

PROLEGOMENA TO A STUDY OF THE DOMINICAL  
LOGOI AS CITED IN THE *DIDASCALIA APOSTOLORUM*  
PART II: METHODOLOGICAL QUESTIONS (CONT.)\*

JAMES J. C. COX  
Andrews University

In the previous article<sup>1</sup> in this series, I tested those methodologies I had proposed earlier<sup>2</sup> as necessary for an adequate and responsible "determination" of the dominical *logoi*, as cited in the original text of the Greek *Didascalia Apostolorum*, on the canonical dominical *logos*, "For it is written in the Law, 'You shall not commit adultery.' But I say to you (that is, I spoke, in the Law, through Moses, but now I myself speak to you), Everyone who shall look at his neighbor's wife, to desire her, has already committed adultery with her in his heart," as it is cited in the *Didascalia* (*Didasc.* 1.1.4). I now test those methodologies, proposed on the same occasion, as necessary for an adequate and responsible "evaluation" of the dominical *logoi*, as cited in the original text of the Greek *Didascalia*, on the same *logos*.

\*Abbreviations employed in this article, which are not spelled out on the back cover of this journal, indicate the following series: *AAA* = *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*; *CAC* = *Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum Saeculi Secundi*; *GCS* = *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*; *NTG* = *Novum Testamentum Graece*; *PTS* = *Patristische Texte und Studien*; *SC* = *Sources chrétiennes*.

(*Editor's Note*: The style used in this article, including that for citing biblical texts, differs somewhat from current *AUSS* style. This is in order to maintain consistency throughout the series, which was begun prior to adoption of the present *AUSS* Style Guidelines.)

<sup>1</sup>"Prolegomena to a Study of the Dominical *Logoi* as cited in the *Didascalia Apostolorum*, Part II: Methodological Questions (cont.)," *AUSS* 17 (1979): 137-167.

<sup>2</sup>"Prolegomena to a Study of the Dominical *Logoi* as cited in the *Didascalia Apostolorum*, Part II: Methodological Questions," *AUSS* 15 (1977): 1-15.

COMPARISON OF THE GREEK DIDASCALIST'S  
CITATION WITH ITS COMPARABLE PARALLEL IN THE  
GREEK GOSPEL TRADITIONS

1. *The Texts*

(a) <i>Didasc. Grk. 1.1.4</i> (Reconstruction)	(b) <i>Mt 5.27-28</i> (Legg, <i>NTG: Matthaëum</i> , ad loc.)
(i) ὅτι ἐν τῷ Νόμῳ γέγραπται·	ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη·
(ii) Οὐ μοιχεύσεις.	Οὐ μοιχεύσεις.
(iii) Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν,	Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι
(iv) τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐν τῷ Νόμῳ (τῷ) διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα, νῦν δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς ὑμῖν λέγω·	Πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτήν, ἦδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτήν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.
(v) Πᾶς, ὅστις ἐμβλέψῃ εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πληστοῦ αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτήν, ἦδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτήν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.	Πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτήν ἦδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτήν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

2. *The Comparable Parallel in the Canonical Gospels*

I take up now an "evaluation" with respect both to the *form* (in the more technical sense of the term) and to the *function* of the parallel in the first gospel, namely, Mt 5.27-28.

*The Form*

The dominical *logos*, "You have heard that it was said, 'You shall not commit adultery.' But I say to you, Everyone who looks at a woman (wife), to desire her, has already committed adultery with her in his heart" (Mt 5.27-28), belongs in the "form-historical" category "legal *logoi*."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> R. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 2d ed. (New York, 1968), pp. 134-35, 149.

One form of these "legal *logoi*" has *two basic elements*:

1. The *old point of view* (introduced with a formula such as ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη [τοῦς ἀρχαίους] ["you have heard that it was said (to the ancients)"]).

2. The *new point of view* (introduced with a formula such as ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν [ὅτι] ["but I say to you (that)"]).

The "old point of view" (the "thesis") is set forth in the form of a *prohibition* (οὐ φονεύσεις ["you shall not kill"] [Mt 5.21]; οὐ μοιχεύσεις ["you shall not commit adultery"] [Mt 5.27]; οὐκ ἐπιορκήσεις ["you shall not perjure (yourself)"] [Mt 5.33]); and the "new point of view" (the "antithesis") is propounded in the form of an *assertion* (πᾶς ὁ ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει ["everyone who is angry with his brother shall be liable in the judgment"] [Mt 5.22a]; πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτήν ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτήν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ ["everyone who looks at a woman (wife), to desire her, has already committed adultery with her in his heart"] [Mt 5.28]) or as an *imperative* (μὴ ὀμῶσαι ὅλως ["do not swear at all"] . . . ἔστω δὲ ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν ["but let your word be"] . . . [Mt 5.34, 37]) which has "the sense of a legal prescription."<sup>4</sup>

The *logos* we are discussing, in its Matthaean form, has precisely these *two basic elements*:

1. The *old point of view* (ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη· οὐ μοιχεύσεις ["you have heard that it was said, 'You shall not commit adultery'"]).

2. The *new point of view* (Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτήν ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτήν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ ["but I say to you, Everyone who looks at a woman (wife), to desire her, has already committed adultery with her in his heart"]).

### The Function

This "legal *logos*," as it occurs in the Matthaean *sermo in*

<sup>4</sup> Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, p. 132.

*monte*, serves two functions, *polemical/apologetical* and *catechetical*.

I agree with those who include this *logos* among those "debating *logoi*" which serve "polemic and apologetic purposes—substantially with Jewish opponents."<sup>5</sup> I am persuaded that it functions as part of the debate between the Matthaean church and the synagogue "across the street."<sup>6</sup> I also agree with those who include this *logos* among those "legal *logoi*" that have been "gathered together into a catechism"—a catechism in which *logoi* that were "originally much more polemic than legal in character were turned into rules . . . by which the 'better righteousness' of the church must judge itself."<sup>7</sup>

### 3. *The Didascalist's Citation*

Before comparing the Greek Didascalist's citation with its comparable parallel in the canonical gospels, namely, Mt 5.27-28, it will be necessary to "evaluate" his citation as to both its *form* (in the more technical sense of the term) and its *function*.

#### *The Form*

The dominical *logos*, "For it is written in the Law, 'You shall not commit adultery.' But I say to you (that is, I spoke, in the Law, through Moses, but now I myself speak to you), Everyone who shall look at his neighbor's wife, to desire her, has already committed adultery with her in his heart" (*Didasc.* 1.1.4), belongs, as does its canonical parallel, in the "form-historical" category "legal *logoi*."

It has the same *basic elements*:

1. The *old point of view* ([with a comparable introductory

<sup>5</sup> E.g., Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, p. 146.

<sup>6</sup> K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament, with a New Introduction* (Philadelphia, 1968), pp. xi-xii.

