

Regrettably, her discussion is often guided by secondary sources rather than by careful exegesis. In reference to Paul and the letter to the Colossians, her book would have been much stronger if she had paid more attention to the marked differences both in terms of tone as well as substance among these letters. With regard to the Gospels, it would still seem that the Sabbath controversies reflect real debates within Christianity concerning permissible activities on the Sabbath. Moreover, to limit eschatological interest only to Hebrews, denying it in the Gospel of John and the letter to the Colossians, in particular, appears to bypass the evidence. The author herself suggests an eschatological interest in Lucan theology. Still, Mayer-Haas corroborates the diversity that characterized early Christianity, and her concern to find a Jesus that best accounts for this diversity is welcomed.

2262 Green Elf Dr.
Berrien Springs, MI 49103-9160
USA

Herold WEISS

Alan J.P. GARROW, *The Gospel of Matthew's Dependence on the Didache*. (JSNTSS 254) London-New York, T&T Clark International, 2003. xxxiii-272 p. 16 × 24. £70.00.

The relation of the *Didache* to the Synoptic Gospels, in particular Matthew, has been controverted ever since its publication in 1883 by Brycnnios. Two main lines of argument have been advocated. F.E. Vokes (*The Riddle of the Didache* [London 1938]) concluded that the *Didache* was dependent on Matthew, an assessment that was repeated by B. Massaux (*Influence de l'évangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée* [Louvain-Gembloux 1950]) and more recently by K. Wengst (*Didache (Apostellehre), Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Klemensbrief, Schrift an Diognet* [Darmstadt 1984]). But since the late 1950s a second line of argument has been promoted by H. Köster (*Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern* [TU 65; Berlin 1957]) and J. P. Audet (*La Didachè: Instructions des apôtres* [Ebib; Paris 1958]) who have argued that the *Didache* depends not on the written form of the Synoptics but on oral pre-synoptic tradition. This view is advocated in the recent commentary by K. Niederwimmer (*Die Didache* [Kommentar zu den apostolischen Vätern 1; Göttingen 1989]) and in the many essays of Jonathan Draper. Now, in this revised Oxford dissertation supervised by C.M. Tuckett, Alan Garrow argues a novel thesis: that not only does the *Didache* reflect pre-synoptic tradition, but that Matthew betrays dependence on a version of the *Didache* lacking only *Did.* 8,2b, 11,3b, 15,3-4 and 16,7.

The book is divided into two main parts, a compositional analysis of the *Didache* (13-156) followed by an argument that the contacts between Matthew and the *Didache* suggest Matthew knows the *Didache* (158-252). A compositional analysis is important to Garrow mainly in order to cast doubt upon the two dominant theses. For if, as most acknowledge, the *Didache* is

composite with components of varying ages and provenances, it is unlikely that every portion is literarily dependent upon Matthew. Neither, argues Garrow, is it likely that the *Didache* and Matthew drew coincidentally “on the *same* selection of Jewish paraenesis, liturgical modes of expression, Old Testament sayings, and so on”, as Garrow supposes that Köster’s theory requires (6, emphasis original).

Parenthetically, it should be noted that Garrow’s argument here is fallacious, based on a misstatement of the data. Of course Matthew and the *Didache* coincide at certain points — material that Garrow calls “uniquely similar material”. But the overlap between Matthew and the *Didache* is not nearly complete nor is it the case that they draw on the “same” selection of Jewish sources. On the contrary, Matthew contains much that the *Didache* lacks and *vice versa*. The situation is not logically different from that of Matthew and Luke: there is distinctive material as well as common material — in fact far more common material than what Matthew shares with the *Didache*. Given the commonalities, it is not *a priori* more likely that Matthew depends on Luke or *vice versa* than that the two use one (or more) common source(s). Nothing is settled in the abstract.

