Durham University

Durham E-Theses

New and old in Matthew 11-13 : normativity in the development of three theological themes.

Lena Lybaek

How to cite:

Lybaek, Lena (1999) New and old in Matthew 11-13 : normativity in the development of three theological themes. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/1114/ is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the full Durham E-Theses policy for further details.

Academic Support Office, The Palatine Centre, Durham University, Stockton Road, Durham, DH1 3LE
e-mail: e-theses.admin@durham.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
https://etheses.durham.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: LENA LYBÆK

TITLE: NEW AND OLD IN MATTHEW 11-13: NORMATIVITY IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THREE THEOLOGICAL THEMES

PHD THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM, DECEMBER 1998

On the background of a) the gospel of Matthew's concern for the preservation of the Jesus tradition, as well as the centrality of scriptural tradition and its world view for the gospel's theology, and b) The gospel's freedom in relation to these sources in the transmission of the sayings of Jesus and the narratives describing events in his life, as well as the translation and employment of scriptural citations, the thesis examines how these traditions can be said to be authoritative for the first evangelist. Following a review of earlier research concerning Matthew's use of sources, the gospel is defined as theological discourse. In this theological discourse the reception and transmission of Scripture and synoptic source material involves the interpretation and actualisation of both strands of tradition. The study analyses the authoritative and normative function of these respective traditions in the theological reflections of the gospel. Matthew 11-13 serves as a representative unit of material in the gospel where all strands of tradition are present. Three theological themes are identified as central. Two Christological themes are dominant: Jesus is a) present as the coming one, in whom the kingdom of heaven is brought near, and b) as the one who is 'greater than' previous figures and places of revelation. The third central theme of the chapters depicts the callousness of Israel regarding Jesus as the coming one. The themes are largely adapted from the Jesus tradition as it was available to the evangelist in the written form of Q and Mark. Their interpretation is shown to be grounded in the tradition of Scripture. The study finds that Jesus tradition and Scripture function authoritatively in the gospel in similar ways and are interpreted in light of each other. The conclusion summarises the findings and places them in dialogue with recent studies.

New and Old in Matthew 11-13

Normativity in the Development of Three Theological Themes

by Lena Lybæk

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without the written consent of the author an information derived from it should be acknowledged.

PhD Thesis

Submitted to the
University of Durham
Department of Theology
December 1998

23 AUG 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Table of Contents	3
	Acknowledgements	5
	Declaration	6
	Statement of Copyright	7
1.	Introduction	8
2.	Matthew's Use of Sources	13
2.1.	Tradition and Interpretation in Jewish Sources..	14
2.1.1	Inner-biblical Exegesis	15
2.1.2.	The Translations of Scripture	17
2.1.3.	Exegetical Practice in Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha	18
2.1.4.	Exegetical Practice in Qumran Literature	18
2.1.5.	Midrash	19
2.1.6	Conclusion	20
2.2.	The Use and Authority of Scripture in the Gospel of Matthew	21
2.2.1	Introduction	21
2.2.2.	Text Form and Origin of Matthean Citations of Scripture	22
2.2.3.	The Fulfilment Citations	28
2.2.4.	The Concept of Fulfilment in the Context of Matthean Theology	32
2.2.5.	Conclusion	37
2.3.	Redaction and Composition of Jesus Tradition	38
2.3.1.	Introduction	38
2.3.2.	The Text of Matthew's Written Sources	39
2.3.3.	Matthew's Reception and Interpretation of Jesus Tradition	40
2.3.4.	Matthew's Composition of Received Tradition	43
2.3.5.	Motives for the Transmission of Jesus-material	46
2.3.6.	Conclusion	49
3.	The Gospel as Theological Discourse and the Function of Tradition as Authoritative	51
3.1.	The Gospel of Matthew as Theological Reflection	51
3.2.	Scripture and Authoritative Tradition	55
3.2.1.	Jesus Tradition as Normative Versus the Normativity of Scripture	55
3.2.2.	The Gospel as Theology and the Evaluation of Tradition as Authoritative	58
3.3.	Limiting the Study: Matthew 11-13	61
3.4.	Definitions	65
3.5.	Procedure	68
4.	ὁ ἐρχόμενος as a Christological Complex in Matthew 11-13	71
4.1.	The Normative Use of Scripture in the ὁ ἐρχόμενος Complex	73
4.1.1.	Matthew 11:3 – John the Baptist and the Coming one of Genesis 49:10	73
4.1.2.	Jesus as the Messenger of Good News in Matthew 11:5	83

4.1.3. Matthew 12:18-21: Jesus as the Isaianic Servant 91
4.1.4. Conclusion 99

4.2. The ὁ ἐρχόμενος Motif in Matthew's Adaptation of Jesus Tradition 102
4.2.1. The Beelzeboul Controversy 103
4.2.2. The Use and Authority of Tradition in the Parable of the Tares and the Parable of the Dragnet 119
4.2.3. Conclusion 133
4.3. The ὁ ἐρχόμενος Theme in Mt11-13 and the Normativity of Tradition 134

5. The πλεῖον/μείζον Motif in Matthew 11-13 136
5.1. The Autoritative use of Scripture in the Development of the πλεῖον/μείζον Motif 137
5.1.1. More than Elijah, the Eschatological Prophet – Mt 11:10,14 138
5.1.2. The 'More than' of Jesus: The Presence of God's Wisdom in Mt 11:28 146
5.1.3. More than the Temple, Lord of the Sabbath. The Adaption of Hos 6:6 in Mt 12:1-8 156
5.1.4. The Normativity of Scripture in Matthew's Development of the More than Christology 164
5.2. The Normativity of the Synoptic Tradition in the Development of the πλεῖον/μείζον Motif 166
5.2.1. The Greater in the Kingdom of Heaven: Matthew's Adaptation of Q Material in Matthew 11:7-9 11 166
5.2.2. More than Jonah and Solomon (Mt 12:41-42) Matthew's Adaptation of Q 11:16, 29-32 177
5.2.3. The Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Pearl 184
5.2.4. Conclusion 192

6. Revelation, Concealment, and the Problem of Obduracy 194
6.1. Scripture as Normative and Formative in the Development of the Obduracy Motif complex 194
6.1.1. The Adaptation of Is 29:14 in Mt 11:25-26 195
6.1.2. The Use and Adaptation of Is 6:9-10 in Mt 13:14-15 204
6.1.3. Matthew's adaptation of Psalm 78:2 in Mt 13:35 210
6.1.4. The Sign of Jonah in Mt 12:40 and the Problem of Obduracy 216
6.1.5. Conclusion 221
6.2. The Normativity of Synoptic Tradition in the Development of the Revelation, Concealment and Obduracy Theme 223
6.2.1. Hiddenness and Revelation: The Parables of the Leaven (Mt 13:33) And the Treasure (Mt 13:44) 224
6.2.2. Revelation and Understanding: Normativity in Matthew's Adaptation of the Parable of the Sower and Its Interpretation Mt 13:1-23 231
6.2.3. Obduracy and Discipleship: Normativity in Matthew's Adaptation of Material in 12:46-50(doing the will of God) 237
6.3 Conclusion 240

7. Conclusion 242

Bibliography 249

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writing of this thesis has been a long process. I wish to express my gratitude to the following persons and institutions for their help and support in the production of this thesis. This thesis would not have been written without their engagement in my work.

Professor James D.G. Dunn, my supervisor, has not only encouraged and supported my work throughout the period of research and writing, but also patiently and repeatedly pointed out to me aspects which needed improvement.

The University of Durham awarded me a research studentship over two years (1995-1996; 1996-1997), and the ORS Awards Scheme for Overseas Research Students provided me with an ORS award for the same period. Also Baptistenes Teologiske Seminar, Stabekk, Norway, provided a grant.

At the end of my Studentship, the Norwegian Baptist Union, Sarpsborg Baptistmenighet and BTS Stabekk, found employment for me, and gave me time and space to complete this thesis.

Friends in Durham, now moved to other corners of the world, provided a good environment for the exchange of ideas: Annemei Mahler, Dr. Natalie Knödel, Elizabeth Raine and Dr. John Squires, Dr. James and Elena McGrath, Dr. Elizabeth Danna.

Dr. Loren Stuckenbruck, supervisor for a term, and Dr. Stephen Barton were always ready to help when help was needed.

Mr. Huw Williams, Nannestad, Norway, kindly agreed to proof-read the thesis and suggested ways in which my English could be improved. Thanks to him, numerous spelling mistakes and misprints could be eliminated. Whatever is left of awkward formulations and typographical errors is my responsibility alone.

The supportive, patient and loving environment given to me by my husband Jan and our daughter Maike is invaluable.

Last, but not least, the helping and supportive attitude of my parents in law Prof. Dr. Erich Geldbach and Dr. Ursula Geldbach has been extraordinary. This thesis is dedicated to them in gratitude.

DECLARATION

I confirm that the Graduate School committee has given approval for submission of a thesis which does not conform with the prescribed word length for the degree for which I am submitting it for examination.

I confirm that no part of the material offered has previously been submitted by me for a degree in this or any other university. If material has been generated through joint work, my independent contribution has been clearly indicated. In all other cases material from the work of others has been acknowledged and quotations and paraphrases suitably indicated.

Signed: Jena Lybach

Date: December 1998

COPYRIGHT

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.

No quotation from it should be published without the author's prior written consent,

and information derived from it should be clearly acknowledged.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Matthew 11-13 is composed of material from a variety of different sources and consists of a diversity of forms. Yet, the three chapters constitute an important unit in the gospel as a whole, addressing three issues which are central in the development of the Jesus story as it is presented in Matthew. In these chapters two Christological themes are dominant: first, Jesus is presented as the coming one, in whom the Kingdom of heaven is brought near, and second, he is presented as the one who is 'greater than' previous figures and places of revelation. The third central theme of the chapters depicts the callousness of Israel faced with Jesus as the coming one. The themes are largely adapted from the Jesus traditions as they were available to the evangelist in the written form of Q, Mark and diverse material commonly referred to as M.[1] The Christological themes as they are developed in the three chapters, as well as the theological reflection around the rejection of Jesus by the people, is, however, grounded in the tradition of Scripture.[2] Matthew's[3] redactional efforts expand and strengthen the scriptural links through the addition of citations and allusions to Scripture. This redactional activity illustrates the evangelist's work as a creative adaptation of the sources. Nevertheless, through the composition of the material Matthew does not simply create a new story, but preserves

---

[1] The so-called *two-source hypothesis* is here presupposed as the most comprehensive solution to the question of the *relationship* between the synoptic Gospels, the arguments of e.g. W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, ICC (1988-1997), vol. 1, 97-127 and U. Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, EKK 1 (1989-1990), vol. 1, 28-31 having been found convincing. The two sources which have given the hypothesis its name refer to the two written sources behind Matthew and Luke. The special Matthean material, commonly referred to as M could be derived from a variety of both oral and written sources. To a certain extent therefore, the name 'two- source hypothesis' is misleading, as it is here assumed that Matthew draws on at least three sources of Jesus tradition, in addition to Scripture. An evaluation of alternative hypotheses can for reasons of space not be included here. Nevertheless, in examinations of texts where so called 'minor-agreements' pose the question of synoptic relations, the relevant issues will be discussed in notes to the body of the text.

[2] Throughout this thesis, what is known as the Old Testament in Christian tradition is referred to as Scripture or the Bible (the tradition referred to as scriptural or biblical), when defining its influence on the gospel of Matthew. Although the question of the authoritative standing of the Jesus tradition in comparison with Scripture is at stake, there is little doubt that the church at the time of Matthew's composition had not yet established or defined a *canon* of a 'new' testament. Although καινὰ καὶ παλαιά in Mt 13:52 may be considered a beginning of such a tradition, the notion of a new tradition *replacing* or superseding Scripture as Scripture, is, as the study will show, not present in the gospel of Matthew. The recent, ecumenically sensitive Christian notions of 'the first testament' (later supplemented by the 'second testament') or Hebrew Scripture are likewise not useful in the present study. The latter, because the designation 'Hebrew' referring to something of Jewish descent or tradition, may easily in the present context be confused with 'Hebrew' as referring to the language. This may be misleading, as Matthew's usage of the Septuagint is easier to establish than the influence of Scripture in its Hebrew form.

[3] For the sake of convenience, following tradition, I have chosen to refer to the redactor of the first gospel as 'Matthew'. The name and identity of the historical person(s) remains an open question.

and interprets the traditions in question. Despite the creativity Matthew diplays, it is the preservation of material which is dominant in the gospel as such.

The development of theological themes based on Scripture as well as the preservation of synoptic material indicate a certain normativity or authority of the different traditions to the evangelist. It is this issue: the comparative normativity of Matthew's sources as it is evident in the preservation and interpretation of tradition in the creation of the gospel narrative, which is the interest of the present thesis. The question will be examined on the basis of the development of the three theological themes in chapters 11-13.

Because of its interweaving of scriptural themes and citations into the Jesus-story, the gospel of Matthew has been used as an example or prototype of a biblical theology.[4] Although the extent of the canon at the time of the composition of the gospel of Matthew is debated,[5] there is little doubt that Matthew's references to "the law and the prophets" in various ways throughout the gospel show a reverence for this literature in its authoritative function as Scripture. Yet, the content of the gospel is Christological, and in the exposition of it, Matthew not only preserves Jesus tradition, but through preservation grants it some kind of authority or normativity, in form as well as theology. Hence, when Matthew in 13:52 speaks of "the scribe trained for the Kingdom of God," who brings forth both new and old things from his storehouse, it is the combination of Scripture and Jesus tradition in the gospel which is referred to.

In Christian exegetical tradition the question of Matthean use of scriptural tradition has been addressed from a variety of perspectives. The reading of Scripture in light of the Christ event has been pointed out, as well as the influence of Jewish tradition on the Matthean narrative. Likewise Matthew's creative use of sources, also in comparison with Jewish exegetical and narrative tradition, has been studied and commented on. Scholars have defended both the continuity and the discontinuity of Matthew's *Jesus* with Jewish scriptural tradition. The issue is normally combined with the question concerning the identity of the group in which the gospel came into being, and whether it remained inside, or had parted with, Judaism. Hence, because the community would be committed to the revelation of God in Christ, and because Jesus therefore was the authoritative interpreter of tradition, Jesus as the *fulfilment* of Scripture is thought either to surpass Scripture (i.e. Scripture can only be Scripture as read through faith in Christ), or to stand in continuity with, and uphold, Scripture. Considering the literary nature of the gospel and its sources, however, it would seem

---

[4] Cf. e.g. H. Frankemölle, "Das Matthäusevangelium als heilige Schrift und die heilige Schrift des früheren Bundes" (1993); U. Luz, "Das Matthäusevangelium und die Perspektive einer biblischen Theologie" (1989); Mogens Müller, "Salvation-History in the Gospel of Matthew: an Example of Biblical Theology" (1994).

[5] Several factors are unclear, e.g. the role, influence and extent of Jamnia, the relation between the canons of the LXX and BH, the time of the closing of a Greek canon, as well as the place and date of the composition of Matthew.

appropriate to transfer the question hitherto asked of the Matthean Jesus (or Christ) to the level of Matthew's written sources. In other words, the observation that Matthew stands in dialogue with Jewish scriptural tradition on the one hand, and that, on the other hand, he "feels committed to"[6] the synoptic source material, would lead to the seemingly beneficial and necessary question to examine the comparative use, authority and normativity of these sources over against each other.

Traditionally the relation of Scripture to the Matthean narrative has been one of theological significance, whereas the relation of Mark and Q to Matthew has been one of source-critical importance. Matthew's use of Scripture and of synoptic tradition is normally understood to be two separate issues. In chapter 2 of this thesis, previous studies on Matthew's use of sources will be reviewed. Here, in order to point to the relevance of the present study, attention will be drawn to the work of Hubert Frankemölle.

H. Frankemölle, in an essay published in 1993,[7] is the first to draw explicit source-critical conclusions from the insight of scholarship that Matthew's gospel is influenced by Scripture in a variety of ways.[8] He holds that in the composition process of the gospel of Matthew, Jesus tradition is for the first time consciously composed as Scripture. Frankemölle argues from a form critical perspective as well as a thematic and theological perspective that Matthew in the writing and composition of the gospel sees the Jesus movement as fundamentally grounded in the Jewish tradition. Scripture is a source for Matthew, providing the evangelist with literary form, world view, and theology around which the gospel is formed. Placing Jesus tradition in continuity with the literature, thought and theology of Scripture, the evangelist lifts the Jesus tradition to a scriptural level. From a source-critical perspective Frankemölle therefore pleads for the use of a "three source" hypothesis, arguing that Matthew adapts material from three written sources; the Scriptures, Mark and Q.

Frankemölle believes that the first recipients of the gospel would only be familiar with the first of these sources.[9] The insight of scholars that the gospel of Matthew is not only in its theological outlook, but also in its form, uniquely dependent on scriptural tradition, must lead to a paradigm shift in exegesis, he argues, away from a purely

---

[6] Cf. U. Luz, "Fiktivität und Traditionstreue im Matthäusevangelium im Lichte griechischer Literatur" (1993), 154, 174: Matthew '*weiß sich* (eine Gemeinschaft tragende Tradition) *verpflichtet.*'

[7] Frankemölle, "Matthäusevangelium", 297.

[8] Before him, O. L. Cope, *Matthew A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven* (1976), 7 called Scripture 'a much more sure source' for the gospel of Matthew than Mark or Q. Cope, however, referred only to the scriptural quotations, and not the whole "existential horizon" of the evangelist in the way Frankemölle does.

[9] Frankemölle would here find support from W. Schmithals, "Die Bedeutung der Evangelien in der Theologiegeschichte bis zur Kanonbildung" (1992), 138: „Der jeweils spätere Evangelist entnimmt also seine Quellen nicht der Lehrtradition ... seiner eigene Gemeinde ..., sondern dem 'Archiv', oder er lernt sie ... auswärts kennen. Er führt die Evangelienüberlieferung in seine Gemeinde jeweils allererst ein." (Cf. also 145.)

Christological reading and understanding of the Christian texts, towards an appreciation of Jewish Scripture as Scripture, in its literary, form and tradition-historical aspects. That is, Scripture is not simply to be understood as a theological and conceptual source book of the first gospel, but as literature which defines the whole existence and reflection of the Evangelist and his community. Frankemölle describes the context from which the gospel arose as "reformist Judaism" and Matthew as a Jewish reform theologian.[10] The continuity of the first gospel with Scripture is of such a nature, he argues, that the "self understanding" of the gospel is that of being Scripture. Frankemölle further holds that scholars have not sufficiently taken this fact into account. Matthew as a gospel is simply an actualisation of Scripture for the time of the evangelist and is therefore also Scripture in itself.

Frankemölle's essay is provocative, partly because of his statements concerning Matthew's self understanding as one of creating Scripture, partly because of his insistence that Scripture is more than simply a religious or theological text, and must be understood in its function toward action and religious life so that it is always text-in-situation. If he is right in his assumption regarding Matthew's self-understanding and in assuming that the Matthean community was unfamiliar with written gospel tradition, the relation between scriptural tradition and the gospel of Matthew is one of integrated unity. Jewish Scripture on the one hand remains normative as the point of reference, yet on the other hand is flexible and open towards the future and is re-created and renewed in the face of new revelatory history, in this case, the gospel of Matthew.

Frankemölle's exposition remains focused on the level of the Matthean church and its Christ faith in continuation and affirmation of Scripture. The Jesus tradition in itself has no normative status in the Matthean community before the writing of the gospel itself. It would seem, however, that by placing Scripture in a source-critical relation to the gospel of Matthew, along with the written synoptic tradition, Frankemölle also makes an implicit statement concerning the normativity of that tradition in light of and in relation to Scripture. Matthew's creative yet conservative editing of the tradition gives an indication of its value as source material and gives it a certain authoritative standing.

On the assumption therefore, that chapters 11-13 as a unit is representative of Matthew's use of sources where Scripture and the Jesus tradition together are used to develop central theological and Christological themes, this study seeks to analyse Matthew's use of written sources in order to establish how they function normatively and authoritatively in the creation of the narrative. The study proceeds as follows:
Chapter 2 will review the state of research on Matthew's use of Scripture and the Jesus tradition.

---

[10] Frankemölle, "Matthäusevangelium", 309. Apparently he has reformed his own previous understanding of Matthew as a gospel which grew out of a gentile Christian context, yet still with its identity dependent on the continuity between YHWH of Scripture and God the father of Jesus Christ. Cf. H. Frankemölle, *Jahwe-Bund und Kirche Christi* (1974), 200.

Chapter 3 will discuss the nature of the gospel as theological reflection and the notion of normativity and authority in the theological narrative of the gospel. Further the limitation of the study to chapters 11-13 will be explained.

In chapters 4-6 the exegesis of relevant passages will substantiate the claims concerning thematic unity of 11-13 made in chapter 3; while, more importantly, the analysis of the use and normative function of tradition in development of the theological themes will show that Matthew's redactional adaptation of the Jesus material employs the same exegetical methods as his use of Scripture. It can also be shown that in Matthew the Jesus tradition shares the same function as that of Scripture and may thus be said to be authoritative tradition for Matthew. Scripture in its paradigmatic nature remains however the framework for Matthean Christology and Messianic exegesis.

A final conclusion will summarise the findings and place them in the perspective of biblical theology.

CHAPTER 2

MATTHEW'S USE OF SOURCES

The subject of the present thesis is the normative function of written tradition in the composition and creation of the narrative in Matthew 11-13. Before the texts are analysed, Matthew's use of sources, as it has been recognised in previous scholarship, must be reviewed. Further an understanding of the position of Scripture and Jesus tradition in the gospel of Matthew must be gained from past studies. With regard to both these aspects, scholars have pointed to the relation between Matthew's gospel and Jewish hermeneutical methods and literary techniques. Hence, it is also meaningful to review shortly the most imortant of these as they relate to the present thesis.

Following Frankemölle's notion, one can say that Matthew's gospel is a creative composition of material from three different *written* sources, two of which may be classified as Jesus tradition (Mark and Q) and Scripture. While Scripture and Mark is available to all in written form, Q as a hypothetical source may only be reconstructed on the basis of a synoptic comparison. It has already been noted, that in addition to these, Matthew may presumably have used other oral and possibly pre-written material which can be classified as Jesus tradition, and which is commonly referred to as M.[1] In chapters 11-13, it is specifically the parables particular to Matthew which have often been thought to come from a pre-written source of parables.[2]

In past research, the question of Matthew's use of Scripture and the question of the relation of Matthew to the synoptic sources have often been two different areas of study. Matthew's use and interpretation of Scripture has been considered in relation to the identity of the evangelist, and the question of continuity/discontinuity between Matthean Christianity and Judaism. Naturally, the question of the textual form of the quotations plays a role here. Matthew's use of the Jesus material has been relevant for redaction and composition critics for the most part and has been used to define Matthew's theological positions within the framework of Christian theology in the first century.[3] The redaction and composition critical insights will prove relevant for the analysis of Matthew's understanding of the Jesus tradition in this thesis. Hence the exegetical analysis of Mt 11-13 will make use of redaction and composition analytical findings.

---

[1] Hence, M is a common designation for material which was probably derived from a plurality of sources. Cf. Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol. 1, 125; Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 1, 31.

[2] Cf. e.g. Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol. 1, 125; B. Gerhardsson, "The Seven Parables in Matthew XIII" (1972/73), 16-37. Differently Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 295-296, assigns all parables particular to Matthew either to redaction or to a oral source.

[3] Also here a few exceptions can be found. Graham Stanton, "Matthew as a Creative Interpreter of the Sayings of Jesus", in *A Gospel for a New People* (1992) 326-345, for example, points to the exegetical work of the evangelist in the expansions and interpretation of Jesus tradition.

Because of the areas of study involved, the review of past research is divided into Four parts. First, because they will be referred to in the subsequent chapters, a general overview of relevant Jewish exegetical practices and literary methods will be presented. The state of research relevant to Matthew's use of Scripture is reviewed second. Third, Matthew's use of Jesus tradition is presented. Finally, an evaluation of the state of research and suggestions for a way forward are then considered. The chapter, therefore, serves as a background for and introduction to the reflections on procedure in chapter 3.

2.1. Tradition and Interpretation in Jewish Sources

It is a pre-understanding in ancient Jewish literature, witnessed to already in the formation of Jewish Scripture itself, that the comprehension of tradition depends on its interpretation.[4] The task of interpretation is integral both to the character of Scripture as proclamation, and also to its capacity of being received and preserved tradition. This relation between revelation and interpretation is continued in ancient, non-scriptural, Jewish writings. The interpretation of Scripture in itself constituted a "revelation of new meaning", which also means that Scripture is renewed and actualised through its authoritative interpretation.[5] It is through this interpretation that Scripture is kept alive.
In Matthew's gospel, the task of interpretation as revelation of new meaning involves both Scripture and Jesus tradition. The way in which Matthew treats these different traditions shows affinities with practices of interpretation in ancient Judaism.

Although the short review of these within the limited space available in the present thesis in no way can do justice to the many nuances and strands of tradition present in ancient Judaism, it is nevertheless necessary background for the understanding of the use of sources in Matthew's gospel. The review will briefly look at the interpretation of normative tradition within Scripture itself, in the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, in translations of Scripture, and in Qumran literature. Finally, some comments will be made with regard to the use of the term *midrash*.

It will become clear from this short review that there are two basic types of interpretation which takes place. First, there is the interpretation which involves a rewriting of Scripture or tradition, or which draws on scriptural images and concepts in the creation of independent narratives. In these, formal citations of, but also allusions and references to, previous tradition occur. Second, there is the type of authoritative interpretation of Scripture which is concerned with the content of the Biblical text, which also influences the structure of the interpreting text. Here, in most cases, the explicit citation of Scripture precedes or follows the interpretation. Still, the translations, where the boundaries between text and its interpretation is blurred, belong to this group of

---

[4] See for example Georg Fohrer, "Tradition und Interpretation im Alten Testament," (1961) 5-7, 12-19.

[5] Michael Fishbane, "Inner Biblical Exegesis: Types and Strategies of Interpretation in Ancient Israel," (1986), 20.

material. Matthew's use of sources has been related to both of these types of interpretation.

2.1.1. Inner-biblical Exegesis

Jewish biblical literature is in its nature the interpretation of tradition or of history. The concern of the different traditions is related to three important aspects of Jewish national self-understanding: Israel as an elected people, God as the God of the covenant, and the Torah. These practical and constitutive aspects of tradition are important also for Matthew, as well as the use of tradition in critique of the religious elite at the time of Matthew. The subsequent analysis of this chapter will show that Matthew's use of Scripture and Jesus tradition resembles both prophetic and narrative interpretations of Scripture.

The Pentateuch and the Narrative Tradition

Although the term "historiography" for the historian may not be adequate for the historical narratives of Jewish Scripture,[6] it is used in this sense here, with regard to the Pentateuch, the books of the former prophets, 1-2 Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah. These historical narratives are in essence the interpretation of previous traditions and historical events in light of the historical situation of the compilers and writers. The narratives are of such a nature that stages of interpretation of history can be detected. The final redaction of the Pentateuch and Chronicles will serve as examples of this group.

The Pentateuch, in its final redaction, has a special standing in this category and may be understood as a constitutional narrative, in which the stories and traditions from the past are used to define the formation and identity of Israel. The collected narratives in the Pentateuch tell of the beginnings of the people, their covenant relationship and of the possession of the land as a part of this covenant relationship. In this constitutional narrative, sources were edited and composed in order to depict past history as *paradigmatic* for the later experience and history of the people. That is, the paradigmatic concept was the key by which history and tradition was interpreted and made into a narrative whole. It did not grow out of the reflection of the past, but of the writer's present reality of destruction and restoration.[7]

The history of 1 and 2 Chronicles is a rewriting of history, composed on the basis of several sources including the Pentateuch, 1-2 Samuel, Ezra-Nehemiah and 1-2 Kings, but also extra-biblical sources. In it, the continuation of the second temple with the first is emphasised. Further the negative or positive destiny of the king's reign is dependent on the adherence to God and God's law. There is a clear understanding of rewards and

---

[6] Cf. Thomas L. Thompson, "Historiography (Israelite)," *ABD* 3, 207-208.

[7] Cf. Jacob Neusner, *Torah Through the Ages: A Short History of Judaism*, (1990), 25-37.

punishment as God's involvement in history.[8] Again the present situation of the writer influences the interpretation and representation of history. According to Sara Japhet, the purpose of the reformulation of history is twofold: 'the past is explained so that its institutions and religious principles become relevant to the present, and the ways of the present are legitimised anew by being connected to the prime source of authority - the formative period in the people's past.'[9]

The Chronicler employs the source material for the reformulated history with both fidelity and freedom. The methods and principles of reception and preservation vary from verbal agreement (direct citation) of the sources to exclusion of material.[10] Material of specific theological interest has been selected, restructured and included in the Chronicler's history. Some material is shortened into summaries, while some passages are cited and elaborated upon. The literary, historical and chronological framework of the Deuteronomistic history is preserved in 1.-2. Chronicles, yet the theological interests of Chronicles is notably different from the sources, and the final composition is "not only divergent, but sometimes contrasting."[11]

In the formation of the Pentateuch and in the history of 1.-2. Chronicles, we see therefore, a tendency to compose history on the basis of, and with great adherence to, existing traditional sources, but from the perspective of the historical situation of the redactor. This perspective influenced the way in which the traditional and formative material was presented, but also the selection process of what was included and what was excluded from the accounts.

The Prophets

In the prophetic literature, the past tradition is used as proof of, or justification for, the prophetic critique of the social and moral structures of the present time of the prophets. Past tradition is used to point both to the reasons for, and the solutions to present crisis, so that the "past stands both as a warning and basis for hope in the future."[12] The adaptation of traditional motifs relates history and tradition to the present of the prophet, often in a paradigmatic or typological fashion. It is the exodus, the election of Zion and the election of David which seem to be the major historical paradigms of adaptation and interpretation in the prophets. But the prophetic books also pick up past prophetic material and reinterprets it in light of the present historical situation, as for example the reinterpretation of the Isaianic tradition within the book of Isaiah itself, or the adaptation of Jeremiah passages in the message of Ezekiel.[13]

---

[8] Sara Japhet, *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary* (1993), 44.

[9] Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 49.

[10] This description of the use of sources in Chronicles is bbased on Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 14-23.

[11] Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 15.

[12] Thompson, "Historiography," 211.

[13] Cf. Walther Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1* (1979), 44-45.

2.1.2. The Translations of Scripture

The translations of Scripture necessarily also includes the interpretation of Scripture. The two translations which are relevant as background and comparative material for the present thesis is the Septuagint and the *Targumim*. While the translation(s) of the Septuagint, through the re-reading of texts, displays the fact of the interpretative aspect of translation, the Targumim were not meant to be simply translations but also explications of the Hebrew text. This could take the form of clarification of the text or of actualising it to the present context of the author.[14]

The translation of Hebrew Scripture into Greek was a long process which underwent numerous revisions in light of the more authoritative Hebrew texts.[15] Hence, there was no unified Septuagint text. The Qumran findings also revealed that some of the discrepancies between the Masoretic and the Greek text can be traced back to the Hebrew original of the translation.[16] The various translations within the Septuagint show different levels of interpretative renderings of the Hebrew text. The translations do show however exegetical practices similar to later rabbinic exegesis, such as the harmonisation of passages for interpretative purposes, and interpretation through analogy and context.[17] The interpretations were particularly influenced by messianic and eschatological expectations of the time of the translations. Recent history is also incorporated into the Greek text, so that again the present receives meaning in light of Scripture, and Scripture is actualised though relating it to the present.

The Targumim originated in pre-rabbinic Judaism, as translations and explications of the Hebrew text in a Palestine where Hebrew was replaced by Aramaic. The translation which originally may have been simultaneous, was later developed and written down, but was to be recited orally in the synagogue. The texts do, however, display advanced exegetical and theological reflections. Fragments of *Targumim* have been found in the Qumran caves, which proves their origins to be pre-rabbinic. The exegetical practice of the *Targumim* resembles that of rabbinic midrash. Within texts of the *Targumim* examples of both literal translation and interpretations are found. The interpretation is achieved through additions in the text, through substitution and through rewriting of the Biblical text.[18] The interpretative elements serve to clarify, to actualise or to interpret through relating the text to other Biblical events or texts.

---

[14] R.T. France, "Jewish Historiography," 102-103.

[15] Cf. Martin Hengel, "Die Septuaginta als 'Christliche Schriftensammlung', ihre Vorgeschichte und das Problem ihres Kanons" (1994), 243.

[16] Hengel, "Septuaginta," 245.

[17] Cf. Schaper, Joachim. "Die Septuaginta-Psalter als Dokument jüdischer Eschatologie," 56-58. For the reabbinic exegetical pracitces see below.

[18] Cf. Philip S. Alexander, "Targum, Targumim," *ADB* (1992), 329.

2.1.3. Exegetical Practice in Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

The interpretation of Scripture in Ancient Jewish literature can be said to follow in the same tradition of actualising of Scripture and of understanding the past as paradigmatic for the events in the present. Devorah Dimant has shown that in the apocryphal and pseudepigraphal literature, two different uses of Scripture may be identified.[19]

First, the use of Scripture is found in explicit citations and references to Biblical persons and events. Here the concern is to explain the Biblical text, which is often separated clearly from the interpretation of the text. Second, the use of Scripture is found in implicit use, through allusions, and by copying its language and composition. In both cases the Biblical texts serve as paradigmatic models though which the historical present receives its meaning.

Of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, the book of Jubilees has in particular been related to Matthew's gospel and its retelling of the Markan Jesus story. R. France[20] labels the book of Jubilees an enlarged Targum on Genesis and Exodus. It retells the biblical story in an apocalyptic perspective, and interprets the Biblical story through other passages of Scripture which seem relevant. The writer of Jubilees also assimilated recent history to the Biblical story so that the Biblical story became typological and paradigmatic for the present. Hence, the present was understood to stand in relation to, and was interpreted by, the past story, but at the same time the Biblical stories received new meaning in light of the present of the writer.[21]

2.1.4. Exegetical Practice in Qumran Literature

The exegetical practice which is most often referred to in the context of Matthean studies is the *Pesher* commentaries from the Dead Sea Scrolls. In these commentaries, but also other Qumran texts, the concern was with the correct esoteric interpretation of Scripture. The Qumran community preserved and interpreted scriptural tradition by relating it to recent history, whereby the apocalyptic understanding of their present situation was the main concern. The methods of citation and interpretation vary in the Qumran material, but are comparable to some of the methods found elsewhere in ancient Jewish sources.

In the *Pesher*[22] commentaries the text of the prophetic book determines the structure of the interpretation. The form is one where the text of Scripture is followed by an interpretation: "its pesher concerns the...". The Pesher uses the prophetic texts to

---

[19] The review is based on Devorah Dimant, "Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha," (1988), 379-419.

[20] R.T. France, "Jewish Historiography, Midrash and the Gospels" (1983), 103.

[21] Cf. Daniel Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine* (1971), 187-188.

[22] The Pesher formula and the Matthean fulfilment citations have been related to each others by some.

reveal, through its interpretation, new eschatological truths for 'the time at hand'.[23] Here the present time gives the basis for discerning the true meaning of the prophetic text.

In the anthological literature of Qumran, Scripture is interpreted by Scripture through harmonisations of texts, by analogy and by context.[24] Again, these elements of interpretation are found also in rabbinic material.

In the material represented in the Dead Sea Scrolls, several other methods of interpretation are found. These include the use of Scripture as a model for language, as a model for composition, and as a model for practical living in the community. There is also use of allegorical and typological exegesis. In all of these it becomes evident that Scripture is on the one hand normative for the practices and beliefs of the community, but on the other hand cannot serve this function without the authoritative actualisation and interpretation of it in the present.

2.1.5. Midrash

The interpretation of Scripture, whether in the New Testament or in ancient Judaism, is often referred to as *midrash*. The term is used in 2 Chronicles (2 Chr. 13:22; 24:27) and in Qumran literature. It is now recognised that the meaning of *midrash* in these sources is uncertain,[25] but in the past, the rabbinic use of the term has influenced scholarly understanding of its use in pre-rabbinic literature.[26] The form and partly the method of rabbinic midrash has a particular historical context, and, although the roots of midrashic exegesis antedates rabbinic literature, to use the term *midrash* in the context of New Testament interpretation of Scripture would be misleading and inaccurate.[27] For the sake of clarity, the use of the term to denote any other exegetical practice than the rabbinic, is avoided in this thesis.

The unique form of rabbinic midrash has already been affirmed. It consisted of a scriptural word or phrase followed by a commentary. In some exegetical midrash this commentary could be a chain of interpretations, often conflicting, attributed to various rabbis.[28] The chain of interpretation from different sages as they appear in the midrashic works is due to their nature as collections of rabbinic expositions, though they may not be without a compositional plan.[29]

---

[23] Michael Fishbane, "Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran" (1988), 351.

[24] Fishbane, "Use," 352-353.

[25] Cf. Philip S. Alexander, "Midrash and the Gospels," (1984), 2; Günter Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, (1996[1991]), 234; Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 854.

[26] Cf. Gary G. Porton, "Midrash," *ABD* 4 (1992), 818.

[27] Cf. Philip S. Alexander, "Midrash and the Gospels," 1-18. Past scholarship has tended to use the term m*idrash* to mean anything from the specific form of rabbinic exegesis to any type of exegetical or homiletical interpretation of Biblical texts. Cf. the comments by France, "Jewish Historiography," 100.

[28] Stemberger, *Introduction*, 240.

[29] Stemerger, *Introduction*, 240.

The exegetical principles (*middot*) of rabbinical exegesis have been summarised in lists attributed to various rabbis: the 7 rules of Hillel, 13 of Ismael and 32 of R. Eliezer.[30] Historically, it is not possible to prove the origins of these summaries with the respective rabbis.[31] The exegetical midrash are not limited to the use of these principles, and they are to be understood as examples of possible interpretative methods rather than rules to be adhered to.[32] Despite the late collection of the *midrashim*,[33] some of the principles which are used can be found in Scripture and ancient Jewish literature.

The interpretation of Scripture through Scripture is a practice which was found in Jubilees and other Ancient writings. Several of the *middot* are variations of this exegetical practice, for example the *Gezerah Shawah* or the *Ke-yose bo be-maqom aher* (the 2. and the 6. *middot* of Hillel), which both describe an argument from analogy where the same term, or similar expressions, in two different passages of Scripture make it possible to interpret them in light of each other.[34] The use of one text to interpret a collection of topically related texts is also related to this general principle.

The collection of texts which were related thematically are found in Qumran literature. For example 11 Q Temp. Here legal texts related by theme are collected with harmonising and exegetical comments. Hence passages of Scripture are used to interpret other passages. The method is the same as is found in Rabbinic midrash. The clear difference is that whereas the rabbis present different interpretative possibilities, the text from Qumran is presented as the new Torah or the authoritative interpretation of the Law.

In the present thesis it will become clear that the text of Matthew displays that passages of Scripture and tradition are related to, and interpreted by, topically related passages. Moreover, other aspects of the Matthean text show similarities with later rabbinic exegetical practice, most notably the legal argument in Matthew 12:1-8. In these cases, it is appropriate to note the similarities between Matthew and later rabbinic material, because the two point to aspects of Jewish interpretations of sacred texts. It is to be noted, however, that literary dependence or direct historical links can not be drawn on the basis of these similarities.

2.1.6. Conclusion

The brief review of tradition and interpretation in ancient Judaism has shown that the authority and interpretation of normative tradition are directly linked to each other

---

[30] Cf. Stemberger, *Introduction*, 15.

[31] Cf. Stemberger, *Introduction*, 18.

[32] R.B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (1989), 12, describes the middot as 'an inventory of tropes' in the sense that they 'provide a descriptive account of a repertoire of possible imaginative operations that can be performed on the text in the act of interpretation.'

[33] 350-450 CE. Cf. Neusner, *Torah*, 51-52.

[34] Cf. Stemberger, *Introduction*, 18.

from the formation of the Biblical texts themselves. From the time of the translations of Scripture into Greek and Aramaic, the need to explain Scripture's true meaning through interpretation and actualisation may be observed. In this review, the differences between legal and narrative material has not been noted. This is because the general trend can be observed with regard to both types of textual material. Already the expansions of legal material in the Pentateuch witness to the need to interpret, modify and explain the law as it proved to be insufficient in clarity or meaning in practical life. Also the paradigmatic aspects of history and historical figures and events needed to be interpreted and actualised through relating the present to the past.

To summarise the interpretation and preservation of Scripture in Judaism in only a few pages as it has been done here, is in danger of becoming too generalised. A comparison with Matthew's exegetical and narrative methods to principles used in different ancient Jewish writings cannot here be completed with justifiable detail. I propose that it is nevertheless useful to observe in general the similarities in use of tradition between Matthew and other Jewish tradition. In Matthew as well, one finds the rewriting of existing tradition, explicit citations which display the intention of explaining the Biblical text, and the use of Biblical paradigms and persons to interpret the present. One finds evidence of similar exegetical practice, like, for example, the interpretation of texts through harmonisation and analogy, or in light of the eschatological and messianic understanding of the present events. One can, however, on the basis of these general similarities not place Matthew in a particular genre or tradition, be it historiography, apocalyptic revelation or wisdom teaching.

With this general review of the Jewish interpretation and rewriting of Biblical material as background, Matthew's use of sources, both scriptural and Jesus material, will be presented.

2.2. The Use And Authority of Scripture in the Gospel of Matthew

2.2.1. Introduction

After the Dead Sea discovery and the subsequent use of material from the scrolls by Krister Stendahl[35] and the response to his work by B. Gärtner in 1954,[36] the use and interpretation of Scripture in the New Testament in general and the gospel of Matthew in particular, received new interest. Most of these studies grew out of a concern to locate the sources and traditions behind the gospel and to clarify the evidence for a redactional employment of these sources. The Qumran texts gave scholarship comparative material by which Matthew's methods of interpretation could be measured. Yet, two questions

---

[35] K. Stendahl, *The School of Saint Matthew and its use of the Old Testament* ([2]1969).

[36] B. Gärtner, "The Habakkuk Commentary (DSH) and the Gospel of Matthew" (1954). For a bibliography of the most influential modern studies on the subject, see Graham Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (1992) 399-401.

remained central. First, the issue of the text form of Scripture available to the evangelist, especially with regard to the fulfilment quotations,[37] has been analysed. The answer to this question would lead to an understanding of the identity of the Matthean evangelist and the early Christian tradition which he represented. Second, the employment and significance of the Scripture quotations in the gospel setting was the subject of analysis, and again especially the fulfilment quotations have been at the centre of study.[38] For the redaction critic the two issues in combination were important: in how much was the evangelist himself responsible for the text form of the citations?

In the synoptic tradition Matthew is alone in using quotations introduced by a sentence of fulfilment. This has led to the question of how the quotations contribute to the composition of the gospel. Other studies have analysed the scriptural exegesis of Matthew from a more general perspective.[39] In light of the general discussions with regard to the use and authority of Scripture in Matthew, the state of research will here be reviewed under the headings of text form and origin, the nature of the fulfilment citations, and the fulfilment concept in the Matthean narrative.

2.2.2. Text Form and Origin of Matthean Citations of Scripture

Students of the gospel have noted that Matthew's citations from Scripture are remarkably free in nature and seemingly atomistic in use.[40] At times Matthew's citations do not correspond with any known versions of the text in question,[41] and from time to time Matthew combines different scriptural passages into one citation.[42] In some instances the scriptural citations are adapted to the gospel narrative in such a way as to force correspondence.[43] The issue of the text form of the scriptural citations in the

---

[37] The terminology with reference to the citations in question is not uniform. Cf. the comments in Graham Stanton, "Matthew's Use of the Old Testament," in *A Gospel for a New People* (1992), 347-348. I have chosen to follow the trend in recent German research, dating back to the work of Wilhelm Rothfuchs, *Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäusevangeliums. Eine biblisch-theologische Untersuchung* (1969). The verb πληρόω is the common feature in the introductory formula which unites the citations in question. According to Stanton, "Matthew's Use", 347, the distinct mixed form of the fulfilment quotations as a group was noted already in 1885 by E. Massebieau, *Examen des citations de l'Ancien Testament dans l'evangile selon saint Matthieu* (1885), 93f.

[38] The two questions, the issue of text form of the citations, as well as the issue of their exegetical application, are not new, but have been central to the study of scriptural citations in the New Testament since the patristic church. Cf. the sketch of the history of research presented in E. Earle Ellis, *The Old Testament in Early Christianity: Canon and Interpretation in light of Modern Research* (1991), 53-74.

[39] See also Graham Stanton, "The Origin and Purpose of Matthew's Gospel: Matthean Scholarship from 1945-1980" (1985), 1930-1934 for a review of recent Matthean scholarship of Matthew's use of Scripture.

[40] Cf. e.g. Eduard Schweizer, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (^{4}1986), 10-11. It is the mixed textform of the fulfillment citations and their particular and untraditional links with the Matthean Jesus which is the reason for this conclusion.

[41] E.g. Mt 4:15-16; 12:18-21; 13:35.

[42] E.g. Mt 11:10; 21:5.

[43] Cf. e.g. M. D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* (1974), 124-129.

gospel of Matthew is therefore complex, and it is for this reason that the question is a recurring one in Matthean scholarship. The issue is relevant in the present study in order to gain an understanding of Matthew's redactional freedom in relation to the written text of Scripture.

Past studies have attempted to systematise the variations of text form in the gospel of Matthew. In light of these studies, two factors appear to be characteristic for the gospel of Matthew: First, although the quotations from, and allusions to, Scripture in the gospel generally display the employment of a variety of text forms and a varying degree of redactional adaptation of the quotations, the tendency in the quotations proper is towards the Septuagint, and show only minor variations.[44] Second, the fulfilment citations are not uniform in their text form, although all tend to diverge more from known text forms either in Hebrew or Greek than the other citations.[45] Thus, the question of text form is very much related to the issue of the place of the fulfilment citations in the gospel of Matthew. The difference in text forms has led to divergent theories both about Matthew's sources and to the identity of 'Matthew', his knowledge of languages and his exegetical skills. From the point of view of the present study it is especially the question of theological exegesis evident in the function of citations in the narrative section which is of interest. Hence, the establishment of text form as a key to locating the evangelist's historical setting is important, not as an end in itself, but as an aid in establishing redactional intention.

On the basis of the general consensus regarding the scriptural citations in Matthew, it has been common to speak of the Septuagintal text form of in-text scriptural quotations[46] and the mixed text form of the fulfilment citations.[47] Krister Stendahl, who was one of the first to include insights from the Qumran discovery, affirmed this conclusion. He attributed the ambiguous evidence of the Matthean texts to the existence of a Matthean school of biblical interpretation, which used several versions and translations of Scripture in its transmission of material. According to Stendahl, proof of Matthean familiarity with the Hebrew text and contemporary Targumic interpretations of Scripture is found in the fulfilment quotations, which for him constitute Matthean *interpretations* of Hebrew Scripture similar to the Targumim and the exegetical methods of the Qumran community.[48] The distinctive introduction to the fulfilment citations was for Stendahl the key to their peculiar text form. He proposed that these particular

---

[44] See the detailed charts in Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol. 1, 32-57, which also include allusions to Scripture in the gospel.

[45] Cf.Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 88-89.

[46] In-text citations refers to citations which form a part of the gospel narrative, and do not include a redactional introductory formula. In contrast the fulfilment citations are redactional comments inserted as parentheses into the narrative.

[47] Cf. e.g. G.D. Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (1946), 56-57.

[48] Stendahl, *School*, 200.

citations were evidence of *actualisations* of Scripture in the style of Qumran pesher exegesis, which are characterised and limited by prevailing interpretations/translations of the MT. Further, Stendahl suggested that the tendency to perfect the Septuagintal text form in the remainder of the Scripture citations in Matthew was a result of a gradual adaptation to the text form the Matthean community was familiar with.[49] Stendahl thus differentiates between the work of the School of Matthew, which knows and uses a variety of texts and translations, and the community of Matthew, which knows and uses the Septuagint.

Robert Gundry, whose study on the use of Scripture in the gospel of Matthew was written shortly after that of Stendahl, reaches similar conclusions. Gundry, who includes allusions to Scripture in his study, denies the previous consensus that the in-text citations are more aligned with the text of the Septuagint than the fulfilment citations.[50] Gundry's thesis is that all of Matthew's scriptural citations and allusions show the same seemingly free text form. He finds that this evidence points to the existence of a Matthean targumising tradition, a kind of 'Ur - Matthew' which can be traced back to the apostle Matthew's note-taking during Jesus' earthly ministry.[51] Apart from this problematic hypothesis, Gundry's textual work is important. Gundry, like Stendahl, assumes that the gospel betrays targumising tendencies, points to the analogy found in the Qumran community and reasons for Matthean familiarity with several text forms of Scripture.[52]

Both Stendahl and Gundry, in varying degree, attribute the peculiar text form of the Matthean citations to the translation of the person(s) behind the gospel of Matthew. Other scholars have found the discrepancy between the Septuagintal citations and the mixed citations to be a problem and by pointing also to the hapax legomena sometimes found in the fulfilment citations, have assumed that the citations which show an unknown text form are to be attributed to a written source.

The evidence provided by Stendahl's study, that in general citations from Scripture in Matthew without the formulaic introduction tend to assimilate to the text of the Septuagint, led Georg Strecker[53] to agree with Stendahl that the Septuagint was the translation used in the Matthean church, but to oppose him in his conclusion as to identity of the Matthean redactor. To Strecker, Matthew as a gentile Christian simply handed on pre-existing material in the use of the fulfilment citations. Matthew had no knowledge of Hebrew or Aramaic.[54] To explain the phenomenon of the fulfilment

---

[49] Stendahl, *School*, 148.

[50] Robert H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel: With Special reference to the Messianic Hope* (1967), 152.

[51] Gundry, *Use*, 182.

[52] Gundry, *Use*, 174-178.

[53] Georg Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit. Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Matthäus* (1962).

[54] Strecker, *Weg*, 29.

quotations, Strecker found the Book of Testimonies hypothesis[55] useful, a source of collected Scripture quotations or testimonies organised according to the key-word principle to help memorisation.[56] Strecker's reliance on the Book of Testimonies hypothesis met criticism. Wilhelm Rothfuchs found like Gundry that the Septuagint influence on Matthean citations had been emphasised more than the evidence warrants.[57] Like Gundry he placed the citations in the Targumic tradition, but differed in assigning this tradition to a written source available to Matthew, i.e. not the work of the Matthean evangelist himself.

The work on scriptural traditions in Matthew completed in the 60's and 70's set the agenda for later studies of scriptural citations in Matthew. Subsequent studies more concerned with redaction and composition analysis have shown that particularly those citations which do show a mixed form with influence of the Masoretic Text reveal theological concerns of the gospel of Matthew that are not otherwise 'typical' of the early church.[58] They are well integrated into the narrative context in which they appear, so that there is wide consensus that the formulations of the citations can on the whole be attributed to Matthew, or that, if they are derived from a written source, a large degree of redactional adaptation may be presumed.[59] Hence, it is concluded that a certain familiarity of the evangelist with the Hebrew text must be presupposed.[60] In this context, Graham Stanton turns Strecker's hypothesis on its head, by claiming that in the citations which Matthew adapts from Mark and Q, his loyalty is to the synoptic sources rather

---

[55] Drawing on W.C. Allen, "The Old Testament Quotations in St. Matthew and St. Mark," (1900/1901), 281ff, Francis Crawford Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission* (1906), 124-128; and Charles Harold Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: the Substructure of New Testament Theology* (1953), 29-57.

[56] Strecker, *Weg*, 83. The presence of similar concern for the fulfilment of Scripture in the gospel of John has been thought to support this hypothesis. The relationship of the gospel of John to the synoptics is not clear. It is interesting to note that the citations which are introduced as fulfilment in John all occur in John's passion narrative, while Matthew's citations are unevenly spread throughout the gospel. Cf.George M. Soares-Prabhu, *The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew: an Inquiry into the Tradition History of Mt 1-2*, (1976) 47f, who emphasised the difference of the Johannine citations from those of Matthew. Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 151-177, concludes that both John and Matthew make use of existing traditions to which they each have individual access.

[57] Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 75, 104-109. Supported also by Soares-Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 77-83.

[58] Cf. Soares-Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 71-73. This is also where John and Matthew differ. The Johannine Scripture quotations show a Christian apologetic concern and are mainly to be found in the passion narrative. Cf. Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (1961), 271; Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to Saint John*, vol 1 (1968), 38f.

[59] Gundry, *Use*, 172; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 57-89, 107; Frans van Segbroeck, "Les Citations d'accomplissement dans l'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu d'après trois ouvrages récents" (1972), 129; Richard S. McConnell, *Law and Prophecy in Matthew's Gospel: The Authority and Use of the Old Testament in the Gospel of St. Matthew* (1969), 138; Stanton, "Matthew's Use", 358-362; Alexander Sand, *Evangelium, 151-156;* Alexander Sand, *Das Gesetz und die Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Evangelium nach Matthäus* (1974), 6; Donald A Hagner, *Matthew 1-13* (1993), lvi-lvii.

[60] Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, 58.

than to the Septuagint per se, but that with respect to the fulfilment citations, 'Matthew himself is almost certainly responsible for the choice and adaptation'.[61]

More recently, Luz, facing the same diverging evidence as the generation before him, finds that the fulfilment quotations are such a part of the narratives in which they occur that the narratives together with the quotations must stem from an already formed Christian tradition available to the Matthean redactor.[62] The difference between the form of the fulfilment citations and the Septuagint forms of other citations peculiar to Matthew forces this conclusion according to Luz. Further, where Gundry opts for a plethora of manuscripts and textual traditions available to Matthew, Luz is a minimalist in claiming that evidence of verbatim citations can only be found in quotations from Isaiah;[63] and consequently Isaiah is the only written Scroll of Scripture available to Matthew. Like Stanton, Luz finds that Matthew does not quote the Bible according to the Septuagint or MT. He goes even further by saying that Matthew does not himself translate or targumise; rather Matthew's fidelity to his sources shows that Matthew quotes the Bible according to Q, Mk or M.[64]

The study of the text form of Matthew's scriptural citations and allusions does not indicate a clear trend toward one particular textual tradition. Presuppositions with regard to Matthew's community and background often serve to limit or guide the scholars' handling of the ambiguous evidence the gospel includes, and hence are consequential for the conclusions reached.[65] The studies have, however, revealed that deductions made regarding the text form of Matthean citations and the question of availability of sources for the Matthean evangelist, cannot simply be based on the background of the Matthean text itself. Factors which must be considered include the multilingual environment of Palestine in the first century, the fluidity of text form of Hebrew, Greek and Aramaic scriptural traditions, the education system the Matthean redactor may have been subject to, literacy, and the tradition of oral recitation of Scripture. These factors could open a well of explicit hypotheses to explain Matthew's

---

[61] Stanton, "Matthew's Use", 363. In his essay Stanton raises the question of the remainder of the citations peculiar to Matthew, but in his analysis fails to address it. The question was previously raised by Soares-Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 105, who suggests that the 'in text' quotations in Matthew were shaped through catechetical and liturgical use in the Matthean community and hence belong to the material which became the sources of the Matthean narrative. The fulfilment quotations, however, are ad-hoc translations by the redactor.

[62] Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 1, 138. Similarly also Schweizer, *Matthäus*, 11. Already Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 94-95 suggested that this combination may have originated in the liturgy where the reading of Jesus tradition was combined with certain O.T. lessons.

[63] Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 1, 135.

[64] Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 1, 138.

[65] Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 1, 135, uses the apparent break of the Matthean community with the synagogue, to claim that 'Zur Synagogenbibliothek hatte der Evangelist offenbar keinen Zutritt mehr.' Gundry's hypothesis of Matthew as a targumising disciple of Jesus, and Stendahl's 'School of Matthew' are speculations that cannot be proven by textual analysis only.

use of textual traditions.[66] It would seem more fruitful, however, to let these elements simply serve to inform and thus to set the loose parameters within which Matthean use of Scripture must be considered.

Several scholars have pointed out that deviations from the text of the Septuagint in a citation or allusion, with a text leaning toward the Hebrew (or the Aramaic Targum), does not necessarily prove an independent translation or adaptation of the Hebrew, but may show dependence on a different, unknown Greek textual tradition of the Bible.[67] While it is true that the evidence from Matthew's reception and adaptation of Mark and Q show only slight redactional tendencies towards agreement with the Septuagint, the evidence does not exclude the possibility that Matthew also knew and read Hebrew and/or Aramaic. The place of composition, of course also plays a role here. The use of the Septuagint may, but does not necessarily, point to a setting of the gospel outside of Palestine.[68] The Matthean adaptation and redaction of Mark in several places, e.g. 12:1-8, 9-14, shows familiarity with Jewish exegetical practices and would presuppose a certain level of Jewish education.[69] Although there is little evidence that Hebrew played a role in Jewish education in the diaspora, it was still in use in the Near East, as was Aramaic.[70] Because this education as well as the synagogue liturgy included recitation of Scripture and Targumim,[71] allusions and quotation from Scripture may well be 'from memory' rather than literary dependence.[72] It is thereby not simply inferred that divergence in text form is caused by a 'lapse of memory' on the part of the evangelist.

---

[66] Like the Ur-Matthew of Gundry, *Use*, 182. His hypothesis does not do justice to the evidence of the assimilation of many citations to the text of the LXX.

[67] Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 1., 137-138 considers it plausible that the tradition is oral. The kaige text and the textual tradition underlying Theodotion's and Aquila's Greek translations of Scripture prove the relative fluidity of the Greek text, and a general tendency towards bringing the Greek translation closer to the Hebrew can be documented around the beginning of the Christian era. Cf. Martin Hengel, "Septuaginta," 243; Leonard J. Greenspoon, "Aquila's Version", *ABD* 1 (1992), 320-321; Leonard J. Greenspoon, "Theodotion, Theodotions Version" *ABD* 6 (1992) 447-448. Stendahl, *School*, ii-iv, in the preface to the second edition of his book, recognises that this fact will naturally have implications for his own study and produces the need for an adjustment of his hypotheses regarding the sources of Matthew's citations.

[68] Cf. Hengel, "Septuaginta", 186.

[69] The passage will be analysed below. On the pattern of Jewish education cf. e.g. John T. Townsend, "Education (Greco Roman Period)", *ABD* 2 (1992), 312-317.

[70] John E. Stambaugh and David L. Balch, *The New Testament in its Social Environment* (1986), 123, 88. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Languages of Palestine in the First Century A.D." *CBQ*. 32 (1970), 501-531.

[71] Cf. Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 39-40; 97-98; Geza Vermes, "Bible and Midrash: Early Old Testament Exegesis", (1971), 201; Townsend, "Education", 316; Martin McNamara, *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentatecuh* (1978), 40-43. Possibly the formulation in the antithesis, 'you have heard it was said', points exactly to this type of recitation and interpretation of texts. McNamara, *New Testament*, 126-131.

[72] Luz, *Evangelium*, 135-136. Luz connects the large percentage of Septuagint agreement of the Matthean Isaiah quotations to his hypothesis that the Matthean community owned an Isaiah scroll, hence less agreement would point to the absence of the written text.

The repeated recitation of Scripture and Targumim led to an exact internalisation of the tradition. Frequency in citations and allusions to a specific book may point to specific theological significance or the availability of sources to Matthew, or both.[73]

The ambiguity of the evidence requires therefore that the text of the Matthean citations and allusions can only be analysed in light of the text forms available to us. Hence, where the Matthean text does not display literary dependence on any known text form, and the Matthean text form and the surrounding narrative show similar interests, the presence of a specific Matthean theme is to be presumed. Therefore, on the basis of the existing evidence it is possible to reach conclusions about the function of the scriptural citation or allusion in the Matthean narrative, and the theological value of this in the gospel. The evidence cannot prove that the Matthean redactor is responsible for the translation itself, but the place of textual variations in the gospel context may serve as an indication.

2.2.3. The Fulfilment Citations

Because the text forms of Matthean scriptural citations do not seem to have a common denominator, and since the fulfilment citations seem to pose greater textual problems than other quotations, scholarly research on Matthew's use of Scripture has put greater emphasis on the fulfilment citations. They form a group not only because of their mixed text form, but more distinctively because of their particular introductory sentences, and thereby also by their function as redactional comments inserted into the narrative.[74] As redactional comments they are perceived to be of particular importance because they are direct signals from the redactor to the reader concerning the Matthean pattern of scriptural interpretation and understanding of Scripture.[75] The exact number of such citations in Matthew is debated since the introductory formula varies and because a few follow the text form of the Septuagint. Passages which have been discussed as fulfilment citations are: Mt 1:22f; 2:5; 2:15, 17f, 23; 4:14-16; 8:17; 12:18-21; 13:14f; 13:35; 21:4f; 24:15; 26:31, 54, 56; 27:9.[76]

In the context of Matthew 11-13, there are three fulfilment citations: Mt 12:17ff, Mt 13:14f and Mt 13:35. Further, Mt 11:10 shares a similar concern. Matthew 13:14-15

---

[73] For comments on the content of the Christian libraries cf. Martin Hengel, *Die Evangelienüberschriften* (1984), 37ff; Peter Müller, *„Verstehst du auch, was Du liest?" Lesen und Verstehen im Neuen Testament* (1994), 75-77.

[74] See definition in Soares-Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 40.

[75] David B. Howell, *Matthew's Inclusive Story: a Study in the Narrative Rhetoric of the First Gospel* (1990), 179-189 addresses this aspect of the fulfilment citations from the point of view of narrative criticism. His insights that the ideological point of view of the narrator is here betrayed should be taken seriously in the attempt to identify the stance of the Matthean redactor. The exegesis of the relevant passages in Mt 11-13 show that the citations do not primarily function apologetically, but kerygmatically in the gospel.

[76] Cf. Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 17-26; Poul Nepper-Christensen, *Das Matthäusevangelium. Ein Juden christliches Evangelium?* (1958), 139-141; Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 1. 134, et al.

is generally not considered to belong to the group of fulfilment quotations, because the introductory formula differs and because Jesus is not the subject of fulfilment in the passage. In addition, the text form of the citation and its insertion into the context of the narrative section adapted from Mark places the citation in a different category. Nevertheless, since, as the later discussion will show, it is the Matthean theme of fulfilment which links all the fulfilment citations to each other, Mt 13:14-15 may prove to be significant for the understanding of the Matthean fulfilment theology.

The Matthean fulfilment citations are introduced by a recurring formula which also is thought to signal the particular importance of the quoted passages in the gospel of Matthew. The introductory sentence of the individual fulfilment citations varies so that it is not correct to speak of a single formula. The dispute with regard to the exact number and definition of the citations in question is caused by the absence of such a uniform formula. The introduction does in all instances include the verb πληρόω and in the majority of cases the clause τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου, but the rest of the introductions varies: τότε ἐπληρώθη//(τοῦτο δε ὅλον γέγονεν) ἵνα//ὅπως πληροθῇ//πληρωθῶσιν ... αἱ γράφαι τῶν προφητῶν//τὸ ρηθὲν (ὑπὸ κυρίου) διὰ (Ἱερεμίου/ Ἡσαΐου) τοῦ προφήτου//τῶν προφητῶν ... λέγοντος.[77] The introductory sentences are marked by formulaic and repetitious language and express the same intent or meaning. The bulk of the citations introduced with the formulaic sentences refer to particulars in the life of Jesus.[78] The others are concerned with events related to Jesus, but do not refer to Jesus' person or ministry.[79] The flexibility in the formulaic expression and its vocabulary points to a Matthean redactional formulation[80] drawing on Mark 14:49, which the parallel in Mt 26:56 shows.[81] Mt 26:56, which relates the arrest of Jesus to Scripture in a more general way, includes the language of the formulaic introduction, but lacks a subsequent citation.[82] In the development of the fulfilment formula, Matthew employs the clause ἵνα

---

[77] Greater variations occur: cf. e.g. Mt 13:14: καὶ ἀναπληροῦται αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία Ἡσαΐου ἡ λέγουσα. For an analysis of the different elements of the introductory formula cf. Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 27-44; Soares-Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 46-62.

[78] Mt 1:22; 2:15, 23; 4:14, 23; 8:17; 12:17; 13:35; 21:4. Mt 26:56 includes only the formulaic sentence without a citation. In Mt 27:35 a formulaic introduction is included in a textual variant which is clearly secondary and assimilation to the text of John 19:24.

[79] Mt 2:17; 13:14; 27:9. All three of these have been questioned with regard to their status as original 'fulfilment citations'. No textual evidence supports the hypothesis that the citations or the introductory formulations may be later insertions.

[80] cf.Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 1, 135-137; Soares-Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 49-61; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 18f.

[81] The combination of ἵνα with the passive subjunctive of πληρόω is present in the Markan parallel. Cf. Wolfgang Schenk, *Die Sprache des Matthäus. Die Text-Konstituenten in ihren makro- und mikrostrukturellen Relationen* (1987), 412 and Reinhart Hummel, *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Matthäusevangelium* (1966), 134. Contra Soares-Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 28-30; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 30-31 who understand Mt 26:56 to be secondary to the fulfilment formula.

[82] It is a redactional feature of the gospel of Matthew to adapt and expand Markan formulations and repeat them in a formulaic manner.

πληρώθη from Mark. Distinctively Matthean is the use of τὸ ῥηθὲν (ὑπὸ κυριοῦ) διὰ τοῦ προφήτου.[83] The clause is similar in formulation to the one found in 1 Chr. 36:22, which refers to the fulfilment of the word of the Lord through the mouth of Jeremiah. The usage of the aorist passive in Paul (Rom 9:12, 26; Gal 3:16) is related to the Matthean usage outside the fulfilment citations, and may indicate that Matthew's language is here informed by common usage in his environment. Matthew uses the formulation parallel to the γεγράπται of his sources,[84] and a distinction should therefore not be made between the spoken and the written word.[85]

The result of the formulaic language of the introductory sentence is a statistical preference of Matthew for the verb πληρόω, which in redaction critical thought points to a Matthean emphasis on the actualisation of prophetic promise in the person of Jesus, thus illustrating the claim of Matthew 5:17. Matthew's understanding and interpretation of Scripture has thus been perceived as epitomised in the Matthean fulfilment citations.

The fact that citations and allusions in the passion narrative do not (except in general terms in 26:54, 56) include fulfilment introductions shows that a one-sided emphasis on the concept of fulfilment in Matthew is misleading with regard to Matthew's overall understanding or use of Scripture.[86] Further, as history of research shows, the flexibility of the introductory formula makes a narrow definition of the fulfilment citations difficult. Therefore also a narrow definition of Matthew's concept of fulfilment must be avoided. Both Mt 2:17 and Mt 27:9, seldom questioned in their status as fulfilment citations, do not include the characteristic ἵνα πληρώθῃ ..., a fact which is attributed to a Matthean concern to distinguish between divine foreknowledge (in the passages in question) of the consequences of opposition to Jesus, and divine will and providence in the events in the life of Jesus.[87] Yet the two passages, in their concern to document prophetic foreknowledge of these consequences, are further away from the concern of the majority of the fulfilment citations, than e.g. Mt 2:5 which is concerned with an event in the life of Jesus. Matthew 2:5 is not often referred to as a fulfilment citation because it lacks the key 'formula'. The passage does, however, include a proper citation, and it seems that only the narrative context prevents the employment of a proper

---

[83] The aorist participle passive is not used elsewhere in the NT and not in the LXX. Matthew uses the aorist passive also outside the introductions to the fulfilment citations: in a fulfilment related introduction (Mt 3:3), in the antithesis (5:21, 27, 31, 33, 38, 43). With reference to the word of God: Mt 22:31; 24:15. Related use is found in the three occurrences of the aorist passive in Paul: Romans 9:12, 26; Gal 3:16.

[84] Cf. e.g. Mt 3:3; 11:10. Here the first is a Matthean formulation, the second is a reception form Q.

[85] Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 132, sees it as influenced by the rabbinic שנאמר employed when citing scriptural proof and equivalent to כתוב.

[86] Cf. Donald Senior, "The Lure of the Formula Quotations: Re-Assessing Matthew's Use of the Old Testament with the Passion Narrative as a Test Case" (1997), 90-103.

[87] Cf. Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 131-132 et al. For a more detailed discussion of these and the following examples cf. Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 90-97.

'formula', while 2:23, which shares the same concern as 2:5, includes the formula, but no proper citation and hence is often excluded among the group of fulfilment citations. Further, Matthew 13:14, concerned with explaining opposition to Jesus, builds a bridge between the formulaic introductions and a similar Isaiah passage cited in Mt 15:7-9, but here with the introduction καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν περὶ ὑμῶν Ἠσαΐας λεγῶν. Neither of these are generally considered to belong to the fulfilment citations. One must ask, however, whether these two differ more in content from the fulfilment citations concerned with the events in Jesus' life, than 2:17 and 27:9. Further still, the language of Mt 3:3 (οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ῥηθεὶς διὰ Ἠσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος) ties into the formulaic introductions,[88] excluding only the word πληρόω, and thus builds a bridge to less formulaic expressions like the one found in Mt 11:10, which is also the role of the baptist as it is to be found in Scripture.[89]

In conclusion, it may be said that the fluidity of language in the introductory sentences allows, on the one hand, for the reading of the fulfilment passages together with other references to Scripture in Matthew,[90] but on the other hand makes it necessary, in the interpretation of the individual passages, to take seriously the changes in the introductory sentences. As a result, the term 'fulfilment' in Matthew as it is expressed in broad terms in Mt 5:17 or 26:56 can not be employed as a general key by which a certain number or all of scriptural quotations are to be interpreted. As previous studies have shown, to discern how Matthew understands the Scriptures to be fulfilled in each instance the individual variations of the introductory sentences must be considered as well as how the passages fit in the narrative context of the gospel.[91] The individual passages may, in turn, inform the interpretation of Mt 5:17 and 26:56.

In view of the particular interest of the present thesis, which is to analyse the authority of the different traditions in Matthew, it is nevertheless important to establish the framework within which the introductory sentences and the citations may be understood in the context of Matthew's gospel. It is necessary, therefore, to examine the meaning of the concept of 'fulfilment' in Matthew, and whether Matthew's understanding of Scripture can be summarised under this principle.

---

[88] Differently, Ellis, *Old Testament*, 69-70, 80, 83-84 apparently draws a clear line between the fulfilment formula and οὗτος ἐστιν, the latter being perceived to have affinities to Qumran pesher exegesis.

[89] Luz, *Evangelium* vol 1, 134, recognises these "borderline" passages, but distinguishes them from the fulfilment citations proper (Mt 1:22f; 2:15, 17f, 23; 4:14-16; 8:17; 12:18-21; 13:35; 21:4f; 27:9). They are, rather, 'bridges to normal citations', which for Luz include: Mt 2:5; 3:3; 13;14; 24:15. The borderline passages do show, however, that Matthew's preference for formulaic language does not necessarily point to, or allow for, a clear cut definition of categories.

[90] Hence the assertion of Gundry, *Use*, 152, that the only thing which connects the fulfilment citations is their common introduction, is only partly true. There are no clear cut lines here either.

[91] Cf. Cope, *Matthew*, 11-12, 121; Soares-Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 107-123.

2.2.4. The Concept of Fulfilment in the Context of Matthean Theology

One can say that the question pertaining to the meaning of fulfilment in Matthew lies at the heart of the present investigation. Understanding how the Scriptures are thought to be fulfilled, and what consequences this has for Matthew's view of Scripture *and* Jesus material, will ultimately be seen in the function which the two traditions have in the development of the theological themes of the gospel. Yet the use of the verb πληρόω with regard to the prophetic word is important as an indicative guide.

Addressing the question of the interpretation of Scripture in the New Testament, Wilfried Ploch claims that the concept of fulfilment is decisive in all use of Scripture in the New Testament.[92] In content, this would imply that all exegesis in the New Testament is eschatological exegesis,[93] where the Scriptures point toward a future time of salvation, and where Jesus' person introduces this time of salvation. It is not the place of this thesis to examine the validity of this definition with respect to the use of Scripture in all of the New Testament. For the understanding of Matthew's use of fulfilment, however, the definition is important.

Ploch's statement introduces a time element which is central to Matthew's world view. It presupposes on the part of the evangelist an understanding of a progression of time towards an end time judgement. It further presupposes an understanding of history in which God is at work for the salvation of God's people. Both aspects belong to the world view of the evangelist, and are significant aspects of the prophetic texts the evangelist employs in the citations. What needs to be established, however, is the nature of past tradition in its relation to the new or in relation to the unfolding of salvation history. Scholars have attempted to answer these questions in different ways, placing emphasis on different meanings of the verb πληρόω.[94]

Matthew's understanding of fulfilment in terms of the actualisation of predictive prophecy appears to be the conclusion of R. S. McConnell.[95] For McConnell it is important to emphasise Matthew's understanding of prophetic texts as authoritative Scripture, but only in as much as they could be found to contain predictions of specific events in the life of Jesus.[96] Accordingly it is not a problem for Matthew to edit the wording of the passages. The Jesus event, as fulfilment of Scripture, becomes the key to reading Scripture. Matthew's partly atomistic exegetical practice, tying passages of Scripture to geographical and biographical details in the life of Jesus, may support this understanding. However, most of the passages in question show a deeper and more

---

[92] Winfried Ploch, *Jesaja-Worte in der synoptischen Evangelien Tradition* (1993), 19-22.

[93] Cf. also Gerhard Delling, "Πλήροω", *TDNT* 6 (1968), 296.

[94] Delling, "Πλήροω", 290-298.

[95] McConnell, *Law*, 101-141.

[96] McConnell, *Law*, 138: 'Old Testament prophecies were not regarded as authoritative in themselves. Rather, the prophecies which were important were determined by the life of Jesus.' Similarly also Soares-Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 102

dynamic relationship between the Jesus event and scriptural promise in the gospel of Matthew, where prophecy cannot simply be limited to the foretelling of details in the life of Jesus.[97] Thus, for example, the correspondence between Mt 1:23 and the preceding and coming events reveals a more discerning level of theological reflection (which develops throughout the entire gospel narrative) with regard to the person of Jesus, than a mere prediction-actualisation scheme would suggest. As the analysis below will show, the same is true for all three fulfilment citations in Mt 11-13.

The element of eschatological and messianic exegesis guides E.E. Ellis when he defines the term fulfilment as the eschatological consummation of Scripture in Jesus.[98] The use of the terms suggests an understanding in which Scripture reaches its completion or end in the person of Jesus.[99] According to this view, Matthew understands all of Scripture as prophetic and as pointing beyond itself to the event of Jesus. Hence, because the eschatological time has arrived, Scripture in its 'original' meaning is replaced by its messianic exegesis. In a related, but more subtle way M. Müller speaks of the fulfilment quotations as an expansion of Scripture so that the actual events in the life of Jesus interpret the prophecies and fill them with new (and final) content.[100] The result is the same: The Scriptures have their end in the Jesus event. This insight, however, cannot stand alone, but must be placed in the context of Matthew's understanding of history.

In his early work Hubert Frankemölle supports this understanding of the concept of fulfilment, claiming that for Matthew Scripture loses its original meaning in the life of Jesus Christ.[101] Understanding Jesus, or interpretation of Scripture in light of Jesus, as the replacement of Scripture in Matthean theology is based on the assumption that Matthew had already severed his ties to Judaism. Hence, the function *(Sitz im Leben)* of Matthean fulfilment citations as salvation historical readings of Scripture, would be to form a part of the Matthean apologetic over against the synagogue. In this salvation historical approach the church replaces Israel as the people of God, and through Jesus the Scriptures 'have come to an end.'[102] Frankemölle modifies this statement by maintaining that in its function of telling the history of Israel, and primarily of prophetic prediction of the messiah, Scripture preserves its validity.[103] Hence, it is only to be read in light of Jesus. After Jesus, new Scripture is required to tell the story of the new people of God. Hence, Scripture has its end in Jesus, by God's will. In this sense the fulfilment

---

[97] Cf. Nepper-Christensen, *Matthäusevangelium*, 167; Müller, "Salvation-History", 63.

[98] Ellis, *Old Testament*, 80. Cf. also Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 132-135.

[99] Cf. also Sand, *Gesetz*, 156; Gundry, *Use*, 157, 234.

[100] Müller, "Salvation-History", 63. Müller compares the process with a chicken hatching: 'What remains of the egg is nothing but a shell'. Cf. also Mogens Müller, *The First Bible of the Church: a Plea for the Septuagint* (1996), 132.

[101] Frankemölle, *Jahwe-Bund*, 390.

[102] Frankemölle, *Jahwe-Bund*, 357, 391.

[103] Frankemölle, *Jahwe-Bund*, 299-300.

of Scripture in Jesus would only be eschatological in the sense that the time of Jesus inaugurates a new epoch in the history of salvation, the time of the church. Hence, the eschatological fulfilment would in the Matthean perspective be both a past event, with regard to the Christ event, and a present one in the existence of the Matthean community itself.[104]

This emphasis on Matthean eschatological exegesis based on the salvation historical principle is often compared to the exegetical practice at Qumran which is based on the present setting of the community.[105] Exegetical works on the prophets, including the Habakkuk commentaries as well as the new versions of haggadic or halakhic traditions like the Temple Scroll, betray an understanding of Scripture where Scripture contains God's mysteries in a veiled form and only becomes true Scripture when it has been interpreted appropriately by a sage or visionary.[106] This view of Scripture is a mark of apocalypticism, which in its revelations draws mainly either on scriptural tradition as typological for the present or on the prophetic passages of Scripture which concern the not yet realised oracles that speak about the day of the Lord, about eschatological war and judgement of the whole world.[107] In both cases Scripture is understood to refer to the present or the immediate future; the present is understood to be the beginning of the last days, and the sectarians understand themselves to be the elect to whom particular knowledge is revealed.

Drawing parallels to Jewish apocalyptic literature, D. Orton understands Matthew's selfunderstanding to be that of an Apocalyptic Scribe.[108] U. Luz suggests the book of Jubilees as a literary *Vorbild* for Matthew.[109] The book of Jubilees as an example of Jewish apocalypticism is a rewriting of Scripture where scriptural events became typological for events in the present and the present became a part of sacred history. The secret revelations contained in the book of Jubilees do not simply hold an actualisation of Scripture, but also new, secret revelation which functioned as a supplement to Scripture. The Jewish apocalyptic tradition represented in the Qumran literature and the book of Jubilees reveal secrets which laid bare the fuller meaning of Scripture; their new revelation was not thought to replace the Torah or the scriptural

---

[104] Wolfgang Trilling, *Das wahre Israel* (1964), 87; Rolf Walker, *Heilsgeschichte*, 132-133; Strecker, *Weg*, 84-85.

[105] Cf. Müller, *First Bible*, 132; McConnell, *Law*, 139-141 makes the parallel between Matthew and Qumran explicit. Michael Knowles, *Jeremiah in Matthew's Gospel: the Rejected-Prophet Motif in Matthean Redaction* (1993), 25; Akio Ito, "Matthew and the Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls" (1992), 23-42 tries to show a connection of Matthew to the community of the Dead Sea Scrolls in a common apocalyptic background.

[106] Cf. Michael Fishbane, "Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran" (1988), 364; Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 187. Many exegetes compare the Q- saying in Mt 11:25-27 par to this apocalyptic understanding of Scripture and its fulfilment. The passage will be discussed below.

[107] Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 189-192.

[108] David Orton, "Matthew and Other Creative Jewish Writers" (1994), 136-139.

[109] Luz, "Fiktivität", 177.

tradition.[110] The new revelation was either structured in a typological manner on Scripture and consisted of an explication of Scripture, or present events became revelatory by assimilating them to Scripture and describing them in the language of Scripture. Hence new revelation did not mean a consummation of Scripture or an end to tradition, but Scripture remained in focus as the locus of revelation. It was the mark of sectarianism that the 'elect', to whom apocalyptic secrets were revealed, remained reactionary and exclusivist with regard to the hellenisation of Jewish culture and to what was perceived as a lax attitude to the Torah. The strict upholding of the Torah became the mark of the sectarian communities.[111]

As the subsequent exegetical study will show, there are indeed parallels between the use of Scripture in the apocalyptic material and the gospel of Matthew. Perhaps the Pesher commentaries are the closest to Matthew in eschatological outlook as well as the interpretation of Scripture in light of contemporary events and the understanding of the imminent future.[112] There are, however, also significant differences with regard to outlook and understanding of Scripture. The factors which are viewed as parallel to the Matthean fulfilment theology: that the pesharim interpret the Scriptures as pertaining to the last days, and focus on the teacher of righteousness as the authoritative teacher of the Scriptures to whom commitment and dedication is of supreme importance,[113] may also be listed as the factors which mark the difference between Matthew and the apocalyptic texts. Although Matthew in the context of the gospel twice uses vocabulary which shows affinities to apocalyptic language of special revelation, and depicts Jesus as an authoritative teacher,[114] the interpretation of Scripture as 'fulfilled' is not based on particular authority or secret revelations on the part of Matthew. Here is the major difference between Matthew and the apocalyptic literature.[115] The understanding of Scripture as containing esoteric truths, only available through the authoritative interpretation of a teacher, is not a presupposition necessary for understanding the Matthean passages. The law and the prophets as taught and 'fulfilled' in Jesus are open and present for those who have eyes to see and ears to hear (Mt 12:1-8; 13:13-15; 23:3); what is happening is open and witnessed to in the Scriptures. Further, though realised eschatology surely is the perspective from which Matthew writes, there is relatively little interest in the events of the last days. Finally, the gospel draws on the Biblical texts, but is not primarily a textual commentary,[116] hence the interpretation of Scripture is not the

---

[110] Cf. Fishbane, "Use", 340; Christopher Rowland, "Apocalyptic Literature" (1988), 181-183.

[111] Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 165.

[112] So also Luz, "Matthäusevangelium", 242.

[113] Bruce D. Chilton, "Commenting on the Old Testament (with Particular Reference to the Pesharim, Philo and the Mekilta)" (1988), 123-127.

[114] Mt 11:25-27 and 13:35ff.

[115] See also Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 137-143.

[116] This is also the difference between Targumim and the Matthean interpretation of Scripture.

main focus, but the doings and sayings of Jesus as they are supported by Scripture. The fulfilment of Scripture does not signify the consummation of Scripture in Jesus in the meaning the Scriptures have come to an end. Rather, what Jesus is, and what he represents, is witnessed to in Scripture. Scripture does not receive its meaning from Jesus, but in Jesus the true meaning of Scripture is present.

The weakness of the emphasis of the historical *Sitz-im-Leben* which is present in earlier historical analysis is evident in the one-sided reading of the Matthean text in the context of the break between the Matthean church and the synagogue. In connection with a recognition of Matthean realised eschatology, Jesus and the Church then are described as representing something new and different. Reading Matthew's fulfilment theology in light of the salvation historical principle in combination with Matthean anti Pharisaic polemic and the 'new' inaugurated with the birth of Jesus may have resulted in a greater break with Judaism than the Matthean text actually gives witness to. In the context of interpreting the fulfilment passages in Matthew, Lars Hartmann has called for a theologically more neutral usage of the term 'fulfilment', and speaks of the possibility of understanding Scripture as vessels to be filled with events.[117] Studies concerned with the use and interpretation of Scripture in Judaism before and at the time of Jesus/the primitive church show that the concern for the actualisation was not simply one present in the apocalyptic literature, or in the eschatological oriented sect at Qumran from which the pesher material arose.[118] The halakhic material in itself is evidence for such an understanding of Scripture.

Although the lines between the prophetic and the apocalyptic traditions within Judaism at the time may not be clear cut, it is here proposed that the parallel to Matthew's Christology understood as a fulfilment of Scripture is found in the prophetic rather than in the apocalyptic tradition. The radicalisation of the Torah, the demand for compassion, and the rejection of those sent by God all have precedents in the prophetic material Matthew cites. Moreover, in as much as in the liturgy, the haphtarah, the reading of the prophets were meant to express the will of God for redemption,[119] Jesus may be said to fulfil that function of the Scriptures in performing or embodying God's salvific attitude to humans. In this sense one can say with Rothfuchs that Scripture and Christ event together constitute revelation for Matthew.[120] But Matthew's fulfilment theology does not imply an end or a completion of Scripture. It is only because Jesus fills

---

[117] Lars Hartmann, "Scriptural Exegesis in the Gospel of St. Matthew and the Problem of Communication" (1972), 136.

[118] In fact, Rowland, "Apocalyptic Literature", 180 points out that the particular difficulty when dealing with the use of Scripture in the apocalyptic literature is to distinguish its use from other Jewish literature of the same period in time. To Rowland it is the literary aspects of apocalypticism, the claim to be divinely inspired interpretation of the esoteric truths found in Scripture, which makes apocalypticism different from other Jewish literature. This element is not present in Matthew in the apocalyptic sense.

[119] Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 45-46.

[120] Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 117-119.

the prophetically spoken paradigm for the Messiah, that he fulfils the prophetic oracles, consequently Scripture is confirmed and upheld, as expressed in Mt 5:17.[121] The exegetical study Matthew 11-13 will show how the scriptural passages receive their content in Jesus, but point beyond themselves to be filled yet again. Hence Matthew understands the Scriptures to have been fulfilled, but not to have lost their significance or relevance.

2.2.5. Conclusion

In line with the specific subject of this study - the use and authority of traditions in Matthew 11-13 - the above analysis has been concerned with Matthew's use of Scripture as a source for composition as it is laid open in the use of citations, mainly, but also of allusions. The purpose has been to show that the formula-quotations specifically, but also other citations, as well as the Matthean addition of scriptural allusions to gospel tradition, do not simply demonstrate an apologetic need to ground the Jesus story in the history of the Jewish people. They reveal that the Christological or messianic exegesis of Matthew presupposes the Hebrew Scriptures and understands itself a part of a world shaped in thought and theology by the same Scriptures. To state the obvious: Scripture constitutes authoritative tradition for Matthew. The preoccupation of past research with the text form of the Matthean citations shows that the continuity with tradition and reverence for Scripture is not located in the exact translation of individual passages, and not necessarily in the original context of the passages which the evangelist cites. Even herein, the gospel betrays its Jewish origins: the citation and selection of Scripture in itself is an act of interpretation, an actualisation of Scripture.[122] Hence, it is possible to postulate that the evangelist himself is responsible for mixed citations and variant readings of texts where a Matthean theological motif can be established.

The thesis which will be demonstrated in the present study is that Matthew, as a historical theologian,[123] primarily uses Scripture in its paradigmatic nature. Other aspects of Matthean use of Scripture, as e.g. in the Moses typology demonstrated by Dale Allison[124] or the Jeremiah typology analysed by Michael Knowles,[125] have not been touched upon in this brief exposition. This choice has been made despite their relevance for the present study. In Matthew 11-13 Matthew presents Jesus as 'greater than...' biblical figures in many ways, and Allison's book touches upon the wisdom/torah motif in 11:28-30, which is relevant for the understanding of Jesus as an antitype to Moses as

---

[121] Gerhard Barth, "Das Gesetzesverständnis des Evangelisten Matthäus" (1960), 60-66.

[122] Cf. Jacob Neusner, "Scripture and the Mishnah: Authority and Selectivity" (1982), 65; Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 72 cites Rabbinic tradition: 'R. Judah said: If one translates a verse literally, he is a liar; if he adds thereto, he is a blasphemer and a libeller.'

[123] *Geschichtstheologe*, cf. Frankemölle, *Jahwe-Bund*, esp. 308-400.

[124] Dale C. Allison, *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (1993).

[125] Knowles, *Jeremiah in Matthew's Gospel* (1993).

the giver of the law. The rejected prophet motif which Knowles points to is also very present in Mt 11-13, especially as a part of the Deuteronomistic understanding of history represented in the obduracy of the people.[126] Likewise, other hermeneutical aspects of Matthean scriptural usage have not been accounted for. These hermeneutical aspects are better treated in the context of the analysis of the passages.

A question which has not yet been explored is *how* Scripture functions as authoritative. In chapter three, this question will be addressed, as well as the presuppositions and methodology which is used in the exegetical analysis of the citations and allusions within the narrative context in which they occur. Ultimately, it is the context in the gospel which must inform how Matthew altered sources to fit into his own world, which also must include the question of how the different strands of tradition were fused together. Before this question is addressed, a review of Matthew's reception of Jesus tradition will be presented.

2.3. Redaction and Composition of Jesus Tradition

2.3.1. Introduction

The gospel of Matthew is not a free creation, but a composition of material woven together from different sources and traditions. As it is common to speak of scriptural citations in Matthew, the passages from Mark and Q as they are transmitted in Matthew, may be labelled citations of Jesus tradition. In much the same way as it has been noted that Matthew treats the scriptural tradition which he preserves freely as far as selection, text and interpretation of Scripture is concerned, redaction critical studies of the gospel have shown Matthew to deal creatively and independently with his written sources.[127]

Methodologically, a redaction critical analysis seeks on the basis of synoptic comparisons to establish the kind of lexical, stylistic and redactional changes the evangelist has made in the reception of the gospel traditions in order to draw conclusions as to the redactional intentions of Matthew. This analysis also tries to establish the structural composition of the Matthean narrative, and the use of source material therein, in order to gain insights into the Matthean understanding of the Jesus tradition. In the first instance the historical *Sitz-im-Leben* in terms of the practical needs or theological issues of the Matthean community is often emphasised. The transparency of the Matthean narrative toward the Matthean context is frequently assumed. In the latter instance the focus is on Matthew as a theologian.

An aspect of the transmission of Jesus tradition which is of importance in light of the question of the authoritative status of these sources is also the question of non-reception: that part of tradition which is discarded. In the reception of material certain

---

[126] This theme has also been carefully and exhaustively analysed by Odil Hannes Steck, *Israel und das Gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten* (1967).

