

BOOK REVIEW

Alan J.P. Garrow, *The Gospel of Matthew's Dependence on the Didache* (JSNTSup 254; New York/London: T & T Clark, 2004). xxxiii + 272 pp. Hdbk. \$140.00 USD.

The Gospel of Matthew's Dependence on the Didache by Alan Garrow is his attempt to promulgate the idea that the *Didache* did not rely on Matthew for its inspiration, but that Matthew used the *Didache* as a source for his information.

Within the introduction, Garrow acceptably outlines the Greek version of the *Didache* that he is using and gives his own translation. Within this section, Garrow also indicates what redactional layer each section belongs to, the relationship to previously existing traditions and, where possible, each section's Matthean parallel.

Garrow opens with a general introduction to the *Didache* and presents some background information to its initial discovery. Here he also presents his thesis and outline for the book. Garrow believes that there are a number of redactional layers within the *Didache* and that, by understanding these layers, a number of the assumptions regarding the *Didache's* reliance on Matthew are exposed.

The Gospel of Matthew's Dependence on the Didache is divided into two Parts. The first Part describes a number of textual issues and Garrow's proposed redactional history of the *Didache*. The second Part focuses on the parallel texts of Matthew and the *Didache* and their different potential relationships.

Chapter 2 discusses the similarities between *Didache* 9 and 10. These two chapters have a number of similarities, especially regarding the issue of overlapping content in the Eucharistic prayers. In order to explain this phenomenon, Garrow refers to Jewish literature to help understand prayer during this time period. This would have been more helpful had Garrow better introduced his sources and summarized their content.

Garrow concludes that these two chapters are parallel accounts of alternate traditions and that the redactor decided to incorporate both of them.

In Chapter 3, Garrow tackles the issue regarding the lost ending of the *Didache*. Garrow makes good use of Greek to develop a number of different interpretations of this section. By giving his interpretation, Garrow then decides to try his hand at reconstructing the ending, based on *Apostolic Constitutions* Book VII. Although there are a number of parallels between these two works, it has been shown that reconstructing a work is often very imprecise. Garrow does make good use of *Constitutions* and other biblical passages to develop his proposed ending. In spite of this, Garrow attempts to use his reconstruction to show structural patterns within the final chapter. This is questionable, especially as about one third of this pattern is a reconstruction.

Garrow attempts to confront the belief that the Two Ways teaching in chs. 1–5 is one cohesive unit. Using traditional redactional methodology, Garrow divides this passage into four sections: Two Ways, Law Summary, Sayings Onion and Modification of Sayings Onion. This section has a number of positive ideas and is generally convincing.

Chapters 5–10 outline and describe the different redactional layers and their corresponding verses. The Peri Layer, based on the περί δὲ construction, forms the base layer. This layer provides the general structure for the *Didache* and is responsible for the introduction and preliminary discussion for a variety of topics. The Prophet Document incorporates an alternate view of the Peri Layer of how to interact with a prophet. This section also indicates characteristics of a false prophet and how they should be treated.

The Modifying Teacher Layer is scattered throughout the *Didache* and modifies the didactic portions. This layer, added at a later time, was inserted to address pressing issues within the church community that were either not mentioned within the *Didache*, or issues that demanded different actions than the original layer suggested.

The Gospel Layer includes the verses that specifically reference ‘the gospel’. It is these references that initially led scholars to believe that the *Didache* used the Gospel of Matthew. Garrow states that these references were inserted to give credibility to certain sections, and were added after Matthew’s finished Gospel. This is the lynchpin for Garrow’s theory, because if these references are shown to be original, then there is severe difficulty for arguing that the *Didache* did not use Matthew.

Also included in the book, which is very helpful, is a chart outlining the various layers and their place within the *Didache*. Overall, Garrow adequately expresses his division of the different redactional layers. However, there are a few sections where it would have benefited Garrow to refer to other scholars who might have come to similar views. In addition, one large editing error resulted in the conclusion for Part I being duplicated.

Part II outlines the different sections that indicate Matthean dependence on the *Didache*. Garrow opens this section by comparing Matthew to the Modifying Teacher Layer and stating that if it could be shown that Matthew used this layer, then he must have had access to the other preceding layers. In this section, Garrow correctly indicates a number of parallel passages between Matthew and the *Didache*, and shows for a number that there is a possibility of Matthew's dependence on the *Didache*. For other cases, however, Garrow's argument is not convincing, in that the same logic could be used to promote the *Didache's* use of Matthew.

Chapter 13 outlines the relationship of the last chapter of the *Didache* and Matthew 24. Garrow challenges the traditional understanding of Markan priority. In this section, Garrow proposes that Mark 13 depended on a redaction of *Didache* 16 for understanding of Dan. 7.13. Matthew, therefore, conflated both Mark and the *Didache* for his construction of ch. 24. One major issue in this section is that Garrow again uses his reconstruction of ch. 16 as evidence for his position.

Garrow then develops the relationship between Matthew and *Did.* 1.1-6. Garrow states that Matthew 5-7 makes use of eight of the ten separate elements of *Did.* 1.1-6. In addition to this, Garrow also states that Luke also used these verses in 6.27-32. In order to explain the differences between Matthew and the *Didache*, Garrow suggests that Luke first redacted *Did.* 1.1-6 and that Matthew conflated both Luke and the *Didache* for his production of chs. 5-7. This is interesting because of the general belief that Matthew did not have access to Luke. Garrow realizes this, but states that this 'suggestion has larger implications that cannot be explored in full [or in part] in this monograph'.

Overall, there are some conspicuous issues with Garrow's methodology. First, Garrow does not place the *Didache* within a particular time period in the ancient world. He does not give approximate dates for the different redactional layers within the *Didache*

or for the work as a whole. In addition, stating that both Luke and Mark relied on the *Didache* places them both after the construction of the *Didache*; however, there was no extrapolation of this point.

Secondly, Garrow continually uses his reconstruction of the conclusion of the *Didache* as evidence and support for his conceptions. Finally, there is a lack of opposing viewpoints in a number of different sections. Garrow does not adequately respond to the variety of viewpoints that contradict his, and, as a result, he fails to interact with them.

On the other hand, Garrow makes excellent comparisons of the different Greek texts in developing his ideas. There are a number of charts that help the reader visualize his redactions. In addition to this, there is a helpful supporting website that has colour graphs that better indicate connections between the different texts and other resources.

Overall, *The Gospel of Matthew's Dependence on the Didache* presents a variety of interesting ideas that, if further developed, could have a profound effect on not only the study of the *Didache*, but could also influence the study of the New Testament as well.

Sean A. Adams
McMaster Divinity College