

# NEW TESTAMENT ESSAYS

STUDIES IN MEMORY OF  
**Thomas Walter Manson**  
1893-1958

sponsored by  
PUPILS, COLLEAGUES  
AND FRIENDS

edited by  
**A. J. B. HIGGINS**  
*Lecturer in New Testament Language  
and Literature in the University  
of Leeds*

MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY PRESS

© 1959

*Published by the University of Manchester at*  
THE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
*316-324 Oxford Road, Manchester 13*

Printed in Great Britain by Butler & Tanner Ltd., Frome and London

# THE PRIMITIVE CATECHISM AND THE SAYINGS OF JESUS

by

C. H. DODD

---

THE critic of the Gospels, however 'objective' he seeks to be, can hardly get on without some presuppositions, however hypothetical and tentative. I may as well say at once, therefore, that I start with the presupposition that the community which claimed Jesus as its founder is likely to have preserved some memory of what he taught. That they may sometimes have misremembered, or misunderstood, what he said, or deliberately paraphrased<sup>1</sup> or expanded it to make it more intelligible or more 'contemporary', that they may even in honest error have fathered upon him things he had not said, is likely enough. But the presupposition to which I have confessed seems on general grounds more probable than the assumption (which appears often to be made tacitly) that the early Christians had forgotten, within a generation, almost everything that Jesus had said, and found themselves obliged to think up maxims to meet the needs of their changing circumstances, maxims which they then attributed (in all reverence, no doubt) to 'the Lord'. If however the early Church did treasure the memory of sayings of Jesus, the attempt to recover them is a legitimate enterprise, and the criticism of the Gospels, with the examination of the tradition that lies behind them and the *Sitz im Leben* of various elements in it, has the ultimate purpose (over and above any light it may throw on the early history of the Church) of working back to a point as near as we can hope to get to what Jesus actually said. This purpose may be served by the attempt to identify, as far as possible, the channels through which the sayings may have been transmitted, in order to estimate the extent to which the accuracy of the report may be trusted, or, on the other hand, its content may have been subject to modifying influences.

There has in recent years been much inquisition after such channels of transmission, especially with the aid of the methods of form-criticism, and not without valuable results; but it may be worth while going over some of the ground once more.

It is natural to assume that the sayings of Jesus were recalled to serve the purpose of instruction in the principles of Christian belief and practice. Indeed, that is perhaps a glimpse of the obvious. In itself it does not get us very far, for our direct knowledge of methods of instruction in the early Church is limited, and the argument does not always avoid the danger of slipping into a circle. In one department, however, I think we may now say that we have at any rate a little solid knowledge: I mean the elementary instruction given to candidates for admission to the Church as preparation for their baptism, commonly described as *catechesis*. I would refer in particular to the work of the Archbishop of Quebec<sup>2</sup> and Dr. E. G. Selwyn<sup>3</sup> on catechetical material in the Epistles. They have, I believe, laid down lines on which it is possible to envisage what the former calls the Primitive Catechism—fragmentarily, no doubt, but as something that one can work with. In order to do so it is not necessary to accept all the details of their ingenious reconstructions. But I believe we are entitled to assume that forms of teaching of the kind envisaged were traditional during the New Testament period. Assuming that, I raise the question, Is this the kind of thing which served as channel for the transmission of the sayings of Jesus? And I shall try by ‘sampling’ to suggest an answer.

In the first place we may recall that we have evidence for the beginnings, at any rate, of some traditional scheme of teaching at a very early date. Already in what is probably the earliest extant Christian document, Paul’s First Epistle to the Thessalonians, we find references to a ‘tradition’ (2:13, 4:1–8; 2 Thess. 2:15, 3:6) which the recipients of the letter had received from the apostles. As they were Christians of no more than a few weeks’ standing, we may take it that the writer is recalling teaching which he had given either as *catechesis* in the strict sense, or at any rate as elementary instruction for new converts. 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 (*παραγγελίαι*, i.e. 'marching orders', 4:2, 11, cf. 2 Thess. 3:6, 10, 12): the holiness of the Christian calling; repudiation of pagan vices; the law of charity (4:3-9); eschatological motives (5:2: note *αὐτοὶ ἀκριβῶς οἶδατε*—this is among the things they have already learnt).

