

July 2015

Frank W. Nelte

AN EVALUATION OF THE DIDACHE

"Didache" is a Greek word that means "Teaching". The title "Didache" is given to a brief so-called "Christian treatise" that was discovered in 1873 by the Greek Orthodox Metropolitan (i.e. archbishop) Philotheos Bryennios in the library of the Greek Convent of the Holy Sepulchre in Constantinople (i.e. Istanbul today), along with a number of other ancient documents like "the Epistle of Barnabas", "First and second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians", etc. Bryennios was 40 years old at that time, and he had already studied in Germany at the universities in Berlin, Leipzig and Munich. Bryennios was actively committed to introducing church reform into his church. His university training in Germany had suitably equipped him for the role of a reformer.

The manuscript Bryennios found contains the date of the year **1056 A.D.**, a date that was provided by the scribe who produced this manuscript. This date is not in dispute, and the physical manuscript Bryennios found certainly does not go back to earlier than the eleventh century. Many of the extant New Testament manuscripts also only go back to the 11th century.

Bryennios chose to publish in 1875 the various letters he had found, but only published the Didache in 1883. That is somewhat surprising in view of his close association with scholars at three German universities, and also since scholars frequently visited his library in the hope of finding something new. One would have expected Bryennios to be eager to share his find with the academic world. But Bryennios kept his find secret for 10 years, till eventually publishing it in 1883.

Prior to 1873 the existence of this anonymous document was unknown. Specifically, two Western Greek language scholars who had combed through the content of that library very meticulously, looking for anything out of the ordinary, in 1845 and in 1856 respectively, had not come across this parchment, which is also somewhat surprising, because it consists of 120 sheets of parchment, each measuring 7.4 inches by 5.8 inches, and bound under a leather cover. It is a fine specimen which one would expect to attract some attention from zealous Western researchers looking for new information. It is in fact of a better quality than most of the relatively older New Testament texts that have survived. But the Western scholars somehow never found this work in 1845 and in 1856, decades before Bryennios discovered it.

Roswald D. Hitchcock made a translation into English in 1884, the year after Bryennios had published the Greek text. Hitchcock divided the whole text into 7 chapters. Subsequent translators and editors have revised Hitchcock's organization, and today the whole text of the Didache has been divided into 16 chapters, which together consist of a total of 97 verses.

The separation into chapters is quite arbitrary, and the division into 16 chapters specifically was motivated by **a desire to compare it to the Gospel of Mark**, the shortest of the gospels, which also has 16 chapters (but almost seven times as many verses as the Didache). There was a motivation amongst scholars to elevate the supposed importance of the Didache, a manuscript they know was only produced in 1056 A.D.

Most verses consist of from one to three sentences in length. The whole work translated into English is basically the length of a short article, about 8 pages of print, which, incidently, required 120 sheets of parchment to write down. So it takes about 15 sheets of parchment in that format for one page of print in modern text format.

Today we would hardly divide a script of a mere 97 verses into 16 separate chapters, but that's what the editors have done in an attempt to elevate the importance of the Didache. In fact, 7 of those 16 chapters consist of 5 verses or less each. It is a short work.

The first line of this treatise reads: "Teaching of the Lord to the Nations by the Twelve Apostles", an obvious appeal to Matthew 28:19. Now that brings us to why this document is deemed to be so very important.

You see, some of the early Catholic so-called "church fathers" had mentioned a work they called "**Teachings of the Apostles**". They classified this as amongst the spurious works, alongside works like "The Epistle of Barnabas" and "The Apocalypse of Peter", etc. For example, Eusebius wrote around 324 A.D. in his "Historia Ecclesiastica", in Book III, chapter 25 the following:

"Let there be placed among the spurious works the *Acts of Paul*, the so-called *Shepherd* and the *Apocalypse of Peter*, and besides these the *Epistle of Barnabas*, and **what are called the Teachings of the Apostles**, and also the *Apocalypse of John*, if this be thought proper, for as I wrote before, some reject it, and others place it (i.e. the Book of Revelation) in the canon."

Note that Eusebius used the expression "what **are** called" and **not** "what **is** called". Eusebius may have had several different works in mind, rather than just one specific work? Those other early "church fathers" likewise used the plural "Teachings" and not the singular "Teaching" for the title of what they had in mind, perhaps a collective title for several works? Yet the Didache uses the singular "Teaching" in its title.

Those scholars today who have gone all gaga over the work presented by Bryennios (and very many have!) very conveniently overlook small details like this. They have convinced themselves that there was **one** work that circulated amongst the early Christians, and that what Bryennios presented is a faithful copy, made in 1056 A.D., of that one ancient work.

[COMMENT: The fact that Eusebius questioned the validity of the Book of Revelation is of no consequence to us.]

A number of those "church fathers" placed the works they referred to as "Teachings of the Apostles" in the "apocrypha" category (i.e. secret mystical books of unknown authorship) with questionable merit, and some of those "church fathers" rejected "Teachings of the Apostles" outright. Whatever those "Teachings of the Apostles" had been, they had not enjoyed the support of those early Catholic church leaders.

However, before Bryennios nobody knew anything at all about the supposed content of the "Teachings of the Apostles", how long it was or what subjects it addressed; or whether it was just one specific work or whether it consisted of several different works. The **content of the work or works mentioned by the "church fathers" was totally unknown** to all the scholars prior to 1883 when Bryennios published his find. In fact, there is actually no concrete evidence that what Bryennios found is actually connected with the "Teachings of the Apostles" that those "church fathers" made reference to.

But when Bryennios published this document, it was automatically and very conveniently accepted as being **the only surviving copy** of the "Teachings of the Apostles", **without any kind of outside validation** that might have been mentioned by early writers. So note!

The work Bryennios published, which is acknowledged as having been produced in the 11th century, is fully accepted as being a correct and legitimate copy of what early church writers (Eusebius, etc.) called "Teachings of the Apostles", **not because it contains verifiable statements that were quoted** by some or other "church father", but because it has the opening statement "Teaching of the Lord to the

Nations by the Twelve Apostles". **That opening statement is its sole ticket to acceptance and to fame.** There is not, and never has been, any other document against which this text produced in 1056 A.D. can be corroborated.

In spite of a gap of over 900 years between the supposed origin of the content of the Didache (anywhere between 60 A.D. and 150 A.D.) and the making of the only copy (i.e. 1056 A.D.) anyone has ever seen, most scholars have embraced the Didache as a supposedly valid representation of the teachings of the first century New Testament Church of God. **They have accepted the Didache without any kind of proof whatsoever**, based on nothing more than that opening statement "Teaching of the Lord to the Nations by the Twelve Apostles".

In plain terms: the academic world has accepted the Didache as a valid document not based on its content being compatible with some other verifiable document, but based solely on its title. The title "Teaching of the Lord to the Nations by the Twelve Apostles" is the sole justification for the acceptance of the Didache.

Now my primary concern here is not whether or not the Didache is a faithful copy of what early church writers referred to as "Teachings of the Apostles", or whether it is a spurious document, which I am fairly strongly inclined to suspect. But ultimately whether this document only originated in the year 1056 A.D., or whether it is a copy of some work that was originally written around 100 A.D. is not really important to me. Back in the early centuries "Teachings of the Apostles" **was already classified** even by Catholic theologians as "**apocryphal**"; and therefore even theoretical "genuineness of transmission" for this 1056 A.D. document does not get rid of that apocryphal status.

My real and greatest concern is as follows:

There is a huge question about **the validity of the text of Matthew 28:19** with its obviously Trinitarian baptismal formula. That subject I have covered extensively in the accompanying 111-page article entitled "**OUR TRINITARIAN BAPTISM FORMULA**". One of the arguments presented repeatedly in support of the triune baptism formula in Matthew 28:19 consists of **appeals to the Didache**, to claim that the Matthew 28:19 formula was already used by the apostles during the first century A.D., because this triune statement also appears in the Didache.

In this present article I will prove that the claim of the Didache to represent teachings from the original apostles is patently false! I will prove beyond any shadow of doubt that the Didache had nothing to do with any of the apostles, or with any other leaders in God's Church during the first two centuries A.D. or, for that matter, at any time thereafter. With this proof it really makes no difference whether the Didache is a genuine copy of something from around 100 A.D. or whether the Didache only goes back to 1056 A.D.

I will provide this proof by examining **the actual content of the Didache**. English translations of the Didache are readily and freely available.

ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF THE DIDACHE

I feel that, if you are in a position to do so, you should actually make the effort to look up the text of the Didache for yourself, at least briefly, even though I will present it in full in this article.

Here are some sources for the Didache on the internet.

1) Go to www.earlychristianwritings.com. On the opening page, under the years "50-120" select

"Didache". A new screen will open with 4 different English language translations of the Didache. Those 4 translations are:

- Roberts-Donaldson English Translation
- English Translation by J. B. Lightfoot
- English Translation by Charles H. Hoole
- English Translation by Kirsopp Lake

Look at some of them, at least briefly, to show you the minor variations amongst these translations.