[127] Cf. the review of important redaction critical studies since 1945 in Stanton, "Origin".

motives for reception can be established, and these motives may say something about how Matthew understood the nature of his sources.

In the following sections, the issue of Matthew as recipient and interpreter of Jesus tradition will be discussed, before the question of Matthew as a composer of traditional material as well as his motivation for preservation of Jesus tradition will be addressed. First, however, a few reflections concerning the written text of Matthew's sources will be offered.

2.3.2. The Text of Matthew's Written Sources

The successful work of the redaction critic depends upon the presupposition of the existence of written sources where the form of the text is established, at least approximately. The present review is concerned with the sayings-source normally referred to as Q, and the gospel of Mark, since the probability in establishing the original wording of the sources in these two instances is greatest.

The opponents of the Q-hypothesis use the absence of an actual textual manuscript as an argument for their searching for alternative solutions to the synoptic problem. The wording of Q can only be established on the basis of a synoptic comparison with Luke. The form of the text available to Matthew can not with certainty be established. Neither is it certain that the text of Mark known to us through the text represents the exact *Vorlage* to which Matthew (and Luke) had access. Some of the minor agreements between Mt and Lk over against Mark may indeed point to a different Markan text. The possibilities of different versions of Q is more widely accepted.

The fluidity of the scriptural tradition at the time of the writing of the gospel has been pointed to above. The possibility that Mark and Q existed in variant forms must be taken into account even outside the context of the minor agreements. Barabara Aland has in the case of the gospel of Matthew been impressed with the relative accuracy of written transmission of the Matthean text at an early stage and is thereby convinced of the possibility of reconstruction the original gospel text.[128] In contrast, Stanton has called for a greater discernment in redaction criticism with regard to the possibility both that the edition of Matthew available to us represented a redacted form of an earlier Matthew, and the possibility that the sources of Matthew were not yet complete in written form before they were used.[129] In Matthew, scholars have been able to identify linguistic and stylistic traits of the evangelist,[130] which show that despite the discrepancies in

---

[128] Barbara Aland, "Das Zeugnis der frühen Papyri für den Text der Evangelien" (1992), 325-335. On the example of the gospel of Matthew, Aland points out that the textual variants of the gospel fragments are of such a character that they first and foremost witness to the copyists' regard and respect for the correct preservation of the written text (that is, the gospel text as it was written down in the first century and preserved through careful copying). Theological motivations did not result in the rewriting of the text itself.

[129] Stanton, "Origin", 1897-1899.

[130] Cf. Schenk, *Sprache*; Goulder, *Midrash*, 116-123, 476-485; Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew: a Commentry on his Literary and Theological Art* (1982), 641-649; Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 1, 31-56.

Matthew's reception of material into the narrative, the interweaving of material in the gospel does not in general betray the evidence of a subsequent redactor.[131] The question therefore remains open as to how criteria could be established to identify redactional layers in Matthew.

It remains vital that the reception of the synoptic material in Matthew must be analysed in light of Matthean style and in light of the literary and theological context of the passage in question. Although the exact text form of the sources as they were available to Matthew can only be postulated on the basis of the existing manuscripts available to us, Matthean redactional intention can be assumed where the text does not correspond to the text of the existing sources and correspondence with the Matthean narrative exposition and theology can be shown. Further, the extent and nature of redactional modification of the sources must be sought explained and confirmed in light of theological and thematic interests in the gospel. Here the restructuring and recomposition of traditional material may be indicative.

2.3.3. Matthew's Reception and Interpretation of Jesus Tradition

In his Heidelberg thesis, H.J. Held finds the redactional achievement of Matthew in relation to Markan source material in chs 8 and 9 to be threefold: preservation of tradition, interpretation of the Jesus stories, and actualisation of the material for the disciples in the present.[132] This interpretation process is not only performed through abbreviating and fashioning the tradition, but also by creative addition to the stories, whereby the additions only are meant to bring out more clearly the meaning already inherent in the source.

It is relatively common to emphasise the stylistic changes and shortening of the written sources as primarily representative of Matthean narrative style, and the more radical changes as intentional interpretation of tradition.[133] In the process of Matthean abbreviation of received tradition, however, there lies an inherent choice in how a passage is presented in the narrative. Stylistic changes are also conscious and may reflect, if not an intentional theological development, at least something of the frame of reference within which the evangelist works. Further, the rearrangement of material into a different narrative context is a redactional choice made not simply on an external basis, but on the perceived statement of the passage in question. A study of Matthew's redaction of Q material in chapter 11 shows that this reception process of both stylistic and more

---

[131] Certain passages in Matthew have been questioned; e.g. both fulfilment citations in Mt 13 have been labelled interpolations by some scholars.

[132] Heinz Jocahim Held, "Matthäus als Interpret der Wundergeschichten" (1960), 284-287. He here repeats the insights of his teacher, Günther Bornkamm, "Die Sturmstillung im Matthäusevangelium" (1960/1948), 51, who speaks of Matthew as the first exegete of the Markan stories he preserves.

[133] Cf. e.g. Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 1, 56-59. Luz emphasises Matthew as the 'heir' (*Erbe*) of his sources, like Held, prefers to accentuate the continuity of the Matthean narrative with the written sources.

evident redactional changes includes another three elements:[134] First, Matthew, with the help of additions and clarifications, *explains* parts of the tradition which seem obscure or meaningless. Here we also find Matthew's linguistic improvement of the tradition.[135] Second, Matthew picks up on themes which may be hidden or undeveloped in the tradition. Through creative weaving of traditional material as well as in additions which are peculiar to Matthew, these themes are emphasised and developed greatly in comparison with the sources.[136] Finally it may be observed that Matthew, through redactional activity, not only eliminates traditional material, but also clearly corrects the tradition and places it in the context of particular theological themes.

Exegetes frequently speak of Matthew's fidelity to or respect for his sources. Michael Goulder, who assumes that Mark was Matthew's sole source and considers the Q material to be Matthean creative expansions of Mark, holds only one and a half percent of the Markan material to be completely eliminated from Mark.[137] A number of passages and minor eliminations are according to Goulder not omissions, but reinterpretations of the Markan text. Although Goulder's thesis with regard to the Q material is not very credible, it does account for the minor agreements between Mt and Lk. It does not, however, account for what would have to be called the fragmentation and simplification of the Matthean speech material in Luke (as for example with Mt 18). Further, whereas Matthean replacement of the Markan material with creation of his own (e.g. the parable of the tares as opposed to the seed growing secretly) may be called reinterpretation, the process is more than a faithful retelling of the story: It is substituting it with a text which represents a divergent point of view or an altogether different subject.

Goulder himself points to aspects of Matthean redaction which are contradictory in nature.[138] Matthew on the one hand engages in transcription or verbatim citation of the source, and in large portions (from ch 13 onwards) also follows the basic structure of Mark.[139] This pattern points to a reliable reception of traditional material. On the other hand, the evangelist in the twelve first chapters departs largely from the structure of his sources, modifies source material and, moreover, creates material partly by duplicating tradition, partly by inserting fictitious material into the narrative. Goulder does not assign

---

[134] Cf. Lena Lybaek, "Wisdom Christology in Matthew" (1994), 33-36.

[135] Goulder, *Midrash*, 38 refers to specific explanations as in Mt 16:6 (Mk 8:15). Changes for clarification may include more than this: e.g. substitution of terms that may be ambiguous, or simply specifications of the situation in question over against a general description in the source.

[136] This is also in part what has been demonstrated by Knowles, *Jeremiah*, 218.

[137] Goulder, *Midrash*, 34, only considers nine verses or 1 ½ per cent of Mark to be completely eliminated from Mark; it is so because he understands a number of passages to be included in Matthew as reinterpretations or alterations, not omissions.

[138] Goulder, *Midrash*, 34-46.

[139] Cf. In light of the relative freedom with which material is structured in chs 1-12, Goulder labels the opposite procedure in chs 13ff, fatigue. Cf. Gundry, *Use*, 10: 'editorial fatigue set in.'

any motives for the creation of twin stories and fictitious narrative other than referring to the rabbinic traits of midrashic methods of Matthew.[140]

In an attempt to explain the phenomenon, Ulrich Luz isolates two basic motives for the procedure.[141] First, he argues, the reason for the duplication of passages is partly to be found in Matthew's structure of material, and partly due to the faithfulness to his sources. Therefore, when the structure required a certain motif in a certain place (e.g. the healings of a blind and a dumb man before the citation in Mt 11:5), but the fidelity to the wording of the synoptic material and theological considerations kept him from removing it from the context of the sources, duplicates of healings were created (cf. Mt 9:27-31; 20:24-34). Second, Luz ascribes other fictitious elements of the Matthean narrative primarily to the theological motivation of depicting the Jewish leadership as responsible for the death of Jesus, and thus the transfer of God's offer of salvation to the Gentiles.[142]

Luz, like Goulder, ascribes Matthean redactional procedures to Jewish literary techniques. Both note that the duplication of material and fictitious material are interpretative methods, and may be compared to Jewish historiography as it is found in the Deuteronomistic history or in Chronicles.[143] Jewish literature often attributes fictional words and deeds to historical figures.[144] The function of this fictitious material is often of kerygmatic and confessional character and is not perceived to be fictitious because it seeks to point out truths in history which would not have been clear in a description of actual events.[145] The similarities between Matthew's creative writing and Jewish literature again places Matthew in the setting of Jewish culture and thought. Further, if the interpretative methods used in Scripture is found to be employed in the reading of Jesus tradition, this may give an indication of the status of that tradition in the understanding of Matthew.

---

[140] Interestingly, the repetitions and doublets in Matthew, which serves Goulder in his argument for Matthew's midrashic expansions of Mark, had before Goulder served both the argumentation for a two-source theory (John C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem*, 1898, 35), and to prove Mark's dependence on Matthew (Basil Christopher Butler, *The Originality of St. Matthew: A Critique of the Two Source Hypothesis*, 1951, 53). Cf. also the review in Janice Capel Anderson, *Matthew's Narrative Web: Over and Over and Over Again* (1994), 13-16.

[141] Luz, "Fiktivität", 153-162.

[142] Cf. also Ulrich Luz, "Die Wundergeschichten von Mt 8-9" (1987), 163-165. The duplicates in the Matthean story can also be shown to fill a function in the overall Matthean narrative. Here the insights of a purely linear reading of the gospel may supplement redaction critical analysis fruitfully. Anderson, *Matthew's Narrative Web*, 177-180, in a narrative reading of Matthew, has pointed to the structural aspect of the Matthean doublets, showing that they in appearance form a chiastic pattern, centering on the response to Jesus by four different character groups in the gospel: the outcasts, the leadership, the disciples and the gentiles. Possibly the nature of the concern as presented by Anderson may be reversed to involve Jesus' attitude and response to the different character groups.

[143] Luz, "Fiktivität", 175-177;

[144] R.T. France, "Jewish Historiography, Midrash and the Gospels" (1983), 99.

[145] Manfred Oemig, "Bedeutung und Funktionen von 'Fiktion' in der alttestamentlichen Geschichtsschreibung" (1984), 262-263.

Redaction critical study has revealed a number of aspects of Matthean reading and integration of traditional material concerning Jesus, where relatively minor changes, abbreviation of material, clarification, even modifications and corrections take place in addition to both transcription and new creation of material. It is to be affirmed that in this process one can read not just Matthean preferential style and language, but also the guiding theology and setting of the evangelist. Further, the redactional techniques which have parallels in Jewish historiography, may give an indication of the status of Matthew's sources. This can be further exemplified in Matthew's ordering of traditional material.

2.3.4. Matthew's Composition of Received Tradition

The gospel of Matthew displays a number of artful techniques by which the gospel is organised and arranged so that it has been common to speak of Matthew's *literary art*.[146] It is the agreement of most scholars that Matthew's composition of material is both intentional and systematised. But whereas sections of the narrative can successfully be structured around certain principles,[147] agreement on the overall structure of the whole gospel has not been reached.[148] The creative and planned literary work of the gospel, however, seems to be significant for the establishment of particular concerns of Matthew. There is a noteworthy development from Bornkamm's understanding of the evangelist as primarily a collector, organising material according to external criteria,[149] to the recognition of the composition of material as theologically relevant.[150] Redaction criticism has evolved from an early preoccupation, mainly with the individual words and deeds of Jesus as the primary elements of tradition, to an appreciation of the significance of the composition and structure of the gospel as part of the reception and interpretation of tradition. What is significant with regard to the issue of the authoritative status of the traditions in question, is how these traditions are received into the greater structure of the gospel.

It has already been noted that in the gospel a break seems to occur between chapter 12 and 13, where the creative character of the Matthean composition from ch 13 onwards follows the Markan structure of events. In the introduction to their ICC Commentary on the gospel of Matthew, Davies and Allison have further illustrated this

---

[146] Cf. e.g. Gundry, *Matthew* (1982); Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom* (1975), 15-17; and Paul Gaechter, *Die Literarische Kunst im Matthäusevangelium* (1965).

[147] E.g. Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 1, 186 on the chiastic structure of the sermon on the mount with its centre in the Lords Prayer; D.E. Garland, *The Intention of Matthew 23* (1979), 8-33 on the structure of Matthew 23; and Cope, *Matthew*, 11-12, on the structuring of certain blocks of material (incl. passages in Mt 11, 12 and 13) on the basis of scriptural citations which he labels 'mid-point' texts.

[148] Cf. the overview in David R. Bauer, *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (1988), 21-54 and Stanton, "Origin", 1903-1906.

[149] Bornkamm, "Sturmstillung", 53. His own conclusion, which he sees as a single case, is nevertheless that the composition of material in Matthew contributes to the interpretation of the Stilling of the Storm.

[150] Bauer, *Structure*, 54.

aspect by pointing to triadic structures in the first part of the gospel until Mt 12:58 and the absence of such structures in the latter part of the gospel.[151] They explain this phenomenon with the observation that the first part of the gospel builds on material from both Q and Mark in addition to special Matthean material.[152] According to Davies and Allison, Matthew 'used up' most of the Q material in the first part of the gospel. The 'fatigue' which the latter part of the gospel gives evidence to, is accordingly caused by the limitations imposed on the evangelist by restricted source material.

Davies and Allison illustrate in their findings the conclusion of F. Neirynck, according to whom the order of material in the first part of the gospel (4:23-11:1) is both traditional and systematic, and that the section despite its character as the only truly original structural creation in Matthew, still, by and large, remains true to the Markan order.[153] The influence of Q causes the replacement of certain passages. Hence, the overall conclusion is that Matthew remains true both to the order of Q and to that of Mark. Despite this insight, the attempt to structure the gospel of Matthew according to that of Mark has not been successful. The model advocated by Kingsbury,[154] dependent on the formulaic sentences in 4:17 and 16:20,[155] would with the passion prediction as in Mark introduce the second part of the gospel: the way to the cross. Few people have been convinced of the theory, however, mainly because the formulaic sentences are not perceived to mark the beginning of units.[156]

With Neirynck, many scholars would in terms of the form of the gospel of Matthew, understand it to be a rereading (*relecture*) of Mark, Matthew having chosen the narrative rather than the logia form of his gospel. However, the influential essay of Bacon who structured the gospel according to the discourses in the gospel of Matthew,[157] illustrates the impression of Q on the gospel as a whole. Therefore, the

---

[151] Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol. 1, 62-72.

[152] Q has served as a source almost exclusively for the sermon on the mount, as the principle source for the discourses in 10, 11 and 12:25-45 and in a very subsidiary manner in the parables in chapter 13.

[153] F. Neirynck, "La Rédaction matheénne et la structure du premier Évangile" (1967), 72-73; also Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 1, 24-25.

[154] Kingsbury, *Matthew*, 5f.

[155] And others before him: cf. Neirynck, "Rédaction matheénne", 56-57.

[156] Cf. Neirynck, "Rédaction matheénne", 57-58; Stanton, "Origin", 1905.

[157] B. W. Bacon, "The Five Books of Moses against the Jews" (1918), 55-56. The major difficulty with Bacon's thesis is the division of material between five major discourses and narrative material. Chs. 23-25, for example consists of two separate consecutive discourses. Also the material in 10-13 consists largely of discourse, interrupted by narrative questions. These observations do not disqualify the emphasis Bacon placed either on the Matthean interest in Moses, nor the impact on the discourses in Matthew. Allison, *New Moses* has shown that the Moses figure is significant to the evangelist. Moreover, the relation discourse-narrative in the gospel has led others to find chiastic relations between the individual discourses in the gospel. Cf. J. C. Fenton, "Inclusio and Chiasmus in Matthew" (1959), 174-179; C. H. Lohr, "Oral Techniques in the Gospel of Matthew" (1961), 424-432.

gospel is both a rereading of Mark *and* a variation of the logia collection of Q.[158] This becomes particularly evident, when the redaction of the sources reveal that many of the prominent themes in Matthew are derived from Q rather than Mark.[159]

It is evident, and therefore also a presupposition of redaction criticism, that the reception and interpretation of written Jesus tradition in the gospel of Matthew is to be found both in the ordering and in the redactional modification of the synoptic material. With regard to the actual ordering of material in the gospel, it is possible to show that, in general, the evangelist orders material on the basis of its order in Mark or Q or both. It is also, however, noteworthy that within the framework of this general inclination Matthew does transpose material and thereby even in minor ways changes the content of the text. In the example of Mt 4:23-11:1, labelled by Neirynck as the only truly original order created by Matthew, the transposition and abbreviation of Markan pericopes may schematically look moderate.[160] The result is nevertheless in terms of the gospel text remarkably different form Mark. Further, despite the conservative attitude of Matthew to his sources, the ordering of the individual pericopes, together with the modification and creation of material, achieves a structure in the gospel. In this structure, an internal correspondence between significant themes is found. The emphasis found in this structure is not on external factors of the narrative, but on thematic and theological issues.[161]

Matthew's gospel is a retelling of the Jesus material as it is found in Q and Mark. The parallel between Matthew's creative story writing in the context of the gospel and Jewish historiography has been noted above. The manner in which Matthew treats the Jesus material in his *relecture* of the written material is likewise to be compared to Jewish historiography. Frankemölle has described the combination of story and discourse in the gospel of Matthew as a mixed form based on Q and Mark, patterned on the Deuteronomistic history.[162] Although one might argue that the freedom with which Matthew composes and arranges the existing material into a completely new story speaks against an understanding of the existing traditions as having had authoritative or 'sacred' status,[163] the methods chosen for the telling of the story, as well as the relative loyalty to the order and wording of the existing sources, do show, despite creativity, that the

---

[158] Cf. Frankemölle, *Jahwe-Bund*, 331; also Helmut Köster, "Überlieferung und Geschichte der frühchristlichen Evangelien Literatur" (1984), 1529-1530.

[159] Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 1, 56ff, describes Mark as providing the main framework for the gospel, but Q as providing specific theological concepts like the aspect of judgement. Further, he claims that the evidence of the existence of prophets and scribes in the Matthean church, places Q in a particular relation to the Matthean community.

[160] Cf. Neirynck, "Rédaction matheénne", 67.

[161] Cf. for example the chiastic structure of the Matthean doublets above, or the internal correspondence of themes in the sermon on the mount.

[162] Frankemölle, *Jahwe-Bund*, 345-347.

[163] Cf. France, "Jewish Historiography", 121; Stanton, "Origin", 1902.

stories preserved in the gospel have been perceived to own some kind of standing as sacred writings. Hence, the conclusions which concerned the Matthean duplications of material in the redactional insertions (cf. section 2.3.3.), apply also to the Matthean composition and creative re-reading of synoptic tradition. This will be explored further when the motivation of Matthew for the preservation of the material, and the motivation for the preservation of the material in this particular manner are considered.

2.3.5. Motives for the Transmission of Jesus-Material

In connection with the results from redactional and compositional analyses of the gospel of Matthew, research has been faced with the question of the motivation for the preservation of the Jesus material as well as the motivation for the altering of tradition. The historical-critical analysis of the gospels, drawing on classical *Formgeschichte* with its emphasis on the *Sitz-im-Leben* of pericopes of the Jesus tradition, assumed community-oriented motivation for such preservation and alterations.[164] The situation, environment and needs of the community are perceived to be mirrored in the specific separation and transmission of Jesus material. This 'redactional adjustability' of Jesus material in the reception process, characterised by both remembrance and continuity as well as amnesia and discontinuity, is presumed to have taken place at the oral level of transmission and reception before the texts of the gospels were formed and became fixed.[165] Hence, the practical motives of transmission and reception of material has been found in the *Sitz-im-Leben* of the primitive church.[166]

In contrast to this development, S. Byrskog has drawn attention to what he calls the 'non-practical motives of transmission' in the gospel of Matthew.[167] The point of departure for his study is the claimed interest of the church fathers in Jesus as the one teacher (εις ουν διδάσκαλος), noting the influence of Matthew 23:8-10 on the formulation.[168] Byrskog presupposes a connection between the early isolation and

---

[164] Paul-Gerhardt Müller, *Der Traditionsprozeß im Neuen Testament. Kommunikationsanalytische Studien zur Versprachlichung des Jesusphänomens* (1981), 113-116.

[165] Cf. Werner H. Kelber, "Die Anfangsprozesse der Verschriftlichung im Frühchristentum", 27-38.

[166] Köster, "Überlieferung", 1504-1531.

[167] Samuel Byrskog, *Jesus the Only Teacher: Didactic Authority and Transmission in Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism and the Matthean Community* (1994), 15-16. In his focus on non practical motives Byrskog joins Riesner in a critique of the 'classical *Formgeschichte*'. Cf. Rainer Riesner, *Jesus als Lehrer* (1984), 35-40. Riesner's interest is to demonstrate the actual '*Geschichtswert*' of the Jesus tradition as transmitted in the synoptic gospels.

[168] Byrskog cites Ignatius' letter to the Ephesians 15:1. Ignatius refers to Jesus as the only teacher also in Magn 9:1. Both passages are reminiscent but no explicit citation of Mt 23:8. The respective contexts of the saying in Mt 23 and the letters of Ignatius do not correspond, so that a clear relation to the Matthean concept is possible, but not verifiable. Cf. Wolf-Dietrich Köhler, *Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus* (1987), 81-82. Byrskog quotes similar formulations also from Clement of Alexandria. Other documentation of the absolute use of ὁ διδάσκαλος for Jesus among the church fathers is, however, scarce. Cf.Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, "Διδάσκαλος" *TDNT* II (1964), 157.

separate transmission of Jesus sayings and Jesus' didactic authority.[169] In the gospel of Matthew, Byrskog views Mt 23:8-10 as an indication that the understanding of Jesus as teacher and Jesus' didactic authority, had a specific motivating force on the transmission of Jesus tradition in the Matthean community.[170]

Byrskog finds three types of didactic motives in the gospel narrative: The *didactic* motive is found in the commissioning of the disciples to continue the teaching ministry of Jesus (Mt 28:19). The *didactic-biographical* motive is evident in the gospel itself: Matthew sought through the narrative to ground the teaching of Jesus in the life of Jesus. Finally, the *didactic-labelling* motive is found in the way the narrative of the gospel uses didactic labels, narrative structures and authoritative formulations to ascribe authority to Jesus as the only teacher. Byrskog holds that the character of transparency to the present found in the Matthean gospel narrative as described e.g. by U. Luz[171] makes it possible for the narrator and the community of the Matthean gospel to feel included in the Jesus story as pupils of Jesus. They identify themselves with the disciples and understand their identity to be 'the school of Jesus'. Motivated by the faith in Jesus as the only teacher, this school strove, according to Byrskog, to keep Jesus tradition separate from post-Easter Christian traditions. The gospel of Matthew, though displaying creativity in *elaborating* on the tradition, places the supreme importance on the *preservation* of the Jesus-tradition.

With regard to the process of transmission, Byrskog holds that the careful organisation of the gospel of Matthew requires a high degree of 'internalisation' of the written sources, an internalisation which would only be possible by the 're-oralisation', memorising of the written Jesus tradition.[172] Re-oralisation of the sources in turn made the creation of a new gospel narrative possible, in which the whole of the received tradition was included. Thus, Byrskog argues, although the Matthean community received a large amount of written sources, that written text was not a finalised one. Through the internalisation of the text, re-oralisation of the tradition took place. It was flexible and could be retold in a different form.

Here is not the place to discuss whether the stress on Jesus as the only teacher is representative of Matthew's primary understanding of Christ.[173] Consequently, it is not

---

[169] Byrskog draws on the work of Gerhard Kittel, *Die Probleme des Palästinischen Spätjudentum und das Urchristentum* (1926); M. Dibelius, *Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (1933) and Birger Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript* (^{2}1964).

[170] Similarly Müller, *Traditionsprozeß*, 157.

[171] Luz, "Wundergeschichten", 155-159.

[172] *Ibid.*, 343-348.

[173] The evidence is ambiguous. Jesus refers to himself as teacher four times in the gospel. The noun is used addressing Jesus only by his opponents. The number of occurrences of the verb with Jesus as the subject is reduced in relation to the Markan occurrences, but these are in central places like in the summaries combined with κηρύσσω. The question remains whether Matthew would not have made use of the noun more frequently in a positive sense if this was the basic motivating force for transmission. The disciples call Jesus κύριε, and in Jesus' own teaching the Messiah is called the same even by David

necessary here to adopt Byrskog's model of reception of didactic material in a Matthean 'school of Jesus'. Byrskog's study is nevertheless of particular interest for the question of the relation between transmission of tradition and the question of authority in Matthew. This is so not simply because it emphasises the authority of Jesus as a primary motivating force in the reception process, but also because in light of his concept of 're-oralisation' this authoritative teaching is not tied to the accurate verbal transmission of the material, but much more in the faithful reception and preservation of the actual content of the teaching.[174] The concept is helpful and important as a correction of previous understanding of the 'direction' in which the process of interpretation moved. Whereas previously the isolation of *Gemeindetheologie* in the text of the gospel would read the post-Easter situation *back into* the Jesus story, Byrskog, and with him P.G. Müller, portray a text process which moves from Jesus tradition into the community. Here, the preservation of Jesus material takes place in its actualisation and reformulation on the level of the Matthean community.[175] It is very doubtful, however, whether this reformulation of tradition as faithful preservation of authoritative teaching could avoid the process of situationally oriented interpretation which eliminates and includes on the basis of the subjective situation of the community. The preservation of Jesus material over against its post-Easter interpretation, even if perceived as authoritative teaching above and beyond all practical needs and motivations, would still be formed and marked by the stages of transmission.[176]

Finally, Byrskog's study raises questions with regard to the actual standing of the written tradition in relation to the authority of Jesus, as the origin of tradition. Byrskog emphasises both the continuity of Matthew with the written sources and the discontinuity, maintaining that the main interest both in reception and retelling of the story was the preservation of authoritative teaching over against the church-related theology. The phenomenon of re-oralisation of the tradition as postulated by Byrskog does not account for the careful 're-fixation' of tradition into a unified narrative which takes place in the gospel of Matthew. The mere fact that at least two written sources were available to Matthew shows that early in the Christian tradition a beginning fixation of Jesus-tradition had taken place. It is also probable that not only a special 'school' of scribes was familiar with this material, but that it was available to, and used by, the community. The re-oralisation and subsequent re-fixation into a gospel according to

---

(Mt 22:45). Logically Mt 22:45 in connection with Peter's confession would serve better as the motivating force and explains why Jesus can teach authoritatively at all. Cf. Byrskog, *Jesus the Only Teacher*, 200ff. where Byrskog addresses this question.

[174] Similarly again Müller, *Traditionsprozeß*, 113-115 distinguishes between the rabbinic reciting and memorisation of sentences and teachings and the creative reformulation of the actual meaning of the words of Jesus in Christian tradition.

[175] Cf. the distinction as it is made in Müller, *Traditionsprozeß*, 113-130. Müller speaks of the speech process initiated by Jesus.

[176] Kelber, "Anfangsprozesse", 36-40.

Matthew, thus, involved an alteration and reinterpretation of this tradition. Apart from an interest in the preservation of tradition, and a respect for the authority of the teaching therein, the creation of a whole new narrative in which the preserved tradition receives new meaning points to a process which is more radical than that which Byrskog insinuates. If the transmitted, internalised material was meaningful and served its purpose in the form it was received, what motivated the re-fixation of the material into a whole new gospel, where parts are fictitious and the existing tradition corrected? Are the criteria by which the selection and rearrangement of material was made found within the written Jesus tradition itself, in the interpretation of the community (i.e. in the understanding of what Jesus should have said), or do they lie outside the boundaries of Jesus tradition itself? Byrskog and his predecessors are interested in centering the primitive Christian tradition in Jesus and in affirming the historical accuracy of the sayings attributed to him, be it verbal accuracy or accuracy in content. In the present study the interest is the standing of that tradition in and of itself, as grounded *in* Jesus and in relation to Scripture as it is perceived by the Matthean community. If the motivation behind the writing of the first gospel is grounded in the evangelist's faith in Jesus as the messiah, and the purpose was to write a true and accurate account of his teaching, the written material consisting of the words and deeds of the messiah which were already in existence and available to the evangelist, must have enjoyed a privileged position of some kind.

2.3.6. Conclusion

The overview of Matthean redaction as it illustrates the process of reception and transmission of Jesus material in the gospel of Matthew has shown that in the process Matthew makes use of general Jewish hermeneutical practices in order to create his own version of the words and deeds of Jesus.[177] Matthew deals both conservatively and creatively with his sources, whereby both continuity and discontinuity with the older sources are achieved. Particularly the parallels with Jewish historiography and narrative material in which sacred history is retold and refashioned, and thereby also actualised for the present, gives an indication that the written Jesus material was highly regarded by the evangelist. The rewriting of Jesus material witnesses to a need for interpretation and actualisation of Jesus material similar to that which was observed as Matthew's attitude to scriptural tradition.

The survey in this chapter has reviewed the use of written sources in the gospel of Matthew. It has been shown that Matthew relates to the law and the prophets as Scripture, and actualises their prophetic claims into the present of the Jesus story. It has also been shown that Matthew's reception and transmission of written Jesus material

---

[177] The general practices of retelling and actualising tradition was already shown in the short review in § 2.1. Also the use of fiction in narrative material, meant to interpret tradition as described on p. 42 is such a hermeneutical practice.

indicates both a high regard for the sources as well as a need for reinterpreting and actualising of the material. It is this which takes place in the writing of the gospel.

The Matthean use of sources, both Scripture and synoptic material, has shown similarities both in the preservation and interpretation of tradition. Matthew's similar treatment of the sources, invites to an examination of how these traditions may be said to be authoritative for the evangelist. Matthew's interests seems to lie both in the true reading of Scripture as well as in the true interpretation of the Jesus tradition in light of Scripture. It becomes pertinent to examine and compare Matthew's use of the traditions, not with the view to establish a specific text form as 'the Matthean Bible', nor with the view to identifying the Matthean redactor, but rather to examine the texts from the point of view of how they are used as authoritative sources to form the Matthean gospel narrative.

The guiding question in the present thesis is therefore that of Matthew's use of sources and their authoritative standing in relation to each other. The first problem such a question poses is the difference in the nature of the material. The gospel of Matthew is the presentation of Jesus as the Messiah. It is not first and foremost concerned with the interpretation of Scripture. It has already been indicated that Matthew regarded Scripture as sacred and hence as authoritative. It has also been suggested that the identification of Jesus as Messiah gives authority to Jesus as well as the transmitted words and deeds of Jesus. The exegetical analysis, which will follow, is concerned with how these two traditions function together and over against each other in an authoritative manner in the development of the central theological themes of the section as well as of the gospel. In order to achieve a successful analysis it has been necessary to formulate beforehand the three presuppositions on which the exegesis is performed: first, the understanding of the gospel of Matthew as theological discourse, second, the understanding of the authority of written tradition in its transmission and interpretation as practical and theological in *function,* and finally the unity of Matthew 11-13 and its central place in the gospel. This will be presented in chapter 3.

CHAPTER 3.

THE GOSPEL AS THEOLOGICAL DISCOURSE AND THE FUNCTION OF TRADITION AS AUTHORITATIVE

The composition of the gospel of Matthew as an arrangement of written material from different sources has been pointed out repeatedly. The survey of chapter two makes clear that the question of the standing of scriptural tradition in and of itself and over against Jesus and Jesus' teaching as well as the interpretation of the law and the prophets, and hence also the place of the Matthean community in relation to Judaism, is not new. On the basis of the recognition of Matthew's written sources the present study seeks to complement previous insights by removing the question from the primarily historical (Matthew's setting in the history of the primitive church) and Christological (Jesus as the fulfilment of the law and the prophets) issues to the question of the transmission of tradition and the relation between written Jesus tradition and Scripture in the Matthean gospel narrative. The possibility of doing so depends on three suppositions or theses upon which the analysis builds: First, it is presupposed that the gospel of Matthew, by transmitting traditional written material, constitutes in its narrative form a coherent theological reflection upon the meaning and significance of the story it tells. Further, it is presupposed that the authoritative or normative standing of the respective traditions is detectable by analysing their function in the narrative exposition of the Jesus story. Finally, it is presupposed that chapters 11-13 of the gospel as a narrative block is representative of the gospel as a whole so that conclusions which may be drawn from the study of the transmission and interpretation of sources therein is valid for the whole gospel. The exegetical exposition in chapters 4-6 is structured according to the three motifs which have been found to be central in the three chapters: the ὁ ἐρχόμενος Christology, the πλεῖον-theme, and the theme of the hardheartedness of the people. The following reflections will seek to justify these presuppositions.

3.1. THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW AS THEOLOGICAL REFLECTION

Narrative and reader response criticism have emphasised the literary unity of the gospels and advocated a synchronic or linear reading of them. As such this synchronic attitude to the gospel literature is an extension of composition criticism and a rejection of

earlier redaction criticism's emphasis on the direct transparency of the texts to the historical situation of the evangelist. Overstated, one could say that the gospel text has been read allegorically, finding the meaning in the text in the direct situation into which it was thought to speak. The question which this 'literary' as opposed to a historical analysis of the gospels raises, is not simply the method by which to discover the meaning of the text (i.e. by describing its literary universe, or by locating the historical situation from which the text arose and to which it speaks). Inherent in the debate is also the question of the form or genre of the gospel: what are the gospels, what is the gospel of Matthew, which purpose does it/did it serve? The linear reading of the gospel, the coherent exposition of the life, suffering and resurrection of Jesus which it portrays, is important in this regard, yet this linear reading cannot be detached from the historical question. What the linear reading provides is a correction to the reading of the gospel purely as 'history', be it as a clue to discover the 'historical Jesus' or the 'historical Matthew'. A synchronic reading of the gospel, however, is only useful in combination with historical and redactional analysis. The nature of the gospel as a composition and adaptation of written sources does not allow for a reading of the gospel simply as 'story'. It is more than 'story', it is 'story' or narrative in the context of conscious theological reflection and as such constitutes in itself a theological discourse.

The hermeneutical process found in the reception and interpretation of written Jesus/gospel tradition in the gospel of Matthew has been compared to the method of reworking traditional historic material into a new narrative in Jewish historiographic literature. As Deuteronomy reworked and reapplied the Exodus tradition, so Matthew reworked and reapplied the tradition received through Mark and Q.

This process of combining Jesus material from several sources and its reception and transmission in Matthew, is more than an attempt to compile the recollections of the apostles. The association of the gospels with ὑπομνήματα or ἀπομνημονεύματα of the apostles is found in Justin in the second half of the second century.[1] While this designation gives authenticity to the gospel literature, it does not denote a specific body of literature. That the term εὐαγγέλιον became the common form of designation of both the gospel form and the kerygma at the time of Justin shows that the content of the gospel literature was perceived to extend beyond that of memories of the apostles.[2]

---

[1] 1 Apol 66,3. A continuation of the earlier use of the term for the gospel of Mark as found in Papias. Cf. Köster, "Überlieferung", 1469.

[2] Although also here their normativity is based in their nature as memories of apostles. (Iren II.22.3.) Cf.

The introduction to Matthew's gospel "Βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ" is, due to the ambiguity of its formulation, not immediately helpful. Although the formulation replaces an introduction like that of Mark 1:1, and it could be argued that the Matthean introduction is analogous to the opening of Βίβλος λογῶν Τοβιθ in Tob 1:1,[3] the continuation of Mt 1:1 (υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ υἱοῦ Αβραάμ) and the following genealogy, the repetition of γένεσις in 1:18, and the parallel formulations in Gen 2:4; 5:1, indicate rather that only the prologue of the gospel is introduced in this way.[4] Naturally in its function of introducing the prologue of the gospel the sentence also in an extended sense introduces the whole book. This does not, however, allow for an uncritical theological explication of the sentence which understands Matthew 1:1 as a replacement of Genesis, introducing the new 'Pentateuch' according to Matthew.

The fictitious creations and duplication of material in the gospel of Matthew itself reveals that the main concern of the gospel is not to create a factually accurate account of the words and deeds of Jesus. The concern of the gospel is to explain or witness to the person of Jesus; hence the stories have Christological content. The gospel is therefore not to be viewed as a hidden account of the beginnings of the church as opposed to the sacred history of the people of Israel as it appears in Exodus and Deuteronomy.

Frankemölle has emphasised the theological and reflective structure of the gospel of Matthew. The gospel *Gattung*, he argues, shows that Matthew's interest is with the past, not in a linear temporal sense, but in a historical theological manner. The parallels which he draws between Jewish historiography and the gospel leads him to place the emphasis in the gospel on the creation of a new people of God and hence on the end of Israel as the people of God.[5] Frankemölle is thereby making a choice with regard to the function of the gospel itself. For him, the gospel is first and foremost, in a variety of themes, the story of how the church became the people of God, replacing Israel. The double level of the story is thereby emphasised, when Jesus in the story addresses the disciples, it is simultaneously the risen Lord addressing the Matthean church.[6] While this

---

Detlev Dormeyer, *Das Evangelium als litarische und theologische Gattung* (1989), 19-20.

[3] And hence should be translated book of revelation in an apocalyptic sense. Cf. Frankemölle, *Jahwe-Bund*, 363-365; Schenk, *Sprache*, 304-305.

[4] Edgar Krentz, "The Extent of Matthew's Prologue: Towards the Structure of the First Gospel" (1964), 409-414.

[5] Frankemölle, *Jahwe-Bund*, 350-357; Schmithals, "Bedeutung", 144-146 follows Frankemölle. He places the gospel geographically in Syria and historically after the break with the Synagogue, as written primarily for the leaders of the church for post baptismal instruction.

[6] This is in later literature also referred to as an 'inclusive story' or a two-level drama. Cf. Ulrich Luz,

transparency of the text, also emphasised by other exegetes, is an important aspect of the gospel, and the reason why its function beyond the mere recollection of the words and deeds of Jesus is to be affirmed, the one-sided stress on the replacement of the people of God does not do justice to the content of the gospel. As theological reflection, the gospel is not mainly apologetic, but kerygmatic.

The fact that written tradition has not simply been collected, but rewritten and reflected upon in relation to Scripture, reveals both a theological and a kerygmatic concern with the evangelist. The composition of Matthew is both an actualisation and interpretation of the Jesus story, as well as an application and interpretation of certain passages of Scripture. This character of the gospel as theological in general, kerygmatic in particular may be perceived through the choice of scriptural genre with which the Jesus tradition is placed in dialogue.[7] The prophetic texts are in general not perceived to be predictive, but on the one hand to speak God's redemptive will, and on the other hand to uphold the law and call for repentance.[8] The weaving in of citations and allusions to the prophets, with redactional comments, fictitious stories and Jesus material, places the written Jesus tradition in dialogue with theological writings. Therefore, it is correct to speak of the gospel of Matthew as theological reflection upon the significance of the words and deeds of Jesus.[9] This emphasis on the gospel of Matthew as theological in character is fundamental for the understanding of how traditions may be described to fulfil a normative and authoritative function therein.

"The Son of Man in Matthew: Heavenly Judge or Human Christ" (1992), 10-11; Howell, *Matthew's Inclusive Story*, 203, 205-248, speaks of this inclusive story from the point of view of narrative criticism, seeking to avoid the identification of groups in the narrative with actual historical groups in the Matthean setting. Nevertheless, the involvement of the 'actual readers' in the story through the 'implied reader' makes the narrative 'transparent' in its communication to a specific community in a specific situation.

[7] Kerygmatic is not measured according to the extent of the Christian theological reflection around the meaning of the passion and Easter stories. The lack of such a reflection, and presence of apologetic elements in the same stories, leads Schmithals, "Bedeutung", 144-15, to conclude that the purpose of the gospel is to serve as a source book for instructions with the church.

[8] Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 45-46.

[9] Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol. 1, 4; Müller, *First Bible*, 125; Dormeyer, *Evangelium*, 190-194.

3.2. SCRIPTURE AND AUTHORITATIVE TRADITION

Focusing a New Testament study on the subject of "authority" of Scripture and tradition is always in the danger of becoming too general, of stating the obvious and at the same time stating nothing at all. It is therefore imperative that the study is preceded by a reflection upon the meaning of authority or normativity and what criteria exist by which these concepts can be measured.

The freedom with which the gospel of Matthew cites Scripture and the freedom with which the synoptic sources are employed in the gospel of Matthew has been noted by many. In both cases the freedom of citation and freedom of interpretation has been contrasted with the notion of normative or authoritative tradition.[10] The alteration of wording and context of the sayings of the prophets and the sayings of Jesus are perceived, at least initially, to be contradictory to the normative claim of Scripture or Jesus tradition. In chapter two the nature of scriptural interpretation in ancient Judaism, as characterised by a continuous transmission and actualisation of sacred tradition, was established, and it was pointed out that the fulfilment theology of Matthew in general terms corresponds with this use of Scripture. It was also confirmed that Matthew's method in the reception of written sources may be likened to Jewish historiographic rewriting of tradition. In the comparison between Matthew's use of Jesus tradition on the one hand and scriptural tradition on the other hand, the question of authoritative tradition is dual in character. First, the legitimacy in comparing the use of Jesus tradition with that of Scripture must be verified. Second, the question of the functional nature of normative tradition in the context of the gospel as a theological discourse must be addressed. If Matthew uses the sources, be it Hebrew Scriptures or the Jesus tradition, in much the same way,[11] how do these function normatively in relation to each other?

3.2.1. Jesus Tradition as Normative Versus the Normativity of Scripture

The question of the authoritative standing of Scripture for Matthew involves partly the question of the closing of the Canon. The extent and normativity of the

---

[10] Thus e.g. Schmithals, "Bedeutung", 138, argues that the synoptic sources could impossibly have existed as normative literature in the communities of Mt and Lk, *because* normative literature could never have served as sources for the creation of new literature. Stendahl, *School* reflects on the discrepancy between the freedom of translation in the fulfilment citations and the authoritative claim 'they must have had to be useful' (p. 127).

[11] Stanton, "Use", 358.

canonical writings in the first century has been a subject of debate. The theory that the closing of the canon of Jewish Scripture took place at the synod of Jamnia (90 CE) has been widely accepted.[12] Noting objections to the hypothesis, H. Hübner, on the basis of the Sadduccean and the Samaritan respective limitation of the canon to include only the Torah, as well as the existence of apocalyptic literature with scriptural authority in some circles, concludes that the question of the canonicity of Scripture was still open before 70 CE. Further, he assumes with J. Barr that the standing of the prophets and the writings was less fixed and was not regarded on the same level with the Torah as Scripture.[13] For the Christian reception of Scripture, however, Hübner sees no difference in the standing of the different parts of Scripture. This open-endedness of the canon would, however, not diminish the understanding that the majority of the prophets and the writings were inspired and "holy". The list in Ecclesiasticus 44-50 indicates that already at the time of its writing the books which were later to be included in the Jewish canon had some kind of special standing.[14] The Matthean use of ὁ νόμος και οἱ πορφήται parallel to αἱ γραφαί indicates that the terminology is in general use and denotes writings which are authoritative and normative as Scripture. The evidence that Matthew did at least know and use the Septuagint, and the possibility that Matthew may be using the language of Ecclesiasticus in Mt 11:28-30, indicate that to Matthew normative books extended beyond that of the Hebrew canon.[15] Again, the variations in text form may reflect the fact that the text form of the Septuagint was not finalised until the second century CE.[16] It has already been pointed out that the use and need for an interpretation of Scripture

---

[12] According to Hans Hübner, "Vetus Testamentum und Vetus Testamentum in Novo Receptum. Die Frage nach dem Kanon des Alten Testaments aus neutestamentlicher Sicht" (1988), 149 n.6, this hypothesis was introduced by H. Graetz in 1871.

[13] Hübner, "Vetus Testamentum", 152-153; James Barr, *Holy Scripture: Canon, Authority, Criticism*, (1983), 19. In the context of the Christian Scriptures Ferdinand Hahn, "Das Problem 'Schrift und Tradition' im Urchristentum" (1970), 452-453, sees the closing of the 'Old Testament' canon as perceived by the New Testament church to have taken place in the new act of God in Jesus Christ.

[14] Roger T. Beckwith, "Formation of the Hebrew Bible" (1988), 46; Ellis, *Old Testament*, 39-40. C.H. Roberts, "Books in the Greco Roman World and in the New Testament" (1970), 49-50.

[15] The parallel to Ecclesiasticus is not unquestionable. The language is similar, but there is no clear literary dependence. Further, if Matthew's text does include an allusion to Ecclesiasticus, it may not be 'proven' to have normative character, as it is not cited 'as Scripture' with an appropriate formula. (Cf. Hengel, "Septuaginta", 269). Nevertheless, if the text does entail an echo of Ecclesiasticus 51, the use is of such a character that it is to be classified as allusion to Scripture or employment of scriptural language.

[16] Emmanuel Tov, "The Septuagint" (1988), 162, 182-187.

also in the narrative text of the gospel implies a reflection on the meaning of the scriptural writings in a way that indicates their authoritative or normative status.[17]

There is no apparent general agreement in New Testament scholarship as to the standing of the written gospel sources in the early church. Frankemölle remains convinced that the community of Matthew, despite the use of the sources in the composition of the material, has no knowledge of the written Jesus tradition.[18] Similarly, Byrskog, who postulates a complete re-oralisation of the written sources as a prerequisite for the rewriting of the tradition in a different form, doubts that the 'school of Jesus' identity of the Matthean community remained restricted to a small circle within the Matthean church.[19] This is supported by Schmithals, who claims that the gospels (and hence, important for the present study, implicitly the gospel sources) received little attention in the first three to four generations of the Christian church, and their theological relevance, he adds, was close to nothing.[20] Only at the time of the closing of the Christian canon, he argues, did the gospels receive some kind of authoritative status.[21]

The citation of gospel texts and references to the gospels in the apostolic fathers and other second century literature, does not point to the understanding of these texts as authoritative or normative as canonical or biblical literature. For Matthew, Scripture consisted of Jewish Scripture.[22] Thus, we cannot speak formally of the authority of Jesus tradition in its function of Scripture before the canonisation of the Scriptures took place. The reception/interpretation process of early Christian Jesus material nevertheless indicates that a motivation existed for the preservation of the material which may be, with Byrskog, ascribed to the 'authority' of the person with whom they are concerned, or with James D.G. Dunn, in their 'influence as normative and determinative of the life and faith of the communities.'[23]

---

[17] Cf. also Gösta Lindeskog, "Autorität und Tradition im Neuen Testament. Einige Bemerkungen" (1973), 53-55.

[18] Hubert Frankemölle, "Matthäusevangelium", 286.

[19] Byrskog, *Jesus the Only Teacher*, 236.

[20] Schmithals, "Bedeutung", 129-132.

[21] So also Roberts, "Books", 52-55;

[22] Dormeyer, *Evangelium*, 7; Roberts, "Books", 6-7.

[23] James D.G. Dunn, "Levels of Canonical Authority" (1982), 20.

One aspect of Dunn's reflections is of particular relevance to Matthew's use of the gospel of Mark. It is the observation that at the level of the final author or better, at the level of the final composition of the gospel material, the form of the material at that stage was "so decisive and endured so successfully precisely because in that form it made lasting and continuing impact."[24] As a gospel in its own right the gospel of Mark remained normative in the church and later gained a place in the collection of canonical Christian writings. If the formation of a canon can be said to be a process, then the establishment of a canon is at the end of that process, where books or literature which had proven to be of the kind of character that give "lasting and continuing impact". In that case it may be legitimate to speak of the authority of the Jesus tradition in the formation of the gospel of Matthew.[25]

3.2.2. The Gospel as Theology and the Evaluation of Tradition as Authoritative

When addressing the question of the Canon of Scripture in the primitive church, E. Earle Ellis states that 'The writings to which Jesus and his messianic community appeal as a divine sanction for their message were well known and evidently recognised ... not only as *divinely inspired*, but also as *continuing normative authority* for the faith and life of the people of God.'[26] Ellis' assertion with regard to the Jewish Scriptures defines 'canonical authority' in theological terms on the one hand (Scripture is authoritative because it is divinely inspired), and on the other hand in functional terms (Scripture is authoritative because it *functions* as normative).[27] By separating between the theological and functional understanding of canonical authority, this definition is helpful. There is a difference between the theological reason for the status of certain writings as "canonical" and the actual authoritative function of the same writings in a specific community.[28] Thus, bypassing the theological reflections on the status of Scripture in Early Christianity, and avoiding the attempt to define which properties were

---

[24] Dunn, "Levels", 23.

[25] Lindeskog, "Autorität", 45-49, emphasises that despite the fact that Jesus tradition could not be designated Scripture before the canonisation, the early Christian writers do show a 'canonical consciousness' with regard to the original tradition.

[26] E. Earle Ellis, "The Old Testament Canon in the Early Church" (1988), 254-255.

[27] The distinction is the same as between the *de facto* and *de jure* authority of Scripture. Cf. e.g. Francis Schüssler Fiorenza, "Crisis of Scriptural Authority" (1990), 359-363

[28] When McConnell, *Law*, 3-5 begins his study of the authority of Jesus and the authority of Scripture in Matthew with the word ἐξουσία, this may explain the theological grounding of the material.

thought to be inherent in Scripture to account for its special standing, this thesis will focus on the second part of this twofold characteristic of canonical authority, namely their function.

For this study, then, *authority* is defined in terms of function: something which has a binding, *normative* or determinative effect upon that to which it is an authority. Examining gospel texts, the thesis deals with a final product of a transmission process. It is assumed that the transmission process itself is an indication of the valued status of the tradition it preserves so that it constitutes "*authoritative tradition*" for the redactor. In the case of Matthew 11-13, *authoritative tradition* consists of the Hebrew Scriptures, Mark and Q.

When focusing on the functional character of authoritative tradition, it is necessary to distinguish between two different types of function. First, the pragmatic function is the function of the traditional segment on the life and faith of the community to which it speaks. This is the traditional concern of form and historical criticism, where the *Sitz-im-Leben* to which the text speaks, the situation to which it responds, is located. Second, the function in the theological rhetoric of the composition of material is to be sought. Here, the explanation of the interrelation or discrepancy between the Matthean text and that of the sources will help clarify the dependence or distancing of the gospel from the earlier text, and hence on its function in the theological development of the gospel.

Matthew's gospel has been defined as theological reflection, and Matthew's use of Scripture has been identified as standing in continuity with Jewish practice. Now, both the pragmatic and the rhetorical/argumentative function of traditional material may be compared with the function of normative tradition in Early Judaism. Early Jewish material reveals three central aspects of how Scripture *functions* authoritatively and hence is *normative* in the community. First, Scripture was historical and found to be revelatory or the locus of revelation only in the process of contextualising it to Jewish life, that is in its interpretation and actualisation.[29] This could take the form of specific interpretation of certain passages (rhetorical) or the application of Scripture to already existing patterns of life (pragmatic).[30] Inner biblical exegesis itself shows evidence that the salvation historical aspects of Scripture arose in the need to actualise and apply

---

[29] Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 9; Vermes, "Bible and Midrash", 220.

[30] Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 101-105; Vermes, "Bible and Midrash", 221.

history to the present.[31] Second, Scripture as Scripture has a sociological function in that it contains revelation and history of election. Hence Scripture gives identity to the community both rhetorically, by application of Scripture, and pragmatically. In the Torah, Scripture serves as a set of criteria by which to live out this election.[32] Finally, Scripture points to God's will to redeem. In the Synagogal service the use of the prophets in particular was in order to bring consolation and encouragement in foretelling the ultimate redemption.[33]

The fulfilment theology in Matthew in particular, but also Matthew's other interweaving of Jesus story with Scripture, may show affinities in use to these aspects of the pragmatic and rhetorical functions of Scripture: the history of salvation actualised in the present throughout the Matthean Jesus story (including the rejection of the prophets motif characterised in the Deuteronomistic view of history),[34] and the sociological function in which Scripture or authoritative tradition becomes an identity factor to the community as 'elect', and also as guide for the living out of that election. Finally, it has already been suggested that the interest of Matthew's gospel with the fulfilment of prophecy transfers this function onto the Jesus tradition, so that it together with, and as extensions of, the Prophetic passages is kerygmatic in character as well as critical of existing piety. The call of the prophet to return to God is also a factor in this kerygmatic aspect of tradition. The exegetical chapters will demonstrate how the different written sources of Matthew operate normatively with respect to these three functions of Scripture.

The presupposition that the gospel of Matthew may be understood to be theological reflection in narrative form depends on the integration of scriptural citations and themes into the Matthean narrative. In a general way, the gospel of Matthew may be described as a *montage* of citations from different sources, sewn together by redactional comments. The *montage* and the redactional comments together form the internal coherence of the gospel. It is a presupposition of the exegetical analysis of chs 4-6 that the citation or adaptation of traditional material served one of three functions: to strengthen the argument of the narrative, to stimulate certain associations for the reader,

---

[31] Oemig, "Bedeutung", 262-264.

[32] Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 135-142.

[33] Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 45-46. Hence the haphtarah had to end on a positive note, and the readings were accordingly fitted, by skipping sections if necessary.

[34] Cf. Steck, *Israel*.

or to colour the text with the words of tradition.[35] All these functions may point to the original text as authoritative. It is also to be presumed, however, that in the process of citation or adaptation of traditional material a progression or alteration of meaning takes place. It is in this interrelation of sources that the normative use of the sources in their relation to each other is to be found.

3.3. LIMITING THE STUDY: MATTHEW 11-13

The concern of this thesis with the relation between authoritative traditions in the gospel of Matthew and the presupposition on which the exegetical analysis of the next chapters will rest having thus been established, the limiting of the study to Matthew 11-13 will have to be explained.

Matthew 11-13 are chapters which do not easily fit in the attempt to create a coherent structure of the whole gospel. For the sake of the subject of the present study, the chapters are representative because they include material from all relevant traditions preserved by the gospel as well as peculiar Matthean features: Material from what is here called the "Jesus-tradition", i.e. Mark and Q as well as material from a postulated M source; formula quotations (12:17-21, 13:14-15, 35); scriptural allusions (e.g. 12:4, 12:48); quotations of Scripture without the formula (12:7, 40); Matthean 'doublets' (12:7/9:13, 12:22-23/9:32-34, 12:33/7:16-20); the possible adapted allusion to apocryphal literature included in the Septuagint canon (11:25-30).

In terms of content it may be said that the three chapters are (or represent) a conflation of material from several sources. Mt 11:2-27 consists mainly of material from Q: Q 7:18-23; 10:13-15, 21-22.[36] It includes Jesus' speech concerning John the Baptist, the woes over the Galilean cities, and the logion of the revelation of the Father through the son. The Sabbath controversies at the beginning of chapter 12 (vv 1-16) are from Mark 3 (vv 23-28; 1-12), the exorcism of the evil spirits in the second part of chapter 12 is based on Q 11, and material from Mark 3. Following the duplication of the significance of bearing fruit from Q 6:43-45, the request for a sign (Q 11: 16, 29-32) and the return of the unclean spirit (Q 11:24-26) are found. The passage from Mark 3: 31-33

---

[35] Lars Hartmann, "Scriptural Exegesis", 133.

[36] Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 1, 24-25, contends that the Q material in Matthew 11 is placed here because, for other structural reasons, the material could not be included earlier in the narrative. It is therefore material which the evangelist had 'saved up'.

concerning the true family of Jesus concludes the chapter. Matthew 13 consists mainly of parables from Mark 4, plus the parable of the leaven and the mustard seed from Q 13:8-21 and a large section of special M material. The conclusion of Neirynck that Matthew in general follows the gospel order of his sources is true for the composition of Matthew 11-13.[37] The manner of composition as well as the insertion of special material and scriptural allusions nevertheless give the chapters of Matthew their unity and portrays a particular Matthean point of view.

Chapters 11-13 are important to the present study because of their conflation of traditional material. They are, moreover, of significance because of their centrality in the gospel. Although the chapters all have their individual internal structure and seem to be each a literary unit of its own, and although the chapters as such cannot be clearly established as a unit on literary structural signs in the text of the material, they nevertheless form a turning point in the gospel narrative and are internally united by the Christological and kerygmatic themes which are present in them.

In different attempts to structure the gospel the three chapters have been placed in different units, depending on the interpreter's guiding concept of structure. Thus, Frankemölle, whose interest it is to portray Matthew as a historical theologian, who in his gospel actually recounts the history of the replacement of Israel by the church, places Mt 11-12 in a unit with chapter 10, in which context they become an explication of the prediction of success and failure of the mission of the disciples included in chapter 10.[38] The function of the narrative in Frankemölle's exposition is the identification which it creates in the reader so that the Matthean narrative serves the role of Scripture in its recounting of the history and provides the basis of "election." Frankemölle is right in pointing to the failure and success of mission as central to the two chapters. By emphasising the centrality of the salvation historical aspect of the text and by highlighting the function of the text in its identity building character, he overlooks the kerygmatic message of the material in the passages.

Frankemölle is followed by Luz[39] and Verseput.[40] Both stress the salvation-historical function of the text as recounting the origin of the community of disciples to be

---

[37] Neirynck, "Rédaction mathéenne", 64, includes a table of the order of source material in Mt 11-13.

[38] Frankemölle, *Jahwe-Bund*, 343.

[39] Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 1, 24-25.

[40] Donald Verseput, *The Rejection of the Humble Messianic King: a Study of the Composition of Matthew 11-12* (1986), 55ff.

the replacement of Israel as the people of God. While Verseput follows the basic structural and thematic outline of Frankemölle's analysis, Luz's structure of the material differs. To him, chapter 11 forms a transition between the description of the ministry of Jesus in Mt 4:23-11:1 and the beginnings of the church in chapter 12:1-16:2.

Verseput has shown that there exists between chapters 11 and 12 a parallelism in structure which is brought into the context of the parables chapter of Mt 13.[41] Verseput finds in this structure an initial description of Israel's hostility towards Jesus (Mt 11:1-19; 12:1-16; 21-32) and Jesus' stern rebuke of Israel (Mt 11: 22-24; 12: 38-45). In each chapter this is contrasted by Jesus' messianic attitude of grace and humility (Mt 12:28-30; 12:17-21) and the election or designation of the disciples as the people of God (11:25-27; 12:46-47). Verseput then sees the break between Israel and the church as being fulfilled in the middle of the parables chapter, when Jesus in the second half turns to explain the parables to the disciples.[42]

While recognising the importance of the insights of previous scholarship, I propose for the present study the unity of Matthew 11-13 on the basis of both structural indications in the texts as well as the use of biblical language in the chapters.[43] The pain of rejection and persecution suggested by the text of Mt 10 and 23 is not to be ignored and must be read on the background of the Matthean historical context. I nevertheless suggest that the emphasis on the salvation historical aspects of the Matthean text fails to recognise the kerygmatic Christological character of both Matthew's narrative and his use of scriptural citations, as well as the didactic and ethical implications of the recognition of Jesus as the Messiah of Israel.

The first clear line which is found to influence the three chapters is in fact the theme of obduracy, made explicit in the citations of Mt 13:14-15. The theme is already introduced, however, in Mt 11:4 where Jesus' words from Q are slightly altered: "Go and tell John what you hear and see." In chapter 12 the same theme is found in the contrast between the Pharisees and the demon-possessed person, where the latter is healed and can see. Nevertheless, this theme of obduracy is not the only, perhaps not even the main, content of the three chapters. The judgement announced on those who do not see and understand (Mt 11:20-24; 12:38-42; 13:30; 13:50) cannot be limited only to

---

[41] Verseput, *Rejection*, 295-299.

[42] Cf. also Wilhelm Wilkens, "Die Redaktion des Gleichniskapitels Mark. 4 durch Matth" (1964), 324-325.

[43] Cf. Ivor H. Jones, *The Matthean Parables: a Literary and Historical Commentary* (1996), 193.

the failure to recognise the fulfilment of prophecy in Jesus, but rather in the effect that this realisation has in the life of the faithful. Those who see and understand (Mt 13:51, 12:46-50; 11:6) are those who do the will of the father, who perform mercy at the example of Jesus (12:7). Here, the kerygmatic and ethical message is first and foremost a call not to follow the negative example of the Pharisees (cf. the warning of the return of the evil spirits in 12:43ff).

The kerygmatic and ethical message of chapters 11-13 is built around three thematic clusters or motifs which build on the scriptural citations in the material and is developed with the help of the narrative gospel tradition. These motifs I call the 'ἐρχόμενος-Christology' which alludes to a cluster of messianic prophecies from Scripture; the 'πλεῖον/μείζον–motif' which builds on synoptic material and which describes Jesus as greater than or more than in a kind of typological fashion, and lastly the 'obduracy motif'.

What I describe as the ὁ ἐρχόμενος- complex is a collection of scriptural passages which explain Jesus in terms of Jewish eschatological hopes and emphasises both the fulfilment of Scripture in, and the 'not yet' of, the ministry of Jesus. The name chosen for this Christological theme in Matthew 11-13 is dependent on the opening verses of the section, where John asks whether Jesus is ὁ ἐρχόμενος. The question is answered affirmatively through the mixed citation of Mt 11:5. The theme is continued in the use of Is 42:1-4 in chapter 12, which alludes to the baptism and the transfiguration of Jesus, denoting the present reality of the fulfilment, yet where the last sentence points to the future eschatological hope. This present-and-future aspect is continued especially in the parables of chapter 13, but also in the Beelzeboul controversy in chapter 12.

Second, the πλεῖον-Christology expresses the significance of Jesus in *comparison* with other authorities, past and present, and places more stress on the 'already' of Christology. The 'more than' argumentation is derived from Jesus tradition and expanded by Matthew in the passage of 12:1-8. The emphasis in this thematic strand is that of God's presence in Jesus, and as such it is related, but not limited to the Wisdom-Christology, expressed in Matthew 11,[44] or the Matthean Immanuel christology (μεθ' ὑμῶν)[45] as described by previous scholars. How Jesus is more than or greater than is explained through references to Biblical figures. The Christological use of Wisdom

---

[44] Cf. M. Jack Suggs, *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel* (1970), and below.

[45] Cf. Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 20-32.

language and the identification of Jesus with the temple is the climax of this thematic strand.

As already shown, the third motif complex explains the rejection of Jesus and the Kingdom of God in terms of the scriptural ideas of obduracy and rebellion. Central to this theme is the idea of hiddenness and revelation, in relation to the inability to understand the significance of what one sees and hears.

It is important to note that the identification of the themes is dependent on, and their names are derived from, the Matthean text itself. They serve as a hermeneutical key by which the material may be interpreted. Regardless of what one chooses to name these themes, they are theological strands which bind the material in the three chapters together, and make the chapters a unit.

In the following exegetical analysis the centrality of these motifs in the interweaving of tradition in Matthew 11-13 will be demonstrated. In this explication of Matthean theological discourse the leading question of the thesis will be answered: The function of tradition as authoritative in the theological development of the gospel.

3.4. DEFINITIONS

Matthew's text has been described as a theological discourse in which Scripture and Jesus tradition is preserved and transmitted in relation to each other. It has also been noted that Matthew's language is Septuagintal, imitating the language of Scripture. In the context of the Matthean narrative, it may not always be easy to identify scriptural citations and allusions with confidence. Consequently it will be necessary to identify certain criteria to ascertain the presence of a Matthean dialogue with specific texts.

Although it is not explicit as a methodological key in chapters 4-6 of this thesis, underlying the textual analysis is the understanding borrowed from the literary concept of *intertextuality* that 'all discourse is inherently dialogical.'[46] The notion is true for Matthew because of the clear relation between the conceptual world of the Matthean text and its sources. Whereas the concept of *intertextuality* may refer to the dialogue between texts both introduced by the author of a given work and between texts entering the work through the reader, the analysis of the present work understands the concept as a principle of text-interpretation. This means that only those texts are considered relevant

[46] Michael Worton and Judith Still, *Intertextuality* (1990), 4.

as *pre-texts* of the Matthean narrative which can be identified through signals given in the Matthean text itself, whether they enter in an explicit citation, an in-text citation, through an allusion or through other text signals. This also implies the understanding that Matthew, through placing intertextual signals in the text of the narrative, intended a dialogue with the text which can be identified as a pre-text, whether it is by paraphrasing, altering or transcribing the source text.[47] The analysis of the texts will seek to describe *how* the Matthean narrative stands in dialogue with the pre-texts.[48]

A quotation or citation may be defined as *the repetition of a segment derived from a scriptural text within the gospel narrative*.[49] In the context of this thesis, the term *explicit citation* refers to the repetition of a Biblical text following an introduction of some kind. When there is an explicit citation in the text, it is announced through a sentence of introduction which makes it clear that the citation is intended. The text form and the degree of alteration of the text in the citation is not relevant, but will be subject to interpretation in the analysis of the texts. The fulfilment citations are explicit citations, as is the citation in Mt 11:10 (introduced by 'this is the one of whom it is written').

An *(in-text) citation* is found, where the Matthean narrative repeats an extended sequence of words which clearly can be identified as stemming from Scripture. It is inserted into the narrative without an introduction but can be identified on account of the *verbal agreement* with the source. The citation of Jonah 2:1 in Matthew 12:40 is an example of an in-text citation, as is Matthew 11:5.

Matthean citation of texts are often already interpreted texts in that they are harmonisations of different passages from Scripture. Here the term *mixed citation* is used for such occasions where a Biblical text has been merged with another, but still clearly is identifiable as verbal repetition of one or more passages form Scripture. Both explicit citations and in-text citations can be identified as mixed citations.

Whereas a citation can be identified on the basis of its introduction in the narrative or through verbal agreement with the Old Testament text, an allusion is more difficult to define. On the basis of the concept of intertextuality, an allusion to a certain scriptural passage may be identified on the basis of perceived signals in the Matthean narrative. These may include verbal correspondences or similarities with a certain

---

[47] On the grammar of quotation cf. H.F. Plett, "Intertextualities," (1991), 8-16; Allison, *New Moses*, 7.

[48] Cf. also Hays, *Echoes*, 15.

[49] For this definition see Plett, "Intertextualities," 9.

passage, or may be introduced by references to a certain biblical theme, person or event relevant for the passage in question. An allusion may be perceived as a verbal 'echo' of a scriptural theme or passage which triggers the reader's association.[50] Contrary to the definition of Ploch,[51] it is not a criteria for the identification of a textual allusion that the text cannot be understood without it. However, the text looses depth when the allusion is not perceived. The signals of the text which awakens the association of the reader, create the allusion.

Because an allusion to a specific text, event, or person is not simply to be established on the basis of verbal agreement or clear association with a certain text, but is dependent on perceived signals in the text, additional criteria must be established in order to verify the plausibility of any given allusion. This means that evidence must be sought that the author, in this case Matthew, was familiar with the text in question.[52] The context of the passage must support the allusion. Further, the plausibility of a given allusion is supported if other contemporary communities were familiar with the text and interpreted it in a similar way.

With regard to methodology, the above implies that the aim of the textual analysis is first, to identify signals in the Matthean text which places it in dialogue with a certain part of Scripture. These signals may be the explicit introduction to a citation, the verbal agreement between Matthew's text and that of a passage in Scripture, or a combination of verbs or themes which repeat, or signal an allusion to, a certain text. Once the signals are identified, the probability of the intertextual relation must be evaluated, and finally, conclusions may be drawn as to how Matthew employed the pre-text in the context of the narrative, on the basis of the development in meaning between the pre-text and the Matthean narrative.[53]

A final note may be made with regard to the relation between a the interpretation of Scripture in Matthew and the question of text form. The fluidity of the Greek text of

---

[50] Cf. Hays, *Echoes*, 20; Allison, *New Moses*, 15-23. Allison compares the ability to pick up the signals of an allusion to Scripture with the ability to recognise a piece of music on the basis of only two or three notes, and considers it probable that the oral recitation of Scripture in synagogue and education made it possible for the hearers of Matthew to perceive signals in the text which the modern reader would not pick up on.

[51] Winfried Ploch,. *Jesaja-Worte in der synoptischen Evangelien Tradition*, (1993), 17 (citing D. Koch and H. Rese).

[52] Cf. Allison, *New Moses*, 22.

[53] Cf. Cilliers Breytenbach, "Das Markusevangelium, Psalm 110,1 und 118,22f. Folgetext und Prätext," (1997), 201.

Scripture in particular at the time of Scripture makes the identification of textual signals which point to passages of Scripture particularly uncertain. It is sometimes impossible to argue with certainty that a repetition of a scriptural text which includes deviations from the text is Matthean and not the influence of a to us unknown version of Scripture. This is all the more difficult, when allusions are to be identified. In two cases in the textual analysis of Matthew 11-13, the perceived citation of/allusion to Scripture seems to be dependent on the Masoretic Text. These perceived references to Scripture are not to be dismissed simply on the grounds of the impossibility to prove Matthew's knowledge of Hebrew or his access to Hebrew Scripture scrolls. Here, the conclusions drawn in chapter 2 may be repeated: The perceived allusion/citation is made probable if it corresponds to a particular Matthean theological motif or concern present in the larger context of the gospel. The correspondence to the Masoretic text may prove direct dependence or dependence on an unknown Greek version of the text. As long as the Greek text remains unknown, however, the Matthean knowledge of the Hebrew text cannot be excluded.

3.5. PROCEDURE

It has been suggested that Matthew 11-13 can be said to contain three motif complexes in which most of the scriptural quotations and allusions have a significant influence. The first two of these are Christological themes in which Scripture is employed to explain the identity of Jesus as the messiah and the significance of his ministry. The last emphasises the need for an appropriate response to the messianic reality on behalf of the people. The organisation of the narrative material which is the subject of analysis into the three theological concerns or themes is already an indication that in at least two of the three themes Scripture can be said to have a normative function in providing the framework within which the theological reflections take place, and thus is authoritative.

The aim of the following analysis of the three motifs is to establish the ways in which Scripture and Jesus tradition function normatively. The distinction between the pragmatic function of the material for the community to which it speaks, as well as the function of theological normativity it receives in the development of the discourse, are to

be kept in mind. In order for the analysis to be successful, the establishment of certain analytical criteria is necessary.[54]

First, both with regard to scriptural and Jesus traditions, the source of the quotations, the context from which they are taken, and their theological content are to be established. Second, the text form of the original should be established wherever possible and the textual adaptation of the redactor discerned. Third, it will prove fruitful to make comparisons with other usage of the same passages in material prior to or contemporaneous with Matthew's gospel. Fourth, the exegetical methods or hermeneutical assumptions which the use of the citation betrays are to be established. Here, the function of the citation or passage in the narrative context is to be sought. On the basis of these steps it will be possible to conclude how and if the passage in question functions normatively either in a rhetorical or in a pragmatic manner.

With the exception of Mt 12:17-21; Mt 13:15, 35; Mt 12:6 and the possible allusion created with the combination of Mt 11:28-30 with the preceding Q tradition, the scriptural allusions and citations which will be analysed are dependent on Mark or Q. This complicates the analysis, for it will be necessary to ask whether the adaptation of the synoptic source includes a conscious adaptation of the scriptural reference. It is possible to collect enough indications from the Matthean redaction of Mark and Q to assume that this is in fact the case in the first block of material which will be analysed: the ὁ ἐρχόμενος-complex. In this case, the enhancement of scriptural tradition includes both an interpretation of Scripture and an interpretation and adaptation of predominantly Q material.

The analysis will proceed according to the broad thematic lines which are present in the three chapters. The division of the material into these broad themes is not simply a help for the organisation of material (one could have proceeded chapter by chapter), but rather it is of importance for the leading question of the analysis, i.e. to show that the narrative material is connected thematically and structurally in the three chapters. The structure of the material has already been pointed to. The themes do not correspond to this structure, but indicate the theological framework within which the material is to be understood according to Matthew. The creativity of Matthew as well as his respect for tradition is seen in that the material which is gathered thematically in the three chapters, is preserved in much the same order as it appears in the sources. New narrative with new

---

[54] Cf. Klyne Snodgrass, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New", 45-46.

emphasis is created in the careful preservation of the old. In the analysis, each passage of Scripture and synoptic material will be analysed separately under the appropriate thematic heading, in the appropriate order.

CHAPTER 4
ὁ ἐρχόμενος AS A CHRISTOLOGICAL THEME IN MATTHEW 11-13

In the thematic element of Matthew 11-13 which can be labelled the ὁ ἐρχόμενος-complex, the aspect of Christology which includes present and future eschatology is united. The name of the motif-complex is derived from the opening passage of the three chapter unit. In the context of the three chapters, Jesus is described as the coming one both in the present and in the future sense, where the fulfilment of expectation has already happened, is already taking place, but where its completion still lies in the future.

The ἐρχόμενος complex, which may be proven to create a thematic thread throughout the gospel of Matthew, consists on the one hand of a cluster of texts which speak of the coming of a messianic figure combined with the hope for the nations. On the other hand, the motif complex is expressed in the double emphasis of the Matthean narrative on both the presence of the Kingdom of God in the ministry of Jesus and in the expectation of the coming of the Son of Man. With regard to the scriptural background, Matthew's allusions to messianically interpreted texts are inserted into Q material in a subtle way. The presence of a Matthean scriptural allusion at the beginning of Mt 11, which opens up the motif-complex at this point in the narrative, may appear inconsequential. The overall redactional combination of passages from Scripture and material from the Jesus tradition, does indicate, however, that the ἐρχόμενος motif builds a consistent unit of material in the gospel, where the present and future fulfilment of Messianic expectation is the main concern. The key to the specific Matthean use of the motif complex is found in the composition of traditional material.

Three passages in the sayings material which is common to Matthew and Luke contain the designation ὁ ἐρχόμενος with reference to Jesus.

First, in Q 3.16 ὁ ἐρχόμενος is used in the speech of John the Baptist announcing one coming, who, in contrast to John's baptism by water, will baptise by fire and spirit. In the context of John's announcement, biblical images of eschatological judgement are used. The threshing-floor itself is the place of judgement.[1] The winnowing fork in God's hand symbolises judgement in a lament over the city in Jer 15:7. Also, the spreading of the chaff and the unquenchable fire[2] are prophetic images of judgement. In contrast, the gathering of the wheat into the storehouse functions as an image of salvation.[3] The announcement of John is both in Q and Mark therefore related to eschatological interpretations of Scripture.

---

[1] Cf. e.g. Micah 4:12; Isa 41:15.

[2] Cf. Isa 66:24; Jer 4:4; 21:12.

[3] Cf. Isa 11:12; Ezek 11:17; Micah 2:12; 4:6

The announcement of John, in Matthew as in the other gospels, is related to the baptism of Jesus. In Matthew the voice from heaven which affirms Jesus as the present fulfilment of the eschatological expectations is altered from the σὺ εἶ in Mk, to οὗτος ἐστιν, declaring Jesus to be the beloved son, 'in whom I take pleasure.' The result is a steering away from the formulation of Ps 2:7 to which Mk alludes in the baptism, towards the formulation of Matthew's own interpretation of the servant song of Isa 41/42 in Matt 12, and a conformation to the voice of heaven at the transfiguration. (Mk 9:7//Matt 17:5). Hence, although the Matthean narrative of John's announcement and baptism of Jesus is dependent on tradition, there is a direct link to the context of Matthew 11-13, where the second occurrence of ὁ ἐρχόμενος is found. The two units share three elements: the Q formulation ὁ ἐρχόμενος, the particular Matthean formulation of the baptismal announcement related to the particular Matthean form of the servant song in Matthew 12, and the expectation of eschatological judgement expressed in the biblical imagery of harvest, the burning of chaff, and the gathering of good seed into the storehouse.

The third occurrence of ὁ ἐρχόμενος which Q and Matthew have in common is the lament over Jerusalem which includes a line from Psalm 117:26 LXX (Q 13:34-35). In addition, the gospel also preserves the citation of Ps 117:26 (LXX) in the entrance narrative (Matt 21:9) which is taken over from Mark. The two form an *inclusio* around the temple conflict scene in Matthew (Matt 21:9-23:39).

Again the combination of present fulfilment and future expectation is found. The entrance narrative proclaims Jesus' entry into Jerusalem on the ass and its foal as the fulfilment of prophecy. The lament over Jerusalem at the end of the temple conflict scene is placed in the context of the oracle of judgement against the scribes and the Pharisees (Matt 23.29-39). The combination creates a dual threat of judgement patterned on scriptural prophetic oracles. Judgement is spoken against this generation for their rejection of God's representatives on the one hand. On the other hand, the abandonment expressed in Mat 23:38: ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ἔρημος, involves a threat of judgement against the place of God's presence itself, the temple.

It is to be observed that the beginning and end of the temple conflict scene have several aspects in common with Matthew 11-13: the ὁ ἐρχόμενος theme, the understanding of present fulfilment of prophecy, the presence of Jesus related to the temple and the presence of God, and finally the expectation of future judgement, expressed in the sentence, 'behold you will not see me again until you say: blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord.' Hence, the theme of the coming one is related both to the presence of God in the world through Jesus, as well as the future coming of the Son of Man.

The short review of the Matthean adaptation of the ὁ ἐρχόμενος material adapted form the synoptic sources have shown the presence of a motif-complex in the composition of Matthew which centres around the present fulfilment and future hope of

messianic expectation. In this chapter, the development of the motif complex in Matthew 11-13 will be analysed in light of Matthew's adaptation of Scripture and of Jesus material.

4.1. THE NORMATIVE USE OF SCRIPTURE IN THE ὁ ἐρχόμενος COMPLEX

Three passages and combinations of passages of Scripture are important for the Matthean presentation of this Christological concept in Matthew 11-12: Genesis 49:8-12, Isaiah 35 and 61, and Isaiah 41:8-9/42:1-4. In the overall Matthean complex, these passages are expanded by Zechariah 9:9 and Psalm 117:26 (LXX). In these passages, the expectation of a King of Davidic descent is placed parallel to royal traits of the servant in Isaiah 42 and events associated with the day of salvation. The motif complex is held together by the recurring use of ὁ ἐρχόμενος in Matthew, all adapted from the synoptic material. The motif complex in Matthew 11-12 is introduced by a subtle allusion to, and borrowing of language from, Genesis 49:10, contained in the question the disciples of John are sent to pose to Jesus. The combination of elements from Isaiah 35 and 61 constitutes Jesus' answer to the same question. Together they form the introductory paragraph to the three central chapters in Matthew's gospel, and prepare for the development of the theological issues developed in the section: revelation, concealment and the problem of understanding. Jesus is revealed as the coming one, the one who is greater than John; the bystander and the reader are called to see and hear (Mt 11:4) and to understand (Mt 13:51).

4.1.1. Matthew 11:3 - John the Baptist and the Coming one of Genesis 49:10.

Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἢ ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν;

The theme of the coming one in Matthew 11-13 is introduced by the question John sends his disciples to pose to Jesus, a question which extends beyond the immediate context in three directions. The first is the Matthean gospel narrative itself, where the direct reference is John's announcement in Mt 3:11, and the allusions already made to the servant song in that context. Further, the text as an adaptation of Q stands in an interpretative relation to that text. Finally, it will here be demonstrated that by alluding to Gen 49:10 (LXX), Matthew places the question of John in the context of messianic expectations of Scripture.

The Matthean text must be recognised as a conscious implication or hint by the repetition of words present in the passage it alludes to, in order to be identified as an allusion or "echo" of a passage of Scripture. In other words, that the text alluded to was known by the evangelist must be demonstrated in the analysis of the text. The associations the text brings forth, must be proven to be a concern of the evangelist, and

made plausible through the history of interpretation.[4] In this section I will show that if Mt 11:3 is an allusion to Genesis 49:10, Matthew places the question of John in the context of the expectation of a messianic figure of Davidic descent. This expectation was traditionally associated with certain texts which Matthew cites and alludes to throughout the narrative. In order to understand how Matthew interprets Scripture and tradition, and uses it normatively in the present pericope, the passage will be analysed in relation to the two sources respectively.

Matthew 11:3 as an Interpretation of Q 7:19[5]

John's question from prison in Matthew 11:3, "are you the one who is to come, or are we waiting for another", is derived from Q, and preserves in its entirety the Q-wording, with the exception of the substitution of ἕτερον for ἄλλον.[6] In Q as well as in Matthew, ὁ ἐρχόμενος, refers to the one coming who is stronger than John as announced in Mt 3:11/Q 3:16 (ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μού ἐστιν).[7] John's question could be formulated thus: "are you the one of whom I spoke."?[8] The participle functions in both Q and Matthew to indicate the literary link between the material in Mt 11/Q 7 and the appearance of John at the beginning of the gospel as two accounts which deal with Jesus and John and their relation to the kingdom. The sermon on the plain and the

---

[4] For the definition of "allusion" to Scripture, cf. Klaus Koch, *Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums. Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* (1986), 17; Knowles, *Jeremiah*, 163; Ploch, *Jesaja-Worte*, 17. The understanding of allusion as used here is perhaps more in line with the definition of *metalepsis* as put forth by Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scirpture in the Letters of Paul* (1989) 20, which "places the reader within a field of whispered or unseated correspondences."

[5] The reference to the Q passages, using Q followed by chapter and verse where the saying is found in the gospel of Luke, is in accordance with standard usage. The reference does not, however, refer to the Lukan text as more original. The Q wording will be extablished in each case on the basis of synoptic comparison. Cf. Christopher M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q* (1996), 4 n.8; John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (1987), xvii.

[6] Sand, *Gesetz*, 136 suggests that the redactional change from ἄλλον to ἕτερον, reflects Matthew's consistent use of ἕτερος where there is an opposition or comparison of two. Sand seems to indicate that the comparison here is between Jesus and John, possibly on the basis of the hypothesis that the Baptist material in the gospels reflect an early conflict between Jesus' followers and disciples of John. This explanation is illogical considering that the question comes from John himself. Matthew's redaction simply serves to indicate a choice between Jesus and some unknown other. Cf. Schenk, *Sprache*, 20.

[7] Also Q's version of John's announcement of the one stronger than him includes the participle ὁ ἐρχόμενος. The third person present indicative is found in the parallel texts in Mark 1:7 and Luke 3:16. Luke is probably dependent on Mark. The agreements of Mt and Lk against Mk seem to suggest that their versions of John's message are conflations of Mk and Q. With no evidence outside Matthew, it has been debated whether Mt 3:11 renders Q accurately (so e.g. Rudolf Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferungen der Logienquelle und des Markusevangeliums* (1980), 93-96; Stephanie von Dobbeler, *Das Gericht und das Erbarmen Gottes. Die Botschaft Johannes des Täufers und Ihre Reception bei den Johannesjüngern im Rahmen der Theologiegeschichte des Frühjudentums* (1988), 51-63; Ulrich Luz, "Q 3-4" (1984), 376) or whether ὁ ἐρχόμενος is redactional (so e.g. Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 45; Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, 314). With the evidence for the use of the phrase of in Q 7:19 (Mt 11:3), it is not far-fetched to postulate its presence in the Q account of the Baptist's announcement of Jesus.

[8] Cf. J.A.T. Robinson, "Elijah, John and Jesus: an Essay in Detection" (1958), 270.

account of the healing of the centurion's servant is found preceding the John/Jesus material in Q. It has already been pointed out that Matthew follows the Q order in Matthew 11 and in part of 12.

The absolute use of ὁ ἐρχόμενος in Mt 11:3/Q 7:19 has triggered debates among New Testament scholars concerning on the one hand the possible employment of ὁ ἐρχόμενος as a Christological title, and on the other hand the scriptural background for such a usage. In both cases one can detect a development from early acceptance[9] to more recent scepticism,[10] which has resulted in a consensus which doubts a titular usage of the term and denies a specific scriptural allusion in Mt 11:3/Q 7:19.[11] One must here, however, distinguish between the possibility of a messianic titular use of the expression in early Judaism, and the Christian development of Christological appellations. In Matthew's text, the adaptation of Q and the allusion to Scripture which can be detected in the context of Matthew 11, shows a development where the use of ὁ ἐρχόμενος becomes titular.

The redactional consistency with which Matthew reads the passages of a "coming one" in his sources, indicates that with regard to the absolute use of ὁ ἐρχόμενος in connection with the verb προσδοκάω the question posed by John, Matthew either understood the question to include an allusion to certain Biblical texts, or, more likely, Matthew consciously interpreted the term by placing it in connection with texts with specific Messianic expectations. Hence, in Matthew, the language of Q provides a vehicle for Matthew to associate Jesus with the specific expected one. The signals of the Matthean text makes it possible that it in the question posed by John in the context of Matthew 11-13 alludes to Gen 49:10. The term ὁ ἐρχόμενος is, however, associated with other passages in other parts of the gospel. Hence, if the allusion was intended by Matthew titular language is created in the interpretation of Q in Matthew 11:3. The first indication that a specific coming is understood as referred to in the question of John, is found in the significance of ἔρχομαι in Q 7:18-28, 31-34, and the Matthean additional emphasis on the verb through the insertion of 11:14.[12]

---

[9] Cf. e.g. Johannes Schneider, " Ἔρχομαι, κτλ" (1968), 270. For a discussion and extensive review of literature representing pro and contra the titular nature of the phrase, see Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferungen*, n12, 407-408.

[10] Cf. e.g. Gundry, *Matthew*, 205: "The literature of late Judaism does not know this expression as a messianic title."

[11] Cf. Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 167; Tuckett, *Q*, 125.

[12] E. Arens' examination of ἦλθον sayings and related uses of ἔρχομαι in the LXX and Hebrew Scriptures as well as in extra biblical early Jewish literature, shows the frequent use of the verb in theophanic texts (the coming of God or the day of God) or text referring to the coming of the messiah or an endtime prophet (cf. Eduardo Arens, The *ΗΛΘΟΝ-sayings in the Synoptic Tradition: A Historico-Critical Investigation*, 1976). It is thus correct to say with the majority of scholars, that the expectation of God's eschatological coming was widespread, but a messianic interpretation of ὁ ἐρχόμενος cannot be detected before the Christian adaptation of the term.

In Matthew 11:1-20, forms of ἐρχόμαι are found in four instances, referring to the coming of John, Jesus and Elijah, cf. Mt 11: 3 (Q), 14 (Mt), 18 (Q), 19 (Q). Clearly the Q material Matthew preserves is developed around this theme of coming. The inclusion of the quotation from Mal 3:1 in Q indicates that a sending with a purpose precedes this coming, and gives it content. It seems therefore, that the formulation of Q 7:18, using the present participle with the article, in Matthew's understanding did point to a specific coming. In Matthew 11:2-16 as in Q the repeated use of ἔρχομαι with Jesus and John as subjects, implies a coming with a specific purpose. Matthew reinforces the quotation of Mal 3:1 in Mt 11:10 by the explicit identification of John as the messenger of that citation. He is Ἠλίας ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι (in reference to Mal 4:2).[13] The ministry of John the Baptist, his *coming*, bears significance beyond a mere appearance on the scene of life. This is further emphasised in the parable of the children in the marketplace with its interpretation in Mt 11:16-19. Also in this passage the *coming* of John and Jesus and the manner in which they came have a specific meaning. These examples which include scriptural reference to eschatological events and the comparison which is made between John and Jesus in the present context provide the grounds for postulating a specific eschatological expectation as a motivation for Matthew's adaptation of Q in Mt 11-13 and the use of ὁ ἐρχόμενος in Matthew 11:3. This expectation goes beyond the announcement of Mt 3:11 to which ὁ ἐρχόμενος refers on the level of the Matthean narrative. It is in this respect not enough to refer in general terms to the Jewish eschatological hope and theophany as it is expressed in terms of the coming of God or of God's messenger.[14] This general language of the theophany in the form of the coming of God's messenger or ambassador is indeed the background for the use of ἔρχομαι in the present context both with regard to Jesus and John. Considering, however, that both the Q material in the present context as well as that in Matthew 3 to which ὁ ἐρχόμενος refers make a comparison between Jesus and John, one would expect Jesus' significance to be expressed through the language of Scripture, because John's in both places is. Such an expression of significance takes place explicitly in the mixed quotation which forms the reply of Jesus in v 5. This reply, however, only affirms that which is implicit in the question placed in the mouth of John.

The ambiguous verb form προσδοκῶμεν, which could be either a subjunctive or an indicative, functions in Matthew to include both a present realisation and future anticipation in the affirmative answer of Jesus to John.[15] The Matthean text preserves Q.

---

[13] See pt 3.2. below.

[14] The advent of the day of the Lord, of God as King, or as his messenger was fundamental to Jewish eschatology. On the development of this eschatological hope, cf. Sigmund Mowinckel, *He That Cometh* (1956), A. Scriba, *Die Geschichte des Motivkomplexes Theophanie* (1995).

[15] It is not possible to determine whether προσδοκῶμεν is a subjunctive or an indicative. The question in itself suggests an uncertainty, so that most exegetes hold it to be a *conj. deliberativus*, cf. Gundry, *Matthew*, 205; Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 163. For further discussion and literature cf. Gerd Häfner, *Der Verheissene Vorläufer: Redaktionskritische Untersuchung zur Darstellung Johannes des Täufers im*

The Matthean context combines the present realisation of the hope in Jesus, with the future expectation of the community, later connected with the coming of the Son of Man.