Garrow’s compositional theory describes five stages: a “base document,” liturgical in nature which was already connected with the Two Ways document in virtually its present form; a second document that added and qualified material on the Eucharist and the reception of visitors; a redaction of the two preceding layers which showed concern for financial issues and which distinguished Jewish from Christian practices; allusions to “the gospel” added after the editing of Matthew (8,2; 11,3b; 15,3-4); and finally, the addition to 16,7 “to repair a theological deficiency created by the disappearance of the last few lines of the textual tradition” of the H manuscript (11). Hence, Garrow’s five stages are:

1. “Base Document”: *Did.* 1,1-5; 2,2-5,2a; 6,1-7a.c.e; 4a; 9,1-5a; 11,3a.4-6; 16,1-6.8-9.
2. “Prophetic Document”: *Did.* 10,1-7; 11,7-9.12; 12,1-5.
3. “Modifying Teacher layer”: *Did.* 1,5b-6; 7,1d.2-3.4b; 8,2c; 9,5b; 11,1-2.10-11; 13,3a.5-7; 14,1-15,2.
4. “Gospel layer”: *Did.* 8,2b; 11,3b; 15,3-4.
5. “Jerusalem addition”: *Did.* 16,7.

Garrow’s compositional theory is in fact even more complex than what is indicated here, since he also discusses the composition of the “Base Document,” which in his view is comprised of a Two Ways document (1,1-2a; 2,2-7; 3,8-5,2a), a “Law Summary” (1,2b.d.e; 2,1); a “Sayings Onion” (1,3-5a); the *teknon* unit (3,1-7); and the Apocalypse, which is itself evolved in three stages. The “Sayings onion” (1,3-5a) is also the result of a complex compositional process, with the warning against fleshly appetites (1,4a) forming the “hub,” around which the second person plural admonitions to love of enemies (1,3b + 3c) and the second person singular admonitions to non-resistance (1,4b) and generous giving (1,5a) are organized.

At this point Garrow considers the relationship between the *Doctrina apostolorum* and the *Didache* and concludes that the *Doctrina* is dependent on *Did.* 1-6 rather than *vice versa*. The consequence of this conclusion for his overall thesis is that *Did.* 1,3-5a, which is lacking in the *Doctrina* might still

be considered part of the original layer of the *Didache*. This is a very improbable conjecture in my view, since Garrow is also required to assume that the *Doctrina* conflated the *Didache* with *Barnabas* in order to account for various agreements of the *Doctrina* and *Barnabas* against the *Didache*.

Not all of Garrow's compositional conclusions have direct relevance to his principal thesis of determining the literary relationship between Matthew and the *Didache*, discussed in the second part of the book. What is crucial from a methodological point of view is that he shows that Matthew betrays knowledge not only of the base levels of the *Didache* but also of its subsequent modifications. To this end Garrow attempts to establish a redaction of the base level. For example, it is generally noted that 1,5b-6 appears to restrict and qualify the preceding exhortation to unconditional almsgiving (1,5a) and does so by placing strictures on the one receiving. This insertion Garrow relates to 11,1-2.10-11 and 13,1-7 which also appear to be additions to 11,3-9 and 12,1-5 and while affirming the prophets' right to support offers criteria for distinguishing true from false prophets. One wonders whether 1,5b-6 would be better connected with 11,12, assigned to Garrow to his second layer, since both take a highly reserved perspective on receiving financial support. Garrow also treats the Lord's Prayer in 8,2b-3 as an addition as well as the polemical references to the "hypocrites" in 8,1-2a. That 8,1-3 did not belong originally with the surrounding instructions on baptism and Eucharist has also been argued by Draper. But what Garrow does not show is that the material in 8,1-3 is materially connected with the other redactional features in 1,5b-6; 11,1-2.10-11; and 13,1-7.

Armed with this compositional scenario, Garrow then argues that Matthew shows awareness of elements in the first three (but not the last two) compositional layers of the *Didache*: The base layer is the source of Matt 5,5.7.21.22.27.28.33.39.42.44.45.46-47; 7,12.13-14; 15,19; 16,27; 19,18; 22,38-39; 24,10-12.30-31; 25,8.31.43.46; 28,16.19-20; the "Prophetic Document" is the source of Matt 12,31; and the "Teaching Layer" supplies Matt 5,19.24.26; 6,2.5.9-13.16; 7,6; 10,10; and 28,19.

