

J. ANDREW DOOLE

What was Mark for Matthew?

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe*

344

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Herausgeber / Editor

Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors

Friedrich Avemarie † (Marburg)

Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford)

James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)

Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL)

Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg)

344



J. Andrew Doole

What was Mark for Matthew?

An Examination of Matthew's Relationship
and Attitude to his Primary Source

Mohr Siebeck

J. ANDREW DOOLE, born 1984; 2007 BA (Hons) in Theology at the University of Oxford; 2011 Doctoral Thesis submitted to the Theology Faculty at the University of Marburg.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-152538-4

ISBN 978-3-16-152536-0

ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2013 by Mohr Siebeck Tübingen. www.mohr.de

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Nehren on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

In memory of Mary Wilson
6th April 1923 – 10th November 2010

Preface

This monograph is a revised version of my doctoral thesis, which was submitted to the Fachbereich Evangelischer Theologie at the Philipps-Universität Marburg in January 2011. I would like to thank everyone at the faculty for their support, guidance, friendship and instruction during my ‘exile’, for Marburg quickly became my home away from home. The Graeca reading group, Aramaic courses and Syriac classes proved a welcome distraction from the world of gospel commentaries and synoptic parallels which otherwise dominated my life for the past few years.

My thanks extend to my teachers at Oxford who not only introduced me to the texts of ancient Judaism and early Christianity, but also nurtured the aspiring young academic within me and helped me to hone my critical reading of religious literature with their own unique insights and observations. Rev. Peter Southwell guided me through my degree and was truly a rôle model for me in both his accomplished scholarship and genteel conduct. It was Fr. Nicholas King S.J. with his “Greek Lunch” who taught me both how to read between the lines of my synopsis and how to ask questions not only of my teachers, but of the texts themselves. The excursion to the Holy Land with him and our group was a life-changing experience. Finally, I thank my New Testament tutor David Wenham, whose wisdom, honesty, knowledge and faith led me to a greater love of the gospels of Jesus Christ.

The research I undertook, the ideas I came up with, and the proposals I presented, were all discussed and assessed critically and honestly by my friends and colleagues at the *Exegetischer Arbeitskreis* in Marburg. The relaxed yet professional manner in which these sessions were and still are conducted provides the student who is presenting his or her research with helpful guidance concerning the approach, wording, flow and value of the the paper in question. Of greatest importance for me was the feedback I received from the very beginning until the very end from Prof. Angela Standhartinger. Her knowledge of ancient literature was matched by her ability to see both the problems and potential in the ideas I put forward, and her kindness and humour were always reassuring and supportive.

I am also thankful for the opportunity afforded me to consult two of the most accomplished Matthean scholars in the German-speaking world and to discuss my thesis with them. Prof. Ulrich Luz in Laupen (Bern) and

Prof. Matthias Konradt in Heidelberg both accepted my requests for feedback and listened kindly and patiently while I outlined my thoughts on what is, after all, a well-documented area of New Testament criticism. I was and remain fully aware that the goal I have set myself is to disagree with these two great minds, and was not surprised to receive an immediate response from both, focussing on the weaknesses and difficulties of my argument. The conversations I had with both were friendly and demanding, and I am grateful to them for their interest and advice.

I must also thank Prof. Helmut Koester in Harvard, whose enthusiasm for my work and invitation to Cambridge afforded me the opportunity not only to benefit from the library facilities at the Divinity School but to see how things are done on the other side of the pond and to discuss my work with young American scholars. It was during my time at Harvard that I formulated the central tenet of my thesis on Matthew's relationship to Mark and Q. I must also thank those at the *Dr. Wolff'sche Stiftung* in Marburg for funding my brief but valuable stay in the United States.

Prof. Jörg Frey kindly accepted my dissertation for publication in this series, and I am grateful to Dr. Henning Ziebritzki and his staff, foremost Tanja Idler, for professionalism and expertise in helping me to prepare this book for the printers.