Matthew 11:3 as an Interpretation of Genesis 49:10

The combination of the verbs ἔρχομαι and προσδοκάω in Matthew 11:3 may be read as signals of an allusion to the Septuagint translation of Genesis 49:10.[16] Already the use of Χρίστος in 11:2, prepares for the allusion to a messianic expectation.

	Gen 49:10	Gen 49:10 (BHS)
Σὺ εἶ *ὁ ἐρχόμενος* ἢ ἕτερον *προσδοκῶμεν*,	οὐκ ἐκλείψει ἄρχων ἐξ Ιουδα καὶ ἡγούμενος ἐκ τῶν μηρῶν αὐτοῦ ἕως ἂν *ἔλθῃ* τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ[17] καὶ αὐτὸς *προσδοκία* ἐθνῶν	לֹא־יָסוּר שֵׁבֶט מִיהוּדָה וּמְחֹקֵק מִבֵּין רַגְלָיו עַד כִּי־יָבֹא *שִׁילֹה **וְלוֹ יִקְּהַת עַמִּים:

Matthäusevangelium (1994), 174 n. 2. Reading the verb as a subjunctive would displace the emphasis of the question, however, in placing the uncertainty in the verb: "should we keep on waiting". In this case a positive answer to Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος would make the waiting unnecessary. As will be shown, in the present context it is the identity of ὁ ἐρχόμενος which represents an uncertainty, while the waiting is a given. It is better, therefore, to translate the verb in the indicative, cf. A. Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Matthäus. Seine Sprache, sein Ziel, seine Selbständigkeit. Ein Kommentar zum Ersten Evangelium* (1963), 358.

[16] So also Volker Hampel, *Menschensohn und historischer Jesus. Ein Rätselwort als Schlüssel zum messianischen Selbstverständnis Jesu* (1990), 224; Otto Betz, "Jesu Evangelium vom Gottesreich" (1983), 239. Other passages have been suggested to form the scriptural background for the allusion: Mal 3:1, Zech 9:9, Hab 2:3, Dan 7:13, Ps 118:26 (cf. Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferungen* 407 n12; Arens, *ΗΛΘΟΝ-sayings*, 298). In the context of Matthew 11 Mal 3:1 is quoted with respect to John the Baptist, and it is not likely that the same passage is referred to here. Robinson's (Robinson, "Elijah", 267) argument, that in citing 3:1 Jesus' response is "he is himself the coming one," is not convincing. August Strobel, *Untersuchungen zum Eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem auf Grund der Spätjüdisch-Urschristlichen Geschichte von Habakkuk 2,2ff* (1961), 265-277 has argued for the use of Hab 2:3 (Aquila's version) in the present context as a part of a Jewish exegetical tradition dealing with the delay of the *eschaton*. His argument builds on the assumption that Jesus' ministry did not live up to John's expectation as eschatological judge, hence the employment of Hab 2:3. To both authors, one must respond, that the Baptist material in Matthew 11 does not contain a polemic against John either in Q (cf. Tuckett, *Q*, 126-127) nor in Matthew (cf. Häfner, *Vorläufer*), neither is Johns' message refuted or corrected. The allusion in Mt 11:3 can only be understood in light of its present context in Matthew, and this context affirms Genesis 49:10 as the text to which it alludes.

[17] Some manuscripts have ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ᾧ ἀπόκεῖται, giving the translation: "A ruler of Judah will not fail, nor a leader of his descent ('of his thighs'), until he comes to whom it belongs. And he is the hope of the nations." This reading clearly associates the coming of a messianic kingly figure. Martin Rösel, "Die Interpretation von Genesis 49 in der Septuaginta" (1995), 55-56, and Jean Lust, "Septuagint and Messianism with a special emphasis on the Pentateuch", (1997) 40 agree in preferring the reading in which τὰ ἀποκείμενα forms the subject of the final clause, so that the verse would read: "The ruler from Judah will not cease/die nor the leader of his descent ('of his thighs') until that comes which has been kept in store for him (*or* until comes that which belongs to him). And he is the hope/expectation of the nations." What is important for the present study, is that Matthew stands in continuity with the Septuagint and other early translations and interpretations of the Hebrew, in which the שֵׁבֶט and מְחֹקֵק are interpreted as the announcement of a coming leader figure or ruler. So also Rösel, "Interpretation", 63. The variant reading (ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ᾧ ἀπόκεῖται) is in continuation with this reading, and clearly shows the messianic expectations connected with Gen 49:10.

In the formulation, Matthew's text (adapted from Q), alters the subject of the verb, so that it refers to the one who is the expectation of the nations. The noun προσδοκία of the Genesis passage is incorporated into the question posed by John through his disciples. Hence, the expectation is actualised and personalised by John and his disciples. The anticipation of the Davidic figure of universal significance is one of impending nearness. Jesus' answer supports their understanding of events.

The possible allusion can be supported by the existence of contemporary messianic interpretations of the Hebrew text. The Hebrew text of Gen 49:10 does not itself express the hope of the coming of a messiah. The text is an affirmation of the Davidic monarchy and expresses the hope of its continued prosperity.[18] Later traditions in Judaism interpreted the text as expressing the expectation of the coming of a Davidic messiah.[19] Also the Septuagint interpreted the text messianically, moreover several factors indicate that the translation of the Septuagint was influenced by prophetic literature.

The impersonal nouns שֵׁבֶט and מְחֹקֵק of the Hebrew text are replaced by ἄρχων and ἡγούμενος thus personalising the symbols of leadership and rule. In the Septuagint, τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ translates the difficult שִׁילֹה.[20] Although the "coming" here does not refer to the coming of the king or ruler himself, but that which has been prepared for him, the text, through the next clause, distinctly expresses the expectation of an eschatological messianic figure.[21] The expectation of the nations described in the clause καὶ αὐτὸς προσδοκία ἐθνῶν replaces the Hebrew text which speaks of the obedience of the peoples to a Judean ruler. This results in a change in emphasis from the retrospective description of the dominance of Judah and the Davidic monarchy, to the hope of a eschatological figure of universal redemption.

Rösel has pointed out that the choice of vocabulary in the whole of Gen 49:8-12 shows that prophecies from the book of Isaiah may have informed the translation of the passage. In v. 9 "from a sprout you have ascended" (βλάστος) replaces the MT "from the prey," alluding to Isaiah 11.[22] The universality of the messianic hope indicated in

---

[18] Cf. Claus Westermann, *Genesis 37-50* (1982), 230-232. עַד כִּי expresses the arrival of something which will be "the culmination, not the interruption of what preceded". (Lust, "Septuagint and Messianism", 39.) It could be a reference to a messianic figure. Most favour the historical reading which implies the Davidic dynasty. Cf. Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50* (1994), 477-478.

[19] Cf. e.g. Sanh. 98b; 4Q252. In Targum Onquelos, Gen 49:10 is understood messianically while the surrounding context is not. Cf. Martin McNamara, *New Testament*, 239.

[20] For a detailed discussion on various translations and interpretations, see L. Monsengwo-Pasinya, "Deux textes messianiques de la Septante: Gn 49,10 et Ez 21,32" (1994), 358-360.

[21] Monsengwo-Pasinya, "Deux Textes", 362-366; Rösel, "Interpretation", 64 and Joachim Schaper, "Die Septuaginta-Psalter als Dokument Jüdischer Eschatologie" (1994), 50-51 all hold the text to express a messianic expectation. Schaper has shown how Genesis 49:10 has influenced the Septuagint translation and Messianic interpretation of Judah in Psalm 59:9 and 107:9. Lust, "Septuagint and Messianism", 40 is more careful in identifying a messianic interpretation in Gen 49:10 LXX.

[22] Rösel, "Interpretation", 61

49:10d - καὶ αὐτὸς προσδοκία ἐθνῶν - seems to be influenced by Is 11:10; 42:2 and similar prophecies in the Servant songs of Isaiah.[23] Genesis 49:11-12 (both MT and LXX) describes the hope of an abundant eschatological time when clothes can be washed in wine, and the vines are so plentiful that an ass and her foal can be tied to its branches.[24] Again a parallel can be drawn to prophetic literature, to the similar images found in Zech 9:9.[25] The Septuagint version of Genesis 49:8-12 can thus be said to describe the eschatological hope[26] in terms of a messianic figure of universal importance, who will supersede the rule of a national leader or regent of Davidic descent, influenced by the prophecies of Isaiah 11 and 42 and Zech 9.

The formulation of Matthew 11:3 is reminiscent of Gen 49:10 LXX. The language alone, however is only suggestive of an allusion. Further evidence that Matthew knew and used the passage must be sought to make the allusion probable. Two passages in particular of the Matthean narrative bring out aspects of prophecies which are found also in Genesis 49. First, the insertion of the fulfilment quotation from Isaiah 41:8-9/42:1-4 in the context of Matthew 11-13, brings up the same eschatological hope that is expressed in Gen 49:10. The connection between the ὁ ἐρχόμενος motif and the citation was already prepared for in the redactional adaptation of the baptismal narrative. The final clause of this citation is synonymous in meaning with Gen 49:10d: καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν/ ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν.[27] Also here, the universal benefit of the servant's ministry is emphasised.

Second, in Matthew's version of the entrance narrative, the Matthean redaction combines elements which are reminiscent of the blessing of Judah in Gen 49. Again the relation between the passages through Matthean redaction has already been established. The entrance narrative combines two passages from Scripture. At the entrance itself, Ps 117:25(LXX) ὁ ἐρχόμενος in the name of the Lord is praised.[28] In the account of the preparation for the triumphant entry, Zech 9:9 forms a fulfilment citation, referring to the eschatological appearance of a king, coming upon an ass and the foal of an ass. In the latter, the Matthean quotation *differs* from both the Septuagint and the Hebrew text of the prophet, but combines vocabulary found in the LXX version of Gen 49:11.[29]

---

[23] Rösel, "Interpretation", 64.

[24] Cf. Rösel, "Interpretation", 65.

[25] Cf. H. D. Preuss, "בוא" (1973), 559-561.

[26] Cf. Gen 49:1 ἐκάλεσεν δὲ Ιακωβ τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν συνάχθητε ἵνα ἀναγγείλω ὑμῖν τί ἀπαντήσει ὑμῖν *ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν.* The Greek is a direct translation of the Hebrew באחרית הימים, which generally only appear in prophetic contexts, though not all passages have an eschatological sense. (Cf. Wenham, *Genesis*, 471.) Like the Hebrew, the Greek does not necessarily contain an eschatological meaning. (Cf. Rösel, "Interpretation", 57).

[27] Cf. pt. 3.1.3 below.

[28] Matthew preserves Markan tradition here.

[29] ὄνος, πῶλος.

Matthew adapts the previous narrative, apparently in order to fit the citation from Zechariah by adding elements to the Markan text of the preparation for the entrance into Jerusalem.[30] The redactional changes thereby *also* result in a closer parallel to Gen 49:11 alluded to in the Markan text. The disciples find an ass tied (δεδεμένην) and her foal with her, a scene also described in Gen 49:11, using the same vocabulary.

It can be shown therefore, that on the one hand the context of Mt 11:3 includes messianic themes which express the same expectation as does Gen 49:10, and on the other hand that elsewhere in Matthew allusions to the same passage in Mark are brought out more clearly in the Matthean redaction. It is therefore possible, in light of Matthean redaction of both scriptural and synoptic sources, that Matthew understood John's question from prison to include an allusion to Gen 49:10.

On the basis of these observations one can conclude that the term ὁ ἐρχόμενος as it occurs in Matthew 11 and 21, seems to be based on a cluster or complex of images and prophecies from Scripture which gives the term its specific meaning. It is indeed a term denoting a messianic figure. The texts which apparently are important here emphasise *both* the humble character of the coming one (Zech 9; Is 42:1-4), *and* the eschatological and universal significance of the coming (Gen 49:10; Is 11:10; 42:4; Zech 9). It has already been described how the prophetic texts in question may have influenced the translation of Gen 49:10. This fact alone could explain the apparent allusion in Mt 11:3. Hence it may be argued that an possible allusion to Gen 49:10 is simply a result of certain associations made on the level of translation of the Septuagint, and has therefore no actual significance on the level of Matthean redaction and theological reflection. The formulation of Mt 11:3 and the combination of the same passages in Qumran as well as in the Septuagint, however, speaks for the intended allusion in Mt 11:3.

Both in the Qumran community and in the Targumim, Genesis 49 was interpreted messianically. Both reflect the expectation of the "messiah King". An interpretation of the blessing of Judah found in 4Q252, speaks of the continuity of the kingship of Judah until the messiah comes. In 4Q252 the messiah is identified with the branch of David of Is 11:1-5, which in Qumran was a synonym for the messiah.[31] Thus, it can be shown that in the messianic interpretation of Gen 49:10 onwards from the translation of Septuagint,

---

[30] So Gundry, *Matthew*, 407. According to J. Blenkinsopp, "The Oracle of Judah and the Messianic Entry" (1961), 55-64, Zech 9:9 is an innerbiblical intepretation of Gen 49:10-12. It is possible that Matthew was familiar with the connection between Gen 49 and Zech 9:9. The result of the Matthean redaction in Mt 21, is the linking of the entrance into Jersualem with two Messianic readings of Scripture: Zech 9:9 and Gen 49:10-11. This reading is supported by Wim Weren, "Jesus' Entry into Jerusalem: Mt 21:1-17 in the Light of the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint" (1997), 132-133.

[31] 4Q285, 4QpIsa^{a}. Cf. Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "'Messias'. Texte in den Schriften von Qumran" (1996), 134-135. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, 19-20 citing Zech 3:8, thought that root/branch/sprout developed into a messianic title in the Hebrew bible.

certain prophetic passages, including Is 11, 42 and Zech 9:9 were influential. It is not surprising therefore when the combination of passages occur also in Matthew.[32]

Matthew, in adapting the text of Genesis 49:10, is either familiar with a Greek messianic reading of the text, or in the allusion to Genesis 49:10 clarifies a text with ambiguous meaning, and interprets it in light of the expectation John expresses in Mt 11:3. Thus the eschatological hope of universal redemption is brought into the present. This is not at all a surprising development of the Matthean narrative, since the pericope expressing the previous Jesus/John encounter already brought eschatological texts into the present.

ὁ ἐρχόμενος and Σοφία in Matthew 11:2-19.

It may be argued that it is not a royal Christology denoting the present and future expectation of a Davidic Messiah which is the theme of Matthew 11:2-19. The redactional alterations forming a frame around the section through the use of τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ in verse 2 and καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπο τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς, seem, rather to identify Jesus with Wisdom incarnate. Much has been made of this Wisdom Christology in the gospel of Matthew, the identification of Jesus with wisdom occurs only here in the Matthean narrative, however.[33] It has been shown that there is a redactional link between the ὁ ἐρχόμενος passages adapted from tradition in the composition of Matthew's gospel. The specific Wisdom references in Matthew do not exceed chapter 11, which also is dependent on tradition. There is, therefore, more evidence for a ὁ ἐρχόμενος motif than a wisdom motif in Matthew, irrespective of whether the allusion to Gen 49:10 is to be considered plausible. The two are not incompatible, however. Clearly the wisdom motif of chapter 11 prepares for the presence motif of chapter 12 (see below). Further the combination of the royal motif and that of wisdom is found in the mention of Solomon in the context of the request for a sign towards the end of chapter 12. The different aspects emphasise different realities with regard to Matthew's understanding of Jesus as the fulfilment of the law and the prophets, and simply shows how complex the Matthean narrative is in terms of theological imagery.

---

[32] In pointing out the parallels a literary dependence or a specific development in the history of interpretation is not automatically to be assumed. The combination of texts with apparently the same theme, or the use of a certain text to help interpret another was a much used hermeneutics device in Judaism. It was employed in the Targumim (cf. Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 76), in biblical intepretation at Qumran (often with the differences of texts harmonised to each other, cf. Fishbane, "Use", 350), and in rabbinic exegesis (Cf. Günter Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, 1996, 18-19). The parallels in the combination of texts from Qumran, LXX and the New Testament at the least indicate that in different strands of Judaism, the texts were perceived to be related in the theme of an eschatological messianic hope.

[33] An identification may also be implicitly also in the context of the temple conflict seen and the oracle of doom againt the scribes and the Pharisees in Matthew 23, where Matthew replaces the text of Q 'the wisdom of God says' with 'I say to you'. The passage could also be a concious avoidance of the Wisdom terminology. It nevertheless expresses what is also the expressed in Matthew 11-13, the presence of God in the world through Jesus.

Use and Normativity of Q 7:18 and Genesis 49:10 in Matthew's Adaptation

John's question from prison is a narrative element from Q which Matthew uses as an introduction to Matthew 11-13. In it the term ὁ ἐρχόμενος can seem to function as a messianic title, alluding to a complex of scriptural passages which expect a messianic kingly figure, whose coming will bring the hope of salvation to the nations. Specifically, the question possibly borrows vocabulary from the Septuagint version of the blessing on Judah in Gen 49. The seeming allusion to Gen 49 LXX in Matthew 11:3 is subtle. The coinciding vocabulary alone does not prove that Matthew intended the question of John to be read in light of the Genesis passage. However, the context of Matthew 11-13 and the further evidence for Matthew's employment of its messianic interpretation, make it probable that Matthew read the Q text in light of Genesis 49:10. Although the text is not originally a messianic prophecy, later interpreters of the text understood it as such. Through reading the Q text in light of Scripture, Matthew achieves both an actualisation of Scripture, and a conforming of Jesus tradition with the content of the Scripture passage.

If there is an allusion of Mt 11:3 to Genesis 49:10, *Scripture functions normatively* in that it holds conceptual value. The Genesis passage and the eschatological expectation it expresses provide the conceptual parameters for the narration of the conversation between Jesus and John's disciples. By using the language of Scripture, the Q text is interpreted in light of Scripture. Q becomes a continuation of Scripture and receives its meaning from Scripture. The expectation of redemption expressed in Genesis, is the hope expressed in John's question. Scripture and John speak with one voice. Here, provided the allusion is intended, Scripture is authoritative both in its pragmatic and its rhetorical capacity. Pragmatically, Scripture is an identity factor: the future hope of universal redemption promised by the God of Israel is the future hope of John and the future hope of the reader. Before Jesus' answer actualises the eschatological hope in the present, the coming of the messianic figure refers to a future hope, which goes beyond the notion of God's restoration of Israel. If Genesis 49:10 was on Matthew's mind, it is the prophetic, predictive elements of the passage alluded to which is appealed to. The eschatological event to which the passage refers, remains a hope for the future. The rhetorical function of Genesis 49:10 in the seeming allusion of 11:3 lies also, therefore, in its providing a language for theological reflection. As a kind of "coded" language, it communicates on sub-narrative level with those who pick up on the allusion.

Scripture also functions as kerygmatic and as proclamation in the present text. In the case of an allusion to Gen 49:10 in the question of John. it interprets the text messianically, and actualises it by making imminent the realisation of the hope it expresses. Jesus' affirmative answer in 11:5 stresses the present reality of this eschatological hope. The use of the present subjunctive/indicative, however, also opens

for the double use of the ἐρχόμενος language later in the gospel. While Jesus fills the expectations of Scripture, the texts are not yet fulfilled. While it is already present, the coming is also a eschatological reality yet to be fulfilled. This corresponds with the previous usage of ὁ ἐρχόμενος, where the eschatological judgement associated with the day of Yahweh is identified with the coming of Jesus. For Matthew this judgement awaits realisation.

With regard to *Matthew's reception of Q*, and the normative use of tradition, it is clear that the question of John gains its significance through the allusion to Scripture if it is in accordance with Matthew's intentions. In that case, the question functions both as a reference to the Q narrative in the meaning "are you the one of whom I spoke?" and as a reference to Genesis: "are you the coming one of Scripture whom we expect?" This is an expansion of the Q text, yet one that is possible on the background of the Q material. In placing the question in the context of Mt 11-13, the seeming allusion to Genesis 49:10 introduces issues pertaining to the identity of Jesus which will be answered in several ways in the following material, composed of traditional elements from several sources. Further, the possible allusion gives ὁ ἐρχόμενος as a title applied to Jesus content in terms of common eschatological messianic expectations, including the notion of universalism: the coming one is the hope of the nations. Hence Q becomes authoritative as an interpretation of Scripture.

4.1.2. Jesus as the Messenger of Good News in Matthew 11:5

τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν καὶ χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν,
λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν,
καὶ νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται καὶ πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται:

The mixed citation adapted from Q in Matthew 11:5 constitutes Jesus' answer to the question of John in Matthew 11:3. Together with Mt 11:2 which speaks directly of the works of the Christ, the messianic and eschatological expectations are related to the person of Jesus. The exhortation that John's disciples should report back to him what they hear and see may in itself be an allusion to Scripture: πορευθέντες ἀπαγγείλατε Ιωάννῃ ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ βλέπετε is reminiscent of the imperatives of Isaiah 42:18: οἱ κωφοί ἀκούσατε καὶ οἱ τυφλοί ἀναβλέψατε. The same combination of verbs appear in reversed order with the same meaning in Matthew 13:16. The issue of hearing and seeing, in the meaning understanding the significance of, is one of the leading themes of chapters 11-13. This theme is introduced in Matthew 11:4.[34] The saying is followed by a catalogue of eschatological events: the direct and affirmative answer to the question whether Jesus is the coming one: the messiah. The mixed citation continues the Matthean combination of the Davidic messianic texts with Isaianic servant imagery. As a reply to John, the catalogue of eschatological events draws the hope of redemption into the

[34] Cf. below ch. 6.

present, but the catalogue still remains descriptive of a future hope, the possession of which is dependent on the individual's ability to perceive the significance of the present events. Because Matthew adapts the Q text almost unchanged, it is necessary to delineate the use of the passage in Q before an independent interpretation and employment of the passage can be established for Matthew.

The Interpretation of Isaiah in Q 7:22

The catalogue of eschatological events in Q 7:22 draws on several prophecies from Isaiah 61, 35 and 26. The blind receiving sight, the deaf hearing, and the healing of the lame are elements found in Is 35:5-6.[35] It is possible also that Is 35:8 may be background for the cleansing of the lepers.[36] Is 26:19 speaks of the raising of the dead. Both prophecies concern events at the day of the coming of "the Lord". The preaching of good news is derived from Is 61, which in the context of Isaiah is performed by one anointed by God.

> Q 7:22 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πορευθέντες ἀπαγγείλατε
> Ἰωάννῃ ἃ βλέπετε καὶ ἀκούετε: 1) τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν, 2) χωλοὶ
> περιπατοῦσιν, 3) λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται καὶ 4) κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν,
> 5) νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, 6) πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται:

Is 61:1	**Is 35:5-6**	**Is 26:19**
πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ οὗ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέν με 6) εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς ἀπέσταλκέν με ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν καὶ 1) τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν	1) τότε ἀνοιχθήσονται ὀφθαλμοὶ τυφλῶν καὶ 4) ὦτα κωφῶν ἀκούσονται 35.6 τότε 2) ἀλεῖται ὡς ἔλαφος ὁ χωλός καὶ τρανὴ ἔσται γλῶσσα μογιλάλων ... Is 35:8 ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁδὸς καθαρὰ καὶ ὁδὸς ἁγία κληθήσεται καὶ 3) οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἐκεῖ ἀκάθαρτος	5) ἀναστήσονται οἱ νεκροί καὶ ἐγερθήσονται οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις

The first and the last element of the allusion uses language from Isaiah 61:1. Isaiah 35 provides the framework for the second and the fourth element, and possibly the third. Hence, the two passages, may be said to form the framework and background for the catalogue of end-time events in Q 7:22,[37] borrowing the language of the jubilee. In the adaptation of the expectations to the Q text, the future has become present tense.

---

[35] Also Is 29:18-19; 42:18, could serve as background here (cf. Siegfried Schulz, *Q. Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (1962), 196; Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 169), though there seems to be a difference between the *Heilsgeschehen* catalogued in Mt 11:5 par, and the plea to hear, see, and understand in Mt 11:4f and e.g. Is 42: 18.

[36] Cf. Verseput, *Rejection*, 68; Häfner, *Vorläufer*, 180f. Both with reference to J. Dupont, "L'Ambassade de Jean- Baptiste (Matthieu 11,2-6; Luc 7:18-13)," NRTh 93 (1961) 805-825, 943-959; 950.

[37] So also Ploch, *Jesaja-Worte*, 30 n66. For further discussion, cf. Frans Neirynck, "Q 6,20b-21; 7,22 and Isaiah 61"; Hubert Frankemölle, "Jesus als Deuterojesajanischer Freudenbote. Zur Rezeption von Jes

The mixed citation is formed according to the principle of association. Through their common imagery of the opening of blind eyes, Isaiah 61 is read in light of the eschatological vision of Isaiah 35 (cf. v 5). Thereby the two elements from Isaiah 61:1 frame the elements from Isaiah 35 and 26. Whereas Q 7:8-23 may not originally have formed a unit,[38] in the present context in Q the mixed allusion to Isaiah passages may be shown to be significant. In the original Isaiah passages, the return from Babylonian slavery is understood and interpreted in light of the exodus from Egypt. Hence, the desert becomes the place of redemption (Is 40:3; 35:1-10).[39] Further, the oracles of salvation proclaiming the end of the present time and the imminence of the time of redemption, while speaking into a political and historical situation, receive in subsequent interpretation eschatological significance. In the context of Q, the mixed Isaiah allusion is placed after John's announcement of a coming one in Q 3 and the sermon on the plain in Q 6. In the pericope following the present one in Q, again "going out into the desert" and John's prophetic ministry is emphasised. Hence, the scriptural allusion in Q 7:22 both interprets the previous pronouncement of blessing to the poor in Q 6 through the citation of Isaiah 61:1 *and* continues the desert motif and the figure of John the Baptist as an eschatological prophet through the allusions to Isaiah 35. It is appropriate to speak of Q's use of Scripture here as prefiguring the events which Q relates. The events of the present are interpreted by and given meaning by Scripture. The authority of Scripture here does not necessarily lie in its predictive prophecy, but in proving continuity of revelation and of God's will to redemption. John's ministry in the desert prepares the way for the renewal which takes place in the eschatological ministry of Jesus. It is important to note that in Q, only one healing miracle precedes the mixed citation (Q 7:1-10). In Q, the central content of the healing passage is the concluding apophthegm concerning faith,[40] and can also not be said to corresponds schematically to the citation. Hence the function of the citation is kerygmatic and proclaims the imminence of God's salvation and judgement through the allusion to Scripture. This is also in correspondence with John's announcement of a Baptism with the Holy Spirit and with fire (Q 3).

The allusion or mixed quotation in Q 7:22 has played a significant role in the discussion of the origin of the Christian use of εὐαγγέλιον. A part of this discussion involves the question whether the allusion with its climactic point in πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται indicates that Q understood Jesus to be the eschatological prophet of Is 61:1.[41] The mixed quotation in Q is in the first instance primarily a catalogue of

---

52,7 und 61,1 im Neuen Testament, durch Jesus und in den Targumim" (1989), 50-53; Werner Grimm, *Weil ich dich liebe. Die Verkündigung Jesu und Deuterojesaja* (1976), 124-131.

[38] Tuckett, *Q*, 126. Cf. the similar construction to Q 7:22 in 4Q521 below.

[39] Ploch, *Jesaja-Worte*, 256-257.

[40] Migaku Sato, *Q und Prophetie. Studien zur Gattungs und Traditionsgeschichte der Quelle Q*, (1988) 82.

[41] Cf. Frankemölle, "Jesus", 50-53; Anton Vögtle, "Wunder und Wort in Urchristlicher Glaubenswerbung" (1971). Tuckett, *Q*, 221-239 attempts to prove the importance of Is 61:1 for Q, with

transforming events which mark the presence of the time of salvation. Although the pericope receives a distinct Christological emphasis through John's question from prison, and the concluding saying of the pericope: καὶ μακάριός ἐστιν ὃς ἐὰν μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοί (Q 7:23),[42] the emphasis is nevertheless on the significance of these events. In the context of Q, which has no real interest in miracle stories, the catalogue functions as an announcement of salvation (rather than as a summary of events as in Lk and Mt) in the present tense indicating that it is already taking place. Through the present tense, the climactic placing of the element from Is 61:1, points back to Jesus as the speaker of the announcement. Hence, the allusion in Q, on the one hand affirms the question of John that Jesus is the one whom he announced (Q 3:16), and, on the other hand, brings out the eschatological significance of this affirmation. In the reply of Jesus itself, Is 61:1 is being fulfilled. In Jesus' ministry, the eschatological age, the kingdom of God, has arrived.[43]

The Eschatological and Messianic Reading of Isaiah in 4Q521

The catalogue of eschatological events based on Isaiah in Q may originally have existed as a separate unit. The form, creating a new biblical composition through the combination and altering of passages was not unknown or unique in Judaism.[44] The uniquely Christian creation has often been ascribed to the insertion of elements 3 and 5, the raising of the dead and the cleansing of the lepers.[45] Exegetes have understood these to be influenced by Jesus' own ministry and the Elijah and Elisha narratives of raising the dead and healing lepers.[46] A text from the Qumran caves, fragment 4Q521 (2 ii + 4) which has received much attention as a possible parallel to Q 7:22, shows, however, that in early Judaism, healing and the revival of the dead were expected as a part of the

---

its implications for Q's Christology, by drawing parallels between the present text, the beatitudes, and Lk 4. His arguments are based on the Q origin of texts which more probably can be ascribed to Mt or L so that the influence would be reduced to the present allusion, where the element from Is 61:1 is only one part of the list of eschatological events. On the beatitudes see discussion in Neirynck, "Q 6,20b-21; 7,22 and Isaiah 61". See also Sato, *Q* 255; François Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* vol. 1 (1989), 207-208.

[42] Thus, Sato, *Q*, 141-143, believes the catalogue in Q 7:22 to be older than the pericope of which it is presently a part.

[43] Cf. ἤγγκεν ἐφ' ὑμας ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ Q 10:9b

[44] It is found especially in Qumran literature. Cf. Fishbane, "Use", 356-357.

[45] Neirynck, "Q 6,20b-21; 7,22 and Isaiah 61", 10-11.

[46] Cf. Schweizer, *Matthäus*, 165, et al. This is perhaps due to the later mention of Elijah in the Mt context, or the use of Elijah and Elisha as examples in Lk 4, following the reading of Is 61:1 in the synagogue. If the healing of the leper and raising of the dead in Elijah and Elisha stories were alluded to in the present context, it would be with the emphasis that the present events exceed even the time of these two prophets. Cf. Sato, *Q*, 141-142. This notion, however goes beyond the scope of the present passage, which is concerned with the eschatological significance of the ministry of Jesus, rather than in a Elijah/Elisha typology or a comparison in line with Q 11:29ff.

wonderful works of God at the Jubilee. For the present study, only lines 1-2, 8, and 11-12 are of interest:[47]

> *1:* [the hea]vens and earth will listen to His messiah[48]
> *2:* [and all th]at is in them will not swerve from the commandment of holy ones
> ....
> 8: as He frees prisoners, gives sight to the blind, straightens up those be[nt over]
> ...
> *11*: Wond<r>ous things, such as have never been, the Lord will do, as He s[aid][49]
> *12*: For he will heal the wounded, revive the dead, (and) announce good news to lowly ones

The text of line eight adheres very closely to Psalm 146:7d, 8ab, while line 12b and c are allusions to Is 26:19 and 61:1. It is not likely that Mt 11:5/Lk 7:22 is literary dependent on 4Q521. Neither is there evidence that 4Q521 forms the background of a prophetic messianic expectation, as e.g. *Elijah Redivivus,* used by Q and applied to Jesus.[50] The text is nevertheless significant, because it gives an example of Early Jewish Biblical interpretation in the interweaving of passages expressing eschatological hopes similar to Q 7:22. In their context in the book of Isaiah, the eschatological expectations are tied to the action of God. Only in Is 61:1 it is God's prophet, anointed and endowed with the spirit of God, who is the subject of the action. In the adaptation of the text in 4Q521, God is the one who announces good news. Hence Q 7:22 continues a tradition of interpretation which hopes in God's salvific intervention at the eschaton. Although the emphasis in the Q text is on the events themselves, its Christian application connects the events with the ministry of Jesus as the messiah.

Matthew 11:5 as an Adaptation of Q 7:22 and Isaiah 61, 35 and 26

In Matthew's adaptation of the Q passage the relevance of the mixed citation is enhanced. The citation of Isaiah 61:1 is developed in Matthew, as a correspondence to Matthew's depiction of Jesus as a Messiah of Davidic descent. Matthew further creates a closer correspondence between the separate elements in the mixed citation and the preceding narrative. Finally, the Matthean narrative places added emphasis on the continuation of the works of Jesus in the ministry of the disciples. Hence, Matthew's

---

[47] The translation is that of Joseph Fitzmyer, "Dead Sea Scrolls and Early Christianity" (1995), 314 which seems to follow the reconstruction of the text by Émile Puech, "Une Apocalypse Messianique (4Q521)." (1972), 485.

[48] Although the parallelism in line 1 and 2 seems to require a plural reading of messiah, to correspond to the "holy ones" in the second line, Puech, "Apocalypse", 487 n.14, prefers the singular reading.

[49] J. D. Tabor and M.O. Wise, "4Q521 'On Resurrection' and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition: A Preliminary Study". (1992), 150, reconstruct and translate thus: "And as for the glorious things that are not the work (מעשה rather than Puech's יעשה) of the Lord when he [come]s ([בוא]י rather than Puech's [בר]ד)," assuming "he comes" [בוא]י to be a reference to the messiah. Thereby they have created a closer correspondence with Matthew 11:2-3, where the works of the messiah and the coming one are elements. Apparently the Matthean text has influenced the reconstruction of the Qumran text fragment.

[50] Contra John J. Collins, "The Works of the Messiah" (1994), 106ff.

adaptation of Q is at the same time an independent interpretation and adaptation of the mixed Isaiah citation.

In Matthew, both elements of Jesus' reply to John's inquiry preserve the Q *Vorlage* without great alterations. Mt 11:4: καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πορευθέντες ἀπαγγείλατε Ἰωάννῃ ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ βλέπετε: reverses the order of the verbs in Q (Lk 7:22: εἴδετε καὶ ἠκούσατε). The present tense is probably original in Q.[51] While the allusion in Luke 7:22 consists of two clusters of three events separated by one καί between the third and the fourth element of the catalogue, Matthew's text adds a καί between the first and the second element, the fifth and the sixth element, and the fourth and the fifth element, so the result is a list consisting of three sets of two events.[52]

In the gospel of Matthew the pericope receives a greater Christological emphasis, but also ecclesiological aspects are brought in. The notion of messianic identity implied and incorporated into John's question has been pointed to above. The shift of emphasis from the events to the person of Christ is already announced in the introductory statement, where the Matthean redactor points to the works of the messiah (Mt 11:2ʿ Ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης ἀκούσας ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ). It is widely recognised that τὰ ἔργα here refers to the miracle narratives of Mt 8-9. Moreover, Is 61:1-2 can be shown to have been influential in the Matthean redaction of the beatitudes, particularly 5:3,4.[53] The catalogue of eschatological events from the book of Isaiah have therefore already been performed by Jesus in the previous Matthean narrative. Matthew 11:5 may be said to function as a summary of these events, and are repeated in a slightly changed narrative form in Mt 15, but even more than that, the verse interprets these events in light of the prophecies of Isaiah.[54] Hence, in the actions of Jesus, i.e. his proclamation and his deeds, Jesus fills the paradigm of the prophet, the bringer of good news in Isaiah. The

---

[51] So also Häfner, *Vorläufer*, 162. It is difficult to establish order of the verbs in Q with certainty. The Matthean "chiastic connection" referred to by Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, Vol. 2, 242, could well have been in Q. Schulz, *Q*, 192 and Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 166, holds the Matthean to be closer to the original, because of Luke's emphasis on the miracles of Jesus. But, as Luz himself notes, the order of verbs in Matthew corresponds to Matthew's interest displayed in the placing of the discourse in Mt 5-7 before the miracle stories in Mt 8-9. Where the same combination of verbs occurs in Mt 13:14, Matthew corrects the word order of Mark. The reversal in Mt 11:4 is here considered to be Matthean redaction in light of that passage. Undoubtedly, Jesus' reply in 11:4 anticipates the citation of Isaiah 6:9 in Matthew 13. The reverse order of Q is further attested by the order of verbs in the Q logion Lk 10:22-23//Mt 13:16-17.

[52] It is not possible with certainty to establish the Q wording. Ploch, *Jesaja-Worte*, 27, following Paul Hoffmann, *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle*, 193, assumes that the Q text originally joined the elements of the text together with καί, arguing that it reflects the Hebrew use of the conjuctive waw. The three pairs of two in Matthew corresponds with the Matthean trend to form material into threes. Hence, Matthean redaction is here assumed.

[53] Whether the Matthean redactor preserved an already existing formulation can not be determined here for the sake of space. It is nevertheless unlikely that the Matthean form reflects the Q formulation. For a discussion on Matthean or pre Matthean origin, cf. e.g. Neirynck, "Q 6,20b-21; 7,22 and Isaiah 61" 4-6; Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol. 1, 436-439.

[54] Cf. Häfner, *Vorläufer*, 182 n.1; Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol. 2, 253.

combination of Is 61 with Is 35, gives the citation as it occurs in the context of Matthew an eschatological perspective. Moreover, the text which frames the mixed citation in Matthew 11:5, Is 61:1 is part of a prophetic call narrative, where the prophet proclaims: πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ οὗ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέν με. The text continues the Davidic Christology which was alluded to in Mt 11:3. Hence, the combination of Gen 49:10 with Is 61:1 in Matthew 11:2-6, prepares for the fulfilment citation in Matthew 12. Jesus fills the paradigm for the anointed one, the Christ.

Further, Matthew 11:2-6 includes yet another allusion which anticipates the citation of Is 42 in Matthew 12. It is clear from the Matthean narrative that John has already heard (ἀκούω) what is going on. Therefore when Jesus asks the disciples to report to John ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ βλέπετε, it does not mean that the answer is self-evident. Using the language of Is 42: 18, ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ βλέπετε is an invitation to understand the following explication of these events, and not to take offence.

The ecclesiological aspect which runs beneath the Christological proclamation in the passage is found in the similar catalogue to Mt 11:5 in the commissioning of the disciples in Mt 10:8 (ἀσθενοῦντας θεραπεύετε, νεκροὺς ἐγείρετε, λεπροὺς καθαρίζετε, δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλετε). Also this catalogue refers back to the miracles performed by Jesus in the previous chapters. The disciples are commissioned to go out and perform the same type of ministry among the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Although the catalogue in Mt 10:8 is not as comprehensive as Mt 11:5, the latter has also been thought to interpret the ministry of the disciples, so that the reception or opposition to Jesus in 11-12 is really the account of the response to the message of the disciples.[55] There are significant differences between the commission of the disciples and messianic claims of Mt 11:5. The call to see, hear and understand is also a call to the disciples; blindness to the compassion of God is also possible within the church (cf. Mt 12) so that it is not correct to onesidedly read the beginnings of and the legitimisation of the church in the Matthean narrative here.[56] The similarities of the accounts nevertheless signal that the ministry of the disciples is a faithful response to Jesus, and that they have their commission from him. If this ecclesiological aspect is to be read into the present pericope on the basis of the transparency of the Matthean narrative, then it is in the meaning that the one who commissioned them, is ὁ ἐρχόμενος, the expectation of the nations. As such the question of John in 11:3 may be understood in terms of the coming of the Son of Man spoken of

---

[55] Hubert Frankemölle, *Jahwe-Bund*, 343.

[56] „Wenn es richtig ist ..., dass die ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ auch das (nachösterliche) Wirken der damit auch als Träger der Verkündigung des Evangeliums an die Armen zu denkenden Jünger einschliessen, dann wendet sich der Makarismus unmittelbar auch an die Leser des Mt." Cf. Häfner, *Vorläufer*, 189.

in Mt 10:23, 16:28 and 24:30. Here also, Matthew goes beyond Q.[57] The already-but-not-yet-eschatology of the Matthean community is made clear.

Contrary to the interpretation of some scholars,[58] Jesus' answer to John does not include a correction of John's expectation of impending judgement as proclaimed in Mt 3:11ff/Q 3:16ff. The apparent discrepancy between the salvific events of Jesus' ministry and the images of judgement of John's message, is reduced in light of the eschatological perspective. The appearance of ὁ ἐρχόμενος is still in the future.[59] Matthew's placing of the Q material following the sending of the disciples in Mt 10 makes the post-Easter nature of the question of John more clear than in Q. The events which marked the ministry of Jesus and that of the Christian community function as signs of the imminent day of Yahweh in accordance with the Scriptures.

The Use and Normativity of Q 7:22 and Isaiah in Matthew 11:5

The catalogue of eschatological events appropriated from Isaianic prophecies in its present context in the Matthean narrative brings out theological points with regard to Christology, ecclesiology, and eschatology.

Christologically, Matthew 11:5 has been shown to be important in its context following the sermon on the mount and miracle stories. On the narrative level of the gospel, Matthew appeals both to the predictive aspect of prophecy and its paradigmatic/typological aspect. In the first instance the mixed citation functions as a proof text, to give indirect evidence of Jesus' identity as the one who is to come. The authorisation process is simple: It compares the events foretold by the prophet with the events which take place in the ministry of Jesus and in the church. The fact that they correspond, proves the theological conclusion. A literal or perfect correspondence is, however, not a prerequisite for its authority to legitimise the events of Jesus' ministry. Hence the prophecy is authoritative in its paradigmatic nature, in that it provides examples of God's works of salvation. On the basis of these one can discern that Jesus is the Christ. Hence Scripture functions normatively in providing a measure by which to interpret the present events.

In an extension of the messianic interpretation of the Jesus event, Scripture and through Mt 10, the gospel of Matthew, both function normatively in providing "the history of election" of the community. This pragmatic normativity of Scripture is dual. First, it creates identity by grounding the commission of the church in the commission of Jesus from God. Hence the church continues the role of Jesus, in acting out God's will

---

[57] Contra Tuckett, *Q*, 127, who holds that the future Son of Man is already implied in the use of ὁ ἐρχόμενος in Q 7:18. The present/future aspect is similar to the Matthean use of the Son of Man, where the dual notion of humiliation and future coming is adapted from Q. Cf. Luz, "Son of Man".

[58] Davies, et al., *Saint Matthew*, 241; Bauer, *Structure*, 92; John P. Meier, "John the Baptist in Matthew's Gospel" (1980), 392-393.

[59] So also Luz, *Evangelium*, 167, and Tuckett, *Q*, 222.

for salvation. Second, it creates the framework by which one is to live out this commission. The commission can only be filled in hearing and seeing, in Jesus' words and deeds, the true meaning of Scripture in its function of the proclamation of God's salvation.

A final point is obtained from a diachronic reading of the pericope, which also considers the allusions made in the text of the dialogue. The eschatological dimension alluded to in the question of John in Mt 11:3, expects an answer which goes beyond an affirmation in light of present events. In a different way than as a proof text, the catalogue of eschatological events in Mt 11:5 gains importance as an eschatological prophecy. A prophecy must be tested if one is to know its truth value. In a reciprocal way, then, Scripture proves the identity of the Christ, and the works of the Christ in return proves the truth of Scripture. Its kerygmatic value is not exhausted in the events tied to the appearance of Jesus, but is fulfilled in the ministry of Jesus' followers, and is still to be fulfilled "when he comes". Consequently, the mixed quotation from Isaiah in its context makes a point about realised and future eschatology, and describes the works of the Christ who is to come. That the list of healing events does not include the fiery judgement expected by John in chapter 3, in no way implies that John's understanding of the eschatological events was faulty. The following chapters will show that the eschatological coming will be marked both by the healing works of God, and by judgement. But whereas the wonderful works of healing are taking place in the present, the time of judgement is still to come. Yet, as Mt 11:6 indicates, understanding the significance of the powerful works of Jesus is crucial, and one's response in the present has implications for the future.

4.1.3. Matthew 12:18-21: Jesus as the Isaianic Servant

The fulfilment citation in Mt 12:18-21 is the longest one in the gospel of Matthew. Scholars have attempted to establish the influence of the citation on its immediate context, since, compared with other Matthean fulfilment quotations, the servant quotation may seem only loosely connected with the foregoing events to which the fulfilment formula refers.[60] Although formally a quotation, Mt 12:18-21 is similar to Mt 11:5 in that it combines three texts from Isaiah. Like Mt 11:2-6 its formulation forms a bridge to the beginning of the gospel and the baptism of Jesus by John. As a part of what in the present study has been labelled the ὁ ἐρχόμενος complex, the quotation continues the Christological themes of present fulfilment and future expectation which were found in Matthew 11:2-6, the introductory pericope to chapters 11-13. In fact, the

---

[60] In depth: Cope, *Matthew*, 34-36; Rudolf Schnackenburg, "Siehe da mein Knecht, den Ich erwählt habe" (1991), 217-220; and Jerome Neyrey, "The Thematic Use of Isaiah 42:1-4 in Matthew 12" (1982). Neyrey (458) comments on previous discussions: "The relationship ... of citation to narrative has not been established on exact verbal links, as was the case in other quotations of Isaiah in Matthew."

allusions in the introductory pericope anticipate the citation of Is 42:1-4. Through the fulfilment formula Jesus is presented as the embodiment of the Isaianic servant through his healing ministry in the present. The final or ultimate fulfilment of the prophecy, however, lies in the future.

In order to establish the extent of the Matthean redaction it is necessary to analyse the nature of the citation from Isaiah 42:1-4, its original context and theology and history of interpretation. These steps will help place Matthew's use of the passage in context, so that an understanding of the use and normativity of the prophecy may be determined.

The Text Form and Redaction of Matthew 12:18-21

Matthew 12:18-21 combines three texts from Isaiah: Is 41:8-9, Is 42:1-4 and Is 11:1-10, whereby the last is only alluded to. Like the majority of the fulfilment citations, the text constitutes, at least in part, a translation from the Hebrew independent of the Septuagint. With the exception of v. 21, there is no unambiguous evidence of influence by the Septuagint on the translation. Further, evidence of Targumic influence on the text form is very slight, and literal dependence is unlikely. The quotation includes several Matthean *hapax legomena*. Assuming that at least the core of the citation reflects one of Matthew's sources, the following analysis will first point to elements which are either the mark of Matthean redaction, or prove to serve Matthean interest particularly well.[61]

The opening verse of the fulfilment quotation combines in its formulation Is 41:8-9ab and Is 42:1. Thereby it forms an almost verbal link to the account of the baptism of Jesus. It is not dependent on any known Greek version, but agrees with Theodotion over against the LXX in retaining ἰδου for הֵן[62] and translating רָצְתָה with εὐδόκεω.

Mt 12:18	Is 41:8-9a[63]	Is 42:1[64]
Ἰδοὺ ὁ παῖς μου	וְאַתָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל עַבְדִּי יַעֲקֹב	הֵן עַבְדִּי אֶתְמָךְ־בּוֹ
ὃν ᾑρέτισα	אֲשֶׁר בְּחַרְתִּיךָ	
ὁ ἀγαπητός μου	זֶרַע אַבְרָהָם אֹהֲבִי	בְּחִירִי רָצְתָה נַפְשִׁי
εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχή μου:	אֲשֶׁר הֶחֱזַקְתִּיךָ מִקְצוֹת הָאָרֶץ	
	Is 11:2a, 4	
θήσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν	וְנָחָה עָלָיו רוּחַ יְהוָה	נָתַתִּי רוּחִי עָלָיו
καὶ κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπαγγελεῖ.	וְשָׁפַט בְּצֶדֶק דַּלִּים	
	וְהוֹכִיחַ בְּמִישׁוֹר לְעַנְוֵי־אָרֶץ	מִשְׁפָּט לַגּוֹיִם יוֹצִיא:

---

[61] For discussions on the text form of the quotation cf. Stendahl, *School*, 109-114; Gundry, *Use*, 110-115; John Grindel, "Matthew 12:18-21" (1967), 110-115; Rotfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 72-77.

[62] Targum follows MT. Matthew's translation agrees with that of Theodotion, LXX substitutes it with Ιακοβ. It is questionable whether Theodotion's and Matthew's translation may be designated as actively "rejecting LXX's obvious interpolations." (Cf. Gundry, *Use*, 112.)

[63] LXX: σὺ δέ Ισραηλ παῖς μου Ιακωβ ὃν ἐξελεξάμην
σπέρμα Αβρααμ ὃν ἠγάπησα οὗ ἀντελαβόμην ἀπ' ἄκρων τῆς γῆς

[64] LXX: Ιακωβ ὁ παῖς μου ἀντιλήμψομαι αὐτοῦ Ισραηλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἡ ψυχή μου ἔδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐξοίσει

The terminology and parallelism of the first two elements of the Matthean quotation are influenced by Is 41:8. Matthew's ὁ παῖς μου and ὁ ἀγαπητός μου corresponds to עַבְדִּי and אֹהֲבִי of Is 41:8, and ὃν ἡρέτισα translates אֲשֶׁר בְּחַרְתִּיךָ, minus the 2.p.sg. suffix.[65] Also the parallelism with the relative pronoun corresponds to Is 41:8.[66] The introductory ἰδου, the use of 3. person singular, and the absence of the designations "Israel", "Jacob" and "seed of Abraham", prove Is 42:1 to be the foundation of the quotation. Through the εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησεν, Mt 3:17 is recalled.The whole phrase of the second line of the quotation echoes the voice from heaven at the baptism (Mt 3:17) and transfiguration (Mt 17:5) of Jesus: Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα. From this point on, the quotation follows Is 42:1-4.

Matthew 12:18 departs from the text of Is 42:1 in the Hebrew and the LXX version. Possibly the quotation existed in this form in Matthew's source, the fusion caused by the very similar vocabulary of the two passages. It may also be that the incentive to the combination of the two Isaianic passages in Matthew 12 was given in the voice from heaven passage in the synoptic material. Matthew is thus adapting the second line of the quotation to the Jesus tradition.[67]

In Mark 1:11, the heavenly voice makes an announcement to Jesus in an allusion to Psalm 2: Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.[68] The phrase in Matthew is redacted in order to create the parallel between Mt 3:17 and 12:18. The second person singular announcement (σὺ εἶ) is changed to third person (οὗτός ἐστιν), which is adopted from the heavenly voice in the transformation narrative in Mt 17:5 //Mk 9:7. Thus, Matthew interprets the Baptism of Jesus in light of Is 42:1.[69]

---

[65] בחירי occurs both in Targum and in the Masoretic text in the parallel structures as synonymous to עבדי in the second line of Is 42:1. It is equivalent to ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου in the Septuagint. In Isaiah 41.8, however, עבדי is qualified by the verb of the same stem (also both in MT and in Targum). Even LXX translates ὃν ἐξελεξάμην here, but the verb is often also translated with αἱρετίζω. Cf. Judges 5:8, 1 Chr 28:4, 6, 10; 29:1; II Chr 29:11; Ps 24 (25):12; 118 (119):30, 173. Hg 2:23; Za 1:17, 2:12. Ez 20:5. The occurrence of παῖς μου and αἱρετίζω in Haggai 2.23 has led some scholars to conclude that there is a deliberate allusion to, or drawing on, that text in the mixed quotation of Matthew 12.17-21 (cf. Schenk, *Sprache*, 302).

[66] Also the elements of Is 42:1-2 form a parallelism of nouns with following relative clauses, but without אֲשֶׁר. The sequence of terms in Mt 12:18, can nevertheless only be explained through the influence of Is 41:8.

[67] So also Stendahl, *School*, 110; Rotfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 145.

[68] Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol. 1, 336-339, assume that Mark 1:11 par. is a mixed quotation, the first part of which is derived from LXX Ps. 2:7, and a non-LXX version of Is. 42.1. The version of Is 42:1 would then be the same as is quoted in Matthew 12:18. (cf. Grindel, "Matthew 12:18-21", 110-112; Morna D. Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant*, 1959, 70). There is however *no other* significant linguistic link to Is 42:1 in Mark 1.11 par., except through the Matthean fulfilment quotation in Mt 12.18-21 (Cf. Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant*, 72).

[69] Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 1, 156.

The second half of Matthew 12:18 (Is 42:1) includes a description of the servant which is also characteristic of the branch of David in Is 11. God's spirit rests on him, and he will proclaim justice to the nations. There is here also a parallel to the prophetic messenger in Is 61:1, who is alluded to in Mt 11:5. The future of ἀπαγγέλλω differs from the Septuagint translation;[70] it is synonymous with εὐαγγελλίζω in Mt 11:5 and may be redactional.[71] Verse 20 illustrates that the sentence is to be understood as a parallel to Is 11:4 (but with righteousness he shall judge the poor, and decide with equity for the meek of the earth.) The bruised reed and the smouldering wick are metaphors for the poor and the lowly. Also here, there is a parallel in the mixed quotation in Mt 11:5.

The above analysis of Mt 12:18 only has already made clear that Isaiah 42:1-4 as it appears in the context of Matthew's gospel, is well placed. Again, as in the question of the "coming one", lines are drawn to the beginning of the gospel. In addition the allusions which were found to influence Mt 11:2-6, and the themes which it brought up, are all present here: Davidic sonship, messianic commissioning through the gift of the Spirit, the proclamation of good news or justice to the poor, and finally the inclusion of the nations. The analysis of the remainder of the citation will continue to support these findings.

Mt 12:19-20	Is 42:2-4 MT	Is 42:2-4 LXX
19) οὐκ ἐρίσει οὐδὲ κραυγάσει, οὐδὲ ἀκούσει τις ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ.	2) לֹא יִצְעַק וְלֹא יִשָּׂא וְלֹא־יַשְׁמִיעַ בַּחוּץ קוֹלוֹ׃	2) οὐ κεκράξεται οὐδὲ ἀνήσει οὐδὲ ἀκουσθήσεται ἔξω ἡ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ
20ab) κάλαμον συντετριμμένον οὐ κατεάξει καὶ λίνον τυφόμενον οὐ σβέσει,	3) קָנֶה רָצוּץ לֹא יְשַׁבֵּר וּפִשְׁתָּה כֵהָה לֹא יְכַבֶּנָּה לֶאֱמֶת יוֹצִיא מִשְׁפָּט׃	3) κάλαμον τεθλασμένον οὐ συντρίψει καὶ λίνον καπνιζόμενον οὐ σβέσει ἀλλὰ εἰς ἀλήθειαν ἐξοίσει κρίσιν
20c) ἕως ἂν ἐκβάλῃ εἰς νῖκος τὴν κρίσιν.	4a) לֹא יִכְהֶה וְלֹא יָרוּץ עַד־יָשִׂים בָּאָרֶץ מִשְׁפָּט	4a) ἀναλάμψει καὶ οὐ θραυσθήσεται ἕως ἂν θῇ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κρίσιν
21) καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν.	4b) וּלְתוֹרָתוֹ אִיִּים יְיַחֵלוּ	Is 11:10 (LXX) ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν / Is 42:4b (LXX) καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν

After portraying the servant's gracious attitude to the weak, Matthew 12:19 explains his peaceful ministry. The Matthean ἐρίσει has no parallel in LXX, Targum or

---

[70] cf. fn. 60.

[71] Cf. Neyrey, "Thematic Use", 462. This differs from Matthew's general use of the verb, which, as in Mt 11:4 simply means "tell." Schenk, *Sprache*, 33-34, has shown that in the context of Mt 12:18d, ἀπαγγελεῖ, may reflect a particular structural interest.

MT.[72] It is a *hapax legomenon* in Matthew (and the New Testament), and may well be an indication that Matthew's text is dependent on a pre-existing translation. "He will not argue" nevertheless fits the context of Mt 12 on the surface of the narrative, where Jesus has just withdrawn from a verbal quarrel with the Pharisees.[73] The Matthean text of v. 19b, may also indicate dependence on an already existing Greek translation in contrast to both LXX and MT; τις is the subject of the clause, and renders the verb in the active, so that the sentence reads: no one will hear his voice in the streets.

Matthew 12.20c seems to be a conflation of Is 42:3c and Is 42:4b. The Matthean quotation thereby loses or omits Is 42:4a. The omission may just be scribal error. If the omission is intentional, it shows that here, as in Mt 8:17, it is not the suffering of the servant which is important for Matthew.[74] Through the omission v. 20c-21 stand parallel to Mt 12:18d: "and he will proclaim justice to the gentiles." The task of the servant expressed in v 20, to bring forth justice successfully,[75] therefore also continues a theme which is particularly present in Mt 11-13. The formulation is unusual, but again, it fits into the Matthean narrative context on the surface level. The verb ἐκβάλλειν which here is Matthew's translation of יצא is used in two different ways in the context of Mt 12. In the context of casting out demons (vv 22-30), it is negative in meaning.[76] Far more neutral in meaning is its use in v 35, ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ ἐκβάλλει ἀγαθά, καὶ ὁ πονηρὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ θησαυροῦ ἐκβάλλει πονηρά, a use which is repeated in Mt 13:52. Both these occurrences are peculiar to Matthew and may reflect a conscious adaptation of the citation to the context and vice versa.[77] Κρίσις connects well with the narrative context both on the surface level and in the deeper

---

[72] Stendahl, *School*, 111-112, claims Matthew is here influenced by the Syriac of the Old Testament Peshitta, where "to cry" is used, a word which in Aramaic has the meaning "to contend." Both Gundry, *Use*, 113 and Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 244, question this conclusion, however.

[73] This is the obvious link between the quotation and the narrative context, although one should be careful in making this one sentence the "summary" of Jesus' ministry and being, as does Barth, "Gesetzesverständnis", 128 and McConnell, *Law*, 122. As Neyrey, "Thematic Use", 468-470, also observes, the previous and following pericopi consist of controversies with the Pharisees. The withdrawal from the contest in this case is in response to the specific plotting of the Pharisees.

[74] V. 4a is suggestive of the suffering of the servant. Cf. Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66* (1969), 95.

[75] Cf. translation by Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol. 2, 326. לאמת is rendered εἰς νῖκος in Matthew, a formulation which is not typically Matthean. Davies and Allison see a connection between the Matthean text form and Hab 1.4 which reads וְלֹא־יֵצֵא לָנֶצַח מִשְׁפָּט (cf. 1 Cor 15:54). Grindel, "Matthew 12:18-21", 113, compares the Matthean text to the combination of Is 42.3 and Hab 1.4 in 1QH4.25. Grindel assumes a common Isaiah manuscript as source for Matthew and 1QH. Cf. also Gundry, *Use*, 115, defines the translation as an Aramaism, and Goulder, "Midrash", 330 fn 57, who believes Matthew is influenced by Paul here. The formulation is another example of the unique text form of the citation in Matthew.

[76] The few places LXX translates hifil of יצא with ἐκβάλλειν, it is also used in the sense of bringing out unwanted elements. Cf.: 2 Chron 23. 14 (bringing out Athaliah); 29.5; 29.10 (defilement from the Sanctuary).

[77] Cf. Neyrey, "Thematic Use", 466.

structure of the text. The noun appears several times in Mt 11-13,[78] and thematically, the whole section describes how understanding (as it is evident in lived life) is decisive at the day of justice.

The final verse in the Matthean quotation differs from the rest of the citation in that it follows the Septuagint. Both in Is 42:4 and Is 11:10, the Septuagint departs from the Hebrew text and speaks of the hope of the nations. In the Septuagint the two passages were already interpreted in light of each other, and the formulation has also influenced the Septuagint understanding of Gen 49:10. When Matthew inserts the same formulation into the citation of Is 42:1-4 as it occurs in the present place in the narrative, it reintroduces the theme of future expectation which was alluded to in John's question from prison in Mt 11:3. Hence it is not to be understood as a later interpolation into the citation.[79]

The analysis of the text form of Is 42:1-4 in Matthew 12 has shown that the translation may be dependent on a source. Redactional features are nevertheless present in the formulation of the quotation, evident from its lexical and thematic links with the surrounding narrative. In particular, the combination with Is 41:8 serves Matthew's inclination to associate the image of the Spirit-endowed servant with the expectation of the Davidic messiah, who is the hope of the nations. It remains to show Matthew's adaptation of the passage, by contrasting the meaning and understanding of the Isaiah citation in its original context with its function as a part of the ὁ ἐρχόμενος complex in the central section of Matthew. As a result the use and normativity of the text in the context of Mt 11-13 can be found.

Matthew's Adaptation of Isaiah 42:1-4

Isaiah 42:1-4 constitutes the first servant song in Deutero- Isaiah. The text is tripartite and follows a strict scheme of parallelism for each part. They present the servant and his mission under three aspects. V 1 - the preparation for his mission; vv 2-3a - the way the mission is performed; and vv 3b-4 - the successful completion of his mission.[80] The form and content of the oracle, seems to identify the servant as a prophet or messianic figure of royal dimension. His mission is to bring מִשְׁפָּט to the nations.

The servant language in Deutero- Isaiah is (perhaps deliberately) ambiguous, and may refer to both the individual (Is 42:1-4) and the nation. Outside the servant songs, עבד

---

[78] Outside the citation: Mt 11:22; 24; 12:36, 41, 42; parallel to συντέλεια αἰῶνος, in 13:39, 40, 49.

[79] See Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 245, for arguments for the verse as secondary, Davies, et al., *Saint Matthew*, vol. 2, 327, for arguments against. Luz suggests a *testimonium* background for the text, the verse added by the Matthean red. Davies/Allison follow Gundry and assume the whole quotation to be the work of the Matthean redactor. In addition to the connection with the allusion in Mt 11:3 and the parallel formulation within the citation itself, the line may appeal to Matthew, in its use of ὄνομα, which Matthew uses frequently with reference to Jesus. Mt 1:21, 23, 25; 7:22; 10:22; 12:21; 18:5, 20; 19:29; 24:5, 9; 28:19. Cf. Schenk, *Sprache*, 374

[80] Cf. Karl Elliger, *Deuterojesaja* (1978), 199-221.

and בחיר, a term borrowed from the kingship language, often signifies Israel and Jacob, where being chosen lies in the history of Israel since Abraham.[81] The two "servants", Israel and the prophet, exist side by side and are distinguishable from each other in Deutero- Isaiah,[82] but in later interpretation, the distinction between the two is blurred. In his analysis of the servant songs in Isaiah, O.H. Steck has pointed to five layers of interpretation of Is 42:1-4 within the book of Isaiah itself.[83] A secondary interpretation is found already in 42:5-7 where its application is still individual. In Steck's analysis, the history of Israel from the time of Deutero Isaiah until the final redaction of the whole book of Isaiah is traceable in the interpretation of the servant songs. In the last stage of redaction, it is the true people of God, composite of Israel *and* the nations which prove themselves to be the chosen servant of YHWH, in contrast to the enemies of God, who will face the imminent end time judgement.[84] The usage of the servant language in the Targumic version of the passage is messianic.[85] As in the Matthean citation and the Septuagint version, the Targum reads Is 42 in light of Is 11.[86]

Like the Aramaic Targum, Matthew understands Is 42 in messianic terms. The citation can be interpreted as a summary of the Jesus story in Matthew.[87] The servant's calling (with reference to the Baptism), the manner in which his task is fulfilled (in humility; responding to the poor and the needy), and the successful completion of his mission are included in the passage (the hope and expectation of the nations). The notion of a people of God consisting of faithful persons from "Israel" and "the nations" present in Isaiah, is kept in Matthew in extension of the citation of Is 42:1-4. The ἐρχόμενος motif clearly includes this universalising aspect of redemption, and the text legitimises the spread of the gospel to the Gentiles, but the anti-pharisaic features in Matthew are not to be translated into a general rejection of Israel.

In Matthew 12 the citation of Isaiah 42 is placed between controversies with the pharisees concerning the Sabbath and concerning exorcisms. The narrative summary in vv 15-16 recounts Jesus' healing ministry and immediately precedes the fulfilment formula which introduces the quotation in Mt 12:18-21. The summary is only a condensed form of a longer narrative sequence in Mark. In it Jesus withdraws from the Pharisees, heals many who follow him, and commands them to be silent. In this,

---

[81] Is 41.8, 44.21-22, etc.

[82] Israel is under judgement, the servant establishes judgement. Israel suffers from her sins, the servant suffers in fulfilling his mission, etc. Cf. Hans Jürgen Hermisson, "Israel und Gottesknecht in Deuterojesaja" (1982), 1-25.

[83] Odil Hannes Steck, *Gottesknecht und Sion* (1992).

[84] Steck, *Gottesknecht*, 170-171.

[85] Cf. Bruce Chilton, *The Isaiah Targum* (1987), 81-83.

[86] "*The poor who are like a* crushed reed, he shall not break, *the needy who are like a* dim light, he shall not extinguish."

[87] Cf. Luz, *Matthäusevangelium*, vol 2, 239, who describes the citation as the centre of Matthew's gospel.

however, it is not Jesus' humility *per se* which is exemplified. Rather it is the withdrawal from further contention with the Pharisees and the healings themselves, as they correspond to the attitude of the servant as portrayed in vv 19-20.

The healings and the fulfilment quotation, however, are only the conclusion of that which has preceded. Matthew 11:25-30, and 12:1-13 have already portrayed Jesus as the *son* of the father, whose ministry is the proleptic presence of the eschatological Sabbath, the significance of which is not understood by the wise, but only by "babes." The quotation from Isaiah, shows that in this Jesus "fulfils" Scripture. In this context, παῖς and υἱος are made synonymous through the insertion of the phrase recalling the baptismal voice of Mt 3:17. Further, the invitation to those who are heavy laden to find rest, the Sabbath healing and the healings in the summary, have their corresponding link in v 20, and stand in continuation of Mt 11:5.

Verbal and thematic links between the quotation and chapter 12 can also be identified. Thus, for example, in Mt 12:24-30 the Pharisees' question by whose spirit (πνεῦμα) Jesus casts out (ἐκβάλλω) demons. The question of judgement occurs through the whole chapter, esp. vv 43-45, and gentiles are favourably spoken of in vv 41-42. These links lead Cope to understand the whole of chapter 12 as constructed on the basis of the citation.[88] They are better understood, however, as developments of themes already introduced in Mt 11:2-6, a pericope which finds an echo in Mt 12:18-21.

In several points the quotation brings up themes presented in the introductory pericope Mt 11-13. The question, "Are you the one who is to come?" has future messianic connotations and is answered affirmatively in terms of what is already taking place in the ministry of Jesus. Likewise the fulfilment citation in Mt 12:18-21 identifies Jesus as God's servant and chosen one (in the aorist tense) whose ministry of peace, healing and judgement occur in the present (through the correspondence in the immediate context) and in the future (tense). The quotation affirms that it is the spirit of God which rests on Jesus, a repetition of Mt 3, and alluded to in the combined citation in Mt 11:5. Moreover, recalling the question of John in 11:3 the universal and eschatological aspects of the prophecy are expressed in the final clause: the nations hope in his name. Judgement is both present and future in this theological application of prophetic expectations, and is connected with one's response to the ministry of Jesus. This was implied in Jesus' allusion to Is 42:18 in 11:5 and the following makarism. The hearer/reader is invited to see, hear and understand. The offence taken by the Pharisees, the inability of the wise and intelligent to understand, has present and future implications in relation to the kingdom of heaven. Also this inability to hear and understand has its corresponding element in the fulfilment citation: no one will hear his voice in the streets.[89]

---

[88] Cope, *Matthew*, 34-36.

[89] So also Neyrey, "Thematic Use", 461.

The Normativity of the Prophetic Text in Matthew 12:18-21

Despite a clear reference to the Prophet Isaiah as Scripture, the text of the fulfilment quotation is rendered quite freely. Not only is there an integration of another Isaianic text into the narrative, but there is also an integration of Jesus tradition into the quotation. Further, the translation of the text is accommodated to the context both superficially through key-word association, as well as more fundamentally through themes. The quotation continues the Christological theme of the immediate context as well as that introduced in Mt 11:3, and thereby also a theme which began with the appearance of John the Baptist in chapter 3: the question of the coming one. The quotation therefore is not meant simply as a reciting of Scripture word for word, but is in itself both an interpretation of Scripture as well as an interpretation of the ministry of Jesus.

In Mt 12:17-21, the fulfilment formula explicitly announces an interpretation of Scripture, and appeals to its prophetic aspect as significant for the inclusion of the quotation at the present place in the narrative. Formally the introduction ties the quotation to the immediately preceding healing summary. Also here the fulfilment serves a two way function. On the one hand Scripture is used as a proof text, validating Jesus' healing ministry. On the other hand, Jesus' ministry fulfils the prophecy and thereby validates the prophecy. The two together serve to give credence to the eschatological hope of judgement and Sabbatical restoration expressed in the final clause of the quotation. Fulfilment here cannot mean final once and for all and complete; rather, the employment of the prophecy here, points beyond the present fulfilment to the ultimate fulfilment in the future.

In the insertion of the citation in the present position, Matthew again appeals to Scripture in order to express the nature of Jesus' ministry. Scripture thus functions as authoritative and normative in that it provides the conceptual framework used to describe the events which take place. This is not a unified framework which speaks with one voice, but is constructed through the employment of several passages which were understood to speak about the same things: the messiah and the messianic age.

4.1.4. Conclusion

Jewish rabbinic exegesis used the combination of texts of a similar theme as an interpretive tool. In the ὁ ἐρχόμενος complex in Mt 11-13 texts are combined in two ways. In Mt 11:5 and 12:18-21 texts are combined in one saying or one "citation" which deals with the same aspects of prophecy. In 11:5 the theme is the Jubilee, the day of the Lord, and the wonderful things which will be reality in the presence of God. In 12:18-21 it is the servant motif which unites the two (three) passages from Isaiah. In this way, Scripture is used to interpret Scripture. On a larger scale, the two quotations together with the allusion to Gen 49:10 in Mt 11:3 form a complex of scriptural passages which

are used to interpret each other. Inserted into the narrative of the gospel, they serve to bring out the importance of the Jesus happening as it is preserved in the Jesus tradition. Jesus tradition and scriptural tradition become intertwined and speak of the same realities.

The theological emphasis which unites the three quotations in the ὁ ἐρχόμενος concept is dual. On the one hand they unite the present and future aspects of Jesus' ministry and on the other hand, they define the present aspect of this ministry as one of healing and salvation of the "poor". The three passages themselves point to the eschatological hope of Israel. In the case of Gen 49 this hope is tied to a kingly figure, in the case of Is 35/61 to the events which will signify the presence of the day of God or the messiah, and in the case of Is (11)41/42, to "the servant" of God. In the context of the narrative sequence of Mt 11-13, the allusion to Gen 49 and the mixed quotation from Isaiah together answer John's introductory question in Mt 11:2. But whereas the allusion simply defines the term ὁ ἐρχόμενος in terms of the expectation of a ruler descendant of Judah, the second one actually answers the question positively, in terms of the content of the ministry of Jesus. The fulfilment quotation, while placed following the Sabbath controversies in chapter 12, is only loosely connected to that context through the withdrawal of Jesus from the plotting of the Pharisees and the healings which he performs in the preceding summary. The main emphasis of the quotation in Matthew's employment of it is to be found in its affirmation of Jesus' messiahship, as the one who is to come, who is endowed with the Spirit of God, - and in the definition of his ministry as one of mercy. Further, the obvious narrative connection with Mt 3 combines the quotation with the question of John the Baptist just as the baptism of Jesus is tied to the announcement of John the Baptist at the beginning of the gospel. The quotation thus also functions as an affirmative answer to the question "Is this the coming one?", as well as to define the ministry of that coming one as a peaceful one. But while they are applied to the ministry of Jesus, the prophecies remain prophecies with regard to the hope for day of the coming of God. The extension of God's mercy to the gentiles is encompassed in this hope. The future tense of the prophecies is retained.

One can say then that there are two aspects of Scripture which are appealed to in Matthew's theological exposition in the ὁ ἐρχόμενος complex. First, Scripture contains examples for the expectation of the peaceful character of the day of God's presence, and of the inclusion of the Gentiles. Scripture functions much as a proof text here, to provide evidence for the messiahship of Jesus by analogy. Turned around, this "proof text" provides the normative understanding for how the days of the Messiah are to appear, and thus the Jesus story, to be true, must correspond to this normative paradigm. The healings and exorcisms performed by Jesus, as well as his teaching ministry are analogous to the activity of the servant of Is 41 and 42, and the events signifying the day of the Lord of Is 35 and 61. Second, the prophetic predictive character of Scripture is appealed to and used. Again Scripture affirms Jesus' ministry, and Jesus ministry proves

the accuracy and immediacy of the prophetic text. That of which the prophet spoke is reality. But the prophetic aspect of Scripture is not fulfilled, in the sense of being satisfied or completed in its application to Jesus' ministry. It is fulfilled and will be fulfilled again. Scripture is authoritative or normative, because it speaks of a hope beyond the present. Ὁ ἐρχόμενος is ὃν προσδοκῶμεν also for Matthew: The hope of the gentiles is yet to be fulfilled. The future expectation of the passages receives its authority and trustworthiness through the fulfilment in the present.

4.2. THE ὁ ἐρχόμενος MOTIF IN MATTHEW'S ADAPTATION OF JESUS TRADITION

In 4.1. the normative use of Scripture in the development of a ὁ ἐρχόμενος Christology in certain passages in Matthew 11 and 12 was described. The expectations of a davidic king were seen to be fused with expectations of coming justice for the nations. The use of ὁ ἐρχόμενος in Mt 11:3, and the subsequent development of the texts, included the simultaneous notion of the present and future messianic coming, yet with the emphasis on the future hope related to the coming of the messiah at the end of the age. The introductory pericope to chapter 11-13, Mt 11:2-6, indicates that Jesus can be said to constitute the *typos* for the expected coming one. With his coming the kingdom of heaven is present, and his coming reveals the nature and identity of the future coming one. Hence, the Kingdom of God is both already a present reality and a future hope. The motif complex, based on scriptural messianic prophecies, had three aspects to it. First, messianic prophecies of the coming royal messiah were employed. Second, the lowliness and humility of the messiah were pointed out. The third aspect, emphasising the messiah as the hope of the nations, lends a universal significance to the coming. In Matthew this universal significance has a dual aspect, and as the fulfilment quotation in Mt 12:17-21 explains, it includes both eschatological judgement and salvation. The ὁ ἐρχόμενος motif was demonstrated to be based on several messianically interpreted passages of Scripture.

In the analysis of the fulfilment citation of Matthew 12:18-21, the elements of Matthean redaction of the passage could be identified as they were found to fit the Matthean context both on the superficial level of the text as well as in the deeper textual structures. In the case of the latter, Matthean redaction was found in elements which continued certain themes already developed or alluded to in the previous narrative. The Christological aspects drawn from passages of Scripture pointed to the recognition of messianic expectations in Jesus, as well as the hope for their future realisation. On the superficial level, the citation was shown to connect with the previous and coming narrative through key words. It is partly through this "key word" composition that the continuation of the ὁ ἐρχόμενος Christology is recognised in the subsequent narrative.

Turning now to the Jesus tradition which continues the motif-complex in Matthew 11-13, I will demonstrated that it is the future, the eschatological aspect of the expectations which is developed and emphasised. The motif complex of the coming one, as it appears in the Jesus tradition is concerned with the role of the messiah in executing judgement and pronouncing salvation. But even this event which is yet to come, is already present in the ministry of Jesus. Three passages, one controversy dialogue and two parables, are representative of the ἐρχόμενος-Christology in the Matthean adaptation of the Jesus tradition. First, the dispute over Jesus exorcisms of Mt 12:22-30 shows how the present may be paradigmatic of the future. Then, the yet-to-come aspect is developed in the parable of the tares (Mt 13:24-30; 36-43) and the parable of the dragnet (Mt

13:47-50). In both cases the present is also seen to have an impact on the outcome of future events.

The analysis of Matthean redaction and adaptation of the sources presupposes the nature of the Matthean narrative as theological discourse, and assumes that the normative function of the texts may be distinguished in the theological development of themes. The analysis of the Matthean development of the ὁ ἐρχόμενος Christology in chapter 12 and 13 will show that Matthew creates new "tradition" on the basis of old tradition. Despite this apparently free use of tradition, it is here that its use and function in the Matthean narrative comes close to that of Scripture. Traditional formulations, literary forms and "paradigms" are used to create new narrative, while still marked by Matthean structural and stylistic preferences as well as theological interpretative elements. The texts function normatively, in providing continuity between Scripture and tradition. Further, they function to support the actualisation of Scripture in the Jesus story and thus become extensions of Scripture in its kerygmatic function.

In order to show the extent of the Matthean redaction, the study will follow the same procedure as the study of the use of Scripture. That is, first the source and text of the source will be identified. In the case of Q material, this involves a reconstruction of Q where possible. Second, the redactional features of the Matthean version will be identified. These two steps will be completed simultaneously. Third, the meaning of the "citation" in its original context will be analysed, so that four, the adaptation and interpretation of the text may be identified. In conclusion, the normative function of tradition will be delineated.

4.2.1. The Beelzeboul Controversy

In the narrative which follows the citation of Is 42:1-4 in Mt 12:17-21, Matthew includes the dispute over Jesus' exorcisms. The narrative is connected with the previous citation through the catch words πνεῦμα (θεοῦ) and ἐκβάλλω. These two words do not simply function as a seam between material, but tie the controversy in with the previous Christological emphasis. The controversy mainly serves to continue the proclamation begun in Mt 11:3-6; of the presence of the Kingdom of Heaven in the ministry of Jesus, and Jesus as God's chosen, endowed with the spirit of God. Further, the exhortation of Mt 11:6 is repeated in the concluding words of the controversy: whoever does not gather with me, scatters.

The redactional work of Matthew, his use and adaptation of sources to build the connections with the ὁ ἐρχόμενος motif again shows that Matthew adapts the source material with freedom, yet, develops the Christological emphasis within the framework of what the sources provide. Further, although the sources function normatively for Matthew in structure form and content, the material remains within the paradigms of Christological thought given in Scripture.

Matthew's redaction of the Beelzeboul controversy, and the original wording of the sources will be analysed in a verse by verse fashion, whereby the features of significance for the understanding of the normative use of the sources will be highlighted. Then the content of the controversy in the context of Mark and Q respectively will provide the background for understanding how Matthew preserved and adapted the sources also theologically.

Features of the Matthean Redactional Adaptation of Synoptic Material

Matthew's redaction and creation of the Beelzeboul controversy can be divided into six elements or features. Three elements may be discerned as the textual or linguistic level of redaction. These include preferential vocabulary, preference in style (tightening and structuring material), and lexical links to previous and following pericopes. These elements may be described as mainly technical in nature; they do however, often give indications of theological emphasis and direction in the narrative. Three further elements are of particular interest as the pericope is also a fictional creation. First, Matthew uses synoptic language to create a doublet. Second, Matthew's adaptation corresponds to traditional *forms* of controversy. Finally, Matthew introduces key words which function as interpretative signs in the narrative. These elements give an indication of how the synoptic texts have normative function for Matthew, in that they provide a framework for composition, but are also developed and interpreted in light of Matthew's theological emphasis. In the following analysis these redactional traits will be pointed out.

Matthew's Redaction of the Synoptic Sources

In placing the Beelzeboul controversy (Q 11:14-15; 17-23; Mk 3:22-27) *after* Jesus' thanksgiving (Mt 11:25-27//Q 10:21-22), the Sabbath controversies and the healing summary (Mt 12:1-16//Mk 2:23-3:12), and *before* the request for a sign (Mt 12:38-42//Q 11:29-32) and the true family of Jesus (Mt 12:46-50//Mk 3:31-35), Matthew follows the order of both his sources. The healing of the demoniac and the accusation is a duplicate of Mt 9:32-34 (Q 11:14). Added to it in 12 is the controversy which also contains material from both Q and Mk.[1] The analysis of the Matthean redaction will have to take Mt 9 into consideration in the synoptic comparison.[2]

---

[1] As Albert Fuchs, *Die Entwicklung der Beelzeboul Kontroverse* (1980), 22-25 has shown, the exorcism in 9:32-34 breaks with the Markan order which Matthew can be shown to follow, whereas the controversy in 12:22-30 can be found to correspond to the markan order. Further, with Fuchs (27-30) it is possible that the doublet in Mt 9 serves as a preparation for Mt 11:2-6. The fact, however, that Matthew chooses to use the parallel text to Lk 11:14 in Mt 9, as an insertion into the Markan gospel order, and (differently than Lk) to add a redactional frame to the Beelzeboul dialogue, (where it *is* missing in Mk) vv 22-23, clearly suggests the separate existence of Mt 9:32-34//Lk 11:14 and the Beelzeboul controversy (Mk 3:22-27). Hence, in the case of Mt 12:22-30, a two-source theory seems to explain the minor agreements between Mt and Lk than Fuchs' proposed three-phase theory (p. 169ff), where Mt and Lk should be drawing upon a Deuteromarkan account.

[2] The relationship between the Markan account and the Q account is difficult to assess. It is unlikely that Mark knew the Q version which can be reconstructed from the minor agreements between Mt and Lk.

Mt 12:22-23

Unlike 9:33 which follows the account of the exorcism in Q 11:14 relatively closely,[3] Matthew 12:22-23 is a redactional composition containing traditional vocabulary, adapting the account to the surrounding material.

Matthew preserves tradition in several ways: Matthew follows Mark in introducing the controversy after the healing of the man with the withered hand. Between the two pericopes Matthew follows Q in using a healing as incentive for the controversy. Further, the Matthean redaction expands on Q's version by introducing it in a manner typical of the synoptic tradition, by having the demon possessed be brought to Jesus. Προσήνεχθη αὐτῷ is similar to the opening of the doublet in Mt 9:32 (though the verb is here in the active: προσήνεγκαν). The phrase belongs to the Jesus tradition of Mark; it is adapted and multiplied in the Matthean usage. Hence, the insertion of it here is redactional, but the formulation is traditional, and functions like Matthean adaptations of scriptural language.[4]

In 12:23 as well as in 9:33, Matthew adds a choral response[5] to the miracle story. This *acclamation* in direct speech follows and illustrates a description of the effect of the healing on the crowds (*admiration*) which in both cases is traditional.[6] Matthew 9:33 is

---

[3] Also in Mt 9:32, Matthew creates an introductory sentence which makes it necessary to rearrange the following Q sentence, using vocabulary already present in Q. Matthew then adds statement describing the amazement of the crowds as a contrast to the accusations of the Pharisees.

[4] The verb προσφέρω occurs 15 times in Matthew, mostly in the aorist indicative active, though three times as aorist passive (Mt 12: 22; 18:24; 19:13). The phrase is used thrice in Mk 1:44; 2:4; 10:13; the first and the third of which are adopted by both Mt and Lk. Mark, however, prefers φέρω πρός τινι (6 times), a formulation which is distinctive to the second evangelist (Peter Dschulnigg, *Sprache, Redaktion und Intention des Markusevangeliums*, 1984, 90-91). Matthew replaces it by προσφέρω twice. (The statistics of Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew*, 647, do not take this into account). It is unusual for Matthew to introduce a compound where the source has a simple verb (cf. Ulrich Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 1, 34). *The redactional tendency of Matthew* then, is the adaptation of the Markan phrase προσφέρω αὐτῷ, (Mk 2:4; 10:13), placed in the aorist: προσήνεγαν/- ηνέχθη αὐτῷ; and repeated 11 times in a formulaic manner (9 and two variants: the imperfect in 9:2 and the disciples replacing αὐτῷ in 17:16; cf. Wolfgang Schenk, *Sprache*, 423.) Four times a demon possessed is the one acted upon: 4:24, 8:16, 9:23; 12:22. Despite the evidence for Matthean formulaic language, the aorist passive rather then the active of Vaticanus should be the preferred reading in Mt 12:22. The passive occurs in 18:24 and 19:13 as well, and is therefore not foreign to Matthew. The reading of Vaticanus may be a harmonisation with the more frequent aorist active. In sum, the redactional tendency is significant as a comparison to Matthew's imitation of scriptural language. Gundry, *Matthew*, 231 notion that in Matthew the term denotes a peculiar type of offering to Jesus in line with Mt 2:11 is to be rejected.

[5] Named *Chorschluß* by M. Dibelius, *Formgeschichte* (1933), 50, 54.

[6] Gerd Theißen, *Wundergeschichten*, 78-81, distinguishes between the narrative description of *admiration* ('and all were amazed'), and the *acclamation* (Dibelius' *Chorschluß*) of the onlookers, which can be descriptive ('and they praised God') or include a statement ("saying: such things we have never seen"). Both elements would in the structural language of Werner Kahl, *New Testament Miracle Stories* (1994) belong in the category of *Sanctioning performance* (160). The dual aspects of the *acclamation* could be described as a) gestures and expressions, (147), and b) "an assessment of the subject affecting the healing" (143).

dependent on Q whereas Mt 12:23 is an adaptation of Mk 2:12[7] which Matthew omitted there. The choral response in 12:23 expresses the question of the identity of Jesus as the result of the miracle, and is a Matthean adaptation of a traditional synoptic form. Generally the Matthean miracle stories (but not accounts of authoritative teachings) include the element of acclamation. This Matthean pattern of the miracle stories is created on the basis of traditional forms, and serves as a norm to which the present story is adapted. [8]

---

[7] ἐξιστῆναι πᾶς (cf. also Mk 5:42 and 6:51 for people's reaction to miracles of Jesus). The compound is a *hapax legomenon* in Matthew's gospel.

[8] Both in 9:33, where the acclamation is reminiscent of Mk 2:12 and in 12:23, it completes the miracle story. As such the acclamation constitutes an added element to the described admiration (ἐξιστημι, ἐκ/θαυμάζω, ἐκπλήσσομαι, ἐκ/θαμβέομαι, φοβέω) of the onlookers which concludes any story of the genre in the synoptic tradition, as well as in Graeco-Roman parallels (cf. Harold E. Remus, "Miracle", 1992; Kahl, *New Testament Miracle Stories*, 56-141). In Mark 2:12 the admiration consists of two elements. The element of praise (gestures and expressions: δοξάζω τὸν θέον) *and* a statement expressing amazement (assessment of the healer: λέγειν). The ending of Matthean miracle stories are not marked by particular preferential vocabulary. Here Matthew generally follows the sources. On the basis of his sources, however, Matthew has adapted a pattern in the ending of miracle stories which is pursued throughout the gospel.

With the exception of 9:33 Matthew adopts all miracle story conclusions (*admiration*) in the gospel from Mark (Mt 8:10 par Lk 7:9 constitutes a variant: here Jesus is amazed at the faith of the centurion). If one includes episodes where Jesus' speech or teaching is miraculous, Mark employs the element of amazement 15 times in the context of a miracle story. Six of these are specifically related to Jesus' teaching (Mk 1:22; 6:2; 10:24, 26; 11:18; 12:17). Five times an *acclamation* is attached to the ending, four times with λέγω (Mk 1:27; 4:41; 6:2; 7:37) and once with δοξάζω as well as λέγω (Mk 2:12). The remaining nine times lack the *acclamation* (Mk 1:22; 5:15, 20, 33, 42; 6:51; 10:24, 26; 11:18; 12:17). Matthew adopts seven of the Markan passages and omits eight, whereby three with *acclamation* are kept. Four times the Markan vocabulary is kept. (In Mt 7:28//Mk 1:22 the same tense and structure is kept, but Mt adds subject. Mt 13:54//Mk 6:2 includes *the acclamation*. Here Mt changes the imperfect indicative + present participle of Mark to ὥστε + aorist infinitive + present infinitive, cf. Mk 2:12. Mt 19:25 is identical to Mk 10:26. In Mt 22:22//Mk 12:17 Mt changes the imperfect of Mk to aorist and uses simple θαυμάζω rather than the compound with ἐκ). Three times Matthew changes the verb. (In Mt 9:8//Mk 2:12 Mt uses φοβέω rather than ἐξίστημι and inserts ὄχλοι as subject rather than πάντες. Further Matthew omits λέγω and the sentence it introduces. In Mt 8:27//Mk 4:41, Mt uses the aorist indicative of θαυμάζω rather than the Markan inner object structure with φοβέω, and adds subject. In Mt 15:31//Mk 7:37 Mt uses θαυμάζω rather than ἐκπλήσσομαι. The *acclamation* consists of a narrative description with δοξάζω, rather than direct speech with λέγω. Further Mt changes the imperfect indicative + present participle of Mark to ὥστε + aorist infinitive + aorist indicative). In addition, Matthew adds an *acclamation* to Q in 9:33, to Mk/Q in 12:23 and to Mk 15:39 in 27:54. Matthew also adds an *admiration* in 22:33 (added to Mk 12:27, but perhaps a permutation of Mk 11:18; one could possibly also include 17:6 added to Mk 9:7).