So much is clearly the minimum content of the *παράδοσις*. That it actually contained more than this there can be little doubt. In particular, the injunctions regarding Church order and discipline in 5:12-22 are given with an allusive brevity which would be more in place in recalling maxims already familiar than in breaking fresh ground. In 2 Thess. 3:7-10 similar injunctions are expressly said to have been given previously (*τὴν παράδοσιν ἣν παρελάβετε . . . ὅτε ἡμεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς τοῦτο παρηγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν*—note the imperfect tense of continuous or habitual action).<sup>4</sup> And it is noteworthy that under this head the mutual duties of members of the Church expand into universal social duties (*πάντοτε τὸ ἀγαθὸν διώκετε εἰς ἀλλήλους καὶ εἰς πάντα*, 1 Thess. 5:15), which may have been specified in the actual teaching. Similarly, we must suppose that a good deal of the eschatological *paraenesis* in 5:3-10 comes under the rubric, *ἀκριβῶς οἶδατε*, although these words apply directly only to the content of 5:2.

We see already emerging a 'pattern of teaching' (*τύπος διδαχῆς*, Rom. 6:17), the general lines of which appear in other epistles. Omitting for our present purpose the properly theological portions, we may set out the table of contents somewhat as follows:

- A. The holiness of the Christian calling.
- B. The repudiation of pagan vices, leading up to—
- C. The assertion of the Christian law of charity (*ἀγάπη*, including *φιλαδελφία*).
- D. Eschatological motives.
- E. The order and discipline of the Church: duties of its members to one another; [social duties at large].

These topics tend to reappear in combination in the 'ethical section' of various epistles. Even the long and comprehensive outline of Christian ethics in Rom. 12-13 follows with little divergence the plan of the *παραγγελίαι* of 1 Thessalonians. Starting with the holiness of the Christian calling (A), here under the figure of sacrifice (12:1-2), the writer moves on to the theme of the unity of the Church and the functions of its members (E) (12:3-8); then

comes a long section applying the law of charity (C) to Christian conduct within the community (*φιλαδελφία*, 12:10-16) and to social duties in general (12:17-13:7), and subsuming it all once again under the law of charity (13:8-10); he then finishes with a section of eschatological *paraenesis* (D),<sup>5</sup> in terms closely similar in part to those of 1 Thess. 5:2-10. Only the section on the repudiation of pagan vices is missing, and this theme has been dismissed in ch. I.

It is not necessary here to trace the pattern in other epistles, where it has been amply studied. But it is noteworthy that it still underlies the detailed manual of instruction known as 'The Teaching of the Lord through the Twelve Apostles' (commonly referred to as *Didache*). There is nothing indeed expressly corresponding with section A, on the holiness of the Christian calling, but the contrast between pagan vices and the Christian law of charity (B, C) is here, only in reverse order, in the passage on the Two Ways (1-6). The familiar list of vices in 5 leaves no doubt where it belongs. There follows an elaborate section on Church order and discipline (D), (7-15). It contains a great deal for which earlier examples of the *τύπος διδαχῆς* found no place, including liturgical matter, but in the less specialized sections familiar turns of phrase are frequent enough to arrest the attention of the reader who has earlier writings in mind. Finally we have a passage which combines apocalyptic prediction with *paraenesis* (D) in the traditional manner (16). The *Didache* is of course not a 'catechism' in the proper sense, but it comprises a large amount of catechetical material, some of it closely akin to passages in the epistles, and it gives evidence of the long persistence of a pattern once established.