None of this would have been possible without the love and patience of my parents, Alan and May, who never once gave voice to any concerns they might have had about sending their only son overseas. Only when the curtains were finally hung in a small flat in central Marburg did it finally cease to be a family holiday and become a new chapter in our family history. The little university town on the Lahn soon became the favourite holiday resort of the Dooles, and I am always grateful that they shared with me the warmth, love and joy of a Christian family.

I was always the most important person in the world to my grandmother, Mary Wilson. She was my 'granny', and I her only grandson. I soon became her 'big' grandson, and she was as proud of me as it is possible for a humble, wise, Christian lady to be. I owe her more than I can show, and it is therefore to her memory that this book is lovingly dedicated.

I would finally like to thank the most important person behind this book, although it is too late to do so. My *Doktorvater*, Prof. Friedrich Avemarie, supervised my research on Matthew's use of his sources from day one. It was he who accepted my request to complete research under him in Marburg, although we had never met. It was he who brought me to a foreign country and looked after me like a father. It was he who welcomed me into his home to discuss what contribution I could make to modern gospel scholarship, and whose own interests and insights guided my work in its early stages. It was he who continued to demand more detailed

exegesis, more thorough consideration of possible alternatives, more refined explanation of the implications of my proposals. It was he whose approval I sought when I looked for the little pencilled-in 'O.K.'s in the margin of my manuscripts. It was he who was with me right until the end, and who first congratulated me on the successful completion of my *examen rigorosum*. It was he who oversaw the improvements I had to make to my dissertation before it could be published in this series. It is he whom I shall now miss as my journey in life continues without him. Friedrich was a teacher, a supporter, a paragon and a friend. It was a joy to work under him and a joy to know him. Thank you, Friedrich.

Marburg, Jan. 2013

J. Andrew Doole

Contents

| | |
|---|--------|
| Preface | VII |
| Abbreviations | XV |
| Chapter 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1. Statement of the Problem | 1 |
| 1.2. <i>Point de départ</i> | 1 |
| 1.3. <i>Forschungsgeschichte</i> | 4 |
| 1.4. Thesis | 10 |
| 1.5. Method | 12 |
| Chapter 2. Matthew's Sources | 14 |
| 2.1. Mark | 15 |
| 2.1.1. The Text of Mark | 15 |
| 2.1.2. The Genre of Mark | 17 |
| 2.1.3. The Status of Mark | 23 |
| 2.2. Q | 26 |
| 2.2.1. The Text of Q | 26 |
| 2.2.2. The Genre of Q | 28 |
| 2.2.3. The Status of Q | 30 |
| 2.3. M | 32 |
| 2.3.1. Independent Tradition or Dependent on Mark? | 33 |
| 2.3.2. Oral or Written? | 35 |
| 2.3.3. The Rôle of M in Matthew | 36 |
| 2.4. The Jewish Scriptures | 38 |
| 2.4.1. Version(s) | 39 |
| 2.4.2. Scripture References in Matthew's Copy of Mark | 40 |
| 2.4.3. Prophecy | 42 |
| 2.4.4. Law | 43 |
| 2.4.5. Matthew's Use of the Jewish Scriptures as a Source | 44 |
| 2.5. Matthew's Sources: A Summary | 45 |