In summary: the redactional trend of Matthew can be found in the adaptation of the traditional form of the stories. Standardising the traditional form, Matthew prefers proper endings. With regard to the vocabulary, Matthew adapts that of the sources. With the exception of ἐκπλήσσομαι, which only occurs in the context of "miraculous" teaching (Mt 7:28; 13:54; 19:25; 22:33) Matthew uses all the vocabulary of his sources, though θαυμάζω is more frequently used in Matthew (four times; φοβεομαι twice, ἐξίστημι once). Important in Matthew is that only one of five stories which refer to authoritative teaching (13:54) includes an *acclamation*, whereas all six miracle stories concerned with powerful works include an *acclamation* using either δοξάζω or λέγω (8:27; 9:8; 9:33; 12:23; 15:31; 27:57). Three of these, (two are redactional) refer to Jesus' person specifically by the use of οὗτός (8:27; 12:23 and 27:57), so that the Christological theme is evident. Interestingly, the *acclamation* which follows the admiration from Q (καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι) in Mt 9:33 Οὐδέποτε ἐφάνη οὕτως ἐν τῷ' Ισραήλ is reminiscent of the *acclamation* in Mk 2:12, which is replaced by the redactional

In Mt 12:22-23, Matthew also interprets and expands tradition: Matthew shortens the summary healing account, the calling of the twelve and the Markan introduction to the controversy. In their stead Matthew includes the fulfilment formula which repeats the voice from heaven at the baptism, in which is declared that the servant will be given the Spirit of God. In this way the traditional order is preserved, while the Servant citation prepares for the Beelzeboul controversy and points to the Christological emphasis of the coming pericope.

Matthean vocabulary can be distinguished in the use of τότε, which is a common word of transition in the Matthean redaction.[9] Θεραπέυω is used also in Mt 4:24 and 17:18 with regard to the casting out of demons, and here forms a linguistic link to the abbreviated summary in v 15.[10] As a redactional feature, it is more significant, however, that the demon possession results in an illness which may be healed. The demon possessed is not only deaf but also blind, a Matthean addition. The healing of the deaf and blind demoniac therefore combines the elements which in chapter 9 are found separate in the double healing story of two blind men (vv 27-30) and the dumb demoniac (vv 32-34).[11] The adding of the blindness motif also ties the account in with the emphasis of seeing and hearing in ch 11-13. Although the demon possession results in physical deficiencies here, there is an underlying reference to the theme of obduracy. As in Mt 11:2-6, seeing and hearing may be the result of physical wholeness, but also a sign of spiritual insight. Physical and spiritual blindness both have the same source and may be healed by Jesus, who overcomes the demon who causes them. Healing results in speaking and seeing.

Although the choral response preserves traditional form, the question: Μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Δαυίδ; stands in continuation with the concern raised in Mt 11:3. The question of John the Baptist, which has been answered in various ways through each pericope from there to the present one, is rephrased here. In Mt 12 this is expressed in

---

phrase in Mt 12:23. Thus much like the double citation of Hos 6:6 functions to tie material together, so does Mk 2:12 though the usage of the different elements redactionally. However, affinities to Mk 2:12 is found in the Matthean redaction of Mt 13:54 as well as Mt 15:31 (construction with ὥστε and infinitive), so that Mk 2:12 with its double *acclamation* entails something of a paradigm for the Matthean subsequent usage of the form. Matthew never employs more than one of the two elements, however. Luke frequently does (cf. e.g. Lk 5:26).

[9]Based on an extensive analysis, Ivor H. Jones, *Parables*, 94 disputes this general agreement and concludes that many of the transitional particles in Matthew may be traditional, mnemonic aids. Though he may be right with regard to the function of these particles, the distinct and common usage of these in Matthew shows independence from the written tradition, and may safely be characterised as a Matthean feature. Jones does not distinguish enough between traditional language and redactional employment of this language.

[10]Here its meaning may well be general: "attend to" or "provide for" (H. G. Liddell, *Greek English Lexicon*, 1985, 362-363) as the lack of any reference to illness may indicate. See also 19:2, and Schenk, *Sprache*, 293.

[11] Gundry, *Matthew*, 231, holds the healing in Mt 12 to be a conflated doublet of the two healings in ch 9.

their wondering about the possible messianic identity of Jesus as son of David, which apart from Son of God is the most explicit Christological emphasis of Matthew. Apart from the two references in Mt 3:3 and 11:10 where it refers to John the Baptist, οὗτος ἐστιν occurs only with reference to Jesus. It repeats the voice of Heaven in Mt 3:17 and prefigures 17: 5, "this is my son." In the voice of others it represents the different reactions of people to Jesus ministry: he is the son of David (12:23), the son of the carpenter (13:55), John the Baptist resurrected (Mt 14:2), the prophet Jesus (after the triumphant entry, Mt 21:11 where the Davidic sonship again is a theme), and King of the Jews (Mt 27:37).

Mt 12: 24

The accusation of the Pharisees in Matthew 12:24 although traditional from both Mark and Q, is a rephrasing of that tradition with several Matthean features. Matthew departs from his sources in introducing the Pharisees again as the disputants of Jesus.[12] In the formulation of the accusation εἶπον[13], although it coincides with the Lukan account, corresponds to Matthean preferences in expression. Both Matthew and Luke frequently alter the Markan use of the indicative active imperfect (aorist imperfect) of λέγω in the introduction of direct speech in the past.[14] Hence, despite Matthew's rendering of the Markan imperfect in Mt 9:34, the correspondence between Matthew and Luke in Mt 12:34//11:15 provides no sure indication for the Q formulation. The Matthean text, redactional or not, reflects Matthean language.

Another frequent synoptic formulation is inserted into the narrative in 12:24: The combination of λέγω with the aorist participle of ἀκούω repeats Mt 11:2, where John's hearing about Jesus' actions provokes a response or inquiry. Matthew reformulates the accusation of the Pharisees in the tradition in 12:24, introducing it with οὗτος οὐκ ἐκβάλλει, omitting from Mk ἔχει και ὅτι thus with Luke reducing the double (synonymous) accusation of Mark to one. It is probable that Luke's account represents the Q text.[15] Through the repetition of οὗτος the reformulating of the Pharisees accusation stands in contrast to the confession of the crowds in Mt 12:23.

---

[12] Also 9:34. Q has simply some of the crowds. The Pharisees, sometimes in combination with the scribes or the Herodians have the same function in Mt as οἱ γραμματεῖς have in Mark. (Cf. Dschulnigg, *Sprache*, 360-366)

[13] Mt 9:34 - uses Markan verb form ἔλεγον.

[14] The imperfect indicative active of λέγω occurs 50 times in Mk over against 11 in Matthew and 24 in Luke, the aorist indicative 70 times in Mark, 144 in Matthew and 263 in Luke. Peter Dschulnigg differentiates between different formulae of introduction to direct speech in Mk, whereby καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς is the most common and occurs outside of 12 (15) x in Mk only in Lk 6:5 and John 5:19; 8:23. (Dschulnigg, *Sprache*, 86-87; 103-104; 107) For the use of the imperfect in Mk cf. Friedrich Blass, et al., *Grammatik*, (1990) §329.

[15] Mt 9:34 contains only the second accusation of Mark (he casts out demons by the prince of demons), omitting any reference to Beelzeboul. This account affirms the possibility that Q included only one element of the Markan accusation. It is unlikely, however, that the formulation of Mt 9 reflects Q in the

Mt 12:25

Recounting Jesus' answer in Mt 12:25, Matthew preserves tradition in the conflation of the source accounts. The alterations reflect the Matthean interest to structure and tighten the narrative. Thereby correspondence in the narrative and consistency in theological development is achieved.

In v. 25a, Matthew follows the Q text, but substitutes τά διανοήματα with τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις.[16] The sentence is nearly identical to Mt 9:4a, and together with the accusation of the Pharisees, it recalls that controversy over the authority to forgive sins. In the aphoristic parable of the kingdom divided against itself (12:25b) Mt chooses the Q form, but replaces ἔπι with κατά here and in the following. It may be argued that κατά here is derived from the Q text, since κατά also occurs in Q 11:23, and Luke's version corresponds to Mark in the employment of ἔπι. The rest of the Lukan text, as well as the following sentence probably reflects Q, hence also ἔπι belongs to the Q text.[17] Hence, Matthew substituted ἔπι with κατά achieving a more consistently structured account and correspondence with Q 11:23. Matthew therefore emphasises the reciprocal meaning of the two sayings.[18]

---

omission of Beelzeboul, since the continued argumentation of Q 11:18-19 presupposes the mention of the name in the accusation.

[16] Both Matthew and Luke agree in omitting Mk 3:23 where Jesus calls the crowd together and asks how it is possible for Satan to exorcise Satan. The second part of the verse is included later in the Matthean account as a conclusion rather than introduction to the similes of the kingdom and house divided against itself. This and several equivalent redactional omissions in Mt and Lk may suggest a more complex synoptic relationship beyond the affirmation of the existence of the pericope in both Q and Mark. The missing exorcism as immediate introduction to the controversy in Mark is not a problem in the composition of that gospel. Several aspects of the Markan account which can be identified as Markan redaction (because they function to structure the Markan narrative) are omitted or replaced in both Mt and Lk: a) Mark does not need an introduction to the controversy, since Mk 3:7-12 is sufficiently close to account for the delayed accusation. Does this mean that Mk redactionally omitted an introduction similar to that of Q? b) Βεελζεβοὺλ ἔχει (Mk 3:22) - πνεῦμα ἀκάρθον ἔχει (Mk 3:30) forms a redactional frame around the controversy in Mark. Lk includes a similar frame Lk 11:15, 18c, whereby the latter makes the narrative repetitive. It is especially noteworthy that neither Lk nor Mt included the double accusation. In Mk the redactional adding of the dual accusation ties in well as a repetition of the accusation voiced in Mk 3:21. In Mk the inclusion of the sin against the Holy Spirit, which is inserted after the controversy in Mt but is omitted in Lk, answers to the first part of the dual accusation. c) Mk 3:23a points to 4:2 and the parables chapter, and could well have been omitted by Mt and Lk. Mk 3:23b, however, forms an *inclusio* with Mk 3:26, making a well rounded argument, beginning and ending with the end of Satan. In Mt and Lk the argument begins and ends with the fall of the kingdom divided against itself. d) The conditional sentences of the Markan double simile with the repeated οὐ δύναται, may be an indication of a redactional structuring more refined than the version in Q. The Markan account is clearly built on this structure: πῶς δύναται (v 23), οὐ δύναται (v 24), οὐ δύνήσεται (v 25), οὐ δύναται (v 26), οὐ δύναται (v 27). To postulate a Matthean priority as a solution to these particularities, is not adequate, because it would not satisfactorily account for the omission of two important logia in the Markan account. One must, however, at least be open to the possibility that the final redaction of Mark is later than the Markan *Vorlage* used by Mt and Lk. For a study of the tradition history of the double simile, including issues of synoptic relationships and redaction cf. Michael G. Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte in den Synoptischen Evangelien* (1981), 124-147.

[17] Cf. Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 137.

[18] Half of the Matthean usage of κατὰ is to be found in ch. 12. Cf. Schenk, *Sprache*, 318.

Mt 12:25c conflates the texts of Q and Mark. The Markan οἰκία takes the place of Q's οἶκος. The form is adapted to that of the first parable in Q, creating a parallel structure of rhetorical syllogism[19] similar to the text in Mark,[20] though tighter and less complex:

Πᾶσα βασιλεία μερισθεῖσα καθ' ἑαυτῆς ἐρημοῦται
καὶ πᾶσα πόλις ἢ οἰκία μερισθεῖσα καθ' ἑαυτῆς οὐ σταθήσεται.

Matthew adds πόλις to the tradition (cf. Mt 10:14), and further prefers the parallelism of Mk to the practical depiction of a desolate kingdom which is found in Q.[21] The markan inspired οὐ σταθήσεται, is used in preparation for the following logion, the Q version of which employs the identical form of ἵστημι.

In sum: the Matthean redaction in 12:25 is characterised by stylistic motivation, tightening the structure and harmonising it with both sources and the material which is to follow.

Mt 12:26-29

In the last part of the Beelzeboul controversy (vv 26-27) Matthew's interest to preserve tradition is evident, but also here the Christological interest from the citations from Scripture in 11-12 is evident. In 12:26a, Matthew again creates a new saying by combining traditional material from Q and Mk, and thus harmonises the accounts. Inserted into the Q text, after the interrogatory particle ει, is a phrase adapted from the beginning of Jesus' response in Mk 3:23 σατανᾶς (τὸν) σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλειν.[22] Matthew

---

[19] „...zieht den induktiven Schluss aus dem Voranstehenden, von wo auch das Vokabular entlehnt ist." Hans-Josef Klauck, *Allegorie und Allegores in den synoptischen Gleichnistexten* (1978), 177.

[20] For the Markan redaction of the aphorism cf. Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 124-129.

[21] καὶ οἶκος ἐπὶ οἶκος πίπτει. The Mark-Q overlap makes it difficult to reconstruct Q with certainty. In contradiction to most scholars (cf. e.g. François Bovon, *Lukas*, vol. 2, 172-173; Klauck, *Allegorie*, 176; Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 255 n 21; Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 132; Siegfried Schulz, *Q*, 205) Luke's version is here considered to be closer to Q. The verb πίπτω cannot be proven to be of more use in Lk than in the other synoptics. The usage in the sentence is different from most occurrences in the synoptics. The argument that Lk misunderstood the meaning of οἰκία in the context, as household or family (Mk) and substituted it with οἰκός is farfetched, although the synoptics use the two words synonymously. Luke has a very similar text in Lk 12:52 inserted into Q material: ἔσονται γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν πέντε ἐν ἑνὶ οἴκῳ διαμεμερισμένοι, τρεῖς ἐπὶ δυσὶν καὶ δύο ἐπὶ τρισίν. It has no synoptic parallel but is similar to gospel of Thomas 16. The inclusion of 12:52 does not support a notion of "misunderstanding" 11:17. The text of Lk 11:17c breaks with the logic of comparison of the preceding and following, by placing two entities against each other rather than one divided in itself (cf. Lk 21:10 //Mk 13:8). It is difficult to explain how Luke should have misunderstood and removed the parallel phrasing of Mk 3: 23-24 if Q consisted of the same parallel phrasing (according to common consensus this Q wording would coincide with the reconstruction of Q's and Mark's hypothetical common source in Klauck, *Allegorie*, 176: πᾶσα βασιλεία ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν μερισθεῖσα ἐρημοῦται, καὶ πᾶσα οἰκία ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν μερισθεῖσα οὐ σταθήσεται; also Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 137). Matthew's redaction, in contrast, using Mk as pattern but creating its own parallelism can easily be explained. Hence Lk follows Q rather than Mk (in accordance to the gospel's general inclination not to mix the sources).

[22] Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 126, 128, holds that the different placing in Mt and Mk proves that the sentence originally belonged with the double aphorism in both the pre-Mark and pre-Q traditions, and that it thus also existed in Q. Later inclusion of previously omitted material is a common feature in

thereby completes the Q text, providing an example of how Satan would be divided against himself.[23]

Matthew 12:27-28 preserves the Q text accurately, but makes one significant alteration. Continuing the elements of the ἐρχόμενος Christology, Matthew substitutes δακτύλῳ with πνεύματι.[24] In the present context, it refers back to the citation of Is 42:1 in Mt 12:17 and the allusion to Is 61:2 in Mt 11:5. Matthew thereby signals that 12:28 is to be read in light of these passages. The text emphasises the presence of God's kingdom in the healings of Jesus. Jesus tradition is therefore here adapted to the passages of Scripture which are normative for Matthew. The subsequent saying concerning the robbing of the house of the strong (Mt 12:29) is an adaptation of the Markan text. Also here, stylistic traits are recognisable. Matthew fashions the saying on the rhetorical question in Mt 12:26b (=Q) ἢ πῶς, and consequently must substitute οὐδείς with τις. In Mt 12:29 as in 12:25-26 Matthew prefers the simple verb to the composite verb of the sources, using only ἁρπάζω.

The Lukan text differs significantly from that of Mark and retains only little of the Markan vocabulary (Lk 11: 21-22). Many hold the Lukan text to reflect Q.[25] It is more likely however, that Luke, despite the Lukan tendency not to mix his sources, has composed freely according to his own theological interests with Mark as basis.[26] The

---

Matthean redaction. It is thus more likely that Lk follows Q in not including the saying, than to assume that Luke should have omitted it against the presence in both traditions.

[23] Lk 11:18c is a Lukan explanatory addition similar to Mk 3:30, in this context serving the same function as Matthew's insertion in 12:26a.

[24] cf. Schenk, *Sprache*, 413. The change from finger to spirit in Matthew is easily explained in light of Matthean redactional interests. That finger was in the original Q text is clear from its concrete imagery, but also this imagery, like that of the Spirit of God in Mt, is dependent on scriptural images (cf. Ex 8:19; Deut 9:10), and denotes God's intervention. The allusion to Ex 8:19 has led James D. G. Dunn, "Matthew 12:28//Lk 11:20" (1988), 39 n 24 to assume the Lukan text to be secondary and dependent on Luke's "clear Exodus typology". According to Dunn, Matthew would not have opted away from this clear allusion to the Moses narrative to an inclusion of the Spirit which holds a less dominant role in the Matthean narrative than in Luke. Cf James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit* (1975), 45-46. In the present context, the ὁ ἐρχόμενος- motif is dominant, Matthew depicts Jesus as the beloved servant endowed with the Spirit. The Moses motif is less important here, and explains why Matthew altered the Q text. See also Maria Trautmann, *Zeichenhafte Handlungen Jesu* (1980), 263-268 for an account of the possible authenticity and Semitic background of Lk 11:20.

[25] So Bovon, *Lukas*, vol. 2., 167, 177; Heinz Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 2/1 (1994) 245-247; Gerhard Schneider, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (1977) 266.

[26] There are no similarities Mt//Lk which cannot be explained by a common dependence on Mark. So also Schulz, *Q*, 203 n. 200; Dieter Lührmann, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle* (1969), 33. To assume both that the logion originally was independent from the controversy, *and* its presence in both Q and Mark (cf. Rudolf Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition* (1964), 11; Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 128) is difficult to sustain without assuming a dependence of Mark on Q. Possibly Luke alone knew a different version of the similitude and inserted it as a replacement of the Markan account. (This would explain the hapax legomena in the passage in Lk.) That both Lk and Mt inserted the similitude of the strong man in the same place can be explained by the tightness of the Q argument. If it were inserted before Mt 12:27//Lk 11:19 it would be disruptive of the Q argument. If it were inserted after Mt 11:30//Lk 11:23 the controversy would lose its stinging conclusion. For an account of the Lukan red. of the similitude cf. Klauck, *Allegorie*, 183. The similar story in the gospel of Thomas shows a tradition similar to that of Mark. The Lukan story has no parallels. It is of secondary character

concluding sentence in Matthew corresponds to that in Q, and is not included in the Markan version.

To conclude: the evaluation of the Matthean redactional alterations to the texts of Mark and Q have shown that Matthew's alterations both intend to preserve and to interpret tradition. It is now possible to begin drawing conclusions as to Matthew's normative use of synoptic material. Matthew's language, style and linguistic links to the narrative context were pointed out, as well as Matthew's creative use of tradition in the use of language, form and interpretative terms. In the first part of the controversy, Matthew recreated tradition on the basis of traditional language and form. Here the imitation of style functions in much the same way as Matthean language often imitates Scripture. In the second part of the controversy the harmonising of the two accounts is evidence of Matthew's stylistic preferences. Further, in the harmonising, both narratives become more structured and the different parts of the tradition are better fitted to each other. In this lies both the wish to preserve tradition coherently, but also to give indications with regard to the meaning of the narrative. Therefore, the continuation of the ἐρχόμενος theme which began with Mt 11:3 is evident in the addition of two key phrases in particular. First, the question of the bystanders, and second Jesus' response to the Beelzeboul charge. Consequently Μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Δαυίδ; in the beginning of the passage and εἰ δὲ ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ towards the end of the passage build the same type of structure as Mt 11:3-6, and become key passages for the interpretation of the controversy: it is in character Christological. The texts of Mark and Q have in the development shown themselves to be normative for the evangelist, in providing language and form for the rewriting of history. The harmonisation and rewriting of the stories give them renewed relevance as they are actualised in a different narrative context. Their need for interpretation also give the sources normative status; it witnesses to their relevance at the present time of the writer.

In the next step of the analysis, the theological significance of Matthew's redactional alterations will be presented in order to show that also here Matthew preserves the interests of the sources. He simultaneously turns the emphasis in the direction of the Christological motif which was introduced already in the citation immediately preceding the controversy. In order to achieve an understanding of how Matthew changes the theological perspective of the sources, the meaning of the controversies in the original narrative settings must first be clarified.

The Beelzeboul Controversy in Mark

In order to understand how Mark as a source of Jesus tradition has normative function or value for Matthew, it is important to understand how Matthew alters the

---

in relationship to the Markan text, and shows signs of Lukan redaction and contextualisation (cf. Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, 246 n 134).

Markan perspective in the retelling of the gospel's content. It is therefore necessary to establish the theological content of the Markan account of the Beelzeboul material.

Mark's account of the Beelzeboul controversy has both apocalyptic and ecclesiological overtones. The apocalyptic theme is recognisable in the text of the controversy itself, whereas the ecclesiological aspect is primarily recognised in the structure of the part of the gospel within which Mark inserts the controversy.

It has already been noted that Mark's version of the Beelzeboul dispute includes no account of an actual exorcism as an incentive for the debate. Hence the dispute is not prepared for in the text immediately preceding the pericope. Earlier in the narrative there is a reference to the casting out of evil spirits as part of the summary statement in Mk 3:7-12 which Matthew shortens radically in Mt 12:15-16. It is probably this account which prompts the controversy which begins with the insinuation of Jesus' family (οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ)[27] that he is himself possessed.[28] This accusation is then sharpened by the scribes and those who came down from Jerusalem, who accuse him of being allied with the prince of demons. Jesus answers the accusation in form of a double aphorism that a city and kingdom divided against itself will not stand, and concludes with the parable of the binding of the strong man and the logion concerning the sin against the Holy Spirit.

The structure of Mark which gives the Beelzeboul account its ecclesiological and apocalyptic emphasis is chiastic, with the dispute placed in the middle:

---

[27] The exact meaning of οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ is unclear. It is, however, distinguishable from οἱ περί αὐτόν in Mk 3:32, 34. It could mean anything from follower, supporter (cf. Ernst Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Markus*, 1937, 77, compare e.g. the use on 1 Macc 4:13; 7:32; 9:12 etc. where it denotes the soldiers of a certain army), to relatives or fellow countrymen (Blass, et al., *Grammatik*, § 237,2). The connection to Mk 3:31, however makes it probable that the reference is to Jesus' relatives (cf. Joachim Gnilka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, 1978, 144; Eduard Schweizer, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, 1978, 44).

[28] Although the closest reference for the aorist participle of Mk 3:21 ἀκούσαντες is the gathering of the crowds (a specific motif in Mk, cf. 2:2, but also 3:7-12), and although the accounts of the exorcism and the controversy are separated by the constitution of the group of twelve, the accusations of "those to him", and those who had come down from Jerusalem, must be dependent on rumours of his exorcism. Cf. Reinhold Zwick, *Montage im Markusevangelium* (1989), 305-306; 292-294, who in his narrative reading of Mark postulates a situation, where the submission of the demoniacs to Jesus in the midst of a huge crowd, lead to the rumours that Jesus was aligned with the demons. (Compare the seemingly contradictory confrontation with the demons in Mk 1:23-26.) This reading is plausible, but is neither endorsed explicitly nor implicitly by the text.

a) Jesus among the crowds by the sea (exorcism)(Mk 3:7-12)
b) constitution of the group of twelve (Mk 3:13-20)
c) Jesus' relatives set out to restrain him: οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξῆλθον κρατῆσαι αὐτόν (Mark 3:21)
d) the Beelzeboul controversy (Βεελζεβοὺλ ἔχει Mk 3:22- πνεῦμα ἀκάρθον ἔχει 30)
c`) Jesus' family arrives: καὶ ἔρχεται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτου... (Mk 3:31a)[29]
b`) Jesus' disciples and followers as his true family (Mk 3:31-35)
a`) Jesus and the crowds by the sea. (Mk 4:1-10)

In this structure, the Beelzeboul controversy constitutes a closed thematic unit, which is inserted into and interrupts the narrative concerning the relatives of Jesus.[30] The framework serves to show how the Beelzeboul controversy in Mark is set in an apocalyptic perspective on the one hand, and an ecclesiological perspective on the other.

In the apocalyptic perspective Jesus is depicted as the one with authority to bind the evil spirits and overcome the power of Satan. This is especially clear in the argument of Jesus. In the first part the double aphorism ends not with the kingdom of Satan but with the end of Satan himself. Also the similitude of the second argument describes the binding of Satan.[31] The illogical accusation of the opponents is pointed out via readily understandable aphorisms. Satan would prepare his own end by working against himself. The casting out of demons can only happen via the overcoming of the evil power by a power stronger than him. From the perspective of Mark, this is an already accomplished event, illustrated in the casting out of demons by Jesus.[32]

The ecclesiological content of the Beelzeboul controversy in Mark is that familial relationship does not influence one's partaking in the Kingdom of God, only doing the will of God.[33] This includes recognising the true spirit which is at work in Jesus (which

---

[29] The unity of Mk 3:20-21 with Mk 3: 31-34 is pointed out by Bultmann, *Geschichte*, 28, Gnilka, *Markus*, 144, et al. It is not the interest of this study to identify tradition and Markan redaction in the passage (for a summary concerning scholarly opinion on Mk red. of the section see Walter Schmithals, *Das Evagelium nach Markus*, 1979, 210-211). It is important to note the use of ἐξέρχομαι and ἔρχομαι in linking the movement of Jesus' family. (Differently Lohmeyer, *Markus*, 80 and Rudolf Pesch, *Markusevangelium*, 221-222, who see Mk 3:31a as the introduction to a new, separate pericope, without reference to Mk 3:21.)

[30] *Schachteltechnik* is a common narrative technique employed by Mark, by which short units are inserted into the narrative to express lapse of time. Cf. Schweizer, *Markus*, 60, who regards 3:22-30; 5: 25-34; 6:14-29; 11:15-19; 14:1-11, 53-72, as such insertions.

[31] There may be an allusion to Is 49:24-26 in the Markan text of the binding of the strong man, although the Markan text, through the context of the Beelzeboul controversy has apocalyptic rather than political implications. Apocalyptic literature envisions the eschatological binding of evil, cf. e.g. Daniel 10-12 Jubilees 5:10; 10:5-11; Testament of Levi 18:12; Testament of Simeon 6:6-7; Testament of Dan 5; Testeament of Asher 7:3; Ethiopic Enoch 10:9, 12f; 16:1-4; 64, 68, 88, 90, etc; Ascension of Moses 10:1. The early stages of the apocalyptic visions are found in Biblical prophecy, e.g. Is 24; Is 27.

[32] Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 229.

[33] Klauck, *Allegorie*, 184, also correctly points to the distinction between those περὶ αὐτόν (Mk 3:34) and those ἔξω, (Mk 3:31, 32; 4: 11). Cf. Detlev Dormeyer, "Die Familie Jesu und der Sohn der Maria im Markusevangelium" (1989), 115. By implication, those who came down from Jerusalem belong to the latter group.

by example 3:21, 23 the relatives and those who have come down from Jerusalem do not do, but those who follow potentially do). It is important to note the contrast between what the evil spirits say in Mk 3:11 (you are the Son of God), and the viewpoint of the relatives and the scribes in 3:21-22 (he is beside himself, casting out demons by the prince of demons). This distinction between disciples as the true family of Jesus and the others is continued in the parable theory of Mk 4:10-12, where the inability to understand serves as both reason for and purpose of the speaking in parables. The connection is already prepared for in the inability of Jesus' family to understand Jesus' ministry (v 21). Mark further draws a connecting bridge between the question of the spirits and the obduracy theme which the citation of Is 6:9-10 brings up in Mk 4:10-12, through the insertion of the pericope concerning the sin against the Holy Spirit. The accusation that Jesus should be casting out demons by the prince of demons, is a blasphemy which stands well in connection with the hardheartedness of the people.[34]

The Markan account of the Beelzeboul controversy has thus been found to display both an apocalyptic as well as an ecclesiological concern. Since Matthew's account is a creation and harmonisation of both Q and Mark, the content of the controversy in the original Q context must also be described.

The Beelzeboul Controversy in Q

The Q version of the controversy is introduced by the healing of a man who is dumb. Due to the double reception of the incident, it is difficult to know the extent of the Q account. In the present analysis, space does not allow a detailed reconstruction of Q beyond that which is necessary in order to establish Matthean redaction. In general, however, one can presume that Q included an account similar to the one in Mark. In including the actual exorcism as the point of grievance, its form conforms to that of a controversy dialogue. It concludes with the saying: "whoever is not against me is for me." In Q the Beelzeboul controversy is preceded by the Lord's prayer and the encouragement to pray.[35] It is followed by the logia on the return of the evil spirit and the sign of Jonah, and possibly also the speech against the Scribes and the Pharisees.[36] Although there seems to be a *caesura* between Q 11:13 and Q 11:14,[37] the combination of logia can be shown to reveal a dual concern. On the one hand there is a concern for the coming and the presence of the kingdom of God (Q 11:2; 11:20; 11:25; 11:30) and on the other hand the possibility that one remains in or returns to the kingdom of the evil one (Q 11:4[38] 11:23; 11:26; 11:31-32). Thus, in Q as in Mark there is a dualistic

---

[34] Cf. Evald Lövestam, *Spiritus Blasphemia* (1968), 51-57. Cf. Klauck, *Allegorie*, 184.

[35] Cf. Bovon, *Lukas*, vol. 2, 148.

[36] The original structure of Q is difficult to reconstruct. The Q passages of Lk 11 occur in the *same order* in Mt although in Matthew the material spans over almost the whole gospel, from ch 6 to ch 23.

[37] Cf. Bovon, *Lukas*, vol. 2, 165.

[38] Prayer to avoid temptation, including the plea for forgiveness of sins.

apocalyptic world view, in which Jesus' exorcisms are understood to be a pre-figuring of the victory over the evil spirits. In Q the anthropology of this world view is stronger than in Mark. Those to whom Jesus is speaking are called "evil" as opposed to God and the Kingdom of God, that are good. The concluding sentence of the Beelzeboul controversy (the one who is not with me is against me) is illustrated by the possibility of being "reinhabited" by evil. The concluding prayer Q 11:1-4, "lead us not into temptation," becomes particularly relevant in this context. Thus, in Q, the war against Beelzeboul is still very much a present reality, and the significance of one's responsibility in this war weighs heavily. It becomes important for the individual not to become "inhabited" or possessed by the evil spirits. The warning included in this apocalyptic dualism of Q is a contrast to the obduracy theme which is introduced by Mark.[39] In Mark those who are around Jesus are secure, because they have been given the right understanding, while those "outside" cannot come in, because they do not have the insight of those on the "inside".

The Beelzeboul Controversy in the Context of the ἐρχόμενος Motif in Matthew.

The analysis of Matthew's redaction and composition of the Beelzeboul controversy indicated the Christological emphasis of the Matthean account. A comparison of Matthew's redaction and composition of Mk and Q, reveals that Matthew adopts motifs found in both his sources. Thus, as will be demonstrated below, the Markan hinting at obduracy is continued in Matthew, despite the removal of the "true family" pericope from the immediate context of the controversy. The controversy itself, however, continues the motifs which were found to be dominant in the ὁ ἐρχόμενος Christology.

Several elements point to the appropriateness of reading the Matthean account of the controversy in light of the ὁ ἐρχόμενος Christology. First, the connection to the previous fulfilment citation is established on the linguistic side by the insertion of ἐκβάλλω in the penultimate phrase of that quotation, and the substitution of Finger of God with Spirit of God. Further, the demoniac is described as one blind and dumb who through Jesus' healing sees and speaks. The theme of hearing and seeing as a sign of the presence of the kingdom (Mt 11:5) is thereby continued.[40] Moreover, Matthew inserts the confession of the crowds that Jesus must be "the son of David". The phrase represents the royal messianic expectation which is a part of the ἐρχομένος Christology, from Mt 1:1 through to the entrance into Jerusalem in Mt 21: 9 - "Blessed is the one

---

[39] Possibly a Markan redaction to tradition. Cf. Schmithals, *Markus*, vol. 1, 229; Gnilka, *Markus*, 162-163.

[40] The interrelatedness of the three leading motifs in the chapters are illustrated by the connection between the citation of Mt 11:5 and Mt 13:14-16. The blindness motif as hard heartedness (see ch 6), is of course also present in the healing of the demoniac. The blind and dumb demoniac, who through Jesus' action sees and speaks marks a contrast to "this generation" who despite seeing and hearing do not perceive.

who comes in the name of the Lord, ... hosanna to the son of David." This notion of the kingly messiah is continued in v 28, where the spirit of God as the agent by which Jesus heals, again alludes to Is 42 and Is 11. The concluding sentence (Mt 12:30) adapted from Q, refers back to the imagery of Mt 3:11 where the ἐρχόμενος strand begins, and the notion of judgement announced by John includes gathering and scattering. In the gathering and scattering motif there is again a reference to the eschatological hope of justice, which was announced in the citation of Is 42:1-4. It also points forward to the repeated citation of Psalm 117 in Mt 23:39. Also here Jesus is depicted as the one who has sought to "gather" without success, and here the "coming" is only future.

Like Mt 11:2-6, the Beelzeboul controversy depicts Jesus as the one who is to come. The Kingdom of God is already present in his ministry.[41] This is illustrated by the exorcism, and the speaking and seeing of the healed demoniac. The presence is, however, proleptic, and points forward to the eschatological judgement, where gathering and scattering will occur. In a sense then, the exorcisms and the plundering of the house of the strong one, are types for the eschatological judgement. Hence the future διάρπασει is a real future also for the reader/hearer and not simply the expression of the future from the perspective of Jesus, but from the perspective of the church, something to look back upon.[42] In Matthew, the binding and final robbing is, in the context of the ἐρχόμενος Christology, both already and not yet.

Matthean redaction of the Jesus tradition can be observed on two levels with regard to the Beelzeboul controversy. Both on the level of the composition of the material, and on the redactional changes in the pericope itself Matthew redirects the emphasis of both his sources. Although through the inclusion of both Markan and Q material, the apocalyptic emphasis of both Mark and Q is present, it is toned down in favour of the biblical messianic interpretation of the ministry of Jesus. This is especially evident through the links of the pericope with the fulfilment citation immediately preceding the controversy. The future reality expressed in v 20 ἕως ἂν ἐκβάλῃ εἰς νῖκος τὴν κρίσιν is present in the healing ministry of Jesus, and the healing ministry of Jesus serves as a paradigm for the future overcoming of evil.

Matthew, therefore takes over both the apocalyptic elements of Q, as well as the obduracy theme of Mark, but develops in the material the Christological question of the source of Jesus' healing powers in the events that take place. The double οὗτος of the accusers and the onlookers directs the attention to the person of Jesus. Yet, it is the recognition of the Spirit of God resting on Jesus which is at stake rather than the person

---

[41] Cf. also Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 136, sees a connection between Mt 11:4 and the Beelzeboul controversy, in which the point of the controversy, the overcoming of the evil power, proves the presence of the kingdom in the ministry of Jesus. They fail to see the dual perspective of both passage, however, in which the messianic identity of Jesus in viewed as both present and future.

[42] Contra Klauck, *Allegorie* 182.

of Jesus himself. The inclusion of the Markan saying concerning sin against the Holy Spirit in continuation of the Beelzeboul controversy makes this clear.

Conclusion

The analysis of Matthew's adaptation and interpretation of Q and Mark has shown that Matthew preserved both text and themes of the synoptic material, but harmonises, rearranges and reinterprets the tradition in view of Christological affirmations. The Beelzeboul controversy accounts of the synoptic sources is normative for Matthew mainly in the creation of the new narrative, and in its kerygmatic aspect.

The form and vocabulary of the redactional elements, of the Beelzeboul controversy, though created by Matthew, are dependent on the Jesus tradition itself. The duplication of material in Mt 9 and 12, the conformation of the accounts to a set form of miracle story followed by an apophthegm, shows both restriction and creativity on the part of Matthew. The additions and adaptations in Mt 12:23, 25 show how the tradition constitutes a basis for their development. The sources therefore prove to be authoritative in that they to a great extent provide the language and form for the Matthean redactional additions. Authoritative use for Matthew, however, does not imply the exercise of exact preservation of the words and actions of Jesus. Rather the redactional insertions show that the material is open to correction, interpretation and development. Thus for example the duplication of the miracle story is purely fictional. It is not meant as a further example of Jesus' miraculous powers nor simply as an introduction to the controversy itself. Much more, through the vocabulary it signals continuity with all the previous material and connection with the themes addressed. The designation of the demoniac as τυφλὸς καὶ κωφός and the hesitant interrogative response of the crowds continues the question of John the Baptist. At the same time Jesus emerges as the one who makes people see and hear, the one in whom God's kingdom comes near. The traditional form and vocabulary of the miracle story makes the story plausible and true. The created story interprets tradition in light of the particular concerns of Matthew: Christology and the correct response. Within this development it is important to recognise that the tradition interprets and is interpreted by the scriptural passages preceding the controversy, the passages which were found to underlie the ἐρχόμενος theme in particular.

Because the main theological concerns of the sources (the apocalyptic urgency of Q, and the ecclesiological aspects of Mark) have been reinterpreted or left aside in the Matthean retelling of the story, they have in these aspects not had a normative influence on Matthew. The authority of the sources lies simply in their kerygmatic nature, their illustrating Jesus' election, and hence God's presence in his ministry. Also in containing a paradigm for the future coming in justice, do the stories have an authoritative effect on the Matthean preservation of the material. This aspect is for Matthew understood to be in continuation of the passages cited from Scripture. Consequently Jesus tradition is here

measured in content by Scripture. However, in bringing the Jesus tradition in connection with Scripture, the tradition interprets Scripture, and stands in continuity with it.

While the Beelzeboul controversy emphasises the presence of the Kingdom of Heaven in the exorcisms of Jesus, it also functions as a prefiguring of future judgment. The parables of the tares and of the dragnet in Matthew 13 continue this theme. In the next section the two parables will be analysed.

4.2.2. The Use and Authority of Tradition in the Parable of the Tares and the Parable of the Dragnet

The parables of the tares and of the dragnet are parables which may stem from pre-Matthean oral or written tradition. In their adaptation, as in the account of the Beelzeboul controversy, Matthew makes use of motifs, images and language from both Q and Mark. The language and form of tradition is thereby preserved, yet the content is once again converted into aspects of particular interest for Matthew. The sources are nevertheless normative for Matthew not only in providing the language by which Matthew's concerns are expressed. They are also authoritative in their prophetic character: proclaiming future salvation, as well as being a critique of present piety. Also here, however, the aspects of synoptic tradition which Matthew takes up, are conformed to Matthew's interpretation of Scripture. Both the theme of the harvest and the gathering of the riches from the sea are images drawn from Scripture, and here read in light of the future expectation of ὁ ἐρχόμενος, as adapted from Q. Thus again, Jesus tradition is altered and placed in continuity with Scripture.

Because the Matthean texts of the parables of the tares and the dragnet are so influenced by Matthean composition, the original text form, the content and traditional context of the parables is impossible to reconstruct. The analysis of the Matthean adaptation can consequently only describe how traditional themes are employed by Matthew in the composition of material. Hence the analysis will seek to identify traditional material in the Matthean text, the function of the Matthean adaptation of this material, and the emphasis of these new compositions of Matthew. It will show that Matthew's compositions are a result of theological reflection upon the Jesus tradition in light of Scripture and in light of the ecclesiological perspective of the evangelist.

Matthew 13:24-30, 36-43.

The parable of the tares and its interpretation is concerned with the presence of the kingdom, and the present and future role of the Son of Man in relation to this world. While the interpretation of the parable is probably a Matthean creation, the parable itself is a composition which draws on the parable of the seed growing secretly, and possibly material from Matthew's written or oral tradition. The parable replaces the parable of the

seed growing secretly in Mark 4.[43] That Matthew employs motifs from the Markan parable and places the new composition in the place where the Markan material was omitted points to the normative character of the synoptic source for Matthew. The omitted material is reproduced in a new form, employing also motifs from Q. Although it has a parallel in the Coptic gospel of Thomas, 57, a comparison with the account will not be helpful in identifying Matthean redactional features, as it is likely that the gospel of Thomas is dependent on the Matthean text.[44] As in the Beelzeboul controversy the Matthean redactional features of the parable can be classified as either technical (preferential vocabulary, style, and lexical links to context) or interpretative (using language or form of the sources, catchwords as interpretative signs.)

The Parable of the Tares Mt 13:24-30

The parable of the tares in Matthew 13:24-30 is a Matthean redactional creation based on material from three sources. The new creation is an interpretation of the Markan parable in light of the ὁ ἐρχόμενος motif and Scripture. First, Matthew knew the parable of the seed growing secretly in Mk 4:26-29. The placement of the parable of the tares, and the use it makes of vocabulary of the source speak for this conclusion.[45] Second, certain conflicts of formulation within the parable, and between the parable and its interpretation, make it probable that Matthew also included material from a different source in the creation of the parable of the tares.[46] Finally, Matthew includes material from John the Baptist's speech in Q.

In the parable, Matthew uses the language and form of tradition. The evangelist employs vocabulary which occurs in the same order as, and designs a structure similar to,

---

[43] Of importance redaction analytically, but also for the understanding of the relation of the synoptic problems, is the absence of the Parable of the Seed growing secretly in both Mt and Lk as a "minor agreement". Solutions vary. Johann Rauscher, *Vom Messiasgeheimnis zur Lehre der Kirche* (1990), 169-174, following Fuchs, *Entwicklung*, 253 and Franz Kogler, *Das Doppelgleichnis vom Senfkorn und vom Sauerteig* (1985), ascribes the absence of Mk 4:26-29, and the inclusion of the parable of the tares to a deuteromarkan gospel. A solution which conveniently may explain minor agreement, but which raises many more questions (cf. Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 322 n.11). In the case of both the Beelzeboul controversy and the parable of the seed growing secretly, Markan redaction seems to go beyond that which is preserved in Lk and Mt, and may suggest that the Markan account preserved in the canon may represent a later stage of redaction (not earlier) than the one available to Mt and Lk. The Matthean use of Markan vocabulary and image, suggests however, that Matthew knew this parable.

[44] Cf. Wolfgang Schrage, *Das Verhältnis des Thomasevangeliums zur Synoptischen Tradition* (1967), 124-125; Hans Weder, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu als Metaphern* (1978), 125.

[45] Gundry, *Matthew*, 261-262; M. D. Goulder, "Midrash", 367ff. Klauck, *Allegorie*, 226-227 holds the development to be pre Matthean. Cf. also n.43.

[46] Joachim Gnilka, *Das Matthäusevangelium* (1987) vol. 1, 489-490; Donald A Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 382; Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 322; Ulrich Luz, "Vom Taumellolch im Weizenfeld" (1989), 162; Francis Wright Beare, *The Gospel according to Matthew* (1981), 303 all hold the parable of the tares to be pre-Matthean. Jones, *Parables*, 112-114 assumes the Q and Mk overlap happened in a collection of parables on which Mt draws. Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (1962), 64ff; Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 125-126; Eduard Schweizer, *Matthäus*, 197; William David Davies and Dale C. Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol. 2, 410-411; Eckhard Rauh, *Rede in Vollmaht* (1990), 165 hold the parable to go back to the historical Jesus (perhaps to be read alongside Mt 5:45).

the Markan parable. The parable of the seed growing secretly and the parable of the tares both include the following words in this order: ἄνθρωπος, καθέυδω, βλάστανω, πρῶτον, χόρτος, σίτος, κάρπος θερισμός, ἀποστέλλω. The structure sowing-growth-harvest is the same in both parables.[47] Hence Matthew preserves tradition in the creation of a new parable.

Several *hapax legomena* in the Matthean parable, as well as conflicts in use of language, suggest that Matthew may also have used an unknown parable in its creation. The verbs ἐπισπείρω and συναυξάνομαι occur only here in the synoptic tradition. The simple form of both, however, is found in the near context of the parable.[48] The verbs are therefore redactional duplications. Their compound nature in the parable is due to the action they are meant to describe. Θερίστης occurs once in the synoptic tradition, but in Matthew picks up the image of harvesting Mt 9:37-38 (Q) and the need for workers (ἐργατής).[49] Finally, but significantly, the use of ζιζάνια,[50] συλλέγω[51] and δέσμας[52] along with ἐκρίζω,[53] and ἅμα,[54] cannot with certainty be ascribed to Matthean redaction. Their use is found only in the present parable or in material which may well be ascribed to M as a written source.

The conflicting formulations within the parable has been listed by Rauscher:[55] ἄνθρωπος σπείρας (v 24) - οἰκοδέσποτης (v 30); καλὸν σπέρμα (v 24) - σίτος (v 25); αὐτοῦ ὁ ἐχθρὸς (v 25) - ἐχθρὸς ἄνθρωπος (v 28); δοῦλοι (v 27) - θερίσται (v 30). Perceived conflicts between the parable and its interpretation consist mainly in the failure to interpret several elements:[56] the interpretation does not take notice of the servants, nor of the sleeping, nor of the tying of the tares in bundles. Further, the emphasis of the interpretation lies solely on the eschatological judgement, whereas the parable, with the final judgement in view, points out the present need to avoid judgement, in order not to uproot the fruit-yielding wheat. Several of these apparent conflicts can be ascribed to the Matthean adaptation of Q and Mk material, redactional concerns, and the structure of the Matthean chapter. The evidence of Matthean redaction is therefore significant, and a

---

[47] Cf. Rauscher, *Messiasgeheimnis*, 166 n.50.

[48] σπείρω is found ten times in ch. 13. Matthew derives αὐξανω from Q twice: in Mt 6:28 and in the following parable, Mt 13:32.

[49] The interpretation of the noun: ἀποστελεῖ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ anticipates Mt 24:31 (=Mk).

[50] Eight occurrences only in the present context.

[51] Seven occurrences in the present context and the parable of the dragnet. Once in 7:16 adapted from Q.

[52] *Hapax legomenon* in the synoptic tradition.

[53] cf. Mt 15:13

[54] Cf. Mt 20:1

[55] Cf. Rauscher, *Messiasgeheimnis*, 168.

[56] Cf. Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 120ff.

reconstruction of a possible original tradition virtually impossible.[57] Apart from joining Mark and an unknown tradition, Matthew includes elements from Q. The interpretation of the parable is divided in two,[58] building a clear bridge between the present reality of the Kingdom, and the future expectation of the coming of the Son of Man.

In the creation of the parable of the tares, therefore, Matthew preserves and utilises words and form of tradition. The motivation is here dual. First the new creation preserves normative tradition in form and language, and second, the merging of traditions into a new parable also serves to interpret tradition. This is true also for Matthew's use of the Christological theme from Q.

There are a few words which the parable of the tares has in common with the announcement of John the Baptist in Mt 3:12: κατακαίω, συνάγω, σῖτος, ἀποθήκη, πῦρ, in addition to the general motif of the harvest. The gathering of wheat into the storehouse is a metaphor of salvation also in prophetic literature (Is 11:12; Ezek 11:17; Micah 2:12; 4:6), and the unquenchable fire, a metaphor for judgement (Is 66:34; Jer 4:4, 21:12). The insertion of these motifs here, in place of the parable of the seed growing secretly, stands in continuation with the references back to the Baptist's announcement which have been identified throughout ch 11-13 (Mt 11:2-6; 11:10; 11:27; 12: 18; 12:23; 12:28; 12:34). It seems therefore plausible, that the inclusion of the parable here continues the ἐρχόμενος motif which has been identified as a redactional thread. Together with the subsequent interpretation of the parable, a whole picture of the reality of the Kingdom is conveyed. The Kingdom of Heaven is both present in Jesus/the Son of Man, but is also as a reality still to be fulfilled.[59]

In the creation of the parable of the tares, the use of Matthean vocabulary betrays Matthean redaction. These include προσέρχομαι,[60] δοῦλος,[61] οἰκοδηςπότης,[62] κύριε,[63]

---

[57] Contra Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 123ff, who identifies three pre-Matthean layers of tradition, the earliest being close in meaning and form with the parable of the dragnet.

[58] Luz, "Taumellolch", 159.

[59] Already Manson, *Teaching of Jesus*, 222 saw parallels to the proclamation of John the Baptist. Klauck, *Allegorie* 226 n 196 recognises the similar expression in Mt 3:12, but fails to draw any conclusion as to the significance of this similarity. Also Jones, *Parables*, 313-315 (esp. fn 118), emphasises the link with Mt 3, but sees it as proof of a pre-Matthean source, combining elements from Q and Mk. The analysis of the ἐρχόμενος motif in the present thesis, however, has shown the recurring references to Mt 3 to be redactional.

[60] 51 occurrences in Matthew, 5 in mark and 9 in Luke.

[61] 30 occurrences in Mt, 5 in Mk and 26 in Lk.

[62] Mt 7 times, Mk 1, Lk 4.

[63] 34 occurrences in Matthew, over against two in Mk. In Luke the vocative occurs 25 times. Luz, *Evangelium* vol. 1, 43 considers 16 occurrences in Matthew to be redactional. It is used consistently as the address of the disciples to Jesus. (Cf. Armin Kretzer, *Die Herrschaft der Himmel und die Söhne des Reiches*, 1971, 125).

σός[64]. Further, the use of redactional phrases betray the specific Matthean interest in the inclusion of the parable in the place of Mark's seed growing secretly. They function as structural devices, tying the parable with the previous and subsequent material, and to strengthen the theological concerns of Matthew.

The phrase ἄλλην παραβολὴν παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, in v 24 is found only in the gospel of Matthew, and only in chapter 13. In Matthew it functions as a structural device like the threefold ὁμοία ἔστιν and should be considered redactional.[65] The passive ὡμοιώθη in parable introductions is peculiar to Matthew, and occurs together only with the Matthean redactional ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν (13:24; 18:23; 22:2), and replaces the traditional ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ as an introduction to the parable. In using the aorist passive ὡμοιώθη, in the introduction here, Matthew indicates the 'already' of the kingdom, i.e. its presence in the ministry of Jesus, and can be translated: 'The kingdom of heaven has become like'.[66]

Κάλος is an adjective with ethical connotations found especially in the Q tradition, and which Matthew picks up and duplicates.[67] Its occurrence here, designating the seed as 'good', picks up τὴν καλὴν γὴν of v 23[68], and connects with the theme of judgement at the end of the parable which is very much influenced by the speech of John the Baptist in Q 3:9//Mt 3:10. The whole subclause (ὡμοιώθη) ἀνθρώπῳ σπείραντι ... ἐν

---

[64] The possessive adjective is not common in the NT. In Mt σός is found in 7:3 (red. used reflexively); 7:22 (3x red?); 13:27; 20:14 (M?); 25:25 (?). Mk uses it once (5:19), Lk thrice (6:30; 15:31; 22:42)

[65] Cf. Jack D. Kingsbury, *The Parables in Matthew 13*, (1969) 14-15; Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 1, 47. Word statistics alone cannot with certainty ascribe the individual elements of the phrase to Matthean vocabulary. The formulation ἄλλην παραβολὴν occurs only in Matthew as an introduction to parables when they occur in series, as in 13:24, 31, 33 and 21:33. The compound verb occurs only here in Matthew and the combination παρέθηκεν αὐτόις with an abstract object only Mt 13: 24, 31 and in 1 Tim 1:18 in the NT. The compositional evidence for a Matthean interest, however, leads to the conclusion that the phrase in its use is redactional. Possibly, Matthew has again adapted a traditional phrase and multiplied it through redactional insertions. Differently, Jones, *Parables*, 109, holds the uniqueness of the phrase in Mt 13:24, 31, 32 to be evidence for a pre-Matthean collection of parables. Nestle-Aland follows Vaticanus as "undisputed precedence" and the majority text against several important witnesses in omitting λέγων in v 33, the inner evidence may support this reading, as the change to ἐλάλησεν in the same verse prepares for v 34 (from Mark, though tense is changed), as it in v 3 prepares for v 10.

[66] Among the synoptics, Matthew is alone in using the passive form in the introduction to parables. It occurs sometimes in the future sometimes in the aorist. In meaning, the passive is a deponent denoting "to be like" rather than "to liken" or "to compare". Cf. D.A. Carson, "The ΟΜΟΙΟΣ word group as introduction to some Matthean parables" (1985); followed by Davies, et al., *Saint Matthew*, vol. 2, 411 and Jan Lambrecht, *Out of the Treasure* (1991), 55, 164-165. The parable with the action of the enemy may be seen as a parallel to Mt 11:12, where the Kingdom is described as being taken by force by violent men, or to the parable of the return of the unclean sprit in Mt 12.

[67] Apart from the parable of the tares and its interpretation: Mt 3:10//Q 3:9; Mt 7:15-20 picks up and duplicates Q 6:43-44 in combination with elements from Q 3:9; and brings the same motif again in Mt 12:33-35 (Q 6: 43-45); Mt 13:8 and 23 are dependent on Mk 4: 8, 20; Mt 13:45 and 48 is in material only to be found in Matthew. V 48 is in the parable of the dragnet which forms a parallel to the parable of the tares.

[68] par Mk 4:20

τῷ ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ is almost identical to the Matthean redactional addition in the following parable of the mustard seed (Mt 13:31), and is also to be considered a Matthean construction here. The sentence is similar in structure to the opening of Mark 4:26-29: ὡς ἄνθρωπος βάλῃ τὸν σπόρον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, and can, like Mt 13:31 be considered a Matthean redactional change of the introductory sentence. Again the use of σπείρω forms a connection to the previous parable, whereas ἀγρός which is redactional throughout, links this parable to the parable of the mustard seed as well as the parable of the treasure in the field (13:44).[69]

The construction ἐν τῷ + infinitive in v 25 is particularly frequent in Luke, and occurs three times in Matthew, redactional in Mt 27:12. In the present context it copies the phrase ἐν τῷ σπείρειν of Mt 13:4, and thus forms another connection to that parable. Three times in the context of the parable and its interpretation ἐχθρός occurs. Matthew adapts the noun from his sources in two instances, and uses it redactionally at least once.[70] If it reflects a redactional concern here, it anticipates Mt 22:44 (Mk 12:36) where Ps 110:1 is cited, showing that the Christ is (even) more than the son of David, but also showing how the Christ is more than the son of David: in the "binding" of evil, placing the enemy under his feet. Hence the future, as well as the present, aspect of the ὁ ἐρχόμενος motif is continued in the parable. In the present, the kingdom is suffering from the work of "the enemy" spreading lawlessness. In the future, lawlessness will be eradicated and the enemy will be bound.

The seemingly conflicting formulations in v 25 and v 28 are common Matthean sentence structures,[71] whereby the latter is a Semitism, with ἄνθρωπος as substitute for the indefinite pronominal adjective.[72] Κάρπον ποίεω expresses the Matthean concern of the necessity of bearing fruit (often in connection with κάλος).[73] As is generally the case in Matthew, the phrase is used metaphorically also in the parable. Thus it is redactional

---

[69] The noun is used 17 times in Matthew as against 9 in Mark and Luke respectively. It is used redactionally in 6:28, perhaps to create a parallel to 6:30 (=Q). It is also redactional in 13:31, and 24:40, and otherwise occurs in material peculiar to the gospel (the parable of the tares and its interpretation, the parable of the treasure in the field, in addition to four occurrences in Mt 27:1-10).

[70] Mt 5:43 antithesis redactionally formed to Mt 5:44 = Q 6:27 (Ulrich Luz, *Matthäusevangelium*, vol. 1, 245-247; 310-311). Mt 22:44 = Mk 12:36. Mt 10:36 in redactionally inserted citation of Micah 7:6. Otherwise 13:25, 28, 39.

[71] Although the structure of the formulation in v 25 is common, and thus a redactional preference beyond Markan and Lukan usage cannot be identified, it can be shown that Matthew does not actively avoid such a structure. The placement of the possessive pronoun before the article occurs in redactional phrases in Mt 7:24, 26; 8:3; 9:30; 28:9.

[72] Also Mt 7:9; 9:32 (red.); 11:19; 12:11 (red.); 13:28 (?), 45, 52; 18:23; 21:33; 25:24; 27:32 (red.), 57. Cf. Blass/Debrunner/Rehkopf § 301[2]. Further examples are listed in Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol. 1, 81. Many of these occurrences are found in parabolic material peculiar to Matthew, and could be traditional. The idiom is known to Matthew, however, and used redactionally in several places.

[73] Again, Matthew develops a theme found in the sources. Apart from 13: 26. Cf. Mt 3:8, 10 (= Q 3:8, 9) duplicated in Mt 7:19; Mt 7:18 (= Q 6:43) duplicated in Mt 7:17 and 12:33-34; 21: 43 (+ Mk 12:11). (Cf. also Mt 21:19). Matthew also adds ποιέω after καρποφορέω in Mt 13:23 (+ Mk 4:20)

and to be read in light of the related material in the gospel: the only way to know the nature or identity of something is on the basis of the fruit it yields.[74] The verb φαίνω, continues that same motif.[75] In Matthew it is particularly used in the connection of doing good deeds for show, as in the examples of the Pharisees in Mt 6 and 23. In the context of Mt 11-13 the underlying meaning is evident, the wheat will be known by its fruits, the "weed" will reveal itself.

The combination householder/servant is prominent in several parables. They are stock-figures and are only used metaphorically in Matthew. In Mt 10:25 and in 13:27, οἰκοδηςπότης, is used Christologically, δοῦλος is used allegorically for the disciples, both of which are confirmed by the address κύριε. The allegorical use of the figures in the parable is so clear that for Matthew a later specification in the interpretation is not necessary.[76] Their appearance in the present parable, and the emphasis of the interpretation on the judgement to come, supports the notion that the parable is a creation responding to a specific concern of the church/ community of Matthew.

In conclusion: Matthew's creation of the parable of the tares functions as a preservation of traditional material. The use of vocabulary from the Markan parable and a possible other source, as well as the insertion of the parable in the place of the Markan parable, show a concern both to remain true to and to interpret tradition. In both cases the tradition preserved has a normative function. In interpreting the tradition of Mark in light of Q tradition and Scripture, Matthew does not simply omit the traditional material, but is in dialogue with it.

The text in Mark is concerned with the nature of the kingdom. Together with the parable of the mustard seed, that of the seed growing secretly underscores the time aspect of the kingdom. In the latter, the emphasis is on the time it takes for the Kingdom to become great. In the parable of the seed growing secretly, the time of the harvest is emphasised: it will come when the time is ready, in the fullness of time.[77] Matthew retains the waiting aspect of the Markan parable, but adds aspects from Q. The presence of the kingdom is emphasised through the passive aorist of the introduction: the kingdom of God has become like. Through the addition of the tares, the work of the enemy, and the bearing of fruit, Matthew has again addressed the obduracy theme of the fulfilment citation in 13:14-15. The need for understanding made visible in the life of the disciples is emphasised. The Q additions add the aspect of the future separation of those who bear good fruit from those who do not. This is the work of the coming one. By using

---

[74] Contra Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 124, who fails to see the metaphorical use in the parable. Cf. also 4.3.3. below.

[75] Mt 1:20; 2:7, 13,19; 6:5, 16, 18; 9:33; 13:26; 23:27, 28; 24:27, 30. (Mark and Lk each have two occurrences).

[76] Cf. Schenk, *Sprache*, 370.

[77] Cf. Nils A. Dahl, "The Parables of Growth" (1952), 148-149.

traditional metaphors, forms and language, Matthew harmonises his sources, and the creation remains within tradition, while being interpreted by it. In the present parable, the Q tradition becomes normative by becoming a standard by which the Markan parable is interpreted.

The Interpretation of the Parable of the Tares Mt 13:32-43

The interpretation of the parable of the tares is a Matthean creation. In the interpretation of the parable, vv 37-43, the vocabulary can again be identified as Matthean: κόσμος,[78] πονηρός,[79] διάβολος,[80] πῦρ,[81] ἀποστέλλω,[82] and σκάνδαλον[83], ἀνομία[84], δίκαιος[85] (ἐκ-)λάμπω[86] should all be considered redactional.[87] Further, συντελεία (τοῦ) αἰῶνος, which is used in the interpretation of the parable, occurs only in Matthean eschatological texts. Possibly, Matthew found it in the parable of the dragnet, and introduced it, in typical Matthean manner, into a text with similar content.[88] This redactional feature is also found in the phrase ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων, which Matthew found in Q 13:28, and duplicated in a number of passages.[89] Also the use of φήμι is twice as common in Matthew as in Luke,[90] and is a feature of Matthean language. The call to repentance in Mt 13: 43 ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκουέτω, again functions as a link back to John the Baptist material in Mt 11:15.

Conclusion

The analysis has shown that the majority of the vocabulary and language of the parable of the tares and its interpretation is Matthean. It makes it plausible that the parable is a Matthean creation; if not in its entirety, it at least witnesses to significant

---

[78] Mt 9 occurrences, 3 in Mk and 3 in Lk

[79] 26 occurrences in Mt, 2 in Mk and 13 in Lk. It here looks back at 13:19 and the occurrences in Mt 12.

[80] Matthew probably takes over all from Q, and adds it here. Possibly a source word. Cf. 25: 41 M

[81] 12 occurrences in Matthew, three in ch 3, 3 in ch 13... (4 times Mk, 7 time Lk)

[82] Almost identical in all gospels (22, 20, 26).

[83] 5 occurrences in Matthew, none in Mk and one in Lk. Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 137, points to its use in Mt 16:17f, and the relation between φρόνιμος and συνίημι. Peter becomes a skandalon because he does not understand.

[84] 4 occurrences in Mt, none in Mk and Lk.

[85] 14 occurrences in Mt, 2 in Mk and 1 in Lk.

[86] (1) and 3 occurrences in Mt, none in Mk and once in Lk.

[87] Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 144, adds θελέω, ἕως, ἀπέρχομαι.

[88] Mt 13:39; 13:40; 13:49; 24:3; 28:20. Only in 24:3 it occurs as a redactional insertion into synoptic tradition.

[89] Mt 8:12; 13:42, 50; 22:13; 24:51; 25:30.

[90] 17 occurrences in Matthew, 5 in Mark and 8 in Luke.

Matthean redactional activity in its formation.[91] In its present form the parable continues the concerns of the announcement of ὁ ἐρχόμενος and his task in Mt 3:12, by using imagery adapted from that passage as well as from the Markan parable of the seed growing secretly, which it replaces. Further the parable joins the imagery of the "coming one" from the first Q passage with eschatological Son of Man imagery reminiscent of the apocalyptic tradition, which becomes more prominent in the eschatological speech in Mt 24-25. The present and future task of the Son of Man/coming one comes together in the parable. The sowing activity of the present equals that of the parable of the sower in Mt 13:1-9, but the imagery is taken a step further. In the Markan parable which Matthew preserves with little redaction, the seed is the word of the kingdom, and the ground on which it falls is the "hearts" of the receivers, who may or may not understand. In the parable of the tares the good seed which is sown into the world represents those who have heard and understood the word of the kingdom and bear good fruit, whereas the seed of the tares is the seed which was stolen by the evil one in the previous parable. This seed is not distinguishable from the wheat before both bear fruit.[92] In the day of judgement, at the end of the age, it is this fruit which saves them from or commits them to the eternal fire. Like in Mt 11:2-6, the parable combines the ἐρχόμενος Christology with the obduracy theme (also signalled by the repeated "let the one who has ears hear"), and the ability of the people to hear and bear fruit is dependent on several factors, the openness of the hearts, the sower, and the activities of the evil one.

The Matthean version picks up some of the metaphors of future judgement contained in the Baptist's announcement in Mt 3 which Matthew derived from Q. The vocabulary between the two passages overlaps only in a few instances. There are, nevertheless, many parallel features. Both the Baptist's announcement and the parable depict judgement in light of the metaphor of the harvest of wheat. It is gathered and stored in the storehouse. The weeds or the chaff respectively are destroyed by fire. The

---

[91] Those who hold the parable to be a Matthean redaction of an already existing parable from Matthew's special Source material, point to the movement in meaning from parable to interpretation, typical of material where the interpretation is secondary. This movement in meaning is explained through the concern of the parable with the growing together of weed and wheat, where as the interpretation is concerned with endtime judgement only. Cf. Gnilka, *Matthäusevangelium*, vol. 1, 489-490. In light of the above analysis, it is clear that the Matthean redaction of the parable, if it already existed in core in oral or written tradition, is so major that not much separates it from original composition. In fact, it is impossible having noted the overlap between the Markan parable of the seed growing secretly and the motifs found elsewhere in tradition, to reconstruct the wording of the original parable. Differently Gnilka, who sees no relation between Mk 4:26-29 and the present parable, believes the original parables to have constituted vv 24-29.

[92] The parable as such neither tries to explain something which usually happens, nor is it biologically correct. As Luz, "Taumellolch", 156-157 shows, the parable includes many surprising elements, which against general use does not become the focus. An enemy wouldn't go out to sow tares; they usually occur together with the wheat. The reaction of the servants is surprising: unless there is an enormous number of tares, no-one would find their presence disturbing. The tares are in fact distinguishable from the wheat before they bear fruit. The real point of surprise, however, is the delay of the weeding of the tares. They would normally be uprooted before the harvest.

parable can consequently be said to continue the future aspect of the ἐρχόμενος-motif, which was begun in Mt 3:11, and continued through the question of John in Mt 11:3.

The parable of the tares constitutes a Matthean creation which can be described as an interpretation and harmonisation of Jesus tradition. It collates imagery which Matthew has already adapted from Mark and Q, and develops an allegory which on the narrative level functions as a continuum between strands of tradition. Theologically the creation functions to explain two theological dilemmas in the Matthean ecclesiological situation. Christologically it addresses that which was already addressed through the use of scriptural material in Mt 11 and 12, the present and future coming of the messiah. Here Matthew fuses his own ἐρχόμενος Christology with the Son of Man tradition taken over from his sources. In continuation with Mt 13, the earthly ministry of Jesus is that which is expressed through the mixed quotation in Mt 11:5: with the emphasis on 'preaching the good news to the poor.' The future ministry of the Messiah is to sit in judgement, imaged as the gathering of the righteous, and the destruction of lawlessness.[93]

In the parable, traditional material is used as the framework for an interpretative allegory, and placed in the mouth of Jesus. Tradition functions authoritatively in that process, as it provides the imagery which the formulation uses. Traditional vocabulary and motifs are used to create a new piece of tradition. It is included in the Jesus tradition and hence becomes a part of it. The new creation functions as an authoritative answer therefore, to a contemporary problem which apparently the parable of the seed growing secretly could not answer. Whereas the seed growing secretly had no meaning anymore, the new parable both develops the Christological interest of the Matthean redactor and provides an answer to communal needs. What these needs were is difficult to establish with certainty. The motif of wheat growing together with weeds is common in early Judaism, and would normally be used as metaphors for Israel and Gentiles respectively.[94] It can however, also signify the righteous/unrighteous. This is obviously the motif which motivates the Matthean redaction. It is not added to the sources, however, but only adapted from the sources and emphasised in relation to them. Hence, certain themes or theological issues adapted from the sources were seen to be more significant (or authoritative) than others.

---

[93] Kretzer, *Herrschaft* 140-143: „Warum verbindet Math den Menschensohn und den Basileiabegriff miteinander? (Mt 13:41; 16:28.) Zeitlich sind beide Begriffe eschatologisch ausgerichtet, d.h. die offenbaren ihre volle Herrlichkeit erst am Ende. Personal gesehen: ihnen gegenüber ist das Tun des Menschen gefordert (16:27) positiv oder negativ. An diesem Tun entscheidet sich der Schicksal des Menschen. In einem räumlichen Aspekt käme noch die Aussage hinzu: beide Grössen sind in dieser Welt bereits anwesend aber noch in Geborgenheit und Niedrichkeit, die sich eben erst am Ende enthüllt als Macht und Herrlichkeit in Vollendung."

[94] This interpretation does, however not fit with the introduction of the activity of the enemy, hence Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 123-124, ascribes the activity of the enemy secondary, though pre-Matthean stage of the parable.

Matthew 13:47-50 - The Parable of the Dragnet

In the parable of the dragnet Matthew adapts an already existing parable and conforms it to the parable of the tares and its interpretation. Thereby also the imagery of Q as it is preserved in Matthew 3 is used again. Again, one part of Jesus tradition is used to interpret tradition, or, one can say that Matthew harmonises the content of the traditions. The critique of present piety, which in Q and Matthew occurs as a continuation of prophetic literature, here constitutes the normative tradition. The confession of Jesus as the coming one legitimises that normativity.

The parable of the net, although it has no parallel in the gospel tradition, not even in the Coptic sources, in all likelihood stems from a source and not from the Matthean evangelist. Several observations makes this conclusion compelling. Unlike the parable of the tares, it includes a number of *hapax legomena*. The parable uses a well known imagery of the gospel tradition, the casting of a net into the sea. In the tradition, Jesus called his first disciples while they were casting or mending their nets at the sea of Galilee, (Mt 4:18-21, Mk 1:16-20; Lk 5:4-11). In these gospel narratives, however, the vocabulary used is quite different. Whereas all these stories use δίκτυον,[95] Matthew 13:47 uses σαγήνη.[96] Also γένος,[97] ἀναβιβάζω,[98] and ἄγγος,[99] are found only here in the gospel, although Matthew uses προβιβάζω in 14:8,[100] so that the verb could be redactional also in the parable. Also αἰγιαλός and ἀφορίζω are words which seldom occur in Matthew. The use of the former in Matthew 13:2 is probably a Matthean redactional adaptation of source vocabulary. It is used in anticipation of Mt 13:47. The verb ἀφορίζω occurs in M material in the parable of the sheep and the goats in Mt 25:32, which conveys the same concept of separation as the parable of the dragnet. The uncommon vocabulary could of course be explained as dependent on the subject matter,[101] but the imagery is not uncommon in the gospels, as already pointed out. Also other aspects of the parable indicate its pre-Matthean existence either in written or oral form. The parable is short, almost enigmatic. Thus, there is no introduction of those who drag the net onto the shore, neither is there a description of the actual fate of the bad

---

[95] Or Mt 4:18: ἀμφιβλήστρον adapted from the verb in the Markan parallel ἀμφιβάλλοντας (Mk 1:16)

[96] Hapax legomenon in the New Testament. (Six occurrences in the LXX).

[97] Hapax legomenon in Mt, while Mark uses it twice: Mk 7:26 (in the context of the debate with the Syrophoenician woman) and Mk 9:29. Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 149 considers it redactional, because it points to the universality of the final judgement. This fits Kretzer's thesis of the universally oriented understanding of the 'kingdom' in Matthew.

[98] Hapax legomenon in the New Testament. It is used 38 times in the LXX, of these, seven times with reference to the Exodus (God *brought* Israel *out* of Egypt.)

[99] Hapax legomenon in the New Testament. (It is found six times in the LXX, never in connection with fish.)

[100] Luke uses ἐπιβιβάζω in 10:34 and 19:35.

[101] Thus partly Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 357.

fish.[102] Further, the use of σύλλεγω for the gathering of the good fish, as opposed to the regular συνάγω as the metaphor of God's act of salvation, is unusual.[103] This feature could be explained through its use in the previous sentence however, which parallels the gathering of all nations in Mt 25:31. Possibly the imagery of the gathering of "all kinds of fish" is an allusion to Is 66:5, where the eschatological pilgrimage of the nations to Jerusalem is expressed in a similar way: "all the riches of the sea shall turn[104] to you."

There are several indications of Matthean redaction and adaptation of the parable. The combination of καλός and σαπρός is Matthean, as is ἔξω βάλλω,[105] πονήρος and μέσος.[106] Further, the whole of the interpretation can be considered redactional, and corresponds in general to the interpretation of the parable of the tares.

In the context of the gospel, the parable of the dragnet recalls the calling of the disciples to become fishers of men. This is also the task of the angels in the parable. Like the angels of the parable of the tares, they separate the good from the bad. Unlike the parable of the tares, there is no explanation why the bad are bad, and the good are good. Due to the unevenness, the allegorisation of the parable does not go as far as the parable of the tares or the parable of the sower. In the thematic development in Matthew 13, the parable goes another step beyond the parable of the tares, and picks up its idea of end-time separation according to good and bad. As such, the parable of the tares functions as a bridge between the parable of the sower and the parable of the dragnet. The parable of the dragnet refers only to the angels and the future judgement. Significant in the connection of the Christological emphasis of Mt 11-13, is the gathering of all kinds of fish, prefiguring the gathering of all the nations in Mt 25:31ff (and Isaiah 60:5?). Although the parable does not include a figure representing the messiah as judge, the Christology is clear through the sending out of the angels of the previous parable of the tares. The angels represent the messiah and judge with him. The hope for the nations, which the ἐρχόμενος Christology symbolised, becomes clear in the parable. The fish are not judged according to kind (γένος) but according to their actions. The use of καλός and σαπρός recalls the trees with good and bad fruit in Mt 12. The criteria of judgement are made on ethical and moral standards, according to the will of God

To summarise: Matthew employs a traditional parable describing the hope of the gathering of all nations to Jerusalem, much in the line of Is 60. In Isaiah 60 the nations come to see the light and obey the people of God (v 3), but those who fail to bow down

---

[102] They are thrown out. From the point of view of the fish, these would suffer the better fate, assuming 'out' means back into the sea. Cf. Luz, *Evangelium*, 360.

[103] It is used for the collection of the tares in Mt 13:29, 30, perhaps, again, as a keyword connection to the pre-formulated parable of the dragnet.

[104] The Septuagint uses the verb μεταβάλλω.

[105] Mt 18: 8 and 9 is dependent on Mk 9:47, 48. Matthew also uses the expression in Mt 5:13, for salt which is no longer usable (βάλλω ἔξω).

[106] Mt 10:16 (=Q), 13:25; 14:6; 18:2 (=Mk); 25:6; 25:6.

to Jerusalem will be destroyed (v 12). In Matthew's adaptation of the parable, the fish are judged according to their nature: whether they are good or bad. Again Q tradition is used as a norm for the interpretation of the parable. The future hope of salvation includes also a continuation of the critique of existing piety. It is here not a question of salvation historical perspective of the church replacing Israel as the new people of God. Rather for both, the message of John is still relevant: faith in Jesus as the coming one will be evident in the life of the believer. At the end of the age, this is the criterion of separation.

The Parables of the Tares and of the Fishnet in the Context of Matthew 13

The parables of the tares and of the dragnet have often been read on the basis of the dual level of the Matthean narrative, and thus a strong ecclesiological concern has been ascribed to them. The possibility of the parallel existence of both "the sons of evil" and the "sons of the kingdom" in the church is sought, explained and solved in the parables.[107] But the parables are also meaningful on the narrative level. The structure of Mt 13 shows that the ὁ ἐρχόμενος related motif of separation dominates the second half of the chapter, whereby the chapter shows a development from concern with the present to concern with the future aspects of the ὁ ἐρχόμενος Christology.

The parables of the tares and of the dragnet are parallels to the parable of the sower (which will be analysed under the obduracy motif). The three parables raise the two main themes which were found in Mt 11:2-6: the identity of Jesus as the coming one, and the call to hear and understand. On the level of the ἐρχόμενος motif, the three parables follow a successive explanation of the coming. The emphasis is on the presence of the kingdom in the first parable, where the word of the kingdom is sown and an appropriate response is required. In the second parable, the Kingdom is both present (indicated by the use of the aorist ὡμοιώθη)[108] and future (ἐν καιρῷ τοῦ θερισμοῦ *ἐρῶ*). The third parable, the parable of the dragnet, emphasises the description of the consummation of judgement at the end of the age and therefore links the kingdom to the future. Although in the latter parable there is no mention of the Son of Man as judge, the parallels between its interpretation and the interpretation of the parable of the tares, as well as the near proximity of the parables to each other, indicate that they are to be read together. The angels therefore are the same as those in v. 41, sent by the Son of Man. The two parables have no parallels in the canonical synoptic tradition, but are found in different forms in the gospel of Thomas.

---

[107] The double level of the narrative is viewed in differing ways. Cf. e.g. Gerhard Barth, "Gesetzesverständnis", 55-56; Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 325; Luz, "Taumellolch", 158. Both understand the issue to be a warning to the Matthean community itself. See also David C. Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew* (1992), 210, who holds the parables to be concerned with the universal church rather than the Matthean community in particular; or Kingsbury, *Parables*, 74, who sees the issue to be the relation of the Matthean community to Pharisaic Judaism. Robert H. Smith, "Matthew's Message for Insiders" (1992), 231, holds that as uniquely Matthean parables, these are direct statements to the "post-Easter community".

[108] 'The kingdom of heaven has become like...'. Cf. above p. 109 (and f.n. 66).

The parables of the sower, of the tares, and of the dragnet, although they differ in length, have in common that they appear in Matthew 13 with an interpretation. This, as well as the progressive development of thought which they represent, shows that they are central parables in the discourse of Mt 13. Their occurrence also provides a structure for the chapter. The discourse can be divided into two parts. The first part consists of the parable of the sower, its interpretation and the fulfilment citation which separates them.[109] The second part is built around the double occurrence of a set of three parables, separated by the second fulfilment citation and the interpretation of the parable of the tares. The parables of the tares, of the mustard seed, and of the leaven are joined by a redactional phrase ἄλλην παραβολὴν παρέθηκεν/ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς (λέγων). The three times lead up to the fulfilment citation in v 35. The same device is used in the three parables following the interpretation of the parable of the tares (the parables of the treasure, of the pearl and of the dragnet) ὁμοία ἐστιν, ... πάλιν ὁμοία ἐστιν, ... πάλιν ὁμοία ἐστιν. The double set of double parables likewise correspond to each other in theme, and concern the greatness or the hiddenness of the Kingdom.[110] The structure which apparently frames the interpretation of the tares is therefore chiastic:[111]

a) parable of separation (tares vv 24-30)
b)greatness/hiddenness of the kingdom (vv 31-32)
c)greatness of the kingdom (vv 33-34)[112]
d) fulfilment citation and interpretation (vv 35-43)
c')greatness of the kingdom (vv 44)
b')greatness of the kingdom (vv 45-46)
a') parable of separation (vv 47-50)

---

[109] Many attempts have been made at structuring the chapter. For a review see Michael Krämer, *Die Gleichnisreden in den Synoptischen Evangelien* (1993), 33-44. The two fulfilment citations and the interpretation of the three parables in question make the Structure complicated. George M. Soares-Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 32 fn. 180, shows a chiastic beginning and end structure of vv 1-3 and 34-36; and hence, seeing the entering into the house forms the beginning of the second part of the chapter (v. 36). Cf. Gerhardsson, "Seven Parables". Krämer, *Gleichnisrede*, 44-48, holds the evidence of different possible structures to point to the growth of the chapter in Matthew from a concern with the obduracy of Israel to a concern and polemic against antinomians.

[110] Also here there is development in the approach to the theme, as in the three interpreted parables in the chapter. The first double parable (b,c) is concerned with the nature of the Kingdom: it is small but becomes great; whereas the second double parable (b',c') is concerned with the human response in finding the hidden kingdom.

[111] B.B. Scott, *Hear Then the Parable* (1989), 347 similarly sees a relationship between the three parables and the structure of the chapter, understanding the sower, the tares and the dragnet to be "organising parables" dealing with the theme of separation.

[112] Thus the form ἄλλην παραβολὴν has no other function than to introduce "another parable". A. Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 127, holds the formulation to be a sign of the unity of the three parables in Mt 13:24-34, dealing with the fate of the word of the Basileia. Although on a general level, the parables can be said to have the Basileia theme in common, they do not stand out as a thematic unit over against the other parables in the chapter, nor is there an inner unity between the parable of the tares and the following two parables beyond that the of the Basileia. They illustrate different points. It is incorrect therefore to ascribe a meaning to the introduction beyond a mere narrative device of connecting related material.

The different parables as they appear in Matthew 13 share with Is 60 a number of similar images. The gathering of the riches of the sea (Is 60:5) has already been pointed to as an image similar to that of the parable of the dragnet. Further, in Isaiah 60:1-2 Jerusalem is said to shine because the light of the Lord has come upon her. Similarly, the righteous are said to shine in the kingdom of their father in Mt 13:43. The parable of the leaven and the parable of the mustard seed in the Matthean version contrast the initial smallness of both with their subsequent greatness. Likewise Is 60:22, speaks of the least becoming great. Is 60:21 speaks of the people of God as being righteous and the shoot of God's planting. The interpretation of the parable of the tares speaks of the righteous, and the central imagery of the parables in the first part of the chapter is the growing of the seed. Apart from the similarity in images there is neither overlapping vocabulary nor use of language which suggests or gives evidence of a conscious allusion to Is 60.

If the eschatological hope of the pilgrimage of the nations to Israel in Is 60 underlies Matthew 13, the Matthean parables chapter has become an interpretation of Jesus tradition in light of Scripture. The inclusion of the gentiles into the people of God continues the emphasis of the ὁ ἐρχόμενος Christology expressed in Mt 11 and 12. The coming one as the hope of the nations (Gen 49:10LXX and Is 42:4LXX) has been actualised and belongs to the present. The coming separation includes all different kinds of nations, but only the righteous make up the real people of God. Their righteousness will be visible in their actions.

Matthew has in the parables of the tares and the dragnet created new tradition from the existing synoptic sources. In the process, the imagery of John's announcement in Mt 3 (Q) has been normative in the rereading of traditional parables. This tradition has already been placed in the context of Scripture. Matthew therefore, preserves both Scripture and Jesus tradition as normative in the two parables. On the one hand the sources function normatively in deciding content and form of the Matthean creation. On the other hand they function normatively in continuing the prophetic proclamation of the expectation of God's salvation, and in continuing the critique of present piety. The sentence which concludes the interpretation of the parable of the tares, "Whoever has ears, hear", makes this clear.

4.2.3. Conclusion

In the adaptation of and composition of material in Mt 11-13, Matthew continues the Christological theme which initiated the section through the Q pericope in Mt 11:2-6. Jesus is seen as the promised coming one both on the level of Scripture, as well as on the level of contemporary prophecy (John the Baptist). The Matthean redaction of Jesus tradition can be seen to continue both scriptural themes, as well as themes initiated by the Jesus tradition itself. Thereby Matthew uses Jesus tradition to interpret and develop Jesus tradition. This is done on two levels: on the level of language and vocabulary, as well as on the level of theological concepts.

Thus, the Jesus tradition, which Matthew emphasises in the redactional activity, the Baptist's speech with vision of judgement and emphasis on action as a criterion for its fulfilment, and the Christological statement from the Baptism of Jesus with the voice from heaven, can be said to form an authoritative frame of reference by which the subsequent tradition is measured and interpreted. The language of the tradition itself functions as authoritative in the formulation of interpretative additions to the tradition. The imitation of the language of the written Jesus tradition is similar to Matthew's imitation or reuse of Biblical language in the gospel narrative.[113] In Matthew, therefore, redactional activity can be found to imitate scriptural language, as well as the language of Mark and Q. In both cases, Matthew imitates the language of tradition. The result is not simply continuity on the literary level, but also that the language in itself authorises the new, specifically Matthean additions to the material.

Matthew appeals to the kerygmatic and prophetic-critical aspects of the synoptic sources in the development of the Christological theme in Matthew 11-13. In the Beelzeboul controversy as well as in the parables the proclamation of the presence of the kingdom of heaven in Jesus' ministry is central, as well as the proclamation of future salvation for the righteous. Although Matthew alters his sources, the aspects of salvation and of exhortation found in the sources are continued and emphasised. Hence, the synoptic sources can be said to be authoritative for Matthew in the rhetorical function of the development of the narrative theology of the gospel. They also function authoritatively in the pragmatic sense, providing guidelines for how to remain within the elect people of God: by avoiding unlawfulness and "bearing fruit". It is only in the extension of Scripture, however, that Matthew's sources may be said to have constitutive function, telling the story of the "election" of the people of God. The opening up of the boundaries of the righteous to include people of "all kinds", not only includes the gentiles, but also the tax collectors and sinners.

4.3. The ὁ ἐρχόμενος Theme in Mt 11-13 and the Normativity of Tradition

In the analysis of the ὁ ἐρχόμενος theme in Matthew 11-13 it has been shown that in the adaptation of sources to the Matthean narrative, Matthew employs Scripture and synoptic sources in much the same way.

First, it was demonstrated that in the same way as scriptural citations were used to interpret passages from Scripture, it was found that passages of synoptic traditions was used to interpret passages of tradition. In the case of Scripture this took the form of either forming new citations of several biblical passages, as in Mt 12:17-21, or in the connecting of several passages into one family of scriptural citations concerning ὁ

---

[113] Cf. Luz, *Evangelium* vol 1, 32. The same tendency is evident in the Qumran writings. Cf. Michael Fishbane, "Use", 356-57.

ἐρχόμενος. In the case of the synoptic sources, it took the form of harmonising different passages with similar themes, or in reading one tradition in light of another, thereby changing the focus of the first passage.

Second, it has been shown that Scripture and tradition were normative for Matthew in providing a *language of revelation.* In the imitation of Scripture, language, image and forms of Scripture have been adapted by the Matthean redactor in the creation of the narrative. Likewise, in the creation of the Beelzeboul controversy and the parable of the tares, Matthew utilised the language and form of the sources in a tradition-imitating sense, forming new tradition.

Third, Scripture and tradition were found to be authoritative in that it expresses the hope for future salvation and provides paradigmatic imagery for that event. Here, however, Jesus tradition functions authoritatively in extension of Scripture, being in itself an actualisation and interpretation of Scripture.

Fourth, Scripture and tradition are both normative in their prophetic predictive capacity. Again Jesus tradition functions in extension of Scripture, so that it is only in conformity to Scripture that Jesus tradition can speak with authority of the future of ὁ ἐρχόμενος.

There are however also major differences in the understanding of the traditions as normative. While in the context of the ὁ ἐρχόμενος motif complex the scriptural passages are mainly kerygmatic, and the Christological concern of Jesus tradition continues this proclamation, the Jesus tradition alone includes material which gives it a practical normativity. Through the emphasis on righteousness, on understanding, and on bearing fruit, the Jesus tradition in the material that was analysed provided a code by which belonging to the chosen community is measured. The code is nevertheless only to be understood as an intra-mural critique, a self assessment, rather than the means by which groups are excluded or included. Moreover, this normative teaching can only take place in Jesus tradition as a continuity of scriptural tradition. The critique is therefore patterned on prophetic critique of the past. It is clear therefore, that in the material analysed under the ὁ ἐρχόμενος motif complex, continuity with Scripture is fundamental. Scripture still remains the place in which the story of election is narrated.

CHAPTER 5.

THE πλεῖον/μείζον MOTIF IN MATTHEW 11-13

The analysis of the use and normativity of sources in the development of the ὁ ἐρχόμενος Christology in Matthew 11-13 revealed that Matthew employs the same techniques in the interpretation of both Scripture and synoptic tradition. The Christological or messianic content of the ἐρχόμενος complex was drawn from Scripture, placing the words and deeds of Jesus in light of messianic expectations of mainly prophetic literature. Thus both Jesus tradition and Scripture functioned normatively in their kerygmatic capacity: proclaiming God's will for the salvation of God's people. It was also demonstrated that whereas Scripture remained normative in its function as proclamation and as a critical voice, Jesus tradition added to these two functions the practical norms for living in accordance with the will of God. This normative capacity, however, could only be assumed on the basis of the correspondence of the synoptic tradition with the kerygmatic aspects of Scripture.

In this section, another Christological theme which is central to Matthew 11-13 will be analysed. Again it becomes apparent that Scripture remains normative mainly in its prophetic function of proclamation and critique of existing piety. It also provides the paradigm for the appearance of the Christ. Synoptic tradition again becomes normative in providing an ethical standard for the people of God. Also here, however, this takes place in extension of, and agreement with, Scripture. Moreover, the figure of Jesus, as presented in the Jesus tradition, becomes a new paradigm for the expectation of the messianic age. Also this is in extension of Scripture, as interpreted by Matthew.

The second theological aspect which Matthew takes over from Q and develops in chs 11-13 can be named the "more-than" theme, a term adopted from R. Kieffer.[1] Kieffer points to the Christological significance of the Q material which defines the present reality of Jesus' preaching in the comparative as πλεῖον (Q 11:16, 29-32//Mt 12:38-42). In Q, the point of comparison is between the present reality of Jesus' ministry and the past prophetic message of Jonah or the wisdom of Solomon. The main issue of the pericope, however, is the failure of ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη to respond adequately to that reality. By placing the Q material in the context of Mt 11-13 which is introduced in John's question "are you the one who is to come," Matthew relates it to the ὁ ἐρχόμενος complex, and simultaneously expands and develops the Christological emphasis of the sources. This is done in relating the person and ministry of Jesus to passages of Scripture. In the extension of the scriptural use in defining the reality which Jesus embodies as πλεῖον, Matthew also uses the greater than/more than language of Q to

[1] René Kieffer, "Mer än Kristologin hos Synoptikerna" (1979).

define small as great in the kingdom of God. Here Jesus becomes the paradigm for the nature of the kingdom.

The πλεῖον Christology in Matthew is to be understood from the post-Easter perspective in which Matthew was written, in light of the exaltation of the risen Christ and the expectation of the second coming. As in the ὁ ἐρχόμενος-complex, the already but not yet of Christology is the underlying theme. The more than/greater than Christology emphasises the proleptic presence of the age to come in Jesus' ministry. It also moves beyond that, however, to express the extent and significance of the kingdom as it is present in Jesus.

This chapter will demonstrate the use and normativity of Scripture and Jesus tradition in two successive parts. First the authoritative function of Scripture in defining Matthew's greater than-Christology will be analysed (5.1.), and second, Matthew's interpretation of the πλεῖον/μείζον motif of the synoptic sources (5.2.) will be presented.