2) Do a Google search on "text of the Didache", and you will find a few more translations, including:

- 1884 Translation by Roswald D. Hitchcock
- Didache Greek/English Interlinear by Wieland Willker, with English text by Philip C. Dybel
- The Greek text on its own
- Text of the Didache translated and edited by Tony Jones

The point is that the English text of this document which was written in 1056 A.D. is readily available for anyone who has access to the internet. I myself do not prefer one translation to another. Also, the fact that there are so many different translations just into English, in addition to translations into other languages, shows the importance that Academia attaches to the Didache.

While these translations vary somewhat amongst themselves, the things I will discuss apply to all of those translations. It is not a matter of "translation shopping" in order to make my points. Differences in wording amongst these different translations do not in any way impact the things I will explain. I will present the Tony Jones translation because it allows copying and reproduction with minimal conditions.

But before I present the full text of the Didache (about 8 pages in this particular format) I should point out something extremely important.

THE CARNAL MIND CANNOT IMITATE THE CONVERTED MIND

Since Old Testament times there have been people who have tried to produce forgeries of instructions from God. People have produced books pretending to be Isaiah or Daniel or some other servant of God. Such works are generally known as "apocryphal books" because they are identified as spurious.

The same happened after the Church was started on Pentecost in Acts chapter 2. Numerous works started appearing in the names of some of the apostles or of some other prominent men in the early New Testament Church.

Now there is always one thing that all such works do:

They invariably claim to present information or instructions either from God directly or from one of God's recognized servants.

But that presents such forgers with an insurmountable problem. Do you know what that insurmountable problem is?

The forgers are all carnal, unrepentant people, servants of Satan, since Satan is the obvious real author of faked religious teachings and instructions. Satan is the father of all lies (John 8:44).

Now in order to attempt to deceive people into believing that what they are writing is a message from God or from one of God's servants, they have to **try to imitate** how **a converted mind** (i.e. the mind of a servant of God) would think and reason.

BUT THAT THEY CANNOT DO!

The carnal mind is totally and absolutely incapable of mimicking the converted mind. The carnal mind cannot understand how the converted mind thinks and reasons. The carnal unconverted mind cannot see any difference between God's instructions and God's ways of doing things, and its own interpretations of God's instructions and God's ways.

The carnal mind actually thinks that it understands God's ways! The unconverted mind cannot see the difference between itself and a converted mind. And when the unconverted mind attempts to fabricate an instruction from God or from one of God's servants, even quoting a biblical text, then it will always and without exception present such instructions from a carnal and unconverted point of view! That's all the unconverted mind is capable of doing!

Can you understand that God is never the author of carnally-minded instructions?

I ask this question because this is something the carnal mind itself cannot understand, that God will never give carnally-minded instructions. The carnal mind is hostile towards everything that represents God (Romans 8:7), and that hostility prevents the carnal mind from understanding how God thinks and what God wants from us and expects from us, and what actions are actually pleasing to God.

The result is that **the carnal mind wrongly assumes that certain actions will please God**. Therefore the carnal mind will devise such actions that it assumes will please God. The carnal mind will direct the focus towards "do this" and "do that" in its efforts to please God.

You, a converted member of God's Church, should be able to learn to distinguish between carnally-minded instructions and instructions coming from a converted mind. You should be able to distinguish between a genuine instruction from a true servant of God (in this case the apostles), and a faked instruction from "Jezebel" trying to teach God's people (see Revelation 2:20).

The converted mind will simply never give certain instructions, which same instructions the unconverted mind will view as noble and as pleasing to God. There is a huge chasm between the converted mind and the unconverted mind; yet the unconverted mind cannot even see that chasm.

As I've said, this is something that the unconverted mind is simply not capable of seeing or understanding. This point is illustrated by the prophet Micah.

Wherewith shall I come before the LORD, *and* bow myself before the high God? shall I come before him with **burnt offerings**, with calves of a year old? Will the LORD be pleased **with thousands of rams**, *or* with **ten thousands of rivers of oil**? shall I **give my firstborn** *for* my transgression, the fruit of my body *for* the sin of my soul? He hath showed you, O man, what *is* good; and what does the LORD require of you, but **to do justly**, and **to love mercy**, and **to walk humbly** with your God? (Micah 6:6-8)

Micah illustrates the difference between the converted mind and the unconverted mind. The unconverted mind is highly impressed by giving generous gifts or making huge sacrifices **in an attempt to erase guilt**. The unconverted mind is impressed by outward actions and appearances. The converted mind, on the other hand, understands that God does not look at outward appearances, but at the inner motivations. 1 Samuel 16:7 makes the same point, that God looks at the heart while man looks at the outward appearance.

In the Didache we will see that the carnal mind can read biblical instructions, and not understand at all what those instructions actually mean. As Paul said, the carnal mind cannot understand the things of God (that's the essence of 1 Corinthians 2:11). And so when the carnal mind then attempts to use those biblical instructions, it will always get "the wrong end of the stick".

So when we read a work that **consistently gets the wrong end of the stick**, that consistently focuses on outward appearances, and that tries to micro-manage people's lives with endless do's and don't's, **then we are reading the work of an unconverted mind**. And that is precisely what we have here with the Didache.

Can you follow what I am trying to explain?

I will now present the complete, unedited by me, translation of the Didache. I will then spell out exactly why it is abundantly clear that **the Didache is not even Christian in nature**; i.e. it does not at all reflect the teachings of the true Church of God, and it is consistently the expression of a totally carnal mind. It has nothing whatsoever to do with any teaching that came from any of Jesus Christ's apostles. **The entire document is just so perversely carnal and creepy**. It presents Satan's version for how to live a righteous life.

It should also become quite clear that **the real author of the Didache was a monk** in the 11th century, either a Catholic monk or else an Eastern Orthodox monk, because the thinking presented in the Didache betrays **the mind of a monk**. See if you can also pick that up.

So as you read through the text of the Didache, see if you can recognize some of the sections that I will afterwards quote to illustrate these things.

Here is the complete text of the Didache. I am presenting the text that was translated and edited by Tony Jones, because the copyright holders give permission to reproduce this work as long as some basic requirements are met. Following the text I will then present my evaluation of it.

So here follows the full text of the Didache, with the following credits, in compliance with the requirements for reproduction.:

- 1) This text is translated and edited by Tony Jones.
- 2) It is under the protection of a Creative Commons license.
- 3) For guidelines on using this text please visit www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/3.0/us
- 4) This Didache text is available at www.paracletepress.com/didache.html
- 5) I have not made any changes whatsoever to the text by Tony Jones. It is presented exactly as I downloaded it, including any highlighting.
- 6) In no way do I imply that the licensor endorses anything I will say about the Didache. In fact, I am

confident that the licensor would vigorously and emphatically disagree with my evaluation of the merits of the Didache.

The Didache - The Complete Text

1 There Are Two Ways 1:1 There are two ways, one of life and one of death! and there is a great difference between the two ways.

1:2 The way of life is this: First, you shall love God who made you. And second, [love your neighbor](#) as yourself, and do not do to another what you would not want done to you.

1:3 The meaning of these sayings is this: Bless those who curse you, and pray for your enemies, and fast for those who persecute you. For what reward is there for loving those who love you? Do not the heathens do the same? But you should love those who hate you, and then you shall have no enemies.

1:4 Abstain from fleshly and bodily lusts: If someone strikes your right cheek, turn the other also, and be perfect. If someone forces you to go one mile, go two. If someone takes your cloak, give also your coat. If someone takes from you what is yours, don't ask for it back. You really cannot.

1:5 Give to every one who asks you, and don't ask for it back. The Father wants his blessings shared. Happy is the giver who lives according to this rule, for that one is guiltless. But the receiver must beware; for if one receives who has need, he is guiltless, but if one receives not having need, he shall stand trial, answering why he received and for what use. If he is found guilty he shall not escape until he pays back the last penny.

1:6 However, concerning this, there is a saying: "Let your alms sweat in your hands until you know to whom to give them."

2 The Second Commandment

2:1 The second commandment of the teaching is this:

2:2 Do not commit murder; do not commit adultery; do not corrupt boys; do not have illicit sex; do not steal; do not practice magic; do not practice witchcraft; you shall not murder a child, whether it be born or unborn. Do not covet the things of your neighbor.

2:3 Do not swear or bear false witness. Do not speak evil of others; do not bear grudges.

2:4 You should not be double-minded or double-tongued, for a double-tongue is a deadly snare.

2:5 Your speech should not be false nor empty, but fulfilled by action.

2:6 Do not be covetous, or greedy, or hypocritical, or malicious, or arrogant. Do not have designs against your neighbor.

2:7 Hate no one; correct some, pray for others, and some you should love more than your own life.

3 My Child, Flee Evil

3:1 My child, flee evil of all kinds, and everything like it.

3:2 Don't be prone to anger, for anger leads to murder. Don't be jealous or quarrelsome or hot-tempered, for all these things lead to murder.

e 3:3 My child, don't be lustful, for lust leads to illicit sex. Don't be a filthy talker or allow your eyes a free reign, for these lead to adultery.

3:4 My child, don't observe omens, since it leads to idolatry. Don't be an enchanter, or an astrologer, or a purifier, or be willing to see or hear about these things, for these all lead to idolatry.