<sup>7</sup> E.g., Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, p. 149. With reference to the *logoi* in Mt 5.31-32, 38-39, 43-44, Bultmann remarks, "The motive for the formulation is clear: the antithetical form commends itself by its catechetical character" (*Synoptic Tradition*, pp. 135-36). Stendahl also sees this *logos* as fulfilling a catechetical function. See his *School of St. Matthew*, pp. 136-137.

formula] ὅτι ἐν τῷ Νόμῳ γέγραπται· Οὐ μοιχεύσεις ["for it is written in the Law, 'You shall not commit adultery'"].

2. The *new point of view* ([with an identical introductory formula] Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν . . . Πᾶς, ὅστις ἐμβλέψῃ εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτήν, ἥδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτήν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ ["but I say to you . . . Everyone who shall look at his neighbor's wife, to desire her, has already committed adultery with her in his heart"]).

In addition it has a qualifying parenthetical statement which immediately follows and emphasizes the introductory formula ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ("but I say to you"), namely, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐν τῷ Νόμῳ (τῷ) διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα, νῦν δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς ὑμῖν λέγω ("that is, I spoke, in the Law, through Moses, but now I myself speak to you").

### *The Function*

The Didascalist's *logos* is employed *paraenetically*. It occurs in a context in which the "children of God" are exhorted to flee from "all avarice and evil dealing." They are not to "desire that which is any man's," for "he who desires his neighbor's wife or his servant, or his maidservant, is already an adulterer, and a thief." This *paraenesis* is supported by two citations, the one (cf. Ex 20.17), from the *Torah*, and the other (the citation under consideration), from the "Gospel."

### 4. *The Comparison*

The questions with which we must deal now have to do with the relationship between the Didascalist's *logos* and that in the Matthaean *sermo in monte*. Is the Didascalist's *logos* lineally related to Mt 5.27-28? Or is it rooted in the same source as that employed by Matthew? Is it more, or less, primitive than the Matthaean form?

The significant differences between the two *logoi* are:

1. While in the Matthaean *logos* the "old point of view" element is introduced with the formula ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη

(“you have heard that it was said”), in the Didascalist’s *logos* it is introduced with the formula  $\delta\tau\iota \ \acute{\epsilon}\nu \ \tau\tilde{\omega} \ \text{Ν}\delta\mu\psi \ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\alpha\pi\tau\alpha\iota$  (“for it is written in the Law”).

2. While in the Matthaean *logos* the “new point of view” element is introduced with the formula  $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\tilde{\omega} \ \delta\acute{\epsilon} \ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega \ \acute{\upsilon}\mu\tilde{\iota}\nu$  (“but I say to you”) alone, in the Didascalist’s *logos* it is introduced with the same formula expanded by a qualifying parenthetical note, namely,  $\tau\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\tau' \ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu \ \acute{\epsilon}\nu \ \tau\tilde{\omega} \ \text{Ν}\delta\mu\psi \ (\tau\tilde{\omega}) \ \delta\iota\tilde{\alpha} \ \text{Μ}\omega\tilde{\upsilon}\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma \ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\tilde{\omega} \ \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\sigma\alpha, \ \nu\tilde{\upsilon}\nu \ \delta\acute{\epsilon} \ \acute{\omicron} \ \acute{\alpha}\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\delta\varsigma \ \acute{\upsilon}\mu\tilde{\iota}\nu \ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$  (“that is, I spoke, in the Law, through Moses, but now I myself speak to you”).

3. While in the Matthaean *logos* the first clause of the “new point of view” element is formulated by the use of the adjective  $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$  (“everyone”) + the articular participle  $\acute{\omicron} \ \beta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omega\nu$  (“who looks”) + the anarthrous noun  $\gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\tilde{\iota}\kappa\alpha$  (“woman,” “wife”), in the Didascalist’s *logos* the same clause is formulated by the use of the adjective  $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$  (“everyone”) + the indefinite relative pronoun  $\acute{\omicron}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$  (“who”) + the finite verb (in the future tense)  $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\beta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\psi\epsilon\iota$  (“shall look”) + the prepositional phrase (employing an articular noun)  $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma \ \tau\tilde{\eta}\nu \ \gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\tilde{\iota}\kappa\alpha$  (“at the wife”) + the distinctive modifying factor  $\tau\omicron\tilde{\upsilon} \ \pi\lambda\eta\sigma\tilde{\iota}\omicron\nu \ \acute{\alpha}\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}$  (“his neighbor’s”).

Item 1 is probably to be explained as a development—a development inspired by an attempt to add more specific authority (“it is written in the *Torah*”) to the prohibition which immediately follows—a development the responsibility for which must be attributed to the author of the qualifying parenthetical note attached to the introductory formula in the “new point of view” clause.

Item 2 is probably to be explained as a development—a development also inspired by an attempt to add even more authority (“it was *I* who spoke, in the *Torah*, through Moses; it is *I* who speak again, this time in the *Gospel*, directly; and what I have to say now supersedes what I said before”) to the assertion which immediately follows—a development the responsibility for which must be attributed to the author of the introductory formula in the “old point of view” clause.

Both of these items are to be attributed to the editorial work of the Greek Didascalist himself. In the first place, the expression "it is written" (*ktyb* = *scriptum est* = ὅτι γράπεται) is a distinctive feature of his writing. He employs it on 34 occasions<sup>8</sup> with reference to citations from all three divisions of the *Tanak*—from the *Torah* (on 13 occasions), from the *Nebi'im* (on 11 occasions), and from the *Kethubim* (on 10 occasions).<sup>9</sup> Furthermore on 12 of these occasions it is introduced with the conjunction "for" (*mṭl* = *quoniam* = ὅτι). In the second place, the phrase "in the Law" (*bnmws'* = *in lege* = ἐν τῷ Νόμῳ) is also a distinctive feature of his style. He employs it on 6 occasions, all with reference to citations from the *Torah*. And, in the third place, the pattern of authority—first a citation from the *Tanak* (especially from the *Torah*) and then a citation from the "*Gospel*" — occurs again and again in his document. Note, for example, the following illustrations: (a) The "children of God" are not to "desire that which is any man's" "for it is written in the *Law*, 'You shall not desire that which belongs to your neighbor . . . his wife . . .' (cf. Ex 20.17). . . . As also in the *Gospel* renewing and confirming and fulfilling the Ten Words of the Law, (he says) ' . . . Everyone who looks at his neighbor's wife . . .' (= Mt 5.27-28);"<sup>10</sup> (b) "While we speak and repeat these things often, we are not blameworthy; for through much teaching and hearing it happens that a man is put to shame, and does good and avoids evil. For the Lord also said in the *Law*, 'Hear, O Israel' (cf. Deut 6.4a) . . . And in the *Gospel* likewise he often proclaims and says, 'Everyone who has ears to hear, let him hear' (cf. Mt 11.15, 13.9, etc.)."<sup>11</sup>

Item 3 is probably to be explained as a development—a development resulting from editorial modification.

a. The expression "he who/everyone who/whoever looks" is variously formulated in the Gospel traditions: (1) *article* + *par-*

<sup>8</sup> See "Prolegomena," *AUSS* 15 (1977): 2-3, nn. 8-10.

