

The volume concludes with a list of “Publications of Gerald F. Hawthorne” (241-44), contributors (245-48), “Tabula Gratulatoria” (249-52), and indexes of modern authors (253-54) and “Scripture and ancient literature” (255-62). The volume contains some important discussions for a wide readership, although some are “in-house” discussions most meaningful in an American evangelical context. While this book was written by former students of Hawthorne, it is not a book for students, in view of numerous citations of biblical Greek and extensive sections of German.

This book is a fitting tribute to a capable and respectable scholar and represents the diversity and detail that has marked Hawthorne’s scholarship for nearly five decades. The book will probably be of most interest to those who are appreciative of Gerald Hawthorne’s scholarly works and teaching.

Fika J van Rensburg

*School of Biblical Studies and Bible Languages,
North-West University, Potchefstroom
sbbjjvr@puk.ac.za*

GARROW, A J P, *The Gospel of Matthew’s Dependence on the Didache.* JSNTSS 254. London/ New York: T & T Clark International, 2004. Hardback. ISBN 0-8264-6977-9. Pp. 272.

In the century since its re-discovery, the *Didache* has presented problems to attempts to place it in space and time. Hailed by the great Adolf von Harnack as an ancient and reliable key to understanding Christian origins, it subsequently fell into neglect because of the intractability of the question of source and redaction in the work. A majority of scholars deemed it to be dependent on Matthew’s Gospel and it was quietly relegated to obscurity. However, there has been a widespread recognition in recent years of its importance as a source for understanding Jewish Christianity and as a document which may hold the key to understanding the Sayings Source, “Q”. In this volume, which represents his doctoral dissertation, Alan Garrow analyses the relationship between the *Didache* and Matthew’s Gospel with meticulous care and concludes, as the title suggests, that far from being dependent on the gospel, the former represents a key source for Matthew. He argues that all the problems of literary relationship can be solved on the assumption that Matthew reworked and conflated Mark, *Didache* and Luke.

In the first part of his book, Garrow begins with a careful study of source and redaction throughout the whole of the *Didache*. He finds that twelve pre-existing sources or traditions have been utilized in five different redactional layers. A *foundational layer* incorporates much of the Two Ways section from various sources, including material found also in “Q” sayings in Matthew and Luke (1-6, excluding 1:6 and 6:1), together with instructions on baptism (7, excluding 7:1d, 2, 4b), on the eucharist (9, excluding 9:5b, 10:1-7), on apostles (11:1-6, excluding 11:1-2, 3b, 7-12), together with an eschatological warning (16, excluding 16:7). This base layer receives an interpolation of *material associated with prophets*, including a second eucharistic prayer (10:1-7), instructions on how to relate to prophets in the context of community worship (11:7-9, 12), and finally instructions on the financial provision for prophets (12:1-5). This composite document is then edited by a *modifying teacher*, who deals with problems which emerge in the course of time, such as the abuse of giving in the community (1:5b-6); minor adjustment to the Two Ways tradition (5:2b); the introduction of baptism in the name of the trinity (7:1b, d, 2-3, 4b); adjustments to fasting and the addition of the Lord’s Prayer (8:1-2a, 2c-3d); prohibition of the unbaptised from the eucharist (9:5b); addressing the abuse of the privileges of prophets (11:10-11); providing financial support for the prophets and teachers and offering instructions on the weekly eucharist (13:1-15:2). After the emergence of the Gospel of Matthew as authoritative in the community, the instructions of the *Didache* are systematically subordinated to the teaching of that gospel, wherever there is a divergence, in a new *gospel layer* (8:2b, 11:3b; 15:3-4). Finally there is an *eschatological interpolation* in the Jerusalem manuscript only (16:7).

Having established the character of the *Didache* as the product of multiple redactions, Garrow charts the occurrence of parallels between it and Matthew’s Gospel in the second part of his book. He correlates these parallels with the redactional layers in which they occur, to show that there is evidence of a literary relationship between the two texts at all of its layers and spanning 14 out of the 18 source components of the *Didache*. In doing so, he has already demonstrated that dependence of the latter on Matthew is extremely improbable since this would require “that numerous direct and indirect contributors to the *Didache* each happened to use, over a period of time, the same traditions that were coincidentally also gathered, at one time, by Matthew” (159). Garrow proceeds to examine each layer in turn, to show

that none of the parallels require dependence of *Didache* on Matthew, whereas dependence of Matthew on the *Didache* provides the best explanation for the relationship on each occasion, provided that Matthew is seen as a conflator of tradition he takes from Mark and the *Didache* and, he argues, also Luke.