It is indeed the pattern itself which is the constant element. There is not sufficient evidence of a complete documentary catechism from which various writers might be supposed to quote. All that we are entitled to infer is a kind of programme or schedule of instruction, which could be filled in and expanded orally, no doubt, in various ways. Nevertheless, in passages which we may suppose to be following the established pattern we frequently discern a common style, and this style is often in contrast with the habitual style of the author concerned.<sup>6</sup> We may take it to be the style of early Christian *catechesis*. It has analogues in the style of the Jewish Wisdom literature, and of documents like the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and the *Manual of Discipline* from

Qumran, and also in Jewish-Hellenistic propaganda-literature such as that of the pseudo-Phocylides. On the other side it has some resemblance to the style of Greek gnomic writers.<sup>7</sup> Agreeably with these indications from style we note that in form and often in content the early Christian *catechesis* has clear points of contact both with forms used in the admission of proselytes to Judaism,<sup>8</sup> on the one hand, and, on the other hand, with popular Stoic teaching. That is to say, it bears traces of precisely those influences which we should expect to have helped to mould the practice of the new community as it first grew up in a Jewish environment and then moved out into the Graeco-Roman world, following largely in the tracks of Jewish-Hellenistic missionaries. If we are to conjecture a date for the more or less definite fixing of the pattern, we should be led, it seems, to the earliest period in which Greek-speaking converts from paganism began to enter the Church in such numbers that the need for a standardized *catechesis* became pressing. This period might perhaps begin with the rise of a Gentile Christianity at Antioch, and, as we have seen, the ethical *παράδοσις* was already in existence at any rate by the time of Paul's visit to Thessalonica, A.D. 49.

The way in which the content of these largely inherited forms was transformed by distinctively Christian motives I have tried to illustrate elsewhere.<sup>9</sup> The question before us here is a different one. Granted that we have a not inadequate general picture of the forms of catechetical instruction employed in the early Church during its formative period, can these be related to the teaching of Jesus as presented in the Gospels in such a way that they may reasonably be regarded as a channel through which His sayings were transmitted during the period of oral tradition before the Gospels were written?

The first general observation that occurs is that the pattern of teaching almost always includes a passage, which tends to be placed at the end, appealing to eschatological motives for Christian conduct, and that in the Gospels eschatological *paraenesis* holds a similar place. In all three Synoptics the report of the teaching of Jesus closes with the Eschatological Discourse, which has its equivalent in portions of the Farewell Discourses in the Fourth Gospel.<sup>10</sup> It is a probable inference that the traditional order of *catechesis* determined, to this extent at least, the arrangement of material in the Gospels.

Moreover, traces of its influence are perhaps not confined to the composition of the Gospels as a final product, but are to be found also in some of their constituent parts, which may point to earlier sources constructed on a similar plan.

The Great Sermon, in its Matthaean form, ends on an eschatological note. The reference in Matt. 7:22 to *ἐκεῖνη ἡ ἡμέρα* makes it clear that this evangelist at least understood these sayings in an eschatological sense, and that he took the storm and floods of the parable of the Two Builders as symbols of the coming Judgment. With this clue, it is possible to suspect a wider influence of the general pattern in the structure of the Sermon as a whole. The Beatitudes, with the sayings immediately following (5:3-16), may be regarded as an equivalent for the section on the holiness of the Christian calling (A). Then comes a long section in which, as in sections B and C, the new Christian way is contrasted with the old ways which the convert is leaving (5:17-48). Like the *catechesis*, it culminates in the statement of the Christian law of charity, but where the *catechesis* contrasts the Christian way with the vices of paganism, the Sermon points the contrast with the casuistry of scribal Judaism. The next section of the Sermon (6:1-18) deals with almsgiving, fasting and prayer (corporate prayer, since the model provided is in the first person plural), and this would readily fall into the section (E) about Church order and discipline, to which also the sayings about pearls before swine (7:6) and about false prophets (7:15-20) might reasonably be assigned. Both of these themes, as well as those of prayer and fasting, are integral parts of the corresponding section in the *Didache* (8, 9:5, 11:3-5). The intervening sections of the Sermon fall outside the common pattern.