<sup>9</sup> He also employs it on 12 occasions with reference to citations from the "Gospel." See "Prolegomena," *AUSS* 15 (1977): 3-4, n. 12.

<sup>10</sup> *Didasc.* 1.1.2ff.

<sup>11</sup> *Didasc.* 2.6.17.

*ticiples*: ὁ βλέπων (“who looks”) (so some gospel mss,<sup>12</sup> Athanasius [1/1],<sup>13</sup> and Irenaeus [1/2]<sup>14</sup>); ὁ ἐμβλέψας (“who has looked”) (so some gospel mss,<sup>15</sup> Clement of Alexandria [3/7],<sup>16</sup> Chrysostom [5/6],<sup>17</sup> Nemesius of Emesa [1/1],<sup>18</sup> and Theodoret of Cyrrihus [1/1]<sup>19</sup>);<sup>20</sup> (2) *adjective + article + participle*: πᾶς ὁ βλέπων (“everyone who looks”) (so the majority of gospel mss,<sup>21</sup> Irenaeus [1/2],<sup>22</sup> Clement of Alexandria [1/7],<sup>23</sup> Origen [1/5], Eusebius [1/1],<sup>24</sup> Macarius of Egypt [1/1],<sup>25</sup> and Cyril of Alexandria [1/1]<sup>26</sup>);<sup>27</sup> and (3) *indefinite relative pronoun construction + a finite verb in the subjunctive mood*: ὅς (ἐ)ἄν ἐμβλέψῃ (“whoever should look”) (so some gospel mss,<sup>28</sup> Justin

<sup>12</sup> See Legg, *NTG: Matthaëum*, ad loc.

<sup>13</sup> *Supplicatio pro Christianis*, 32.8 (Otto, *CAC* 7:166.7ff.).

<sup>14</sup> *Adversus haereses*, 4.16.5 (Rousseau, et al., *SC* 100:573.9ff.).

<sup>15</sup> See Legg, *NTG: Matthaëum*, ad loc.

<sup>16</sup> *Paedagogus*, 3.5.33.2 (Stählin, *GCS* 12:1.255.24); *Stromata*, 2.14.61.3; 4.18.114.2 (Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 52<sup>3</sup>:3.146.9f.; 3.298.24f.).

<sup>17</sup> *In Matthaëum, Hom.*, 61.2 (Migne, *PG* 58:594.2ff.); *In epistolam primam ad Corinthios, Hom.*, 7.7; 42.3 (Migne, *PG* 61:64.64f.; 366.49f.); *Catechesis* 1.32 (Wenger, *SC* 50:124.30f.); 2.5 (Migne, *PG* 49:240.17f.).

<sup>18</sup> *De natura hominis*, 40.86f. (Migne, *PG* 40:769.24f.).

<sup>19</sup> *Graecorum affectionum curatio* 9.57 (Canivet, *SC* 57:354.10f.).

<sup>20</sup> Clement of Alexandria also has ὁ ἰδῶν (“who has looked”) (*Stromata*, 2.50.2 [Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 52<sup>3</sup>:3.139.18f.]) and ὁ ἐπιθυμήσας (“who has desired”) (*Stromata*, 2.15.66.1 [Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 52<sup>3</sup>:3.148.13]).

<sup>21</sup> See Legg, *NTG: Matthaëum*, ad loc.

<sup>22</sup> *Adversus haereses*, 4.13.1 (Rousseau, et al., *SC* 100:525.5ff.).

<sup>23</sup> *Stromata* 3.14.94.3 (Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 52<sup>3</sup>:3.239.18f.).

<sup>24</sup> *Comm. on John*, 20.17 (Preuschen, *GCS* 10:4.349.33f.).

<sup>25</sup> *Homiliai pneumatikai*, 26.13 (Dörries, et al., *PTS* 4:211.3f.).

<sup>26</sup> *In Zachariam*, 768c (Pusey, *In XII Prophetas*, 2:468.17ff.).

<sup>27</sup> Theophilus of Antioch (1/1) has πᾶς ὁ ἰδῶν (“everyone who has looked”) (*Ad Autolyicum* 3.13 [Bardy, *SC* 20:230.24ff.]); Clement of Alexandria (1/7) has πᾶς ὁ προσβλέπων (“everyone who looks”) (*Stromata* 3.2.8.4 [Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 52<sup>3</sup>:3.199.16]); Basil (1/1) has πᾶς ὁ ἐμβλέπων (“everyone who looks”) (*Letter* 46.1 [Deferrari, *LCL* 190:284.21ff.]); *Acta Philippi* (2), 142 has πᾶς ὁ ἐμβλέψας (“everyone who has looked”) (Lipsius and Bonnet, *AAA* 2.2.80.26ff.); and Chrysostom (1/1) has πᾶς ὁ ἐμβλέπων (“everyone who looks”) (*In Matthaëum, Hom.* 17 [Migne, *PG* 57:255.1ff.]).

<sup>28</sup> See Legg, *NTG: Matthaëum*, ad loc.



Martyr [1/1],<sup>29</sup> Origen [4/5],<sup>30</sup> and Cyril of Jerusalem [1/1]<sup>31</sup>).<sup>32</sup> The Greek Didascalist has the formulation: *adjective + indefinite relative pronoun + finite verb (future tense, indicative mood)*: πᾶς, ὅστις ἐμβλέσσει (“everyone who shall look”).

b. The object of the verb “to look” is variously construed in the gospel traditions: (1) as an *anarthrous noun in the accusative case*: βλέπειν γυναῖκα (“to look on/at a woman/wife”) (so the gospel mss,<sup>33</sup> Athenagoras [1/1],<sup>34</sup> Irenaeus [2/2],<sup>35</sup> Clement of Alexandria [1/3],<sup>36</sup> Origen [1/5],<sup>37</sup> Eusebius [1/1],<sup>38</sup> Macarius of Egypt [1/1],<sup>39</sup> and Cyril of Alexandria [1/1]<sup>40</sup>);<sup>41</sup> (2) as an *anarthrous noun in the dative case*: ἐμβλέπειν γυναίκε (“to look on/at a woman/wife”) (so Justin Martyr [1/1],<sup>42</sup> Clement of Alexandria [2/3],<sup>43</sup> Origen [1/5],<sup>44</sup> Basil [1/1],<sup>45</sup> Cyril of Jerusa-

<sup>29</sup> *Apologia*, 1.15.1 (Otto, *CAC* 1:46.6ff.).

<sup>30</sup> *Contra Celsum*, 3.44 (Koetschau, *GCS* 2:1.240.7ff.); *Comm. on John*, 20.23 (Preuschen, *GCS* 10:4.350.14f.); *De principiis* 3.1.6 (Koetschau, *GCS* 22:5.202.7f.); *Selecta in Ezechiel*, 6 (Lommatsch, *Origenis, Opera*, 14.195).