5.1. THE AUTHORITATIVE USE OF SCRIPTURE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE πλεῖον/μείζον MOTIF

Matthew 11-12 depicts Jesus as more than Elijah, and more than the Temple. In inaugurating the kingdom of heaven, Jesus is described in terms similar to that of God's Wisdom as God's presence in the world. One can say that the passages continue the Immanuel Christology of Mt 1:23. Matthew appeals to the predictive, kerygmatic and law-upholding aspects of prophecy to describe Jesus as the presence of God. Thereby these aspects of the passages in question are considered normative. Scripture is normative in providing the imagery which Matthew uses to express the significance and extent of Jesus' ministry. It is also authoritative in providing the ethical norm for the followers of Jesus.

Due to the nature of the theme as a comparative Christology, the passages which relate to it mostly include allusions or references to Scripture or persons in Scripture (Jonah and Solomon in Mt 12:38-42). Not all of these allusions can be dealt with in the present context. Because the "sign of Jonah" passage has received different emphasis through the Matthean addition of Jonah 2:1, the passage will be analysed below under the theme of obduracy, revelation and concealment (Ch 6). In the present analysis three Matthean expansions of the πλεῖον/μείζον motif will be the subject of interest. First, Matthew's adaptation of Q in Mt 11:10. Second, the use of special Matthean material in Mt 11:28-30 with allusions to texts from Jeremiah and Isaiah, which, third, must be read in connection with the Markan material 12:1-14 and the quotation of Hos 6:6 in 12:7. In all instances, Matthew's citations and allusions also make use of the scriptural context from which the citations are drawn.

5.1.1. More than Elijah, the Eschatological Prophet - Mt 11:10, 14

In Matthew 11, Matthew not only preserves Q tradition in reproducing a mixed citation from Mal 3:1 and Ex 23:20, but also clarifies the meaning of the citation by explicitly making a reference to Elijah in Mt 11:14, thereby alluding to Mal 3:24. The citation refers to the ministry and person of John the Baptist, in relation to the Kingdom of God. The saying is nevertheless one of Christological significance because it indirectly speaks of the identity of Jesus. Matthew here appeals to the predictive and typological aspects of Scripture, in describing the role of John and Jesus respectively. Hence, Scripture is authoritative in providing a norm by which to recognise the signs of the coming of the kingdom. It is also authoritative in providing the "type" of the eschatological prophet, through which the ministry of John receives its significance. Although Matthew's use of the citation from Mal 3:1 is completely dependent on Q, the theological argument of Matthew shows an independent and conscious adaptation of the passage. This will be demonstrated by examining the form of the citation in Q and Q's use of the passage, Matthean redaction of Q, and Matthew's theological argument in subsequent steps.

The Textform of Mal 3:1//Ex 23:20 in Q 7:27 and Q's use of the Citation

The source of Matthew 11:10 is Q. The citation combines Malachi 3:1 with Ex 23:20. The majority of the citation stems from Mal 3:1, while the use of the second person singular, and the phrase πρὸ προσώπου σου, inserted after τὸν ἄγγελόν μου, is from Ex 23:20.

Q 7:27
οὗτός ἐστιν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται, Ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου.

Ex 23:20	Ex 23:20
הִנֵּה אָנֹכִי שֹׁלֵחַ מַלְאָךְ לְפָנֶיךָ לִשְׁמָרְךָ בַּדָּרֶךְ וְלַהֲבִיאֲךָ אֶל־הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר הֲכִנֹתִי:	καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου ἵνα φυλάξῃ σε ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ὅπως εἰσαγάγῃ σε εἰς τὴν γῆν ἣν ἡτοίμασά σοι
Mal 3:1	**Mal 3:1**
הִנְנִי שֹׁלֵחַ מַלְאָכִי וּפִנָּה־דֶרֶךְ לְפָנָי וּפִתְאֹם יָבוֹא אֶל־הֵיכָלוֹ הָאָדוֹן אֲשֶׁר־אַתֶּם הַבְּרִית מְבַקְשִׁים וּמַלְאַךְ אֲשֶׁר־אַתֶּם חֲפֵצִים הִנֵּה־בָא אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת:	ἰδοὺ [ἐγὼ][2] ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου καὶ ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου καὶ ἐξαίφνης ἥξει εἰς τὸν ναὸν ἑαυτοῦ κύριος ὃν ὑμεῖς ζητεῖτε καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος τῆς διαθήκης ὃν ὑμεῖς θέλετε ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ

Two aspects of the Malachi quotation speak for its great age in the context of the Jesus tradition.[3] First, the rendering of Mal 3 is in non-Septuagintal Greek.[4] Second, the

[2] Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus et al. add ἐγώ here, perhaps influenced by Ex 23:20.

[3] August Strobel, *Untersuchungen*, 271, on the basis of the possibility that John consciously placed himself in the Elijah tradition, and James B. DeYoung, "The Function of Mal 3:1 in Matthew 11:10" (1994), 66, on the basis of the unusual introductory formula, hold the quotation to be a genuine saying of

quotation has a parallel in Mark 1:2 where it occurs in combination with Is 40:3 in the context of John the Baptist's ministry.[5]

The citation in Q is not dependent on any known Greek translation of the passage. It agrees with Symmachus (ἀποσκευάζω) and Theodotion (ἑτοιμάζω) in translating the piel of פנה, whereas the Septuagint translates the verb as if it were qal. The text also translates the second לְפָנֶיךָ of the citation (missing in Mark) as ἔμπροσθέν σου independently from the Septuagint. The construction is adapted from Malachi but the second person singular is introduced in correspondence with the previous insertion from Ex 23:20.

The incentive to the association of the passage with Ex 23:20 in Q and with Is 40:3 in Mark may have been given by the allusive nature of the Malachi text itself.[6] The quotation probably circulated independently as an interpretation of the significance of John's ministry, and added to the present Q context as an explication of Q 7:27.[7]

Q 7:23-35 is a continuation of the question of John the Baptist concerning Jesus in Q 7:18-22. Jesus, in addressing the crowds, explains the significance of John the Baptist so as further to give evidence that he in fact is the coming one. The witness concerning John includes several significant comparatives: John is greater (περισσότερον) than a prophet (Q 7:26//Mt 11:9), and no human is more (μείζων) than him, yet who is smaller (μικρότερος) in the Kingdom of heaven is greater (μείζων) than John (Q 7:28//Mt 11:11).[8] It is in the context of the first of these comparatives that Q includes the mixed quotation drawing on Mal 3:1 and Ex 23:20. It is preceded by a fulfilment sentence unlike any other in the synoptics, applying the prophecy to John.

The significance of the identification of John with Elijah in Q has been debated. The parable of the children in the marketplace (vv 31-34) which concludes Jesus' speech concerning John in Q 7, gives an impression of Jesus and John as two parallel prophets whose ministries as children of God's Wisdom complement each other. In the parable, John's asceticism and Jesus' association with sinners and taxcollectors may be perceived as prophetic acts illustrating the need for repentance and God's eschatological feast.

Jesus. Cf. also Joachim Jeremias, Ηλιας, (1964) 936-937; Dieter Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 27; Siegfried Schulz, *Q*, 233. Assuming that the Markan usage of the passage at the beginning of the gospel is not a later adaptation of the Q tradition, this is, however, unlikely. Here, the quotation occurs in the voice of the narrator, with a similar introductory formula.

[4] Cf. Krister Stendahl, *School*, 51; Ernst Lohmeyer, *Markus*, 11 n3.

[5] Mark 1:2: Καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ, Ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου:

[6] Cf. David L. Petersen, *Zechariah 9-14 and Malachi* (1995), 209-210.

[7] Cf. François Bovon, *Lukas*, vol 1, 371; Michael Tilly, *Johannes der Täufer und die Biographie der Propheten* (1994), 89.

[8] The latter comparison will be discussed further below, pt. 5.2. in the analysis of Matthew's employment of the synoptic sources material.

Some scholars have postulated a history of tradition as the background for Q 7: 24-28, where Q 7:31-35 preserves pre-Christian material in which John and Jesus were seen as equal carriers of salvation, envoys of wisdom, not unlike the double messiah expectations of Qumran literature.[9] Q 7:24-28 would then subsequently have been added in as a result of adapting tradition to Christian faith, designating John as the forerunner of Jesus.[10] The text of Mal 3:1 is ambiguous, and allows for an interpretation where the messenger of Mal 3:1a is a forerunner of the messenger of the covenant in Mal 3:1b.[11] At the beginning of Q, Is 40:3 is cited with reference to John's ministry. The citation was associated with the coming of the day of the Lord, and no specific messianic expectation was attached to it. Apparently then, Mal 3:1 is here cited to identify John with an eschatological prophet, "preparing the way of the Lord". Q does not explicitly identify John with Elijah, but in light of the earlier use of Is 40:3, this may be inferred in the citation of Mal 3:1. In that case, the identification of Jesus with the Lord or the day of the Lord is already implicit in the Q text. In Matthew's redaction of Q, this identification is made explicit through identifying John with Elijah.

Matthew's Redaction and Adaptation of Mal 3:1(Ex 23:20)

Matthew's redaction of Q in connection with the citation of Mal 3:1 reflects a conscious interpretation of the Q passage in light of Scripture. Matthew achieves this by adding ἐγώ in the first clause of the citation (Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου), thereby strengthening the parallel to Ex 23:20.[12] In contrast to Mal 3:1, Ex 23:20 includes the personal pronoun before the verb (הִנֵּה אָנֹכִי שֹׁלֵחַ מַלְאָךְ). Further the allusion to Elijah is made explicit in Mt 11:14, where Matthew clearly identifies John with Elijah. In the context, it is clear that Matthew is familiar with the interpretation of Mal 3:1 found in Mal 3:22-23(4:5) (ιδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ὑμῖν Ηλιαν). When Matthew identifies the messenger with Elijah as the eschatological prophet, he echoes the expectation uttered in Mark 9:11.[13] Also in Mark there is no mention of Elijah as the forerunner of the Messiah, only as a prerequisite for the resurrection. It can be said therefore, that

---

[9] Cf. Otto Böcher, "Johannes der Täufer" TRE 17 (1988), 178.

[10] Cf. Gösta Lindeskog, "Johannes der Täufer" (1993), 56

[11] Cf. Petersen, *Zechariah 9-14 and Malachi*, 209.

[12] So also Bovon, *Lukas*, vol 1, 371. Cf. Donald A Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 305, and Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol. 2, 249.

[13] Mark 9:11 (καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες," Οτι λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς ὅτι' Ηλίαν δεῖ ἐλθεῖν πρῶτον) The μέλλων is in Matthew analogous to δεῖ as it is used in Mark. Cf. Wolfgang Schenk, *Sprache*, 166-167. Although there is no explicit citation in Mark, Alfred Suhl, *Die Funktion Alttestamentlicher Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium* (1965), 44, 133ff, holds that there is an allusion here to Mal 3:23. So also M. D. Goulder, "Midrash", 356; Walter Wink, *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition* (1966), 15-17 and Alexander Sand, *Evangelium* 244. Differently J.L. Wentling, "A Comparison of the Elijah Motifs in the Gospel of Matthew and Mark" (1982). In Q, this identification has not been made explicitly. It is possible that Q may have reserved the role of Elijah for Jesus as suggested by Bovon, *Lukas*, vol. 1, 377, depending on how Mal 3:1 and 3:24 was understood at the time. It is more likely however, that Matthew here only makes explicit what is implicit in Q.

Matthew expands the usage of the quotation found in Q by introducing an allusion to Mal 3:22-23 (4:3). The redactional addition of Matthew indicates that the combination of the two passages in question may be of specific importance to the evangelist. In Matthew's interpretation, John's function in filling the role of the eschatological prophet Elijah, is to prepare the people for the coming of the Lord.

The combination of the Ex 23:20 and Mal 3:1 is found also in rabbinic tradition.[14] The lectionary of the synagogue, with Mal 3:1 as the *haftarah* to Ex 23:20, has been suggested as the source of the mixed citation in the synoptic tradition.[15] The Exodus passage has nevertheless been given little importance in the analysis of the use of the combined quotation in the gospel tradition. Since Malachi expects the coming of a messenger before the great and terrible day of the Lord,[16] the main purpose of the combination, it has been argued, was to introduce a third person, the messiah, into the quotation. The combination of the passages provides for the change in the personal pronoun from first to second person singular. Accordingly it is thought the main concern of the introduction of the Malachi passage and the mention of Elijah in the gospel tradition, is to bring scriptural evidence for John the Baptist as a forerunner of the Messiah, the addressee of the text being the Messiah.[17] The change in the personal pronoun results in a reinterpretation of the Malachi passage, and the messenger becomes the forerunner of Christ rather than of God.[18] This reinterpretation may correspond to contemporaneous Jewish expectations that Elijah would return before the coming of the messiah, and the main concern of the scholarly treatment of the passage has been to identify and emphasise the figure of Elijah in Jewish tradition's eschatological expectations.[19] The particular content of these expectations beyond that of John as Elijah

---

[14] Midrash Rabbah Exodus 32:9 (ExR) Cf. P. Billerbeck and Hermann L. Strack, *Kommentar* (1922), 597; Ulrich Luz, *Evangelium*, vol 2, 176.

[15] Stendahl, *School*, 50, with reference to J. Mann, *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue*, (1940) 44.

[16] Although Mal 3:23 is probably a later addition to the book, the interpretation of Mal 3:1 indicates that the messenger is one who prepares the way for God. Cf. Petersen, *Zechariah 9-14 and Malachi*, 209-210; Horst Seebaß, "Elia" TRE 9 (1982), 501; Günther Baumbach, "Messias, Messianische Bewegungen" (1992), 631-632.

[17] So Gerd Häfner, *Vorläufer*, 224.

[18] So e.g. Goulder, "Midrash", 355; Davies, and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, 250; Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 305; Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew*, 208; Christopher M. Tuckett, *Q*, 133, et al.

[19] Although the expectation of Elijah as a forerunner of the messiah exists, this notion appears late in Jewish apocalyptic midrashim (3rd century CE), and the eschatological role of Elijah as a precursor is not unified. Elijah was perhaps even more commonly expected as eschatological restorer, high-priest, and even messiah. Cf. Paul Billerbeck and Hermann L. Strack, "Prophet Elias" (1965), and Nico Oswald, "Elia", TRE 9 (1982) 503. A previous consensus that the gospels here draw on widespread traditional expectations (cf. Jeremias, Ηλιας, 936; Suhl, *Funktion*, 134ff), understood to be documented by Mark 9:11 (cf. Dale C. Allison, "Elijah must come first", 1984, 256-258) has been replaced by a recognition that if the gospels are drawing on such a tradition, the evidence for its existence at the time of their writing is "meagre." Cf. Davies, and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol 2, 714; Morris M. Faierstein, "Why do the Scribes say that Elijah must come first" (1981), 86, and Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "More about Elijah coming first" 1985, 295-6. J.A.T. Robinson, "Elijah" 269-71, followed by John H. Hughes, "John

being the messianic precursor, have seldom been the focus of research. Therefore, the significance of Matthew's redactional addition of ἐγώ and the allusion to Mal 3:23 in Mat 11:14 have not fully been appreciated.[20]

The combination of Ex 23:20 and Mal 3:1 has evidently occurred because of the similarity between the respective introductory phrases. Yet, the contexts, including the actual task of the two divine messengers, differ to such a degree that to conclude that the reading together of the two passages should serve simply to provide for a change in the personal pronoun in the Malachi passage does not seem to account adequately for this particular association of themes.[21] Moreover, understanding the second person singular as addressing Jesus, in the context of a speech by Jesus addressed to the crowds, assumes an awkward and unnatural use of the language. Even the reference to both Ex 23:20 and Mal 3:1 in Midrash Rabbah Exodus 32:9 does not account for the mixed wording in the gospel tradition. First, there can be no mention of literal dependence between Q and ExR 32.[22] Second, although the latter does correlate the two passages, they are not merged.[23] A parallel may indeed be drawn from the much quoted rabbinic passage, but one based in Matthew's own allusion to Mal 3:23, a text where the eschatological Elijah is depicted as figure of restoration. In the context of Matthew 11, this allusion is indicative of Matthew's interpretation and use of the Q quotation. In the citation, the actual identity of the one coming (God or Messiah) is not the real issue. The two may be said to be identical to Matthew, since in the work of the messiah, God is present. For Matthew, it is the *function* of John as Elijah which is important.

More than simply designating John as an eschatological messenger or herald of the messiah, Matthew 11:14 functions to develop the content of the Elijah prophecy in terms of an eschatological figure with a ministry which is described in contrast to the ministry of Jesus. This expansion of the application of the prophetic expectation explains

---

the Baptist" (1972) 193n2, 212, prefers to understand the expectation of Elijah as messianic, and the assigned role as a "precursor" a Christian development of the tradition. There is no doubt however, that the passage in Malachi to which Matthew refers in 11:14 identifies Elijah as an eschatological figure, whose coming and purpose as a restorer is reproduced also in Sirach 48.

[20] Davies, and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol 2, 249, are an exception as they identify a typology here. Entering the promised land is a *typos* of entering the Kingdom. They do not, however, adequately explain the link between this type and the identification of John as Elijah.

[21] A fact which leads Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 305 to assume the adaptation to Ex 23:20 in Mt 11:10 to be a later development: "The first line of the quotation is found verbatim in Ex 23:20, but its context, ...does not permit the present application of the words." Gundry, *Matthew* (comment to 11:10) solves the apparent clash by understanding Ex 23:20 as the clue to the reinterpretation of the Malachi passage: Israel of Ex 23:20 is a type for Jesus, the messiah, so that Mal 3:1 and Ex 23.20 become "synonymous." This interpretation is convincing, but does not consider the crowds which Jesus addresses in the second person.

[22] As with other rabbinic literature, the parallel between Matthew and Midrash Rabbah can show similarity of thought, but not provide evidence for a pre-Christian combination of passages. Cf. Häfner, *Vorläufer*, 225 fn. 2.

[23] Cf. Wilhelm Michaelis, ὁδός (1967), 70 n96.

the mixture of passages in Mat 11:10. In Mal 3:23 the ministry of Elijah, the forerunner of the day of Yahweh, is to turn the hearts of the sons to their fathers.[24] To prepare the way of Yahweh includes preparing the way of the people by calling them to repentance (cf. also Mal 3:7). This understanding of the passage corresponds with the occurrence of the passage in combination with Is 40:3 in Mark. Also here, preparing the way of the Lord, involves preparing the way of the people.[25] Hence, the allusion to Mal 3:23 in itself allows for a change in the personal pronoun of Mal 3:1. Jesus' speech is directed to the crowd, asking them why they went out into the desert if not to find a prophet, or even something more. The quotation recalls God's sending of a messenger who guided through the desert, as well as the promise of another messenger who will prepare for the coming of God. The eschatological messenger receives a role similar to, though not equivalent to the messenger of Ex 23. The previously referred to ExR 32 understands the role of God's messengers in a similar way. Referring to Gen 24:7, Ex 23:20, and Mal 3:1, the task of divine messengers from the age of Abraham to the time of the coming of the Lord is described to be one of leading and sustaining, and the bringing salvation.

The σού in the present context in Matthew's application of the passage, is therefore not a reference to Jesus, as opposed to the μοῦ of Yahweh, but refers to God's people represented by the crowd who listen to Jesus.[26] The ministry of the Baptist as the eschatological prophet Elijah involves a ministry to the people. The main concern of Matthew 11 is to show the relationship between the ministries of John and Jesus. In this context, the Malachi passage, like the parable of the children in the market place, and Matthew 3, describe the different natures of John and Jesus in order to point to Jesus as the expected messiah. The nature of the ministry of John as one of calling the people to reconciliation and repentance is a contrast to the ministry of Jesus which in the previous chapter has been described with words reminiscent of Micah 7:6:

> ἦλθον γὰρ διχάσαι ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ θυγατέρα κατὰ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς καὶ νύμφην κατὰ τῆς πενθερᾶς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐχθροὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οἱ οἰκιακοὶ αὐτοῦ. (Mt 10:35-36)

In chapter 10 Jesus' coming is said to divide a man against his father, a daughter against her mother. Micah 7:6 reflects Jewish expectations of conflict and strife as events

---

[24] Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ὑμῖν Ηλιαν τὸν Θεσβίτην πρὶν ἐλθεῖν ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ ὃς ἀποκαταστήσει καρδίαν πατρὸς πρὸς υἱὸν καὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ. Mal 3:22-23

[25] Is 40:3, Mal 3:1, Is 57:14 and 62:10 are the only occurrences of פנה דרך in the Hebrew Bible. The last two involve the preparation of the way of the people. These may be of significance for the interpretation of Mat 11:10, since they indicate that a preparation of the way of the people, removing obstacles from their entry into Jerusalem, does indeed have relation to preparing the way of the Lord.

[26] ὁ λαός. Cf. Lohmeyer, *Markus*, 11, who also understands the second person singular in the mixed quotation in Mark as referring to the people. His comments concern Mk 1:2, but are valid also with regard to the Matthean usage of the passage.

which mark the end of the age, the time before eschatological deliverance.[27] It stands here in continuation with the imagery of salvation and judgement as expressed in John's announcement of the coming one in Mt 3:11. In Matthew this division takes place in the understanding of the presence of the kingdom in Jesus' ministry and in the doing of the will of the father (Mt 12:46-50). In contrast, John the Baptist is identified as Elijah *redivivus* whose coming was connected with a ministry of reconciliation, returning the hearts of the sons to their fathers. Reconciliation here is similar in function to turning to God, in that those who turn are spared judgement.[28]

The identification of John with Elijah, serves to describe John's role in opposition, as fundamentally different in nature to that of Jesus. In a quite different way, this contrasting nature of the ministries of Jesus and John is expressed in the parable of the children in the market place, which follows Mt 11:7-15. In Mt 11:16-19 John's fasting is portrayed over against Jesus' gluttony. John's not eating and not drinking symbolises repentance, while Jesus' non-fasting points to the reality of the kingdom of God present in the ministry of Jesus. Drawing on the text of Micah and Malachi, the day of the Lord for which the messenger prepares is in Matthew depicted as a time of wrath and judgement, as much as it is a day of healing and restoration.[29] Consequently, the revelation of John's identity with its implication for understanding the identity of Jesus is followed by a prophetic warning: "Let the one who has ears hear!"

The two passages in Matthew 11:10 and 11:14 introduce scriptural tradition in order to point out the significance of John in relation to the ministry of Jesus and the βασιλεία. John can not be understood except in relation to Jesus and the kingdom come.[30] Adapting the text of Q Matthew displays Elijah *redivivus* in the role of the eschatological restoration figure as a type for John. In this way John is more than a prophet, περισσότερον προφήτου, one who guides the people of God to the place which God has prepared for them. But simultaneously, identifying John as Elijah implicitly relates Jesus' identity to the coming of the day of the Lord. Already in Mt 11:5, the presence of Jesus is identified with the presence of the Kingdom of God. The "more than" theme, which comes to expression in Matthew's employment of Ex 23:20 and Mal 3:1 in describing John the Baptist, is thereby a continuation of the ἐρχόμενος- theme.

---

[27] Cf. P. Grelot., "Michée 7.6" (1986) . See also Davies, and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol 2, 219-220 and Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 292.

[28] Petersen, *Zechariah 9-14 and Malachi*, 231-234, sees in Malachi 3:22-23 a social political expectation of the prophet, that the covenant people will not remain divided against itself or its ancestors, but rather remain in unity as the covenant community.

[29] Cf. Billerbeck, et al., *Kommentar*, 586.

[30] In Matthew, therefore, John the Baptist and Jesus are both eschatological figures: Their messages coincide (compare Mt 3:10 with 12:34; 23:33 and 7:19), they share the same fate, and their adversaries are the same. Cf. Wolfgang Trilling, "Die Täufertradition bei Matthäus" (1959), 283; Sand, *Evangelium*, 244

To summarise: Matthew's redaction of Q consists of two steps. First, Matthew relates the mixed citation closer to Ex 23:20. Second, Matthew alludes to Mal 3:23 through the identification of John with Elijah. This shows that Matthew interprets Q in light of Scripture and has an independent understanding of the passages in question. Hence Matthew's redaction of Q is simultaneously an adaptation of Scripture. In this adaptation, Matthew interprets John the Baptist and his ministry in terms of Biblical concepts. In correspondence with Ex 23:20 John is one who leads the people of God. In calling to repentance, he fills the function of a divine messenger. Further, with respect to Mal 3:1, 23, this John is the eschatological prophet, Elijah, who reconciles the people with each other before the arrival of the day of the Lord. Here it does not matter whether John fulfils those explicit actions. More important is that John's message and baptism serve the same purpose as the expected ministry of Elijah: to reconcile people to God. Implicit in the statement of v 14, but already stated in the previous pericope, Jesus is the one who brings in the Kingdom of God. Hence Mt 11:7-15 is a continuation of Mt 11:2-6. The word of warning in Mt 11:15: "Let him who has ears hear", is parallel in function to Mt 11:6: "Happy the one who does not take offence at me."

Conclusion: Scripture as Normative in Mt 11:10, 14

The application of Mal 3:1,23 and Ex 23:20 in Matthew 11 may be called typological exegesis.[31] John fulfils two "types". He is the prophet leading people in the wilderness, and he is the eschatological prophet, preparing people for the coming of the Lord. In the latter case, it is not Elijah the prophet as he is described in first or second Kings that John corresponds to. Neither is John expected to have the specific characteristics of Elijah displayed there.[32] His special prophetic abilities, but particularly his ascent to heaven (2 Kings 2:16-18) nevertheless form the background for the expectation expressed in Mal 3:23. In Jewish literature Elijah used as a figure filling a number of different eschatological functions.[33] John is not understood as filling all these expectations. Rather, as expressed in Mal 3:1 and 3:23 John is the messenger who before the coming of God, prepares the way of the people back to God, by calling for repentance and reconciliation. Jesus, as the one who has come after John, and who is stronger than John (ισχυρότερος Mt 3:11), is by implication the one who receives the right to judge. This judgement, in the *Sitz im Leben* of Matthew, is a future event in the hands of ὁ ἐρχόμενος.

In the Elijah typology in Mt 11:10, 14, there is no notion of John superseding the type. "Elijah" in Malachi simply gives a name to a divine messenger envisioned by the

---

[31] Cf. Michael Knowles, *Jeremiah*, 230-233. Knowles, however, fails to recognise the significance of the Elijah expectation as it relates to John and his ministry.

[32] Although, on a historical note, John's clothing and diet, may have led to an early identification of him with Elijah the prophet. Cf. Baumbach, "Messias", 632; Böcher, "Johannes", 172.

[33] Cf. Billerbeck, et al., "Prophet Elias".

prophet.[34] John is simply placed in the role of this divine messenger who is to come before the day of YHWH.[35] The combination of Mal 3:1 with Ex 23:20 brings in a second typology. The messenger who goes before the people in the wilderness, shows the way and leads to the promised land. John's call to repentance therefore, includes a notion of hope. This is also the case in the last chapter of Malachi. God promises destruction to the faithless, but salvation to those who return to God.

In Mt 11:10,14, Scripture is found to function authoritatively in three ways. It is normative in its predictive prophetic function: it foretells the events of the last days. Further, it is normative in its paradigmatic function. The pattern of the past is repeated in the present. Finally, it is authoritative in containing the norm for living as the people of God. In its prophetic predictive function, Scripture is not thought to contain the accurate account of the eschatological age. Rather the images and types, based again on previous experience of Israel, serve as base or types for the coming time. Therefore, normative Scripture is paradigmatic. As the combination of passages imply, Scripture contains a treasure of imagery and metaphors which express experience of Israel. In appealing to these metaphors and experiences, the truth of the situation is expressed. The situation cannot, however, be reduced to the metaphors themselves. Thus John is not Elijah *redivivus* in the sense that the same Elijah who ascended to heaven has returned in John. Rather, John is like "Elijah" in his role as a prophet preaching repentance before the coming of the eschatological age. The appeal to Elijah in the context of John's ministry also draws on Scripture's normative function in its prophetic-critical sense. The eschatological prophet was associated with the work of reconciliation and the call to repentance. By associating John with Elijah, Matthew draws on Scripture in the appeal to the crowd in the narrative and the reader of the story to remain faithful to the torah.

5.1.2. The "More than" of Jesus: The Presence of God's Wisdom in Mt 11:28-30.

Seemingly in stark contrast to the image of Jesus as one who brings division and strife, is the image of Jesus as the giver of rest in Mt 11:28-30. The rest Jesus brings, however can be likened to the rest Israel experienced in the promised land, to which God's messenger led them. The parallels to Sirach 6 and 51 in Matthew 11:28-30 has indicated the presence of a Wisdom Christology in Matthew. The context of Matthew 11 supports this. However, in the saying, Matthew also alludes to the prophecies of Isaiah (55:1-3) and Jeremiah (6:16). An analysis of these in the saying of Mt 11:28-30 will show how Matthew understands wisdom to be present in Jesus, and how Matthew

---

[34] Cf. Petersen, *Zechariah 9-14 and Malachi*, 230, for the correspondences between the Elijah narratives and the situation addressed by Malachi.

[35] περισσότερον προφήτου in Mt 11:9 is therefore not with Knowles, *Jeremiah*, 230, to be understood as an indication that John surpasses the Biblical antecedent. Rather, the verse confirms that which is said by the mixed citation: John is a prophet. But not just any prophet: he is the eschatological prophet announcing the coming of the Kingdom of God.

employs Biblical language in the adaptation of material. In Matthew 11:28-30, Matthew appeals to passages of Scripture to describe the presence of God in the ministry of Jesus, and to grant divine authority to the words and acts of Jesus. Scripture is in so far normative, as it contains a "theological" language. Matthew deliberately borrows this language, to indicate to the reader that in the words of Jesus, God or the Wisdom of God, speaks. Hence, Scripture is authoritative in containing a measure for the spoken word of the Messiah. For Matthew, Jesus' words and deeds are a repetition of God's word of salvation throughout the history of Israel. This means also, however, that Scripture is understood as normative in its sociological function of containing the history of God's election. Scripture in these passages is an identity factor, appealed to by the evangelist to proclaim the "gospel" of Jesus the Messiah.

To demonstrate this function of Scripture, the place of Matthew 11:28-30 in the context of Matthew 11-13 will be discussed. Then, the Matthean text will be analysed as an interpretation of Sirach 51, and subsequently as an interpretation of Is 55, 28 and Jer 6:16. Finally, a conclusion will spell out the meaning of the Matthean text and how the language of Scripture indicates its authoritative function in Matthew.

The Place of Mt 11:28-30 in Mt 11-13

One of the central texts for understanding the Christology of Matthew Mt 11:25-30 is a constructed logion drawn from Q and M material.[36] In the passage the reciprocal and exclusive knowledge between the father and the son is asserted. The verses identify the uniqueness of Jesus' person in relation to God in such explicit terms that one can hardly speak of a theme like the markan "messianic secret" in the gospel of Matthew. Matthew 11:25-30 continues two of the specific themes of Matthew 11-13, in each case by drawing on scriptural tradition. The Q saying (vv 25-27) takes up the theme of obduracy, revelation and hiddenness and will be analysed below (§ 6.1.). In it, Matthew alludes to Is 29:14, where God in the prophetic oracle threatens to take away the wisdom of the wise, and to hide understanding. The allusions to wisdom literature in the M logion (vv 28-30) stand in contrast to, and are interpreted by, this logion. Matthew 11:28-30 does not explicitly include the theme of the πλεῖον motif directly. The logion is nevertheless relevant for the present examination. When Jesus speaks as God's Wisdom, then this points to the "greater than" of Jesus. The verses can be shown to relate to the succeeding pericopes of the Matthean narrative, the Sabbath controversies. The explicit quotation of Hos 6:6 which Matthew has inserted into the tradition provided by Mark, serves as the interpretative key for these passages which interpret Jesus as more than the temple and Lord of the Sabbath. There is a relation between Jesus who gives "rest" in the present passage, and the Sabbath controversies which immediately follow.

---

[36] vv 25-27 is derived from Q, vv 28-30 from M.

Matthew 11:25-30 holds a unique position in the gospel of Matthew, being preceded and succeeded by the transitional sentence Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ.[37] The sentence unites it with the surrounding material but also sets it apart.[38] Assuming that there is a certain logic or natural flow of thought or themes in the composition of the gospel of Matthew, understanding the relation to the immediate context becomes important for the interpretation of the passage.

The Interpretation of Sirach 6 and 51 in Matthew 11:28-30

The text of Matthew 11:28-30 is placed in the transition between Mt 11 and Mt 12. As such it relates both to the previous material in chapter 11 and introduces the themes which will be central in the beginning of chapter 12. As a conclusion to chapter 11, it continues the wisdom-motif found in Mt 11:16-19. In the passage, Matthew retains the reference to ἡ σόφια present in Q but changes τῶν τεκνῶν αὐτῆς to τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς. The deeds of Wisdom thus refer to, and are the same as, the works of the messiah of Matthew 11:2. The wisdom motif is therefore given in the Q text, and interpreted by Matthew. This identification of Jesus with wisdom is continued in 11:28-30, where the M logion picks up the language of the teacher of wisdom in Sirach.

Sirach 6:18-22	Sirach 51: 23-27
τέκνον ἐκ νεότητός σου ἐπίλεξαι παιδείαν	*ἐγγίσατε* πρός με ἀπαίδευτοι
καὶ ἕως πολιῶν εὑρήσεις σοφίαν	καὶ αὐλίσθητε ἐν οἴκῳ παιδείας
ὡς ὁ ἀροτριῶν καὶ ὁ σπείρων *πρόσελθε* αὐτῇ	τί ὅτι ὑστερεῖσθαι λέγετε ἐν τούτοις
καὶ ἀνάμενε τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς	καὶ *αἱ ψυχαὶ ὑμῶν* διψῶσι σφόδρα
ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἐργασίᾳ αὐτῆς *ὀλίγον κοπιάσεις*	ἠνοιξα τὸ στόμα μου καὶ ἐλάλησα
καὶ ταχὺ φάγεσαι τῶν γενημάτων αὐτῆς	κτήσασθε ἑαυτοῖς ἄνευ ἀργυρίου
ὡς τραχεῖά ἐστιν σφόδρα τοῖς ἀπαιδεύτοις	*τὸν τράχηλον ὑμῶν ὑπόθετε ὑπὸ ζυγόν*
καὶ οὐκ ἐμμενεῖ ἐν αὐτῇ ἀκάρδιος	καὶ ἐπιδεξάσθω *ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν* παιδείαν
ὡς λίθος δοκιμασίας ἰσχυρὸς ἔσται ἐπ' αὐτῷ	ἐγγύς ἐστιν εὑρεῖν αὐτήν
καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ ἀπορρῖψαι αὐτήν	ἴδετε ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ὑμῶν ὅτι *ὀλίγον ἐκοπίασα*
σοφία γὰρ κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς ἐστιν	καὶ *εὗρον ἐμαυτῷ πολλὴν ἀνάπαυσιν*
καὶ οὐ πολλοῖς ἐστιν *φανερά*	

Matthew 11:28-30

Δεῦτε πρός με πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι,
κἀγὼ ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς.
ἄρατε τὸν ζυγόν μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς καὶ μάθετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ,
ὅτι πραΰς εἰμι καὶ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ,
καὶ εὑρήσετε ἀνάπαυσιν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν:
ὁ γὰρ ζυγός μου χρηστὸς καὶ τὸ φορτίον μου ἐλαφρόν ἐστιν.

---

[37] Cf. Schenk, *Sprache*, 280.

[38] The transitional phrase is used only in 11:25, 12:1 and 14:1 in the gospel. The phrase may be regarded as a structural device, which separates units of material. As with the more famous Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς... . (7:28, 11:1 etc.), however, it does not always introduce a new beginning. Certainly, the material following 14:1 differs thematically from the previous material. In the case of 11:25 and 12:1, the phrase actually functions to separate as well as to unite, an indication that 11:25-30 is a very central text in the gospel of Matthew either thematically or structurally or both.

The origin of the M logion is uncertain. Its broken parallelism indicates that Matthew has redacted the logion through the insertion of the description of Jesus as humble and lowly in heart.[39] The insertion of the logion here is the work of the Matthean redactor. Matthew 11:28-30 is no direct citation of Sirach 6 and 51. Yet the text employs similar language, so that an allusion to the Sirach texts is probable. The terms ζυγός, ἀναπαύσις, κοπιάω, and the imperatives of ἐγγίζω/προσέρχομαι as near synonyms to δεῦτε are found in all passages.

The two Sirach passages are spoken by the teacher of wisdom.[40] The teacher of wisdom in Sirach 51 invites the student to submit to the ζύγος (of paideia) and so to find wisdom and rest. In contrast, Jesus in Mt 11:28-30 invites the hearer/reader to submit to his yoke, and he will give rest. Hence, he is speaking not simply as a teacher of wisdom, but as Wisdom personified.[41]

In the context of Matthew the word ζύγος receives a specific connotation with reference to Jesus as the presence of God. The connection between wisdom/Torah/ and ζύγος which is made in Sirach is of prime importance in the context of Matthean Christology. As the metaphor for the teaching of wisdom, "the yoke" has rightly been interpreted to be the main emphasis of the Matthean passage.[42] The identification of "yoke" of Jesus with "Jesus' interpretation of the law" is however not to be made uncritically. Although Matthew's language makes it possible to compare Jesus' light yoke with the burdens of the legalistic Pharisaic Judaism (Mt 23:4),[43] the context suggests that it is not not Jesus' authoritative teaching which is at stake, but the presence of God in Jesus (cf. Mt 11:5). Hence, spurred by Q's reference to wisdom (adapted in Mt

---

[39] I have analysed the Matthean redaction of the logion in Lena Lybaek, "Wisdom Christology in Matthew" (1994), 51-52.

[40] Celia Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke* (1987), 130, points out that the invitation "come to me" in second temple and tannaitic literature only occurs in the mouth of wisdom, and only in the book of Sirach. She then concludes that no mere *teacher* of wisdom has the authority to utter this invitation. Although not as clear in the Greek text, the Hebrew version of the acrostic poem, shows that the invitation in Sirach 51 is spoken by the teacher of wisdom to "come to me" and "lodge in my school". To learn wisdom is to submit to her yoke.

[41] Cf. M. Jack Suggs, *Wisdom, Christology and Law in Matthew's Gospel* (1970), 141-142. The original hypothesis which connected Sirach 51 with Mt 11:25-30 was built on form critical observations. The hypothesis was based on the assumption of the original unity of the Mt 11:25-30 and concluded that it shared the same hymnic form as Sirach 51. Cf. Eduard Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (1971); T. Arvedson, *Mysterium Christi* (1937); Ulrich Luck, "Weisheit und Christologie in Mt 11,25-35" (1975); C.E. Carlston, "Wisdom and Eschatology in Q", (1982). That Mt 11:28-30 circulated independently is clear because of its absence in Lk, and the close parallel in the gospel of Thomas, logion 90. Mt 11:28-30 forms a complete unit which does not need the previous unit for its interpretation. Also the difference in language and theme, suggests that the combination of Mt 11:25-27 with 28-30 is secondary. Cf. H.D. Betz, " The Logion of the Easy Yoke and of Rest" (1967); Stephenson H. Brooks, *Matthew"s Community*, (1987) 94-95.

[42] Cf. Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, "ζύγος" (1964), 899-900.

[43] Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom*, 42-43, 133-135; Suggs, *Wisdom*, 100-106; Gerhard Barth, "Gesetzesverständnis", 139 n.1.

11:19), Matthew inserts the logion where Jesus speaks as Wisdom, to further point to the presence of God in the ministry of Jesus.

Matthew's thought on the presence of God in Jesus as Wisdom/Torah is similar to what is expressed in Pirke Aboth 3:2, 5, where it is stated: "but two who are sitting and words of the Torah pass between them, the presence is with them. ... From whomever accepts upon himself the yoke of Torah do they remove the yoke of the state and of hard labor. And upon whoever removes from himself the yoke of Torah do they lay the yoke of the state and of hard labor."[44] For Matthew, Jesus as the fulfilment of the law and the prophets (Mt 5:17) can speak of the light burden of his yoke. In the transition between ch 11 and the Sabbath controversies this is an important statement. As presence of God, Jesus becomes the substitute for the temple for Matthew's post 70 community.[45]

Despite the invitation of Wisdom in Matthew 11:28-30, and the reinterpreted Q passage in Mt 11:19, the concerns of Matthew 11 have been influenced by prophetic literature. In view of the Messianic identity of Jesus, the dual emphasis of chapter 11 focuses on the one hand on the call to μετανοία, and on eschatological hope on the other. Both foci are related to the Christological aspect which understands the eschatological reality as already impinging on the present. Wisdom's call for the individual to follow her instructions for a better and longer life is therefore here reinterpreted in light of this previous emphasis.

The reinterpretation of the invitation of Sirach is achieved in two steps. First, Matthew changes the content of the invitation in 11:28-30. Second, Matthew combines the wisdom logion with the logion from Q 10:21-22. In the Sirach passages the toil performed is by those who seek wisdom, and takes place after the individual draws near. In Matthew 11:28, Jesus calls out to those who have laboured and carry heavy burdens to find deliverance. Further the logion is placed after the assertion that revelation is given to the νηπίοι and *not* to the wise and understanding. In the context of Matthew 11, these groups are both to be associated with the πτωχοί in Mt 11:5. Thereby a prophetic critical aspect is introduced into the saying. By associating wisdom language with Jesus, Matthew achieves a continuation of the critique of the existing piety of his people, and reinterprets the understanding of wisdom as being available only to the wise.[46] Further, in the present context the theme of the fortunes of the individual is played down for the benefit of the communal understanding of the covenant people of God. Hence, while

---

[44] Translation by Jacob Neusner *Pirke Avot.* (1984)

[45] Mt 12:6: "Something greater than the temple is here". Daniel Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 28, writes in a comment to Abot 3:2; "Therefore the Torah is a surrogate of the Temple, the place (maqom) ... of the presence of God." Fred W. Burnett, *The Testament of Jesus Sophia*, 241-145, relates Abot 3:2 to Mt 18:20, and concludes that in the Matthean community, the presence of Jesus is only in his words as the intepretation of Torah.

[46] Cf. Sirach 6:20-21.

Matthew can speak of Jesus as the Wisdom of God in the context of an Immanuel Christology, the wisdom theme is in the context of the gospel not a dominant concern.[47]

The influence of Sirach 6 and 51 on Matthew 11:28-30 shows that Matthew was familiar with the book. Matthew uses its language as he uses the language of Scripture, by imitation and by alluding to its content. Its use here shows that Matthew saw a parallel between the presence of God in the Torah and the figure of Wisdom. The texts of Sirach alluded to in Mt 11 have a normative function in providing the language by which Jesus as the presence of God can issue his call to discipleship. The association of the language of wisdom with Jesus essentially expresses the same as Mt 11:2-6: in Jesus the kingdom of Heaven is present, and by submitting to his teaching (Mt 12:6; see below), one submits to the yoke of Wisdom/Torah. On a structural note the use of μανθάνω in the context of the wisdom logion, stands in relation to μαθητεύω in Mt 13:52. It further underlines the unity of Mt 11-13.

The Interpretation of Is 55:3 and Jer 6:16 in Matthew 11:28-30

Wisdom literature is not the only part of Jewish tradition in which the metaphors of the M-logion can be found. The allusion to Is 55:3 and citation Jer 6:16 in Matthew 11:28-30, bring out themes in the passage which are not present in the wisdom theology of Sirach, but which follow up the themes of "the coming one"(11:2-6), obduracy (Mt 11:20-24) and call to repentance (Mt 11:7-19), which have been central in the context of the Christological proclamation in Matthew 11. In the passages, the concern of the Wisdom Christology is nevertheless present, in that Jesus voices the invitation of God to come and find rest and life. Even these passages can through the theme of rest be found to form a bridge between Matthew 11 and the Sabbath controversies in Mt 12. Again, the main function of the passages from Scripture is for Matthew to convey the presence of God in the ministry of Jesus. Matthew does this through the use of Biblical language. The passages are authoritative in that they contain the norm for how one speaks of the reality of God's presence. By introducing themes related to the covenant relationship between God and God's people, Matthew also affirms the Scripture in its sociological normativity as an identity factor.

<u>The Adaptation of Is 55:3 in Matthew 11:28</u>

The difference between the invitation to those who have laboured and who are heavy laden in Matthew 11:28, and the invitation to "work a little" to find wisdom in the texts of Sirach was pointed out above. The Matthean text is simultaneously a statement

---

[47] Cf. Davies, and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol 2, 292-293; James D.G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making* (1989), 205-206; and David Daniel Kupp, *Matthew's Emmanuel* (1992), 280-283. Russell Pregeant, "The Wisdom Passages in Matthew's Story" (1996), 225, concludes from a reader response perspective that the identification of Jesus with Wisdom does not feature particularly strongly in Matthew's gospel. For this reason, G. Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People* (1992) 366-371 doubts the influence of Sirach 51 on Mt 11:25-30.

about the presence of God in the ministry of Jesus, and an invitation to find salvation in him. Possibly, the Matthean invitation is adapted to the prophetic oracle in Is 55:1-3.[48] In the prophetic oracle God speaks an invitation for those who have exhausted themselves for the sake of that which does not satisfy, to come, hear and find life. The Masoretic text of Is 55:3 utters the invitation "come to me" (לְכוּ אֵלָי). To accept the invitation is to be restored:

הוֹי כָּל־צָמֵא לְכוּ לַמַּיִם וַאֲשֶׁר אֵין־לוֹ כָּסֶף
לְכוּ שִׁבְרוּ וֶאֱכֹלוּ וּלְכוּ שִׁבְרוּ בְלוֹא־כֶסֶף
וּבְלוֹא מְחִיר יַיִן וְחָלָב׃
לָמָּה תִשְׁקְלוּ־כֶסֶף בְּלוֹא־לֶחֶם *וִיגִיעֲכֶם בְּלוֹא*
לְשָׂבְעָה שִׁמְעוּ שָׁמוֹעַ אֵלַי וְאִכְלוּ־טוֹב וְתִתְעַנַּג
בַּדֶּשֶׁן נַפְשְׁכֶם׃
הַטּוּ אָזְנְכֶם *וּלְכוּ אֵלַי שִׁמְעוּ וּתְחִי נַפְשְׁכֶם*
וְאֶכְרְתָה לָכֶם בְּרִית עוֹלָם חַסְדֵי דָוִד הַנֶּאֱמָנִים׃
Is 55:1-3[49]

The only exact correspondence between Isaiah 55:1ff and Mt 11 is the לְכוּ אֵלַי and the use of יגע as equivalent to κοπιᾶν.[50] As in Matthew 11:28 the parallelism of the text makes finding rest or life for the soul the result of coming or walking in the way of God. Significant in the context of Matthew, is the parallelism between the invitation to find ἀναπαύσις from labour immediately preceding the Sabbath controversies. The Matthean composition of material here brings about the association between Jesus' offer of rest and the function of the Sabbath to remember God's deliverance of his people. In this context Jesus' invitation to rest is more than Wisdom's invitation to the individual for a fulfilled life.[51] It is the invitation to the people to find deliverance as it is expressed in Mt 11:5, and has implications for the whole people of God.[52]

The prophetic oracle like the text in Matthew combines the invitation with motifs which implicitly speak of deliverance.[53] In Hebrew נוה and of חיה as it is used here are

---

[48] Cf. Werner Grimm, "Weil ich dich liebe", 103-109, who differently interprets Mt 11:28 to be a independent authentic Jesus logion.

[49] The translation of the LXX interprets the invitation of Is 55:3 as a exhortation to walk in God's ways. In this translation the correspondence to the Matthean wording disappears. Also the second significant element of the passage is interpreted by the addition of *ἐν ἀγαθοῖς*. Is 55:3 LXX: προσέχετε τοῖς ὠτίοις ὑμῶν καὶ *ἐπακολουθήσατε ταῖς ὁδοῖς μου* ἐπακούσατέ μου καὶ *ζήσεται ἐν ἀγαθοῖς ἡ ψυχὴ* ὑμῶν καὶ διαθήσομαι ὑμῖν διαθήκην αἰώνιον τὰ ὅσια Δαυιδ τὰ πιστά

[50] Approximately half of the occurrences of δεῦτε in LXX are in translation of לְכוּ, making it the most common translation. LXX translates יגע with κοπιᾶν in Is 45:14.

[51] In wisdom literature the concepts of rest/life and yoke, are brought to bear on the individual's life rather than on the people as a community. Here life and peace, individual success, is the result of walking "in the way of wisdom", to turn away from that way is folly, and leads to (individual) destruction. Cf. Helmer Ringgren, et al., חיה (1977) 887.

[52] „Jesus ruft zum Sabbat und bietet als das Heilsgut schlechthin die 'Ruhe' als messianisches Heil an" Werner Grimm, *Der Ruhetag* (1980), 49

[53] Commentators have also considered Is 55:1-3 as belonging to wisdom literature, due to its peculiar imagery, unlike other prophetic oracles in the book of Isaiah. The food imagery which precedes Is 55:3,

synonymous. In the deuteronomistic history and in the prophetic books, as well as in wisdom literature, the meaning and use of the two words overlap,[54] חיה is the concrete result of God's deliverance.[55] That the notion of salvation is involved in the text of Is 55:3, is evident in that "and your souls shall live" is explicated with "and I shall cut with you an eternal covenant".

The analysis has shown that in the context of Matthew 11 it is possible to understand the invitation of Jesus in Mt 11:28 as an adaptation of the divine oracle in Is 55:1-3. Thereby Matthew achieves a combination of the eschatological gift of salvation of the messiah, and the continuing presence of the rest as a gift of wisdom, granted in the process of discipleship. In the text therefore, both the proclamation of Jesus' ministry as an eschatological event, and the continuing presence of Jesus in the post-Easter church are affirmed. One can say that again the 'already but not yet' perspective of Matthew's eschatology and Christology becomes evident.

The passage in Is 55:3 stands in continuation with other Isaianic texts in Matthew and their influence on Matthean theology. The prophetic text lends language to the offer of salvation in Matthew, and is thereby shown to be normative. Further, the kerygmatic aspect of prophecy is again appealed to, and affirmed, when Jesus in Matthew repeats the promise of the divine oracle of Is 55:3.

Matthew 11:29 includes a citation of Jeremiah 6:16. Also this citation is in continuation of the themes already introduced in the chapter.

<u>The Adaptation of Jeremiah 6:16 in Matthew 11:29</u>

In chapter 11 the dual warning of v. 6 and v. 15 serve as introductions to the theme of revelation, hiddenness and obduracy in the unit of Mt 11-13. The thanksgiving in vv. 25-27 develops the theme explicitly. The introduction of the citation of Jer 6:16c in the call to salvation in Mt 11:28-30 also alludes to the theme. The inclusion of the citation demonstrates how Matthew's use of Biblical language does not simply imitate Scripture, but also that certain theological aspects of the passages used are thereby alluded to. Scripture is here shown to be normative for Matthew both as a source for theological language, and as the context in which new experiences of life and faith must be interpreted.

---

has led to the interpretation that here, it is wisdom who invites to her banquet. (Prov. 9:5) The provision of food which satisfies can also be understood in terms of God's provision for Israel in the wilderness, and the images of the promised land flowing with milk and honey. Cf. J. L. McKenzie, *Second Isaiah*, (1968) 143.

[54] In the book of Deuteronomy itself, both denote the gift of peace and protection following the entrance into the promised land (Deut 4:1; 5:33; 8:1) or as a result of adhering to God's law or the covenant. This does illustrate that in prophetic literature influenced by a deuteronomistic understanding of history, there is a link between rest/life and faithfulness to the covenant. H.-D. Preuss, נוח (1986), 304; G. Gerlemann, "חיה" (1971), 554. In the pre-exilic prophets, these themes are developed. Cf. G. Robinson, "The Idea of Rest in the Old Testament" (1980), 33-34.

[55] Gerlemann, "חיה ", 554.

Matthew 11:29 (καὶ εὑρήσετε ἀνάπαυσιν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν) is a translation of Jer 6:16c influenced by the MT.[56]

Jer 6:16	Jer 6:16c LXX
כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה עִמְדוּ עַל־דְּרָכִים וּרְאוּ וְשַׁאֲלוּ לִנְתִיבוֹת עוֹלָם אֵי־זֶה דֶּרֶךְ הַטּוֹב וְלְכוּ־בָהּ *וּמְצָאוּ מַרְגּוֹעַ לְנַפְשְׁכֶם* וַיֹּאמְרוּ לֹא נֵלֵךְ׃	καὶ εὑρήσετε ἁγνισμὸν[57] ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν

Whereas the Septuagint speaks of purification or sanctification, the emphasis in both Matthew and the Masoretic text is on the promise of rest. The text of Jeremiah defines rest as a condition which is the result of walking in the way of God, or of submitting to God's leading. To find rest is, according to Jeremiah 6, connected with remaining true to the covenant. Rest is a gift of salvation. The context of the saying in the book of Jeremiah is the accusation that Israel is being unfaithful and is worshipping other gods. The prophets and the priests are accused of having dealt lightly with the wounds of the people. Hence, the citation in Matthew alludes to the faithlessness and unwillingness of the people to respond to God's self-revelation.

The motif of the yoke as the submitting to the rule of God is also indirectly present in the citation of Jeremiah. The final phrase of Jer 6:16, "and they say: 'We will not walk,'" is parallel to the saying "I will not serve" in Jer 2:20, where Israel is accused of having broken her עֹל, her yoke, the covenant with God. There is then, in Jeremiah as in Matthew, an understanding of yoke as the covenant with God. There is also a connection between rest and remaining in that covenant relationship. In Jeremiah, as in Matthew, God is the one who invites Israel to find rest. This rest is the result of choosing the right path. Finding this good way is equivalent to heeding the law. The opportunity to find rest may therefore be perceived as the gift of salvation for the people as a covenant community.[58]

Citing Jer 6:16 in Mt 11:29, the evangelist does not simply use the text in an atomistic manner. The situation of Jeremiah like the one of Matthew's gospel is expressed in the sentence "to whom shall I speak and give warning that they may hear"

---

[56] Although agreeing with the LXX in verb form, and the plural of ψυχαῖς, ἀνάπαυσις is derived from the Hebrew. Cf. Robert H. Gundry, *Use*, 135-136.

[57] = LXX B. LXX A has ἁγιασμόν and Aquila ἀνάφυξιν. Cf. Stendahl, *School*, 141.

[58] The noun מַרְגּוֹעַ is used only here in the OT. It occurs in the feminine form in Is 28:12. Jer 6:16 is an adaptation of the text of Isaiah 28:12. Cf. Ute Wendel, *Jesaja und Jeremia* (1995), 172-176. The cognate verb רגע is used in much the same way in Deut 28:26. Here the curse of not following the law is lack of a resting place. In light of the context of both Deut 28 and Jer 6 and 31:2, one can say that in all three instances רגע signifies the rest which comes with dwelling in the land. The opposite is to be scattered among the nations or exile (Deut 28:64, Jer 31:2). רגע, therefore is parallel to the use of נוח in denoting the peace which comes with dwelling in the land or as the result of God's leading. Cf. Is 14:3, Ps 23. etc. Robinson, "The Idea of Rest", 34-37; Preuss, נוח, 299, 305; Fritz Stolz, "נוח" (1975), 243-246.

(Jer 6:10). The Matthean narrative, pointing to the presence of the Kingdom of Heaven in the ἔργα/δυνάμεις of Jesus, and the failure to repent (Mt 11:20-24), is patterned on the situation of the prophets of Isaiah and Jeremiah, and given eschatological significance. In the context, the invitation to find rest is similar to the one of Sirach 51. In both cases the presence of God is implicit. In both cases there is a connection between rest and submitting to the yoke of the covenant. In Jeremiah a communal perspective is added. In calling the people to salvation, Jesus reiterates the call of God to the people, to remain within the covenant relationship with God. Matthew therefore, in the constructed logion of Mt 11:28-30, emphasises Jesus as the Messiah of Israel (cf. Mt 10:6). Jesus' appearance is therefore a continuation of God's repeated deliverance of Israel

The place of Mt 11:28-30 immediately after the thanksgiving for revelation to "babes" in Mt 11:25-27 adds another aspect. In the perspective of the post-Easter, post-70 CE, community, critique is directed at those groups within Israel which have not realised the Messianic identity of Jesus.[59] Here religious and spiritual motives are intertwined with historical/political issues. The placing of Mt 11:28-30 at the end of Matthew 11 indicates that the issues brought out in the logion are not simply to be understood in terms of individual discipleship. Jesus is embodying God's act of deliverance for the people. That the invitation which it issues, is not to be understood in individual terms as a call to discipleship, is affirmed by the fact that the Q-logion to which it has been attached, was together with the judgement of the Galilean cities taken out of the Q setting of the speech to the disciples and placed in the present context.

Conclusion

The above analysis has demonstrated that the logion of Mt 11:28-30 by adapting Biblical language alludes to and quotes several different passages of Scripture. The passage thereby receives meaning both on the level of the Matthean narrative and on the level of Matthean original readership. In the passage, by alluding to Is 55:1-3 and Jer 6:16, Jesus speaks the words of God like a prophet, without, however, the prophetic formula τάδε λέγει κύριος. In the context of the concern of the πλεῖον-Christology then, Jesus is more than a prophet. In fact, by adapting the language of the wisdom teacher of Sirach 6 and 51,[60] Jesus speaks as God's wisdom. Thereby Jesus is depicted as God's presence in the world. This presence is reality not only for those who could "hear and

---

[59] It is astonishing that Knowles, *Jeremiah*, 216, finds no hint of possible rejection in Mt 11:25-30. The double logion is, as has been pointed out, preceded by judgement upon the Galilean cities because they did not repent. The allusions in Mt 11:25-27 is to the history of the rejection of the prophets among the people. The result of the Sabbath controversies in Mt 12:14 is the decision of the religious leaders to kill Jesus.

[60] It is possible, as demonstrated by Grimm, "Weil ich dich liebe", 102, that the similarities between Mt and Is 55:1-3 is due to the dependence of Sirach 51 on the text of Isaiah, which bears resemblance to wisdom literature. The prophetic aspect of v 28, offering deliverance to the weary, does however suggest an independent Matthean reading of the prophecy.

see" the ministry of Jesus (Mt 11:2-6) but also for those who later heard the stories of the Jesus tradition (cf. Mt 18:20).

The yoke and the rest which Jesus offers in Mt 11:28-30, alluding to Sirach 51 and Jer 6:16, are terms which deal with the covenant relationship between God and his people and the hope in God's deliverance. In the context of the present study these terms are of prime importance. Here Matthew draws on Scripture as an identity factor. These parts of Scripture deal with the story of Israel as the people of God. By adapting them in the present context, Matthew affirms and identifies with these aspects of Scripture. Hence Jesus' invitation as God's wisdom, is a call to God's people to remain within that covenant relationship. It is of course a fact that Matthew reinterprets Scripture, the law and deliverance in light of Jesus. This reinterpretation ultimately implies a break with his own tradition. Matthew nevertheless remains within that tradition in the appeal to scriptural tradition as normative. There is, therefore, no replacement of the "ancient ways" by the new yoke of Jesus in Mt 11:28-30.[61] The two are, for Matthew, one and the same.

5.1.3. More than the Temple, - Lord of the Sabbath. The adaptation of Hos 6:6 in Matthew 12:1-8[62]

If Jesus, as a representative of God, can offer rest by appealing to the law and the covenant, it is not unfitting for Matthew to place the controversies over the Sabbath (Mt 12:1-14) following the double logion which concludes chapter 11. The Sabbath in Jewish tradition, was a day of rest given to Israel, in order to commemorate God's bringing Israel out of Egypt (hence, breaking the yoke of oppression they were under) and bringing them to dwell/rest in the promised land. Reading the two pericopes in sequence one may understand the Sabbath day, the day of rest, as a type for the peace which God has offered Israel through the generations, and consequently as a type for the eschatological invitation of Jesus in Mt 11:28-30.

The first Sabbath controversy in Matthew includes several references to Scripture. The disciples picking grain on the Sabbath may be in accordance with the system of Peah as described in Lev. 19:9 and Deuteronomy 23:24-25. Jesus' argument includes references to 1 Sam 21:7 and Lev 24:5-8. Finally, Matthew inserts a citation of Hos 6:6 in the context of the debate. The present analysis will mainly be concerned with the use of the citation from Hosea in the context of the πλεῖον/μείζον- motif in Matthew 11-13. The analysis of Matthew's use of the citation will have to first consider its place in the scriptural argument of Mt 12:1-8 and its implications for the reading of 12:9-14. For a proper understanding of the controversies, the occurrence of the Hos 6:6 citation earlier in the Matthean narrative (Mt 9:13) will be considered second, and related to the argument of the passages in Mt 12:1-14. Third, Matthew's interpretation of Hos 6:6 will

---

[61] Contra Knowles, *Jeremiah*, 217.

[62] Cf. L. Lybæk, "Matthew"s Use of Hos 6:6 in the Context of the Sabbath Controveries" (1997).

be described. Finally the implications of the use of Hos 6:6 for the understanding of the normative function of Scripture in Matthew will be drawn.

The Sabbath Controversy in Mt 12:1-8 and Jesus' Argument from Scripture

The Sabbath controversies are adopted from Mark 2:23-28. Although Matthew makes some redactional changes, the first of the Sabbath controversies concludes with the same saying as is found in Mark, stating that the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath.[63] In Mark, the logion is introduced by ὥστε, so that the presupposition for this conclusion is laid in the previous statement, that the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath.[64] Matthew omits this explanatory sentence, and introduces the quotation from Hos 6:6 LXX instead. (Mt 12:7: εἰ δὲ ἐγνώκειτε τί ἐστιν, Ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν, οὐκ ἂν κατεδικάσατε τοὺς ἀναιτίους.) This has led to the conclusion that unlike Mark, Matthew wanted to defend the continued Sabbath- observance of his community on the basis of the love commandment as proclaimed by Jesus.[65] Although the Matthean community probably did observe the Sabbath, the exegetical argument of the first Sabbath controversy, which ends with the quotation from Hos 6:6, has its place in the πλεῖον- Christology of Mt 11-13, and depicts Jesus as "more than the temple".

The first Sabbath controversy is introduced by the disciples picking grain in the field[66] on a Sabbath. The Pharisees see this and accuse them of doing that which is impermissible on the Sabbath. Jesus' defence of his disciples includes first a haggadic argument already present in the markan tradition which Matthew preserves (vss. 3-4). The Haggadic argument appeals to David and his men eating the shewbread from the Temple.[67] Matthew's redaction of the passage makes the parallel between David and the disciples clear: in both cases hunger led to the doing of something which was not lawful.[68] Here, the question of Sabbath is irrelevant:[69] David and the men who were with him broke the law when they were hungry. Likewise the disciples were hungry and broke

---

[63] Perhaps referring to Lev 23:3 the Sabbath shall be the Lord's in all your dwellings.

[64] Cf. Mark. 2:27-28

[65] Cf. e.g. Richard S. McConnell, *Law*, 68-72; Barth, "Gesetzesverständnis", 75-78; Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 233-234.

[66] Probably according to the system of Peah. Lev 19,9, Deut 23,24-25. Cf. Maurice Casey, "Culture and Historicity" (1988), 2.

[67] 1 Sam 21,7.

[68] Cf. the parallel formulations: οὐκ ἔξεστιν ποιεῖν ἐν σαββάτῳ (vs 2)// οὐκ ἐξὸν ἦν αὐτῷ φαγεῖν (vs. 4) Matthew underlines this parallel further by adding πεινάω and ἐσθίω to the source, in the description of the disciples' action. Cf. Ingo Broer, "Anmerkungen zur Gesetzesverständnis des Matthäus" (1986), 139; Barth, "Gesetzesverständnis", 76.

[69] There is nothing in the tradition which suggests that David and his men broke the Sabbath law. The rabbinic tradition early inferred that the incident took place on the Sabbath, because of the reference to the shewbread which was to be arranged every Sabbath. (Lev 24,5-8) Cf. Billerbeck, et al., *Kommentar*, 618f. The Rabbis excused David because, being pursued by Saul, he was in mortal danger. Matthew's argument, however, is not dependent on the supposition that David ate bread on the Sabbath.

the law, thus human need overrides the commandment. The haggadic argument is followed by a halakhic argument which is added by Matthew (vs. 5).[70] It points to the priests' service on a Sabbath being exempt from the Sabbath law. The second example, related to the first by the mention of the temple and the priests, is an inference *a minori ad maius* ending in the statement which Matthew has added in vs. 6: something greater than the temple is here. (Mt 12:6: λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῦ ἱεροῦ μεῖζόν ἐστιν ὧδε.) If temple service is exempt from the Sabbath law, then certainly that which is greater than temple service will also be excused. The statement needs clarification, however: What is there that is greater than the temple?[71] This clarification is given in vss 7-8: "if you knew what it is: 'I take pleasure in compassion rather than sacrifice,' you would not have condemned the innocent. For the Son of Man is lord of the Sabbath".

Matthew, in the words of Jesus, first brings a denunciation of the Pharisees, then offers a point of correspondence between the disciples and the temple priests. The denunciation of the Pharisees is dual: first, they have not understood;[72] second, as a result of their incomprehension, they have condemned the blameless.[73] The point of correspondence between the temple priests and the disciples is their being without guilt despite breaking the Sabbath law.[74] Following the quotation, the concluding vs. 8: κύριος γάρ ἐστιν τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, constitutes the qualifying statement to vs. 6 and forms the climax of the Matthean argument. It is ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου who is the Lord of the Sabbath and who is greater than the temple. The

---

[70] It is possible that Matthew has added the argument to the original text, because Jewish exegesis demands an example from the law to build a halakhah, a requirement not met by the first example. Cf. Goulder, "Midrash", 328; Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 231.

[71] It is precisely with regard to this sentence that scholarship is divided in the interpretation of the passage. Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 231, pointing to the tightness of the Matthean argumentation, and the neuter of the adjective, concludes that it is the mercy (ἔλεος) of the Hosean citation to which "the greater" in vs. 6 refers. Vs 6 is however, a Matthean construction reminiscent of Q's καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ (Σολομῶνος) ὧδε, which is found in Mt 12,41.42. There the neuter πλεῖον obviously has a Christological reference. Luz, (n.2) vol. 2, p. 231 questions an uncritical Christological interpretation also here, however. Greek usage of the neuter allows for a lack of correspondence between the neuter and the word to which it relates in cases such as this, especially as the "something" in fact is not specified in the argument. The argument of the passage is of such a character, that the parallel is made between the priests and the disciples. Hence, the adjective has a Christological reference. Similarly, Gundry, *Matthew*, 223.

[72] This is the greatest offence of the Pharisees. Lack of understanding, or not recognising the nature of Jesus' ministry, is a theme parallel to the Christological one in Mt 11-13 (cf. e.g. Mt 11:15, 16-19, 25-30; 13:14). The repeated use of γινώσκω in the first 8 verses of Mt 12: "Do you not know", "do you not know", and "if you knew what it means", all refer back to 11:25-30, where "these things" are hidden from the wise, but revealed to children. To those to whom it has been revealed it is also given to recognise the father in the son (Mt 11:27).

[73] Although the accusation does include an implicit exhortation to be merciful, i.e. as a reference to the love commandment (McConnell, *Law*, 68-72), the real issue at stake here is the ability to recognise the father through the son, or through the deeds of the son (cf. Mt 11:19, 27).

[74] Mt 12:5: τοῖς σάββασιν οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τὸ σάββατον βεβηλοῦσιν καὶ *ἀναίτιοί εἰσιν*/Mt 12:7: εἰ δὲ ἐγνώκειτε τί ἐστιν, Ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν, οὐκ ἂν κατεδικάσατε *τοὺς ἀναιτίους*.

disciples, owing service to him, are innocent of breaking the Sabbath law. The significance of this exegetical argument can only be understood first in light of the meaning of the Sabbath in Scripture, and second by understanding the contrast between mercy and sacrifice in Matthew's use of Hos 6:6.

Sabbath in the Septuagint is often translated with ἀνάπαυσις. Ἀνάπαυσις was the purpose of the Sabbath,[75] and as such, it served to commemorate God's bringing Israel out of Egypt from under the yoke of the oppressor. [76] The Sabbath rest is a symbol of the rest and life which is connected with dwelling in the promised land, and consequently, in prophetic literature it is the symbol of eschatological redemption.[77] It is the concept of Jesus as the giver of rest, therefore, which ties the Sabbath controversies to the previous logion in the gospel of Matthew.[78]

The analysis of the scriptural argument of Mt 12:1-8 has shown that the main purpose of the pericope is the identification of the place of the presence of God (the *shekinah*) in Jesus.[79] The haggadic and halakic arguments of the pericope show Matthew's familiarity with Scripture. Matthew draws on Scripture to expound his theological point of view. Matthew also uses Scripture as authoritative in the development of the exegetical argument.[80] In the passage as Matthew has portrayed the controversy, both the Christological "more than" theme, as well as the theme of obduracy are brought out, the latter in the inability of Jesus' antagonists to understand what Jesus is. Matthew's argument in the pericope, contrasts sacrifice and mercy. In the attempt to understand the significance of the contrast between sacrifice and mercy in Matthew, it is necessary to examine the occurrence of Hos 6:6 in the context of Mt 9.

---

[75] Ex 23:23, Deut 5:14.

[76] Deut 5:15.

[77] Zech 14:7. For this three dimensional scope of Sabbath observance, see Samuele Bacchiocchi, *From Sabbath to Sunday* (1977), 23. Bacchiocchi also points out that in Judaism the Sabbath functioned as typology for the messianic redemption in several ways in: Samuele Bacchiocchi, "Sabbatical Typologies of Messianic Redemption" (1986), 155-167. T. Friedman, "The Sabbath" (1967), 445, points to Is 56:1-7; 58:13-14; 66:20-24, where the same terminology is used to describe both the Sabbath and the end of days.

[78] Cf. Eduard Schweizer, *Matthäus*, 181. Matthew does implicitly contrast the light burden of Jesus with the heavy burdens Pharisees places on people (Mt 23:4). However, the Sabbath controversies are not introduced here with the primary purpose to contrast the heavy burdens of the Pharisaic Sabbath observance with the light load of Jesus. Contra Rudolf Schnackenburg, "Siehe", 217; and J.C Fenton, *Gospel of St Matthew* (1963), 187.

[79] Cf. also Bruce Chilton and Jacob Neusner, *Judaism in the New Testament* (1995), 135-144.

[80] It may be, as D.M. Cohn-Sherbok, "Analysis of Jesus' Arguments Concerning the Plucking of Grain on the Sabbath" (1979) shows, that the inferences drawn in Matthew's haggadic and halakic arguments are invalid from a rabbinic point of view, because the parallels as Matthew draws them do not actually correspond. This would show Matthew's familiarity with, but false use of the exegetical rules. The argument of Matthew, is nevertheless intended to communicate his understanding of Jesus with other Jews.

The use of Hos 6:6 in Mt 9:13 and its Implications for the Argument of Mt 12:1-8

It is interesting to note that the citation of Hos 6:6 functions to connect material of Mt 9 and Mt 12 which is found together in the gospel of Mark. Matthew has inserted healing stories, the sending out of the disciples and the John/Jesus material from Q after 9:17. The result is that the Sabbath controversies have been removed from their original context of disputes over purity and other laws in Mark[81] to their present place, where they introduce a set of new conflicts with the Pharisees. Several common factors indicate that the repetition of the quotation in Mt 12 has a specific purpose. First, the quotation is introduced similarly in both contexts, where τὶ ἐστιν emphasises the need for understanding. Jesus' reproach in chapter 12: "if you had known" refers back to chapter 9, where the Pharisees are requested to "go and learn". Second, the antagonists in both occurrences are the Pharisees. Finally, but perhaps decisively, the citation is in both passages preceded and followed by a Christological pronouncement.

In Mt 9, the Hosean citation is inserted into Markan material where the disciples are questioned about the practice of Jesus in eating with tax collectors and sinners. Jesus himself answers "It is not the powerful who need a healer, but those who are worthless," and "I did not come to call the righteous, but sinners." The quotation is inserted by the Matthean redactor between the two statements, and as in Mt 12, interrupts the apparent logic of the pericope. Clearly, the issue in question is the mission or practice of Jesus. Compassion is given content in Jesus' praxis: healing, forgiving sins (Mt 9:6), fellowship with and calling of "tax collectors and sinners" to discipleship (Mt 9:9-13). It seems then, that the demand for mercy in Hos 6:6 is fulfilled in Jesus ministry.[82]

The Christological emphasis in Mt 9:13 seems to disregard the second element of the quotation: sacrifice. Matthew 9 does not give an indication as to the significance of this contrast. The Pharisees are in fact invited, in a teacher-pupil manner, to go and learn what the significance of the citation may be. This significance is subsequently revealed to them in Mt 12, where the citation occurs again, following a statement about the temple. Sacrifice, as a celebration which takes place in the presence of God in the temple,[83] is less significant now that the word of the prophet has been fulfilled, and the presence of God is found in Jesus' ministry of compassion and mercy.[84] That Matthew thought in

---

[81] With Pharisees over eating with tax collectors and sinners, with the disciples of John concerning fasting, with the Pharisees again concerning Sabbath observance.

[82] The quotation may illustrate the meaning of Mt 5:17: "Do not believe that I came to bring an end to the law or the prophets: I did not come to abolish, but to fulfil." Cf. Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 45.

[83] Deut 12:5-12. "זבח", *TDOT* vol IV, 25.

[84] This connection between θυσία and the temple is often overlooked, and the contrast ἔλεος//θυσία is understood to contrast the love commandment of Jesus with the legalism of the Pharisees, and, consequently, Judaism as a whole. Cf. e.g. McConnell, *Law*, 72; O. Lamar Cope, *Matthew*, 68; Goulder, "Midrash", 37; Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 239. The consecutive references to the priests' duty in the temple on the Sabbath (i.e. sacrifice), Jesus' presence as greater than the temple, and the contrast compassion/sacrifice, however, seem to emphasise that θυσία here actually means the obvious: sacrifice in the temple cult.

these terms about the temple is confirmed in Mt 23, where the statement "Behold, I will leave your house desolate" (vs. 38), coincides with the exit of Jesus from the temple (Mt 24:1). Both here and in Mt 23:38 Matthew's post-70 CE situation becomes evident. In the narrative of Matthew, Mt 9:13 prepares for the second occurrence of Hos 6:6 by already placing it in a context of Christological pronouncement. The question at stake is ultimately the question of the "where" of God's presence, reinterpreted in light of both the Jesus event the destruction of the temple.

The exegetical argument of the first Sabbath controversy has thus been shown to be primarily Christological. The quotation from Hos 6:6 "Mercy, I want, rather than sacrifice," as it occurs in Mt 12:7 gives content to the Christological pronouncement of the Sabbath controversy. God's compassion is fulfilled in the ministry of Jesus. The citation from Hos 6:6, therefore, serves also as an introduction to the second of the Sabbath controversies. Also here, Jesus' compassion is symbolic of God's provision for the human being.

In the second Sabbath controversy Jesus enters *their* synagogue where a man with a withered hand is found, and *they* question him about whether it is permissible to heal on the Sabbath.[85] In response Jesus points out that anyone would lift his sheep out of a pit on the Sabbath, and that a human being is worth (διαφέρω) much more than a sheep. Matthew otherwise uses διαφέρω only where it occurs in Q: Mt 6:26 (you are worth more than the birds of the sky and the seeds of the earth) and 10:31 (more than sparrows). The insertion of the phrase here duplicates the Q-tradition[86] and functions to bring the two previous occurrences into mind. The healing of the man with the withered hand by Jesus, as well as other good deeds towards human beings on the Sabbath, are to be understood as an expression of God's compassion.[87]

---

[85] Matthew's preference for the verb ἐπερωτάω rather than παρατηρέω (to watch closely), underlines the feeling of hostility on the part of the Jewish leaders which is already there in the markan account. Cf. Schenk, *Sprache*, 261. The verb has no formal subject, the indefinite "they" of "their synagogues" (12:9), are those who condemn. It is worth noting that this Matthean stereotype (αὐτων as a way to distinguish their synagogues, their leaders, their cities) is only prevalent in the first part of the gospel, ending in 13:58 with Jesus' inability to do any powerful deeds because of their unbelief (Mt 4:23; 7:29; 9:35; 10:17; 11:1; 12:9; 13:54; 13:58). The repetition of "ἔξεστιν" ties the present pericope with the previous, explicitly raising the question of the lawfulness to heal on a Sabbath. In Mark this is only implicit, as they watch him carefully to see whether he would heal.

[86] Schenk, *Sprache*, 183.

[87] Therefore, it is too simple to conclude that the redactionally omitted phrase from Mk 2:27: Τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐγένετο καὶ οὐχ ὁ ἄνθρωπος διὰ τὸ σάββατον was too radical or "gentile" oriented for Matthew. (Cf. Schweizer, *Matthäus*, 180) Differently David Hill, "On the Use and Meaning of Hos 6:6 in Matthew's Gospel" (1978), 114, suggests that Matthew's omission of the statement is grounded precisely in Matthew's knowledge of the Jewish view that the Sabbath was a gift from God to the human being, because it was used to strengthen the Sabbath commandment. Matthew's redaction of the whole of the two controversies, which actually form one unit, shows an understanding of Jesus' ministry where the concern for the human being corresponds with the purpose of the Sabbath commandment. The Sabbath controversies as a unit in Matthew may consequently be interpreted as an expansion of the omitted Markan phrase.

In the context of the Christological theme of Matthew 11-13, the use of Hos 6:6 serves to emphasise the presence of God in the ministry of Jesus. This praxis of Jesus as the giver of rest is at the beginning of Mt 11-13 described in terms which announce the eschatological hope of redemption in the Hebrew Scriptures: "the blind receive sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed and the dead are raised up" (Mt 11,5), and illustrated further in the Sabbath healing in Mt 12:9-14. The associations between Jesus, Sabbath rest and the eschatological hope add force to the Christological argument of the Sabbath controversies. In his ministry of mercy and healing the true purpose of the Sabbath rest is present. This is something greater than the temple. In Jesus' ministry, one may recognise God's redemptive work (cf. Mt 11:27).

The analysis so far has shown that the Matthean Sabbath controversy has meaning beyond that which is revealed in a synchronic reading of the narrative. Hence, an examination of the original context of the citation from Hosea is necessary. This examination will establish that Matthew's use of the citation is not merely atomistic. By inserting the passage in the Sabbath controversies, Matthew again touches upon the theme which was brought out by the citation of Jeremiah 6:16 in Mt 11:29. Also here the theme of covenant faithfulness plays a role.

The Adaptation of Hos 6:6 in Mt 12:1-8

In the original context of the citation in the book of Hosea, ἔλεος is connected with the covenant as faithfulness to God.[88] Hosea 6:6 is part of a prophetic speech of judgement of Israel for its disloyalty. Words of judgement constitute most of the book of Hosea. The purpose of the prophetic judgement, however, is ultimately the repentance of God's people. In repeating the quotation in the context of controversies with the Pharisees, Matthew is alluding to the Hosean judgement upon Israel. Here, as in the prophetic book, threat of judgement implies an invitation to repentance. The lack of understanding among the Pharisees leads eventually to their denunciation, patterned on prophetic judgement in chapter 23. In the employment of Hos 6:6 is implied a prophetic judgement against those who do not recognise in Jesus the mercy of God.[89]

It has been suggested that the inner Matthean connections between the use of Hos 6:6 in controversies with the Pharisees, together with chapter 23 of the gospel, hint at an explanation for the destruction of the temple. The use of the same citation in connection with temple practice in Matthew, as well as the Rabbinic tradition of Yohanan, suggests Hos 6:6 as a text particularly relevant to the Jewish community after

---

[88] C.L. Seow, "Hosea" (1992), 296.

[89] While assuming that a specific problem of Matthean community is dealing with the separation from the mother community, a fact that is illustrated through the extraordinary harsh judgement on the Jewish leaders, it is difficult to conclude with Hill that Hos. 6:6 is used atomistically in the gospel as a source of halakhah. Although Hill, "On the Use", 114-116 uses the Hosea reference to analyse the meaning of חסד in terms of covenant loyalty in the book of Hosea, he prefers to understand the use of Hos 6:6 in Matthew plainly on the level of proper Sabbath observance.

the destruction of the temple.[90] Looking at the destroyed temple, Yohanan ben Zakkai is reported to have quoted Hos 6:6, referring to compassion as a redemptive power equal to sacrifice.[91] The parallel usage of Hos 6:6 in the tradition of Yohanan ben Zakkai, then, supports the notion that the Christological argument of Matthew 12:1-8 in connection with the Wisdom Christology in 11:28-30 is developed in the post 70 situation of Matthew. Significant, however, is that for Matthew, Jesus as the place of the presence of God, is the fulfilment of the compassion spoken of in Hosea, and can therefore also demand compassion.

Conclusion

Matthew's interpretation of the Sabbath controversies is primarily Christological. Jesus is Immanuel, "God with us": something more than the temple. The composer of the first gospel sees the two accounts of Sabbath controversies as revolving around the question of the true reason for keeping the Sabbath. The concern of the Pharisees as depicted in Mt 12:1-14 is the proper keeping of the Sabbath command. In Matthew's understanding, ἀνάπαυσις is the purpose of the Sabbath. The essence of Sabbath observance is as pointed out above, the proleptic presence of the "rest" of the age to come. Through the placing of the Sabbath controversies in the present context, Matthew brings the Sabbatical promise of liberation and rest into connection with the ministry of Jesus.[92] This is practically depicted in the healing of the man with the withered hand: his hand was made whole like the other. Further, and quite significantly, this is set forth in the Matthean addition which at first glance seems an awkward argumentation: Behold something more than the Temple is here. True Sabbath is found in the ministry of Jesus who is "the one who is to come" (Mt 11:3), replacing the temple as God's resting place among God's people.

In the use of Hos 6:6 Matthew appeals to two aspects of the prophetic text. First, it is thought to contain and express the will of God. Second, and only in the extension of the Christological argument, it contains the norm by which to live in the covenant relationship with God. Hence the prophetic text is here neither employed as a proof text nor as predictive, containing knowledge about the eschatological future. What in its context in Hosea is a prophetic speech of judgement against a people that has forsaken

---

[90] Though any literary dependence between Matthew and Yohanan cannot be speculated on account of the problems of dating rabbinic literature, the context of Hos 6:6 in Matthew, does show a common concern.

[91] Cf. Billerbeck, et al., *Kommentar*, 500.

[92] Despite the presence of the eschatological idea here, Jesus' defence of the disciples is not to be understood as a concession to this age. The Christological emphasis does not do away with Sabbath observance in the Matthean community. The practice of Sabbath observance is presupposed in Matthew, and the Matthean community probably still observed the Sabbath. Cf. Luz, *Evangelium*, 233. The Christological accent is much more to be understood as similar to the question of fasting in Mt 9:14-15: while the "bridegroom", or the true Sabbath is present, there is an exemption from the rule, as with the priests in the Sabbath temple service.

the covenant, is by Matthew employed to make a Christological pronunciation, although moral obligation to follow Jesus in his compassionate ministry is implied. The Christological pronouncement is found in the combination of the citation from Hosea with the assertion: Here is something more than the temple. The mercy of Jesus fulfils that which is required for the maintenance of the covenant relationship with God. The passage thereby repeats the content of Mt 11:28-30. The ministry of Jesus, therefore, becomes a paradigm for how God deals with God's people. Scripture therefore witnesses to the mercy of God. This finds its correspondence in the actions and words of Jesus. Just as keeping the Sabbath is done in remembering God's acts of redemption and in imitation of God's actions (resting on the seventh day), so both Hos 6:6 and Mt 12:1-8 also have an exhortative function: for the believer to imitate the mercy of God. Hence Scripture is also normative in containing rules for the practical living of life in relation to God.

5.1.4. The Normativity of Scripture in Matthew's Development of the More than Christology

In the analysis of what can be referred to as the "more than" Christology in Matthew, citations from prophetic books and from the book of Ben Sirach were employed in the context of Christological pronunciations. Through the use of Mal 3:1, 23, John the Baptist is described as one who prepares the way of the people before the coming of the day of YHWH. Implicit in the comparison between Jesus and John in the chapter is the presence of God in the ministry of Jesus. Further, in the citations and complex allusion in Mt 11:28-30, Jesus speaks as the Wisdom of God offering the gift of understanding and of rest to the one who will answer his call. Here the Wisdom imagery serves to proclaim Jesus as the presence of God. Finally, Hos 6:6 lends authority to the ministry of Jesus as one of compassion, as expression of both God's will and God's nature. In all three instances, the notion of impending or possible judgement was underlying the positive proclamation of God's redemption. This judgement becomes more explicit in the theme of revelation, hiddenness and the problem of obduracy which is to be analysed in chapter 6.

In the first of the passages analysed in this chapter, Scripture was demonstrated to function as an authority in its predictive nature, holding knowledge about the events of the end of the age. The events which Matthew interprets in light of Scripture are nevertheless not expected to correspond literally to Scripture. Rather, for Matthew it is the correspondence between the conceptual reality that Scripture describes and the events which Matthew interprets which is important. The events are found to have significance in light of Scripture. Thus despite the fulfilment of Scripture in the present, the text remains normative beyond its fulfilment.

In the latter two examples, the texts were found to be authoritative in containing the language and content of God's relation to the people. Again the present events are

interpreted in light of Scripture, and given significance though the employment of texts and formulations from Scripture. Thereby, the words and actions of Jesus are given authority. As such they may be understood as proof texts: the use of Scripture is designed to prove the identity of Jesus. This is only achieved through the word of Scripture, and therefore Jesus is given authority only in the extension of Scripture. This is the case even though Matthew reinterprets Scripture in light of the present event. There is a reciprocal relationship between the Jesus event affirming the normativity of Scripture, and Scripture affirming the legitimacy of Matthew's claims for the identity of Jesus. As the place of the presence of God, Jesus' words and actions are normative. Yet they can only be so in the extension of Scripture. Here Scripture is normative, because it contains the story of election and God's acts of deliverance in history, to which the Jesus story must conform.

Neither of the allusions and quotations which were analysed were used in a purely atomistic manner. The theological undertones of the passages were all found to play a role in the deeper structure and content of the Matthean passages. The texts are by Matthew, however, all brought out of their historical context and into the present, without losing their reference to the past. As authoritative texts which express God's dealings with God's people, past and present, they may therefore be said to constitute a norm for events in the present.

5.2. THE NORMATIVITY OF THE SYNOPTIC TRADITION IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE πλεῖον/μείζον MOTIF

The analysis of the use of Scripture in the development of the πλεῖον/μείζον motif demonstrated that the Christological pronouncement was its central purpose, and that it functioned to transfer authority to the person of Jesus. Hence, the scriptural correspondence grants legitimacy to the Christian claim concerning Jesus. In this section the analysis of the use of the synoptic tradition will demonstrate that the motif is continued in the concept of the reversal of great and small in the kingdom of heaven. Also here the main purpose of the evangelist is kerygmatic, whereby Christology and the "good news of the Kingdom" go hand in hand.

In the πλεῖον/μείζον motif, the comparative and superlative adjectives are used to express the extent of the reality of the Kingdom of God which appears with the coming of Jesus. The presence of neuter adjectives has led many to doubt the Christological significance of these sayings. In the case of the Sabbath controversies, it became clear that the presence of something greater could not be separated from the person of Jesus. Yet the πλεῖον or μείζον theme as it is developed in the Jesus tradition and through Jesus shows that Christology for Matthew is wider than the person of Jesus. The neuter of the adjective is used to express an indefinite reality which points beyond the person of Jesus. The reality the adjectives in question point to is the kingdom of heaven, and its inauguration or presence in the ministry of Jesus. The two are inseparable. The extent of this reality is expressed through comparison.

The πλεῖον/μείζον motif in Matthew's adaptation of synoptic tradition is found mainly in Q material. Matthew 11:7-9 and 11 is the Q tradition in which the citation of Ex 23:20/Mal 3:1 is situated. Matthew 12:41-42 follows in the context of the Beelzeboul controversy. In both instances, the presence of the βασιλεία in the ministry of Jesus is implied. The extent and nature of the kingdom presents itself in the example of Jesus. The πλεῖον/μείζον motif is introduced on the basis of this example. Matthew uses the synoptic tradition present in Mark 10:42-45 in the interpretation of Q. Hence in the two passages, as well as in the double parable of Matthew 13:31-34, synoptic tradition is used to interpret tradition, and to make it meaningful. Synoptic tradition as an interpretation of the Jesus event is normative in its pragmatic function. First, it tells the story of the election of God's people anew, on the basis of the example of Jesus: The least will become great. Second, it expresses criteria by which to live out that election: by becoming like servants. Although this concept also has its correspondence in Scripture, Jesus tradition is here the dominant norm-giving factor.

5.2.1. The Greater in the Kingdom of Heaven: Matthew's Adaptation of Q Material in Matthew 11:7-9, 11

In ch 5.1. it was demonstrated that the declaration of John as Elijah in Matthew has a function beyond the purpose of placing John in the context of salvation historical

speculations. The role of the eschatological prophet was shown to include other aspects as well. The identification of John's role of restoration and calling people to repentance before the arrival of the day of YHWH was found to be the main function of the citation. Further, the emphasis on John was found to include an implicit Christological pronouncement. The Matthean adaptation of the Q passage accompanying the citation, continues this proclamation of the presence of the Kingdom in Jesus. But more, it proclaims the nature of the Kingdom as "good news for the poor" in line with Mt 5.