In the Lucan form of the Sermon it is much more difficult to discern traces of the catechetical scheme. Here the Beatitudes (with their balancing Woes) no longer have the character which they show in Matthew.<sup>11</sup> The Christian law of charity is stated, but without the contrast with the old ways. The saying about the tree and its fruit (6:43-4) is given without the application to false prophets which it has in Matthew, and so loses its relevance to Church discipline. The saying about those who say 'Lord, Lord' is given without its eschatological setting.<sup>12</sup> The parable of the Two Builders similarly has no expressly eschatological reference.

When source analysis has done all it can do, the relation between



the Matthaean and the Lucan forms of the Sermon remains enigmatic. It seems, however, not too rash to infer that the Matthaean form has been influenced at some stage by a form of catechetical instruction, if it is not based upon it. If so, it must have been a Jewish-Christian form, for the Hellenistic element which we have noted in the *catechesis* of the epistles is entirely absent from the Sermon, and paganism is not in view. Whether the First Evangelist made use of a pre-existing document based upon a form of Jewish-Christian catechism, or being himself familiar with some such form, organized his material on its pattern, the *catechesis* in some form seems to have served as a vehicle for the transmission of part at least of the material comprised in the Sermon.

Although the Lucan version of the Sermon thus appears to retain little of the traditional form of *catechesis*, some of the material embodied in the Matthaean Sermon occurs in a different context in Luke (12:22-34), where it leads up at once to a passage which has much in common with the Eschatological Discourse (12:35-46), as well as with the eschatological section (D) of the common form of *catechesis*. That we may have traces here of an earlier source (whether documentary or oral) which followed the traditional order of the *catechesis*, and ended with a piece of eschatological *paraenesis*, is a not unreasonable conjecture. If so, it has become disintegrated through combination with extraneous material.

So far we have been concerned only with the form and sequence of the *catechesis* as they reappear in the Gospels. We may now inquire how far the contents show significant points of similarity in language or substance. Here again we turn to the eschatological section. The main burden of this section in the *catechesis* is the attitude and conduct demanded of the Christian in view of the fact that the End is near but its date uncertain: τὸ τέλος ἤγγικεν (1 Pet. 4:7), ἡ παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου ἤγγικεν (Jas. 5:8), ἡ ἡμέρα ἤγγικεν (Rom. 13:12), ἡμέρα κυρίου ὡς κλέπτῃς ἔρχεται (1 Thess. 5:2), and the like. The 'Day of the Lord' tends to be thought of as the dawn coming to end the night, and this brings in the antitheses of light and darkness, sleep and wakefulness, drunkenness and sobriety, which are found in Jewish contexts but are also especially beloved of Hellenistic moralists.<sup>13</sup> The recurrent key-words are ἐξ ὕπνου ἐγερθῆναι, γρηγορεῖν, ἀγρυπνεῖν,<sup>14</sup> νήφειν, σωφρονεῖν, in James μακροθυμεῖν. A note of mili-

tancy is not far below the surface: in 1 Thess. 5:8 the call for wakefulness and sobriety suggests the armed Christian warrior; in Rom. 13:12, similarly, since dawn is at hand the Christian must put on τὰ ὄπλα τοῦ φωτός; in 1 Pet. 5:8-9 νήψατε γρηγορήσατε is followed by the call to resist (ἀντιστῆναι) the devil, 'armed', perhaps, with the mind of Christ (τὴν αὐτὴν ἔννοιαν ὀπλίσασθε, 4:1). In 1 Pet. 4:7 the idea of wakefulness or sobriety in view of the nearness of the End is specifically associated with prayer: πάντων δὲ τὸ τέλος ἤγγικεν· σωφρονήσατε οὖν καὶ νήψατε εἰς προσευχάς. In Ephesians, where explicit eschatology is only faintly present, the whole of the eschatological *paraenesis* is reduced to an eloquent passage upon the Christian warfare against the powers of darkness (6:10-17). The picture of the Christian warrior equipped with the πανοπλία τοῦ θεοῦ is reminiscent of the strongly eschatological passage in 1 Thess. 5:7-9, but more elaborate. The exhortation to sleepless vigilance, which is in itself entirely germane to the military imagery, is here, as in 1 Pet. 4:7, associated with prayer: προσευχόμενοι ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ εἰς αὐτὸ ἀγρυπνοῦντες ἐν πάσῃ προσκαρτερήσει (6:18). In the corresponding passage of Colossians (4:2-3) the exhortation to perseverance and wakefulness is again associated with prayer, but it has lost even its vestigial connection with eschatology, occurring in a context which has more affinity with the section on Church order in 1 Thess. 5:12-22 (note ἀδιαλείπτως προσεύχεσθε, 5:17).<sup>15</sup> It is perhaps significant that when all the rest of the eschatological *paraenesis* has faded out, γρηγορεῖτε, ἀγρυπνεῖτε remains as its permanent legacy to the Christian moral ideal.