It is Garrow's argument with respect to the "Teaching Layer" that is crucial to his case that Matthew knows not just the tradition behind the *Didache* but its redaction. For example, he argues that *Did.* 14,1-15,2 belongs to this layer (inserted apparently to elaborate *Did.* 9,1-5a; 10,1-7) and that 14,2 (πᾶς δὲ ἔχων τὴν ἀμφιβολίαν μετὰ τοῦ ἐταίρου αὐτοῦ μὴ συνελθέτω ὑμῖν, ἕως οὗ διαλλάγῳσιν, ἵνα μὴ κοινωθῇ ἡ θυσία ὑμῶν) is a redactional qualification of 14,1 (121). Typically, says Garrow, the redactor agrees with the "host text" (14,1) and then modifies it (14,2). Since Matt 5:24 agrees with *Did.* 14,2 in the use of διαλλάσσομαι and uses δῶρόν σου ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θουσιαστηρίου for the *Didache*'s θυσία ὑμῶν, Garrow concludes that Matthew betrays knowledge of the *Didache*'s redaction and attributed the saying to Jesus because of the *Didache*'s title, "The Teaching of the Lord". Similarly, he argues that *Did.* 1,5b is a redactional qualification of 1,5a (on unconditional giving), and that Matthew has adapted the *Didache*'s καὶ οὐκ ἐξελεύσεται ἐκεῖθεν, μέχρις οὗ ἀποδώ τὸν ἔσχατον κοδράντην at Matt 5:26. He rejects both the solution that the *Didache* deliberately used Matthew — in that case, the *Didache* paid no attention to Matthew's context — and that the influence was unconscious — "this explanation requires a considerable level

of unconscious coincidence" (164) —, and instead posits Matthew's (deliberate) use of *Did.* 1,5b. Curiously, he does not explain why, in that case, Matthew ignores the context of the *Didache*.

A full evaluation of Garrow's argument would require at least a long essay. Some portions of his argument — for example, that *Did.* 16,3-6, 8 does not show dependence on Matthew 24, and that this material has probably influenced the composition of Matthew 24 — have already been argued by this reviewer ("Didache 16,6-8 and Special Matthaean Tradition", *ZNW* 70 [1979] 54–67). His case for Matthew's direct use of the *Didache* is much more problematic, both because his identification of "redactional" features in the *Didache* is at times dubious and his identification of redactional strata unconvincing — in particular the so-called "Teacher Layer," but also because he makes no effort to account for Matthew's omissions of materials which, one might think, would have appealed to Matthew, for example, the meditation of being "double-minded" or "double-souled" (2,4; 4,4) or the highly organized exposition of the second register of the Decalogue (3,1-7) or the elaborate rules concerning the reception of prophets which Matthew only alludes to in 7,15-20. If the thesis of Matthew's use of the *Didache* were to be persuasive, one would also have to show that the sequence of the *Didache*'s materials had an influence on Matthew's organization, just as Mark's order has profoundly affected both Matthew and Luke and Q's sequence has controlled the way in which Matthew and Luke fused Q with Mark. There is, unfortunately, almost no discernible pattern of borrowing from the *Didache* in Matthew.

Garrow's work deserves attention, not only because he has offered an innovative analysis of the composition of the *Didache* but also because he has argued his own thesis of Matthew's use of the *Didache* with careful attention to detail. I do not think that he has made a convincing argument but that does not mean that there is not much fine analytic work here.

Trinity College
University of Toronto
M5S 1H8 Canada

John S. KLOPPENBORG

George H. VAN KOOTEN, *Cosmic Christology in Paul and the Pauline School*. Colossians and Ephesians in the Context of Graeco-Roman Cosmology, with a New Synopsis of the Greek Texts (WUNT 2. Reihe 171). Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck 2003. xii-340 p.

The burden of this revised Leiden dissertation (supervised by Henk-Jan de Jonge) is to illuminate the relationship between Paul and the authors of Colossians and Ephesians. It achieves this by means of an analysis of their respective cosmology in the context of Jewish, Stoic and Middle Platonist philosophy. The clear distinctiveness of Colossians vis-à-vis the authentic Pauline letters, and of Ephesians vis-à-vis Colossians, is a basic point of departure.



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.