<sup>31</sup> *Catecheses* 1.13.5 (Reischl and Rupp, *Cyrrilli Hierosolymarum, Opera*, 2:56.6f.).

<sup>32</sup> *Acta Philippi* (1), 142 has πᾶς ὅς ἐὰν ἐμβλέσῃ (“everyone who shall look”).

<sup>33</sup> See Legg, *NTG: Matthaëum*, ad loc.

<sup>34</sup> *Supplicatio pro Christianis*, 32.8 (Otto, *CAC* 7:166.7ff.).

<sup>35</sup> *Adversus haereses*, 4.13.1; 4.16.5 (Rousseau, et al., *SC* 100:525.5ff.; 573.9ff.).

<sup>36</sup> *Stromata*, 3.14.94.3 (Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 52<sup>3</sup>:3.239.18f.).

<sup>37</sup> *Comm. on John*, 20.17 (Preuschen, *GCS* 10:4.349.33f.).

<sup>38</sup> *Demonstratio Evangelica*, 3.6.4 (Heikel, *GCS* 23:132.24f.).

<sup>39</sup> *Homiliai pneumatikai*, 26.13 (Dörries et al., *PTS* 4:211.3f.).

<sup>40</sup> *In Zachariam* 768c (Pusey, *In XII Prophetas*, 2:468.17ff.).

<sup>41</sup> Theophilus of Antioch (1/1) has ἰδεῖν γυναῖκα (“to look on/at a woman/wife”) (*Ad Autolyicum*, 3.13 [Bardy, *SC* 20:230.24f.]); Origen (3/5) has ἐμβλέπειν γυναῖκα (“to look on/at a woman/wife”) (*Comm. on John*, 20.23 [Preuschen, *GCS* 10:4.350.14f.]; *De principiis*, 3.1.6 [Koetschau, *GCS* 22:5.202.7f.]; *Selecta in Ezechiel*, 6 [Lommatsch, *Origenis, Opera*, 14:195]); and *Acta Philippi* (2), 142 has ἐμβλέπειν εἰς γυναῖκα (“to look on/at a wife”) (Lipsius and Bonnet, *AAA* 2.2:80.26ff.).

<sup>42</sup> *Apologia*, 1.15.1 (Otto, *CAC* 1.46.6ff.).

<sup>43</sup> *Stromata*, 4.18,114.2; 7.13,82.3 (Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 52<sup>3</sup>:3.298.24f.; *GCS* 17<sup>2</sup>:3.58.28).

<sup>44</sup> *Contra Celsum*, 3.44 (Koetschau, *GCS* 2:1.240.7ff.).

<sup>45</sup> *Letter* 46.1 (Deferrari, *LCL* 190:284.21ff.).

lem [1/1]<sup>46</sup> *Acta Philippi* [1] [1/1],<sup>47</sup> Chrysostom [6/6],<sup>48</sup> Nemesius of Emesa [1/1],<sup>49</sup> and Theodoret of Cyrillus [1/1]<sup>50</sup>).<sup>51</sup> The Greek Didascalist construes it as a *prepositional phrase with an articular noun in the accusative case*: ἐμβλέπειν εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα (“to look at the wife”).<sup>52, 53</sup>

c. The few citations which modify the noun γυναῖκα/γυναικῆ (“woman,” “wife”) do so variously: (1) by means of the *adjective* ἄλλοτριζαν/ἄλλοτριζα (“another’s”) (so Theophilus of Antioch [1/1]<sup>54</sup> and Clement of Alexandria [1/3],<sup>55</sup> respectively); and (2) by means of the *phrase* τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ (“his neighbor’s”) (so *Acta Philippi* [2] [1/1]<sup>56</sup>). The Greek Didascalist employs the phrase τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ (“his neighbor’s”).

One other feature should be noted here, namely, the use of the accusative αὐτήν (“her”) (instead of the genitive αὐτῆς [“her”]) as the object of the verb ἐπιθυμεῖν (“to desire”) in the prepositional clause πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτήν (“to desire her”). A good many of the manuscript copyists and editors, and of the fathers who cite this *logos*, have apparently felt the grammatical infelicity involved in the use of the accusative case (αὐτήν [“her”]) after the verb ἐπιθυμεῖν (“to desire”) and have sought to correct the problem either (a) by omitting the

<sup>46</sup> *Catecheses*, 1.13.5 (Reischl and Rupp, *Cyrilli Hierosolymarum, Opera*, 2:56.6f.).

<sup>47</sup> *Acta Philippi* (1), 142 (Lipsius and Bonnet, *AAA* 2.2:80.12ff.).

<sup>48</sup> *In Matthaëum, Hom.*, 17; 61.2 (Migne, *PG* 57:255.1ff.; *PG* 58:594.2ff.); *In epistolam primam ad Corinthios, Hom.* 7.7; 42.3 (Migne, *PG* 61:64.64f.; 366.49f.); *Catechesis* 1.32 (Wenger, *SC* 50:124.30f.); 2.5 (Migne, *PG* 49:240.17f.).

<sup>49</sup> *De natura hominis*, 40.86f. (Migne, *PG* 40:769.24f.).

<sup>50</sup> *Graecorum affectionum curatio*, 9.57 (Canivet, *SC* 57:354.10f.).

<sup>51</sup> Clement of Alexandria (1/3) has ἐμβλέπειν τῇ γυναικῆ (“to look on/at the woman/wife”) (*Stromata*, 4.18,114.2 [Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 52<sup>2</sup>:3.298.24f.]).

<sup>52</sup> *Acta Philippi* (2), 142 has a comparable reading: εἰς γυναῖκα (“on/at a wife”) (Lipsius and Bonnet, *AAA* 2.2:80.26ff.).

<sup>53</sup> See F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature: A Translation and Revision of the ninth-tenth German edition incorporating Supplementary Notes of A. Debrunner* by Robert Funk (Chicago, 1961), § 202.

<sup>54</sup> *Ad Autolyicum*, 3.13 (Bardy, *SC* 20:230.24ff.).

<sup>55</sup> *Stromata*, 7.13,82.3 (Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 17<sup>2</sup>:3.58.28).

<sup>56</sup> *Acta Philippi* (2), 142 (Lipsius and Bonnet, *AAA* 2.2:80.26ff.).

pronoun altogether (so p<sup>67 57</sup>  $\aleph^*$  236 440,<sup>58</sup> Clement of Alexandria [1/1],<sup>59</sup> Origen [3/5],<sup>60</sup> Cyril of Jerusalem [1/1],<sup>61</sup> Macarius of Egypt [1/1],<sup>62</sup> Chrysostom [4/6],<sup>63</sup> and Cyril of Alexandria [1/1]<sup>64</sup>), or (b) by replacing the accusative αὐτήν (“her”) with the grammatically preferable genitive αὐτῆς (“her”) (so  $\aleph^b$  M  $\Sigma$  1 209 22 346 21 262 265 472 485 697 *al. plur.*,<sup>65</sup> Justin Martyr [1/1],<sup>66</sup> Athenagoras [1/1],<sup>67</sup> Irenaeus [2/2],<sup>68</sup> Origen [1/5],<sup>69</sup> Basil [1/1],<sup>70</sup> Chrysostom [1/6],<sup>71</sup> and Theodoret of Cyrhus [1/1]<sup>72</sup>).<sup>73</sup> The Greek Didascalist retains the accusative αὐτήν (“her”).

