One of the many enigmas of the Didache is the opening phrase of chapter XIV, κατά κυριακὴν δὲ κυρίου, a *hapax legomenon* virtually universally regarded as a pleonasm, translated, in what is assumed to be a literal manner, as “on the Lord’s day of the Lord”, and taken by the great majority of scholars to be referring to Sunday. On the text the limited witnesses differ. The version cited above is that of Bryennios’s Greek text (Audet’s *H* or *Hierosolymitanus*). The Georgian version of the Didache (Audet’s *g*) suggests a Greek original reading possibly καθ’ ἡμέραν δὲ κυρίου, while *Apostolic Constitutions* VII (Audet’s *C4*) glosses the text of the Didache with the words τὴν ἀναστάσιμον τοῦ κυρίου ἡμέραν, τὴν κυριακὴν φαμεν. Audet finds the reading of *H* “impossible” and “bien difficile à justifier” and, on the basis of *C4* and *g*, argues that the original text read καθ’ ἡμέραν δὲ κυρίου (pp. 72, 240, 460). He explains the text of *H* as the corrupt result of two stages of interpretation and amendment. At the first stage, to explain the archaic form of the original ἡμέρα κυρίου, he suggests, a copyist added κυριακή in the margin. At stage two the marginal gloss was then, through negligence or due to distraction, substituted for ἡμέρα while the original κυρίου was retained, thus producing the unjustifiable pleonasm of *H*. This is something of a subjective, if imaginative, textual *tour de force*, motivated, one suspects, more by the conviction that Didache XIV has to do with the weekly Sunday “major” Eucharist than by a willingness to face up to the demands of the text-critical principle of the lectio difficilior. There are obvious problems with any attempt to reconstruct the Greek that may lie behind another language version of a text such as the Georgian Didache, and there are clearly dangers in any argument based upon the use and

---

2 Ibid., 72, 460.
3 Ibid., 72-73. Audet considers that the text of *H* has “l’air du résultat d’une gloss intrusive”.
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interpretation of the text of the Didache in later liturgical texts which reflect circumstances quite different from those of the original document. Furthermore, although the provenance of the Didache is still a matter of debate, recent decades have seen a growing consensus towards Syria/Palestine as its place of origin, and κυριακή is widely thought to be distinctively Syrian Christian terminology (see further below). This would support the case for the originality of the Bryennios text of XIV:1 and encourage every effort to make sense of that text as it stands. It is the purpose of this article, therefore, to offer a quite new approach to this disputed issue.

Problems with the Lord’s Day/Sunday Interpretation

If the so-called pleonasm with which Didache XIV opens refers simply to the weekly Lord’s Day, Sunday, as the majority of scholars and commentators assume, then it is difficult to explain the superfluities in the expression. For Sunday we would expect either ἡ κυριακή alone (Ign. Magn., 9:1), or ἡ κυριακή ἡμέρα (Rev., 1:10), or Audet’s ἡμέρα (τοῦ) κυρίου but not the supposedly pleonastic κυριακή κυρίου. Now the problem with this phrase is not simply the apparently unnecessary genitive, κυρίου. The initial problem is the word κυριακή itself. What is the origin of this word and what precisely does it denote? Rordorf, having discussed all the relevant texts and their possible interpretations in some detail, concludes that the phrase ἡ κυριακή ἡμέρα, or simply ἡ κυριακή, is a uniquely early Christian coinage, with no equivalent in Hebrew or Aramaic. He further affirms that it is a word distinctively associated with the early Greek-speaking churches of Syria (it is not found in the LXX) and that it refers “unambiguously to . . . Sunday”. Additionally it should be noted that Didache XIV:1 is possibly the earliest example of the use of κυριακή and, in the context of the Didache, could well be a further instance, as in the cases of fasting and
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