3:5 My child, don't be a liar, since a lie leads to theft. Don't love money or seek glory, for these things lead to thievery.

3:6 My child, don't grumble, since it leads to blasphemy, and don't be self-willed or evil-minded, for all these things lead to blasphemy.

3:7 On the contrary, be gentle, since the gentle will inherit the earth.

3:8 Be long-suffering and pitiful and guileless and gentle and good, and with trembling, treasure the words you have received.

3:9 [Don't exalt yourself](#) or open your heart to overconfidence. Don't be on intimate terms with mighty people, but with just and lowly ones.

3:10 Accept whatever happens to you as a blessing, knowing that nothing comes to pass apart from God.

4 My Child, Remember

[4:1 My child, remember day and night him who speaks the word of God to you, and honor him as the Lord. For wherever his lordship is spoken of, there he is.]

4:2 Seek each day the faces of the [saints](#), in order that you may be refreshed by their words.

4:3 Do not initiate divisions, but rather bring peace to those who contend against one another. Judge righteously, and do not take social status into account when reproofing for transgressions.

4:4 Do not waver in your decisions.

4:5 Do not be one who opens his hands to receive, or closes them when it is time to give.

4:6 If you have anything, by your hands you should give ransom for your sins.

4:7 Do not hesitate to give, and do not complain about it. You will know in time who is the good Rewarder.

4:8 Do not turn away from one who is in want; rather, share all things with your brother, and do

not say that they are your own. For if you are sharers in what is imperishable, how much more in things which perish!

4:9 Do not remove your hand from your son or daughter; teach them the fear of God from their youth.

4:10 Do not give orders to your servants when you are angry, for they hope in the same God, and they may lose the fear of God, who is over both of you. God is surely not coming to call on us according to our outward appearance or station in life, but to them whom the Spirit has prepared.

4:11 And you, servants, be subject to your masters as to God's image, in modesty and fear.

4:12 You should hate all hypocrisy and everything which is not pleasing to the Lord.

4:13 Do not in any way neglect the commandments of the Lord, but keep what you have received, neither adding nor taking away anything.

4:14 In your gatherings, confess your transgressions, and do not come for prayer with a guilty conscience.

This is the way of life!

5 The Way of Death

5:1 The way of death, on the other hand, is this: It is evil and accursed—murders, adulteries, lust, illicit sex, thefts, idolatries, magical arts, sorceries, robberies, false testimonies, hypocrisy, double-heartedness, deceit, haughtiness, depravity, self-will, greediness, filthy talking, jealousy, over-confidence, loftiness, boastfulness—those who do not fear God.

5:2 The way of death is the way of those who persecute the good, hate the truth, love lies, and do not understand the reward for righteousness. They do not cleave to good or righteous judgment; they do not watch for what is good, but for what is evil. They are strangers to meekness and patience, loving vanities, pursuing revenge, without pity for the needy and oppressed. They do not know their Creator; they are murderers of children, destroyers of God's image. They turn away from those who are in need, making matters worse for those who are distressed. They are advocates for the rich, unjust judges of the poor. In a word, the way of death is full of those who are steeped in sin. Be delivered, children, from all of this!

6 See That No One Leads You Astray

6:1 See that no one leads you astray from the way of this teaching, since all other teachings train you without God.

6:2 For if you are able to bear the entire yoke of the Lord, you will be [perfect](#); but if you are not able, then at least do what you can.

6:3 Concerning food, do what you are able to do and be on guard against meat offered to idols, for that is to worship dead gods.

7 Concerning [Baptism](#)

7:1 Concerning baptism, you should baptize this way: After first explaining all things, baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, in flowing water.

7:2 But if you have no running water, baptize in other water; and if you cannot do so in cold water, then in warm.

7:3 If you have very little, pour water three times on the head in the name of Father and Son and Holy Spirit.

7:4 Before the baptism, both the baptizer and the candidate for baptism, plus any others who can, should fast. The candidate should fast for one or two days beforehand.

8 Your Fasts and [prayers](#)

8:1 Your fasts should not be with the hypocrites, for they fast on Mondays and Thursdays. You should fast on Wednesdays and Fridays.

8:2 And do not pray like the hypocrites, but rather as the Lord commanded in the gospel: Our Father in heaven, holy be your name. Your kingdom come. Your will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us enough bread day-by-day. And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors. And do not bring us to the time of trial, but rescue us from the evil one.

8:3 Pray this three times each day.

9 Concerning the Eucharist

9:1 Concerning the [Eucharist](#), give thanks this way.

9:2 First, concerning the cup: We thank you, our Father, for the holy vine of David your servant, which you made known to us through Jesus your servant. To you be the glory forever.

9:3 Next, concerning the broken bread: We thank you, our Father, for the life and knowledge which you made known to us through Jesus your servant. To you be the glory forever.

9:4 Even as this broken bread was scattered over the hills, and was gathered together and became one, so let your church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into your kingdom. To you is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ forever.

9:5 Allow no one to eat or drink of your Eucharist, unless they have been baptized in the name of the Lord. For concerning this, the Lord has said, "Do not give what is holy to dogs."

10 After the Eucharist

10:1 After the Eucharist when you are filled, give thanks this way:

10:2 We thank you, holy Father, for your holy name which you enshrined in our hearts, and for the knowledge and faith and immortality that you made known to us through Jesus your servant. To you be the glory forever.

10:3 You, Master Almighty, have created all things for your name's sake. You gave food and drink

to all people for enjoyment, that they might give thanks to you; but to us you freely give spiritual food and drink and life eternal through Jesus, your servant.

10:4 Before all things we thank you because you are mighty. To you be the glory forever.

10:5 Remember, Lord, your church. Deliver it from all evil and make it perfect in your love, and gather it from the four winds sanctified for your kingdom which you have prepared for it. For Yours is the power and the glory forever.

10:6 Let grace come, and let this world pass away!

Hosanna to the Son of David! If anyone is holy, let him come; if anyone is not holy, let him repent. Maranatha! Amen.

[10:7 But permit the prophets to make thanksgiving as much as they desire.]

11 Welcome the Teacher

11:1 Welcome the teacher when he comes to instruct you in all that has been said.

11:2 But if he turns and trains you in another tradition to the destruction of this teaching, do not listen. If he teaches so as to increase righteousness and the knowledge of the Lord, receive him as the Lord.

11:3 Act according to the precepts of the gospel concerning all apostles and prophets:

11:4 Let every apostle who comes to you be received as the Lord.

11:5 But he must not remain more than one day, or two, if there's a need. If he stays three days, he is a false prophet.

11:6 And when the apostle goes away, let him take nothing but bread to last him until his next night of lodging. If he asks for money, he is a false prophet.

11:7 In addition, if any prophet speaks in the Spirit, you shall not try or judge him; for every sin will be forgiven, but this sin cannot be forgiven.

11:8 But not everyone who speaks in the Spirit is a prophet; only he is a prophet who has the ways of the Lord about him. By their ways will the false prophet and the prophet be known.

11:9 Any prophet who orders a meal in the Spirit does not eat it; if he does, he is indeed a false prophet.

11:10 And any prophet who teaches the truth, but does not do what he teaches, is a false prophet.

11:11 When a prophet, proved true, works for the mystery of the church in the world but does not teach others to do what he himself does, he will not be judged among you, for his judgment is already before God. The ancient prophets acted in this way, also.

11:12 But whoever says in the Spirit, "Give me money," or something else like this, you must not listen to him. But if he tells you to give for the sake of others who are in need, let no one judge

him.

12 Welcome Anyone Coming in the Name of the Lord

12:1 [Welcome anyone](#) coming in the name of the Lord. Receive everyone who comes in the name of the Lord, but then, test them and use your discretion.

12:2 If he who comes is a transient, assist him as far as you are able; but he should not remain with you more than two or three days, if need be.

12:3 If he wants to stay with you, and is a craftsman, let him work for his living.

12:4 But if he has no trade, use your judgment in providing for him; for a Christian should not live idle in your midst.

12:5 If he is dissatisfied with this sort of an arrangement, he is a Christ peddler. Watch that you keep away from such people.

13 Every Genuine prophet

13:1 Every genuine prophet who wants to live among you is worthy of support.

13:2 So also, every true teacher is, like a workman, entitled to his support.

13:3 Every first fruit, therefore, of the products of vintage and harvest, of cattle and of sheep, should be given as first fruits to the prophets, for they are your high priests.

13:4 But if you have no prophet, give it all to the poor.

13:5 If you bake bread, take the first loaf and give it according to the commandment.

13:6 If you open a new jar of wine or of oil, take the first fruit and give it to the prophets.

13:7 If you acquire money or cloth or any other possession, set aside a portion first, as it may seem good to you, and give according to the commandment.

14 On the Lord's Day

14:1 On the Lord's day, gather yourselves together and break bread, give thanks, but first confess your sins so that your sacrifice may be pure.

14:2 However, let no one who is at odds with his brother come together with you, until he has reconciled, so that your sacrifice may not be profaned.