We now turn to the Gospels, and primarily to the Eschatological Discourse which concludes the report of the teaching of Jesus. The burden of the *paraenesis* here is closely similar to that of the eschatological section of the *catechesis*, and its style, though not identical, is sufficiently similar, and sufficiently unlike the prevailing style of some other parts of the Gospels, to warrant the belief that some relation existed between them at an early stage in the formation of the tradition.

Here again the motive for conduct is found in the nearness of the End and the uncertainty of its date, which should lead the Christian to be wakeful and alert: ἐγγύς ἐστιν ἐπὶ θύραις . . . ἀγρυπνεῖτε, οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ καιρὸς ἐστιν . . . γρηγορεῖτε οὖν . . . πᾶσιν λέγω, γρηγορεῖτε (Mark 13:29, 33, 37.); γρηγορεῖτε οὖν

ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν ἡμέραν οὐδὲ τὴν ὥραν (Matt. 25:13); and the like. As the various forms of *catechesis* call for *μακροθυμία* under trial, and for 'armed' resistance in the spiritual conflict, so the Eschatological Discourse calls for *ὑπομονή* to the end (Mark 13:13, Luke 21:19).

In the Lucan form of the Discourse a passage (21:34-6) is introduced which has a striking likeness to the language of eschatological *paraenesis* in the catechetical sections of the epistles, chiefly of 1 Thessalonians:

Προσέχετε δὲ ἑαυτοῖς

μήποτε βαρηθῶσιν ὑμῶν αἱ καρδίαι

ἐν κραιπάλῃ<sup>16</sup> καὶ μέθῃ καὶ μερίμναις βιωτικαῖς,

καὶ ἐπιστῇ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς αἰφνίδιος ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη . . .

ἀγρυπνεῖτε δὲ ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ δεόμενοι . . .

Cf. 1 Thess. 5:7

Cf. 1 Thess. 5:3

Cf. Eph. 6:18,

1 Pet. 4:7

ἵνα κατίσχυσητε ἐκφυγεῖν ταῦτα πάντα . . .

καὶ σταθῆναι ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

Cf. 1 Thess. 5:3

Cf. Eph. 6:13

It is improbable that the evangelist was drawing upon the epistles for his material; but if he was (as I have suggested) following the general arrangement of a common form of *catechesis*, its language too may well have been in his mind.<sup>17</sup> It is noteworthy that the language here belongs more particularly to the Hellenistic strain in the early *catechesis*. Here, then, there is good reason to suppose that the primitive catechism, in serving as a vehicle for transmitting the teaching of Jesus, has influenced the language of the sayings.

In the same passage of 1 Thessalonians which contains these striking parallels with Luke, the unexpectedness of the End is expressed in the terms: *ἡμέρα κυρίου ὡς κλέπτῃς ἐν νυκτὶ οὕτως ἔρχεται*. The image fits in well with the sustained imagery of day and night, sleeping and waking, which pervades the passage. Yet it directly recalls a parable which occurs as part of the Eschatological Discourse in Matthew (24:43-4), and in a passage of Luke which I have conjectured to represent the eschatological conclusion of a sequence which he derived from some earlier source (12:39). Are we to say that this also passed out of the *catechesis* into the tradition of the sayings of Jesus? No one, surely, would seriously contend that the parable, with its characteristically swift and vivid evocation of a situation in real life, is secondary, and the