The manner in which these elements ([1] πᾶς, ὅστις ἐμβλέψει [“everyone who shall look”]; [2] εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα [“at the wife”]; and [3] τοῦ πλησίου αὐτοῦ [“his neighbor’s”]) have been construed in the Greek Didascalist’s citation, as compared with the manner in which they are construed in Matthew’s parallel, certainly indicates that they have been worked over by an editor. The question with which we concern ourselves has to

<sup>57</sup> K. Aland, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum: Locis parallelis evangeliorum apocryphorum et patrum adhibitis* (Stuttgart, 1964), ad loc.

<sup>58</sup> See Legg, *NTG: Matthaëum*, ad loc.

<sup>59</sup> *Stromata*, 3.14,94.3 (Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 52<sup>3</sup>:3.239.18f.).

<sup>60</sup> *Contra Celsum*, 3.44 (Koetschau, *GCS* 2:1.240.7ff.); *Comm. on John* 20.17 (Preuschen, *GCS* 10:4.349.33f.); *De principiis*, 3.1.6 (Koetschau, *GCS* 22:5.202.7f.).

<sup>61</sup> *Catecheses*, 1.13.5 (Reischl and Rupp, *Cyrrilli Hierosolymarum, Opera*, 2:56.6f.).

<sup>62</sup> *Homiliai pneumatikai*, 26.13 (Dörries, et al., *PTS* 4:211.3f.).

<sup>63</sup> *In Matthaëum, Hom.*, 61.2 (Migne, *PG* 57:594.2ff.); *In epistolam primam ad Corinthios, Hom.* 7.7 (Migne, *PG* 61:64.64f.); *Catechesis* 1.32 (Wenger, *SC* 50:124.30f.); 2.5 (Migne, *PG* 49:240.17f.).

<sup>64</sup> *In S. Joannem*, 3.3.267a (Pusey, *In D. Joannis Evangelium*, 1:393.30ff.).

<sup>65</sup> See Legg, *NTG: Matthaëum*, ad loc.

<sup>66</sup> *Apologia*, 1.15.1 (Otto, *CAC* 1:46.6ff.).

<sup>67</sup> *Supplicatio pro Christianis*, 32.8 (Otto, *CAC* 7:166.7ff.).

<sup>68</sup> *Adversus haereses*, 4.13.1; 4.16.5 (Rousseau, et al., *SC* 100:525.5ff.; 573.9ff.).

<sup>69</sup> *Selecta in Ezechiel*, 6 (Lommatzsch, *Origenis, Opera*, 14.195).

<sup>70</sup> *Letter* 46.1 (Deferrari, *LCL* 190:284.21f.).

<sup>71</sup> *In epistolam primam ad Corinthios, Hom.* 42.3 (Migne, *PG* 61:366.49f.).

<sup>72</sup> *Graecorum affectionum curatio*, 9.57 (Canivet, *SC* 57:354.10f.).

<sup>73</sup> On the use of the genitive with the verb ἐπιθυμεῖν (“to desire”) see Blass-Debrunner-Funk, § 171, and J. H. Moulton, W. F. Howard, and N. Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 3 (Edinburgh, 1963): 232.

do with whether or not that editor was the Greek Didascalist himself or a predecessor.

Here we must take cognizance of the remarkable similarity to the Didascalist's citation of the parallel in *Acta Philippi* (2):<sup>74</sup>

*Didasc. I.1.4*

πᾶς, ὅστις ἐμβλέψει  
 εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα  
 τοῦ πλησίου αὐτοῦ  
 πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτήν,  
 ἥδη ἐμοιχευσεὺς αὐτήν  
 ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ

*Acta Philippi* (2), 142

πᾶς ὁ ἐμβλέψας  
 εἰς γυναῖκα  
 τοῦ πλησίου αὐτοῦ  
 καὶ ἐπιθυμῆσας αὐτήν,  
 ἥδη ἐμοιχευσεὺς αὐτήν  
 ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ

Both citations agree with one another, and at the same time differ from their Matthaean parallel, in that (1) they both employ the compound verb ἐμβλέπειν (“to look”) (the Matthaean parallel has the simple verb βλέπειν [“to look”]);<sup>75</sup> (2) they both employ the prepositional phrase εἰς (τὴν) γυναῖκα (“at the wife”) (the Matthaean parallel has simply, as the direct object, the noun γυναῖκα [“woman,” “wife”]);<sup>76</sup> and (3) they both

<sup>74</sup> Lipsius and Bonnet, *AAA*, 2.2:80.26ff.

<sup>75</sup> The compound verb is extensively used in parallel citations in the Patristic literature. See, e.g., Justin Martyr (1/1) (*Apologia*, 1.15.1 [Otto, *CAC* 1:46.6ff.]); Clement of Alexandria (4/8) (*Paedagogus*, 3.5,33.2 [Stählin, *GCS* 12:1.255.24]; *Stromata*, 2.14.61.3; 4.18,114.2; 7.13,82.3 [Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 52<sup>a</sup>:3.146.9f.; 3.298.24f.; *GCS* 17<sup>a</sup>:3.58.28]); Origen (4/5) (*Contra Celsum*, 3.44 [Koetschau, *GCS* 2:1.240.7ff.]; *Comm. on John*, 20.23 [Preuschen, *GCS* 10:4.350.14f.]; *De principiis*, 3.1.6 [Koetschau, *GCS* 22:5.202.7f.]; *Selecta in Ezechiel*, 6 [Lommatsch, *Origenis, Opera*, 14:195]); Basil (1/1) (*Letter* 46.1 [Deferrari, *LCL* 190:284.21ff.]); Cyril of Jerusalem (1/1) (*Catecheses*, 1.13.5 [Reischl and Rupp, *Cyrrilli Hierosolymarum, Opera*, 2:56.6f.]); *Acta Philippi* (1), 142 (Lipsius and Bonnet, *AAA* 2.2:80.12ff.); Chrysostom (6/6) (*In Matthaum, Hom.*, 17; 61.2 [Migne, *PG* 57:255.1ff.; *PG* 58:594.2ff.]; *In epistolam primam ad Corinthios, Hom.* 7.7; 42.3 [Migne, *PG* 61:64.64f.; 366.49f.]; *Catechesis* 1.32 [Wenger, *SC* 50:124.30f.]; 2.5 [Migne, *PG* 49:240.17f.]); Nemesius of Emesa (1/1) (*De natura hominis*, 40.86f. [Migne, *PG* 40:769.24f.]); and Theodoret of Cyrrihus (1/1) (*Graecorum affectionum curatio*, 9.57 [Canivet, *SC* 57:354.10f.]).