14:3 For this is what the Lord has said: "For from the rising of the sun to its setting my name is great among the nations, and in every place incense is offered to my name, and a pure offering; for my name is great among the nations, says the Lord of hosts. . . . For I am a great King, says the Lord of hosts, and my name is revered among the nations."

15 Appoint Bishops for Yourselves

15:1 Appoint bishops for yourselves, as well as deacons, worthy of the Lord, of meek disposition, unattached to money, truthful and proven; for they also render to you the service of prophets and teachers.

15:2 Do not despise them, after all, for they are your honored ones, together with the prophets and teachers.

15:3 And reprove one another, not in anger, but in peace, as you have it in the gospel. But to anyone who acts amiss against another, let no one speak to him, nor let him hear anything from you until he repents. But your prayers and alms and all your deeds so do, as you have it in the gospel of our Lord.

16 Watch Over Your Life

16:1 Watch over your life, that your lamps are never quenched, and that your loins are never unloosed. Be ready, for you do not know on what day your Lord is coming.

16:2 Come together often, seeking the things that are good for your souls. A life of faith will not profit you if you are not made perfect at the end of time.

16:3 For in the last days false prophets and corrupters will be plenty, and the sheep will be turned into wolves, and love will be turned into hate.

16:4 When lawlessness increases, they will hate and persecute and betray one another, and then the world-deceiver will appear claiming to be the Son of God, and he will do signs and wonders, and the earth will be delivered into his hands, and he will do iniquitous things that have not been seen since the beginning of the world.

16:5 Then humankind will enter into the fire of trial, and many will be made to stumble and many will perish; but those who endure in their faith will be saved from under the curse itself.

16:6 And then the signs of the truth will appear: the first sign, an opening of the heavens; the second sign, the sounding of the trumpet; and the third sign, the resurrection of the dead—

16:7 not of every one, but as it is said: "Then the Lord my God will come, and all the holy ones with him."

16:8 Finally, "Then the sign of the Son of Man will appear in heaven, and then all the tribes of the earth will mourn, and they will see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven' with power and great glory."

END OF THE TRANSLATION OF THE DIDACHE!

So now you know what the Didache is all about. Now you have actually read it in its entirety. So what do you think? Can you see what I was speaking about? Let's look at a number of key statements.

AN EVALUATION OF THE TEXT OF THE DIDACHE

In each case I'll quote or refer to a statement from the Didache and then present my comments for that statement. Let's start:

#1 DIDACHE 1:4

Abstain from fleshly and bodily lusts: If someone strikes your right cheek, turn the other also, and be perfect. If someone forces you to go one mile, go two. If someone takes your cloak, give also your coat. If someone takes from you what is yours, don't ask for it back. You really cannot.

MY COMMENTS:

This is an example of the carnal mind not grasping the real intent of the instructions it is quoting. The statement "if someone takes ... don't ask for it back" is utterly absurd! It sounds very righteous to the carnal mind; but that is not what God wants! And that is not what the Scriptures mean.

As all the apostles well knew, Jesus Christ said:

But know this, that if the goodman of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up. (Matthew 24:43)

Jesus Christ did not intend for us to just let people walk all over us, and take whatever they want from us. Christ said the above statement from the premise that we will certainly defend our goods and possessions. The author of the Didache did not really understand the mind of Christ.

#2 DIDACHE 1:5

Give to every one who asks you, and don't ask for it back. The Father wants his blessings shared. Happy is the giver who lives according to this rule, for that one is guiltless. But the receiver must beware; for if one receives who has need, he is guiltless, but if one receives not having need, he shall stand trial, answering why he received and for what use. If he is found guilty he shall not escape until he pays back the last penny.

MY COMMENTS:

This is weird! This is the carnal mind justifying itself. People ask you for things and so you give to them in accordance with "don't ask for it back". Then you find out that they didn't really have "a need" for what they had asked from you, and so they now have to stand trial and pay back every penny. This was written by a monk, and the whole line of reasoning is weird and totally carnal, and emphatically ungodly.

#3 DIDACHE 1:6

However, concerning this, there is a saying: "Let your alms sweat in your hands until you know to whom to give them."

MY COMMENTS:

That's also creepy! This is nothing other than some very carnal reasoning. Compare that mentality to Jesus Christ's instructions regarding giving alms in Matthew 6:1-4. Can you picture this Didache statement as a quote from any of the church leaders in the New Testament? It's creepy and carnal.

#4 DIDACHE 2:1-7

This is too lengthy to quote. See the section above for the actual text.

MY COMMENTS:

There is no way that any of the apostles would have said "the second commandment of the teaching is this:".

This is an attempt by the carnal mind to elaborate on the "second commandment", to love our neighbor as ourselves. The converted minds of the apostles would have started this "second commandment" with "honor your father and your mother ...". But that didn't occur to the unconverted monk who wrote this text. It is also an attempt to micro-manage the lives of people, as in: here are all the things you are not supposed to do.

This is not how the apostles taught the people in God's Church, by giving people lists of do's and don't's. That is not God's mind! True Christianity is not, and never has been, about adhering to a specific list of do's and don't's.

This is a very poor and extremely inferior attempt by the anonymous author to try to copy the way Paul taught God's people. It is also aimed very specifically at some of the issues that monks during the Middle Ages had to deal with (written in 1056 A.D.), and not things that were issues for people who had already come into God's Church during the first century A.D.

The manner of presentation here is also worldly, and not from a converted perspective. Satan gives people a list of things to do or not do. God's New Testament servants explain principles regarding how we are to conduct ourselves. The Didache is way too lazy to explain any principles. Just give people a list of things to do or not do. That's how Satan operates.

The points are also repetitious for no particular reason, other than that the anonymous writer couldn't organize his thoughts particularly clearly. No explanations, just statements of do this, do that, do the other thing, and don't do that. That is not how the mind of God works! And the apostles had "the mind of Christ" (1 Corinthians 2:16). No way did any of the apostles author this sort of garbage!

#5 DIDACHE 3:1

My child, flee evil of all kinds, and everything like it.

MY COMMENTS:

That's how monks very sanctimoniously addressed people, as "my child". So 5 of the first 6 verses here in chapter 3 start with "my child". That's not how the elders in the New Testament spoke to church members. Further, this verse is a wishy-washy instruction that doesn't tell us anything. It doesn't tell people how to identify "evil of all kinds", or how to correctly identify "everything like that". This is nothing but a stupid off-the-cuff platitude, which appeals to the carnal mind as "oh yes, that's righteous".

For the rest of chapter 3: these are largely repetitions of what was already said in chapter 2. What this tells us is that the unconverted anonymous writer of the Didache didn't actually have very much to say; so he repeated things several times to fill in some space. After all, you couldn't possibly make "the teachings of the apostles" too brief either.

#6 DIDACHE 3:9

Don't exalt yourself or open your heart to overconfidence. Don't be on intimate terms with mighty people, but with just and lowly ones.

MY COMMENTS:

This is a weird instruction! I suspect that this was intended by the monks in the Middle Ages to keep the general population in servitude to the ruling class. This is not something the apostles would have said. It is also once again an attempt at micro-managing people's lives.

Paul was familiar with some people in "Caesar's household" (Philippians 4:22). Peter baptized the centurion Cornelius (Acts 10:48). The statement "don't be on intimate terms with mighty people" is preposterous. It is not something the apostles would have preached.

#7 DIDACHE 4:1

My child, remember day and night him who speaks the word of God to you, and honor him as the Lord. For wherever his lordship is spoken of, there he is.

MY COMMENTS:

Again the "my child" approach. This statement is intended to instill respect for the priests and the monks. Note that this instructs people to remember the priest day and night; it is not talking about remembering Jesus Christ day and night. And then honor the priest just like you are to honor Jesus Christ. That's once again creepy! No way would any New Testament leader of the true Church have given this type of instruction. Can you see that? This is a carnal desire to receive the same honor as Jesus Christ.

#8 DIDACHE 4:6

If you have anything, by your hands you should give ransom for your sins.

MY COMMENTS:

This is a thoroughly pagan idea, that you should pay financially for your sins! How can anyone read statements like this and then still believe that this is "a Christian document"? This statement is in fact the antithesis of what true Christianity is all about. Can you see that?

#9 DIDACHE 4:7

Do not hesitate to give, and do not complain about it. You will know in time who is the good Rewarder.

MY COMMENTS:

This is not the way any of the apostles would ever have talked! As Peter told Ananias "while it remained, was it not your own, and after it was sold, was it not in your own power?" (see Acts 5:4). The apostles never pressured people to give anything.

By contrast, here in the Didache this is a demand to give to the Catholic Church, and to not grumble about all the money they demand from their people. The Didache is sprinkled with statements to give money to the church. This statement is a very carnal demand; there is nothing godly about it.

#10 DIDACHE 4:10

Do not give orders to your servants when you are angry, for they hope in the same God, and they may lose the fear of God, who is over both of you. God is surely not coming to call on us according to our outward appearance or station in life, but to them whom the Spirit has prepared.