Matthew remains true to the order of the Q material in the section succeeding 11:2-6, the introductory pericope to chapters 11-13. The question by John to Jesus prompts Jesus' subsequent teaching to the crowds about the significance of the ministry of John the Baptist. It has already been shown that the Q material includes two statements which point to the ministry of John as something extraordinary. First, John is said to be more than a prophet, a statement qualified and explained by the citation from Malachi and Exodus. In a second, parallel statement, John is said to be the greatest among those born of women. It is in the context of this explication of John's ministry that Q brings the saying comparing John's prominence among "those born of women" and the greatness of the "least in the kingdom of God."

The tradition-historical roots of the Jesus-John passages have been debated. Some find in the material the evidence of a double messianic expectation in early Christian literature, similar to the priestly and the royal Messiah of the Qumran literature,[1] or of messianic expectations originally centred on John,[2] and evidence for rivalry between Jesus and John and their disciples.[3] The significance of the material in the context of Matthew however is ultimately Christological. John receives a function not only as a prophet, but as the final prophet, who nevertheless suffers the same fate as all prophets. The interest in Matthew's adaptation of the material is not to express the significance of John and John's ministry in itself, but rather the implications of the correct interpretation of these for understanding Jesus.

In Matthew's interpretation, the intention of Q in proclaiming the extent of the Kingdom in comparison with the person of John is kept. The content of Q's text is clarified and interpreted through Matthew's harmonising of Q with other synoptic tradition. The synoptic tradition is thereby found to be authoritative both in its rhetorical (i.e. in the theological interpretation of tradition) and in its pragmatic function. Tradition

---

[1] Cf. 1QS 9, 11; 1 Qsa 2,13ff; 1Qsb. For a short summary of the double messianic expectation in Qumran literature cf. Günter Stemberger, "Messias, Messianische Bewegungen" TRE 22 (1992) 622-623; John J. Collins, "He shall not Judge by What his Eyes See" (1995). That the double messianic expectations was the predominant one in Qumran literature is questioned by Martin G. Abegg, "Messiah at Qumran" (1995). For John/Jesus as parallel to Qumran, cf. Otto Böcher, "Johannes", 178.

[2] Cf. the exposition in Stephanie von Dobbeler, *Gericht*, 225ff.

[3] Walter Wink, *John the Baptist*, xi, 20-24; Rudolf Bultmann, *Geschichte*, 22; Dieter Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 26-28.

is used here to show the presence of the Kingdom of God in Jesus, and further the nature of the Kingdom. Here God's will to redeem God's people is proclaimed authoritatively.

Moreover, there is a revaluation present in the material with regard to the addressees of the kerygmatic proclamation. As will be evident also in chapter 6, the good news of the Kingdom is not proclaimed only to the people of God, to whom the Baptist was sent. Those who hear and understand, "the poor", are the addressees of the proclamation. The normativity of tradition is made clear in addressing this specific group of people as the recipients of God's favour.

The authoritative aspects of synoptic tradition in Matthew's development of the πλεῖον/μείζον motif in Mt 11:7-9, 11 will be demonstrated by identifying and describing the impact of the Matthean redaction of Q. As in ch 4.2, this will be achieved in three subsequent steps: First, the Matthean redactional adaptation of the Q text will be identified. Second, the theological content of the Q text will be described. Finally, the Matthean adaptation and interpretation of the Q tradition can be described.

Matthew's redaction of Q 7:18-23

Matthew's redaction of Jesus' teaching concerning John in Q 7:18-23 is not extensive. Yet the small alterations of the Q text, plus the insertions of Q material in v 12, are decisive for Matthew's rereading of the Q text. Again Matthew's redaction can be distinguished as either "technical" or "literary". The technical changes can be identified in the use of preferential vocabulary and style, or by use of linguistic links to the narrative context. The literary redaction makes use of the linguistic links as interpretative elements in the text, and in the use of the language and form of the sources.

Matthew's preservation of traditional material is predominant in the passage. With a few exceptions Matthew remains true to the wording of Q. This is in accordance with Matthew's partly conservative preservation of source material. In the redactional transition between 11:6 and Jesus' teaching about John, it is likely that Matthew's sentence is structured on the Q phrase which it replaces. The Matthean τούτων δε πορευομένων, employs the verb of Mt 11:4//Q 7:22.[4] Thereby a lexical link with the

---

[4] So also Ulrich Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 172 and William David Davies and Dale C. Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol. 2, 246. Lk 7:24 is a Lukan redaction, ἄγγελοι referring back to the sending of Lk 7:19 and is perhaps influenced by Lk 1:23; 2:15. Cf. Siegfried Schulz, *Q*, 229. Differently, Elisabeth Sevenich-Bax, *Israel's Konfrontation mit der letzten Boten der Weisheit* (1993), 211 and Paul Hoffmann, *Studien*, 194, both hold the Matthean text to reflect the Q wording. The evidence is not conclusive. Ἀπέρχομαι (Luke's text) occurs 20 times in Lk. Of these 13 are derived from sources (6 L, 5 Mk, 2 Q) and four are probably redactional. Luke omits the verb from Markan material in six instances and replaces it with a different verb in five cases. The same verb is in Matthew omitted nine times, and replaced four times in the Markan text. It is kept 20 times where it occurs in source material, whereas 11 additional occurrences probably are redactional. Twice, ἀπέρχομαι can be ascribed to Q (Q 9:57, 59). In six cases, three times in Lk and four times in Mt, the verb occurs in material of the double tradition, or as minor agreement Mt/Lk, but can not positively be ascribed to the Q source. Πορεύομαι, is found 29 times in Mt, of these 18 are dependent on the sources, nine times it has been inserted redactionally. In Lk 26 instances can be ascribed to sources, and 19 are redactional. The verb occurs five

previous pericope is established, and the literary continuation between Jesus' answer to John and the speech to the crowd concerning John, already there in Q, is strengthened. The differing texts of Mt 11:8//Lk 7:25 are probably due to Lukan redaction.[5] Matthew therefore reflects the Q text.[6] In conclusion of the passage Mt 11:15 is a prophetic call to repentance. Again the text is an adaptation of a synoptic form. The sentence is derived from Mk 4:9. Matthew has duplicated it and inserted it here. It functions as a conclusion of the pericope in the same way as Mt 11:6 for the previous pericope. Again, therefore, Matthew is found to imitate synoptic language. The sentence serves a clear structural and rhetorical role in its present place.

Matthew alters tradition in two ways: by adding preferential vocabulary and altering the structure of Q in v. 11. The insertion of preferential vocabulary is found in v 7 and v. 9. Matthew adds ὁ Ιησοῦς to Q's text after ἤρξατο. This addition corresponds to Matthean redactional praxis. Jesus is clarified as the acting or speaking subject, an aspect which in Q and Mark often remains implied.[7] The frequent use of the name always points back to Mt 1:21 (she will bear a son, and you shall call his name Jesus, for he will save his people from their sins).[8] Matthew also exchanges τοῦ θεοῦ with τῶν οὐρανῶν.

The parallelism of Mt 11:11 differs from the structure of Q 7:28. The Lukan text reflects Q and places two parallel structured sentences next to each other:

μείζων ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν' Ιωάννου οὐδείς ἐστιν:
ὁ δὲ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστιν.

---

times in Q (Q 7:8 [twice], 22; 11:26; 15:4). Eight occurrences of the verb, six in Lk and two in Mt are found in material where the source cannot be identified with certainty. The statistics, which show a frequent use of πορεύομαι in Lukan material, and transitional sentences similar to Mt 11:7 also in Mt 12:45; 22:15; 27:66 and 28:11, suggest that the Matthean text is redactional. It does, however, not prove that Lk preserves the Q wording. The genitive absolute in both Mt and Lk and the reference to the departing of John's disciples suggest that a similar transitional phrase existed in Q. It is, moreover, likely that neither Lk nor Mt reflect the original Q. (So also Volker Schönle, "Johannes, Jesus und die Juden" (1982), 41).

[5] For more detailed discussion cf. I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke* (1978), 294; François Bovon, *Lukas*, vol. 1, 370-371.

[6] Cf. Schönle, "Johannes", 42. The original scribe of Sinaiticus reverses the word order in v. 8 and 9 (here also W Z 892 and the first corrector of Vaticanus), introducing the noun (ἄνθρωπον v. 8 and προφήτην v, 9) before the infinitive 'ιδείν. In this way he alters the parallelism in the rhetorical questions: τί ἐξήλθατε (εἰς τὴν ἔρημον); θεάσασθαι κάλαμον/ ἄνθρωπον 'ιδείν / προφήτην 'ιδείν. The weight of the external witnesses speaks against the text of Sinaiticus, although their parallelism may be assimilation to the parallelism of the Lukan text. The reversal shows that the punctuation of the sentences was not clear. Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 171, translates the sentences in line with the Sinaiticus alterations: Why did you go out? To see ...? Davies, and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol. 2, 247-248 translate "What did you go out to see?" The difference in the sentence punctuation does not significantly alter the meaning .

[7] Wolfgang Schenk, *Sprache*, 298-299.

[8] Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Matthew*, 84-84.

Matthew, omits οὐδείς ἐστιν at the end of the first clause (Q 7:28a), and inserts οὐκ ἐγήγερται[9] at the beginning of the clause. Further μείζων is moved towards the end of the first clause. Matthew thereby creates a parallelism where the emphasis of each falls on the comparative μείζων. The restructuring of Q reflects Matthew's tendency to structure and tighten the material of the sources. Further, the restructuring alters the emphasis of the verse, so that Matthew's theological interpretation of the verse becomes evident.

Finally, Matthew expands the Q passage. Matthew 11:12f//Lk 16:16 is omitted from its original place in Q and inserted into the speech.[10] Matthew 11:14 is a Matthean composition and is a rewording or interpretation of the citation in v 10. The significance of this allusion to Mal 3:23 was discussed in ch 5.1.1.

Before conclusions can be drawn regarding the extent and significance of the Matthean redaction, it is necessary to analyse the content of the passage as it appeared in Q.

Jesus' Teaching about John in Q

The Q section which deals with Jesus and John the Baptist (Q 7:18-23, 24-26, 31-35) follows immediately after the healing of the centurion's servant,[11] which is placed after the sermon on the mount/plain. As was shown in ch 4.1., the two prepare for the mixed quotation in 7:22. They give examples of miracles as well as of the proclaiming of good news, although in Q, the emphasis in the miracle story there focuses on the faith of the centurion.

Despite the focus on the faith of the centurion, the negative response to Jesus and John depicted in the parable of the children in the marketplace in Q 7:31-35 does not serve as a contrast to the centurion. Rather the parable, and the possibility of rejection

---

[9] For the Matthean preferential use of ἐγείρω, cf. Schenk, *Sprache*, 209-210. Bovon, *Lukas*, 371, nevertheless, holds Matthew's text to reflect the original Q wording.

[10] In disagreement with Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 27-28 and Arland Jacobson, *The Wisdom Christology of Q* (1978), 84, the saying is not to be considered a part of the Q collection of Jesus and John in Q 7. The Lukan version has been redacted and together with two other Q logia (Lk 16:18//Mt 5:32 and Lk 16//Mt 5:18) inserted into material from Luke's special source. It is possible that Luke found it already coupled with Lk 16:17. An indication of this is their connection through the key word νόμος (cf. Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 207-208). The logion fits poorly with the context in Lk, and it is unlikely that it should have been moved and placed there by Luke had it originally been found in the context of Q 7. Possibly the logion was not a part of Q, but existed in two different forms in two parts of the tradition. John S. Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 113-114, includes a short review of the arguments concerning the Logion's place in Q. Kloppenborg is interested in the theological and tradition-historical aspects of the Q document, and argues for its reading together with the material in Q 7 on account of the similar content. Exactly this is an argument against the context of Q 7 being original. Would Luke then have removed it? The Matthean redaction of Mt 11:12 will only marginally be touched upon in the next chapter. For a history of interpretation of the passage cf. Peter Scott Cameron, *Violence and the Kingdom* (1984). For shorter reviews of possible interpretations cf. Davies, and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol. 2, 255-256; Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 177-178; Helmut Merklein, *Die Gottesherrschaft als Handlungsprinzip* (1978), 80-97.

[11] One of two miracle stories in Q.

serves as an introduction to the missions discourse and the section on following Jesus which precedes the discourse.[12] The discourse ends with the great thanksgiving in Q 10:21-22. The connecting thought therefore between Q 7:31-35 and the missionary discourse is the (possibility) of negative response of some to Jesus and John as children of divine Wisdom, and subsequently to Jesus' disciples. It has already been pointed out, that in Q, the superiority of Jesus over John is, if not explicit, at least implicit. The connecting thought between the parable and the great thanksgiving is the reversal of the understanding of wisdom. The νήπιοι have received revelation and are blessed.

Together with the account of John's question to Jesus, Jesus' teaching concerning John serves well as an introduction to the parable of the children in the market place. The threefold question τί ἐξήλθατε, implies a certain amount of ignorance or lack of insight on behalf of the listeners. Together with the concluding parable, it becomes apparent that "this generation" does not understand what it sees. The reed shaken in the wind and the man dressed in fine clothing are not simply ridiculous solutions to the rhetorical question. Though they are that as well, they are realistic in that they ironically depict the contemporaries' expectations of what the eschatological prophet should be. Likewise the parable indicates that neither Jesus nor John met the expectations of "this generation". Going out into the desert, the crowd came to see a prophet, but what they found did not meet their expectations, hence Jesus asks, "what did you expect"? The final saying: "Wisdom will be justified by her children" extends back to include the whole of the previous section, referring not only to Jesus and John, but also to those who understand their mission as Wisdom's children. In this, the positive judgement of John by Jesus parallels the answer Jesus gives John's disciples. It forms the centre of the section regarding John as that which the crowds have failed to understand.

The saying in Q 7:28 concurs with and explains the citation from Mal 3:1: John is the prophet who announces the coming of the kingdom, the new age. The kingdom of God, the eschatological age, is greater than the present age, hence, even the smallest in the kingdom is greater than John. Consequently, the contrast ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν and ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ is to be understood as a contrast between members of the previous age and participants in the eschatological age. The comparison is meant not to diminish the significance of John, but rather to express the greatness of the eschatological age, by using John, the greatest among human beings, as a measure.

It is evident then, that the main concern of the Q passage is to assign eschatological roles to both John and Jesus. John announces the coming of the eschatological age and Jesus introduces it. The greatness of the Kingdom is explained in

---

[12] The contrast made by Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 118-119, between the positive response of the gentile Centurion in Q 7:1-10 and the negative response of Israel in Q 7:31-35, seems informed by research on the texts as they appear in the context of Matthew and Luke. Although the Centurion's faith is commended (a commendation which is repeated in 7:23: blessed is the one who does not take offence at me,) and "this generation" is criticised, there is nothing in the parable which implies a judgement of *Israel* as such.

relation to John. After the significance of the passage in Q has been identified, it is possible to demonstrate how Matthew has adapted and interpreted his source.

Matthew's Adaptation of Q in Mt 11:7-9, 11

Although Matthew's composition changes the order of Q, the adaptation of the Jesus/John material seeks to enhance the meaning of the source. In the process, however, the emphasis on the greatness of the kingdom is diminished in an attempt to explain the status or significance of John. Matthew's addition of Mt 11:12//Lk 16:16 along with the concluding verses 14-15, give the pericope in Matthew a different structure from that of Q. The Matthean text consist of two parts. The first, which is dependent on Q, consists of the threefold question or ridicule of "this generation'. The second consists of the Matthean insertion of Q 16:16, and further redactional additions to the Q text. Each part concludes with a reference to the expected eschatological prophet Elijah (Mt 11:10; Mt 11:14).[13] The second part as a whole functions as an explanation of v 10. Therefore, the part which concludes the Q text (Mt 11:11//Q 7:28) and which is intended as a further interpretation of the citation, is expanded in Matthew for clarification.

As in Q the first of the comparatives of the John/Elijah material in Matthew 11:9, περισσότερον προφήτου, serves to prepare for the mixed quotation in v 10. Or conversely, the citation serves to explain the statement in v 9. The reference to Elijah is to the expected eschatological prophet, whose ministry goes beyond that of a prophet. Mt 11:11 introduces the Matthean expansion of the previous text. In it a double comparison takes place. John is first compared to human beings in general, and in the second stage, the "least" in the kingdom of heaven is compared with John:

> οὐκ ἐγήγερται ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν μείζων Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ·
> ὁ δὲ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστιν.

There is no scholarly consensus as to the meaning of the comparison either in Q or in Matthew. The interpretation of Q advocated in the present analysis emphasises the eschatological aspect of the saying, and avoids a "relational" and an ecclesiological interpretation. In Matthew, the statement is most often interpreted in connection with the so called *Stürmerspruch* which Matthew has inserted into the context. It is understood to have a salvation historical meaning, so that John appears as the inaugurator of the time of salvation (Mt 11:12-13), while still appearing as a part of the "old covenant', as one born of a woman Mt 11:11.[14] In this interpretation, John as the last of the old covenant is compared to ὁ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ, the least in the church (as the entity of the new covenant). The interpretation is unsatisfactory because it leaves two statements which Matthew has connected redactionally to stand in open contradiction to each other.

---

[13] So also Joachim Gnilka, *Matthäusevangelium*, vol. 1, 411-412.

[14] Cf. e.g. Gnilka, *Matthäusevangelium*, vol. 1, 416-417, who holds that Matthew understood John to be a part of the time of fulfilment, so that the inclusion of Mt 11:11 from Q stands in opposition to Matthew's understanding of the role of the Baptist.

The insertion of Mt 11:12-13 in the present place makes sense only if Matthew understood the sayings to be somehow related to each other.

The "relational" interpretation, which holds μικρότερος as a comparative to refer to Jesus as a previous disciple of John, is also problematic.[15] This interpretation understands the saying as referring to the historical relationship between Jesus and John, thought to be expressed through ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχομενος in Mt 3:11.[16] It is doubtful, however, whether the formulation did express or suggest the relationship of a disciple to a master in the context of John's eschatological oriented announcement.[17] Further, in all gospel traditions the saying occurs in a context where Jesus is in one way or another clearly depicted as more than John.[18] Thus, an understanding of Jesus as μικρότερος, in specific comparison to John as Jesus' master, makes little sense in the context of the Christologically oriented gospel text.[19]

The apparent contradiction between Mt 11:11 and Mt 11:12-13 is reduced when one refrains from salvation historical deliberations, and the relationship between Jesus and John in this salvation history. Although the text does deal with both these implicitly, the centre of the text in Matthew as in Q, is a statement concerning the greatness of the kingdom. Whereas the stress in Q was found to be on the greatness of the approaching kingdom and hence eschatological, in Matthew this greatness of the kingdom has Christological and also ecclesiological significance.

The key to Matthew's understanding of the Q saying may lie in the changed sentence structure. Contributing to the difficulty of understanding the comparison of the Q saying is the different usage of the comparatives in the logion. Whereas μειζων is used comparatively in both sentences, μικρότερος with the article has the meaning of the superlative. By changing the word order of the first clause of the saying, Matthew avoids the parallel structure which compares the greater among those born of women to the

---

[15] I.e. but the lesser of the two is greater than John in the kingdom of God. For this interpretation in the history of interpretation cf. Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 1, 175 n. 29.

[16] e.g. Hoffmann, *Studien*, 220-224; Otto Böcher, "Johannes der Täufer in der neutestamentlichen Überlieferung" (1978) 48, 57-58.

[17] So also Josef Ernst, "War Jesus ein Schüler Johannes des Täufers?" (1989), 19-21.

[18] The Markan text uses ἰσχυρότερος, which in the gospel context explicitly speaks of Jesus as more than John. The Q text is not easily distinguishable at this point. Even if it only spoke of the coming one baptising in fire and spirit it would imply a "greater than" the water baptism of John. The gospel of John agrees with the synoptics in stating the unworthiness of John in relation to Jesus. If the gospels have Christianised the tradition at the announcement, it is little likely that the present text refers back to a historical relationship in which John was thought to be greater.

[19] The question of the authenticity of the logion and the meaning for the historical relationship Jesus/John will remain unanswered in this study. Michael Tilly, *Johannes*, 92-94, understands vv 7-9 to be a historical exaltation of John by Jesus, in light of John's message against the Herodian rule. Matthew 11:11 would then be considered to be a Christian polemicisation against the followers of John. Cf. Gösta Lindeskog, "Johannes", 56. It speaks against such a view for Matthew, that Matthew over against Q and Mark speaks positively of John. Cf. Wolfgang Trilling, "Täufertradition", 283; Alexander Sand, *Evangelium*, 244. Whatever the historical development and *Sitz im Leben*, the texts in question see Jesus as superior, even on the Q level. See also Ernst, "War Jesus ein Schüler?", 25-27.

least among the Kingdom of God. The result is a structure, whereby the first sentence as a whole has the meaning of a superlative which the second superlative stands in relation to, and is contrasted with. Matthew's redactional move is an interpretation of the Q text, where the contrast is made between the least and the greatest among those born of women, in comparison to John and with regard to the coming kingdom. The point, as in Q, is to make a dual assertion, first concerning the greatness of John, and second concerning the reality of the kingdom:

οὐκ ἐγήγερται ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν μείζων 'Ιωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ·
ὁ δὲ μικρότερος (ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν)
ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστιν.

In this construction, ὁ μικρότερος is to be understood in relation to the previous sentence (no one is greater than John, but the least is greater than him in the βασιλεία). Therefore ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν is no longer to be understood as an attribute to ὁ μικρότερος, but as the presence of a new reality which goes beyond human measure. The contrast ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν/ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν is not a statement of salvation-historical character contrasting the old age (before Jesus) with the new (after Jesus = church), but contrasting "this age" with "the age to come'. As in Q, the kingdom is the eschatological age, but with the accent on the "already/not yet" of the Matthean ἐρχόμενος motif. Here it is not the limitations of John the Baptist as a Jew, as a non-believer, or as a mere human which are in view, but the greatness of the kingdom which is announced by him. In the Matthean construction, μικρότερος may refer not only generally to human beings,[20] but also specifically to Jesus.

Through the development of the Q text in Mt 11:12-15, the identity and significance of John has been established. He is the eschatological prophet. The significance of this realisation is explicated through the comparison of Mt 11:11. It compares the least among human beings (the reed which is shaking in the wind,[21] the blind, the lame, the poor) to someone greater than a prophet. The statement contains more than one meaning. It is first to be read with Mt 18:4; 20:26-27 and 23:11, as a statement about the kingdom of heaven, where the one who is the servant of all is the

---

[20] For such a reconstruction (on Q level) (Q=Mt,) cf. Merklein, "Gottesherrschaft", 86-87; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 222.

[21] Gerd Theißen, "Das 'schwankende Rohr' in Mt 11.7 und die Gründungsmünzen Tiberias" (1985), 43-55 seeks to show that Mt 11:7-9 par Luke, through the use of metaphorical language, alludes to the historical conflict between John and Herod Antipas. According to Theißen, the reed depicted on coins minted in the new capital Tiberias in 20 CE would have been familiar to people as a name of ridicule for the tetrarch. As such the name would indicate his slyness as a politician in changing his ways according to the direction of the wind. In the *context of Matthew* 11-13, the contrast in Mt 11:7-9 is more likely to have a double meaning. First, on the literal level, the two are simply ironical answers to the rhetorical question. The reed, as the most common plant in the region, is not something you would seek in the desert. Likewise the man in fine clothing does not move in the desolate areas of the desert. On a symbolic level, there is a contrast between the poor and weak (Cf. Mt 12:20), and the powerful.

greatest.[22] Second, it is to be read Christologically, because the example for the "least" among those born of women (which all humans are), is found in Jesus himself (20:28).[23]

Matthew therefore, building on the statement concerning the greatness of the kingdom in Q, expands it to make a statement concerning the nature of the kingdom. The context of the saying in Matthew confirms both a general and a Christological reading of the text. The general reading, understanding the text to refer to the reversal of the "least" becoming "great" in the kingdom of heaven, is confirmed by the immediately preceding and the following pericopes. The mixed quotation in 11:5 refers to the events of the kingdom in which the "weak" in the society will be restored. By placing the mission discourse before the question of John, Matthew also brings Mt 11:25-27//Q 7:34-35, the revelation to "babes" (cf. Mt 18:1-5), closer to the parable of the children in the marketplace, only intercepted by the judgement upon the Galilean cities. Also this revelation is a reversal of the norm. The Christological reading is also supported by the context. First, the question of John in 11:3 raises a question of the identity of Jesus not just for that pericope, but for the following narrative. The interconnectedness of the presence of the kingdom with the ministry of Jesus is stressed. The presence of the kingdom is also the interest of Mt 11:7-19, evident in the Matthean stress on the role of John as Elijah through the added material in Mt 11:12-15. Further, Jesus' humility is mentioned in Mt 11:29, and he is referred to as "servant" in Mt 12:18. The interconnectedness of both the general and the Christological reading has a parallel in the previous chapter, where, in 10:38, discipleship is connected with "losing one's life" for the sake of Jesus.

It is clear then that keeping in mind the eschatological perspective present in both Q and Matthew is essential for reading Mt 11:11. The reality of the breaking in of the Kingdom of God is at the centre of the message. In Q, John as the precursor of the Kingdom stands on the threshold of its appearance. His person, as the final prophet greater than anyone born of women, is used as a measure for that which is to be expected of the age which is inaugurated. In the time of the Kingdom of God, even the least is greater than John the Baptist is now. The question of John's inclusion in or exclusion from the Kingdom is not relevant. What is relevant is his significance as the eschatological messenger announcing something greater.

Matthew expands on this significance of John's ministry by the insertion of Mt 11:12-15. John not only stands on the threshold of the kingdom, but as the prophet Mal 3 spoke of, his ministry marks the beginning of its coming (ἀπο τῶν ἡμερῶν Ἰωαννου, Mt

---

[22] So also Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew*, 208-209; O. Michel, "Μικρός" (1967), 653. Gundry reads the present text as an exhortation to humility, whereas, in the present context it would seem more appropriate to speak of "good news of the kingdom" being proclaimed (cf. Mt 11:5; 5:3.)

[23] Similarly W. Grundmann, "Μεγας" (1967), 535, who refers to "the fathers". Grundmann assumes however, that the kingdom is purely a future reality. For Matthew this is not so. The point of the strengthened emphasis on John as more than a prophet points to the understanding of fulfilment in the present. It is the "already but not yet" I have emphasised in the context of the ερχόμενος-Christology.

11:12). For Matthew the Kingdom of God is already present (ἕως ἄρτι).[24] The greatness of Jesus and John, however, does not lie in what they are in themselves, but, in full accord with Matthean theology, it rests on what they do. Μικρότερος therefore is not a designation referring to age or size, but to a specific attitude or action. The presence of the kingdom marks the presence of something greater. Paradoxically, the nature of this μειζῶν is the greatness of the small. Thus the "πλεῖον" of Jesus can only be understood in terms of his humility (Mt 11:29; 12:19; 21:5).

Conclusion: Normative Tradition in Mt 11:7-9, 11

The redactional changes of Matthew to the source are minor, yet significant enough for analysts to understand how the text of the source was understood and interpreted. Matthew adds the name Jesus to the source to specify that the words that follow are the words of Jesus. Matthew changes these words however, and adds to them. Mostly for the sake of clarifying and making more explicit the tendencies which are already present in the text of Q. In interpreting the teaching of Jesus in the present text, Matthew makes use of both strands of the Jesus tradition. As was shown in chapter 3, the citation inserted in the Q material here was already found in Mark 1:2 in connection with John. The reality of Jesus' ministry is thus further emphasised through the insertion of Q 16:16, showing that with Jesus the Kingdom of God is present. Further, the changes of Matthew to Q 7:28 show that Matthew understood the contrast great/small in light of Mk 10:43-45. Hence, again Matthew uses tradition to interpret tradition.

The synoptic tradition which Matthew adapts in Mt 11:7-9, 11 is by Matthew interpreted in light of synoptic tradition. The authoritative strand of tradition is here already given in the beginning and closing pericopes of chapter 11. The imagery in Matthew 7 and 8, contrasting the poor and the weak with the strong, the revelation to "babes" and proclamation of good news to the poor, leads Matthew to read Q in light of the reversal of great and small in the kingdom of heaven.

The contrast between the suffering of the Son of Man and the future coming of the Son of Man was already present in the christologies of both Q and Mark. This aspect of tradition is employed by Matthew in the reading of Q's account of Jesus' teaching concerning John. The text mainly continues the Christological pronouncement of Q 7. Jesus is depicted as the one in whom God's Kingdom is present. The greatness of this kingdom, in terms of its being good news to the poor, is explicated in Mt 11:5 and 11. In terms of theological content, Mark 10:43-45 serves as the norm by which Q 7:24-26, 28 is interpreted in Matthew. The vocabulary and language of Q make the interpretation possible.

The synoptic tradition by which Matthew interprets Q is not simply the background for Christological pronouncement and theological explication of the nature

---

[24] So also Merklein, "Gottesherrschaft", 84-85.

of the Kingdom. In extension of the Christological application, the tradition focuses on the Cross and resurrection of Jesus as the example or paradigm for those to whom the Kingdom is given. There is therefore, implicit in the text, also a norm for living in anticipation of the Kingdom.

Whereas the use of Scripture in the πλεῖον/μείζον motif appealed to the covenant relationship, the law and the presence of God to justify Christological claims and to develop the Christological pronouncement, the synoptic tradition interprets the presence of the Kingdom in terms of the reversal of the great and small at the example of Jesus. A new norm is thereby created, by which to remain in the covenant relationship to God. This is, however, perceived to be in continuation with the law and the prophets as the previous section demonstrated.

5.2.2. More than Jonah and Solomon (Mt 12:41-42) Matthew's Adaptation of Q 11: 16, 29-32.

The πλειον motif which Matthew draws on in the first Sabbath controversy has its roots in the Q material which follows closely on the sign of Jonah pericope. As in Mt 11:7-19, the motif is coupled with the notion of lack of repentance by, and subsequent judgement upon, "this generation". Thematically, the request for a sign and the judgement which follows are concerned with the hardheartedness of this generation. Therefore the citation of Jonah 2:1 and the subsequent judgement are also to be analysed there.

In the context of the πλεῖον motif in Mt 11-13, the double saying in Q has been proven to be formative for Matthew's Christological pronouncement. The citation of Jonah 2:1, in addition to having significance as an answer to the request for a sign, prepares for the πλεῖον sayings which follow. It interprets the Q pericope in light of the resurrection of Jesus. Here again the "more than" Christology is found in the post-Easter perspective of the Matthean situation. Such was the case also in Mt 11:28-30 and 12:7.

Although the attempt to distinguish between thematic strands which run through Mt 11-13 led to the analysis of the Beelzeboul controversy under the heading of the ἐρχόμενος motif, the controversy is closely connected with the double πλεῖον saying both in Q and in Matthew, and explains its placing in the present place in both documents. It is evident therefore, that the three leading motifs in chapters 11-13 are closely related to each other, and almost every passage could be analysed in light of each theme.

The "more than Jonah"/"more than Solomon" passage in Mt 12:41-42, has been influential and normative in the Matthean composition of Matthew 11-13. It has provided the conceptual key to the important combination of Mt 11:28-12:14. In that passage, as well as the present, the post-Easter, post-70 perspective of Matthew interprets the "greater than" of Jesus, in Jesus' replacement of the temple as "the place of the presence of God". Through the insertion of the Jonah citation, Matthew has adapted and interpreted the passage in light of the death and resurrection of Jesus. Hence the Christological pronouncement is the main emphasis of the passage. It is therefore only in

its interpreted form that the Q passage remains normative for Matthew, in the context of the present theme.

The double πλεῖον saying in Matthew 12:42-43 has by Matthew largely been kept in its original Q form. On that basis, one could claim that Matthew's conservative adaptation of source material is here evident. Yet, through the composition of material, Matthew alters the significance of Q, so that despite a practically verbatim preservation of the source material, Matthew alters the content of the saying decisively. This will be demonstrated by first analysing the meaning of the double saying in its Q context. Subsequently the function of the Matthean composition of material in the interpretation and adaptation of the saying will be pointed out.

The Double πλεῖον Saying in Q

The request for a sign passage in Mark 8:11-13 shows that the Jonah/Solomon saying originally existed as an independent unit before being combined with the sign request. The Q passage does not preserve an account of the actual request itself, but presupposes it. The introduction to the issue in Mt 12:38 is in its entirety a redactional formulation.[25]

Tradition-historically, one can postulate a growth process whereby the request for a sign material was expanded by the Jonah/Solomon pericope as an exemplification of the wickedness of this generation. In a subsequent step the post-Easter sign of Jonah material was inserted as an interpretation of the request for a sign, prompted by the

---

[25] Τότε, ἀποκρίνομαι ... λεγῶν, is a Matthean construction. It occurs five times in Matthew against one occurrence each in Mark and Luke (cf. Schenk, *Sprache*, 338). Τινες τῶν γραμματέων ... is a duplication of the Markan tradition preserved in Mt 9:3 (cf. Schenk, *Sprache*, 445). The combination γραμματεῖς καὶ φαρισαίοι is a standard formulation in Matthew. Διδάσκαλε is used by characters addressing Jesus who do not belong to the followers of Jesus (cf. Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 1, pt 3.2, vol. 2, 272). Θέλομεν ἰδειν: The use of θέλω + inf. expressing a desire to do something, occurs 23 times in Matthew. Seven of these are in M material, whereby once in 22:3 it may be a redactional prefiguring of 23:38. Nine times Mt differs from the sources in including the phrase, which may give evidence of redactional usage. The remaining seven are traditional. Although Matthew omits the phrase from his sources five, possibly six times, the evidence shows a preference for the formulation in Matthean redaction and special source material. Luke 11:16 is a redactional insertion into the Beelzeboul controversy adapted from Mark 8. Mt 16:1 and Lk 11:16 agree against Mk 8:11 in bringing πειράζοντες forward to the beginning of the sentence, and in using ἐκ instead of ἀπο as a preposition. Matthew uses ἀπο οὐράνου only once, in 24:29, and ἐκ is overall the preferred preposition used with οὐράνος in the whole of the synoptic tradition. Further, if the reading of the Majority text in addition to Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus and L, W, Θ, et al., of Mk 9:9 is correct, Matthew has made the same redactional move in Mt 17:9 (cf. Davies, and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol. 2, 580). The minor agreements of Mt 16:1 with Lk 11:16 could indicate the existence of a Q account of a request for a sign similar to that of Mark. If this were so, and it did serve originally as an introduction to the passage found in Q 11:29-32, both Matthew and Luke have removed it from its present place. Matthew replacing it with a redactional verse, bringing the Q wording into the redaction of the Markan request in Mt 16:1. It seems unlikely that both Luke and Mt would separate the introductory sentence from the rest of the account if it had been there, hence, it must be concluded that *if* Q included an account of a request for a sign, it existed much in the same form as that of Mk 8:11-12, separately from the sign of Jonah pericope. It is, however, more likely that the minor agreements Mt-Lk can be explained by linguistic preference rather than through a common source separate from Mark.

mention of the Ninevites and Jonah in the subsequent material.[26] As key words,[27] they function to connect the elements of the pericope forming a unit.

The Solomon/Jonah material is a continuation of the statement on this wicked and adulterous generation. Thematically it belongs in Q together with similar negative statement about "this generation." The "more than Jonah"/"more than Solomon" saying in Q, emphasises the repentance of Gentiles in contrast to this generation's failure to repent.[28] Simultaneously the refusal to realise the presence of something more than Solomon and Jonah, increases the guilt of "this generation." The judgement on this generation continues in the woes against the Pharisees in Q 11:39-52, interrupted only by a seemingly unrelated passage in vv 33-36.[29]

The Sign of Jonah followed by the double πλεῖον saying is preceded by the Beelzeboul controversy. In Q also the return of the evil spirit is placed before Q 11:29-32. The order of the Q text suggests a dualistic apocalyptic and eschatological world view. In the context of this dualistic apocalypticism, it is of prime importance to remain

---

[26] So also Richard Alan Edwards, *Sign of Jonah in the Theology of the Evangelists and Q* (1971), 49-51. The tradition history of the pericope is difficult to establish. That the sign pericope did exist separately is clear from Mark 8:11-12. Mark and Q have probably preserved the same saying in different contexts. Since the request for a sign itself can be shown to be absent in Q, the original saying lying at the base of Mark and Q must have included simply a statement that this generation, if it were to have asked for one, would not have been given a sign. (ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη ζητεῖ σεμεῖον καὶ εἰ δοθήσεται σεμεῖον.) In the tradition underlying Mark the saying has been provided with a introductory narrative, placing the saying in a context. In the tradition underlying Q, the saying lacks an introductory narrative, but two additions to the saying reflect two different interests. On the one hand the sign of Jonah is an obvious emendation of the refusal to give a sign. It probably was added in light of the post-Easter experience. That the Q sign pericope including the sign of Jonah, should represent an authentic Jesus tradition is very unlikely in light of the Markan parallel. On the other hand the Solomon/Jonah comparison shows no interest in the sign as such, but follows up on the wicked and adulterous generation motif in general, and the theme of obduracy in particular. Rather than viewing this generation in continuation with past generations however, the positive response of previous generations of Gentiles is pointed out. The double judgement prediction makes no sense without an introduction (like a statement concerning the wickedness of ἡ γενεᾶ ταύτη), and thus probably did not exist as a separate tradition before it was joined with the refusal-of-a-sign saying (Contra Bovon, *Lukas*, vol. 2 197). The sign of Jonah represents as such an interruption of the line of thought which exists between the request for a sign and the double judgement. (Contra Marshall, *Luke*, 483. Vögtle, "Spruch", supported by Kloppenborg, *Formation*, holds that only v30 with its three connecting keywords, provides the reason for vv 31-32 with the refusal of a sign logion. The use of ἡ γενεᾶ ταύτη does, however, provide such a connecting phrase.) It seems likely therefore that the addition of the sign of Jonah represents a later stage of development than that of the double judgement.

[27] *Mots-crochets* Cf. Bovon, *Lukas*, vol. 2 195.

[28] Joachim Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations* (1958), 50. Whereas there is no obvious rejection of "Israel" over against the gentiles in the parable of the children in the marketplace, there is one here. In Q this theme is connected with the faith of the centurion in Q 7:9 as well as the sayings in Q 10:13-15 and 13:28-29.

[29] Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 137-139 labels the logia on light a "contrast between adequate and faulty moral vision." With Kloppenborg and Migaku Sato, *Q*, 40, it is to be asserted that the seeming lack of connection between the logia and their context speaks for the order in Luke to be dependent on the original Q sequence. Sato also considers the possibility that the logia originally were connected with 12:2f (4ff) due to several connecting key words. A redactional replacement of the material to its present place by Luke, is, however, difficult to explain.

on the side of the "light", on the side of God, represented by Jesus. There is therefore a natural progression of thought in the connecting of the three pericopes in Q. Jesus is proclaimed as the one who overcomes evil in the casting out of demons (Q 11:14-15, 17-20). This action is an example of the binding of evil which will take place at the eschaton (Q 11:21-23). Those who see and listen to the ministry of Jesus must beware of the present danger of evil (11:24-26). "This generation" (as the last generation) is aligned with the evil one and is facing judgement (11:29-32). Those who hear the prophetic warning must be careful to be on the right side (11:33-36).

The recognition that exorcisms were common in Judaism is recorded in Q 11:19, although this exorcising activity is not seen as a sign of the presence of the Kingdom of God.[30] Davies and Allison suggest that the passage concerning the return of the evil spirit placed after the saying concluding the Beelzeboul controversy (Q 11:23: ὁ μὴ ὢν μετ' ἐμοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐστιν) shows the need to contrast the exorcistic activity of Jesus as different in kind from that of contemporaries.[31] There is, however, no explanation or clarification in Q which stresses that the return of the evil spirit is conditional upon how or by whom it was expelled. The saying is formulated in the present tense, denoting not a one time possibility but a general truth of the way things usually or at least plausibly could happen. It is added to the previous passage without any transitional sentence. It is more likely, therefore, that Q 11:23 along with 11:24f issues a warning of what is a genuine possibility, whereas the judgement against "this generation" in the subsequent pericope is extended in particular to those who voice the allegations against Jesus in Q 11:15. The general warning voiced in 11:24f is picked up again in vv 33-36, exhorting the crowds to be of the right allegiance (v 35 σκόπει οὖν μὴ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν). This warning is in turn followed by further oracles of judgement against this generation. Ἡ γενεὰ ἄυτη is in Q therefore not to be understood generally as all of Israel, but rather in terms of those who have spiritual leadership and have the authority or responsibility to "request" signs, and to "test" the teaching and healing activity of Jesus, represented by the Pharisees in the oracle of judgement of Q 11:39ff. "This" generation will be subject to the wrath of God, for not recognising "the greater than Jonah and Solomon" in Jesus, the presence of the Kingdom of God.

That the πλεῖον Σολομῶνος ὧδε serves as a link to the Beelzeboul pericope, indicating that the other exorcists mentioned in 11:19 were casting out demons "by the wisdom of Solomon," is possible.[32] Although this observation explains why the logion on Solomon precedes that of Jonah in Q, the connection does not explain the reference to Jonah and his kerygma. The whole emphasis of the Q section lies on judgement of

---

[30] Gerd Theißen, *Wundergeschichten*, 275 notes that this connection is made only in early Christian literature.

[31] Davies, and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol. 2, 360.

[32] Evald Lövestam, *Jesus and 'this Generation'* (1995), 32-34; Roman Hanig, "Christus als 'wahrer Salomo' in der Frühen Kirche" (1993), 117, 127-128.

some and warning to others about the necessity to choose allegiance. The πλεῖον sayings refer back to the "binding of evil" in Jesus' ministry, and serve to illustrate the expediency of the situation.

The common denominator between Solomon and Jonah in the double πλεῖον saying in Q, is the contrast between the stubbornness of this generation and the faith or repentance of the gentiles. It has already been pointed out that "this generation" is not to be identified with "the people of Israel" as a whole. The faith of the gentiles in the example of Jonah and Solomon nevertheless stands in opposition to, and in judgement of, those among the people of God who do not repent at the signs of the coming kingdom. Hence, the gentiles bring "this generation" to shame.[33]

In summary: The main emphasis of the πλεῖον sayings has been shown to be the threat of judgement at the failure of recognising the nearness of the Kingdom of God. The "more than" does point to the reality of the approaching eschaton. This reality is present already in the exorcism performed by Jesus. Hence in Q there is an indirect reference to the person of Jesus as the πλεῖον. It is this aspect of Q which has been adapted and expanded in Matthew 11-13.

The Double πλεῖον Saying in Matthew 12:41-42

In Matthew's interpretation and adaptation of Q 11:31-32, the material connected with the πλεῖον-motif earlier in the chapter is influential. Interestingly, the formulation of the double saying in Q was influential in the formulation of the μειζῶν saying in Mt 12:7. Here again the "more than" saying is a Christological pronouncement. The "greater than" is combined both with the humility of Jesus, as well as the prophetic call to repentance.

Matthew has inverted the order of Q,[34] but otherwise preserves the Q text in its entirety.[35] In the "sign of Jonah" passage which precedes the double πλεῖον saying, Matthew has inserted a citation of Jonah 2:1 as a reference Jesus' death and resurrection. This has resulted in a stronger emphasis in the πλεῖον motif in Mt. The pericope consists of two parallel statements about the judgement of this generation which end with a statement concerning the presence of something greater.

---

[33] Similar notions regarding Ninevites in their causing Israel to be condemned are also present in Rabbinic tradition. E.g. Mekilta Ex 12:1. Cf. P. Billerbeck and Hermann L. Strack, *Kommentar*, 643-644; Lövestam, *Jesus*, 29-30.

[34] Bovon, *Lukas*, vol. 2 196, holds that both Luke and Mt could be redactional, and holds it impossible to make a decision concerning the order of Q. Luke could have followed the OT order and Matthew a Jewish liturgical tradition. It has been shown that the Q order is explained through the reference to Jewish exorcists in Q 11:19, and the relation of that activity to the Wisdom of Solomon. The Matthean order is a secondary. The purpose of Matthew's redaction here is to bring related material together in the narrative. So also e.g. Gerhard Schneider, *Lukas*, vol. 2, 270.

[35] Luke has added τῶν ἀνδρῶν before τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, and consequently completed the necessary change of the personal pronoun from singular to plural in v 31. Cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 486.

ἄνδρες Νινευῖται ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης
καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτήν,
ὅτι μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ,
καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ ὧδε.

βασίλισσα νότου ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης
καὶ κατακρινεῖ αὐτήν,
ὅτι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκοῦσαι τὴν σοφίαν Σολομῶνος,
καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Σολομῶνος ὧδε.

On the basis of the climactic clause in each of the stanzas,[36] one can say that the central statement of the pericope is the urgency of realising this πλεῖον which is present. In the Matthean interpretation of the sayings, it is this Christological pronouncement which is central.

Some scholars have questioned the Christological reference of πλεῖον because of the neuter gender of the adjective.[37] The point of comparison in the double logion is between the person of Jonah and the person of Solomon and the πλεῖον. The theme of the stubbornness of this generation which is the emphasis of the Q pericope is evident. The two figures represent the groups of prophets[38] and wise-men (cf. Mt 23:34 par) who in Deuteronomistic history have been rejected by the people. Further, in light of the texts from Scripture appealed to in the ὁ ἐρχόμενος texts, it is also significant that the two are remembered for the positive reaction to them among non-Jews. It is nevertheless the climax of each stanza which is of importance to Matthew. The word ὧδε points to the tangible presence of something which is greater than both Jonah and Solomon. As with the expression in Mt 12:7, which Matthew adapted from the present text, the "more than" has ultimately a Christological significance.[39] The presence referred to is in the context of the Beelzeboul controversy the presence of God in the ministry of Jesus.

The Matthean insertion into the Jonah pericope is important for understanding the significance of the presence of God in the context of Matthew 12:41-42. In connection with the sign of Jonah, Matthew introduces a comparison by which both the previous logion and the double πλεῖον saying are interpreted: ὥσπερ γὰρ ἦν Ἰωνᾶς ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τοῦ κήτους τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας, οὕτως ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας. From Matthew's post-70 perspective, the reference to the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus connects these "greater than" sayings with the passage in Mt 11:11. Hence, also here the contrast

---

[36] cf. Sato, *Q*, 152.

[37] Eduard Schweizer, *Matthäus*, 190. Followed by Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 281. Luz suggests that the central point in the Matthean context is the mission to the Gentiles which is prefigured in the two sayings.

[38] On Jonah's status as one of the prophets cf. Tob 14: 4, 8 (LXX). See also Reinhold Then, "Gibt es denn keinen mehr unter den Propheten?" (1990), 104-105; Hartmut Gese, "Jona ben Amittai und das Jonabuch" (1985), 256-272.

[39] For Luke/Q also Bovon, *Lukas*, vol. 2, 198; Schneider, *Lukas*, vol. 2, 271.

between humiliation and exaltation is given. The greater than of Jesus is, therefore, for Matthew, in the resurrection as the confirmation of the presence of God in Jesus.

The Matthean change of emphasis is evident in the Matthean restructuring of material in chapter 12. The development of thought present in the Q passage, beginning with the Beelzeboul controversy and ending with the oracle of doom against the Pharisees, is destroyed in Matthew. The Matthean redactor inserts different material following the Beelzeboul controversy. Instead of the unified speech of warning and judgement, Matthew's text is a development of Q 6:43-45 and speaks of bearing good fruit as a sign of a "good tree". While also speaking to the example of Jesus in connection with the previous pericope, the text also points to the correct response to the Kingdom, and consequently to Jesus. This *Scheltrede* concludes with a sentence of judgement, which leads to the desire of the scribes and the Pharisees to see a sign. Paradoxically the speech of judgement itself contains the criterion by which the Pharisees may find the sign they are looking for: a good man brings forth good things from his treasure.

In summary: The Matthean redaction of the double πλεῖον saying in Q reinterprets the Q saying and continues the Christological pronouncement of the earlier πλεῖον/μείζον texts. The "greater than" is placed in the context of the Matthean post-resurrection situation. The humiliation and exaltation of Jesus is emphasised. The Q text does not point to the continuing presence of Jesus in the post-resurrection situation. In the context of Matthew, however, this aspect is included in the pericope of the request for a sign. It has already been shown that he statement of Mt 11:28-12:14 does point to the continuing presence of Jesus. Because the "greater than the temple" text precedes the present one in the Matthean order, and because of the Matthean insertion of the "sign of Jonah", this presence is implicit in the present text. While the reference to the three days is certainly a reference to the synoptic tradition of the resurrection after three days,[40] it may also allude to the saying of the destruction and rebuilding of the temple.[41]

Conclusion: Normative Tradition in Mt 12:41-42

In the adaptation of the double πλεῖον saying of Q 11:31-32, Matthew remains true to the Q source on the basis of the text. Matthew can therefore be said to be conservative in the preservation of Jesus tradition. It is mainly in the wording of the Q passage which is of importance to Matthew. He interprets the Q material in light of the post-resurrection situation and explains the meaning of the "more than" as the presence of God in Jesus. Also the humiliation of the cross and the confirmation of the resurrection influences the interpretation of Q. Thereby the dualistic apocalypticism of Q

---

[40] Cf. Mk 8:31; 9:31; 10:34.

[41] Mk 14:58. The accusations in Mt 26:61 and 27:63 presuppose announcements which are not verbalised in the gospel of Matthew except in the present text. Cf. also Edwards, *Sign*, 99-100.

is lost. The eschatological expectation of judgement remains and is kept as a part of the Matthean obduracy theme.

The interpretation gives evidence for the need of an actualisation of the Q material in light of experience. This use of synoptic tradition can be compared to the constant reinterpretation of Scripture in Judaism. The Christological orientation suggests implicitly that the text is formative for the identity of those who are followers of Jesus. Hence it is normative. It is important to note that in the context of the judgement upon this generation, Matthew places the requirement to bear good fruit. Hence again, repentance is visible in the life of the individual and community. The humility of Jesus provides the norm for this living. Hence, interpreted tradition is normative for Matthew both in a rhetorical and in a pragmatic function. The text draws upon personalities important in the Jewish tradition. The "more than" of Jesus, despite its identity-forming character, is not in contrast to Jonah and Solomon. Matthew still understands the Jesus tradition to be in continuation of Scripture.

5.2.3. The Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Pearl

In the structure of the second part of Mt 13, the two sets of twin parables frame the interpretation of the parable of the tares. All four describe on the one hand the greatness of the kingdom, and on the other hand, the kingdom in light of both hiddenness and revelation. The parable of the mustard seed will here be analysed together with the parable of the pearl in Matthew. This is to illustrate the structure of Matthew 13, and because they correspond in meaning. Together the two parables illustrate the two central aspects of the πλεῖον/μείζον theme in Matthew 11-13. Their use in Matthew, again shows the normativity of the synoptic tradition which speaks of the reversal of great and small, first and last event in the forming identity of the Christian community. In the synoptic tradition, this is formulated in various ways. In the context of Matthew 11-13, the language of Q (μικρός/μείζον) is employed to formulate the motif.

The normativity of the synoptic tradition of the reversal of great and small in the interpretation of the parables of the mustard seed and of the pearl will here be demonstrated. Again this will be done on the basis of Matthew's redaction of the text, in light of the meaning of the text in its original context and its adaptation into the Matthean context.

The Parable of the Mustard Seed and the Parable of the Pearl in Matthew 13

The parable of the pearl is a companion parable to the parable of the treasure. The parable of the mustard seed is a companion to the parable of the leaven. Both twin parables express the greatness of the kingdom of heaven. The first twin parable does this in the comparison between great and small. Mustard plants and leaven are both ambiguous metaphors in the Jewish context in which the gospel of Matthew was

written.[42] First, the companion parables express in narrative form, how, though small, their enormous power causes enormous growth. Second, they show how something which is barely visible reveals itself and cannot remain hidden. The same two concepts are expressed in the companion parables in Mt 13:44-46.[43] In the parables of the treasure and the pearl, that which is hidden, and that which is sought after, is found or revealed. But also the value of them both is expressed in the action of the two men: they sell everything they own (become small) in order to own "that treasure" or "that pearl".

The companion parables are generally interpreted in pairs. Because they have been clustered together they are expected to have the same content.[44] The present study departs from this practice. This is because the order of material in Mt 13 seems to place the double set of twin parables in a chiastic relation to each other. The interpretation of the parables will show how the double set of twin parables express two of the central concepts in Mt 11-13, and how Jesus tradition on the one hand, and scriptural tradition on the other, influence the Matthean composition.

Because the parables do not occur as part of an argument in a controversy, they differ from the material previously analysed in this chapter. The introductions to all four parables indicate the subject of the parables to be the nature of the kingdom of God/heaven. The introductions of the parables of the mustard seed and the leaven are dependent on synoptic tradition but redactionally adapted by Matthew. The introductions to the parables of the treasure and the pearl are Matthean. The first two are spoken as general truths to the crowds and the disciples, the two others are spoken to the disciples; and hence include an exhortatory aspect.

The parable of the mustard seed and the parable of the pearl have in common the expressed contrast between great and small. The occurrence of ὁ μικρότερος and μείζον in the parable of the mustard seed, is similar to the use of the two adjectives in Mt 11:11, and continues the thoughts of the πλεῖον motif. The implications are clear also here. The extent of Jesus ministry comes in a paradox expressible in the terms small and great. The reversal of great and small hinted at in Mt 11 is brought out again here where the smallest becomes the greatest of trees. The parable of the pearl expresses the same

---

[42] Cf. Mt 16:5-12; Mk 8:14-21; Lk 12:1; 1 Kor 5:6; Gal 5:9. The leaven was to be taken out of the house before Sabbath. Cf. Turid Karlsen Seim, "Gudsrikets Overraskelse" (1983), 6-7. The mustard plant was seen as negative, because of its enormous growth. Once there one could not get rid of it. Cf. Hans-Josef Klauck, *Allegorie*, 210ff.

[43] Scott, *Parable*, 319, questions the validity of the designation "twin" parables for the parables of the treasure and the pearl. The differences he points to, following, Otto Glombitza, "Der Perlenkaufmann" (1961), 157, supports the hypothesis of their existence as originally separate parables. Yet, the similarity in progression of the narrative, namely "finding" and subsequently the selling of all, justifies considering the two "companion parables". Their differences do not allow for reading the element of joy into the latter parable (contra Joachim Jeremias, *Parables*, 200). The analyses of Scott and Glombitza, show nevertheless the necessity of interpreting the parables individually, beyond the borders of their twin parables.

[44] Rudolf Laufen, "ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ und ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ" (1989), 109.

concept in the contrast between one and "all". Furthermore, it includes the exhortative aspect alluded to in Mt 11:11. The merchant found one (εἷς) pearl, and to own it he sold all that he had (πάσα ὅσα εἶχεν.)

Matthew's Redaction of the Parables

The parable of the mustard seed belongs to the synoptic material which exists both in Mk and in Q. Three aspects of the parable may be listed as proof of its existence in both strands of the Jesus tradition:[45] the agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark,[46] the fluctuation between aorist (like Luke) and present tense (like Mark) in the Matthean parable, and the combination of the parable with that of the leaven in Mt and Luke.[47] The combination of the two parables is not original.[48] This is evident from the separate existence of the two parables in the gospel of Thomas.[49] It is probable that Luke preserves the Q version of the text.[50]

---

[45] Cf. Laufen, "ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ", 105.

[46] ὁμοία ἐστὶν βασιλεία; ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος; the use of αὐξάνω; δένδρον; ἐν τοῖς κλαδοῖς αὐτοῦ. But cf. M. D. Goulder, "Midrash", 369 who evaluates the minor agreements as evidence for Lukan dependence upon Matthew.

[47] Goulder, "Midrash", 366, in accordance with his two-source hypothesis scepticism, holds the parable of leaven to be a Matthean creation, corresponding to Matthew's custom of contrasting men-women in parables. Others, e.g. H. Flender, *Heil und Geschichte in der Theologie des Lukas* (1965), 15 would find this aspect more dominant in Lukan redaction. The joining of different material according to different criteria, also the combination of man/woman is a common feature of the development and preservation of material. Together with the contrast garden/house is the background for the joining of the two parables into a twin parable. Cf. Laufen, "ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ", 110.

[48] Whether the two were combined at the stage of the redaction of Q or earlier is not possible to determine. Bultmann, *Geschichte*, 186; Klauck, *Allegorie*, 210 points to common expressions shared by the parable of the seed growing secretly and the parable of the mustard seed in Mark. On the basis of this observation, he concludes that the two existed together pre-Mark. Hence, the parable of the mustard seed originally existed separately. For a review of research with regard to the tradition history of the parables cf. Franz Kogler, *Doppelgleichnis*, 31-42. Questioning the adequacy of the two-source hypothesis to account for the minor agreement between Matthew and Luke, Kogler postulates one single tradition of the parable. He constructs on the basis of the agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark, a Deuteromarkan source on which the two other gospels would be dependent. Kohler's main problem with the two source hypothesis, is that Matthew would not have the hypothetical Q text if also the Markan text was known to the Evangelist *because the description of the mustard plant in Q is less accurate than that of Mark*, (72-73) hence a stage of development of the text is created between the text of the canonical Mark (which reflects the *ipsissima verba Iesu*) and the text of Matthew and Luke respectively. In the present context, the minor agreements are to be considered as evidence for the presence of the text in Q. As will be discussed below, the faulty description of the mustard plant is an integral part of the parable as it exists in Q.

[49] GTh 20 and GTh 96. Gth 20 shows affinities to both Matthew ("kingdom of heaven") and Mark (present tense). The difficult tradition historical relationship between Thomas and the synoptics makes a synoptic comparison with the text of Thomas difficult, especially in light of the particular theological interest represented by the gospel of Thomas. For the relation between the parables in Thomas and the gospels see further Michael Fieger, *Das Thomasevangelium* (1991), 91-92; 245. Kogler, *Doppelgleichnis*, 24-26, considers the parables in gospel of Thomas to be dependent on Mark and secondary to the synoptic tradition.

[50] So e.g. Laufen, "ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ", 107. According to Bovon, *Lukas*, vol. 2, 410, this is in accordance with Lk's tendency to refrain from mixing the sources, and to avoid doublets. The only significant

Matthew's Redaction of the Parable of the Mustard Seed (Mt 13:31-32)

The redaction of the parable in Matthew is marked by Matthew's combination of both available traditions.[51] The relative sentence in the introduction of the parable (v. 31) and its structure (ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔσπειρεν) is adapted from Q, although Matthew keeps the Markan verb. Like the Markan ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, the place of sowing (ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ) repeats the introduction to the previous parable (cf. Mk 4:26 and Mt 13:24). Here, it is evident that Matthew copies the form of Mark and the relation between the parables. Mt 13:32 is an adaptation of the Markan text,[52] keeping the contrast between μικρότερον πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων and μεῖζων but omitting παντῶν before λαχάνων. Matthew thus turns the superlative meaning of μεῖζων in Mark (the greatest of all the herbs) to the comparative (greater than the herbs) which makes the adaptation of the Q version (καὶ γίνεται δένδρον)[53] possible.

Matthew also alters the tradition in the adaptation of the parable. The parable is introduced with the redactional ἄλλην παραβολὴν παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων. Consequently, Matthew omits the double introductory question of Q,[54] inserting ἡ βασιλεία τοὺ οὐρανοῦ into the opening sentence of the Q parable indicating the subject of the parable.[55] The place of the sowing, ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ, replaces εἰς κῆπον ἑαυτοῦ of Q and ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς of Mark. The remainder of the Matthean text follows Q in the Old Testament allusion, but keeps the Markan ὥστε and adds ἐλθεῖν. The alterations are to be ascribed to Matthew's structuring of the chapter. The introductory sentence is repeated in v. 24, v. 31, v. 33. The connection with the previous parable is established through the same procedure found in Mark. The Matthean redaction of the parable is therefore to be ascribed by two motivations: First, the preservation of the available tradition in the form of harmonising is similar to the procedure in the Beelzeboul controversy. Second, the structure of the chapter is a motivating force.

---

textual difference in the parable of the leaven is the use of the simple κρύπτω rather than the compound ἐγκρύπτω in some significant manuscripts of the Lukan text (Vaticanus most importantly, but also K L N et al.). This minor difference may be significant for the interpretation of the parable in Q/Lk. (See below).

[51] Ivor H. Jones, *Parables*, 323 suggests that the "combining of traditional language and syntax from both Mark and Q" is part of a consistent Matthean policy of "using available traditions in their traditional form.'

[52] Because the subject of Matthew's previous sentence is ἄνθρωπος (from Q) rather than the seed, Matthew turns Marks participial clause into a second relative clause, rendering the verb εἰμι in the present indicative.

[53] Matthew keeps the present tense of Mark rather than Q's ἐγενετο εἰς δένδρον.

[54] The double question is traditional according to Bovon, *Lukas*, vol. 2, 411. cf. Lk 7:31

[55] Cf. 13:33, 44, 47.

Matthew's Redaction of the Parable of the Pearl (Mt 13:45-46)

The parable of the pearl has no parallel in the synoptic tradition. It is to be assumed that the parable is derived from the M tradition. The parable has a parallel in the gospel of Thomas logion 76. The versions share some vocabulary (μαργαρίτης, εὑρίσκω, εἷς), yet their significance differs notably, so that they probably reflect divergent[56] developments of tradition.[57] The introduction of the parable of the pearl repeats the redactional introduction of Mt 13:44. The phrase ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν of both parables is redactional.[58] It is, however, a duplication of traditional introductions.[59] Further, the syntactic structure of the parable matches several of the parables in ch 13, forming a repetitious formula throughout the chapter.[60] The hapax legomena (ἐμπόρος, πολύτιμος) indicate that the parable is traditional.[61] The redactional phrases ζήτουντι καλοὺς μαργαρίτας[62] and πέπρακεν πάντα ὅσα εἶχεν,[63] emphasise the Matthean employment of the parable in the context of Mt 13.[64] Κάλος picks up the

---

[56] I.e. Matthew's source is probably not identical to the source of the gospel of Thomas. Fieger, *Thomasevangelium*, 210-212 holds Thomas to be dependent on Matthew. However, GTh 76 also shows affinities to Mt 6:19f//Lk 12,33, while the parable of the treasure first is found in GTh 109. It is doubtful that the gospel of Thomas draws on a tradition where the two parables are joined.

[57] Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 353 (and fn 36) considers the parable to be authentic Jesus tradition, because there is no significant parallel in Jewish tradition. This is possible but not verifiable.

[58] Used in Mt 13:31, 33, 44, 45, 47; 20:1.

[59] Cf. Q 13:18. The Matthean adaptation of the phrase omits the interrogative τίνι. Further the more traditional ὁμοία/ὁμοίος ἐστίν is found in Mt 11:16 and 13:52. Cf. also Luke 6:48, 49 (where Mt red has ὁμοιωθήσεται); 13:18, 19, 21.

[60] Following the introductory sentence: Mt 13:31, 33, 44, 47 have a dative + relative pronoun + participle + finite verb. Mt 13: 24 and 45 are similar with dative and participle, though no relative sentence. Cf. Gundry, *Matthew*, 277; Luz, *Evangelium*, 349 fn 5.

[61] Contra Schenk, *Sprache*, 11, 444, who holds both to be Matthean redaction.

[62] Cf. Merklein, "Gottesherrschaft", 65. Ζητέω is a verb which Matthew in most cases adopts from the sources (cf. Schenk, *Sprache*, 270). The parable repeats in narrative form the significance of Mt 7:7-8 (=Q 11:9-10) (Cf. Jones, *Parables*, 353) and Mt 6:33 (= Q 12:31). The redactional phrase could be a result of conscious adaptation of the parable in the context of the gospel material.

[63] πάντα ὅσα ἐχει/εἶχεν (v 44, 46) is a phrase which in the first gospel is found only in parabolic material peculiar to Matthew. The phrase is found in Mk 10:21 (omitted in Mt 19:21) and 12:44 (the widow's mite, the whole pericope is omitted in Matthew.) The combination with πιπράσκω both here and in 18:25 may indicate that πιπράσκω is Matthean over against the traditional πωλέω which Matthew uses redactionally in Mt 13:44 with allusion to Mk 10:21 par. Schenk, *Sprache*, understands the usage in Mt 13:46 to be influenced by Mk 12:44, this conclusion is, however, not compelling. Matthew prefers the expression πάντα (οὖν) ὅσα, used without parallel, in addition to Mt 13:44,46; 18:28, in Mt 7:12; 23:3 and 28:20, with parallel in Mt 21:22 (Mk 11:20) (cf. Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 1, 49) so that a dependence on Mark is not a necessary conclusion.

[64] Further, ἀπέρχομαι is a compound frequently used redactionally in Matthew (cf. Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 1, 36). The use of ἀγοράζω (used seven times in Matthew) here and in the previous parable does not give a clear indication of redactional or traditional usage. Matthew omits the verb three times from the Markan text (Mk 6:37; 15:46; 16:1), possibly because he found them redundant (cf. Schenk, *Sprache*, 10). Five times (13.44,46; 25: 9,10; 27:7) the verb occurs in material peculiar to Matthew, and four of these are in parabolic material. This usage could indicate a Matthean redactional preference in formulating from oral tradition, or simply a dependence upon sources.

thread of v 23 and 24: As the good seed have their source in the Son of Man, the pearl which is sought after, is good. The emphasis on one valuable pearl is important in so far as it illustrates how something which is small can be so valuable, that a person will sell everything[65] to own that one single pearl.

Matthew's redaction can again be explained in the adaptation of the text to the context. The redactional work is relatively extensive, so that an oral tradition for the parables is possible. Matthew's redaction recalls the logia concerning seeking treasures for oneself. Again the Matthean theological and structural emphasis is recognised. The theme ties it to the present material, and indicates the appropriate interpretation of the parable as the response to the *basileia*.

Summary

In both parables, the Matthean redaction is found to betray an interest in the placing of the parable in the structure of the chapter. In the case of the mustard seed, the careful preservation of the sources is found to be central in Matthew's redaction. Both sources are harmonised, and the structure of Mark is followed. In the redactional adaptation of the parable of the pearl, theological motifs are evident. Traditional motifs play a role here, and Matthew is again found to make use of language and forms of the tradition in the redaction. Hence, tradition is normative in the Matthean redaction of the source, evident both in the preservation of the sources, as well as in the imitation of synoptic tradition in the creation of redactional phrases. The rhetorical and pragmatic normativity of tradition is discernible on the basis of a comparison of Matthew's account with the account of the sources.

The Parable of the Mustard seed in Mark and Q

The use of different tenses in the parable of the mustard seed in Q and in Mark not only assigns the two versions to different genres of parables,[66] but also indicates their different emphasis.[67]

The Parable of the Mustard Seed in Mark

Mark's account is rendered in the present tense and is thus to be designated a similitude, telling a story of something which normally happens when a mustard seed is

---

[65] The parable here differs clearly from the version found in GTh 76, where the man simply gets rid of his (other) merchandise, and buys the pearl for himself.

[66] Cf. Laufen, "ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ", 105.

[67] My exposition here essentially follows the excellent analysis of the three different synoptic versions of the parable of Seim, "Overraskelse". Seim maintains that the nuances found in the different versions have typically been overlooked in tradition-historical exegesis, which has either been preoccupied with the peculiar mixed form of the Matthean parable, or more often with its original (authentic) wording. What I here attribute to Q based on synoptic comparison of the texts, Seim discusses on the level of Luke. True to her intention of showing the difference of the three synoptic versions, Seim only hints at the Q text when she speaks of the mixed version of the Matthean parable.

sown.[68] The parable uses the example from nature, whereby the smallest of all seeds becomes a great plant. The parable remains within the limits of that which is normally expected with regard to the mustard seed. The contrast between the small seed and the great plant which it becomes, is the central point of the parable. This contrast is to be read in light of the previous parable, the seed growing secretly. Here the growth is not encouraged in any way, but happens, just like a mustard seed grows and becomes great. The final greatness of the plant has a function: the shadow of its branches becomes a place of rest for the birds of the air.[69]

The Parable of the Mustard Seed in Q

In Q, it is not the theme of great and small which is of significance. What in Mark may be designated a simile, is in Q a parable. By using the aorist, it expresses something which is unusual, a one time happening. Hence, designating the final result as a δένδρον Q is not expressing a faulty biological fact, but rather gives a picture of the surprising element of the Kingdom. The man in question does not sow the seed, but throws it, perhaps nonchalantly in the garden. The surprising element is the growth into a tree. Thus, it can be shown that the parable of the mustard seed has a different aspect in Mark and Q.

The Parable of the Mustard seed and the Parable of the Pearl in Matthew

In Matthew, the point of both the parable of the pearl and the parable of the mustard seed is to be found in the contrast between great and small. What is illustrated is the contrast between the original size of the seed and that which it grows to be. The parable of the pearl has a similar, yet not identical concern: the amount the merchant gave up (all that he had) in order to own one, valuable pearl. The seed becomes a plant which is greater than all vegetables, like a tree.[70] The one pearl is valuable enough for the merchant to give up plenty to own it.

In the parable of the mustard seed, Matthew combines elements from both Q and Mark, and a fluctuation between the tenses is a result. It is the form of the parable which prevails in the Matthean exposition, however: the exposition of the particular event.[71]

---

[68] Cf. Eta Linnemann, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu* (1978), 13-14 and Charles Harold Dodd, *Parables of the Kingdom*, (1961) 16-18 for the distinction between parable and similitude: The similitude depicts a typical or recurrent situation, using the present tense. The parable describes "a particular case" with the verb(s) in a historical tense.

[69] There is an allusion here to Ez 17:23, although the allusion does not seem to have an extended influence on the text.

[70] In emphasising the contrast, Matthew follows Mark. Luke follows Q in which the unexpected growth in it self is the major point. Cf. Bovon, *Lukas*, vol. 2, 415.

[71] Cf. Dodd, *Parables*, 18; Seim, "Overraskelse", 5. The present here is a historic present. The use of tenses in the parable in Matthew is not only due to the redactional combination of two versions of the parable, it is also a typical Matthean feature. Cf. Wolfgang Schenk, "Das Präsens Historicum als Makrosyntaktisches Gliederungssignal im Matthäusevangelium" (1975/76).

The parable includes a comparison which is only reminiscent of the phrase of Mt 11:11, but which seems to express a similar idea:

> ὃ μικρότερον μέν ἐστιν πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων,
> ὅταν δὲ αὐξηθῇ μεῖζον τῶν λαχάνων ἐστὶν
> καὶ γίνεται δένδρον
> (Mt 13:32)

The mustard seed is the smallest of seeds, but when it has grown it has become a tree, even greater than the herbs. In this comparison there is no qualitative contrast between the seed and the plant which it becomes. Rather, it cannot become anything without its previous existence as a little seed. In the case of the kingdom of God, the seed is the smallest of all, but the tree it produces becomes a place where birds nest.

The final sentence in Mt 13:32 is an allusion to Dan 4:21. The tree in Nebuchadnezzar's dream predicts his own destruction. It is unlikely that there is a "typological" relation between the text from Scripture and Mt 13:32. Rather, in the context of Matthew, the text alludes to the theme which is present both in Daniel 4 and in the similar text in Ez 17:23. Here God will be known as the one who humbles the great, and makes great the small. This theme is also present in Is 60, which has possibly influenced the structure of material in Mt 13.

In Matthew, therefore, the parable of the mustard seed does not emphasise the growth itself, but the contrast between one small mustard seed and what it grows to be. As in Mt 11:11, the emphasis here is both ecclesiological (hence the fluctuation between present and aorist) and Christological. The reversal of great and small is the theme even here . Christologically, from a post-Easter perspective, it may refer to the humiliation of Christ on the cross and the subsequent exaltation (Mt 28). That this perspective is important for Matthew, and that it therefore is brought into the gospel material is clear from the inclusion of Jonah 2:1 in Mt 12:40. Ecclesiologically, the reversal of standards joins the exhortation to bear good fruit.

The parable of the pearl does not use the vocabulary of great and small, which links the parable of the mustard seed to Matthew 11 and 18. The action of the merchant however, expresses the same paradoxical nature of the kingdom. The exact value and size of the pearl is not expressed in the parable, nor is the merchant described as wealthy. The contrast between one and all, and the knowledge that the pearl, though valuable, is not enormous, serve to make Matthew's point again. Though seemingly small, the pearl is exceedingly valuable. In order to own it one must humble oneself, become small.[72]

Another aspect of the parable of the pearl also ties the parable to the πλεῖον/μείζον motif. The pearl is so valuable to the merchant, that he sells all to possess it. For the merchant, the pearl is worth "more than" all his possessions. Its value can be

---

[72] Cf. Jones, *Parables*, 354-355.

compared to the value of wisdom.[73] The pearl resembles Wisdom, and becomes a metaphor of Wisdom.[74] There is thus a relation between the call of wisdom in Mt 11:28-30 and the present parable, where the "more than" is expressed in the presence of the Wisdom of God. Further the "selling of all" is equivalent to submitting to the yoke of Wisdom.[75]

Conclusion

The Matthean adaptations of the parable of the pearl and the parable of the mustard seed have pointed to both the rhetorical and the pragmatic authority of the synoptic tradition by which Matthew interprets the parables. The proclamation of the Kingdom as that which is great and valuable is found in the parables. The interpretation of this greatness is, in the parable of the mustard seed, first and foremost found in the example of Jesus. This example is the origin of the synoptic tradition which reflects upon the reversal of great and small in the kingdom of Heaven. The allusion to Scripture in the final clause of the parable, however, shows that also for Matthew this reversal is paradigmatic and rooted in Scripture. In the parable of the pearl, the witness to the greatness of the pearl, and the allusion to Wisdom as a tangible presence for the person who gives all to posses it, are normative in their kerygmatic function. Again the place of the presence of God is the question, and even more clearly than in Mt 11:28-30, discipleship in Christian terms is the way to achieve it.

Thus the texts also point to the pragmatic normativity of tradition as identity-forming, and as providing the criteria for living that identity. The reversal of small and great and "the selling of all" as requirements for discipleship, also serves as a kind of identity marker. The one who recognises the place of the presence of God in Jesus, will follow the example, repent, and humble him/her-self.

5.2.4.Conclusion

The analysis of the use of synoptic tradition in the development of the πλεῖον/μείζον motif demonstrated that Matthew's redaction of the tradition was conservative and motivated by the preservation of the order and text of the sources. The harmonisation of similar traditions, and the preservation of texts and formulations, was

---

[73] In Job 28:18 and in Proverbs 3:15 and 8:11, she is described as more valuable than silver, gold and jewels. Schenk, *Sprache*, 11, cites the passages in Proverbs and Job to illustrates his claim that the pearl "schnell zur Metapher der Weisheit avancierte." His presupposition is that pearl and "coral" are identical in meaning. It is doubtful whether פְּנִינִים can be interpreted as pearl. Cf. F. Hauck, Μαργαρίτης (1967), 473 n8. A general use of pearl as a metaphor for wisdom cannot be documented.

[74] The Wisdom imagery is already given in the preceding parable. Wisdom is compared to a hidden treasure in Prov. 2:4; Sir 20:30; 41:14. Cf. Dieter Zeller, Θησαυρός (1981), 374.

[75] There is a dual meaning in the parable of the pearl and the treasure, equivalent to Mt 6:25-34. On the one hand the value of a person is in God's eyes so great, that God provides what is necessary for the keeping of that person. On the other hand, God's kingdom is, for the person, more valuable than all wordly possessions.

found to be predominant. Matthew's adaptation was nevertheless found to be a rereading and reinterpretation of the sources, showing that the texts, like Scripture, were found to be actualised in light of present experience. In the passages, it was in particular the post-resurrection and post-70 CE situation of Matthew which became evident.

The appeal to the synoptic tradition of humiliation and exaltation, or the reversal of small and great in the kingdom of heaven, has its example in Jesus. Hence the tradition as interpretative key and norm is authoritative in its function as formative for the community. This interpretative key is, however, also a fulfilment of Scripture for Matthew. The reversal of values under the rule of God is prefigured therein.

In comparison with the use of Scripture in the development of the πλεῖον/μείζον motif, there is a change from the Christological theme treated in chapter 4. There, the Messianic expectations were found to influence the preservation and redaction of the texts to which they were related. In the present chapter the Christological theme was often accompanied by the prophetic threat of judgement patterned on scriptural material. The Christological pronouncement was found to be grounded in Jesus tradition, and subsequently placed in relation to scriptural and formative tradition. Hence, that which is formative for the Matthean community is placed in continuity with Scripture and thereby also supported by Scripture. The humility of Jesus and subsequent exaltation, is paradigmatic for the present community and the hopes for the coming age. It is presented as the new place of the presence of God in light of the fall of the temple. It is thereby also legitimised as the true "fulfilment" of the law and the prophets.

CHAPTER 6
REVELATION, CONCEALMENT, AND THE PROBLEM OF OBDURACY

The problem of obduracy, the third and final thematic strand which is dominant in Matthew 11-13, has its centre in Mt 13:14f and the quotation from Isaiah 6:9-10. The necessity of an appropriate response to the ministry of Jesus has already been touched upon in the analysis of the Christological motifs in chapters 4 and 5. The motif of hiddenness, concealment and the problem of obduracy in Matthew 11-13 is used in two ways. On the one hand, it provides scriptural answers in the situation of national crisis and intra-communal conflict. On the other hand it provides clear criteria for remaining within the community. In the development of the motif, Matthew actualises both Scripture and synoptic tradition, and the normativity of both "new" and "old" is found. The normative function of the sources in the theological development of the theme is again found both in their kerygmatic and prophetical-critical aspects. While these aspects were found to be more dominant in the development of the Christological themes, the present motif draws on the normative standing of the sources also in their formative and pragmatic functions. Identity and standards for living are central in this section.

6.1. SCRIPTURE AS NORMATIVE AND FORMATIVE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE OBDURACY MOTIF COMPLEX

Scripture forms the background for the Matthean denunciation of those who do not respond positively to the words and works of Jesus Christ. From the beginning of the three-chapter unit in Mt 11-13, the contrast was made clear between the "blind that see, and deaf who hear" (11:5) and those who would take offence at Jesus (11:6; parallel to "let whoever has ears hear" in 11:15). In four instances in Matthew 11-13, one allusion and three literal quotations, the theme of concealment and of revelation is made an issue, in each case with reference to the obduracy or the hardening of the heart of "this generation". In two of these, passages connected with Isaiah's call to cause incomprehension of God's revelation are cited (Mt 11:25-27; 13:14-15). In two, the Deuteronomic notion of this "evil and unrepentant generation" is appealed to. (Mt 12:40 and 13:35).

Matthew appeals to prophetic tradition in these passages. It functions normatively by providing Matthew language and symbolism by which present history can be interpreted and made meaningful. It further functions as an identity-forming factor for the community. Finally it is normative in its kerygmatic function, with the stress being on the faithfulness of God.

These normative aspects of Scripture will again be demonstrated by showing Matthew's independent use and interpretation of Scripture. The analysis will take the

passages' original contexts into consideration, as well as Matthew's redaction and composition of material.

6.1.1. The Adaptation of Is 29:14 in Matthew 11:25-26

The Q logion which is combined with the call of wisdom in Mt 11:25-27 includes an allusion to Is 29:14. The composition of Matthew 11-13 already demonstrates an independent reading of the citation in Matthew. This is supported by the Matthean redaction of the passage.

Mt 11:25-26 is the only one of the scriptural allusions/citations to be analysed in light of the theme of revelation and concealment that actually uses both the verb to reveal (ἀποκαλύπτω) and the verb to hide (κρύπτω). The text, however, turns the emphasis away from these issues, and centres upon the receivers of revelation and the victims of concealment. Disclosure of secrets, hiddenness and the callousness of this generation, must therefore be understood as aspects of the same theme. The Q logion in 11:25-26 serves to introduce the problem of the rejection of Jesus in light of the Isaianic theme of obduracy. Matthew finds the solution to the problem in God's faithfulness.

The normativity of Scripture is here shown, in that the crisis in the Jesus story, as well as that of the present of Matthew's community, is made meaningful in light of the words of the prophet. The prophetic word is perceived to contain both predictive and revelatory qualities. Further, the prophetic word is thought to contain God's redemptive word.

The Form and Conceptual Background of Mt 11:25-26

Matthew 11:25-27 is a double logion derived from Q, and it is the first instance in Mt 11-13 where the theme of revelation and concealment is explicitly introduced. The double logion follows the woes on the Galilean cities, which are patterned on the prophetic speech of judgement. As has been pointed out above, it is combined with Jesus' invitation to find rest. It is separated from, as well as being connected with, the surrounding narrative by a redactional sentence of transition preceding and succeeding it. The first of the two logia, Mt 11:25-26, consists of a thanksgiving in the form of a hymn.

> ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς,
> ὅτι ἔκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν
> καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις:
> ναί ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἔμπροσθέν σου.

The opening sentence of the logion (with the exception of πάτερ) consists of elements of traditional hymnic language in Judaism as it is found in the LXX[1] and the

---

[1] ἐξομολογήσομαι//ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι ὅτι (אוֹדְךָ כִּי): Ps 51:11; 53:8; 117:21; 117:28; 138:14 and Dan 2:23. κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ὁ θεὸς τῆς γῆς is found in Gen 24:3,7. In the Psalms the phrase is expanded with ὁ ποιήσας before "heaven and earth". cf. eg. Ps 113:23, 123:8. The formulation κύριος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς is only found in Tobit 10:14. The address of the

hodayot of the Qumran literature.[2] Also the final sentence uses hymnic language,[3] and repeats, through ναὶ ὁ πατήρ, the thanksgiving of the previous verse. If revelation presupposes a state of concealment, the prayer may be said to bring out both these aspects, and they are placed in the realm of God's activity or dealings with human beings.

With regard to revelation, the Q prayer is unusual in two ways. The form of the logion corresponds to the prayer of an individual, but the content expresses a communal rather than a personal concern.[4] While thanksgiving for revelation or the disclosure of God's wisdom, word or way is common both in Scripture and other literature of the period,[5] these occurrences are found in individual psalms, where the psalmist praises God for the personal gift of discernment. Further, the notion that νήπιοι are receivers of revelation, is uncommon. In the sayings tradition, νήπιοι does not signify children or immature persons in the Greek sense of the word.[6] Rather, its use in Q 10:21 is in agreement with the Septuagint translation of פתים, the innocent, who are, especially in the Psalms, recipients of God's protection and guidance.[7] Without alluding to a specific scriptural passage, the prayer picks up this language of the psalms, and expresses a conception which is also found in Ps 118:130 ἡ δήλωσις τῶν λόγων σου φωτιεῖ καὶ συνετιεῖ νηπίους.[8] The innocent and naive, who previously had no insight, have now received revelation.

---

prayer in Mt 11:25//Lk 10:21 uses common hymnic language and does not fit into a specific "form" of address or prayer. Cf. also William David Davies and Dale C. Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol. 2, 273-274.

[2] אודכה אדוני כי . Celia Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom*, 101 points out the similarity between the *hodayot* and Mt 11:25. The language is so common, however, that literary dependence is not plausible. The Q formula also goes beyond that of the *hodayot* in that it includes a reference to the creator of the heaven and the earth, so that a common literary format can not be postulated beyond the identification of general hymnic language.

[3] Corresponding to יהי רצון מלפניך which is Jewish, not scriptural, prayer language. Cf. Ulrich Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 205 n 57.

[4] To define the concern as communal, is not to assume that in Matthew the logion is addressed or refers solely to the disciples or the community of believers. Matthew's arrangement of material does not support this conclusion.

[5] Cf. e.g. Ps. 16:11, 1QGenAp 22:16. See the overview of thematic similarities between Mt 11:25-27 with second temple and tannaitic literature by Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom*, 55-112. Deutsch's study does not explore the element of κρύπτω ἀπό with God as a subject, beyond pointing out that Wisdom can be described as both hidden and revealed. In seeking parallel notions in order to understand the logion in light of its literary environment, this aspect seems crucial.

[6] Cf. G. Bertram, Νήπιος, (1967) 912-913.

[7] Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 206, sees the term as an equivalent to the *am haaretz*. So also Albrecht Oepke, Κρύπτω (1965), 973.

[8] Compare also Psalm 19:8; 116:6. Jaques Dupont, "Les Simples (petayim) dans le Bible et à Qumran", (1985) 585, points out that the LXX is consistent in the usage of νήπιος. In Proverbs, the term occurs only in instances where the content is similar to the cited passages in the psalms. Whenever פתים is used in opposition to the wise, it is translated with different words, e.g. ἀκακως or ἄφρων. In slight contradiction to this view, Braumann, Νήπιος, (1975) 381 distinguishes between the dull or foolish "babes" in the LXX text of Proverbs over against the simple of faith who have found favour with God, in the Psalms. Cf. also Bertram, Νήπιος, 917.

Although the concept of concealment is necessary for an understanding of revelation, there is no parallel in Jewish literature where God is praised for actively concealing wisdom or knowledge.[9] It is all the more interesting that, in a passage which is by most thought to be influenced by wisdom or apocalyptic tradition, it is the wise and the discerning, those who previously had been revealed to, who are victims of God's activity of hiding. In fact, the Matthean text stands in direct contradiction to the hymn of Daniel 2:20-21, 23, where Daniel praises God because he gives wisdom to the wise and insight to those who understand:[10]

Δανιηλ καὶ εἶπεν εἴη τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ εὐλογημένον
ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος ὅτι
ἡ σοφία καὶ ἡ σύνεσις αὐτοῦ ἐστιν
καὶ αὐτὸς ... διδοὺς σοφίαν τοῖς σοφοῖς καὶ φρόνησιν τοῖς εἰδόσιν ...
σοί ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων μου ἐξομολογοῦμαι καὶ αἰνῶ
ὅτι σοφίαν καὶ δύναμιν ἔδωκάς μοι

Further, in scriptural tradition, whenever the wise are seen in opposition to babes or the "naive", it is the former who have received understanding, whereas the νήπιοι are seen in a negative light.[11]

The act of hiding wisdom from the wise in Matthew implicitly holds it against them that they have departed from what is "the will of the Father". In hymns and in the psalms of Scripture and tradition, the hiding of God's face is a result of apostasy or failing to walk in God's way, and is lamented by the psalmist.[12] The psalmist who rejoices in having found favour with God, also appeals to God: "do not hide your face from me."[13] The hiding of wisdom from the wise is similar in meaning.

That God actively hides wisdom or understanding from people, has a parallel in the call narrative of Isaiah 6. Here Isaiah is commissioned to cause the people not to understand his words. In continuity with this, is the prophetic oracle of judgement in Isaiah 29:13-15, where God threatens to take wisdom and understanding away from people who have already been in possession of these. It is likely that the Q logion alludes to the text of Isaiah 29:14:

LXX	MT
διὰ τοῦτο ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ προσθήσω τοῦ μεταθεῖναι	לָכֵן הִנֵּנִי יוֹסִף לְהַפְלִיא
τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον καὶ μεταθήσω αὐτούς	אֶת־הָעָם־הַזֶּה הַפְלֵא וָפֶלֶא
καὶ ἀπολῶ τὴν σοφίαν τῶν σοφῶν	וְאָבְדָה חָכְמַת חֲכָמָיו
καὶ τὴν σύνεσιν τῶν συνετῶν κρύψω	אוּבִינֹת נְבֹנָיו תִּסְתָּתָר

---

[9] On account of the contrast between the wise and the simple, Hans Joachim Ritz, "Κρύπτω", 798 speaks of God's salvation historical preference for the νήπιοι in the discussion of Mt 11:25-26.

[10] Cf. Werner Grimm, "Weil ich dich liebe", 173-175. Grimm holds Matthew 11:25-26 to be a polemical allusion to Daniel.

[11] Cf. Braumann, "Νήπιος", 381

[12] Cf. Ps 10:1; 30:8; 44:24; 88:15; 89:46.

[13] Cf. Ps 27:9; 69:18; 102:3; 119:19; 143:7.

The Place of Isaiah 29:14 in the Book of Isaiah

Isaiah 29:14 is a part of Is 29:9-16, which repeats the commission to harden the hearts of the people in Is 6: God has poured out a spirit of deep sleep over the prophets and the leaders of the people. [14] The object of critique in Isaiah 29 is the careless and distanced partaking in the cult.[15] The phrase of Is 29:14 is directed toward the class of "the wise" in their function as leaders.[16] The judgement consists of removing wisdom from the wise and hiding insight from the discerning. It is debatable whether the prophecy is referring to a historical incident, or is to be understood as a reference to eschatological events. The criticism of the political elite, and the reference to Jerusalem in the previous oracle (vv 1-4) suggest that the oracle has its specific historical setting. The prophecy is nevertheless thought to hold continual validity, in its pointing to God's acting in the history of the people:[17] The Hebrew oracle uses language which places the concealment of understanding in the same category as creation (Ps 89:6) or the liberation from Egyptian bondage (Ps 77:12: 78:11), hence the "miracle" is to be related to God's acts in history.[18] The Septuagint, in contrast, speaks of the transformation or transplantation of "this people." This is perhaps to be understood as a judgement taking the form of a new exile.

Important to the place of the allusion to Is 29:14 in the gospel of Matthew is its place within the obduracy motif in Isaiah. The theme corresponds to the concern of the Deuteronomistic tradition (e.g. Deut 32), in which the history of the people of God is seen in light of their rebellion and apostasy, and is found particularly as a part of the prophetic tradition (cf. Jer 5:21,23; Ez 3:7). As Evans and McLaughlin have pointed out, the particular viewpoint expressed in the Isaianic tradition places the responsibility of the hardening of the hearts with God. [19] This is best expressed in the Hebrew text, while the aspect is toned down in other textual traditions including the LXX.[20] Isaiah 29:14 LXX, however, in its translation of the Hebrew, has kept part of the Hebrew motif with God as the source of the stubbornness of the people. This comes out most clearly in the passage alluded to in the Q passage preserved in Mt 11:25-26, in which the prophetic oracle predicts judgement on the leaders of the people, in the form of their wisdom and

---

[14] For the influence of Is 6:9-10 on whole of the book of Isaiah, cf. John L. McLaughlin, "Their Hearts were Hardened" (1995). McLaughlin discusses the centrality of the motif in the Hebrew text.