<sup>76</sup> When they employ the compound verb ἐμβλέπειν (“to look”), the Patristic writers, with but one exception, namely, Origen, consistently employ its object in the dative case ( γυναῖκα [“woman,” “wife”]) (so Justin Martyr [1/1] [*Apologia*, 1.15.1 (Otto, *CAC* 1:46.6ff.)); Clement of Alexandria [2/4] [*Stromata*, 4.18,114.2; 7.13,82.3 (Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 52<sup>a</sup>:3.298.24f.; *GCS*

employ the modifying phrase τοῦ πλησίου αὐτοῦ (“his neighbor’s”) (the Matthaean parallel has no equivalent).<sup>77</sup> Furthermore, they both employ the personal pronoun in the accusative case after the verb ἐπιθυμεῖν (“to desire”) (the Matthaean parallel also has the personal pronoun in the accusative case).<sup>78</sup>

They differ in that (1) while the citation in the *Didascalia* employs the indefinite relative pronoun ὅστις (“who”) with the

17<sup>2</sup>:3.58.28]; Origen [1/4] [*Contra Celsum*, 3.44 (Koetschau, GCS 2:1.240.7ff.); Basil [1/1] [*Letter 46.1* (Deferrari, *LCL* 190:284.21ff.); Cyril of Jerusalem [1/1] [*Catecheses*, 1.13.5 (Reischl and Rupp, *Cyrrilli Hierosolymarum, Opera*, 2:56.6f.); *Acta Philippi* [1], 142 [Lipsius and Bonnet, *AAA* 2.80.12ff.); Chrysostom [6/6] [*In Matthaicum, Hom.* 17; 61.2 (Migne, PG 57:255.1ff.; PG 58:594.2ff.); *In epistolam primam ad Corinthios, Hom.* 7.7; 42.3 (Migne, PG 61:64.64f.; 366.49f.); *Catechesis* 1.32 (Wenger, SC 50:124.30f.); 2.5 (Migne, PG 49:240.17f.); Nemesius of Emesa [1/1] [*De natura hominis*, 40.86f. (Migne, PG 40:769.24f.); and Theodoret of Cyrillus [1/1] [*Graecorum affectionum curatio*, 9.57 (Canivet, SC 57:354.10f.)]. Origen [3/4] (*Comm. on John*, 20.23 [Preuschen, GCS 10:4.350.14f.]; *De principiis*, 3.1.6 [Koetschau, GCS 22:5.202.7f.]; *Selecta in Ezechiel*, 6 [Lommatzsch, 14:195]) has the accusative case. Clement of Alexandria (2/4) (*Paedagogus*, 3.5.33.2 [Stählin, GCS 12:1.255.24]; *Stromata*, 2.14.61.3 [Stählin and Früchtel, GCS 52<sup>3</sup>:3.146.9f.]) omits the object altogether.

<sup>77</sup> This modifying phrase does not occur in any of the Gospel mss, nor in any other Patristic citations.

<sup>78</sup> The Patristic writers vary in their use and non-use of the personal pronoun after ἐπιθυμεῖν (“to desire”). Theophilus of Antioch (1/1) (*Ad Autolyicum* 3.13 [Bardy, SC 20:230.24ff.); Origen (1/5) (*Comm. on John*, 20.23 [Preuschen, GCS 10:4.350.14f.); Eusebius (1/1) (*Demonstratio Evangelica*, 3.6.4 [Heikel, GCS 23:132.24f.); *Acta Philippi* (1), 142 [Lipsius and Bonnet, *AAA* 2.2:80.12ff.); Chrysostom (1/6) (*In Matthaicum, Hom.* 17 [Migne, PG 57:255.1ff.); and Nemesius of Emesa (1/1) (*De natura hominis*, 40.86f. [Migne, PG 40:769.24f.) employ the personal pronoun in the accusative case, αὐτήν (“her”); Justin Martyr (1/1) (*Apologia*, 1.15.1 [Otto, *CAC* 1:46.6ff.); Athenagoras (1/1) (*Supplicatio pro Christianis*, 32.8 [Otto, *CAC* 7:166.7ff.); Irenaeus (2/2) (*Adversus haereses*, 4.13.1; (*Selecta in Ezechiel*, 6 [Lommatzsch, 14:195]); Basil (1/1) (*Letter 46.1* [Deferrari, *LCL* 190:284.21ff.); Chrysostom (1/6) (*In epistolam primam ad Corinthios, Hom.* 42.3 [Migne, PG 61:366.49f.); and Theodoret of Cyrillus (1/1) (*Graecorum affectionum curatio*, 9.57 [Canivet, SC 57:354.10f.) employ the pronoun in the genitive case, αὐτῆς (“her”); and Clement of Alexandria (1/1) (*Stromata*, 3.14.94.3 [Stählin and Früchtel, GCS 52<sup>3</sup>:3.239.18f.); Origen (3/5) (*Contra Celsum*, 3.44 [Koetschau, GCS 2:1.240.7ff.); *Comm. on John*, 20.17 [Preuschen, GCS 10:4.349.33f.]; *De principiis*, 3.1.6 [Koetschau, GCS 22:5.202.7f.); Cyril of Jerusalem (1/1) (*Catecheses*, 1.13.5 [Reischl and Rupp, *Cyrrilli Hierosolymarum, Opera*, 2:56.6f.); Macarius of Egypt (1/1) (*Homiliai pneumatikai*, 26.13 [Dörries et al., *PTS* 4:211.3f.); Chrysostom (4/6) (*In Matthaicum, Hom.* 61.2 [Migne, PG 57:594.2ff.); *In epistolam primam ad Corinthios, Hom.* 7.7 [Migne, PG 61:64.64f.); *Catechesis*

finite verb ἐμβλέψει (“shall look”),<sup>79</sup> the parallel in *Acta Philippi* employs the article ὁ (“the” [“who”]) with the participle ἐμβλέψας (“has looked”);<sup>80</sup> (2) while the citation in the *Didascalica* employs the articular noun τὴν γυναῖκα (“the wife”), the parallel in *Acta Philippi* employs the anarthrous form γυναῖκα (“wife”); and (3) while the citation in the *Didascalica* employs the prepositional clause πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτὴν (“to desire her”), the parallel in *Acta Philippi* employs the coordinating clause καὶ ἐπιθυμῆσας αὐτὴν (“and desired her”). All three of these differences are to be explained as stylistic variations.

This striking agreement between the Didascalist’s citation and that in *Acta Philippi* (2) can hardly be accidental.