MY COMMENTS:

That is a weird instruction! What does giving orders have to do with being angry? The cause for anger is not identified in any way. Do we have to assume that appropriate valid orders can not be given when something has aroused a feeling of anger? This is just a nice sounding platitude, intended to sound like something the apostles Peter or James might have said. But anyone who has God's Spirit would recognize that there is no way that any of the apostles would ever have given this type of stupid instruction to God's people.

Note once again that this is just an instruction that is thrown out at people, but without any kind of real explanation. People are just supposed to agree without ever using their own minds to think. This instruction is the product of a carnal mind.

#11 DIDACHE 4:12

You should hate all hypocrisy and everything which is not pleasing to the Lord.

MY COMMENTS:

More garbage generated by a carnal mind! Exactly what do you mean by "everything which is not pleasing to the Lord"? You are supposed to figure that out for yourself, right? That's not how a true minister of God, let alone one of the original apostles, teaches God's people.

Obviously, we are to hate everything that is not pleasing to God. But it is the job of the minister to explain what is not pleasing to God, and why that is so. But throwing this statement at people is all that the carnal mind can do.

#12 DIDACHE 4:14

4:14 In your gatherings, confess your transgressions, and do not come for prayer with a guilty conscience.

MY COMMENTS:

This is aimed at justifying the Catholic practice of having "Confession". This statement was written by a Catholic monk. This statement reveals how a carnal mind gets the wrong end of the

stick when reading James 5:16, and thereby revealing a complete lack of understanding of what James was speaking about. You are not supposed to confess your transgressions when you come to church services; that is simply not what our "gatherings" are for! This teaching here did not originate with any of the apostles.

#13 DIDACHE 5:2

The way of death is the way of those who persecute the good, hate the truth, love lies, and do not understand the reward for righteousness. They do not cleave to good or righteous judgment; they do not watch for what is good, but for what is evil. They are strangers to meekness and patience, loving vanities, pursuing revenge, without pity for the needy and oppressed. They do not know their Creator; they are murderers of children, destroyers of God's image. They turn away from those who are in need, making matters worse for those who are distressed. They are advocates for the rich, unjust judges of the poor. In a word, the way of death is full of those who are steeped in sin. Be delivered, children, from all of this!

MY COMMENTS:

This is just some rambling without any focus or purpose. A couple of comments here: The expression "murderers of children" is not the way the apostles spoke. This didn't come from the apostles.

The next expression, "destroyers of God's image", most certainly didn't come from the apostles! This was written by a Catholic monk sitting in some monastery. The apostles didn't ever talk about "God's image", certainly not something that could potentially be destroyed by human hands. The carnal mind that authored this statement clearly did not understand the second commandment of Exodus 20:4-5. Can you see that this was never said by any true servant of God?

The expression "in a word, the way of death is full of those who are steeped in sin" is nothing but waffling. It is an imitation of real instructions, but without telling us anything. That's not how Paul or James or Peter would have summed up the things they were trying to explain. This is a carnal imitation of real spiritual teachings, and it appeals to the carnal mind.

#14 DIDACHE 6:1

See that no one leads you astray from the way of this teaching, since all other teachings train you without God.

MY COMMENTS:

This line of reasoning makes sense to the carnal mind. But that is not how the converted mind reasons. This is again a counterfeit of the type of instructions that Paul gave to the Church.

This is wishy-washy without a real focus for "all other teachings". It is a weak imitation of Paul's injunction "if any man preach any other gospel unto you ..." in Galatians 1:9, where Paul was combating some very specific heresies.

The expression "since all other teachings train you without God" is trying to make this instruction sound reasonable, like a persuasive appeal to the carnal mind to accept this statement.

#15 DIDACHE 6:2

For if you are able to bear the entire yoke of the Lord, you will be perfect; but **if you are not able, then at least do what you can.**

MY COMMENTS:

This is perverse! Can you see the carnal mind in action in this statement? Under no circumstances would the apostles ever have said something like this; it is just so perverse. Yet the carnal mind can't see that. To the carnal mind this is a very reasonable statement.

Would God ever say: if you are not able to keep all of My laws, then at least do the best you can?

"The entire yoke of the Lord" includes that we keep the Sabbath and the annual Holy Days and all of God's commandments. So this statement says: if you are not able to keep the Sabbath and the annual days completely, then **at least do what you can.** Can you at least keep 3 Sabbath days every month? Can you de-leaven at least a part of your home? Can you at least try to fast for a part of the Day of Atonement? etc.

This statement is based on the false premise that God will give us "at least" some credit for **partial obedience.** This is all based on a total lack of understanding the mind of God. It is trying to be reasonable by human standards. This statement is just so totally carnal!

Can you understand that this whole Didache does not in any way reflect anything that the New Testament Church of God practiced or believed? It is nothing more than an ungodly document pretending to come from the apostles!

#16 DIDACHE 6:3

Concerning food, do what you are able to do and be on guard against meat offered to idols, **for that is to worship dead gods.**

MY COMMENTS:

This is more carnal reasoning. The apostles would have known how Paul explained this subject. So note! The monk who wrote this statement would have had ready access to Paul's epistles. Specifically, he could easily have looked up how Paul discussed this subject in 1 Corinthians 8:1 - 10:33. But he didn't do that.

So what this monk gives us instead is his own interpretation of what Paul had said. It is the carnal mind that believes that the problem with meat offered to idols is the worship of "dead gods". But that is false carnal reasoning!

Paul didn't say anything about "dead gods"! There is no such thing as "dead gods"! What Paul explained is this:

But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God: and **I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils.** Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils. **Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy?** are we stronger than he? (1 Corinthians 10:20-22)

Not eating meat offered to idols is a matter of avoiding "fellowship with demons"; and it is a matter of not provoking God to jealousy. Simply referring to "dead gods" reveals a complete lack of understanding. This is not how the apostles discussed this subject.

#17 DIDACHE 7:1-4

Concerning baptism, you should baptize this way: After first explaining all things, baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, in flowing water.

But if you have no running water, **baptize in other water**; and if you cannot do so in cold water, **then in warm**.

If you have very little, **pour water three times** on the head in the name of Father and Son and Holy Spirit.

Before the baptism, both **the baptizer** and the candidate for baptism, **plus any others who can, should fast**. The candidate should fast **for one or two days** beforehand.

MY COMMENTS:

This is the whole section in the Didache that deals with baptism. So note:

THE WHOLE INSTRUCTIONS HERE ARE PERVERSE AND PAGAN! IT IS CARNAL HUMAN REASONING!

There is absolutely no way that any of the apostles had anything whatsoever to do with these instructions here. The statement "baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" I have discussed in great detail in the accompanying article "OUR TRINITARIAN BAPTISM FORMULA"; and here I won't discuss it at length.

For a start, these instructions are trying to micro-manage what "the baptizer" is supposed to do. That's how the carnal religions of this world work ... they micro-manage the lives and actions of their adherents with endless do's and don't's.

The references to "**running water**" and "**cold water**" and "**warm water**" are stupid! They expose the carnal mind of the author!

This is also an attempt to justify with supposed "apostolic approval" the practice of pouring or sprinkling. We have here the description of a pagan custom, which custom was fully accepted and entrenched when this document was **written in 1056 A.D.**

It starts off with supposed baptism in flowing water, and it ends up with pouring a few drops on the head of the person. It is all such carnal, diabolical reasoning. Can you see that?

Understand that **the purpose of these instructions** here is to justify the pagan practice of sprinkling a person three times in the name of the Trinity, a custom that the writer of the Didache in 1056 A.D. himself also practiced.

Next, the instruction that "the baptizer and the candidate" should fast is absolutely weird! It is ungodly! That's not something the apostles ever commanded.

Even the Apostle Paul was not commanded to fast. Paul did fast for 3 days (Acts 9:9), but that was not because of baptism. Paul fasted for 3 days because he was going through the process of repentance and conversion in jet-propulsion mode; his is the fastest repentance, starting from totally carnal to totally submissive to God in less than 5 minutes, that has ever taken place.

And because he had been blinded and had just experienced a vivid contact with the spirit being Jesus Christ, Paul decided (probably he felt compelled) of his own free will without any outside prompting that he would fast. I believe that if Jesus Christ had decided to only send Ananias to Paul after 4 days, then Paul would have fasted for 4 days. Jesus Christ had told Paul "it shall be told you what you must do" (Acts 9:6), and Paul was going to fast until he would be told what to do. The circumstances surrounding Paul's baptism were unique, and those unique circumstances happened to include a prior fast of 3 days.

Next, the statement that "**any others who can, should fast**" is also perverse and diabolical! Why should others also fast? The carnal author of that statement obviously did not understand the real purposes for fasting. What is other people fasting supposed to achieve? This is a creepy instruction. And it didn't come from any leader of the true Church of God. Can you understand that?

Next, the statement that the candidate should fast "**for one or two days beforehand**" is equally carnal! Where fasting is concerned, God doesn't give us a choice like that. Make up your mind: is it one day or is it two days that you expect people to fast? But God never ever gives us an instruction like "fast one **or** two days". If God sets the threshold of "two days", then God will never offer a lower level "passing grade". **This statement exposes the carnality of the author!**

So here is the point regarding this section: The author wrote these statements for **the explicit purpose of endorsing the teachings and the practices of the Catholic Church** (and that includes the Orthodox Church). Every statement here is aimed at that specific purpose.