[15] Jörg Barthel, *Prophetenwort und Geschichte* (1997), 384.

[16] Cf. Is 5:18,f, 21; 28:23-29. Barthel, *Prophetenwort*, 348, 285-286, speaks of the judgement of a „zur polistischen Ideologie erstarrten Weisheit," where the cult has become "political", but is not perceived to require a response of ethical responsibility and of faith. See also Georg Fohrer, Σοφία (1971), 482.

[17] Barthel, *Prophetenwort*, 387.

[18] Cf. Otto Kaiser, *Isaiah 13-39* (1974) 274.

[19] Cf. C.A. Evans, *To See and not Perceive* (1989), 42-43; McLaughlin, "Their Hearts", 9-12

[20] See esp. Evans, *To See*, 61-80.

understanding being taken away from them. In Isaiah, this spells out disaster for Israel. A nation with foolish leaders cannot prevail against its enemies.[21]

Isaiah 29:14 in the Context of Q

The allusion to Is 29:14 in Q and the later adaptation into the gospel of Matthew seem to draw on both the concept of eschatological fulfilment and the prophetic critique of the religious leadership. In Q, the logion is found to place the "wise and understanding" over against the disciples who are understood to be νήπιοι. To the thanksgiving in Q 10:21 is added a second logion, which describes the unique relationship between "the father" and the "son". The relationship is described in terms of their knowledge of each other. To a certain extent the second logion contradicts the first. Whereas the first logion speaks of the father revealing "these things" to babes, the authority to reveal is in the second logion given to the son. In the first logion, to conceal and to make known is according to the discretion and will of God; in the second logion, it is according to the wish of the son.[22] The privilege of knowing God is then extended to those to whom "the son wishes to reveal it." These, chosen by the son, are the νήπιοι. That these are the disciples is made clear from the previous context.

The logion is attached to the account of the commissioning of the twelve.[23] The immediately preceding judgement on the Galilean cities is prompted by the fate of the city which meets the disciples with rejection. Judgement is the result of the refusal to receive the disciples. The concluding saying makes this evident: "whoever refuses you refuses me and ... the one who sent me," (10:16).[24] The relational pattern of Q 10:16 is parallel to Q 10:21, the disciples know God through knowing Jesus. In Q then, the emphasis of the logion is on the privileged position of the disciples as receivers of revelation. The content of this revelation is the nature of God himself, as it is revealed in and through Jesus. The σοφοί καὶ συνετοί, are not simply to be identified with those who reject the disciples, however. The explication of this phrase is given in the following Q logion, which points out that prophets and kings never saw and heard what the disciples see and hear.[25] Here the prophets and kings correspond to the wise and understanding in the previous logion. The combination of this saying with the allusion to Is 29:14, shows

---

[21] See Kaiser, *Isaiah*, 274.

[22] Because of the nature of the logion, it is probably to be considered a post-Easter addition to either an authentic Jesus saying or a traditional prayer, and was probably not an independent logion. Cf. John S. Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 197-198. It is interesting to note that similar to the idea expressed in Mt 11:27, are some of the *Hodayot* from Qumran, where the hymnist claims to have received revelation which he in turn has passed on. (1QH 1:21; 4:23ff; 8:16ff; 12:12ff.) Cf. Markus Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity* (1990), 49.

[23] So also Paul Hoffmann, *Studien*, 104, 108.

[24] Cf. Matthew 10:40. Luke is probably nearer to the Q wording here, while Matthew, perhaps prompted by the vocabulary of Q10:10 (εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν ... μὴ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς), reformulates the logion in light of Mk 9:37. So also Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 149.

[25] For the composition of the commissioning of the disciples in Q, cf. Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 199-201.

on the part of Q a dual understanding of the Isaianic oracle. First, on the level of a social critique, it is the disciples, though they are ignorant and naive, νήπιοι, rather than kings and prophets as the nation's leaders, who are recipients of revelation.[26] Second, on the level of eschatology, the Isaianic prophecy was read in light of the common understanding that prophecy and wisdom in Israel had perished. At the time of the inbreaking of the kingdom of God, however, revelation and the gift of prophecy would resume.[27] Hence the revelation to the "babes" is understood by Q to be a sign of the coming kingdom.

On the basis of the use of Is 29:14 in Q, it is now possible in view of Matthean redaction and composition, to understand how Matthew adopted and interpreted the allusion.

The Adaptation of Is 29:14 in Matthew 11:25-26

There are two aspects of the allusion which are of interest with regard to the adaptation of Isaiah 29:14 in Matthew 11. On the one hand, the opposition between the hidden and the revealed will have to be explored, and on the other hand the contrast between the ignorant and the wise and understanding. Both of these will be examined with regard to their place in Matthew and the function of the allusion to Isaiah in the development of these two themes.

In the redaction of Q 10:21, Matthew adopts the Q wording, but reduces the compound ἀποκρύπτω to the simple κρύπτω. This single feature of redactional activity, as well as the order of material in the Matthean composition, are the only indications of how the allusion to Isaiah 29:14 in Matthew 11:25 is to be understood. The use of the simple verb rather than the compound is on the one hand an indication of Matthean preference for certain vocabulary. On the other hand it may prove to be an adaptation of the logion to the LXX text of Isaiah to which it alludes.[28] That Matthew was familiar

---

[26] Also Hoffmann, *Studien*, 115, concludes that the νήπιοι constitute a socially less fortunate group of people, but on the basis of the historical situation of the Q community, which he presumes recruited its members from the lower social classes. He also sees a link here between Q and EthEn 62:1-7, where kings and the politically powerful are contrasted with the elect. Irrespective of how one chooses to understand the historical constituency of the Q community, the text makes sense in view of the social situation of the disciples of Jesus themselves, as Galilean fishermen. In Q there is a link here to the question of Jonah and Solomon in Q 11:29-38, where "kings and prophets" as the wise and discerning in Q:24-25 get their final definition. What the disciples have part in, is greater than both the wisdom of Jonah and the understanding of Solomon.

[27] Joel 3. Cf. John Barton, "Prophecy" (1992), 495, and M. Eugene Boring, "Prophecy" (1992), 497.

[28] These are the two main arguments for Matthean redaction. Cf. Wolfgang Schenk, *Sprache*, 327, who counts six of seven occurrences of κρύπτω in Matthew as either from M or redactional. Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew*, 645, considers two of the occurrences in Matthew to be redactional, and the remaining traditional. Luz, *Evangelium*, vol 1, 42, with reference to Gundry, holds the word to belong to Matthean preferential vocabulary, but points out that its usage in redactional phrases is uncommon. It is, however, very difficult to ascertain the wording of Q. Mt 10:26//Lk 8:17 also a Q text, includes the same discrepancy: κρύπτος (Mt)/ἀποκρύφος (Lk). Two arguments have been used in favour of the simple verb as the Q reading. First, Luke has a preference for compounds. Second, the verb ἀποκρύπτω forms a parallel to ἀποκαλύπτω in the previous phrase. It is difficult to explain why Matthew should avoid

with the Septuagint text is verified by the use of Isaiah 29:13 in Mt 15:8-10. This citation is adapted from the context of Mark's gospel, but Matthew adds the name of the prophet Isaiah, and changes the word order of Mark's text in order to adapt it more closely to the Septuagint reading.[29]

In reading Mt 11:25-27 in light of Isaiah 29:14, the allusion may be said to serve two functions. First, it introduces a polemic against the "wise and understanding". Second, it explains the reason for their rejection of Jesus: their wisdom has perished, and their understanding has been hidden. The allusion provides a scriptural pattern by which Matthew can read the Jesus story and his own historical situation. In the Matthean critique of the inability of the religious leaders to understand the significance of the ministry of Jesus,[30] lies also the "cult critique" of the Isaianic passage (cf. 12:1-14; 15:8-19). This critique can be extended to the post-70 CE situation of Matthew. Thus, at the heart of the thanksgiving in Mt 11:25-26, lies the obduracy motif found in Isaiah and other prophetic literature. Further, there is an eschatological perspective to its place in the present context. Isaiah 29:14 is understood to be a prediction concerning the events of the last days. Obduracy as God's judgement on the wise and understanding is a sign of the end-time, hence the allusion is found as a part of a thanksgiving.

The reason for thanksgiving is not simply the judgement of the wise and understanding, but much more, the revelation to babes. The location of the logion in the context of Mt 11-13, demonstrates that in Matthew νήπιοι is not simply to be associated with the disciples or with the members of the Matthean post-Easter community.[31] Although the logion in Matthew is still attached to the judgement of the Galilean cities, the cluster is removed from the context of the commissioning speech, and placed together with the invitation to find rest in a pericope of its own. The subsequent Q logion is in Matthew placed in the context of the parables speech of ch 13, again in a setting where there is an explicit reference to the disciples. Consequently, Matthew deliberately separates the double logion of Q 10:21-23 from the context of the disciples. With the subsequent M logion, it stands out in the narrative addressing a general public (the ὄχλος, cf. 11:7). In the Matthean redaction of the logion, the second Q logion (Mt

---

the parallelism. Cf. Joachim Gnilka, *Matthäusevangelium*, 433; Dieter Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 64 n.8; Davies, and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol. 2, 274; John S. Kloppenborg, "Wisdom Christologyin Q", 1978 133, et al. Like Matthew, however, Luke does not show a notable preference for ἀποκρύπτω. The compound verb is found nowhere else in Luke, whereas κρύπτω occurs twice in material peculiar to Luke: Lk 18:34: 19:42. The former is probably redactional. The parallel between the two compound verbs in Lk 10:21 could easily serve as an argument for its existence already in Q. There is therefore no decisive argument for Lukan redaction at this point.

[29] Krister Stendahl, *School*, 56-58.

[30] This reading is also supported by the redaction of the explicatory logion. Matthew formulates οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν instead of Lk: οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς. In Matthew the logion is not so much concerned with knowing the identity of, as much as it is concerned with understanding the significance of the appearance.

[31] Contra Joachim Gnilka, *Die Verstockung Israels* (1961), 96; Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom*, 32, et al.

11:27) together with Mt 11:28-30 is an invitation to perceive and understand, and becomes an example of the revelation to the simple. The νήπιοι in this context is parallel to Mt 11:5, where the πτωχοί have good news preached to them. A sharp distinction between the understanding of πτωχοί in the gospel of Matthew and the understanding of the term in Q only in part reflects the use of the word in Matthew. It is often noted that in Q the poor are to be understood in social terms as the economically poor, while in Matthew, they are rather the "poor in the spirit". The text of the beatitude in Mt 5:3 is here brought in to define the Matthean πτωχοί as those who are faithful to God and act according to his will. This understanding does not reflect the concerns of Matthew 11, where, as noted, there is a relation between πτωχοί in v. 5 and νήπιοι in v. 25. In Matthew 11:25, Matthew's critique is one of the religious leadership. As such it expresses a denunciation in line with Is 29:13-14, where the ethical responsibility in the relation to God is neglected (cf. Mt 23:23). A part of this responsibility is the concern for those who are weak in society.

It has been debated what the ταῦτα and αὐτά of the logion refers to in Mt 11:25. In Q, the explanatory expansion of the logion in v 27 applies it to the knowledge of God which comes though the revelation in Jesus. This reading can be supported in Matthew. Nevertheless, the correspondence between 11:25 and 11:5 redirects the emphasis from the person of Jesus in particular, to his ministry in general. Hence, ταῦτα and αὐτά refers to the place of God's presence in Jesus. Matthew is concerned with the implications of this knowledge in the faith and life of the people (cf. 11:28-30 and the allusions to Scripture therein). There is a parallel to the understanding of revelation here and in Mt 13:35.[32]

In the context of Matthew's gospel, the adaptation of the allusion to Isaiah 29:14 includes a sharper polemic against the σοφόι καὶ συνετόι than does Q. The focus is shifted away from the ministry of the disciples as extensions of the "son" and the "father". The invitation to understand is extended to the crowds in general. In this context, those who are wise and understanding, as in Is 29:14, are seen in a negative light. Because of their faithlessness their understanding has been removed from them. They have ears to hear, but do not hear (Mt 11:15). In the wider context of the gospel, the wise and discerning find their examples in the religious leadership, who are Jesus' opponents in the controversies of chapter 12.

---

[32] See below. Gnilka, *Verstockung*, 96, understands the logion to point beyond this knowledge of God to include the messianic identity of Jesus, particular eschatological events and the mysteries of the Kingdom: „eben ... alles was Jesus zu offenbaren gekommen ist." Similarly, with regard to Q, Hoffmann (*Studien*, 109-112) reads the text on the background of Jewish apocalypticism. The implications of these interpretations is an understanding of heavenly mysteries as something which is imparted only to a certain group of the elect. This is not so. For Matthew, the heavenly mysteries consist in God's compassion for God's people. This is knowledge openly available unless one's heart is hardened. Cf. also Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom*, 28.

Conclusion: The Normative Function of Scripture in Mt 11:25-26

The above analysis has demonstrated that Matthew's use of Q 10:21 also includes an independent reading and adaptation of the allusion to Isaiah. This independent adaptation shows an awareness of the text in question and its place in the book of Isaiah.

In the adaptation of the Q-logion, Matthew aligns the text more closely to the Septuagint wording of Isaiah, and strengthens the allusion already present in his *Vorlage*. Also the placing of the logion in the composition of Matthew 11, suggests that Matthew here intends an allusion to the Isaianic theme of obduracy. In Matthew as in Isaiah, the spiritual hardening of the religious leaders has an impact on the fate of the nation and Jerusalem. If the prophetic oracle of Isaiah was understood as a prediction of the events of the eschatological age, as it seems to have been understood in Q, the allusion serves as a proof that the kingdom of God is indeed imminent. The allusion also provides a paradigm of prophetic speech of judgement against the politically and religiously powerful, and their stubbornness in relation to the covenant with God.

Isaiah 29:14 in the context of Matthew 11, functions as an authority in three ways. First, it is authoritative because it contains a type or paradigm in which the opponents of Jesus fit. Presumably, in light of the double level of the Matthean narrative, also people in leading positions at the time of the Matthean composition may be in view here. The hardheartedness matches that of previous generations. There is therefore a kind of typological relationship between the "wise and understanding" of Isaiah's day, of those at the time of Jesus, and those of Matthew's time. "History repeats itself," and the present Matthean situation is made meaningful through the pattern of revelation and hiddenness of God in history. Matthew's message is legitimised through the appeal to authoritative texts.

Second, for Matthew the prophecy from Isaiah is normative in its witnessing to the acts of God in history, and the relation between the faithfulness to God and the historical event. This does not mean that we are to read the Matthean allusion as an uncritical denunciation of "Israel". The prophetic hope underlying the commission to harden the hearts of the people in Isaiah, is the return of the people to God.[33] This is in the context of Isaiah evident in e.g. Is 6:13, the context to which Is 29:14 refers, where the "remnant" is a hope for the new beginning after the judgement. It is also found following Is 29:9-66, in Is 30:15-16, where the return to God is an alternative to judgement. Hence, Scripture, in its kerygmatic function, is authoritative, because it assures of God's "marvellous acts" in history, and the hope for God's faithfulness to a faithful people.

Third, the understanding of Scripture as a formative norm, stands, of course, in the extension of this proclamation of God's "marvellous acts". Again, the placing of the

---

[33] Barthel, *Prophetenwort*, 117.

Jesus story in the light of Scripture, is a sign of the need to relate the new revelations of the "Father" through the "Son" to the already existing tradition of God's revelation. Only in light of this is the story meaningful. Scripture, therefore, is still identity-forming for Matthew, and provides norms for how faithfulness to God is lived out. As will be demonstrated in ch 6.2, this is supplemented by Jesus tradition.

6.1.2. The Use and Adaptation of Is 6:9-10 in Mt 13:14-15

The second reference to Isaiah's call to harden the hearts of the people is found in chapter 13. Matthew is dependent on Mark in citing Isaiah 6:9-10. In contrast to Mark, however, Matthew cites the whole passage, and thereby makes explicit the concern already touched upon through the Q allusion to Is 29:14 in Mt 11:25-26. Also here the normative function of Scripture lies in its providing a pattern for God's acting in the history of the people. Scripture makes recent history meaningful by placing it in the perspective in the history of the people. Matthew's adaptation of the Markan passage is in fact interpreted in light of Isaiah, avoiding the apocalyptic tendencies of Mark. The understanding of history found in Isaiah is therefore normative for the whole passage in Matthew.

The normativity of Scripture in Matthew's employment of Is 6 will be demonstrated in four steps. First, the text form of the citation will be defined. Second, the place of Mt 13:14-15 in the Matthean fulfilment citations will be discussed. Third, Matthew's interpretation of Mark in light of the citation from Isaiah will be described. Finally, the function of the obduracy motif of Isaiah in Matthew 11-13 will be analysed.

The Text of Is 6:9-10 in Mt 13:14-15

The theme of obduracy is introduced in the book of Isaiah in the call narrative of Isaiah 6, esp. vv 9-10. Here Isaiah's prophetic task is described. Matthew, adapting his Markan source, inserts the quotation from Isaiah 6:9-10 into the parable discourse in chapter 13, and continues the thematic thread of Mt 11:25-26. The citation is one of the longer ones in Matthew's gospel. The text form of the quotation is Septuagintal, and it is rendered without any redactional insertions or alterations. The text from Isaiah is introduced with a citation formula of fulfilment.

καὶ ἀναπληροῦται αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία Ἡσαΐου ἡ λέγουσα,
Ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε,
καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε.
ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου,
καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν
καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν,
μήποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς
καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσιν
καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν καὶ
ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.

Mt 13:14-15

Matthew 13:14-15 in Relation to the Fulfilment Citations

The place of the citation in the original Matthean text has been debated. Several arguments have been used for its secondary nature. The text form is different from most of the other fulfilment citations, adhering to the Septuagint with no trace of difficult translations in relation to known text forms.[34] The introduction of fulfilment does not follow the usual pattern, and includes two hapax legomena: ἀναπληρόω and προφητεῖα.[35] Some point to the apparent duplication of Mt 13:13 which the quotation creates.[36] With U. Luz, however, one must conclude that the quotation is original to Matthew.[37]

The mixed form of the fulfilment quotations may be an indication that some of Matthew's scriptural material was taken from a source. In the redaction of Q and Mark, however, Matthew often adapts the text of scriptural citations to the Septuagint. It was also pointed out in chapter 4 that the final line of Matthew's citation of Is 42:1-4 was Septuagintal. In the context of Matthew 12, it was demonstrated that both this last line, as also the parts of the citation which deviated from any known text form, could be explained as redactional. Consequently, dependence on the LXX even in the context of a fulfilment formula, is not definite evidence for a post-Matthean interpolation. Furthermore, the text is not missing in any known manuscript of the gospel. It may also be significant that Matthew shortens Mk 4:12 and changes it into a ὅτι-clause with indicative.[38] The result is an appropriate introduction, explaining the state of the crowds as the reason for the speaking in parables. The explanatory sentence accommodates the inclusion of the full citation.

The distinctiveness of the fulfilment formula may be explained by its position in the narrative.[39] Unlike the other quotations, this one occurs in the mouth of Jesus, and is

---

[34] Johann Rauscher, *Messiasgeheimnis*, 84.

[35] Cf. Gnilka, *Verstockung*, 104.

[36] For further arguments, cf. Gnilka, *Verstockung*, 103-105; Stendahl, *School*, 129-132; Wilhelm Rotfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 23-24; George M. Soares-Prâbhu, *Formula Quotations*, 31-35; Richard S. McConnell, *Law*, 142; Davies, and Allison., *Saint Matthew*, vol. II, 392-393.

[37] Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 301-302. Cf. also before him Wolfgang Trilling, *Das wahre Israel*, 59f.

[38] Matthew omits the whole final clause of the citation in Mark: Mark 4:12 μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς. Davies, and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol. II, 391, assuming Mt 13:14f to be an interpolation, interpret this as an attempt to soften the statement in Mark. Luke 8:12 also omits the clause (for Stendahl, *School*, 131, further evidence that Mt 13:14-15 is a post-Matthean interpolation), and creates a sentence structure similar to that of Matthew, but retains the ἵνα-clause. In an attempt to explain the agreements between Matthew and Luke, Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 301, postulates a common dependence on a Deutero-Markan source, which has attempted to reduce the Markan motif of the incomprehension of the disciples. Cf. also Rauscher, *Messiasgeheimnis*, 54. The text-form of the citation in Mark, using third person plural in the first two clauses, as well as the ἵνα-clause may reflect a dependence on the text of the Targum. Cf. Bruce Chilton, *A Galilean Rabbi and his Bible*, 91. See also Evans, *To See*, 70.

[39] The notion of Robert H. Gundry, *Use*, 213, that Matthew should through the different formulae indicate different levels of prophecy (making a distinction between purely predictive prophecy and

not a comment of the narrator. This unusual situation is due to the allusion to the passage which Matthew found in his Markan source. This allusion is the incentive for Matthew to include the quotation in full. Further, the quotation is not inserted in reference to an event or fact directly related to the person or life of Jesus, but explains the attitude of the people.[40]

Although the quotation is not found in Mark or Luke, the inclusion of the citation in Matthew is dependent on the allusion in the Markan source. The allusion in Mark is an abbreviated and paraphrased version of the prophecy, whereby the verbs see and hear are inverted. Matthew thought the allusion important enough that the quotation should be included in full. The occurrence of the same citation in Acts 28.26-27, as well as in John 12.40, may explain its inclusion also in the gospel of Matthew. The text was an important one in the early church, explaining the unbelief of the Jews.

It is clear then, that the theme of fulfilment is many-faceted in Matthew, and cannot successfully be narrowed down to a single notion derived from only a limited number of fulfillment passages which fit a prescribed definition. The text of Is 6:9-10 as it is cited is in line with Matthew's theological concerns and fits the context. Hence, there is no reason to assume that the citation was introduced secondarily.

Matthew's Interpretation of Mark 4:10-12 Through Is 6:9-10

The difference between the Markan and the Matthean use of Is 61:9-10 is similar to the difference in the emphasis of the Hebrew text and the Septuagint.[41] In the Hebrew text as in Mark, the purpose of the text is to make "the heart of this people dull". In the Septuagint, as in Matthew, the speaking of the prophet and of Jesus is because the heart of the people is already dull. The difference is not only to be ascribed to the different text form the two evangelists use. For both Matthew and Mark, the use of the citation betrays how they understand the rejection of Jesus by the people. Although Matthew's text is dependent on the Septuagint, the understanding of the relation between understanding revelation, faithlessness and God's action in history is dependent on Isaiah, as it is expressed both in the Hebrew text and in the Septuagint.

The allusion to Is 6:9-10 in the Markan context is influenced by the apocalyptic and the ecclesiological perspective of the previous section which ends in 3:35-4:1. This is

---

prophecy which also had meaning for the prophets own time) is to be rejected. It has already been shown that Matthew's use of prophetic texts go beyond the simple promise-fulfilment scheme.

[40] Consequently the ἵνα of the fulfilment introduction is not appropriate. Cf. Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 302.

[41] The Septuagint changes the imperatives of the Hebrew "Hear indeed but do not understand, see indeed but do not perceive" to the future indicative: " you shall indeed hear...". For an evaluation of the adaptation of Is 6:9-10 in the translation of the LXX. Cf. Evans, *To See*, 61-68. Evans understands the Septuagint to alter the understanding the Hebrew that God should purposefully harden the hearts of the people, as opposed to placing the responsibility with the people themselves. The difference is not that great: also in the Hebrew, the commission to harden the hearts of the people is preceded by the people's turning away from God.

illustrated by the esoteric language of the passage. There is a distinction made between the disciples who are around him when he is by himself (Mk 4:10; cf. 3:32) and those who are outside (Mk 4:11; cf. 3:31-32). In the context of Mark 4, παραβολή is a riddle by which eschatological knowledge is told, in the apocalyptic use of the word.[42] This knowledge is the μυστήριον of the kingdom. The context shows that Jesus is the one who mediates this knowledge, as the disciples themselves do not understand (Mk 4:12). Jesus then, in Mark, is the revealer of the eschatological secret, and those about him are the ones who receive this particular knowledge.[43] In the wider context of the Markan gospel, the allusion to Is 6:9-10 receives a double meaning. In the context of Mark, the ἵνα-clause strikes Jesus' opponents. The clause shows that for Mark, Jesus' proclamation has the *purpose* to harden the hearts of the listeners "outside".[44] This corresponds with the commission of Isaiah to harden the hearts of the people. Their obduracy has a purpose in the Markan Christology: their opposition causes Jesus' death, which is the prerequisite for the resurrection. Evans shows that in the context of the "messianic secret", even the disciples' hearts are hardened. But because these as followers of Jesus are positively inclined to his message and hence do not actively oppose him, he concludes, the mysteries will eventually be revealed, in light of the resurrection.[45]

Matthew tones down the apocalyptic imagery of Mark. The inside/outside language is omitted, and Jesus is not by himself, but still in the presence of the people when the disciples approach him. Three redactional steps indicate that Matthew reads the Markan passage in light of Isaiah's understanding of history. The passage is in Matthew therefore not primarily Christological. First Matthew moves the logion in Mk 4:25 to the context of Jesus' answer to the disciples in Mt 13:11-12. "*For to him who has will more be given, and he will have abundance; but from him who has not, even what he has will be taken away*" now follows "*and he answered them, "to you it has been given to know the secrets of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it has not been given*'" Second, Matthew exchanges the ἵνα with subjunctive to a ὅτι with indicative. Finally, Matthew cites the whole Isaiah passage from the Septuagint, which includes indicatives in Is 6:9 rather than the imperatives of the MT. Through these steps, Matthew shows that Jesus' speaking in parables is not intended to harden the hearts of the people.[46] The speaking in parables is a result of their already being hardhearted. The obduracy continues as a result of the faithlessness of the people.

---

[42] Friedrich Hauck, Παραβολή, 749.

[43] Evans, *To See*, 101.

[44] C. Brown, Παραβολή (1975), 753, shows that Mk 4:11b "is not only concerned with the parables of Jesus but with his preaching in general."

[45] Evans, *To See*, 102-103.

[46] Cf. Ivor H. Jones, *Parables*, 183. Matthew's insertion of Psalm 78: in 13:35 presumes the opposite: that the parables are openly known secrets. See § 6.1.3. below.

The responsibility for this lack of perception is explained through a *passivum divinum*: ἐκείνοις ... οὐ δέδοται. To some it has been given to understand, to some it has not been given. The motif recalls that of Mt 11:25-27: to some these things have been revealed, and from some they have been hidden. The theme continues in the Sabbath controversy. Here the Pharisees are reproached for not understanding the significance of the prophetic oracle from Hosea. The theme of the obduracy is the same as in the parables discourse. As in Isaiah, it is due to the action of God that the heart of the people has become dull. It points to God's actions in the history of the people, where faithlessness causes the inability to understand.

The analysis has shown that Matthew independently adapts Isaiah 6:9-10 in Matthew 13. The place of the citation in the Matthean narrative is dependent on Mark, and is an example of Matthew's conservative preservation of his sources. In the adaptation process, the Markan text has been interpreted in light of the Isaianic view of history.

The Obduracy-Motif of Isaiah in Matthew 11 and 13

A comparison will show that the Matthean citation of Is 6 stands in continuity with the citation of Is 29 in Matthew 11-13. Two aspects of the citation of Is 6:9-10 in Matthew 13 distinguish it from the allusion to Is 29:14 at the end of Matthew 11. First, it is now the disciples specifically who are receivers of revelation, instead of the more general νήπιοι in the former passage. Second, it is now the crowds in general, "this people", not only the wise and the understanding, who are obdurate. Also this is in continuation with the two passages in Isaiah. The result of the people's blindness is the blindness of the leaders. Judgement befalls them both. It becomes evident that in the context of Matthew 11-13, the opposition of the leaders to Jesus, and the incomprehension of the people, is by Matthew understood in light of Scripture. The understanding of God's working in history is in Isaiah 6 and 29 a critique of the political leadership who wish to keep the actions of God within a defined sphere of life,[47] and who neglect the social and ethical response the covenant relationship with God necessitates. The continuous wondrous actions of God in history therefore work against the expectations of the "wise".

Similarities in the two Isaiah citations support these findings. Neither in Mt 11 nor in Mt 13, is the state of incomprehension which leads to judgement, final. It is also true that comprehension without appropriate response is like no comprehension at all. The full citation of Isaiah 6:9-10 in Matthew leaves the possibility open for the possibility of repentance and subsequent forgiveness. As in Isaiah, the obduracy of the people has a history, and is not imposed by a malevolent God. Lack of understanding is part of judgement for unfaithfulness.[48] Both the Hebrew and the Septuagint version of the last

---

[47] Barthel, *Prophetenwort*, 478.

[48] Cf. McLaughlin, "Their Hearts", 6.

phrase in v. 10b leaves an opening for redemption, through the act of repentance. It would then express the same condition as in Is 30:15: through repentance they may be healed.[49] The Septuagint's use of μήποτε in the meaning "perhaps,"[50] likewise opens for the possibility of redemption. Also in Matthew then, the quotation would then express the hope that perhaps, their eyes may see, their ears hear, and they will repent. This reading is supported by the use of Ps 78:2 in the conclusion of the first section of ch 13. There, as will be shown, the speaking in parables may be understood in terms of making known the mysteries of the kingdom. The reading is further endorsed by the concern for hearing and understanding in being confronted with the kingdom, which is one of the concerns in Mt 11-13.

As in Mark, the Matthean parable of the sower which preceded the pericope where the citation is inserted, is concluded with the call: ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκουέτω. In Matthew this recalls the same exhortation in Mt 11:15. It has already been pointed out that the issue of hearing and understanding as response to the presence of the Kingdom is introduced in 11:2 and 4, where John hears from prison about the deeds of the Christ, and Jesus responds to the question from John the Baptist: Πορευθέντες ἀπαγγείλατε Ἰωάννῃ ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ βλέπετε. Both of these indicate that the dullness of the hearts of the people is not a final, unchangeable state of being, but may be changed.

Conclusion

The analysis of the Matthean use of Is 6:9-10 in the context of Matthew 13 stands in continuation with the allusion to Is 29:14 in Matthew 11. Matthew interprets Mark in light of the passage from Isaiah, which was given Matthew by the Markan text. The speech of Jesus will remain incomprehensible to many, because of the hardheartedness of the leadership: they are blind leaders (cf. Mat 23:16, 24). Yet, there is in the proclamation itself hope that they may indeed repent.

Matthew 13:14-15 may be counted among the fulfilment citations, despite the many differences between the quotation and those quotations which traditionally have been considered in this group. The introductory sentence to the citation, indicates that the prophecy is understood as being fulfilled in the present state of the crowds. This fulfilment, however, unlike other fulfilment citations in the gospel is not applied Christologically. Although it explains the parables discourse of Jesus, it does not do so in terms of prophecies which directly apply to events in the life of Jesus. In this instance the prophecy more clearly concerns the relation between Israel, the people, and God. As the analysis of Mt 13:35 will show, the obduracy of the people is not to be understood as an eschatological event which announces the coming of the kingdom. On the contrary, it

---

[49] Cf. Barthel, *Prophetenwort*, 69. The text is therefore not with Evans, *To See*, 20, to be read as an assurance that they will not be healed before judgement has taken place.

[50] Like in 2 Tim 2:25; Lk 3:15. Jones, *Parables*, 284. Cf. also Friedrich Blass, et al., *Grammatik* § 370.3 (n5) and §456 (n2).

described the response of the people to God's messenger as it has been "fulfilled" through the generations. Only the Q material which follows the citation indicates the privileged position of those who do see and understand, for it is more than prophets and righteous of previous generations have seen.

It is evident, then, that again Matthew appeals to Scripture to understand and explain the story of Jesus as well as recent history. The text from Isaiah is authoritative both in its function in the development of the theological argument, and in its pragmatic function in the life of the community. The prophecy is a part of Scripture which both proclaims the history of the people of God in relation to God, and which places misfortune and judgement in the context of that relationship. As a whole, the prophecy explains the history of God with God's people. The faithfulness of God to the people expressed in the hope of salvation, as well as judgement and punishment as a result of turning away from God is described therein. The prophecy, though grounded in the historical situation of Isaiah, is normative because it expresses the nature of the covenant relationship with God. The similarity of situations makes the text meaningful in the Matthean narrative and on the level of the Matthean readership. On the pragmatic level, the use of the Isaiah citation expresses the call for repentance as a normative call, grounded in the prophetic critique of the leadership. Scripture therefore is authoritative and prescriptive in its requirement for repentance and in its hope for redemption.

6.1.3. Matthew's Adaptation of Psalm 78:2 in Mt 13:35

The theme of hiddenness, revelation, and obduracy is continued in Matthew 13 through the introduction of a second fulfilment citation. The quotation of Psalm 78:2 in the parables discourse in Matthew 13 is placed as part of the statement that Jesus spoke in parables, following the parable of the leaven. The citation has no parallel in the synoptic sources. Again the use of the citation appeals to Scripture in its function of being formative for the identity of the people. The psalm appeals to the history of election as an identity factor, and at the same time voices a prophetic critique against the faithlessness of the people. Through the citation of the psalm in the context of the parables chapter, the content of the psalm and the question of the stubbornness of the people are alluded to.

The normative use of Scripture in Matthew's adaptation of Ps 78:2 will be demonstrated according to the scheme followed in the analyses above. In order to achieve an understanding of Matthew's use of Scripture one must first establish the meaning of the citation in the context of the gospel. First, the text form of the Matthean citation will be analysed. Second, the content of the citation text in its original literary context will be described. The meaning of the psalm in Mt 13 may then be established.

The Text Form of Ps 78:2 in Mt 13:35.

The citation of Ps 78:2 in Matthew 13:35 is preceded by a Matthean redaction of Mk 4:33-34. The reference to Jesus speaking in parables to the people probably gave the

incentive for the inclusion of the citation here. The citation refers to the fulfilment of "that which was spoken by the prophet" in Jesus' actions, and the introductory sentence follows the standard formula.[51]

Consistent with the majority of the fulfilment citations, the text form of Mt 13:35 is of mixed nature. The text of the first half of the quotation is derived from the Septuagint. The second clause, which forms a parallel to the first, shows evidence of either an independent translation of the Hebrew or an interpretation of the Greek:

> ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος,
> Ἀνοίξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ στόμα μου,
> ἐρεύξομαι κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς[52]
> (Mt 13:35)

Ps 78:2 MT	Ps 77:2 LXX
אֶפְתְּחָה בְמָשָׁל פִּי אַבִּיעָה חִידוֹת מִנִּי־קֶדֶם	ἀνοίξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ στόμα μου φθέγξομαι προβλήματα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς

In the first clause, corresponding to the Septuagint, the singular משל, is rendered in the plural.[53] The plural in the first clause corresponds closer than the singular to κεκρυμμένα in the second clause. Together with the use of synonym verbs, this forms the parallelism of the two clauses. The parallelism corresponds to that of the Septuagint.[54]

The formulation of the second clause differs from all known versions of Ps 77 (78):2, and the vocabulary is not distinctly Matthean.[55] The insertion of κεκρύμμενα as a

---

[51] ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος

[52] The original hand of Sinaiticus and the majority of the uncials considered among the constant witnesses includes κόσμου in the final phrase. Despite the weight of the external evidence for the longer reading, its absence in Vaticanus corresponds better to the text of the Psalm and is probably the more original reading (one also found in Origen). The full phrase ἀπὸ/πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου is a standard formulation in Greek. The shortened version is therefore considered to be the more difficult reading. The word κοσμοῦ is added in Mt 13:35 in order to complete a phrase perceived to be incomplete. The full phrase occurs nine times in the NT (Matt 24:34, Lk 11:50, Jn 17:24, Eph 1:4, Heb 4:3, 9:26, 1 Pet 1:20, Rev 13:8, 17:8), the shortened version only here. The expression ἀπὸ καταβολῆς does not exist in the LXX, but was common as an expression of a historical starting point in combination with κόσμου from the second century, and in the absolute form from the first century BCE. Cf. H.H. Esser, Καταβολή (1975), 377.

[53] The coincidental wording does not *per se* prove literal dependence. Cf. Stendahl, *School*, 116.

[54] ἐρεύγομαι is used in stead of φθέγγομαι. In the LXX psalms the verb is used as translation of נבע (LXX Ps 18:3; 118:171; 144:7; the latter two as ἐξερεύγομαι) as often as φθέγγομαι (LXX Ps 58:8; 77:2; 93:4). The two therefore function as synonyms in the Psalms (cf. Ps 118:171-172).

[55] ἐρεύγομαι is a *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament. With the exception of Mt 11:25 κρύπτω is found in Matthew only in the context of parables. The simplex in Mt 11:25 is probably a redactional reduction of the compound found in Q (cf. above n.29, and Jones, *Parables*, 346 n248; Schenk, *Sprache*, 327; Gundry, *Matthew*, 645.) Matthew omits ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου from Q in 23:35 (so also Gnilka, *Matthäusevangelium*, vol 2, 298; Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 46-47), but the expression is found in Mt 25:34. The shorter form ἀπὸ καταβολῆς here, is probably the original reading (cf n 188), and

parallel to παραβολαῖς, may be Matthean redaction.[56] The two concepts are essential with regard to the use of the citation in the present context in Matthew.[57] The word παραβολή appears for the first time in Mt 13:3, although parables are found earlier in the gospel. Furthermore, two thirds of the Matthean occurrences of παραβολή are found in the first half of Matthew 13 of which the Psalm quotation forms the conclusion.[58]

One must conclude then that not only does the opening phrase from the Septuagint version of the psalm provide the association to Jesus' speaking in parables as it is described in chapter 13, but the quotation in its present place must also be a significant indicator of how Matthew understood Jesus' speaking in parables. The concept of concealment with relation to the kingdom of heaven is however also a significant theme in the parables discourse especially as it is expressed in the parables of the leaven[59] (13:33) and the hidden treasure (13:44).[60] Consequently the quotation is adapted to the context on the basis of key words as well as content.

Psalm 78:2 in its Original Context

Psalm 77 (78) is a Psalm of Asaph and a didactic Psalm which recites the history of liberation from Egypt and sustenance in the desert. The theme which permeates the psalm is that of God's faithfulness to the people despite their continued rebelliousness. These wonderful acts of God constitute what is to be proclaimed and not to be hidden. These events have been told and heard through generations. They are riddles, and as a whole the Psalm forms a parable from which knowledge may be excerpted. The parable is spoken by a person who only figures in the first two verses of the Psalm. It is, however a person of authority.[61]

---

could be an indication of its prematthean formulation. Καταβολῆς is here used absolutely. The significance in the context of Matthew would presumably be the same for both phrases.

[56] So also Schenk, *Sprache*, 328.

[57] Thus Stendahl, *School*, 116-117 considers the unique text form of the whole second part of the quotation to be an "*ad hoc* Christian interpretation which ... is closely bound up with its context." In contrast, the present analysis seem to suggest only the possible redactional insertion of the participle. The remaining differences may be traced back to a pre-Matthean Gk version/translation of the Psalm.

[58] Mt 13:3, 10, 13, 18, 24, 31, 33, 34, 34, 35, 36, 53; 15:15; 21:33, 45; 22:1; 24:32.

[59] ἐγκρύπτω. Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 336 n. 4, holds the discrepancy between the compound in v 33 and the simplex in v 35 to be an indication that the Psalm citation is not a Matthean translation. The argument is not compelling. The compound may have belonged in the Q wording, although the Q wording is difficult to ascertain (the reading of ἐγκρύπτω in Luke is probably due to synoptic influence). The compound is nevertheless a natural expression in the context of the parable in which the leaven is inserted into the flour and hidden, and hence dependent on its context. Because of the *hapax legomena* the independent translation of Matthew cannot be argued with confidence.

[60] Related to this concept of concealment and revelation are also the Q passages in Mt 10:26 and 11:25.

[61] The vocabulary is often pointed to when the singer is identified as a teacher of Wisdom. Cf. e.g. Hauck, "Παραβολή" V, 748 Notker Füglister, "Psalm LXXXVIII" (1991) 264 n2, however points out that *torah* in the meaning of teaching can be used by priests, prophets and wisdom teachers alike. Both the wise and the prophets use *mashal* and *hidot*. Cf. Ps 49:5 and Ez 17:2. Also C.H. Peisher, Παραβολή (1975), describes the place of משל in different literary traditions.

The opening words of the Psalm are very similar to the song of Moses in Deut 32:1-8, although there is no literary dependence of one on the other. In both songs the singer describes what is to follow as "my teaching",[62] and summons to give ear to the words of "my mouth".[63] The remaining Psalm shares many similar features with Moses' speech.[64] As in Deuteronomy, the goal of the teaching in Ps 77(78), is to learn from the history of previous generations (Deut 32:7).[65] This didactic aspect of the Psalm and the combination of παραβολή/משל with προβλήματα/חידות may identify the singer as a teacher of wisdom, a prophet or a priest.[66] There is no suggestion either in the Psalm or in its use in Matthew 13, that the parables and riddles are apocalyptic terms.[67] The riddle of the Psalm, that which is to be learned, is faithfulness to God and the covenant. The ancestors, described as a stubborn and rebellious generation (γενεὰ σκολιὰ καὶ παραπικραίνουσα),[68] are an example not to be followed.

Matthew's Adaptation of Ps 78:2 in Mt 13:35

On the superficial level of the Matthean text, the insertion of Ps 78:2 into its place in the parables discourse was completed first on account of the key word connection with Mt 13:34: "*All this Jesus said to the crowds in parables; indeed he said nothing to them without a parable*". In the deeper structure of the chapter, the two verses together point back to the previous fulfilment citation, and recall the obduracy motif contained in that citation. Further, the lexical connections with the parables of the treasure and of the leaven, show that the insertion of the Psalm is not to be understood on the basis of a simple prediction-fulfilment scheme.

---

[62] My *torah* in the Psalm.

[63] προσέχε(τε) ... ῥήματα ἐκ/τοῦ στοματός μου.

[64] H. J. Kraus, *Psalms 60-150* (1989), 123-124, relates Psalm 78 in form to the Levitical sermons in the Chronicler's history, and places the singer, in the Deuteronomistic circle.

[65] Cf. P.C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy* (1976), 379. It is worth noting in this context, that the Psalms due to the nature of the literature must have been among the books better known among the general population than most biblical books.. The Psalm is quite unique in form. Its resemblance with Deut 32 may place it in the setting of a Covenant Renewal ritual. Cf. Arthur Weiser, *The Psalms* (1962), 539. A text of the Qumran Manual of Discipline (11Q1.3.18ff) describes the ceremony of the covenant when the priests and the Levites recite both the blessings of Israel, God's "tender mercies towards Israel" as well as "the iniquities of the children of Israel".

[66] Kraus, *Psalms*, deems it very likely to be a Levitical priest.

[67] The apocalyptic terminology where parables and riddles are connected to visions descriptions of the seer, may have its roots in the didactic use where משל denotes the interpretation of history. Hans-Josef Klauck, *Allegorie*, 71-74, finds the roots of the apocalyptic terminology in prophetic literature (spesifically Ez 17:2) where the concern is still an interpretation of history.

[68] Ps 78(77):7. Along with Deut 32:5, this is the only instance in the Hebrew Scriptures which include a denunciation of this generation with two adjectival words combined by καί. The language of Mt 12:29 is reminiscent of this construction. Matthew's combination of adjectives however are the same as those who describe Hosea's wife in Hos 3:1 (LXX): "a woman who loves evil and is adulterous." Could these allusions be more than just coincidental? The Hebrew differs in all three instances. The LXX only has one parallel between Ps 77:8 and Deut 32:5 (γενεὰ σκολιά).

The (deuteronomic) themes of the stubbornness and rebelliousness of the people, which are present in Psalm 77(78) repeat the theme of obduracy which was brought up at the beginning of the parables discourse through the citation of Is 6:9-10.[69] It is unlikely then, that Matthew inserted the text of Ps 77:2 simply as a proof-text for Jesus' speaking in parables.[70] There is a high density of occurrences of the word παραβολή in the immediate context of the quotation. It is more likely, therefore, that both the concept as well as the parables themselves receive meaning and are interpreted in light of the content of the whole Psalm.[71] The speaking in parables is meant as a warning. This is also the case with the recital of history Ps 77 (78), which bears an affinity with the deuteronomic view of history.[72]

The parables, then, become the means by which God's dealing with his people may be understood. Like the history of salvation in the psalm, though easily understandable, the parables contain secrets "from of old", teachings through which the obligations of the covenant are imparted to the present generation. Being more than simple similes designed to make difficult concept more accessible,[73] the parables become a means of revelation, by which God's judgement upon "this people", as well as God's faithfulness become known.

The parables consequently may be said to be audible means of revelation, spoken for those with ears to hear and to understand.[74] They are not limited to a few to hear but are spoken to all, including the crowds. The parallelism of the Matthean form of the quotation, where κεκρύμμενα corresponds to παραβολαῖς, supports this understanding of the parables. The usage of κρύπτω here, though similar in formulation, does not imply an apocalyptic understanding of revelation, where mysteries are kept secret until their manifestation in the eschatological age.[75] Although the Matthean use of the psalm extends beyond the text itself and receives an eschatological time frame in view of the presence of the kingdom, the paradox which is present in the psalm is kept in the Matthean perspective. For as in the Psalm, the history of God's faithfulness and Israel's rebellion has been passed on through generations. It still contains a riddle to be solved. Understanding is required. The parables in the ministry of Jesus place Israel's obduracy

---

[69] There are further similarities between the theme of rebellion in Isaiah 29:13 which Matthew cites in 15:8 (Mk) and the text of Ps 77(78):36f.

[70] Contra e.g. Davies, and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol. 2, 426, and Stendahl, *School*, 117, who understands the insertion of the psalm quotation to interpret speaking in parables as a sign of the messiah.

[71] So also Gnilka, *Verstockung*, 106 and Schenk, *Sprache*, 399.

[72] Weiser, *Psalms*, 539-540.

[73] For this understanding of משל in Ps 78:2 cf. A.C. Feuer, *Tehillim* (1979), vol. 3, 968-969.

[74] Cf. Ritz, Κρύπτω (1981), 798: „Die Sprachform des Gleichnisses gilt hier ... als Typos prophetischer Offenbarungsrede." Ritz, however, mistakenly sees the will of God for salvation which is manifest in Christ, as the centre of this speech of revelation, and denies any relation to the motif of obduracy.

[75] Contra Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom*, 24.

in an eschatological perspective, emphasising the urgency of repentance. They refer to the presence of the Kingdom of God in the ministry of Jesus, and therefore stress the importance of understanding in view of God's eschatological judgement. Matthew, however, finds the promises of this eschatological time in the Scriptures, so even they, like the recited history of Psalm 77(78) have been available for generations for the understanding of those with ears to hear.[76] These promises have only been "hidden" from those who are obdurate.[77]

When Matthew refers to the psalmist as a prophet,[78] it perhaps emphasises that the understanding of Jesus' parables discourse is not a teaching for a prosperous life. Its emphasis is rather on the inherent judgement involved in neglecting the covenant and not bearing fruit. Certainly, the parables include the element of a prophetic critique against those who neglect the social and ethical response which living in the covenant requires. This is especially true of the two parables with motifs of sowing and reaping.[79] Here again a parallel to the adaptation of Is 29:14 and 6:9-10 is to be noted.

For Matthew then, hearing the word is not simply a matter of understanding Jesus as "Immanuel," but of understanding the kingdom of God as present in Jesus' actions of mercy.[80] The hardening of hearts is not simply related to the rejection of Jesus

---

[76] Thus the view of Matthew and the Psalmist are not contradictory in the way McConnell, *Law*, 125-126, would like to see them. McConnell considers the phrase κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κοσμοῦ on the whole to be Matthean redaction, describing Jesus ministry *in toto* to reveal "the long hidden divine mysteries." Contrary to this view, it seems in the present context as well as in the other texts analysed in this study, that fulfilment in Matthew understands Jesus' ministry fully in light of God's promise to Israel, so that continuation is to be stressed. The theme of obduracy present especially in Isaianic prophecy and Deuteronomistic history, explains perfectly the inability for people to understand. Also Gnilka, *Verstockung*, 106, contrasts the parable discourse of Jesus to that of the Psalmist, reasoning that while understanding the Psalm only requires human reflection, understanding Jesus' parables is only possible through the divine gift of discernment. Jesus' speech is therefore, according to Gnilka, superior. There is no evidence in the text of Matthew 13 to suggest such a differentiation.

[77] There is therefore, as in Mt 11:25-26 a reciprocity between the hardening of the hearts of the people and the activity of God in revelation and concealment, hearing and not hearing: To some it has been given to know the mysteries of the kingdom (Mt 13:11), yet the parables are proclaimed to all (Mt 11:35) revealing things hidden from the beginning (Cf. Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom*, 24). The possibility of repentance and regained understanding must be present in this scenario.

[78] Perhaps Matthew even ascribes the quotation to the prophet Isaiah. The majority of text witnesses do not give the name of the prophet, though some important codices (ℵ, θ) and text families (f^1,f^{13}) do have a reference to Isaiah. This is nevertheless the more difficult reading, and could therefore be the more original. It is more easily understood why a faulty reference should be removed rather than added. The faulty addition could only be described as an attempt to harmonise the introductory formula with that of other fulfilment quotation, however, not all of these contain a name, and when the name of the prophet is mentioned, it is not always Isaiah. Cf. the faulty reference to Jeremiah in Mt 27:9. As the citations found in Jerome show, the quotation without reference to Isaiah could be interpreted as ascribed to Asaph as prophet, a role ascribed to him in 1 Chr 25:2; 2 Chr 29:30, probably with regard to the function of cultic prophecy. Cf. J. S. Rogers, "Asaph" (1992), 471. See also Stendahl, *School*, 118.

[79] Cf. Mt 12:33-37; Mt 21:33-43.

[80] Cf. Mt 11:5, 20-24; 12:7 etc.

as God's son, but to lack of mercy and compassion which, in line with prophetic tradition, is neglecting the covenant relationship with God.

Conclusion

By means of the insertion of Ps 77(78):2 at the end of the "public" part of the parables discourse, Matthew again appeals to several aspects of Scripture. First, appeal is made to the prophetic aspect of Scripture. Conformity exists between the prophetic critique of Israel as a rebellious and obdurate people in the pre-exilic and exilic times and the threat of judgement implied in the parables before. Scripture is normative not only in providing the language of the critique. The prophetic critique here stands in continuation with the message of the prophets in the history of salvation, and as such continues God's history with God's people. Again the aspects of Scripture which are referred to, are those which have a formative function for the people of God. Scripture contains and recites the history of the election of God's people. In this history belong also the repeated crises of the past. The problem of obduracy is repeated in these crises. Hence the history which Scripture recites is paradigmatic and normative. It is constitutive for the *identity* of the people. When Matthew includes the passage here, the evangelist himself identifies with these stories. The problem of obduracy, the rejection of the messiah and future judgement, is therefore not simply a denunciation of the representatives of "their synagogues", it touches upon the identity of the whole people of God. Because Matthew recites these texts and identifies with them, his role is like that of the prophet and the psalmist.

Further, Scripture again is paradigmatic. The speaker of the Psalm becomes a prophetic type or paradigm for Jesus' prophetic ministry in revealing and speaking the word of God in the present.[81] Again the normativity of Scripture lies in granting continuity with the present, or acting as a measure for speaking in judgement upon the people.

Finally, Scripture is authoritative, because it contains "history of salvation", the history of God with the people of Israel. This history speaks of a faithful God and a rebellious people. There is no need for a typological explanation here, for God continues to be faithful and to judge justly. Also the people remain true to their nature. They are, like their ancestors, a wicked and adulterous nation.

6.1.4. The Sign of Jonah in Mt 12:40 and the Problem of Obduracy

In the narrative sequence of Matthew, the sign of Jonah pericope, a Q-text with a quotation from Jonah 2:1 added by the Matthean redactor, appears immediately preceding the two quotations found in the parables discourse.[82] When the quotation is

---

[81] Cf. Gundry, *Use*, 211.

[82] O. Lamar Cope, "Matthew 12:40 and the Synoptic Source Question" (1975) summarises the arguments for a later interpolation on account of: a) the reference to Jesus' resurrection is unsuitable in its present context; b) Justin Martyr omits v. 40 in his *Dialogue with Trypho* 107:2, and c) the

dealt with at the end of the present chapter, it is because its relation to the obduracy theme is best understood in light of the Psalm quotation in Mt 13:35.

The adaptation of Jonah 2:1 in Matthew 12 shows Scripture to be normative in its typological nature. Jonah becomes a type not only for the death and resurrection of Jesus, but also for the hope of redemption. The concern of the ἐρχόμενος-Christology is also present here. Scripture again contains a paradigm for God's working in history. The eschatological perspective of the inclusion of believing Gentiles into the people of God is here present.

The normative use of Jonah 2:1 in Matthew 12 will be demonstrated by first describing the place of the citation in the context of the obduracy theme. Then the Matthean interpretation of Q in light of the Jonah passage will be described.

Matthew 12:38-40 in the Context of the Obduracy Motif of Mt 11-13

Two aspects of the sign of Jonah pericope relate it to the Psalm citation in Mt 13:35. First, the phrase "a wicked and adulterous generation", although there is no literal dependence, resembles the formulation which describes the hardened generation in Ps 78:8.[83] Together with the formulation γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη (Mt 17:17// Lk 9:41; Mk γενεὰ ἄπιστος), the phrase remains rooted in the tradition of Deut 32:7 and Ps 78:8, which speaks of the obduracy of this generation.[84] Second, the use of σημεῖον is prophetic, and therefore parallels the employment of παραβολή in the first half of Matthew 13.[85] Whereas the parable is audible revelation, *semeion*, the sign, is visible.

The Matthean composition of material in the context of the sign of Jonah pericope, further indicates that the passage is related to the theme of obduracy. The passage immediately preceding the sign of Jonah section in Q, the return of the unclean spirit, has been placed immediately following the passage in Mt (Mt 12:43-45). Prior to the sign of Jonah, Matthew has inserted sayings about good trees bearing good fruit (Mt 12:33-37). Further, Matthew has reversed the "more than Solomon"/"more than Jonah" passage which builds a unit with the sign of Jonah saying in Q. This is logical, since the πλεῖον' Ιωνᾶ ὧδε saying follows naturally on the sign of Jonah logion.

The change of order is important for the concern of Matthew in the present pericope. The duplication of Q 6:43-45 in the passage before the sign of Jonah pericope has two functions. First, again, it brings the social and ethical responsibility of the

---

Septuagintal form of the quotation. Cf. Stendahl, *School*, 132-133. With Hans F. Bayer, *Jesus' Predictions of Vindication and Resurrection*, (1986) 115-117 it is to be asserted that these arguments are not convincing. See also Gundry, *Use*, 136-137.

[83] Cf. n. 68.

[84] Ernst Lohmeyer, *Markus*, 156, holds the simple Markan phrase "this generation," to include the same kind of allusion.

[85] Similarly Schenk, *Sprache*, 150 sees a parallel to Mt 13:17. Cf. Bayer, *Jesus' Predictions*, 111ff for the use and meaning of *semeion* in Jewish literature.

covenant relationship into the context of the question of obduracy. The same connection as was found in the use of the prophecies from Isaiah is evident here. Second, whereas the sign of Jonah introduces the possibility of bringing the message of the kingdom to the nations, the previous pericope explains the requirement for the inclusion of Gentiles into the community. "Justice, mercy and faith' (Mt 23:23) as principles in the upholding of the law is expected also here.

Matthew's Interpretation of Q 11:30 in Light of Jonah 2:1

The redaction of Matthew in the pericope preceding the double πλειῶν-saying includes several steps. Unlike the Q text on which it is dependent, the sign of Jonah passage in Matthew is introduced by a direct request uttered by the scribes and the Pharisees to see a sign. This request may be influenced by the similar passage in Mk 8:11-13 which Matthew uses at 16:1-4. Here it is redactional, providing the introduction missing in Q.[86] By using the language and form of the sources, Matthew creates the introductory question. Further, in the answer to the scribes' and the Pharisees' request for a sign, Matthew, as has been noted, expands the Q source by calling "this generation" not just wicked, but also adulterous. This sets the saying in the context of the obduracy theme. Finally, but most important, Matthew introduces the LXX text of Jonah 2:1 into the protasis of the Q sentence, so that the form of the saying is significantly changed.

Lk 11:30	Mt 12:40	Jonah 2:1
καθὼς γὰρ ἐγένετο Ἰωνᾶς τοῖς Νινευίταις σημεῖον, οὕτως ἔσται καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ.	ὥσπερ γὰρ ἦν Ἰωνᾶς ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τοῦ κήτους τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας, οὕτως ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας.	καὶ ἦν Ιωνας ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τοῦ κήτους τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας

It appears that the Matthean addition is an attempt to explain and clarify the enigmatic saying of Q.

The Meaning of The Sign of Jonah in Q

Although the exact significance of τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ in Q remains unclear, it is spoken in the context of the expectation of eschatological judgement of this wicked generation. The theme of both of the following logia is the judgement of this generation by the Ninevites and by the queen of the south. It is best therefore, to understand the sign of Jonah in terms of this message of judgement. In light of Jewish tradition there seem to be only two ways in which the saying may be understood. The first centres on the

[86] For the question of the historicity of the question and the relation between the Q and Mk account cf. Vögtle, "Spruch", 103-136; Bayer, *Jesus' Predictions*, 114.

understanding of σημειῶν; the second on the experience of Jonah in the belly of the fish. Only the first is evident in Q. Matthew, in the interpretation of Q, draws on both.

From the perspective of a sign as a means to authenticate a prophetic message,[87] τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ as the only sign which will be given this generation (Q 11:29) is an ironic statement. The ultimate sign or authentication of a prophet was the fulfilment of his prophecy. Jonah's personal tragedy, in his own perspective, was that although he preached the destruction of Nineveh on account of the wickedness of its inhabitants, his prophetic message was never fulfilled because of the repentance of the city. Hence for Jonah, the events turned him into a false prophet.[88] The sign of Jonah is a paradox.

The continuation of the saying in Q 11:30 clarifies the paradox. In the saying, it is the person of Jonah which becomes the analogy to the future coming of the Son of Man who will come in judgement.[89] Judgement is also the theme in the continuation of the pericope in Q 11:31-32. In the analogy, Jonah's relation to the Ninevites is compared with the Son of Man's relation to this generation. Jonah was a prophet of doom for the Ninevites. The eschatological judgement by the Son of Man is patterned on the message of doom by Jonah, and consequently it includes the hope of repentance on the part of this generation.

Matthew's Adaptation of Q

Matthew adapts the sign of Jonah saying in Q, and aligns it further with the obduracy theme. Matthew changes the perspective from the eschatological aspect of Q, to the vindication of Jesus in the resurrection. To do this, Matthew draws on a different part of the Jonah story.

Jonah the prophet was in early Judaism remembered most notably for his survival in the belly of the fish.[90] Due to the specification of Jonah's stay in the water (chaos) for three days and three nights, it is likely that Jonah's experience was understood as a journey to the netherworld and back.[91] This is further supported by the language of the

---

[87] Cf. Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, Σημεῖον (1971), 213-216; P. Billerbeck and Hermann L. Strack, *Kommentar*, 640f.

[88] Friedemann W. Golka, *Jona* (1991), 89.

[89] Richard Alan Edwards, *Sign*, 49 has drawn attention to the particular form of an "eschatological correlative" in Q. The sign of Jonah shares this form with three other Son of Man sayings in Q which refer to the coming of Son of Man in judgement. καθῶς ... οὕτως ἔσται. Cf. Mt 24:27//Lk 17:24; Mt 24:37//Lk 17:26; Mt 24:38f// Lk 17:28, 30. Matthew includes another in Mt 13:40. Cf. also Vögtle, "Spruch", 118-119. Edwards assumes that because of this eschatological correlative, a reference to the experience of Jonah in the belly is presupposed in Q. This is not so. Like the other sayings which include an eschatological correlative it is concerned with the future coming of the Son of Man. The focus of the comparison is on the theme of Judgement and repentance.

[90] 3 Macc 6:8. Cf. Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, 6; Vögtle, "Spruch", 113-114.

[91] Cf. Douglas Stuart, *Hosea-Jonah* (1987), 474.

Psalm in Jonah 2:3-10. The Psalm takes the form of a lament, and includes several images of sheol.[92]

The introduction of the Jonah 2:1 into the Q text, the specific reference to three days and three nights, and the omission of the parallelism between the Ninevites and "this generation" shift the emphasis in Matthew from the parousia (Q) to the resurrection. The Matthean addition is a development of the Markan references to the resurrection after three days, normally connected with the destruction and rebuilding of the temple. Consequently, Matthew's interpretation also shifts the emphasis from the theme of judgement in the πλεῖον sayings which follow, to the Christological emphasis of more than Jonah and more than Solomon.

More important, in the context of the obduracy theme the resurrection referred to through the parallel to Jonah in the belly of the fish becomes a negative sign for "this generation." It will be a *skandalon* to them (Mt 27:64).[93] Like the parables therefore, the sign of Jonah becomes incomprehensible to the leadership. The subsequent logia consist of threats of judgement against his generation, and Jesus defines the generation in vocabulary which is biblical and used in the tradition of the repeated hard-heartedness of the tradition. The function of the sign of Jonah passage in Matthew, is much like that of the parables. The heart of this generation is dull, their ears are heavy of hearing. Therefore, the revelation which takes place before their eyes and ears, through the speaking in parables and the "sign" of the resurrection, will become their judgement.

In the context of the obduracy motif, the reference to the resurrection in Mt 12:40, implicitly speaks a sentence of judgement upon this generation. Yet, the preceding pericope and the following double saying also introduce a notion of hope. Through repentance (like that of the Ninevites) in terms of "bearing good fruit", redemption is in store.

Conclusion

Once more, then, Matthew appeals to the prophetic canon of the Scriptures in its paradigmatic nature. Jonah's experience in the belly of the sea monster is a type for Jesus' death and resurrection. In the case of Jonah 2:1, unlike the previously examined passages, the passage is used at least in part atomistically without any emphasis on the context from which it is taken. The correspondence between the prophet and Jonah does not extend beyond their similar experience of death and resurrection. Jonah's stay in the belly of the fish, was the result of God's judgement of Jonah for his failure to follow his prophetic vocation. In the case of Jesus, the descent into the nether world, his death, is the result of his rejection by "this stubborn and adulterous" generation. The sign of Jonah, then, is authoritative for Matthew, because Jonah's experience in the belly of the

---

[92] Golka, *Jona*, 68-73.

[93] Cf. also Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 277-278.

fish prefigures the experience of Jesus. If Jonah is a type for Jesus, it is nevertheless only in this one instance. It is to be noted that in this case, the present antitype (the death and resurrection of Jesus) surpasses and supersedes the type. "Something greater than Jonah is here."

6.1.5. Conclusion

The theme of obduracy, and in relation to it the theme of concealment and revelation, is a theme which runs as a thread through chapters 11-13 of the gospel of Matthew. The analysis of the quotations and the allusion which are found within this thematic complex, show that Matthew's understanding of the rejection of Jesus and the crisis of his own times was interpreted in light of the obduracy motif of Isaiah. The falling away from God, has resulted in the hardening of the hearts of the people. They fail to recognise the revelation of God in Jesus. It seems that though this applies to the people as a whole, the offence of the leadership is greater on account of their relationship as spiritual authorities for the people. Matthew's understanding of this historical situation and of his contemporaries was clearly informed by the scriptural tradition which he cites and alludes to throughout the chapters which are under examination in this study. This tradition is marked by God's faithfulness despite the rebellion of the people. In all the passages examined this was found to be a dominant theme.

Thus, through the addition of Jonah 2:1 in Matthew 12:40, Matthew specifically refers to Jesus' death and resurrection as a sign given to this generation. This sign is a sign which reveals. The quotations of Psalm 78 and Is 6:9-10 serve to point out the same: God reveals secrets, because the people have become obdurate, not to increase their incomprehension, but to perhaps bring about repentance so that they may be forgiven. Hence, the eschatological call to repentance, ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκουέτω, is also repeated twice in chs 11-13 (Mt 11.15 Q; 13.9 Mk). In the theological context then, Matthew draws on scriptural tradition to explain the inability of the crowds to understand the events which surround the appearance of Jesus. As the parables explain, however, the inability to understand is not yet final. Also in Isaiah 6, the hearing and not understanding, seeing but not comprehending, is a phenomenon limited in time.

In relation to the theme of Israel's callousness, Scripture is appealed to as an authority for Matthew in that it first and foremost contains the story of the covenant relationship between God and Israel. It is this covenant relationship which is severed in the people's rejection of Jesus, as it has been many times before. By placing the Jesus event in light of this tradition of revelation and rejection, the Scriptures function as a normative guide by which the Jesus story is read. Further, the history of salvation recited in Psalm 78, and exemplified in Isaiah, is appealed to in its capacity of being formative for the identity of the community. The Jesus story is given meaning in light of this history.

The prophetic texts are used in their normative function as critical of existing piety. Their kerygmatic function is also recognised in their exhortation to uphold the law, and in the hope for future redemption. Finally, Scripture is normative in containing a type for the death and resurrection of Jesus in the story of Jonah. This event is prefigured in Scripture and is therefore a sign of God's presence in Jesus.

6.2. The Normativity of Synoptic Tradition in the Development of the Theme of Revelation, Concealment, and Obduracy

The motif complex revelation/concealment and obduracy as it is found in Matthew 11-13 is introduced into the narrative through the allusions to Scripture found in the synoptic sources. In the previous section it was shown how the synoptic material was interpreted in light of the scriptural citations and allusions. The conflicts between Jesus and the religious leadership is a common theme in the synoptic material. In the adaptation of the material to Scripture, Matthew introduces the social and ethical aspects of the covenant relationship. Matthew expresses this ethical aspect in the language of the synoptic material as the bearing of fruit. The bearing of good fruit is the sign of true discipleship and righteousness. The lack thereof, is a sign of the inability to see, hear and understand the presence of the Kingdom in the ministry of Jesus. Like the two other motifs, the theme is woven through the material in Mt 11-13. The ethical aspect, though accentuated through the Matthean redaction, is traditional. It is already present in the material Matthew takes over from Q and Mark, and corresponds with the influence of Deuteronomistic thought which has been demonstrated to occupy much of Matthew's interpretation of material in the three chapters. As in Jeremiah, Ps 78 and Deut 32, obduracy or the hardening of the hearts results also in ethical decline. There is a close relationship between action and fate in the Deuteronomistic thought pattern. For Matthew, this thought pattern can be proven to constitute an interpretative key for the preservation and composition of Jesus tradition not only in Mt 11-13, but also elsewhere in the gospel. Hence it is a part of tradition which stands out as more authoritative to the redactor.

Two passages of the synoptic tradition become normative in this particular Matthean development. From Q, Matthew preserves and adapts the image of the good tree bearing good fruit. From Mark, Matthew preserves and adapts the concept of "the will of the father". To Matthew, these two concepts from the synoptic tradition, are normative and decisive in the pragmatic formative sense. In the following, it will be demonstrated how this aspect of tradition, as well as the concept of hiddenness and revelation with regard to the Kingdom of God, is authoritative for Matthew. In order to accomplish this, it is necessary to understand how the material was used in the sources of Matthew.

The Jesus material which can be read in light of the obduracy theme, can be understood to include three aspects of the theme. The first deals with the event of revelation. A second aspect is the obduracy problem itself, which is perceived on the one hand as the negative response to revelation, and on the other hand as a result of the divine will (e.g. the contrast between revelation and hiddenness in Mt 11:25). The third and final aspect uses bearing fruit as a metaphor for the mark of hearing and seeing which also includes understanding. In the texts analysed below, these aspects overlap, so

that it will prove fruitful to point out the interplay of the three themes in the different pericopi.

6.2.1. Hiddenness and Revelation: the Parables of the Leaven (Mt 13:33) and of the Treasure (Mt 13:44)

In the Matthean adaptation of the parables of the leaven and of the treasure, the theme of hiddenness and revelation is stressed. Mainly through the redactional composition of material, the parables are taken to be illustrations of how the revealed things are open for everyone to see, but remain hidden for those who do not understand. The parables in Matthew are so influenced by the Psalm to which they stand in relation, that their rhetorical normativity is dependent on the Psalm. The pragmatic normativity, however, in describing the correct response to revelation, is an interpretation of the Psalm in light of the synoptic material. It is not to be overlooked that the relation to the obduracy theme is only one aspect of the parables. They also speak of the greatness of the kingdom, as they stand in relation to their respective twin parable. The parables will nevertheless only be analysed here in light of the obduracy theme.

The Matthean understanding of the parables as normative tradition will be demonstrated by first describing the relation of the two sets of the twin parables in Chapter 13. Further, the Matthean redaction of the parables and the meaning of the parable of the leaven in Q, will be set forth. Finally, the significance of the parables in Matthew will be presented, before the conclusion as to their normative character is drawn.

The Parables of the Leaven and of the Treasure in the Structure of Mt 13

The parable of the leaven and the parable of the treasure, each have a companion parable, together with which they have traditionally been interpreted. It was argued under pt 5.2.3. that the chiastic structure of the parables in the second part of Mt 13 allows for an alternative reading of the four parables in light of each other and in connection with two of the central themes in ch 11-13. The parables of the treasure and of the pearl have structure and emphasis in common so that they correctly can be called twin parables similar to the parables of the mustard seed and the leaven.[1] They both point out the reaction of persons who find something valuable, and who take great risks in achieving ownership of it.[2] Likewise, the parable of the mustard seed and the parable of the leaven are twin parables and may be interpreted in light of each other. The four

---

[1] The common features are: εὑρὼν followed by a finite verb; and motif of selling all possession in order to gain the treasure or the pearl. The difference in tenses and vocabulary (πωλέω/πιπράσκω) as well as the point of comparison (hidden treasure/merchant), leads Ivor H. Jones, *Parables*, 351 to distinguish the pair from other twin parables. It will be demonstrated that the first parable is a Matthean recreation of a tradition parable, using traditional parable forms.

[2] Cf. § 5.2.3. The parables continue the contrast between great and small in the kingdom, and how giving up everything, becoming small, gives a treasure far greater. Eta Linnemann, *Gleichnisse*, 103 labels this the opportunity of a lifetime. She is followed by Ulrich Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 352.

parables do not illustrate one point only, but the metaphorical language points to several aspects with regard to the reality of the Kingdom, including hiddenness and revelation, and the great significance of its presence. Also the use of tenses in the two sets of twin parables indicate a similar structure. Like the double parable of the mustard seed and the leaven, the double parable of the treasure and the pearl displays a mixed use of tenses. The use of the historic present is a particular Matthean feature.[3] In all cases the parables are proper parables denoting a "one time" event.

It has already been shown that the parable of the mustard seed and the parable of the pearl have thematic links beyond the borders of the companion parables. Although the main point differs, there is a thematic link between the parable of the leaven and the parable of the treasure in the theme of revelation. The participle κεκρύμμενα links the parable of the treasure to the citation in Mt 13:35. Its use corresponds with the employment of κρύπτω as lack of insight and as the result of spiritual blindness as a motif in Matthew. The second occurrence of the verb in Mt 13:44 serves as a link with Mt 13:33, where the action of the man parallels the woman's action with the leaven. The theme of hiddenness and revelation displays a uniquely Matthean interest in relation to these parables. In different ways they depict the context of revelation and the appropriate response to that revelation.

The Parable of the Leaven in Matthew

Matthew follows the Q text of the parable of the leaven.[4] Only the introductory sentence is redactional, connecting it with the previous two parables (ἄλλην παραβολὴν Mt 13:24, 31) as well as the subsequent passage (ἐλάλησεν Mt 13:34)[5]. Matthew uses two aspect of the Q passage and develops them through the composition of the source material. The first of these is the contrast small/great which is introduced through the Markan version of the parable of the mustard seed. The element of surprise which is the second element of the Q passage, is in Matthew developed from the perspective of revelation. That which is hidden becomes evident.

<u>The parable of the Leaven in Q</u>

The parable of the leaven in Q contains an element of surprise, which may well be the main point of the parable. The parable depicts a one time event, where the leavening

---

[3] The last set of parables have no synoptic parallels. The use of the present tense in v 44 led Joachim Jeremias, *Parables*, 182 to identify the parable as traditional. He is supported by Wolfgang Schenk, "Präsens", 467 and Helmut Merklein, "Gottesherrschaft", 65. The use of the present tense in the parable of the mustard seed is clearly dependent on tradition. The present tense indicates the urgency of the appropriate response in view of the presence of the kingdom of heaven, and the revelation of heavenly treasures which takes place in the parables speech. Cf. Armin Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 146. This understanding is also in agreement with Schenk's analysis of other parabolic material.

[4] Cf. Siegfried Schulz, *Q*, 307.

[5] In using λαλέω, Matthew is dependent on Mk 4:33, but, as often is the case, Matthew changes the Markan imperfect to the aorist tense.

of the meal is an unexpected turn in the story. Contrary to traditional exegetical conclusions, T. K. Seim has shown that the action of the woman is not one typical for the task of baking bread, but for storing a piece of the leavened dough in order to use it later as leaven.[6] First, the woman is not depicted as baking the dough. Second, the amount of flour is unusually great.[7]

The traditional terms for baking (πέσσω) or kneading (φυράω) are absent in the parable. There is no mention of mixing the ἄλευρον (dry wheat meal) with the required water and oil (cf. e.g. 1 Kings 17:12; Lev 2:4). The leavening of dough as an everyday parable for "growth",[8] would require that the meal was already mixed, and hence it would be labelled φύραμα (cf. 1 Cor 5:6; Gal 5:9) or σταῖς (Jer 7:18). After the bread had been baked, however, a piece of the dough would be kept as leaven until it is to be used again. The woman's action in hiding (ἐν/κρύπτω) the leaven in a large amount of (dry) meal, may therefore describe the habit of storing a piece of leaven,[9] perhaps even in the context of Passover celebrations, where *hiding* kept it out of sight, as a way to compromise the commandment: "For seven days no leaven *shall be found* in your houses (Ex 12:19; cf. Ex 12:15, and "no leaven shall *be seen* with you" 13:7).[10]

If the context of the imagery is not baking, but storing the leaven, or even hiding it in an attempt to get around the Passover command, the final result is contrary to expectation. In fact the development is astonishing. In Q the initial size of the leaven was not mentioned, the unusual amount of flour suggests, however, that size plays a role for Q as well as for Matthew.[11] Whereas in Q the great amount of flour emphasises the unlikelihood of that which happens, in Mt it serves to continue the notion of contrast between great and small which is the central point of the companion parable.

---

[6] Turid Karlsen Seim, "Overraskelse", 8-9.

[7] The three measures would amount to forty litres of flour. "Enough to feed a crowd" (Francis Wright Beare, *Matthew*, 308). If the woman was actually baking bread, the size of the dough once leavened would be more than one woman could knead. ("en deig som er i storste laget for en kvinne å kna" Seim, "Overraskelse", 5).

[8] As maintained by most exegetes, e.g. Franz Kogler, *Doppelgleichnis*, 203-204, 208.

[9] Seim, "Overraskelse", 9. In discussing the negative metaphors of the parables, B.B. Scott, *Hear Then* 326 states "The figurative use of hiding to describe the mixing of leaven and flour is otherwise unattested in either Greek or Hebrew," yet fails to see the significance of this observation for the interpretation of the parable. He goes on to say "the parable ... focused on the woman's activity, the *kneading* of the *dough*." Cf. also Beare, *Matthew*, 308.

[10] Seim, "Overraskelse", 9. Seim points to the text of *Talmud Pesahim* I.1. Here the command "not to be found" is expanded, indicating that hiding the leaven may have been practised as an (unacceptable) way of keeping the command.

[11] Cf. Kogler, *Doppelgleichnis*, 60-62; Nils A. Dahl, "Parables", 148. There may be a symbolic use of the three measures of flour. It is the amount used by Sarah (18:6) used to make cakes for the messengers from God. Luz, *Evangelium*, 334 n. 63.

The Parable of the Leaven in Matthew

The Matthean text of the parable of the leaven is almost identical to that of Q. Hence it is only in the context of the Matthean composition of the material that an indication of the distinctly Matthean use of the parable can be detected. The structure of the second half of Mt 13, the parable as a twin parable to that of the mustard seed, expresses the greatness of the kingdom. This is made clear in the unusual amount of flour. The placing of the parable immediately preceding the fulfilment citation in Mt 13:35, and the connection of the latter to the parable through keywords, indicates that Matthew understood the two to be connected. The relation between the citation and the parable is therefore not limited to the superficial level of the text. The key word κρύπτω is also an interpretative term for the two passages. Matthew here interprets Jesus tradition in light of Scripture and vice versa. Synoptic tradition is therefore made normative in light of Scripture.

Matthew lets the parable prefigure the statement of fulfilment, and thus places it in the context of the obduracy motif. The leaven does not stay hidden, but its presence in the meal becomes known when it is all leavened. The eschatological perspective which becomes evident through Matthew's placing of the parable in the present context, has meaning both on the narrative level of the gospel and on the ecclesiological level. In the framework of the gospel, the parable announces the ministry of Jesus as revelation in an eschatological perspective. The hidden things in the riddle of the psalmist are the faithfulness of God and God's actions in history. This is true not simply for the past, but it is taking place in the present. The kingdom of God is now being revealed, indicating the fullness of time. The public announcement requires the appropriate response, and this warning or exhortation is issued in various ways in the subsequent pericopes. Here the ecclesiological perspective of the parable becomes evident. The warning against continued obduracy is issued in v 35, and the example of true discipleship is given in verse 44. The eschatological perspective of future judgement (interpretation of the parable of the tares 13:36-43) indicates to the reader that the leaven present in the person's heart also resists hiddenness, and reveals itself in due time. The ambiguity of the metaphor is particularly suitable from the perspective of the exhortative function of the text.[12] Matthew's perspective on the fulfilment of Scripture on the one hand, and the necessity of the correct reception of revelation on the other hand, is reminiscent of this view.

In the adaptation of the parable of the leaven, the surprise element of Q gives way for the Matthean themes of the small and great, and hiddenness and revelation. The riddle of the psalm citation which is to follow is hereby already hinted at. The history of

---

[12] There is an ambiguity of meaning also in Gal 5:9. In Mk 8:15//Mt 16:6 and in Mt 16: 11 it is used negatively of the teaching of Pharisees, the Herodians and the Sadducees. Hence, Kogler, *Doppelgleichnis*, 56-60, insists on the neutral capacity of the metaphor. For examples of the positive use of leaven, cf. P. Billerbeck and Hermann L. Strack, *Kommentar*, 728 (Torah). Luz, *Evangelium*, 334 n. 61 points to Philo, *De Specialibus Legibus* 2, 184f, where leaven is a symbol for happiness.

God with his people is continued and fulfilled in the person of Jesus. In Mt 13:33, Matthew preserves tradition through the accurate reception of the text, and interprets synoptic tradition in light of the subsequent fulfilment citation. The two traditions are thereby combined and actualised in light of each other. The passage is normative in its kerygmatic function: it proclaims the revelation of the kingdom of God, the presence of the kingdom, and its capacity to turn things around.

The Parable of the Treasure in Matthew

The parable of the treasure expresses the main concern of the obduracy theme: the exhortation to respond adequately to the reality of the kingdom. Formulated differently, the parable describes the evident reaction of the person who *perceives* the secrets of revelation. The Matthean parable is a recreation of a traditional parable. Matthew thereby creates material on the basis of traditional images and forms. Again the synoptic tradition is normative for Matthew in its language and form. It also contains the norm for the appropriate behaviour for the person who responds to revelation. Synoptic tradition contains formative material, by which the hearer/reader of Matthew finds identity.

The Matthean Redaction and Adaptation of the Parable of the Treasure

The parable of the treasure in Matthew is a Matthean parable of discipleship, created by drawing upon different traditions of Q and Mark. Like its twin parable in 13:45-46, it has no synoptic parallels, but a version is preserved in the gospel of Thomas. Whatever the traditional form of the parable, the Matthean version is completely reworked.[13] The relation between the gospel of Thomas and the synoptics is uncertain. There is no evidence of a literary dependence between the versions of Matthew and Thomas. The Thomas parable is therefore not relevant for a redactional analysis of the Matthean text.[14] The formulation of the parable of the treasure, and its position in the

---

[13] So that Wolfgang Schenk, *Sprache* 295 and Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew*, 275-276, consider the parable to be a Matthean creation. Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, vol. 2, 434 and Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 349 ascribe it to M and oral tradition respectively.

[14] The relationship of the gospel of Thomas to the synoptics remains unclear, and is a question which cannot be addressed adequately within the limited space of this thesis. Wolfgang Schrage, *Verhältnis*, 139; Michael Fieger, *Thomasevangelium*, 210-212, 269-271; Hans Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 139; Donald A Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 396, all assume that Thomas knew and drew upon the Matthean text. This assumption is generally made because Gnostic interests can be ascribed to the formulations where Thomas differs from Matthew. GTh also includes the parable of the pearl. In Thomas, the parable of the pearl is followed by a saying concerning seeking treasures which do not decay, hence, it is presumed that Thomas knew the Matthean order of parables. This conclusion nevertheless leaves several questions unresolved. The parable of the fishnet, which in Matthew follows the double parable of the treasure and the pearl, is in Thomas closer to the structure and content of the two other parables than it is in Matthew. This is generally perceived to be a redactional trait, yet Thomas preserves the three in opposite order and independently of each other. If Thomas draws on Matthew, why have they not been kept together as a unit? Moreover, unless Thomas used a (to us) unknown gospel harmony (cf. Fieger, *Thomasevangelium;* Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 252), the many parallels between the gospel of Thomas and the different synoptic gospels independently and alternately, cannot be explained adequately. The only

present context, is dependent on Matthean redaction. This can also be said of the joining of the two parables.

The parable of the treasure in Matthew draws on Mark 10:17-22 and Q 12:33-34. Matthew uses the tradition, and the form of the parables in Mt 13:31-33 to (re-) create the parable for the present place. Most of the vocabulary is traditional and used here redactionally. Matthew uses θησαυρός mostly in accordance with the sources.[15] Here and in 13:52 it is redactional. The introduction of the parable is copied from that of the parable of the mustard seed and the leaven in Mt 13:31, 33, and is structured in precisely the same manner. The designation of the treasure as κεκρυμμένῳ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ uses terms already present in the parables chapter, and links the parable of the treasure to the preceding parable both on the superficial level of the narrative, and thematically.[16] The subject ἄνθρωπος, is part of the direct correspondence between the parable introduction of v. 44 and vv 31 and 33, but also to vv 24, and 45. The ἔκρυψεν as the first action of the man, corresponds to the action of the woman in Mt 13:33. The combination of πώλεω with ὅσα ἔχει and θησαυρός exemplifies here in narrative form that which the rich young ruler is exhorted to do in Mk 10:21.[17] Also ὑπάγω is here dependent on Mark 10, and as in the Markan text it is here, and elsewhere in Matthew, connected with the obedient response to Jesus' commission.[18]

The remainder of the Matthean parable can be shown to be redactional: The causal use of ἀπό is increased in Matthew,[19] and the construction καὶ ἀπό or ἀπὸ δε in the causal sense, at the beginning of a clause, is found only in Matthew. With ἐκεῖνος,

---

other reasonable alternative is to assume that Thomas is drawing on a different strand of oral Jesus tradition than that which is represented by the synoptic tradition. Cf. Charles Hedrick, "The Treasure Parable in Matthew and Thomas" (1986), 55; Scott, *Hear Then*, 318, 392-393. The only common denominator in the two parables is the accidental finding of a treasure in a field. The parable of the pearl in GTh 76 is more elaborate in describing the merchant, yet does not contain elements that are significant for the canonical parallel. The emphases of both parables as they are found in GTh, differ significantly from the Matthean text.

[15] Mt 2:11 (M); 6:19 (Q); 6:20 (Q); 6:21 (Q); 12:35 (Q); 13:44 (M); 13:52; 19:21 (Mk).

[16] Whether or not κρύπτω is favoured term in Matthew's vocabulary is not relevant here. The structure of Matthew 13, the double set of twin parables with corresponding but not identical concerns, and the lexical link, are all factors which would correspond to Matthean redactional practice. For the use of the verb cf. Mt 5:14; 11:25; 13:35; 13:44; 13:44; 25:18; 25:25. It is used more often than in Luke (Lk 18:34; 19:42). Gundry, *Matthew*, 645 holds the verb and its cognate noun to be Matthean vocabulary. Luz, *Evangelium*, is uncertain, cf. vol. 1, 43 (not sufficient evidence) and vol. 2, 349 n. 3 (favoured word).

[17] Par Mt 19:21; Matthew omits ὅσα ἔχει. The sentence from Mk 10:21, καὶ ἕξεις θεσαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανῷ forms a link to the Q tradition preserved in Mt.6:22//Lk 12:33.

[18] Schenk, *Sprache*, 450. Hence it is almost always imperative, cf. Mt 5:41; 8:13 (both redactional). In combination with a second imperative, it is redactional in 5:24; 18:15; 21:28, and in accordance with sources in 8:4; 19:21; 26:18.

[19] The same tendency is true for Luke (cf. examples in Friedrich Blass, et al., *Grammatik*, § 210). synoptic comparison makes clear however, that Mt and Lk do this independently of each other. Schenk, *Sprache*, 35 considers 12 of 16 occurrences to be redactional.

which is also Matthean,[20] the vocabulary of the parable indicates that it has been recomposed by Matthew.

The Adaptation of Traditional Material in Matthew 13:44

The Matthean parable of the treasure hidden in a field has been shown to be a Matthean construction, possibly taking the place of a different parable. The parable thus connects a synoptic tradition to the concept of obduracy, and the parable as an open revelation contained in the history of Israel. The history of the people of God is continued in the present. The image of the treasure in the parable connects the ministry or presence of Jesus to the content of the Torah (adherence to which is the concern of Psalm 78), or wisdom.[21] There is a direct link between discipleship and the covenant relationship. It is therefore possible to see the parable as a repetition of the concern of the call of wisdom in Mt 11:25-30. In the context of the obduracy theme, the person who finds the treasure is an example of the "babe" to whom the hidden things of the kingdom have been revealed.[22]

The action of the man is the sign of understanding. He sells what he owns to gain the field where the treasure is hidden.[23] In the context of Matthew thirteen, the eschatological aspect of impending judgement follows the twin parables of the treasure and of the pearl. The parables therefore show the significance of appropriate behaviour for the outcome of the judgement. The social and ethical aspect of remaining within the covenant is here still a theme. Hence, one can not simply equate the significance of the parable with the joy of the treasure which was found.[24] In the context of the obduracy theme in Matthew 11-13, Matthew places discipleship in relation to remaining true to the covenant relationship. To follow Jesus (Mt 19:21) is like finding a treasure or a pearl (the law or wisdom).[25]

---

[20] Approx. 25 times redactional, cf.Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 1, 40.

[21] Prov 2:4; 21:20; Sirach 1:25; 20:30; 29:11; 40:18; 41:14

[22] Paul W. Meyer, "Context as a bearer of Meaning in Matthew" (1988), 70-71. The social status of the man is not clear from the parable. Many (e.g. Linnemann, *Gleichnisse*, 104) conclude that he is a poor farm labourer. The social status of the receiver of revelation is not a theme here. Both the man finding the treasure and the merchant finding a pearl have the decisive insight.

[23] That the man covers the treasure after he has found it, is not a point in itself. The theme of the parable is the hidden treasure which is found. The action of the man simply shows what he must do before the treasure is his. The speculation as to whether this action is legal, lawful or just (Cf. Jones, *Parables*, 349; Luz, *Evangelium*, 351) is unnecessary. One could possibly speculate that the twin parables (treasure and pearl) read allegorically would point to the "mixed" community of Matthew. The gentile would be the man who finds the treasure in the field that is not his, but acts wisely, and gains the field and the treasure. The merchant would be the example of the true Israelite, searching for Wisdom, finding it, and giving up everything to gain it. Although I do believe this would fit the historical situation of Matthew, there is no evidence that Matthew intended such an allegorical interpretation of the parables. The point of both is that regardless of the situation of the person, whoever perceives the sense of the law, and as a result sells everything and follows Jesus (as the fulfilment of the law), is counted among the righteous.

[24] According to Jeremias, *Parables*, 199, this is the point of the parable.

[25] Wilhelm Wilkens, "Die Redaktion des Gleichniskapitels Mark 4. durch Mt" (1964), 323.

The analysis of Matthew's (re-)creation of the parable of the treasure, using traditional motifs and connecting it to the material in the chapter of parables, has shown that Matthew places synoptic tradition in continuity with Scripture. The synoptic tradition in the form of Mk 10:17-22 and Q 12:33-34 is normative and authoritative both in the rhetorical and pragmatic function. It is therefore comparable to the use of Scripture.

The synoptic tradition on which the parable is built, is employed to proclaim the joy and cost of discipleship, of following Jesus. Read in its narrative context the parable proclaims redemption for the person who finds "the treasure" and acts wisely to achieve ownership of it. This is an interpretation of the traditions in question, where forsaking possessions and riches is like having a "treasure in heaven," and equated with discipleship. Creating the parable on the basis of tradition, Matthew presupposes the knowledge of the Markan and Q traditions. The identification between Jesus and the treasure (as the law, or God's wisdom) is the achievement of the Matthean parable. It is in this connection then, that the synoptic tradition which the parable interprets is both formative, and contains the norm for remaining in the covenant relationship. It is formative and normative because it clearly identifies adherence to Jesus' words as the way to gain the treasure, and because a particular course of action, "selling all possessions", is set as a requirement for discipleship.