The distinctive features of the citation in *Acta Philippi* (2), namely, (1) the formulation πᾶς ὁ ἐμβλέψας (“everyone who has looked”), (2) the prepositional phrase εἰς γυναῖκα (“at [the] wife”), (3) the modifying phrase τοῦ πλησίου αὐτοῦ (“his neighbor’s”), and (4) the retention of the accusative case after the verb ἐπιθυμεῖν (“to desire”), are probably not the result of editorial work on the part of the author of that document. There is nothing in the immediate literary context of the citation that would call for any one, let alone all four, of these distinctive features; nor are there comparable formulations (apart from item [4]) in the contemporary Gospel traditions which may have given

1.32 [Wenger, *SC* 50:124.30f.]; 2.5 [Migne, *PG* 49:240.17f.]; and Cyril of Alexandria (1/1) (*In S. Joannem*, 3.3.267a [Pusey, *In D. Joannis Evangelium*, 1.393.30f.]) omit the pronoun altogether.

<sup>79</sup> The formulation πᾶς ὁστίς ἐμβλέψει (“everyone who shall look”) occurs nowhere else in the Greek Gospel traditions.

<sup>80</sup> The formulation πᾶς ὁ ἐμβλέψας (“everyone who has looked”) occurs nowhere else in the Greek Gospel traditions. However, the formulation ὁ ἐμβλέψας (“who has looked”) occurs in Clement of Alexandria (3/7) (*Paedagogus*, 3.5.33.2 [Stählin, *GCS* 12:1.255.24]; *Stromata*, 2.14.613; 4.18.114.2 [Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 52<sup>3</sup>:3.146.9f.; 3.298.24f.]); Chrysostom (5/6) (*In Matthaeum*, *Hom.* 7.7; 42.3 [Migne, *PG* 61:64.64f.; 366.49f.]; *Catechesis* 1.32 [Wenger, *SC* 50:124.30f.]; 2.5 [Migne, *PG* 49:240.17f.]); Nemesius of Emesa (1/1) (*De natura hominis*, 40.86f. [Migne, *PG* 40:769.24f.]); and Theodoret of Cyrillus (1/1) (*Graecorum affectionum curatio*, 9.57 [Canivet, *SC* 57:354.10f.]).

rise to these unique features.<sup>81</sup> While items (1), (2), and (4) may possibly have resulted from the stylistic preferences of the author of *Acta Philippi* (2), item (3), the modifying phrase τοῦ πληστοῦ αὐτοῦ ("his neighbor's"), can hardly be explained in this way. There is no evidence, as far as I can see, of any attempt at accommodation, either to the immediate literary context or to the contemporary Gospel traditions. In fact, the retention of the accusative case after the verb ἐπιθυμεῖν ("to desire")<sup>82</sup> and the inclusion of the modifying phrase τοῦ πληστοῦ αὐτοῦ ("his neighbor's") argue against interest in accommodation. I conclude, therefore, that the author of *Acta Philippi* (2) found the *logos* under discussion in his source essentially as he has cited it.

Furthermore, the comparable distinctive features of the citation in the *Didascalia*, namely, (1) the formulation πᾶς, ὅστις ἐμβλέψει ("everyone who shall look"), (2) the prepositional phrase εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα ("at the wife"), (3) the modifying phrase τοῦ πληστοῦ αὐτοῦ ("his neighbor's"), and (4) the retention of the accusative case after the verb ἐπιθυμεῖν ("to desire"), are probably not, apart from minor details, the result of the editorial activity of the Didascalist. Items (1), (2), and (4) may possibly have resulted from the stylistic preferences of the Didascalist; and item (3), the modifying phrase τοῦ πληστοῦ αὐτοῦ ("his neighbor's"), may possibly have resulted from an attempt at accommodation to another reference, drawn on the

<sup>81</sup> The formulation πᾶς ὁ ἐμβλέψας ("everyone who has looked") has no precise equivalent in the Greek Gospel traditions, nor does the prepositional phrase εἰς γυναῖκα ("on/at a wife"). There is no parallel to the modifying phrase τοῦ πληστοῦ αὐτοῦ ("his neighbor's"), that is, outside of the parallel in the Greek *Didascalia*.

<sup>82</sup> There is a distinct tendency in the Greek Gospel traditions to rectify the grammatical infelicity of the personal pronoun in the accusative case after the verb ἐπιθυμεῖν ("to desire") either (1) by omitting the pronoun altogether (so P<sup>75</sup> N\* 236 440, Clement of Alexandria [1/1], Origen [3/5], Cyril of Jerusalem [1/1], Macarius of Egypt [1/1], Chrysostom [4/6], and Cyril of Alexandria [1/1], or (2) by replacing the accusative αὐτήν ("her") with the grammatically preferable genitive αὐτῆς ("her") (so N<sup>b</sup> M Σ 1 209 22 346 21 262 265 472 485 697 *ad plur.*, Justin Martyr [1/1], Athenagoras [1/1], Irenaeus [2/2], Origen [1/5], Basil [1/1], Chrysostom [1/6], and Theodoret of Cyrrhus [1/1]). For the references see the discussion and footnotes above.

*Torah*, which is both cited and restated in the immediately preceding context, namely, οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον σου ("you shall not desire your neighbor's wife") (cf. Ex 20.17 [LXX]) . . . ὁ γὰρ ἐπιθυμήσας τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ . . . ἤδη μοιχὸς καὶ κλέπτης ἐστίν ("For he who has desired his neighbor's wife . . . is already an adulterer and thief") (*Didasc.* 1.1.2f.). However, I am persuaded that these features are not to be explained in this way.

In view of the facts (1) that the Didascalist, although he does at times change or modify introductory formulae (as in the case of the citation under discussion), usually cites his source, especially when dominical *logoi* are involved, with remarkable fidelity,<sup>83</sup> and (2) that the strikingly similar citation in *Acta Philippi* (2) can be shown to antedate that document in essentially the form in which it is cited in that document, I am convinced that these distinctive features are to be explained otherwise.

I conjecture that the Didascalist drew on a source in which the dominical *logos* we are discussing occurred in a form essentially identical to that found in *Acta Philippi* (2). He has retained the basic elements of the distinctive features we have noted—(1) the adjective πᾶς ("everyone"), (2) the compound verb ἐμβλέπειν ("to look"), (3) the prepositional phrase εἰς γυναῖκα ("at [the] wife"), (4) the modifying phrase τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ ("his neighbor's"), and (5) the accusative case after the verb ἐπιθυμεῖν ("to desire"). He has only slightly edited two of these elements, no doubt, because of his own stylistic preferences: (1) He has reformulated the articular participle ὁ ἐμβλέψας ("who has looked") replacing the article ὁ ("the" ["who"]) with the indefinite relative pronoun ὅστις ("who"), and, consequently, the participle ἐμβλέψας ("has looked") with the finite verb ἐμβλέψει ("shall look"); and (2) he has added the article

<sup>83</sup> For the evidence, see my *Studies in the Determination and Evaluation of the Dominical Logoi as cited in the Original Text of the Greek Didascalia Apostolorum* (unpublished dissertation, Harvard University, 1973), vols. 1-3.



την (“the”) before the noun γυναῖκα (“wife”).

This explanation accounts better for the usual editorial practices of the Greek Didascalist and at the same time the remarkable identity between the Didascalist’s citation and its counterpart in the *Acta Philippi* (2).

This brings us then to the question of sources.