That includes the statement to "**baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit**". It is on the same merit scale as pouring water three times on the head, and as asking all kinds of people to fast for someone else who will be baptized. We know that these other statements are very clearly perverse, but we somehow expect the statement about "Father, Son and Holy Spirit" to be true and unassailable.

It cannot be disputed that this statement is presented in a perverse and ungodly context ... unless you accept sprinkling and pouring as valid forms of baptism.

Let's continue with the carnality of the Didache.

#18 DIDACHE 8:1

Your fasts should not be with **the hypocrites**, for they fast on Mondays and Thursdays. **You should fast on Wednesdays and Fridays.**

MY COMMENTS:

This is an extremely important statement to note, because it reveals the author's carnal mind so openly and blatantly!

The carnality of this statement is so staggering that it is almost unbelievable. The author clearly did not realize that he himself was being just as hypocritical as the people who supposedly fasted on Mondays and Thursdays! The author's hypocrisy is so blatant!

What a creepy instruction! Obviously this does not in any way reflect the mind of any of the apostles. This statement once again makes very clear that this whole Didache has nothing whatsoever to do with the true Church of God. It makes clear that this is a document that

describes and justifies the practices of a counterfeit Christianity. CAN YOU SEE THAT?

#19 DIDACHE 8:2

And do not pray like the hypocrites, but rather **as the Lord commanded in the gospel**: Our Father in heaven, holy be your name. Your kingdom come. Your will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us enough bread day-by-day. And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors. And do not bring us to the time of trial, but rescue us from the evil one.

MY COMMENTS:

For a start, the apostles assuredly would not have stated it this way. They themselves would never have appealed to any gospel account for authority! Such a claim is absurd! They would have appealed to personally having heard Jesus Christ say these words.

This expression "as the Lord commanded in the gospel" reveals that some devious person is trying to impersonate the apostles. This (i.e. from a gospel account) was how the writer himself knew about these words, but he didn't understand that the apostles themselves would have had a completely different perspective on Christ's direct statements, and would not have made the same appeal that he himself made.

Next, all the author here did is quote the incomplete account recorded in Luke's Gospel (i.e. Luke 11:2-4). Luke had not heard these words personally; he only recorded them second or third hand. Luke had not heard any part of Christ's ministry personally. The apostles themselves would have quoted the words recorded by Matthew in Matthew 6:9-13, the words all of them had heard. The apostles themselves would assuredly not have left out the words "**for Yours is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever**", recorded by Matthew. So this here in the Didache was written by some imposter.

Furthermore, all of the apostles understood quite clearly that Christ did not intend for us to endlessly repeat those specific words, rattling off those words from rote memory. And so we don't have a single example of the apostles, including Paul, ever instructing God's people to rattle off those specific words. But the author of the Didache didn't understand this; to his unrepentant carnal mind those specific words had to be repeated three times every day.

#20 DIDACHE 8:3

Pray this three times each day.

MY COMMENTS:

This is a creepy ritual, which has been taught in the Catholic Church. The carnal author could not comprehend that he was changing a teaching from Jesus Christ into a meaningless ritual. This ritualistic instruction obviously did not come from the apostles.

#21 DIDACHE 9:2-3

First, concerning the cup: We thank you, our Father, for the holy vine of David your servant, which you made known to us through Jesus your servant. To you be the glory forever.

Next, concerning the broken bread: We thank you, our Father, for the life and knowledge which you made known to us through Jesus your servant. To you be the glory forever.

MY COMMENTS:

This was written by someone who didn't understand what actually happened at that Passover. This was not written or spoken by any of the apostles who observed that last Passover with Jesus Christ.

THE SEQUENCE IS WRONG!

At the Passover the bread comes first and the cup comes second. Christ's body was broken before Christ's blood was shed. That is absolutely elementary!

So these instructions here were **written by some imposter**, who didn't know any better, and who certainly did not understand the significance of these two emblems of the Passover. And he couldn't even get the sequence correct from the gospel accounts, to which accounts he must have had some access. Can you see that?

This is not in any way a document from the early Church of God. It is a document from the false church.

Next, the apostles did not refer to Jesus Christ as God's "**servant**"! When Jesus Christ asked His apostles "who do you say I am?" (Matthew 16:15), the unequivocal answer was "You are the Christ, **the SON** of the Living God" (Matthew 16:16).

In **Matthew 16:16** the Greek reads "Christos **ho huios tou theou** tou zontos", i.e. "Christ the Son of the Living God".

In the Greek text of the **Didache both 9:2 and 9:3** read "dia **lesou tou paidos sou**", i.e. "through Jesus Your Servant".

The apostles would not have referred to Jesus Christ with the word "pais" (i.e. paidos in the text), because **that word doesn't show the respect that is attached to the word "huios"**.

James used the expression "**the Lord** Jesus Christ" (James 1:1). Peter used the expression "**our Lord** Jesus Christ" (1 Peter 1:3 and 2 Peter 1:2). John spoke about "with the Father and with **His Son** Jesus Christ" (1 John 1:3) and about "**the Lord** Jesus Christ, **the Son** of the Father" (2 John 1:3). Jude referred to himself as "the servant of Jesus Christ" (Jude 1:1). Paul spoke about "**His Son** Jesus Christ **our Lord**" (Romans 1:3) and about "**the Lord** Jesus Christ" (1 Corinthians 1:3).

The point is that none of the New Testament apostles referred to Jesus Christ after His death and resurrection as "**the servant** of God the Father", as the Didache does.

The reason why after His resurrection Jesus Christ is never described as "the servant of God the Father" should be obvious. After all, Christ had clearly prayed: "And now, O Father, **glorify You Me with Your own self with the glory which I had with You before the world was**" (John 17:5). The apostles knew that Jesus Christ has been given the status of sitting with God the Father on the Father's throne (Revelation 3:21). There simply is no "servant relationship" between God the Father and Jesus Christ.

But the carnal monk who wrote the Didache obviously did not understand that. And so he put the wrong words into the mouths of the apostles (i.e. referring to Jesus Christ as "God's servant"). Those wrong words betray that this work did not come from "dia ton dodeka apostolon" (i.e. from the 12 apostles), and that it is not really "didache kuriou" (i.e. the teaching of the Lord), as the subtitle of the Didache so boldly claims. It is a devious attempt to claim apostolic approval for the teachings of a false Christianity.

#22 DIDACHE 9:4

Even as **this broken bread was scattered over the hills**, and was **gathered together and became one**, so let your church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into your kingdom. To you is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ forever.

MY COMMENTS:

This is garbage! The carnal monk is here speaking about the broken bread at the Passover. None of the apostles would ever have spoken that way about the broken body of Jesus Christ. This was written by someone who had no idea whatsoever as to what the Passover is really all about. The imposter was writing about things he himself did not understand.

#23 DIDACHE 9:5

Allow no one to eat or drink of your Eucharist, **unless they have been baptized in the name of the Lord**. For concerning this, the Lord has said, "Do not give what is holy to dogs."

MY COMMENTS:

Here the carnal writer actually reverted to **the correct baptismal formula**, the one that is found repeatedly throughout the New Testament. He forgot about "the Father" and "the Holy Spirit" needing to be included in the baptismal formula.

For more details regarding the correct baptism formula see the article "Our Trinitarian Baptism Formula".

#24 DIDACHE 10:1

After the Eucharist **when you are filled**, give thanks this way:

MY COMMENTS:

This is creepy! You are not supposed to be "filled" by eating the New Testament Passover. Paul very specifically said: "and if any man hunger let him eat at home", i.e. before coming to the Passover service (1 Corinthians 11:34).

No way did any of the apostles ever say something like that. This is a very carnal statement.

There is one other giveaway that this was written by a Catholic, and that is this: it is the Catholic Church that established the custom of also **praying after a meal** (i.e. they talk about "being filled" and then praying)! That was not a custom of the apostles or of the New Testament Church. And there was also not a custom to pray at the end of the Passover.

This section of the Didache is a ridiculous prayer that people were supposed to pray after a meal or even after their "Eucharist". No way did the apostles or any other leaders amongst God's people come up with this syrupy prayer. This is typical of the prayers you can find in the Catholic Church.

In 10:2 and 10:3 it again uses the expression "Jesus Your **servant**". The previous comments apply again.

#25 DIDACHE 10:5

Remember, Lord, your church. Deliver it from all evil and make it perfect in your love, and gather it from the four winds sanctified for your kingdom which you have prepared for it. **For Yours is the power and the glory forever.**

MY COMMENTS:

This statement "for Yours is the power and the glory forever" is in the wrong place. It should have been added to 8:2. The writer should really have known better.

#26 DIDACHE 11:5

But he (the visiting apostle) must not remain more than one day, or two, if there's a need. **If he stays three days, he is a false prophet.**

MY COMMENTS:

This is totally weird! It is the product of a carnal mind trying to micro-manage what people can and can't do, and how long visitors may stay. The statement is absurd!

#27 DIDACHE 11:9

Any prophet who **orders a meal** in the Spirit does not eat it; **if he does, he is indeed a false prophet.**

MY COMMENTS:

This is likewise totally weird! Obviously not from the apostles.