In the context of Matthew's gospel, the synoptic tradition is placed in the extension of Scripture. Matthew places the parable in connection with the obduracy theme, where the question of loyalty to the covenant is specifically interpreted in light of the synoptic tradition. This loyalty is twofold: obeying the command to "go and sell", and subsequently to follow Jesus. This exhortation is not new, but the logical faithfulness to God's continuing revelation and redeeming acts in the history of the people.

6.2.2. Revelation and Understanding: Normativity in Matthew's Adaptation of the Parable of the Sower and its Interpretation in Mt 13:1-23

Discipleship in terms of hearing and understanding is emphasised also in Matthew's adaptation of the parable of the sower. Also here Matthew preserves synoptic tradition. The mere preservation of the tradition shows that it is already normative in itself. By expanding on the obduracy motif which is the context of the parable in Mark, Matthew gives the tradition added significance and meaning through Scripture. Whereas the synoptic tradition already speaks of the experiences of the church and therefore functions as both constitutive and normative text for the community, the connection with Scripture identifies the experience of the church with that of Israel. Again continuation of tradition is the key to understanding Matthew's combination of sources here.

The two passages which frame the parable of the sower[26] in Matthew guide the redactor's understanding of the parable. Both passages, Mt 12:46-50 (Mk 3:31-35) and the fulfilment citation in Mt 13:14-15, can therefore be said to constitute an authority for Matthew. Both passages are dependent on Mark and follow the Markan order, but the latter is expanded by Matthew. The gospel of Matthew understands the parable of the sower and its interpretation as a unit,[27] which addresses the problem of obduracy and the correct reception of the kingdom. As in Mark the parable and its interpretation frames the quotation from Isaiah 6:9-10 which is central to the understanding of the rejection of Jesus' message in the gospel tradition. As has been shown, Matthew expands the scriptural references of this theme by drawing on the Deuteronomistic understanding of the obduracy of the generations throughout the history of Israel (Ps 78//Mt 13:35).

Matthew's normative use of tradition will again be demonstrated on the basis of the significant rhetorical alterations of Matthew to the Markan text. In order to show how this shifts the emphasis of Mark in light of the scriptural tradition, the meaning of the text in Mark must be compared to that of Matthew.

Matthew's redaction of the parable of the Sower and its Interpretation

Matthew' redaction of the parable of the sower and its interpretation shows a clear adaptation of the source in light of the obduracy theme which Matthew has found in the Book of Isaiah.

In the parable of the sower Matthew preserves the Markan order of material. From Mt 12:46 to Mt 13:23, Matthew's compositional order corresponds to that of Mark. Only the interlude between the parable and its interpretation is expanded by Mt. First, it includes the fulfilment citation. Second, Matthew has inserted the thematically related saying from Mk 4:25 (for to whomever has more will be given.. Mt 13:12). Finally, the blessing adapted from the charge to the disciples in Q 10:23-24 is placed after the fulfilment citation, in Mt 13:16-17. Matthew also remains faithful to the Markan text, with a few stylistic changes.

In and before the parable itself, only the introduction to the parable discourse is altered in Matthew.[28] In the parable itself Matthew makes only minor changes.[29] The

---

[26] Scott, *Hear Then*, 344; Christian Dietzfelbinger, "Das Gleichnis vom Ausgestreuten Samen" (1970), 81-82; Jack D. Kingsbury, "Parables", 33 and others have pointed out the lack of correspondence between the title of the parable and the actual theme. It is Matthew who gives the parable its name: Ὑμεῖς οὖν ἀκούσατε τὴν παραβολὴν τοῦ σπείραντος (Mt 13:18).

[27] Cf. Joachim Gnilka, *Verstockung*, 477.

[28] The introduction is an example of Matthew's incomplete redactional adaptations, where Matthew's redaction through composition and introductory formula is not followed through consistently. Cf. M. D. Goulder, "Midrash", 35. Jesus' movement ἐξελθών ... τῆς οἰκίας makes sense in light of Mt 12:46-50 which is also adapted from Mark, although, unlike in Mark, Matthew never mentioned the going into the house. The composition is paradoxical, reflecting both Matthean intentional redactional changes, and the careful preservation of the wording of the source. The same may be said of the redactional alterations of Mt 13:1-3 and 10. Jones, *Parables*, 296 states: "Taken literally 13:1-3, 10 would have to involve the disciples walking on the water." Jones ascribes the inconsistencies to the use of the verb

procedure again witnesses to Matthew's partly conservative preservation of the text of the sources. There are still small but significant alterations to the Markan text. These betray Matthew's conscious adaptation of the parable and its interpretation in the context of the obduracy motif.

Matthew changes the verb which expresses the manner in which Jesus presents the parabolic material. In the introduction to the speech, Matthew uses speak (λαλέω) instead of teach (διδάσκω) and consistently also omits the repetitious ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ. Thereby a logical connection is made between the opening of the parable discourse and the question of the disciples.[30] Further, the imperative ἀκούετε is omitted at the opening in the parable, and inserted as ὑμεῖς δε ἀκουσάτε in the introduction to the parable interpretation (Mt 13:18). This accentuates the point which has been repeated in various forms from Mt 11:2-6, and is made clear in the interlude between parable and interpretation. Only those who understand, are actually receivers of revelation, because they hear, see and understand. Matthew further reverses the order of the fold, from more to less. The change is to be read in connection with the addition of the saying from Mk 4:25. Finally, the *Weckruf* of Mk 4:9 is in Matthew redacted to fit the Matthean form which was used already in Mt 11:15.

In the interpretation of the parable, Matthew again shortens and tightens the Markan text, and most differences are due to stylistic alterations.[31] Also here the

---

προσέρχομαι as a mnemonic aid. Other redactional changes in the introduction are either stylistic or may be ascribed to Matthew's tendency to tighten the narrative of his sources: The setting of the parable speech παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν is adapted from Mark and is dependent on the Markan account in describing the gathering of the great crowd with the result that Jesus teaches from the boat. Συνάγω in the aorist plural replaces the historical presence which is so typical for Mark . The plural corresponds to Mt's crowds rather than Markan crowd. Mt further omits the superfluous distinction of the position of the boat ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ and of the crowds πρὸς τὴν θαλάσσαν (which repeats Mk 4:1) ἐπι τῆς γῆς ἦσαν. Instead, Matthew places the crowds "on the shore" (ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν εἰστήκει). Matthew introduces the setting for the parable through a time reference typical for the gospel: ἐν τῇ ἡμέρα ἐκείνῃ.

[29] Beyond the general tendency to use the plural where Mk uses the singular (ἃ, αὐτά, ἄλλα, τὰ πετρώδη, rather than ὃ, αὐτό, ἄλλο, τό πετρωδης), Matthew's text agrees with that of Luke in not including καὶ καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκεν (Mk 4:7) and ἀναβαίνοντα καὶ αὐξανόμενα (Mk 4:8). The intentional omission of the first of these would be contrary to Matthean interest. First, Matthew's main point of the parable is the exhortation to bear fruit. Second, the omission destroys Mark's threefold parallelism. Cf. Jones, *Parables*, 247. The minor agreement may be explained by the addition of both in a later version of Mark (DtMk). Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 101 and Hans-Josef Klauck, *Allegorie*, 187; J. D. Crossan, "Seed Parables of Jesus" (1973), 246,248, consider them to be elements of Markan redaction of the original parable. Differently Gerhard Lohfink, "Das Gleichnis vom Säman (Mk 4:3-9)" (1984), 98-100.

[30] Also here Matthew changes the source. In Mark the disciples ask Jesus concerning the parables (perhaps for their meaning), rather than why Jesus *speaks in* parables. (cf. Mk 4:13; Joachim Gnilka, *Markus*, vol. 1, 173).

[31] The question has benn raised as to whether all the alterations of the Markan text in Matthew can be assigned to the Matthean redactor. There are agreements between Matthew and Luke in the use of κάρδια (Mt 13:19; Lk 8:12, 15). Further, the syntactical sentence of Lk 8:14-15 agrees with Matthew's sentences in 13:20-23. Cf. Jones, *Parables*, 303; Luz, *Evangelium*, 302.

significant changes are to be ascribed to the Matthean adaptation of the material to the Matthean obduracy theme: Matthew exhorts the disciples to "hear the parable" (Mt 13:18) and omits any reference in Mark to the disciples' ignorance of the meaning of the parable. The emphasis on hearing the word of the kingdom and *understanding* is explicit in Matthew's adding συνίημι in v. 19 and 23. The use of the verb here is dependent on the citation from Isaiah.[32] The theme is also enhanced by the Matthean redaction: Matthew's shortening of the introduction and moving the interpretative sentence (οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν σπαρείς) from before to after the first element of the explication, places the emphasis on the concern of the parable from the beginning : παντὸς ἀκούοντος τὸν λόγον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ μὴ συνιέντος (Mt 13:19)

The action of the evil one is labelled ἁρπάζω, and a connection is thereby made to the difficult logion in Mt 11:12. In the interpretation, the emphasis in Mark is changed by the Matthean removal of the Markan εὐθύς, and change of sentence structure. [33] The activity of the evil does not cause the inability to understand.[34]

The Parable of the Sower and its Interpretation in Mark

Most exegetes concerned with the interpretation of the parable are concerned with the original wording and intention of the Parable of the Sower as Jesus told it.[35] Hence the interpretation of the parable in the synoptic gospels is seen as a hindrance rather than as an aid in discovering the original concern of Jesus.[36] In the present context, where the Matthean adaptation of the text in Mark is the issue, the parable and its interpretation cannot be separated. The two belong together, and the interpretation of the parable for the disciples gives the reader the insight "those outside" are kept from receiving.

In Mark the parable of the sower and its interpretation point to the success and failure of the proclamation of the word of God. The vocabulary of the interpretation is clearly coloured by the experience of the church. The rejection of some, the persecution by others, and the falling away of even more, remind the reader/hearer of the reality of the Christian community. Mark keeps the dualistic apocalyptic perspective in the parable. The action of the devil is the cause of the rejection of the word. The conflict between

---

[32] Cf. Jan Lambrecht, *Out of the Treasure*, 163.

[33] Both Mk 4:15 and Mt 13:19 are difficult sentences. In the Markan interpretation the change in meaning (from the seed being word and earth being the hearts of the hearers, to the product being those who hear the word) has been a problem for many. It is also used as evidence of the secondary nature of the interpretation in relation to the parable itself. Cf. e.g. Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2. 300 n. 4; vol. 1. 34.

[34] The stress Jones (*Parables*, 306-307) places on the power of evil in the context does not seem to do justice to the Matthean text.

[35] For example Scott, *Hear Then*, 344-359; Dahl, "Parables", 152-153; Lohfink, "Gleichnis"

[36] Hence Linnemann, *Gleichnisse*, 122, in part supported by Dietzfelbinger, "Gleichnis", asserts that the original meaning has become lost. Differently Michael Krämer, *Gleichnisrede*, 16, considers it possible that also the interpretation could have originated with Jesus.

good and evil takes place in the present for Mark, and causes the distinction between those outside and those around Jesus.

As in Matthew, the parable and its interpretation must be understood in the context of the parable theory. The reasons for the failure of the word is thereby explained. The parable receives a paraenetical tone through the following logia,[37] where the importance of hearing is stressed. In light of the parable therefore, the Markan text not only explains the reasons for failures, but also serves as an exhortation to self-examination. Finally, the abundance of the crop arising from the seed that falls into the good earth is to be read also in light of the parable of the mustard seed and of the seed growing secretly. The abundant crop stands in contrast to the failure of the seed which falls outside the field. The reward for perseverance is great.

The Matthean Adaptation of the Parable of the Sower

The Matthean interpretation of the Markan parable of the sower has been placed in the context of the obduracy theme of the citation from Isaiah. Several aspects point to this supposition. The change of the verb and of the opening sentence of the interpretation, like the psalm later, call the disciples to hear the parable, i.e. to understand. This understanding is in Matthew placed in connection with hearing and doing (cf. Mt 13:44-46; 7:24-27). Those who hear and understand have already gained understanding, and they will be given more (Mt 13:13). Those who do not hear and hence, do not understand, have turned against God. Because they do not treasure what they have, it will be taken away from them. Not just hearing but also understanding is therefore the main point of the Matthean parable and its interpretation.[38] In light of the scriptural context within which it is placed, this understanding is connected to the Torah, and in living responsibly within the covenant relationship.

Unlike in Mark, in which the exceedingly great harvest of the sowing which falls in good earth stands in positive contrast to the unusual failure of the other sowing, the Matthean interpretation adds the aspect of the reap and sow motif which is typical for Matthew. The hundred, sixty or thirty fold of the harvest is dependent not only on the reception of the sowing, but also on what the person in question does with what is received. This positive bearing of fruit has had its negative example in the previous chapter, where the "scribes and the Pharisees" stand in opposition to Jesus, unable to perceive by whose spirit demons are exorcised, and are judged as a brood of vipers who will be held in judgement for every word they utter. It is important to recognise that for Matthew the difference between those who hear and do not understand, and those who hear and understand, is not great. The key lies in what is done with the revelation which is received. There is therefore, in Matthew, a relationship between the last part of the

---

[37] Gnilka, *Verstockung*, 180-181

[38] So also Weder, *Gleichnisse*, 115.

parable of the sower and the parable of the talents in Mt 25:14ff. This is further expanded in the addition from Q (Blessed are your eyes and your ears) and in the redaction of the parable interpretation. All these particularly Matthean themes are already present in Mark, but Matthew expands them in light of the obduracy motif derived from Isaiah.

The Normativity of Tradition in Matthew's Adaptation of the Parable of the Sower and its Interpretation

The Matthean adaptation of, and alterations to, the Markan parable and its interpretation, make it clear that Matthew could identify with the fate of the church described therein. Persecution and violence as a result of conflict with others, is known to the Matthean community,[39] as well as the rejection and falling away. As such the text is constitutive for Matthew's community. The text does not simply polemicise against opponents. It also constitutes an exhortation to the reader/hearer and the disciples to hear and understand. The type persecution διὰ τὸν λόγον stands in relation to ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης (Mt 5:10) and ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ (Mt 5:11).[40] Hearing the word and understanding it, is therefore related to the righteousness spoken of in that context (Mt 5:20).

The parable of the sower and its interpretation for Matthew is constitutive or formative for Matthew. It contains the history or the experience of the community, as well as the norm for how one remains within that community. What is particular in the Matthean adaptation of the passage is its interpretation, appealing to the history and experience of the people of God as described in Scripture. Although both aspects are present in Mark, Matthew expands on both of them in the adaptation. Thereby, Matthew's community as followers of Christ are at the same time the continuation of the people of God, as those who remain faithful to the Torah. This is clear from the present context as well as from the context of Mt 5, where there are parallels to the present passage.[41]

It is established then, that the parable is normative text for Matthew in both its rhetorical and pragmatic function. It tells the story of "election", and makes demands for how to remain in the group of the "elect". Furthermore, its normativity is confirmed by Matthew by his placing the material in the context of the Isaiah passage and the motif of obduracy.

---

[39] Mt 5:10, 11, 12, 44; 10:23; 23:34.

[40] Schenk, *Sprache*, 197. A connection is also between the text here and the exhortation in Mt 11:6. Cf. Kingsbury, *Parables*, 59-60.

[41] Cf. Benno Przybylski, *Righteousness in Matthew and his World of Thought* (1980), 80-87.

6.2.3. Obduracy and Discipleship: Normativity in Matthew's Adaptation of Material in 12:46-50 (Doing the Will of God)

The obduracy theme in the synoptic material of Matthew 13 as it has been presented in this chapter has been prepared for by the controversies with the "scribes and the Pharisees" in chapter 12. The controversies cover almost all of Matthew 12. They are framed on each side by a reference to discipleship and a citation from Isaiah in which spiritual blindness is a dominant theme. Throughout the material is an affirmation of Jesus as the place of the presence of God and as the expected Christ. The practical answer to the opposition in Jesus through the Matthean passages is found in the Isaian obduracy motif. They hear, but they do not do. Discipleship is therefore a central idea in the context of the obduracy theme.

The theme of discipleship is addressed shortly before the parables chapter in Mt 12:46-50. It is dependent on Mark. The centrality of this text for Matthew and the Matthean community is evident from the deliberations of the analysis of the previous two passages. In the context of the whole gospel, the language of the Markan text has become important for Matthew in describing the nature of discipleship. Because it addresses the theme of identity and discipleship, it is a text which is clearly formative and prescriptive.

Matthew's redaction and adaptation of Mark 3:46-50

In the structure of Mark 3, the question of the true mother and brothers of Jesus is addressed at the end of a pericope where the central question is the exorcisms of Jesus. The arrival of the family at the house where Jesus is staying is prepared for in the previous narrative (Mk 3:21). The passage in Mark therefore concludes a scene where the scribes who came down from Jerusalem, and the crowd around Jesus in the house, are placed over against each other.[42]

Matthew preserves most of the Markan controversy material in the same context, but adds to and harmonises it with Q material and the fulfilment citation in Mt 12:17-21. Further, the Markan introductory passage to the Beelzeboul controversy has been omitted. The result is that the arrival of Jesus' family is not prepared for in the context. The question of discipleship, however, has been introduced in Mt 11:25-30.[43] Mt 11:25-30 and Mt 13:46-50 therefore frame and stand in contrast to the controversies.

The conservative preservation of the source is evident in the changes both in style and in the context of the pericope. Matthew keeps the statements relevant to the Markan setting of the pericope. The placing of the mother and brothers of Jesus "outside" has no meaning in the present context of Matthew.[44] Matthew has also kept the repetitious

---

[42] For Mark's adaptation of the traditional pericope cf. Gnilka, *Markus*, 147.

[43] Hence, Alexander Sand, *Evangelium*, 269, finds it difficult to assume that Matthew is familiar with the Markan setting of the pericope as it is available to us.

[44] Cf. Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 287.

mention of ἡ μήτηρ ... καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί (five times in the context of the pericope), and preserves the overall concept of the story. The occurrence of the pericope in the present context preserves the Markan order. The introductory sentence to the pericope is transitional, adapting the pericope to the Matthean setting. Also here, however, Matthew preserves the language of tradition: Ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, Matthew adapts from Mark elsewhere.[45]

Matthew's alteration of Mark is again typical of his shortening and tightening of Mark's style.[46] Matthew has omitted Mark 3:31b, 32a and 34a. V. 31 seems to be omitted on account of Matthew's economy of style. Mk 3:32a, 34a are both significant elements in the Markan account, which contrast those "outside" with those surrounding Jesus.[47] Hence both alterations are necessary for Matthew, in changing the aspect of the passage to the concern of discipleship. The most crucial change in Matthew's account is the redactional addition of καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν, in Mt 12:49. Further, Matthew changes Mark 3:35 from τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, to the for Matthean significant τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς.[48] The insertion of πατρός μοῦ, here, draws another line back to 11:25-30, and confirms the two passages as a frame for the controversies which lie between them.

The Markan context does not give an indication as to the content of the "will of God". Possibly the original pericope had a "general-ethical" meaning.[49] Matthean redaction of Mark 3:31-35 points to three important aspects of the Matthean adaptation of the synoptic Material. First, by emphatically pointing to his disciples in the pericope preceding the chapter of the parables, Matthew interprets Mark in light of Mark, or, stated differently: Matthew harmonsises the Markan text. In the continuation of the Markan gospel, Mk 4 differentiates between the disciples and the crowd. This development is in contrast to Mk 3:31-35. Matthew therefore, reads the pericope in light of the continuation of the Markan text, where also the question of discipleship is brought up.[50] Second, Matthew places the controversies between two passages dealing with discipleship. Thereby, the content of the controversies is not simply a denunciation and judgement upon the Scribes and the Pharisees as a "brood of vipers".[51] Rather, the

---

[45] Mt 26:47. Possibly Matthew inserts the transition here rather than in the adaptation of Mk 5:35 (omitted in Mt 9:18-26). Cf. Schenk, *Sprache*.

[46] Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2., 286.

[47] Gnilka, *Markus*, 147 holds the two verse halves to be Markan redaction.

[48] ὁ πατρός μοῦ is used 17 times in Matthew. There is one occurrence in Q which Matthew adopts, and none in Mark. Schenk, *Sprache*, 289; Gundry, *Matthew*, 647.

[49] Gerhard Barth, "Gesetzesverständnis", 98.

[50] Gnilka, *Markus*, 152, considers the original wording to concern the disciples, and that Matthew restores this original wording. The context of Mark speaks against such a hypothesis

[51] Cf. the citations from Luther on Mt 12:31-37 in Luz, *Evangelium*, vol. 2, 270. Luz correctly points to the embarrassing Christian tradition of interpretation of the passages. The denunciation of the 'scribes

content of discipleship is given by the negative example of the opponents in the controversies. Hence, the call to "see, hear and understand" is placed in the context of the prophetic oracle of judgement (Is 29:14 in Mt 11:25 and Is 6:9-10 in Mt 13:14-15).[52] Finally, as already indicated, through placing the pericope in accordance with Mark at the transition to chapter 13, the theme of discipleship governs that chapter. To do the will of the father therefore, is placed in the context of seeing and hearing in the sense of understanding.[53] This understanding involves both a Christological aspect and an ethical aspect. To understand is to recognise the presence of God in Jesus, and his words and actions. To understand is also to let this recognition become evident in the performing of the social and ethical responsibility prescribed in the Torah.

The Normativity of Tradition in The Matthean Adaptation of Mark 3:31-35.

The formative and normative function of Mark 3:31-35 is evident in light of the Matthean insertion of the emphatic stress on the disciples in the pericope. It is here necessary to point out that this is not simply an interpretation of the Markan passage. The adaptation of the term throughout the gospel shows that, in Matthew's understanding, the Markan passage expresses the key to the identity of a disciple .[54]

Matthew inserts the reference to the will of God in several significant places in the narrative. At the close of the sermon on the mount performing the will of God is placed in eschatological perspective, and is connected with entering into the future kingdom. Thematically there are relations between the closing of the sermon on the mount and the controversies in chapter 12. Immediately preceding 7:21, there is an exhortation to bear good fruit, and in Mt 7:22, there is a reference to some who cast out spirits in Jesus' name, but still cannot enter the kingdom. Finally, Mt 7:24-27 is concerned with *hearing* the word and *doing* it.[55] Matthew adds a reference to the will of the father in the parable of the temple controversy in Mt 21:31. It is also a part of the Lord's prayer in 6:10 and in Jesus' prayer in Gethsemane (Mt 26:42). In Mt 18:14, the will of God to redeem "these little ones" is proclaimed.

The language elsewhere in the gospel, suggests that the Markan text includes a phrase which is decisive tradition in the Matthean community. The text explains the presuppositions and prerequisites for discipleship. It is to be sought in the performance

---

and the Pharisees' in Matthew always includes an exhortation to discipleship, i.e. an exhortation to the self-criticism of the community. This is central also in the parable of the sower.

[52] So also Barth, "Gesetzesverständnis", 54-58.

[53] So also Barth, "Gesetzesverständnis", 99-104.

[54] Cf. Armin Wouters, „... *wer den Willen meines Vaters tut*" (1992), 173-175; Przybylski, *Righteousness*, 112.

[55] In both contexts it is correct when Hubert Frankemölle, *Jahwe-Bund*, 278, claims that the will of God is always that which God lets Jesus say. The context of both the sermon on the mount and Mt 11-13, the continuity between Scripture and God's redemptive actions in history and the presence of Jesus is an important factor to Matthew.

of the will of the Father. The context of Mt 12:46-50 shows that discipleship, and hence doing the will of the Father, is not simply connected with performance. The prerequisite is the insight which comes from hearing the word (7:24ff). Hence discerning the will of God and living it is decisive for Matthew. The context of Matthew 11-13 indicates that part of this insight is recognising the presence of God in Jesus. This new revelation is, however, considered by Matthew to be in continuation with the old. Hence, there is a connection in Matthew between the will of God and righteousness, as the expression of performing the law appropriately.

The language by which this is expressed, "doing the will of my father" is adapted from the passage in Mark 3.[56] Mark 3 can therefore be said to be normative tradition for Matthew. The passage clearly expresses, in a formative way, the identity of a disciple, and how this identity is to be lived out.

6.3. Conclusion

It has become clear from the above, that in the Matthean adaptation and development of the themes of hiddenness, revelation, and the problem of obduracy, both Scripture and synoptic tradition have normative functions. The controversy material of the traditions is placed in the framework of the prophetic critique of conventional piety. The prophetic texts were actualised through the appeal to them. Further, the texts were shown to interpret the present in light of sacred history. Thereby, Scripture authorised the message of Jesus as described by Matthew. The interpretation of the present in light of sacred history clearly points to the prevailing normativity of Scripture for the Matthean evangelist. Scripture is not simply used against itself to point to its "completion", but rather, Scripture is found to contain the paradigms of God's actions in history. Scripture is therefore a norm by which not just the Christian claims are measured, but also the piety of both those who are followers of Jesus, as well as the opponents of Jesus and their followers. Also, this suggests that the opponents and Matthew appeal to and communicate through the same Scriptures.

With regard to Jesus tradition, the passages related to the theme of revelation, hiddenness, and obduracy, were shown to have normative value in the gospel as well as to the community of readers. The texts were shown to have a formative function, pointing to the key elements of discipleship. Here the terms "hear and understand," taken from Isaiah, were found to receive content through the Jesus tradition. Hence, Scripture was interpreted in light of the present. It became evident that Matthew emphasises the action of discipleship as more than simply hearing and receiving. The act of doing

---

[56] Przybylski, *Righteousness*, 113-115, states that in, Matthew doing the will of the father is distinctly Christian terminology, referring to "those who are religious in a Christian sense". He also wants to show that there is a clear distinction between Christians performing the will of God and the rightcousness of the Pharisees. The lines are not as clear as he wishes to see them.

accordingly was emphasised through the appeal to particular passages from the synoptic tradition by which this claim was justified.

7. CONCLUSION

Matthew 11-13 is a central unit in the gospel of Matthew. Themes that converge in these chapters are central to the Matthean gospel and theology. In the Matthean development of the motifs of the ὁ ἐρχόμενος-Christology, the πλεῖον/μείζον theme and the theme of hiddenness, revelation, and obduracy, both Scripture and synoptic tradition are drawn upon, and aligned to build the theological narrative. It is evident that Matthew indeed uses three central sources in this theological presentation of the Jesus story: Scripture, Mark, and Q. It is also evident that some of the synoptic material becomes normative through the Matthean process of reading the sources in light of Scripture. The analysis shows that some of the synoptic traditions betray language and concepts distinctive to the Christian faith, and that these must have had a normative function before Matthew included the writings into his gospel. Further, some of the synoptic material contains elements distinctive for the Christian identity in continuity with Scripture. These passages in Matthew function normatively in a pragmatic sense, in that they convey the history of the community in and through the Jesus story and example. More significantly, they function to set the prerequisites and presuppositions of inclusion in the community. It is likely that these passages were considered normative already before their inclusion in Matthew's gospel.

In the analysis of the three themes, Matthew's use of Scripture is found to be authoritative in seven main functions:

1. In the development of the first Christological theme, as well as the theme of obduracy and rejection, Scripture is found to hold the normative paradigm for both judgement of unrighteousness, and the peaceful character of the day of God's presence. The latter included the notion that the Kingdom of Heaven will embrace all of creation, also the gentiles. Important here is the symbolic and conceptual value of Scripture. The prophetic passages not only provide the language by which these realities are spoken of, but express the world view within which Matthew and the Matthean community lived. As such, scriptural tradition also functions as a measure to which claims to revelation must conform.
2. Beyond merely the symbolic normativity of its language, Scripture is also found to be normative in the function of its holding *foreknowledge* of future events in a prophetic predictive manner. Again, in this knowledge of future events which have been spoken of and are recorded in Scripture, exact correspondence is not expected. The conceptual nature of the predictions leaves much freedom for the authoritative interpretation of them.
3. In the extension of the previous point, Scripture functions normatively as proof text. This is specifically so in the question of the messianic expectation. Correspondence to Scripture proves divine intention and sending. Scripture defines the nature of the

Kingdom of God, and hence also the meaning of the confession to Jesus as the Messiah.

4. Scripture is used in Matthew 11-13 in a kerygmatic way. The passages are found both to provide the content of God's faithfulness to the people, and also the will of God to redeem and save. The future hope is affirmed through the application of Scripture to the recent history.
5. Texts of Scripture are found to function normatively in the pragmatic sense. Here the issue of the identity of the people of God is central. The recitation of, and appeal to, salvation history identifies the reader and the narrator with the people whose history it is. God's acts of deliverance in the history of the people are appealed to for the understanding of God's actions in the present. Included in this history is always the recitation of the hope of deliverance.
6. The appeal to Scripture as containing the history of election also points to the function of Scripture as normative in its prescriptive way. For Matthew the law is a norm for living in relation to God.
7. Finally, Matthew understands the prophetic critical aspects of prophecy to be normative for the time of Jesus and for the time of his community. The concern for the upholding of the law, and for remaining within the covenant relationship, is important for Matthew, and constitutes the purpose of the employment of prophetic critical texts. Social and religious critique is expressed through the employment of prophetic texts. They thus both provide Matthew with the content of the critique, and lend authority to Matthew's own message of the necessity of "bearing good fruit", i.e. of hearing the word and doing it.

With regard to the synoptic sources of the Matthean narrative, they are found to function normatively in six different ways:

1. In the reception and preservation of synoptic material, Matthew uses similar hermeneutical methods applied to Scripture. Certain aspects of synoptic tradition can be shown to be of particular importance in the development of the theological themes of the three chapters. These themes became interpretative measures by which other source material was evaluated. They were also, by Matthew, perceived to harmonise with the message of Scripture.
2. Certain aspects of the Jesus tradition, especially those of the reversal of great and small, were found to be directly relevant for the interpretation of Scripture in light of recent events at the time of Matthew's writing. This interpretation, where the recent events provided the normative story through which Scripture was read, placed Scripture and Jesus tradition in a reciprocal relation to each other, where the one authenticated the other.
3. Similar to the use of Scripture is that of Synoptic tradition as a "language of revelation". Certain aspects of Synoptic language and form are normative for

Matthew in their paradigmatic and symbolic function. Matthew employs this synoptic language in the adaptation of and creation of "new" material. This technique shows a reverence for the written Jesus tradition, and also lends authority and reality to the fictitious aspects of the Jesus tradition. In other words, they become credible and normative through the language and concepts provided by tradition.

4. Like Scripture, but only in extension of Scripture, synoptic material expresses the hope for future salvation and provides paradigmatic imagery for that event. It is prophetic predictive in continuity and extension of prophetic predictions.
5. Synoptic material is found to be normative in the extension of Salvation history. synoptic passages function normatively by providing the common ground for the identity of the reader: the "story of election".
6. Synoptic material is found to be normative by providing a code by which to live in discipleship. Again this is in continuation and extension of the codes provided by Scripture.

On the background of the results of the exegetical analysis, it can be concluded that Matthew perceives of the written Jesus tradition as authoritative. The manner in which the tradition is interpreted: by a) harmonising it with other strands of tradition, b) imitating traditional language, and c) giving the sayings a prescriptive role, points to the normative nature of tradition. This tradition can neither stand alone nor be independent of Scripture. The three theological themes of Matthew 11-13, though built up of Jesus tradition, are found to be grounded in the language and the conceptual world of Scripture. Jesus tradition is explained and interpreted in light of this language.

In his essay "Das Matthäusevangelium als Heilige Schrift und die heilige Schrift des früheren Bundes", Hubert Frankemölle describes Matthew's self-consciousness as that of writing Scripture. This conclusion is made on the background of Matthew's weaving together of Scripture with Jesus tradition, and placing the story of Jesus in the context of Scripture to give it the function of providing the identity of the community as the people of God. The dependence of Matthew on the language and world of thought found in Scripture is evident. Matthew, in his gospel, nevertheless does not engage in the rewriting of Scripture in a manner evident in the rewriting of the history of the people, as it is found e.g. in Deuteronomy or Jubilees. Rather, it is significant that Matthew engages in the rewriting of the gospel with Scripture as a guide. Hence, both Scripture *and* Jesus tradition constitute material which is decisive for the identity of Matthew and the Matthean community as the people of God and disciples of Jesus.

The gospel of Matthew does not include any autobiographical data by which Matthew's identity can be discerned. The development of the three theological themes in Matthew is a combination of Scripture and synoptic material. The method by which this is done can be likened to the householder bringing forth from his treasury new and old

things, as it is described in Mt 13:52.[1] This is a passage traditionally thought to be an autograph inserted by the Matthean author.[2] The saying or parable is believed to betray Matthew's identity as a scribe. The meaning or implications of γραμματεύς is, however, not clear.[3]

In the analysis of the present thesis, it is not the identity of the γραμματεύς which is of interest. Rather, it seems important to point out the context in which the parable is found. The parable concludes chapters 11-13, and is to be related to this material.[4] Jesus' question to the disciples is significant, and builds a bridge back to the opening of the three chapters: Mt 11:2-6. "Συνήκατε ταῦτα πάντα;" does not simply raise the question as to whether the disciples and/or the reader of Matthew are capable of understanding the parables, but whether they know the significance of the Jesus event as it has been described through the words and deeds of Jesus. The immediate reference of the question is the theme of obduracy as it is expressed in the words of Isaiah 6:9-10 in Mt 13:14-15. As in the use of the Isaiah citation, the parable of the scribe discipled for the Kingdom of Heaven includes an ethical obligation connected with, and following from, the ability to understand. The image of the storehouse and the use of ἐκβάλλω connects the parable to Mt 12:18-21 and Mt 12:35.[5] Jesus' answer to the disciples, Διὰ τοῦτο πᾶς γραμματεὺς μαθητευθεὶς τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν ὅμοιός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδεσπότῃ, ὅστις ἐκβάλλει ἐκ τοῦ θησαυροῦ αὐτοῦ καινὰ καὶ παλαιά, is to be read as an exhortation to recognise the presence of God in Jesus and the future hope he proclaims in word and deed. (Both Mt 12:18 and 12:35 include these aspects). Further, the ethical demand is to act according to this recognition, at the example of Jesus' humble and serving attitude.

---

[1] The parable is almost in its entirety a redactional creation. Cf. Ulrich Luz, *Evangelium* vol. 2, 362.

[2] Cf. e.g. William David Davies and Dale C. Allison, *Saint Matthew*, 445; Joachim Gnilka, *Matthäusevangelium* vol. 1, 511; M. D. Goulder, "Midrash", 375; Francis Wright Beare, *Matthew*, 317-318.

[3] Cf. David Orton, *The Understanding Scribe* (1989), 139-140 for a short summary of scholarly approaches. While some consider the term to refer to a rabbinic style scribe, (Goulder, "Midrash", 375; Joachim Gnilka, *Verstockung*, 96) Orton considers γραμματεύς here to refer to an apocalyptic scribe with quasi-prophetic functions. A rabbinic scribe, would be considered to interpret and exegete Scripture with authority, but would always distinguish interpretation from Scripture. In critique of the preoccupation of past research with the rabbinic understanding of γραμματεύς, Orton holds that Matthew's use of traditions, and in particular his anonymous creativity, is not compatible with the rabbinic scribal "ideal". The apocalyptic scribe, he argues, understands his work as result of divine revelation, and thus authoritative on its own. Orton finds evidence for his conclusion on the one hand in the assumption that Matthew's understanding of Scripture as an entity incomplete without authoritative interpretation, and on the other hand on a perceived parallel description of the disciples as scribes in Mt 13 and the maskilim in Dan 12. Orton's thesis supports Frankemölle in his notion that Matthew's gospel was composed to be Scripture. It speaks against Orton's thesis that the apocalyptic and esoteric language in Matthew is reduced or interpreted in light of wisdom language or prophetic critical texts. Further, the exegetical study has shown that the purpose of Matthew's use of Scripture is not the revelation of heavenly secrets to a selected few.

[4] Cf. Ivor H. Jones, *Parables*, 118.

[5] Jones, *Parables*, 211.

The issue of Matthew 11-13 is the combination of "new and old" in the presentation of the Jesus story. Possibly, Betz[6] is correct in identifying Is 43:18 as the background for the final parable of chapter 13. "Behold, I am doing a new thing," is the message which Matthew wishes to impart to his readers in asking "do you understand these things?". For Matthew, these new things are in continuation with the old. In contrast to the Isaiah passage, however, Matthew does not exhort the disciples to leave the old behind. Rather, the ethical demands of the new are to be seen as both a continuation of, and also an affirmation of the demands of the past. In terms of the authority of the old and the new, the two form an allegiance in Mt 13:52. The identity of the scribe trained for the Kingdom of Heaven is found in the combination of the old and the new. Both have a constitutive, and therefore an authoritative, standing with the Matthean community. It is possible, therefore, to read Matthew 13:52 together with Mt 5:17.[7]

The exegetical analysis of this study shows that Matthew continually adds the Jesus story to Scripture. Matthew uses Scripture not only to interpret the person of Jesus, but also to interpret and explain the significance of the stories that witness to him. Thereby Matthew often corrects normative tradition in light of Scripture. Here the salvation-historical reading of Matthew has placed too much emphasis on the Matthean polemic against the scribes and the Pharisees as pointing to a break with Judaism. Matthew's criticism of the scribes and the Pharisees, as stock figures, is in Matthew's eyes based in Scripture itself. Hence, as affirmed at the beginning of this study, Jesus' teaching, and the Jesus tradition, do not dissolve the law. Rather, they constitute its fulfilment. In his life, Jesus embodies the history of Israel. He is chosen, humble and small who will become great; he becomes the hope of the nations. In fulfilling the law and the prophets, Jesus also is the paradigm and example to follow. To be a disciple of Jesus is to recognise the reality of the new place of revelation, and as a result to return to the law and to "bear fruit". Jesus tradition in Matthew's eyes can only be normative in the extension of Scripture. In itself, it is an actualisation and interpretation of Scripture.

It is possible to argue differently on the basis of the very different nature of Scripture and Jesus tradition in relation to their employment in the gospel. It has been pointed out that Matthew does not rewrite or actualise the history of salvation in the formulation of the gospel. In the use of in Scripture in Matthew 11-13, Matthew preserves both text, form and most significantly the theological framework of mainly prophetic literature. In the preservation of synoptic material there are also examples of interpretation and preservation of form. Most of all it is a preservation of the story of Jesus. It can, therefore, be argued that Matthew's use of Scripture is *interpretation* of Scripture in light of Jesus, while his use of synoptic tradition is mainly *preservation*. The

---

[6] Otto Betz, "Neues und Altes im Geschichtshandeln Gottes" (1987).

[7] Cf. Luz, *Evangelium* vol. 2, 364-365.

issue is important with regard to both the question of the relation between the first and the second testaments, and also attempts to establish a Biblical theology. The relevant question is therefore: is Matthew's use of Scripture simply the adaptation of those parts of Scripture which successfully can be read in light of Jesus? In other words, is Scripture for Matthew limited to that which is affirmed by and in the Jesus story?

The analysis of the different texts of Matthew indicates that this is not the case. Matthew not only interprets Scripture in light of the Jesus event, but, more important, he interprets Jesus as the new act of God in the history of his people. In the development of the gospel narrative, *both* Scripture *and* synoptic tradition are interpreted and preserved. Because the gospel is a gospel, it is the preservation of gospel material which is dominant. Yet, both the allusions to, and citations of, Scripture can be shown to be interpretative tools for the Jesus story, whether they were new citations introduced by Matthew, or already provided by Christian tradition. The citations are not used atomistically, but assume a knowledge on the part of the redactor, and presumably also of his readers, of the textual contexts of the citations .

Can Matthew's gospel then, be a prototype for a Biblical theology of today? In the last decade, several exegetes have argued in favour of recognising the Septuagint as the normative Bible of the early church.[8] In the context of this recognition, it has also been argued that the Scripture of the early church was only meaningful as read in light of the Jesus event. It is important to emphasise here, that the historical nature of the Christian texts must not be forgotten. First, one must keep in mind that the Matthean interpretation of Scripture in light of the Jesus event, in the way it is exemplified in the gospel, does not give the whole picture of how Matthew read and understood Scripture. There is always the danger that the polemics of the New Testament texts against the representatives of the old, becomes codified. Hence the pitfall of understanding and reading *Vetus Testamentum* in terms of the concept *in Novo Receptum* is to not sufficiently consider the historical situation in which this interpretation took place. As for Matthew, it can be shown that the reception and preservation of the synoptic sources are clearly interpreted by Scripture and not vice versa. Further, it must be pointed out that for Matthew, Scripture remains not only a proclamation of justice and salvation at the hand of God, but also always a critique of present piety. The possibility of this critique is provided through the reciprocal interpretative roles between the "old" and the "new" tradition.

The kerygmatic theological character of the gospel may be deduced from the compositional structure of Matthew. By the purposeful addition of scriptural citations, primarily from the prophets, the gospel of Matthew relates the material to parts of Scripture which are not simply predictive or prescriptive, but which proclaim on the one hand the redemptive will of God, and on the other hand the particular claim and call to

---

[8] Cf. Müller, *First Bible*; Hans Hübner, "Vetus Testamentum".

repentance which this will call for. The rereading of Mark and Q into a new coherent narrative enables Matthew to create paradigmatic, ideal, typical, kerygmatic and confessional stories from the material. Thereby the Jesus tradition receives the function of being Scripture to Matthew.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abegg, Martin G. "The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double?" *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2, no. 2 (1995): 125-144.

Aland, Barbara. "Das Zeugnis der frühen Papyri für den Text der Evangelien". In *The Four Gospels 1992*, 1. Edited by F. van Segbroeck. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 100. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992. (325-335)

Alexander, Philip S. "Midrash and the Gospels." In *Synoptic Studies: The Ampleforth Conferences of 1982-83*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplemet Series, 7. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984. (1-18)

Alexander, Philip S. "Targum, Targumim." *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 6 (1992): 320-331.

Allen, W.C. "The Old Testament Quotations in St. Matthew and St. Mark." *Expository Times* XII (1900/1901): 281ff.

Allison, Dale C. "Elijah Must Come First." *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1984): 256-258.

Allison, Dale C. *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.

Anchor Bible Dictionary, vols. 1-6. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Anderson, Janice Capel. *Matthew's Narrative Web: Over and Over and Over Again*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament. Supplement Series, 91. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Arens, Eduardo. *The ΗΛΘΟΝ-sayings in the Synoptic Tradition: A Historico-Critical Investigation*. Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976.

Arvedson, Tomas. *Das Mysterium Christi*. AMNSU, 7. Leipzig/Uppsala:1937.

Bacchiocchi, Samuele. *From Sabbath to Sunday: A Historical Investigation of the Rise of Sunday Observance in Early Christianity*. Rome: The Pontifical Gregorian University Press, 1977.

Bacchiocchi, Samuele. "Sabbatical Typologies of Messianic Redemption." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 17 (1986): 153-176.

Bacon, B. W. "The 'Five Books' of Moses Against the Jews." *The Expositor* 15 (1918): 56-66.

Barr, James. *Holy Scripture: Canon, Authority, Criticism*. Oxford: University Press, 1983.

Barth, Gerhard. "Das Gesetzesverständnis des Evangelisten Matthäus". In *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 1. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1960 . (54-154)

Barthel, Jörg. *Prophetenwort und Geschichte. Die Jesajaüberlieferung in Jes 6-8 und 28-31*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament, 19. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1997.

Barton, John. "Prophecy (Post-Exilic Hebrew)." *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 5 (1992): 489-495.

Bauer, David R. *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. Bible and Literature series, 15. Journal for the Study of the New Testament. Supplement Series. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988.

Baumbach, Günther. "Messias/Messianische Bewegungen III. Neues Testament." *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 22 (1992): 630-635.

Bayer, Hans F. *Jesus' Predictions of Vindication and Resurrection: The Provenance, Meaning and Correlation of the Synoptic Predictions*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament, 20. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1986.

Beare, Francis Wright. *The Gospel according to Matthew: A Commentary*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1981.

Beckwith, Roger T. "Formation of the Hebrew Bible". In *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling. Aassen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress, 1988. (39-86)

Bertram, G. "Νήπιος." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* IV (1967): 912-923.

Betz, Otto. "Jesu Evangelium vom Gottesreich". In *Jesus der Messias Israels. Aufsätze zur biblischen Theologie*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 42. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1987[1983]. (231-254)

Betz, H.D. "The Logion of the Easy Yoke and of Rest (Matt 11:28-30)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 86 (1967): 10-24.

Betz, Otto. "Neues und Altes im Geschichtshandeln Gottes. Bemerkungen zu Matthäus 13,51f". In *Jesus, der Messias Israels: Aufsätze zur Biblischen Theologie*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 42. Tübingen: J.C.B Mohr, 1987[1973]. (285-300)

Billerbeck, P., and Hermann L. Strack. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus: erläutert aus Talmud und Midrasch*. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, 1. München: C.H. Beck, 1922.

Billerbeck, Paul, and Hermann L. Strack. "Der Prophet Elias nach seiner Entrückung aus dem Diesseits". In *Exkurse zu Einzelnen Stellen des Neuen Testaments. Abhandlungen zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Archäologie*, 2. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, 4. München: C.H. Beck, ^{4}1965[1924]. (764-798)

Blass, Friedrich, et al. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, ^{17}1990[1976].

Blenkinsopp, J. "The Oracle of Judah and the Messianic Entry." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 80 (1961): 55-64.

Böcher, Otto. "Johannes der Täufer." *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 17 (1988): 172-181.

Böcher, Otto. "Johannes der Täufer in der neutestamentlichen Überlieferung". In *Rechtfertigung - Realismus - Universalismus in Biblisher Sicht*. Edited by Gotthold Müller. F.S. Adolph Köberle. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1978. (45-68)

Bockmuehl, Markus. *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline*

Christianity. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament, 36. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1990.

Boring, M. Eugene. "Prophecy (Early Christian)." *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 5 (1992): 495-502.

Bornkamm, Günther. "Die Sturmstillung im Matthäusevangelium". In *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 1. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1960[1948]. (48-53)

Bovon, François. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* 1. Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, 3. Neukirchen-Vluyn/Zürich: Neukirchener Verlag/Benziger, 1989.

Braumann, Georg. "Νήπιος." *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* 1 (1975): 380-383.

Breytenbach, Cilliers. "Das Markusevangelium, Psalm 110,1 und 118,22f. Folgetext und Prätext," In *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by C. Tuckett. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997. (197-222)

Broer, Ingo. "Anmerkungen zum Gesetzesverständnis des Matthäus". In *Das Gesetz im Neuen Testament*. Edited by Karl Kertelge. Questiones Disputatae, 108. Freiburg (Br.): Herder, 1986. (128-145)

Brooks, Stephenson H. *Matthew's Community: The Evidence of his Special Sayings Material*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament. Supplement Series, 16. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.

Brown, C. "Παραβολή." *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* 2 (1975): 749-746.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, nF 12 (29). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, ^{6}1964.

Burkitt, Francis Crawford. *The Gospel History and its Transmission*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, ^{2}1907[1906].

Burnett, Fred E. *The Testament of Jesus Sophia: A Redaction Critical Study of the Eschatological Discourse in Matthew*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1981.

Butler, Basil Christopher. *The Originality of St. Matthew: A Critique of the Two Source Hypothesis*. Cambridge, 1951.

Byrskog, Samuel. *Jesus the Only Teacher: Didactic Authority and Transmission in Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism and the Matthean Community*. Coniectanea Biblica NT, 24. Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell, 1994.

Cameron, Peter Scott. *Violence and the Kingdom: The Interpretation of Mt 11:12*. Arbeiten zum Neuen Testament und Judentum. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1984.

Carlston, C.E. "Wisdom and Eschatology in Q". In *Logia. Les Paroles de Jésus - The Sayings of Jesus*. Edited by Joël Delobel. FS Joseph Coppens. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 59. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1982. (101-119)

Carson, D.A. "The OMOIOΣ Word-Group as Introduction to Some Matthean Parables." *New Testament Studies* 31 (1985): 277-282.

Casey, Maurice. "Culture and Historicity: the Plucking of the Grain (Mark 2:23-28)." *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988): 1-23.

Chilton, Bruce D. "Commenting on the Old Testament (with Particular Reference to the Pesharim, Philo and the Mekilta)". In *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture.* Edited by D.A Carson and Hugh Godfrey Maturin Williamson. FS Barnabas Lindars. Cambridge: University Press, 1988. (123-139)

Chilton, Bruce. *A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible: Jesus' Own Interpretation of Isaiah.* London: SPCK, 1984.

Chilton, Bruce D. *The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus.* The Aramaic Bible, 11. Wilmington, Del: M. Glazier, 1987.

Chilton, Bruce, and Jacob Neusner. *Judaism in the New Testament: Practices and Beliefs.* London and New York: Routledge, 1995.

Cohn-Sherbok, D.M. "An Analysis of Jesus' Arguments Concerning the Plucking of Grain on the Sabbath." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 2 (1979): 31-41.

Collins, John J. "'He Shall not Judge by What his Eyes See': Messianic Authority in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995): 145-164.

Collins, John J. "The Works of the Messiah." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1 (1994): 98-112.

Cope, O. Lamar. *Matthew: a Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven.* Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, 5. Washington DC: The Catholic Biblical Association, 1976.

Cope, O. Lamar. "Matthew 12:40 and the Synoptic Source Question." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92, no. 1 (1975): 115ff.

Craigie, P.C. *The Book of Deuteronomy.* Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmann, 1976.

Crossan, J. D. "The Seed Parables of Jesus." *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1973): 244-266.

Dahl, Nils A. "The Parables of Growth." *Studia Theologica* V (1952): 132-166.

Davies, William David, and Dale C. Allison. *The Gospel according to St Matthew* 1-3. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988-1997.

Delling, Gerhard. "Πλήροω." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 6 (1968): 286-298.

Deutsch, Celia. *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke: Wisdom Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11:25-30.* Journal for the Study of the New Testament. Supplement Series, 18. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.

DeYoung, James B. "The Function of Malachi 3:1 in Matthew 11:10: Kingdom Reality as the Hermeneutics of Jesus". In *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel.* Edited by Craig E. Evans and W. Richard Stegner. Studies in Scripture and early Judaism and Christianity, 3. Journal for the Study of the New Testament. Supplement Series, 104. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994. (66-91)

Dibelius, M. *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums.* Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, ²1933.

Dietzfelbinger, Christian. "Das Gleichnis vom Ausgestreuten Samen". In *Der Ruf Jesu*

und die Antwort der Gemeinde. Exegetische Untersuchungen. Edited by Eduard Lohse, et al. FS Joachim Jeremias. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970. (80-95)

Dobbeler, Stephanie von. *Das Gericht und das Erbarmen Gottes. Die Botschaft Johannes des Täufers und ihre Rezeption bei den Johannesjüngern im Rahmen der Theologiegeschichte des Frühjudentums*. Bonner Biblische Beiträge, 70. Frankfurt a.M.: Athenäum, 1988.

Dodd, Charles Harold. *According to the Scriptures: the Substructure of New Testament Theology*. London: Nisbet & Co, 1953.

Dodd, Charles Harold. *The Parables of the Kingdom*. London: Nisbet & Co, ^{5}1961.

Dormeyer, Detlev. *Das Evangelium als literarische und theologische Gattung*. Erträge der Forschung, 263. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1989.

Dormeyer, Detlev. "Die Familie Jesu und der Sohn der Maria im Markusevangelium (3,20f.31-35; 6,3)". In *Vom Urchristentum zu Jesus*. Edited by Hubert Frankemölle. Festschrift für Joachim Gnilka. Freiburg: Herder, 1989. (109-135)

Dschulnigg, Peter. *Sprache, Redaktion und Intention des Markusevangeliums. Eigentümlichkeiten der Sprache des Markusevangeliums und ihre Bedeutung für die Redaktionskritik*. Stuttgarter Biblische Beiträge, 1. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1984.

Dunn, James D.G. *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. London: SCM Press, ^{2}1989.

Dunn, James D. G. *Jesus and the Spirit: A study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament*. London: SCM, 1975.

Dunn, James D.G. "Levels of Canonical Authority." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 4 (1982): 13-60.

Dunn, James D. G. "Matthew 12:28/Luke 11:20". In *Eschatology and the New Testament*. Edited by W. Gloer. Essays in Honor of G.R. Beasley Murray. Peabody, Mass: Hendricks, 1988. (29-49)

Dupont, Jaques. "Les 'Simples' (Petayim) dans le Bible et à Qumran. À Propos des νηπίοι de Mt 11,25; Lc 10:21". In *Etudes sur les Evangiles Synoptiques*, II. Edited by F. Neirynck. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, LXX. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985[1967]. (583-591)

Edwards, Richard Alan. *The Sign of Jonah in the Theology of the Evangelists and Q*. Studies in Biblical Theology, 2/18. London: SCM, 1971.

Elliger, Karl. *Deuterojesaja* 1. Biblische Kommentare, AT XI. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978.

Ellis, E. Earle. "The Old Testament Canon in the Early Church". In *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling. Aassen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress, 1988. (653-690)

Ellis, E. Earle. *The Old Testament in Early Christianity: Canon and Interpretation in the light of Modern Research*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1991.

Ernst, Josef. " War Jesus ein Schüler Johannes' des Täufers?". In *Vom Urchristentum zu*

Jesus. Edited by Hubert Frankemölle. Festschrift für Joachim Gnilka. Freiburg: Herder, 1989. (13-33)

Esser, H.H. "Καταβολή." *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* 1 (1975).

Evans, C.A. *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6:9-10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series, 64. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.

Exegetisches Wörterbuchzum Neuen Testament. Vols 1-4. Edited by H. Balz and G. Schneider.

Faierstein, Morris M. "Why Do the Scribes Say that Elijah Must Come First?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100 (1981): 75-86.

Feldman, Louis H. "Josephus." *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 3 (1992): 981-998.

Fenton, J.C. *The Gospel of St Matthew*. The Pelican Gospel Commentaries, 7/6. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1963.

Fenton, J. C. "Inclusio and Chiasmus in Matthew". In *Studia Evangelica*, 1. Edited by Kurt Aland. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 73. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1959. (174-179)

Feuer, A.C. *Tehillim*. Brooklyn, NY, 1979.

Fieger, Michael. *Das Thomasevangelium. Einleitung, Kommentar und Systematik*. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen (nF), 22. Münster: Aschendorff, 1991.

Fiorenza, Francis Schüssler. "Crisis of Scriptural Authority: Interpretation and Reception." *Interpretation* 44 (1990): 353-368.

Fishbane, Michael. "Inner Biblical Exegesis: Types and Strategies of Interpretation in Ancient Israel." In: *Midrash and Literatur*. Edited by Geofrey H. Hartman and Sanford Budick. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986. (19-37)

Fishbane, Michael. "Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran". In *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible*. Edited by Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling. Assen/Mastricht and Philadelphia: Van Gorcum and Fortress, 1988. (339-357)

Fitzmyer, Joseph. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Early Christianity." *Theology Digest* 42 (1995): 303-319.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Languages of Palestine in the First Century A.D." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 32 (1970): 501-531.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "More about Elijah Coming First." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (1985): 295-296.

Flender, H. *Heil und Geschichte in der Theologie des Lukas*. Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie, 41. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1965.

Fohrer, Georg. "Tradition und Interpretation im Alten Testament." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 73 (1961): 1-30.

Fohrer, Georg. "Σοφία A-B." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* VII 1971 (1967): 465-596.

France, R.T. "Jewish Historiography, Midrash and the Gospels". In *Gospel Perspectives: Studies in Midrash and Historiography*, 3. Edited by R.T. France and D.

Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983. (99-127)

Frankemölle, Hubert. "Das Matthäusevangelium als heilige Schrift und die heilige Schrift des früheren Bundes. Von der Zwei-quellen- zur Drei-quellen- Theorie". In *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism.* Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 110. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993. (281-310)

Frankemölle, Hubert. *Jahwe-Bund und Kirche Christi. Studien zur Form und Traditionsgeschichte des Evangeliums nach Matthäus.* Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen (nF), 10. Münster: Aschendorf, 1974.

Frankemölle, Hubert. "Jesus als deuterojesajanischer Freudenbote. Zur Rezeption von Jes 52,7 und 61,1 im Neuen Testament, durch Jesus und in den Targumim". In *Vom Urchristentum zu Jesus.* Edited by Hubert Frankemölle. Festschrift für Joachim Gnilka. Freiburg: Herder, 1989. (34-67)

Friedman, T. "The Sabbath: Anticipation of Redemption." *Judaism* 16, no. 4 (1967): 443-452.

Fuchs, Albert. *Die Entwicklung der Beelzebulkontroverse bei den Synoptikern. Traditionsgeschichtliche und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung von Mk 3:22-27 und Parallelen verbunden mit der Rückfrage nach Jesus.* Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt, B/5. Linz: Berger, 1980.

Füglister, Notker. "Psalm LXXXVIII. Der Rätsel Lösung". In *Congress Volume Leuven 1989: Proceedings of the 13th Congress of the International Organisation for the Study of the Old Testament.* Edited by J. A. Emerton. Leiden: Brill, 1991.

Gaechter, Paul. *Die literarische Kunst im Matthäusevangelium.* Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1965.

Garland, D.E. *The Intention of Matthew 23.* Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 52. Leiden: Brill, 1979.

Gärtner, B. "The Habakkuk commentary (DSH) and the Gospel of Matthew." *Studia Theologica* 8 (1954): 1-24.

Gerhardsson, Birger. *Memory and Manuscript.* ASNU, 22. Lund²1964.

Gerhardsson, Birger. "The Seven Parables in Matthew XIII." *New Testament Studies* 19 (1972/73): 16-37.

Gerlemann, G. "חיה." *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 1 (1971): 549-557.

Gese, Hartmut. "Jona ben Amittai und das Jonabuch." *Theologische Beiträge* 16 (1985): 256-272.

Glombitza, Otto. "Der Perlenkaufmann." *New Testament Studies* 7 (1961): 153-161.

Gnilka, Joachim. *Das Evangelium nach Markus* 1. Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, II. Zürich/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benziger Verlag/Neukirchener Verlag, 1978.

Gnilka, Joachim. *Das Matthäusevangelium.* Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, I. Freiburg (Br.): Herder, 1986.

Gnilka, Joachim. *Die Verstockung Israels. Isaias 6:9-10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker.* München: Kösel Verlag, 1961.

Golka, Friedemann W. *Jona.* Calwer Bibelkommentare. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag Stuttgart, 1991.

Goulder, M. D. *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*. London: SPCK, 1974.

Greenspoon, Leonard J. "Aquila's Version." *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 1 (1992): 320-321.

Greenspoon, Leonard J. "Theodotion, Theodotion's Version." *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 6 (1992): 447-448.

Grelot, P. "Michée 7.6 dans les évangiles et dans la littérature rabbinique." *Biblica* 67 (1986): 363-377.

Grimm, Werner. *Der Ruhetag. Sinngehalte einer fast vergessenen Gottesgabe*. Arbeiten zum Neuen Testament und Judentum, 4. Frankfurt a.M.: Lang, 1980.

Grimm, Werner. *Weil ich dich liebe. Die Verkündigung Jesu und Deuterojesaja.* Arbeiten zum Neuen Testament und Judentum, 1. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1976.

Grindel, John. "Matthew 12,18-21." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 29 (1967): 110-115.

Grundmann, Walter. "Μέγας." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*

1967 (1942): 529-541.

Gundry, Robert H. *Matthew: A Commentary on his Literary and Theological Art*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdman, 1982.

Gundry, Robert H. *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel: With special Reference to the Messianic Hope*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967.

Häfner, Gerd. *Der verheissene Vorläufer. Redaktionskritische Untersuchung zur Darstellung Johannes des Täufers im Matthäusevangelium.* Stuttgarter Biblische Beiträge, 27. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1994.

Hagner, Donald A. *Matthew 1-13*. Word Biblical Commentary, 33a. Dallas: Word, 1993.

Hahn, Ferdinand. "Das Problem 'Schrift und Tradition' im Urchristentum." *Evangelische Theologie* 30, no. 9 (1970): 449-468.

Hampel, Volker. *Menschensohn und historischer Jesus. Ein Rätselwort als Schlüssel zum messianischen Selbstverständnis Jesu*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990.

Hanig, Roman. "Christus als 'wahrer Salomo' in der frühen Kirche." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 84 (1993): 111-134.

Hartmann, Lars. "Scriptural Exegesis in the Gospel of St Matthew and the Problem of Communication". In *L'evangile selon Matthieu. Redaction et theologie*. Edited by M. Didier. Gembloux: J. Demlot, 1972. (131-152)

Hauck, Friedrich. "Μαργαρίτης." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* IV 1967 (1942): 472-473.

Hauck, Friedrich. "Παραβολή." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* V 1967 (1954): 744-761.

Hawkins, John C. *Horae Synopticae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1898.

Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

Hedrick, Charles. "The Treasure Parable in Matthew and Thomas." *Forum* 2, no. 2 (1986): 41-56.

Held, Heinz Jocahim. "Matthäus als Interpret der Wundergeschichten". In *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 1. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1960. (155-287)

Hengel, Martin. *Die Evangelienüberschriften. Vorgetragen am 18. Oktober 1981.* Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, 3. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1984.

Hengel, Martin. "Die Septuaginta als 'Christliche Schriftensammlung', ihre Vorgeschichte un das Problem ihres Kanons. Unter Mitarbait von Ronald Deines". In *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum*. Edited by Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament, 72. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1994. (182-284)

Hermisson, Hans Jürgen. "Israel und Gottesknecht in Deuterojesaja." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 79 (1982): 1-24.

Hill, David. "On the Use and Meaning of Hosea VI.6 in Matthew's Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 24 (1978): 107-119.

Hoffmann, Paul. *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle* 8. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen (nF). Münster: Aschendorff, 1972.

Hooker, Morna D. *Jesus and the Servant*. London: SCM Press, 1959.

Howell, David B. *Matthew's Inclusive Story: A Study in the Narrative Rhetoric of the First Gospel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament. Supplement Series, 42. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.

Hübner, Hans. "Vetus Testamentum und Vetus Testamentum in Novo Receptum. Die Frage nach dem Kanon des Alten Testaments aus neutestamentlicher Sicht". In *Zum Problem des biblischen Kanons*. Edited by Günter Stemberger, et al. Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie, 3. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988. (146-162)

Hughes, John H. "John the Baptist: the Forerunner of God Himself." *Novum Testamentum* 14 (1972): 192-218.

Hummel, Reinhart. *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Matthäusevangelium*. Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie, 33. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1966.

Ito, Akio. "Matthew and the Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 48 (1992): 23-42.

Jacobson, Arland. "The Wisdom Christology of Q". PhD Thesis. Claremont: 1978.

Japhet, Sara. *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary*. London: SCM, 1993.

Jeremias, Joachim. " Ἠλιας." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* II 1964 (1935): 921-941.

Jeremias, Joachim. *Jesus' Promise to the Nations. The Franz Delitzsch Lectures for 1953*. Studies in Biblical Theology. London: SCM Press, 1958[1956].

Jeremias, Joachim. *The Parables of Jesus*. New Testament Library. London: SCM,

1963.

Jones, Ivor H. *The Matthean Parables: A Literary and Historical Commentary.* Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 80. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996.

Kahl, Werner. *New Testament Miracle Stories in their Religious Historical Setting: A Religionsgeschichtliches Comparison from a Structural Perspective.* Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 163. Göttingen: Vandehoeck & Ruprecht, 1994.

Kaiser, Otto. *Isaiah 13-39: a Commentary.* Translated by R.A. Wilson. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974.

Kelber, Werner H. "Die Anfangsprozesse der Verschriftlichung im Frühchristentum". In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, II.26.I. Berlin: de Greuyter, 1992. (3-62)

Kieffer, René. "'Mer än' - kristologin hos Synoptikerna." *Svensk Exegetisk Årbok* 44 (1979): 134-147.

Kilpatrick, G.D. *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946.

Kingsbury, Jack Dean. *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.

Kingsbury, Jack Dean. *The Parables in Matthew 13.* London: SCM, 1969.

Kittel, Gerhard. *Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentum und das Urchristentum.* Beiträge zur Wissenschaft zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 1. Stuttgart, 1926.

Klauck, Hans-Josef. *Allegorie und Allegorese in Synoptischen Gleichnistexten.* Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen (nF), 13. Münster: Aschendorff, 1978.

Kloppenborg, John S. *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections.* Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

Kloppenborg, John S. "Wisdom Christology in Q." *Laval Théologique et Philosophique* 34 (1978): 129-147.

Knowles, Michael. *Jeremiah in Matthew's Gospel: The Rejected-Prophet Motif in Matthean Redaction.* Journal for the Study of the New Testament. Supplement Series. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

Koch, Klaus. *Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums. Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus.* Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, 69. Tübingen: J.C:B. Mohr; 1986.

Kogler, Franz. *Das Doppelgleichnis vom Senfkorn und vom Sauerteig in seiner traditionsgeschichtlichen Entwicklung. Zur Reich-Gottes-Vorstellung Jesu und ihren Aktualisierung in der Urkirche.* Forschung zur Bibel, 59. Würzburg: Echter, 1988.

Köhler, Wolf-Dietrich. *Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus.* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament, 2:24. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1987.

Köster, Helmut. "Überlieferung und Geschichte der frühchristlichen Evangelienliteratur". In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, II.25.2. Berlin: De Greuyter, 1984. (1463-1542)

Krämer, Michael. *Die Gleichnisreden in den Synoptischen Evangelien. Eine synoptische Studie zu Mt 13,1-52; Mk 4, 1-34; Lk 8, 4-21.* Deutsche Hochschulscriften, 461. Egelsbach: Verlg Hänsel-Hohenhausen, 1993.

Kraus, H. J. *Psalms 60-150.* Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989.

Krentz, Edgar. "The Extent of Matthew's Prologue: Towards the Structure of the First Gospel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 83 (1964): 409-414.

Kretzer, Armin. *Die Herrschaft der Himmel un die Söhne des Reiches. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Basileiabegriff und Basileiaverständnis im Matthäusevangelium.* SBM, 10. Würzburg: Echter/KBW Verlag, 1971.

Kupp, David Daniel. "Matthew's Emmanuel Messiah: A Paradigm of Presence for God's People". PhD Thesis. University of Durham. Durham, UK: 1992.

Lambrecht, Jan. *Out of the Treasure.* Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1991.

Laufen, Rudolf. *Die Doppelüberlieferungen der Logienquelle und des Markusevangeliums.* Bonner Biblische Beiträge, 54. Königstein i. Ts/ Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1980.

Liddell, H. G. *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon: Founded upon the Seventh Edition of Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1985[1889].

Lindars, Barnabas. *New Testament Apologetic. The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations.* London: SCM, 1961.

Lindeskog, Gösta. "Autorität und Tradition im Neuen Testament. Einige Bemerkungen." *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* IX (1973): 43-63.

Lindeskog, Gösta. "Johannes der Täufer." *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 12 (1983): 55-83.

Linnemann, Eta. *Gleichnisse Jesu. Einführung und Auslegung.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, ^{7}1978.

Lohfink, Gerhard. "Das Gleichnis vom Sämann (Mk 4:3-9)". In *Studien zum Neuen Testament.* Stuttgarter Biblische Aufsatzbände, 5. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1989. (91-130)

Lohmeyer, Ernst. *Das Evangelium des Markus.* Kritisch Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, 2/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1937.

Lohr, C. H. "Oral Techniques in the Gospel of Matthew." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 23 (1961): 403-435.

Lövestam, Evald. *Jesus and 'this Generation': a New Testament Study.* Conjectanea Biblica NT, 25. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1995.

Lövestam, Evald. *Spiritus Blasphemia. Eine Studie zu Mk 3,28f par Mt 12,31f, Lk 12,10.* Scripta Minora: Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis, 1966-1967. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1968.

Luck, Ulrich. "Weisheit und Christologie in Mt 11, 25-30." *Wort und Dienst* 13 (1975): 35-51.

Lührmann, Dieter. *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle.* Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 33. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag,

1969.

Lust, Jean. "Septuagint and Messianism with a Special Emphasis on the Pentateuch". In *Theologische Probleme der Septuaginta und der Hellenistischen Hermeneutik.* Edited by Henning Graf Reventlow. Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie, 11. Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser/Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1997. (26-45)

Luz, Ulrich. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* 1-3. EKK, I. Zürich/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benziger/Neukirchener, 1989-1990.

Luz, Ulrich. "Fiktivität und Traditionstreue im Matthäusevangelium im Lichte griechischer Literatur." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 84 (1993): 153-177.

Luz, Ulrich. "Das Matthäusevangelium und die Perspektive einer biblischen Theologie". In *Gesetz als Thema Biblischer Theologie*. Edited by et al. O. Hofius. Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie, 4. Neukirchen-Vluyn: kirchener Verlag, 1989.

Luz, Ulrich. "Q 3-4." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 23 (1984): 374-376.

Luz, Ulrich. "The Son of Man in Matthew: Heavenly Judge or Human Christ." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 48 (1992): 3-21.

Luz, Ulrich. "Vom Taumellolch im Weizenfeld. Ein Beispiel wirkungsgeschichtlicher Hermeneutik". In *Vom Urchristentum zu Jesus*. Edited by Hubert Frankemölle and Karl Kertelge. F.S. Joachim Gnilka. Freiburg: Herder, 1989. (154-171)

Luz, Ulrich. "Die Wundergeschichten von Mt 8-9". In *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament*. Edited by G.F. Hawthorne and O. Betz. Essays in honour of E. Earle Ellis. Grands Rapids, MI/Tübingen: Wm. B. Eerdman/J.C:B. Mohr, 1987. (149-165)

Lybæk, Lena. "Matthew's Use of Hosea 6,6 in the Context of the Sabbath Controversies". In *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by C. Tuckett. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997. (291-299)

Lybæk, Lena. "Wisdom Christology in Matthew". ThM Thesis. Baptist Theological Seminary. Rüschlikon-Switzerland: 1994.

Mann, J. *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue: A Study in the Cycles of Readings from Torah and Prophets, as Well as from Psalms, and in the Structure of the Midrashic Homilies* I. The Libraray of Biblical Studies. New York: Ktav, 1940.

Manson. *The Teaching of Jesus: Studies in its Form and Content*. Cambridge: University Press, [2]1935.

Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. The New International Greek Testament Commentary, 3. Exeter/Grand Rapids: Pater Noster/William B. Eerdmans, 1978.

Massebieau, E. *Examen des citations de l'Ancien Testament dans l'evangile selon saint Matthieu*. Paris1885.

McConnell, Richard S. *Law and Prophecy in Matthew's Gospel: The Authority and Use of the Old Testament in the Gospel of St. Matthew*. Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt Kommissionsverlag, 1969.

McKenzie, J. L. *Second Isaiah: Introduction, Translation and Notes.* The Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 1968.

McLaughlin, John L. "Their Hearts Were Hardened: The Use of Isaiah 6:9-10 in the Book of Isaiah." *Biblica* 75 (1994): 1-25.

McNamara, Martin. *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch.* Analecta Biblica, 27a. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978.

Meier, John P. "John the Baptist in Matthew's Gospel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99, no. 3 (1980): 383-405.

Merklein, Helmut. *Die Gottesherrschaft als Handlungsprinzip. Untersuchungen zur Ethik Jesu*. Forschung zur Bibel, 34. Würzburg: Echter, 1978.

Meyer, Paul W. "Context as a Bearer of Meaning in Matthew." *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 42 (1988): 69-72.

Michaelis, Wilhelm. "῾Οδος." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* V 1967 (1954): 42-96.

Michel, Otto. "Μικρός." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* IV 1967 (1942): 648-659.

Monsengwo-Pasinya, L. "Deux textes messianiques de la Septante: Gn 49,10 et Ez 21,32." *Biblica* 61 (1980): 357-376.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. *He That Cometh*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956.

Müller, Mogens. *The First Bible of the Church: A Plea for the Septuagint*. Copenhagen International Seminar, 1. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series, 206. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Müller, Mogens. "Salvation-History in the Gospel of Matthew: an Example of Biblical Theology". In *New Directions in Biblical Theology: Papers of the Aarhus Conference, 11-19 Sept 1992*. Edited by Sigfred Pedersen. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 76. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994. (55-76)

Müller, Peter. *'Verstehst du auch, was du liest?' Lesen und Verstehen im Neuen Testament*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1994.

Müller, Paul-Gerhardt. *Der Traditionsprozeß im Neuen Testament. Kommunikationsanalytische Studien zur Versprachlichung des Jesusphänomens*. Freiburg: Herder, 1981.

Neirynck, Frans. "La rédaction matheénne et la structure du premier Évangile". In *De Jésus aux Évanglies. Tradition et rédaction dans les Évangiles synoptiques*. Edited by I. de la Potterie et al. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 25. Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1967. (41-73)

Neirynck, Frans. "Q 6,20b-21; 7,22 and Isaiah 61". In *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by Christopher M. Tuckett. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 131. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997. (27-64)

Nepper-Christensen, Poul. *Das Matthäusevangelium. Ein Judenchristliches Evangelium?* Acta Theologica Danica, 1. Århus: Universitetsforlaget, 1958.

Neusner, Jacob. "Scripture and Mishnah: Authority and Selectivity". In *Scripture in Jewish and Christian Traditions: Authority, Interpretation, Relevance*. Edited by Frederick E. Greenspahn. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1982. (65-85)

Neusner, Jacob. *Torah Through the Ages: A Short History of Judaism.* London/Philadelphia: SCM/Trinity, 1990.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. Vols 1-3. Edited by C. Brown. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975-78.

Neyrey, Jerome. "The Thematic Use of Isaiah 42,1-4 in Matthew 12." *Biblica* 63 (1982): 457-473.

Norden, Eduard. *Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte Religiöser Rede.* Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, ^{5}1971[1913].

Oemig, Manfred. "Bedeutung und Funktionen von 'Fiktion' in der alttestamentlichen Geschichtsschreibung." *Evangelische Theologie* (1984): 254-266.

Oepke, Albrecht. "Κρύπτω." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* III (1965): 957-1000.

Orton, David. "Matthew and Other Creative Jewish Writers". In *Crossing the Boundaries. Essays in Biblical Interpretation.* Edited by Stanley E. Porter, et al. FS Michael D. Goulder. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994.

Orton, David. *The Understanding Scribe.* Journal for the Study of the New Testament. Supplement Series, 25. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.

Oswald, Nico. "Elia II." *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 9 (1982): 502-504.

Patte, Daniel. "Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine". DTh Thesis. Chicago: 1971.

Peisher, C.H. "Παραβολή." *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* 2 (1975): 744-45.

Pesch, Rudolf. *Das Markusevangelium* 1. Herder Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, II. Freiburg (Br.): Herder, 1976.

Petersen, David L. *Zechariah 9-14 and Malachi: A Commentary.* Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995.

Pirke Avot. Translated by Jacob Neusner. Torah from our Sages. Chappaqua, NY: Rossel Books, 1984.

Plett, H. F. "Intertextualities." In *Intertextuality.* Research in Text Theory, 15. Edited by H.F. Plett. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1991. (3-29)

Ploch, Winfried. *Jesaja-Worte in der synoptischen Evangelien Tradition.* Dissertationen. Theologische Reihe, 64. St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1993.

Porton, Gary G. "Midrash." *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 4. (1992): 818-822.

Pregeant, Russell. "The Wisdom Passages in Matthew's Story". In *Treasures New and Old: Recent Contributions to Matthean Studies.* Edited by David R. Bauer and Mark Allan Powell. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series, 1. Atlanta, Ga: Scholars Press, 1996. (197-232)

Preuss, H. D. "בוא." *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 1 (1973): 536-568.

Preuss, H.-D. "נוח." *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 5 (1986): 297-307.

Przybylski, Benno. *Righteousness in Matthew and his World of Thought.* Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Puech, Émile. "Une Apocalypse Messianique (4Q521)." *Revue de Qumran* 15 (1972): 475-519.

Rauh, Eckhard. *Reden in Vollmacht. Hintergrund, Form und Anliegen der Gleichnisse Jesu*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 149. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.

Rauscher, Johann. *Vom Messiasgeheimnis zur Lehre der Kirche. Die Entwicklung der sogenannten Parabeltheorie in der Synoptischen Tradition.* Desselbrunn: Rauscher, 1990.

Remus, Harold E. "Miracle (NT)." *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 4 (1992): 856-869.

Rengstorf, Karl Heinrich. "Διδάσκαλος." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* II 1964 (1935): 148-159.

Rengstorf, Karl Heinrich. "Ζύγος in the NT." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* II 1964 (1935): 898-901.

Rengstorf, Karl Heinrich. "Σημεῖον." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* VII 1971 (1964): 200-261.

Riesner, Rainer. *Jesus als Lehrer*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament, 2/7. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1984.

Ringgren, Helmer, et al. "חיה." *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 2 (1977): 393-408.

Ritz, Hans Joachim. "Κρύπτω." *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* II (1981): 797-802.

Roberts, C.H. "Books in the Graeco Roman world and in the New Testament". In *Cambridge History of the Bible*, 1. Cambridge: cambridge University Press, 1970. (48-66)

Robinson, G. "The Idea of Rest in the Old Testament and the Search for the Basic Character of the Sabbath." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 92 (1980): 32-43.

Robinson, J.A.T. "Elijah, John and Jesus: an Essay in Detection." *New Testament Studies* 4 (1958): 263-281.

Rogers, J. S. "Asaph." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 1 (1992): 470-471.

Rösel, Martin. "Die Interpretation von Genesis 49 in der Septuaginta." *Biblische Notizen* 79 (1995): 54-70.

Rothfuchs, Wilhelm. *Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäusevangeliums. Eine biblisch-theologische Untersuchung*. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 88 (5/8). Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1969.

Rowland, Christopher. "Apocalyptic Literature". In *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*. Edited by D.A Carson and Hugh Godfrey Maturin Williamson. FS Barnabas Lindars. Cambridge: University Press, 1988. (170-189)

Sand, Alexander. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. Regensburger Neues Testament. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1986.

Sand, Alexander. *Das Gesetz und die Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Evangelium nach Matthäus*. Biblische Untersuchungen, 11. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1974.

Sato, Migaku. *Q und Prophetie. Studien zur Gattungs- und Traditionsgeschichte der Quelle Q*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament, 2/29. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1988.

Schaper, Joachim. "Die Septuaginta-Psalter als Dokument jüdischer Eschatologie". In *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum*. Edited by Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament, 72. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1994. (38-61)

Schenk, Wolfgang. "Das Präsens historicum als Makrosyntaktischens Gliederungssignal im Matthäusevangelium." *New Testament Studies* 22 (1975-76): 464-475.

Schenk, Wolfgang. *Die Sprache des Matthäus. Die Text-Konstituenten in ihren makro- und mikrostrukturellen Relationen*. Göttingen: Vandehoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.

Schlatter, A. *Der Evangelist Matthäus. Seine Sprache, sein Ziel, seine Selbständigkeit. Ein Kommentar zum Ersten Evangelium*. Stuttgart: Calwer, ^{6}1963[1929].

Schmithals, Walter. *Das Evangelium nach Markus. Kapitel 1-9,1* 1. Ökumenischer Taschenbuch- Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, 2. Gütersloh: GTB Siebenstern, 1979.

Schmithals, Walter. "Die Bedeutung der Evangelien in der Theologiegeschichte bis zur Kanonbildung". In *The Four Gospels*. Edited by et al. F. Van Segbroek. F.S. Frans Neirynck. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992. (129-157)

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel According to St John* 1. Translated by Kevin Smyth. Herder's Theological Commentary on the New Testament. Tunbridge Wells: Burns Oats, 1968[1965].

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. "'Siehe da mein Knecht, den ich erwählt habe ...' (Mt12,18). Zur Heiltätigkeit Jesu im Matthäusevangelium". In *Salz der Erde, Licht der Welt. Exegetische Studien zum Matthäusevangelium*. Edited by L. Oberlinner and P. Fiedler. FS Anton Vögtle. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1991. (203-222)

Schneider, Gerhard. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. Ökumenischer Taschenbuch-Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, 3. Gütersloh: GTB Siebenstern, 1977.

Schneider, Johannes. "Ἔρχομαι, κτλ." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* II 1968 (1935): 666-684.

Schönle, Volker. *Johannes, Jesus und die Juden. Die theologische Position des Matthäus und des Verfassers der Redenquelle im Lichte von Mt 11*. Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie, 17. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1982.

Schrage, Wolfgang. *Das Verhältnis des Thomasevangeliums zur synoptischen Tradition*. Berlin1967.

Schulz, Siegfried. *Q. Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972.

Schürmann, Heinz. *Das Lukasevangelium* 2/1. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, III. Freiburg (Br.): Herder, 1994.

Schweizer, Eduard. *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. Neues Testament Deutsch, 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, ^{5}1978.

Schweizer, Eduard. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. Neues Testament Deutsch, 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, ^{4}1986[1981].

Scott, B.B. *Hear Then the Parable: a Commentary on the Parables of Jesus.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.

Scriba, A. *Geschichte des Motivkomplexes Theophanie.* Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 167. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995.

Seebaß, Horst. "Elia I. Altes Testament." *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 9 (1982): 498-501.

Segbroeck, Frans van. "Les Citations d'accomplissement dans l'Évangile selon saint Matthieu d'après trois ouvrages récents". In *L'Évangile selon Matthieu. Rédaction et Théologie.* Edited by M. Didier. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 29. Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1972. (107-130)

Seim, Turid Karlsen. "Gudsrikets overraskelse. Parablene om et sennepsfrø og en surdeig." *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 84 (1983): 1-17.

Senior, Donald. "The Lure of the Formula Quotations: Re-Assessing Matthew's Use of the Old Testament with the Passion Narrative as Test Case". In *The Scriptures in the Gospel.* Edited by Christopher Tuckett. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 131. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997. (89-115)

Seow, C.L. "Hosea, Book of." *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 3 (1992): 291-297.

Sevenich-Bax, Elisabeth. *Israels Konfrontation mit den letzten Boten der Weisheit.* Münsteraner theologische Abhandlungen, 21. Altenberge: Oros Verlag, 1993.

Sim, David C. *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew.* Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series, 88. London: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Smith, Robert H. "Matthew's Message for Insiders: Charisma and Commandment in a First Century Community." *Interpretation* (1992): 229-240.

Snodgrass, Klyne. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New". In *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New.* Edited by Gregory K. Beale. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1994. (29-51)

Soares-Prabhu, George M. *The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew: An Enquiry into the Tradition History of Mt 1-2.* Analecta Biblica, 63. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1976.

Stanton, Graham. *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992.

Stanton, Graham. "Matthew as a Creative Interpreter of the Sayings of Jesus". In *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992. (326-345)

Stanton, Graham. "Matthew's Use of the Old Testament". In *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992. (346-363)

Stanton, Graham. "The Origin and Purpose of Matthew's Gospel: Matthean Scholarship from 1945-1980." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* II.25.3 (1985): 1889-1951.

Steck, Odil Hannes. *Gottesknecht und Sion. Gesammelte Aufsätze zu Deuterojesaja.* Forschungen zum Alten Testament, 4. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck),

1992.

Steck, Odil Hannes. *Israel und das Gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten.* Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 23. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967.

Steinhauser, Michael G. *Doppelbildworte in den synoptischen Evangelien. Eine Form- und traditionskritische Studie.* Forschung zur Bibel, 44. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1981.

Stemberger, Günter. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash.* Translated by Markus Bockmuehl. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, ²1996[1991].

Stemberger, Günter. "Messias/Messianische Bewegungen II. Judentum." *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 22 (1992): 622-630.

Stendahl, Krister. *The School of St. Matthew and its use of the Old Testament* 20. Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis. Lund²1969[1954].

Stolz, Fritz. "נוח." *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 2 (1975): 43-46.

Strecker, Georg. *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit. Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Matthäus.* Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 82. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.

Strobel, August. *Untersuchungen zum Eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem auf Grund der spätjüdisch-urchristlichen Geschichte von Habakuk 2,2ff.* Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 2. Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1961.

Stuart, Douglas. *Hosea - Jonah.* Word Biblical Commentary. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "'Messias'. Texte in den Schriften von Qumran". In *Mogilany 1993: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Edited by Zdzislaw J. Kapera. In Memory of Hans Burgmann. Kraków: Enigma, 1996. (129-139)

Stambaugh, John E., and David L. Balch. *The New Testament in its Social Environment.* Edited by Wayne A. Meeks. Library of Early Christianity, 2. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986.

Suggs, M. Jack. *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Suhl, Alfred. *Die Funktion alttestamentlicher Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium.* Gütersloh: Güterlsoher Verlagshaus (Gerd Mohn), 1965.

Tabor, J. D., and M.O. Wise. "4Q521 'On Resurrection' and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition: A Preliminary Study." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* (1992): 149-162.

Theißen, Gerd. "Das 'schwankende Rohr' in Mt 11.7 und die Gründungsmünzen Tiberias." *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palestina Vereins* 101 (1985): 43-55.

Theißen, Gerd. *Urchristliche Wundergeschichten. Ein Beitrag zur formgeschichtlichen Erforschung der synoptischen Evangelien.* Studien zum Neuen Testament. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus (Gerd Mohn), 1974.

Then, Reinhold. *'Gibt es denn keinen mehr unter den Propheten?' Zum Fortgang der alttestamentlichen Prophetie in frühjüdischer Zeit.* Beiträge zur Erforschung des AltenTestaments und des Antiken Judentums, 22. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang,

1990.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vols. I-X. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964-76.

Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Vols. 1-2. Edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann. München: Keiser, 1971-1976.

Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Vols. 1- . Edited by G.J. Botterweck, et al. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1970-.

Thompson, Thomas L. "Historiography (Israelite)." *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 3 (1992): 206-212.

Tilly, Michael. *Johannes der Täufer und die Biographie der Propheten. Die synoptische Täuferüberlieferung und das jüdische Prophetenbild zur Zeit des Täufers.* Beiträge zur Wissenschaft zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 137. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1994.

Tov, Emmanuel. "The Septuagint". In *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity.* Edited by Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling. Aassen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress, 1988. (161-188)

Townsend, John T. "Education (Greco-Roman Period)." *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 2 (1992): 312-317.

Trautmann, Maria. *Zeichenhafte Handlungen Jesu. Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach dem geschichtlichen Jesus.* Forschung zur Bibel, 37. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1980.

Trilling, Wolfgang. *Das Wahre Israel.* Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 10. München: Koesel, ^{3}1964.

Trilling, Wolfgang. "Die Täufertradition bei Matthäus." *BZ* 3 (1959): 271-289.

Tuckett, Christopher M. *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.

Vermes, Geza. "Bible and Midrash: Early Old Testament Exegesis". In *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, 1. Edited by P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Verseput, Donald. *The Rejection of the Humble Messianic King: A Study of the Composition of Matthew 11-12.* European University Studies. Theology, 291. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1986.

Vögtle, Anton "Das Spruch vom Jonaszeichen". In *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien. Beiträge zum Evangelienforschung.* Kommentare und Beiträge zum Neuen Testament. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1971.

Vögtle, Anton. "Wunder und Wort in Urchristlicher Glaubenswerbung". In *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien. Beiträge zum Evangelienforschung.* Kommentare und Beiträge zum Neuen Testament. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1971. (219-242)

Walker, Rolf. *Die Heilsgeschichte im ersten Evangelium.* Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 91. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.

Weder, Hans. *Die Gleichnisse Jesu als Metaphern. Traditions und redaktionsgeschichtlicehn Analysen und Interpretationen.* Forschungen zur

Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 120. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.

Weiser, Arthur. *The Psalms*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1962.

Wendel, Ute. *Jesaja und Jeremia. Worte, Motive und Einsichten Jesajas in der Verkündigung Jeremias*. Biblisch Theologische Studien, 25. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1995.

Wenham, Gordon J. *Genesis 16-50*. Word Biblical Commentary, 2. Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1994.

Wentling, J.L. "A Comparison of the Elijah Motifs in the Gospel of Matthew and Mark." *Proceedings of the Eastern Great Lakes Biblical Seminar* 2 (1982): 104-125.

Weren, Wim. "Jesus' Entry into Jerusalem: Mt 21:1-17 in the Light of the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint". In *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by Christopher Tuckett. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 131. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997. (117-141)

Westermann, Claus. *Genesis 37-50*. Biblische Kommentare, I/3. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1982.

Westermann, Claus. *Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary*. Translated by David M.G. Stalker. London: SCM Press, 1969[1966].

Wilkens, Wilhelm. "Die Redaktion des Gleichniskapitels Mark. 4 durch Matth." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 20, no. 5 (1964): 305-327.

Wink, Walter. *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

Worton, Michael and Judith Still, eds. *Intertextuality: Theories and Practices*. Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 1990.

Wouters, Armin. *'...wer den Willen meines Vaters tut'. Eine Untersuchung zum Verständnis vom Handeln im Matthäusevangelium*. Biblische Untersuchungen, 23. Regensburg: Pustet, 1992.

Zeller, Dieter. "Θησαυρός." *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* II (1981): 371-375.

Zimmerli, Walther. *Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 1-24*. Hermeneia. Translated by R. E. Clements. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979[1969].

Zwick, Reinhold. *Montage im Markusevangelium. Studien zur narrativen Organisation der ältesten Jesusersählung*. Stuttgarter Biblische Beiträge, 18. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1989.