passing simile in 1 Thess. 5:2—one of a series of rhetorical figures running through the passage—primary. It is a curious fact that in the Lucan form of the parable there is nothing about night or about wakefulness: *εἰ ἦδει ὁ οἰκοεπότης ποῖα ὥρα ὁ κλέπτης ἔρχεται, οὐκ ἂν ἀφήκεν διορυχθῆναι τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ*. So far as we are told, the raid might have taken place either by night or by day; *ὥρα* would serve for either. The householder may have been at fault, not in falling asleep, but in going from home without providing protection for his property. The moral is not, 'Keep awake', but simply, 'Be prepared': *γίνεσθε ἔτοιμοι, ὅτι ἡ ὥρα οὐ δοκεῖτε ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται*. It is Matthew here who has introduced the terms *φυλακῆ* (implying night) for *ὥρα*, and *ἐγρηγόρησεν ἄν*, and so associated the parable with the *paraenesis* about night and day, sleeping and waking. It appears that these traits may have crept in from the *catechesis*. Yet as regards the substance of the matter we cannot doubt that the Gospel parable has priority.

If so, it would follow that even where the evangelists seem to be following the catechetical pattern as a general guide, they were acquainted also with a tradition of the sayings of Jesus which had been transmitted (by whatever channel) independently of the *τύπος διδαχῆς*. Little, in fact, of the rich and varied material embodied in the Eschatological Discourse by the several evangelists could plausibly be derived directly from the catechetical instruction as we know it from the epistles. Its style for the most part is widely different. But it may well be that material transmitted by other channels was used to illustrate and enforce articles of the *catechesis*. Thus when the teacher reached the point at which he must deal with themes falling under the catch-heading, *τὸ τέλος ἤγγικεν · γρηγορεῖτε*, he might introduce prophetic words or parables of Jesus for which he must have been indebted to a richer strain of tradition. Sometimes the saying or parable might be absorbed into the form of *catechesis*, losing in the process something of its characteristic stamp, like the parable of the Thief in 1 Thess. 5:2. At other times the parable itself might get a twist to make it fit a 'moral' derived from the *catechesis*; and that would explain how certain parables—the 'eschatological' parables in particular—have (as I believe) suffered a certain shift of meaning in transmission.<sup>18</sup>

No general conclusion could legitimately be drawn without a

much fuller examination of the material, but the 'samples' we have taken seem, so far as they go, to point to some such conclusion as this: the catechetical instruction of the early Church was largely based upon earlier models, partly Jewish, partly Hellenistic. It was moulded by distinctively Christian motives partly drawn from the teaching of Jesus as it was remembered at an early date.<sup>10</sup> It was a convenient framework within which remembered sayings of Jesus could be organized for teaching purposes, and so provided an occasion for preserving the sayings rather than the means by which they were preserved. In any case it does not appear to be the main channel through which the tradition came down, but presupposes an independent tradition upon which it could draw, and by which it was influenced, while it also exerted a reciprocal influence. The extent to which the catechetical scheme could absorb sayings of Jesus is illustrated by those sections of the *Didache* in which the formula of the 'Two Ways' is filled out with adaptations of sayings of Jesus which are otherwise known to us from the Gospels, though there is no need to suppose that our written Gospels were a source for the *Didache*. The other side, the influence of the *catechesis* on the Gospels, would evidently repay further examination, but it was limited.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> The sayings were in any case translated; and intelligent translation without any element of paraphrase is, as experience shows, a difficult thing.

<sup>2</sup> P. Carrington, *The Primitive Christian Catechism*.

<sup>3</sup> E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, Essay II, 363-466.

<sup>4</sup> I see no sufficient reason for rejecting the evidence of 2 Thessalonians. The objections to Pauline authorship have no great weight, if we allow for the probability that in 2:6-10 we have material drawn from some Christian prophecy or apocalypse. If however the non-Pauline turns of phrase suggest a different authorship, Silvanus, after all, is named in the superscription, even though it is Paul who signs at the end.

