition in the Didache”, in D. Wenham (ed.). *Gospel perspectives: the Jesus tradition outside the Gospels*, Sheffield : JSOT Press, pp. 269–287.

9. *Draper 2011* = Draper J. A. (2011). "The two ways and eschatological hope: a contested terrain in Galatians 5 and the Didache". *Neotestamentica*, 2011, v. 45, pp. 221–251.
10. *Garrow* = Garrow Alan (2004). *The Gospel of Matthew's dependence on the Didache*. London : T&T Clark.
11. *Gregory* = Gregory A. F. "1 Clement and the writings that later formed the New Testament", in A. F. Gregory, C. M. Tuckett (2005). *The reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, Oxford : Oxford University Press, pp. 129–157.
12. *Harill* = Harrill J. A. (2002). "Coming of age and putting on Christ: the toga virilis ceremony, its paraenesis, and Paul's interpretation of baptism in Galatians". *Novum Testamentum*, 2002, v. 44, pp. 252–277.
13. *Hiestermann* = Hiestermann A. (2016). *Paul's use of the synoptic Jesus tradition. Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Ph.D. University of Pretoria*, available at: https://repository.up.ac.za/bitstream/handle/2263/56971/Hiestermann_Paul_2016.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (27.08.2021).
14. *Lietzmann* = Lietzmann H. (1962). "Die liturgischen Angaben des Plinius", in *Kleine Schriften*, Bd. 3, Berlin : Akademie, S. 48–55. (TU; v. 74).
15. *Moule* = Moule C. F. D. (1952). "The use of parables and sayings as illustrative material in early Christian catechesis". *JTS*, 1952, n. 3, pp. 75–79.
16. *Padree* = Pardee N. (2012). *The genre and development of the Didache: a text-linguistic analysis*. Tübingen : Mohr-Siebeck (WUNT; 2.339).
17. *Rordorf* = Rordorf W. (1996). "An aspect of the Judeo-Christian ethic: the two ways" in J. A. Draper (ed.) *The Didache in modern research*. Leiden : Brill, pp. 148–164.
18. *Rordorf, Tuilier* = Rordorf W., Tuilier A. (ed.) (1998). *La doctrine des douze apôtres*, 2nd ed. Paris : Cerf.
19. *Sandt* = Sandt H., van de (2007). "James 4, 1–4 in the light of the Jewish Two Ways Tradition 3, 1–6", in *Biblica*, 2007, v. 88, pp. 38–63.
20. *Selwyn* = Selwyn E. G. (1946). *The first Epistle of Saint Peter*. London : Macmillan.
21. *Skarsaune* = Skarsaune O. (2007). "Justin and his Bible", in S. Parvis, P. Foster (ed.). *Justin Martyr and his worlds*. Minneapolis : Fortress, pp. 53–76.
22. *Stewart 2001* = Stewart A. C. (2001). "Manumission and baptism in Tertullian's Africa: a search for the origin of confirmation". *Studia Liturgica*, 2001, v. 31, pp. 129–149.
23. *Stewart 2008* = Stewart A. C. "Ἀποκύψις λόγῳ ἀληθείας: paraenesis and baptism in Matthew, James, and the Didache", in H. van de Sandt, J. Zangenburg (ed.). *Matthew, James, and Didache : three related documents in their Jewish and Christian settings*, Atlanta : SBL, pp. 341–359.

24. *Stewart 2011a* = Stewart A. C. (2011). *On the two ways*. Yonker, NY : St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.
25. *Stewart 2011b* = Stewart A. C. (2011). "The Christological form of the earliest syntaxis: the evidence of Pliny". *Studia liturgica*, v. 41, pp. 1–8.
26. *Stewart 2015* = Stewart A. C. (2015). *Hippolytus: on the apostolic tradition*. 2 ed. Crestwood NY : St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.
27. *Tsang* = Tsang S. (2005). *From slaves to Sons: a new rhetoric analysis on Paul's slave metaphors in his Letter to the Galatians*. Frankfurt : Peter Lang.
28. *Tuckett* = Tuckett C. M. (1996). "Synoptic tradition in the Didache", in A. Draper (ed.). *The Didache in Modern Research*, Leiden : E. J. Brill, pp. 92–128.
29. *Wilson* = Wilson W. T. (1991). *Love without pretense: Romans 12:9–21 and Hellenistic-Jewish wisdom literature*. Tübingen : Mohr-Siebeck (WUNT; 2.46).

Abbreviations

1 Apol.	St. Justin Martyr. The First Apology
Barnab.	The Epistle of Barnabas
Didache	Didache
Doctrina	Doctrina apostolorum
Pliny. Ep.	Pliny the Younger. Letter to Trajan
Ref.	Hippolytus of Rome. The Refutation of All Heresies
Trad. Ap.	The Apostolic Tradition