#28 DIDACHE 11:10

And any prophet who **teaches the truth**, but does not do what he teaches, **is a false prophet.**

MY COMMENTS:

He is trying to say that the man must practice what he preaches. However, what he has actually said is an oxymoron, because it is impossible for a false prophet "to teach **the truth**". The apostles didn't say or teach this.

The writer didn't know the principle that "a good understanding have all they that do His commandments" (Psalm 111:10); and the reverse is equally true, that all those who don't obey God's commandments will lack a good understanding. So false prophets cannot really teach the truth, though they certainly can teach Catholic doctrines.

#29 DIDACHE 12:2

If he who comes is a transient, assist him as far as you are able; but **he should not remain with you more than two or three days**, if need be.

MY COMMENTS:

Just what has this monk got against visitors staying more than three days? This instruction is weird! It imputes some kind of wrong motive to the visitors. It is always the host that must decide how long he will allow visitors to stay. And here the carnal writer is trying to control the host's decisions, something that is simply not his business. The length of time that a visitor may be allowed to stay is simply not the Church's business! This instruction assuredly did not come from the apostles.

#30 DIDACHE 13:3

Every first fruit, therefore, of the products of vintage and harvest, of cattle and of sheep, should be given as first fruits to **the prophets, for they are your high priests.**

MY COMMENTS:

This is a **totally pagan** idea! Can you see that? This is a Catholic monk writing, propping up the status and prestige of the priests in his church.

The New Testament Church of God did not ever have any human priests! This statement once again makes quite clear that this whole document has nothing whatsoever to do with God's Church. Someone like Simon Magus could have written the Didache. I know that Simon Magus obviously didn't write it since it was only written in 1056 A.D., but it fits Simon Magus' character and his mentality and his church.

Jesus Christ is the only High Priest we have!

#31 DIDACHE 16:1

Watch over your life, that your lamps are never quenched, and that your loins are never unloosed. Be ready, for you do not know on what day your Lord is coming.

MY COMMENTS:

Just what is that supposed to mean? Sounds like the writer was trying to sound erudite. Those are lofty words that don't actually tell you anything. That's not apostolic teaching either.

#32 DIDACHE 16:3

For in the last days false prophets and corrupters will be plenty, and **the sheep will be turned into wolves**, and love will be turned into hate.

MY COMMENTS:

This is not what the apostles taught! This is something the unknown writer made up in his own mind. It is not a case of sheep ever being turned into wolves! It is really a case of wolves having managed to disguise themselves as sheep for a period of time. At some point it becomes apparent what they have been all along ... wolves!

This is another example of the carnal mind getting the wrong end of the stick.

#33 DIDACHE 16:4-8

The text is too long to reproduce here. See the text presented earlier.

MY COMMENTS:

This is an extremely poor version of what is recorded in Matthew 24. The apostles would have taught Matthew 24 (and Mark 13 and Luke 21), and not the very poor paraphrase as presented in Didache 16:4-8. This poor paraphrase is inaccurate and glosses over the really important statements, focusing on generalities instead.

Instead of saying "oh yes, Didache 16:4-8 mentions this point and that point and that point", we should be saying "**why** does Didache 16:4-8 jumble all these things together as if they were being laid out on a table in a garage sale?" It creates confusion, not understanding. That didn't come from the apostles either.

The next two points are not presented as proof for anything. I realize that they can be argued against in certain ways. I present them simply as something that you might at least consider as a part of the greater overall picture, so you yourself can think these points through and reach your own conclusions.

#34 THE TITLE OF THE DIDACHE

Here is the first of these two points.

In Matthew 28:19 Jesus Christ said they were to make disciples "of all nations", and the Greek word "ethnos" (i.e. nations) was mostly used to refer to non-Israelite nations. So yes, there is a command to go to other nations.

But we also see that **in practice it was the Apostle Paul** who went to the non-Israelite nations, while the original apostles went to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (see Matthew 10:6). That was because Jesus Christ sent Paul to the non-Israelite nations, implying that **with Paul's appointment to this responsibility the original apostles were to be less responsible for those non-Israelite nations from then onwards.**

The Apostle Paul himself said that "**the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me**" (Galatians 2:7), and that the gospel of the circumcision was committed to Peter. In this statement Paul viewed himself as on a par with the Apostle Peter, both of them having been given **their own specific areas of responsibility.**

Matthew 28 occurred before God had even called Paul. Later when Paul was being called by God, Jesus Christ told Ananias "he (Paul) is a chosen vessel unto Me, **to bear My name before the nations**, and kings and the children of Israel" (Acts 9:15). So **the calling of the Apostle Paul resulted in a division of areas of responsibility**, which division of responsibilities had not yet been established at the conclusion of the gospel accounts. Preaching to and teaching the non-Israelite nations **became** primarily Paul's responsibility.

It is not as if Peter and the other original apostles couldn't work amongst non-Israelite nations. Yes, they could preach to anyone of any national background. And Peter had baptized Cornelius, but that was in the area of Palestine (i.e. in Caesarea), and Peter had not traveled to a foreign land for this baptism. But from the time that Jesus Christ commissioned Paul, after Paul had been taught by Jesus Christ in Arabia, preaching to non-Israelite nations became predominantly Paul's responsibility.

So here is the point:

The author of the Didache obviously did not grasp these finer details. And so he titled his work "didache kuriou dia ton dodeka apostolon tois ethnesin", meaning "**Teaching of the Lord to the Nations by the**

Twelve Apostles".

The problem is: it wasn't really "the 12 Apostles" that went and taught "**the nations**", and the word "nations" is used to refer primarily to non-Israelite nations. Those of the 12 apostles that did perhaps go to "the nations" afar off (rather than to the lost sheep of Israel afar off) didn't return to Jerusalem to share their experiences with the two and later three apostles still in Jerusalem (i.e. Peter and James, see Galatians 1:18-19), and therefore they could not have contributed to any document representing the teachings of all 12 of the original apostles. (Galatians 2:9 also mentions John as being in Jerusalem.)

The Didache implies that this "teaching by the apostles" was sent out somewhat like the letters Paul sent out. By way of comparison, the English translation of the Didache here has 3043 words, and the Book of Ephesians in the KJV has 3033 words. So the Didache is close to the size of the Book of Ephesians.

In Acts 9 Paul was called by Jesus Christ. Then Paul went into Arabia for three years (Galatians 1:16-17). After that perhaps Paul spent another three years in Damascus (Galatians 1:18), or perhaps that three-year period is the same as the time he spent in Arabia? At any rate, either three years or six years after he had been called, Paul went to Jerusalem and found only two apostles there, i.e. Peter and James. Now Peter and James would hardly have sent out a set of teachings and then titled those teachings as coming from "the 12 apostles". That seems fairly clear to me.

And of course, teaching "the nations" had by then really become Paul's responsibility. And Paul specifically said:

Yea, so have I strived to preach the gospel, **not** where Christ was named, **lest I should build upon another man's foundation**: (Romans 15:20)

Paul clearly felt that it was his responsibility to preach to the non-Israelite nations.

The author of the Didache presented something in the name of the 12 apostles, when he really should have presented this as teaching coming from the Apostle Paul "to the nations". Presenting these teachings to the nations as coming from the 12 apostles is somewhat like the 12 apostles wanting to work in another man's territory, as per Romans 15:20. You follow?

The author of the Didache was familiar with Matthew 28:19-20 and assumed that the 12 apostles then went to all the nations. But the author did not understand that **the later calling of the Apostle Paul resulted in a division in the areas of responsibility** between the 12 apostles on the one hand and the Apostle Paul on the other hand. And so the author of the Didache gave his work the wrong title. Oh well, we all make mistakes ...

#35 THE 12 APOSTLES

Let's consider the second point.

Calling this document "Teaching ... **by the 12 Apostles**" is also a problem from another perspective. There is no such thing as teachings ever being represented as coming **from a group of men!** The title makes it sound like the 12 apostles functioned like a committee, and then issued their doctrinal statement in the form of these carnal teachings.

Teachings don't emanate from some "collective". That might perhaps be true for some Communist regime, that "a collective" issues laws and instructions and rules. But teaching God's people the truth of God doesn't work that way.

If the Apostle **Peter** was presenting some teachings, then it was from the Apostle Peter. And so we have the books of 1. Peter and 2. Peter. And if the Apostle **John** was presenting some teachings, then it was from the Apostle John. And so we have the three epistles from John. And if the Apostle **James** was presenting some teachings, then it was from the Apostle James. And so we have the Epistle of James.

The fact that we have specific teachings presented in the General Epistles by James and Peter and John and Jude proves that the apostles didn't just lump all their teachings together under one title. That is simply not the way teachings for God's people are ever presented ... lumping them together in some anonymous collection.