Garrett takes two particularly telling steps to argue his case. In the first place, he shows that the redactional material of the *modifying teacher* follows a particular pattern, namely, to restate the rule from the earlier layers of the tradition, then to modify it, and finally to provide an external authority to justify the modification. Matthew is never cited as such an authority, as one would expect if the author of the *Didache* were using his gospel as a source. Instead he uses the Old Testament and other sources to legitimate his changes. Since the specific redactional material deriving from the *modifying teacher* appears also in Matthew, it is probable or even required, that Matthew knew and used the *Didache*. This position is argued in a second step by applying the methodology of his doctoral supervisor, Christopher Tuckett, who argued for the *Didache*'s use of Matthew in 1:3-6 on the basis of the principle that "if material which owes its origin to the redactional activity of [one author] reappears in another work, then the latter presupposes the finished work of [the former]" (187). In every case, Garrett argues, Matthean dependence would require the Didachist to extract from Matthew only the elements not common to Mark or Luke. Far more probable is the hypothesis that Matthew conflates Mark, Luke and the *Didache*, particularly since Matthew uses material which clearly derives from the redactional activity of the *modifying teacher*. While it is unattributed in the *Didache*, Matthew puts it on the lips of Jesus, since he has found it in a source which describes itself as *The Teaching of the Lord through the Twelve Apostles to the Gentiles*.

There is no doubt that Garrett has succeeded in making the most thorough-going and persuasive defence of the independence of the *Didache* from the gospels to date. It is to be hoped that this will enable scholars to re-evaluate this important Jewish Christian work from the first century. My reservations with Garrett's work lie in details, which do not affect the overall thrust of his argument. His depiction of its redactional history is not always convincing. In particular, I do not see that his case requires the complex assertion that *Didache* 9-10 represent two eucharistic prayers, something I consider unlikely. Nor, while it is not improbable, is the

reconstruction of the lost ending of the work on the basis of the *Apostolic Constitutions* VII germane to his purpose. Aspects of his argument may even undermine the case in some ways as, in my opinion, it does by relegating 16:7a to a late glossator, when it may represent a clue to the original link between resurrection and the martyr cult in Judaism, as I have argued elsewhere. Nevertheless, this book is an important contribution to the debate on gospel sources and it will surely arouse further debate in the field of studies dealing with Matthew, “Q” and the *Didache*.

Jonathan A. Draper

School of Theology and Religion, University of KwaZulu-Natal
draper@ukzn.ac.za

MARKSCHIES, Christoph, *Gnosis: An Introduction*. Translated by John Bowden. London & New York: Continuum, 2003. Hardback. ISBN 0-567-08944-4. £50-00. Paperback. ISBN 0-567-08945-2. £14-99. Pp. xi + 145.

Gnosticism was one of the most influential religious and intellectual movements in late antiquity. It is of particular importance for the study of early Christianity because many of the earliest known gnostic leaders were either Christians who attempted to explain Christianity within a gnostic framework, or non-Christians who reacted to, or transformed biblical doctrines from a Gnostic perspective. The study of Gnosticism is and has been a very contentious field, however. Issues of debate not only include the origins and sources of the movement, but its nature and even the very existence of such a movement. In a recent publication M.A. Williams (*Rethinking “Gnosticism”: an argument for dismantling a dubious category* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996]) indeed contends that Gnosticism as a religious phenomenon is an obfuscating modern construction that obscures rather than illuminates the texts and religious communities to which this label is attached (cf. also K.L. King, *What is Gnosticism* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003]).

In this context, the introduction by Marksches, a translation of a German work entitled *Die Gnosis* that appeared in 2001, provides a useful and accessible survey of the main texts and groupings. He prefers the term “gnosis” to “Gnosticism” because the former was used as self-designation by at least some religious groups in late antiquity, while the latter is a



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.