### THE SOURCES

It is necessary here to speak of both (a) *ultimate* and (b) *immediate* sources.

As far as the *ultimate* source is concerned, it seems to me that it is not possible to determine, with any degree of finality, whether the Didascalist’s *logos* derives from its counterpart in the Matthaean *sermo in monte* or from the source on which the author of the first Gospel himself drew, or from a source parallel to it.

There is nothing particularly Matthaean, in style, in the form of the *logos* as it stands in the Matthaean *sermo in monte*. Neither of the introductory formulae (a) ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη (“you have heard that it was said”), and (b) ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν (“but I say to you”), occurs again in the first gospel outside of its use in the six “antitheses”<sup>84</sup> all of which are pre-Matthaean in formulation.<sup>85</sup> Nor are there any distinctly Matthaean idioms in the formulation of either the “prohibition” or the “assertion” clauses. Taking into consideration the differing lengths of each of the Synoptic gospels, it is to be noted that (1) while Mark (once)<sup>86</sup> employs less frequently than does Matthew (9 times)<sup>87</sup> the formulation πᾶς (“everyone”) + an articular participle, Luke (15 times)<sup>88</sup> employs it more frequently; (2) while both Mark

<sup>84</sup> The formula οὐδὲ ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν (“nor do I tell you”) in Mt 21.27 does not have the same significance. Furthermore, it is drawn on Mk 11.33. The same is true of the identical formula in Lk 20.8.

<sup>85</sup> Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, pp. 146-147.

<sup>86</sup> Mk 7.18.

<sup>87</sup> Mt 5.22, 28, 32; 7.8, 21, 26; 11.28; 15.17; 26.52.

<sup>88</sup> Lk 1.66; 2.18, 47; 6.47; 11.10; 13.17; 14.11, 29; 16.18; 18.14, 31; 20.18; 21.15, 22; 24.44.

(once)<sup>89</sup> and Luke (once)<sup>90</sup> employ the formulation  $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma \tau\delta +$  an infinitive less frequently than does Matthew (5 times),<sup>91</sup> the idiom is by no means a common one in Matthew; and (3) while Mark (3 times)<sup>92</sup> employs less frequently than does Matthew (7 times)<sup>93</sup> the formulation ( $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ )  $\tau\eta \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\alpha$  ("in [his] heart"), Luke (9 times)<sup>94</sup> employs it more frequently.

The form of the *logos* as it occurred in the Didascalist's source may have developed either from its counterpart in the Matthaean *sermo in monte*, or independently from the source on which the author of the first gospel drew, or independently from a source parallel to it.

One thing is clear—the source on which the Didascalist drew represents a development from a primary form comparable to that found in the Matthaean *sermo in monte*. I conjecture that the use of the compound verb  $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\beta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\lambda\nu$  ("to look") instead of the simple verb  $\beta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\lambda\nu$  ("to look") represents a development born of an attempt at more precise expression of the idea involved, a development that has received widespread acceptance in the ongoing gospel traditions.<sup>95</sup> I also conjecture that that development has occasioned another, namely, the use of the preposition  $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$  ("at"). As has already been pointed out, three different ways of handling the grammatical infelicity resulting from the use of the compound verb  $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\beta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\lambda\nu$  ("to look") instead of the simple verb  $\beta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\lambda\nu$  ("to look") have been adopted in the transmission of our *logos*: (1) the noun  $\gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha$  ("woman," "wife") has been omitted altogether (so Clement of Alexandria [2/5]<sup>96</sup>); (2) the

<sup>89</sup> Mk 13.22.

<sup>90</sup> Lk 18.1.

<sup>91</sup> Mt 5.28; 6.1; 13.30; 23.5; 26.12.

<sup>92</sup> Mk 2.6, 8; 11.23.

<sup>93</sup> Mt 5.8, 28; 9.4; 11.29; 12.40; 13.19; 24.48.

<sup>94</sup> Lk 1.66; 2.19, 51; 3.15; 5.22; 12.45; 21.14; 24.25, 38.

<sup>95</sup> So Justin Martyr (1/1), Clement of Alexandria (4/8), Origen (4/5), Basil (1/1), Cyril of Jerusalem (1/1), *Acta Philippi* (1) (1/1), Chrysostom (6/6), Nemesius of Emesa (1/1), and Theodoret of Cyrhus (1/1). For the references see the discussion and footnotes above.

<sup>96</sup> *Paedagogus*, 3.5,33.2 (Stählin, *GCS* 12:1.255.24); *Stromata*, 2.14.61.3 (Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 52<sup>3</sup>:3.146.9f.).

noun in the dative case γυναικῆς (“woman,” “wife”) has been substituted for the noun in the accusative (so Justin Martyr [1/1], Clement of Alexandria [2/3], Origen [1/5], Basil [1/1], Cyril of Jerusalem [1/1], *Acta Philippi* [1] [1/1], Chrysostom [6/6], Nemesius of Emesa [1/1], and Theodoret of Cyrhus [1/1]<sup>97</sup>); and (3) the preposition εἰς (“at”) has been introduced to justify the continued use of the noun in the accusative case (so the source[s] of the *Didascalia* and the *Acta Philippi* [2]).

I furthermore conjecture that the inclusion of the modifying phrase τοῦ πληστοῦ αὐτοῦ (“his neighbor’s”) represents a development inspired by a desire for more specificity and occasioned by the influence of Ex 20.17a. Within the *logos* itself Ex 20.13 (LXX): οὐ μοιχεύσεις (“you shall not commit adultery”) is cited as the “prohibition” clause. It is not difficult to see how easily the closely related “prohibition” of Ex 20.17a (LXX): οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πληστοῦ σου (“you shall not desire your neighbor’s wife”) could have influenced the addition of the modifying phrase τοῦ πληστοῦ αὐτοῦ (“his neighbor’s”) in the “assertion” clause πᾶς ἐμβλέψας εἰς γυναῖκα (“everyone [who] has looked at a woman/wife”) . . . ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτήν (“has already committed adultery with her”) . . .

And, as far as the *immediate* source is concerned, it is highly probable, given the evidence set forth above and the evidences I have provided elsewhere<sup>98</sup> with respect to other dominical *logoi* cited in the *Didascalia*, that the Didascalist cited the *logos* under discussion, along with many other *logoi* which he quotes, from a collection of *logoi Jesu*<sup>99</sup> comparable to that collection of “sayings of Jesus” found at Nag Hammadi, namely, the *Gospel of Thomas*.<sup>100</sup>

(To be continued)

<sup>97</sup> For the references see the discussion and footnotes above.

<sup>98</sup> See my *Studies*, vols. 1-3.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. A. J. Bellinzoni’s conclusions with respect to a parallel citation in Justin Martyr’s *Apologia* 1.15.1 (Otto, *CAC* 1:46.6ff.). See Bellinzoni, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr*, *SNT* 17 (Leiden, 1967): 57-60; 96-97.

<sup>100</sup> I will deal with this point in more detail in the next and concluding article in this series.