<sup>5</sup> In Romans the eschatological section concludes the catechetical material (for ch. 14 belongs to a different category). In 1 Thess., as we have seen, it precedes the section on Church order. But in that epistle Paul had special reasons for including fresh teaching (*οὐ θέλομεν ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν*, 4:13) upon eschatology, and he has appended to it a reminder of teaching already known, before going on to Church order. In James, as in 1 Thess. a section of eschatological *paraenesis* (5:7-9) precedes a passage relating to discipline and practice in the Church (5:13-16). In 1 Peter there are two sequences of catechetical material; in the first, a brief piece of eschatological *paraenesis* (4:7) is sandwiched

between the repudiation of pagan vices (4:3-6) and the affirmation of the law of *ἀγάπη* (4:8-9), which in turn is followed by a section on Church order; in the second, the characteristic injunctions associated with eschatological *paraenesis* follow the section on Church order, and virtually close the epistle (5:6-9). In Ephesians the passage corresponding with the eschatological *paraenesis* forms the virtual close of the epistle (6:10-18). In the *Didache* there is a full-scale eschatological section at the end. It is evident that the sequence of sections varies, but the eschatological section tends to gravitate to the close of the *catechesis*.

<sup>8</sup> I have illustrated this in *Gospel and Law*, 17-20.

<sup>7</sup> See H. Chadwick, *The Sententiae of Sextus* (TS., new series, no. 5), introduction.

<sup>8</sup> See D. Daube, 'A Baptismal Catechism', in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, 106-40.

<sup>9</sup> In *Gospel and Law*, 25-45.

<sup>10</sup> See my *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 390-6.

<sup>11</sup> See my essay on the Beatitudes in *Mélanges Bibliques rédigés en l'honneur de André Robert* (1957).

<sup>12</sup> Though the eschatological sayings accompanying it were known to Luke in another version, see p. 112.

<sup>13</sup> See my book *The Bible and the Greeks*, 187-91.

<sup>14</sup> The meaning of these two verbs is substantially the same. The shade of meaning is perhaps something like that between 'to keep awake' and 'to be sleepless': *ἀγουπνία* is insomnia. Neither means 'to watch', in the modern sense of that term, which is either *θεωρεῖν*, or *παρατηρεῖν*, *φυλάττειν*, or the like.

<sup>15</sup> Prayer, along with fasting, comes in the section on Church order and discipline in the *Didache* (viii), and so also, as I have suggested (p. 111) in the *catechesis* behind the Sermon on the Mount. There is in Colossians no section properly devoted to Church order; in Ephesians it is represented, but of normal sequence, by 4:1-16.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *Corp. Herm.* vii. 27: *νήψατε, πύσασθε κραιπαλῶντες*, and see my *Parables of the Kingdom*, p. 157.

<sup>17</sup> Note that Luke has here introduced the association of prayer with the wakefulness, endurance and steadfastness required of the Christian in view of the critical situation. In the epistles, as we have seen, this association is peculiar to Ephesians, Colossians and 1 Peter. But it is far more impressively and memorably affirmed in a passage of the Gospels which ostensibly does not belong to the record of the teaching of Jesus, Mark 14:38: *γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε*. The passage is an organic part of the Passion narrative. Yet Mark was probably not unaware of its didactic value, or of its aptness to the theme of sleeping and waking in the *catechesis*. I would suggest that we have here an instance of the reciprocal influence between the *catechesis* and other branches of the tradition, to which I point in the conclusion of this essay, p. 115. The constant emphasis on the duty of wakefulness helped to keep in memory this element in the story of the Passion of the Lord: that at the crisis of His fate his disciples were in fact asleep. The words which Jesus was remembered to have addressed to them, with reference to the immediate crisis which was upon them, were adapted by Luke (or his source) to the expected crisis of the second advent, and they also passed into the *catechesis* in some of its forms, where the association of wakefulness with

prayer proved, it seems, more durable than its association with the expectation of the approaching End.

<sup>18</sup> See *Parables of the Kingdom*, 154-74.

<sup>19</sup> Partly also, and perhaps more importantly, by motives drawn directly from the central truths of the Gospel as embodied in the *kerygma*. See *Gospel and Law*, 25-45.