The Didache makes everything anonymous. Thus we are not told: Which one of the "12 apostles" supposedly came up with the hypocritical idea of fasting on Wednesdays and Fridays instead of Mondays and Thursdays? Which one of the "12 apostles" supposedly came up with the pagan idea of pouring water instead of baptizing by immersion? Which one of the "12 apostles" supposedly came up with the absurd idea that visiting ministers should not be allowed to stay for 3 or more days? etc. It is all shrouded in anonymity under the general heading of "the 12 apostles". Never mind that by 49 A.D. there were only three apostles left in Jerusalem ... James and Peter and John (see Galatians 2:9).

The title "teachings ... by the 12 Apostles" was intended to confer authority that would not be challenged to this document. If it comes from the 12 apostles then you are not supposed to question anything, is the reasoning underlying this title. You are supposed to be impressed by the claimed source of these teachings and therefore gullibly accept them.

Well, so much for an examination of the actual content of the Didache.

The whole document is basically an example of how the carnal mind can read the New Testament and then repeatedly attach wrong interpretations to the things it has read. Time and again the carnal mind misses the actual intended meaning, and attaches its own wrong applications to the biblical instructions it has read. This is vividly illustrated by the Didache. However, the carnal mind itself cannot see that.

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR US?

For the carnal mind the Didache is a very religious document with important teachings. The carnal mind does not really see any problems with this document.

However, are **you** able to see the numerous problems with the Didache? Can you see where this clashes with what the apostles themselves would have taught? Can you see that the entire Didache is nothing more than a very arbitrary collection of various religious teachings of the Catholic (or Orthodox) Church?

Can you see that it is the product of a carnal unrepentant mind, one that focuses on outward appearances, because that is all the carnal mind is capable of doing when it wants to "talk religion"?

If you can see that, then you would also realize that the Didache in fact does not tell us anything at all about the early congregations of the New Testament Church of God. The Didache does not at all tell us what the apostles taught and what they practiced. **It does nothing more than tell us what a falsely called Christianity taught and believed.**

And there is no evidence of any kind that the Didache actually existed before 1056 A.D., the year the Didache was written. There is nothing to support an earlier existence of the content of the Didache. It is

on the same level as the apocryphal books that were produced during Old Testament times.

The Didache is in fact a document that was produced under false pretenses (i.e. claiming to present teachings from the original apostles) in 1056 A.D. for the explicit purpose of providing a supposed apostolic endorsement for various very questionable religious practices of the Catholic Church. The claim that it is a faithful copy of a first century document is not supported by anything outside of the Didache itself. There is no proof in existence that can lead the Didache back to the first or second century. Claims to that effect are unsubstantiated.

However, it doesn't really make a difference whether the Didache only originated in the year 1056 A.D., the year it was written, or whether it is a more-or-less faithful copy of an earlier document that was produced around 100 A.D. The content of the Didache is garbage, and it is immaterial whether it is "old garbage" or whether it is "young garbage".

The Didache lays out the carnal mind's way of living a Christian life. But for a converted member of God's true Church **there is nothing credible in the Didache**. The reference to the trinitarian baptism formula in Didache 7:1, **written in 1056 A.D.**, is of no more value than the subsequent reference to baptizing a person by pouring water on his head three times. That formula was obviously needed to justify the well-established custom of pouring water "three times" in the Catholic version of "baptism".

When there was no need to justify doing something "three times", then the baptism formula reverted to being simply "in the name of the Lord" in Didache 9:5. This illustrates that the Didache is not even consistent within its own text. It also illustrates that perhaps baptism "in the name of the Lord" may still have been practiced occasionally as late as the 11th century.

For the Church of God the Didache has no credibility of any kind. And it certainly does not support any teachings that were practiced by the first and second century Church of God congregations.

Can you recognize that when everything that the Didache discusses is compared to the Bible, that in the Didache everything is misunderstood or misapplied in some way? It simply doesn't get anything right. This fact unavoidably calls the "in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit" statement into question. This statement is deeply embedded in **a document that distorts all the true teachings of the New Testament** that it happens to discuss. This fact, as demonstrated throughout this article, discredits the trinity formula for baptism.

Let's consider one more point.

SCHOLARS AND THE DIDACHE

The scholarly world has embraced the Didache as something wonderful that was supposedly produced by the first century Church of God. I have just shown that the Didache is in fact nothing more than utter garbage, produced by the false church. So why these totally opposite reactions to the Didache?

Scholars look at the various New Testament statements that are found in the Didache and they seek to establish great merit for these statements. The fact that all those statements, which basically present poor and indiscriminate paraphrases of statements found in the New Testament, are randomly jumbled together without any kind of discernment for context, does not diminish the value of the Didache in the eyes of Academia. And the statements in the Didache that are garbage, academia views as supposed **expressions of devoutness** amongst early Christians.

Consider this analogy:

Let's suppose you have a large drinking glass standing in front of you. The glass is filled **75%** with **pure wholesome orange juice**. The remaining **25%** of the glass is then filled with **highly concentrated arsenic**. Now you have a full glass and the content is stirred well to achieve a uniform mixing. That is what the Didache is like!

Now **the scholars** look at and also extensively test this Didache glass, and all they can see is the 75% orange juice. So they rave about the nutritional benefits of that orange juice. When the presence of arsenic is pointed out to them, they say: that's not a problem because we have ways to filter out all that arsenic, and then we can still get the benefits of that pure orange juice. Their desire for the orange juice blinds them to the fatal effects of arsenic. They believe that the value of the orange juice should not be diminished simply because there is also some arsenic present. The scholars will seek to retrieve from this mixture as much of the original orange juice as they possibly can.

The converted mind also looks at and extensively tests this Didache glass. But the converted mind reaches a completely different conclusion. For the converted mind the presence of the arsenic has totally and completely destroyed any value that might have been attached to the originally pure orange juice. The converted mind realizes that the mixture in its totality is highly toxic, and that there is nothing good that can be salvaged from that mixture. The converted mind will attach zero value to the orange juice component of that mixture, because the orange juice is severely tainted and degraded by the presence of the arsenic. In this context the orange juice has no value at all for the converted mind. So the converted mind rejects the entire glass and wants nothing to do with it.

In this analogy "the orange juice" refers to biblically correct statements and principles; and the "arsenic" refers to pagan practices and carnal teachings.

The carnal mind is blinded by the supposed value of the "orange juice", the statements that are more or less biblically sound. And since the carnal mind already starts out with a high tolerance for "arsenic", therefore the presence of some additional "arsenic", i.e. pagan customs and traditions and beliefs and practices, isn't really a major problem for the carnal mind.

The converted mind, by contrast, is not really looking for statements it can agree with. The converted mind looks at the whole picture. And when the whole overall picture is toxic, then the converted mind recognizes that biblically correct statements in that context are of no more value than Psalm 91:11-12 ("He shall give His angels charge concerning You ...") has any value in the context of Matthew 4:6 ("cast Yourself down for it is written ...").

The context of Matthew 4:6 has eliminated any value of a correct quotation of Psalm 91:11-12. It is not that Psalm 91:11-12 is not a valid Scripture. It is very much a valid Scripture! But it is meaningless in the way Satan attempted to apply this Scripture in Matthew 4:6.

Likewise, it is not that all the biblically (more or less) correct statements in the Didache are somehow not valid points. They are valid points. But they have become meaningless and valueless in the context of the Didache, because in the Didache those correct statements are misapplied and misrepresented, just as surely as Satan misapplied the Scriptures in Matthew chapter 4.

And for that reason the converted mind wants nothing to do with all the seemingly "correct" statements in the Didache. The converted mind knows that it cannot filter out the pure "orange juice" from the highly toxic "arsenic" environment. The whole glass has to be rejected.

So as far as I am concerned, there is no value whatsoever to any statement in the Didache. I know that some of them are poor paraphrases of biblical statements, but the highly toxic context in which those statements appear has eliminated the value those statements might have had, just like the presence of arsenic destroys the value of orange juice.

We need to understand that the appearance of orange juice is supposed to blind us to the presence of arsenic. Likewise, the presence of biblically correct statements, presented indiscriminately, is supposed to blind us to the heretical and the carnal statements liberally strewn all over the Didache.

There is one more point here that we should also note.

Hundreds of scholars have examined the Didache. Most of them have accepted it as a record of what the early New Testament Church of God supposedly believed and taught. Perhaps some scholars question whether this document can actually be led back to the first century? I don't know. However, there isn't a single scholar who has examined the Didache, and who has then concluded that the Didache is a record of **what the false church**, the one that has usurped the name of Jesus Christ, **believed and taught!**

There isn't a scholar around who understands that the Didache was produced by "Jezebel" (see Revelation 2:20). And yet, any converted mind that reads the Didache from beginning to end will immediately recognize the Didache's connection with the false church. A converted mind will recognize that there is nothing "Church of God" about the Didache. But the scholarly minds can't see that. They simply cannot recognize carnal thinking and reasoning.

So don't expect any scholar to agree with the evaluation of the Didache that I have presented in this article. But you, a converted member of God's Church, should immediately recognize the carnality of something like: don't fast on Mondays and Thursdays like the hypocrites, you should instead fast on Wednesdays and Fridays; if you don't have enough water for baptizing then just go ahead and pour water three times on the head of the person to be baptized; etc.

And if you haven't already done so, be sure to also read the article "Our Trinitarian Baptism Formula".

Frank W Nelte