| | |
|--|---------|
| Chapter 3. Mark or Q? | 47 |
| 3.1. A 'Q' Submission? | 48 |
| 3.2. Matthew's Use of Mark in Mt 3-11 | 51 |
| 3.3. Matthew's Use of Q | 69 |
| 3.4. Matthew in the Markan Tradition | 78 |
| 3.5. The Matthean Trajectory | 79 |
| Chapter 4. A New Edition of Mark | 81 |
| 4.1. Matthew's Use of Mark in Mt 12-28 | 82 |
| 4.2. Aspects of Matthew's Edition of Mark | 100 |
| 4.2.1. Additions | 100 |
| 4.2.2. Omissions | 107 |
| 4.2.3. Amendments | 112 |
| 4.2.4. Continuity | 118 |
| 4.3. Matthew as a New Edition of Mark | 128 |
| Chapter 5. A Conventional Scribe | 129 |
| 5.1. Technique | 130 |
| 5.1.1. Review of Previous Contributions | 130 |
| 5.1.2. Ancient Convention | 136 |
| 5.2. Examples from Ancient Authors | 144 |
| 5.2.1. Josephus: Contra Apionem | 144 |
| 5.2.2. Paul: Quotations from the Jewish Scriptures | 149 |
| 5.2.3. The Temple Scroll | 157 |
| 5.3. Writing a Gospel | 164 |
| 5.3.1. Sources and Paperwork | 164 |
| 5.3.2. Content | 169 |
| 5.4. The Conventional Evangelist | 173 |
| Chapter 6. Mark in the Eyes of Matthew | 175 |
| 6.1. Matthew's Proximity to Mark | 175 |
| 6.2. Matthew's Development of Mark | 178 |
| 6.3. Matthew's Continuity with Mark | 183 |

| | |
|---|---------|
| 6.4. The Authority of Mark | 186 |
| 6.5. The Replacement of Mark | 189 |
| 6.6. Matthew's Attitude to Mark: What was Mark for Matthew? | 193 |
| Results | 195 |
| Bibliography | 197 |
| Index of Ancient Sources | 211 |
| Index of Modern Authors | 219 |
| Index of Subjects | 222 |

Abbreviations

| | |
|---------|---|
| Mt | The Gospel of Matthew |
| Mk | The Gospel of Mark |
| Lk | The Gospel of Luke |
| Jn | The Gospel of John |
| Q | The 'Sayings Source' Q |
| NTG | <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> |
| OT | The Hebrew Bible ('Old Testament') |
| MT | Masoretic Text |
| LXX | <i>Septuaginta</i> |
| LAB | The <i>Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum</i> of Pseudo-Philo |
| CD | The Damascus Document (Qumran) |
| | |
| AJEC | Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity |
| ALGHJ | Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums |
| ANRW | Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt |
| ANTZ | Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte |
| ASNU | <i>Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis</i> |
| BETL | <i>Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium</i> |
| BFcT | Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie |
| BhT | Beiträge zur historischen Theologie |
| BibT | Bible Today |
| BPC | Biblical Performance Criticism |
| BZNW | Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft |
| CBQ | Catholic Biblical Quarterly |
| CSCT | Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition |
| EKK NT | Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament |
| ExpT | Expository Times |
| FRLANT | Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des alten und neuen Testaments |
| GP | Gospel Perspectives |
| HNT | Handbuch zum Neuen Testament |
| HThK NT | Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament |
| HZ | Historische Zeitschrift |
| ICC | International Critical Commentary |
| JBL | Journal of Biblical Literature |
| JGRChJ | Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism |
| JHS | Journal of Hellenic Studies |
| JRS | Journal of Roman Studies |
| JSNT | Journal for the Study of the New Testament |
| JSNTSup | Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series |
| JSPSup | Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series |
| JThSt | Journal of Theological Studies |
| LCL | Loeb Classical Library |

| | |
|---------|--|
| LNTS | Library of New Testament Studies (formerly JSNTSup) |
| NovTSup | <i>Novum Testamentum</i> : Supplement Series |
| NTOA | <i>Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus</i> |
| NTS | New Testament Studies |
| ÖTK NT | Ökumenischer Taschenbuchkommentar zum Neuen Testament |
| PAAJR | Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research |
| RHPR | Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses |
| SBB | Stuttgarter Biblische Beiträge |
| SBL MS | Society of Biblical Literature: Monograph Series |
| SBS | Stuttgarter Bibelstudien |
| SE | <i>Studia Evangelica</i> |
| SJT | Scottish Journal of Theology |
| SNTS MS | Society of New Testament Studies: Monograph Series |
| STDJ | Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah |
| ThR NF | Theologische Rundschau Neue Folge |
| ThLZ | Theologische Literaturzeitung |
| ThZ | Theologische Zeitschrift |
| TSAJ | Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism |
| UNT | Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament |
| WdF | Wege der Forschung |
| WMANT | Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament |
| WUNT | Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament |
| ZNW | Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft |
| ZPE | Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik |

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1. Statement of the Problem

The gospel of Mark appears to have proven an overnight success. Not only has its early record of Jesus' life been handed down to posterity, but it was adopted by two subsequent evangelists, who may indeed have been inspired by its popularity and suitability. However its appeal was limited; both latter evangelists showed some degree of dissatisfaction with the text, and following the publication of their longer works, Mark's popularity would inevitably wane.¹ The brief period of Mark's unparalleled success and its zenith in the ancient world remain shrouded in mystery. It is hoped that Matthew, one of Mark's earliest witnesses,² may shed some light on the influence of this enigmatic gospel and its reception in the early Christian community.

1.2. *Point de départ*

In the study of the synoptic gospels the term 'redaction' is used of the work undertaken by Matthew and Luke upon their sources,³ while 'redaction criticism' seeks to reveal the trends in the work of these evangelists. Yet what is 'redaction'? What is happening when an author adopts and adapts an inherently religious text? It is the ambiguity of this phenomenon which has provided the motivation for the following study.

The pivotal text is the Gospel of Mark. Many features common to the 'synoptic' gospels derive to a large extent from common dependence on Mark, rather than from generic Christian tradition or accepted literary

¹ Cf. e.g., LÜHRMANN, *Markus*, p.1, who notes the scarce manuscript evidence for Mark and *ibid.*, p.16, the rare citation of Mark in patristic literature. Cf. also PETERSEN, "Evangelienüberschriften", p.255–257.

² FREYNE, "Jewish Contexts", p.192–193: "Matthew's gospel is our best indicator of how Mark was received."

³ KIRK, "Orality, Writing, and Phantom Sources", p.22, provides the following definition: "Redaction is the means by which written tradition is articulated for new or altered contexts of reception; its wide range may be understood as the effect of the persistence of oral practices and habits into the scribal cultivation of the written tradition in a mixed media cultural environment of pervasive orality."

function. It is Mark and John who are equals in their creativity;⁴ furthermore, they are not alone.⁵ Mark however has the title τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, *the* gospel.⁶ Luke (Lk 1:1–4) informs us of previous accounts (διηγήσεις) by other authors (πολλοί); he posits no claim to absolute originality. It is Matthew however whose early appearance on the literary scene is of interest to this study; his work may clearly be said to follow the example of Mark, even without a specified aim.⁷ Although the two were originally believed to have emerged independently,⁸ their similarity is now generally accepted as attributable to Matthew's faithful reproduction of his source text Mark.⁹

This study is based on the following generally accepted theories concerning the Matthean context.¹⁰ Its conclusions will seek to support such proposals concerning the genesis of Matthew's Gospel. If my conclusions convince, the theories, for such they remain, are supported, and perhaps strengthened; if they fail to convince, it is not to the detriment of such proposals.

I follow the general consensus concerning the date and location of Matthew, positing a date between CE 70–100, probably within the frame CE 80–95,¹¹ and a Syrian provenance.¹² As with all Christian movements at

⁴ STANTON, *Gospels and Jesus*, p.20: "Mark and John have both developed what is, at least in part, a new form of writing." In the course of this study I have no reason to postulate as to the possibility of John having been familiar with the Gospel of Mark, cf., e.g., BAUCKHAM, "John for Readers of Mark"; KIEFFER, "Jean et Marc", &c.

⁵ Cf. Q, the Gospel of Thomas, the Gospel of Peter &c.

⁶ The term εὐαγγέλιον is almost always presented with the article, both in the New Testament (on 74 of 76 occasions) and in the apostolic fathers (Didache, Ignatius, Polycarp, 2 Clement). This may be because the Christian audience is familiar with *the* good news in question (AUNE, "Genre Theory", p.162). See further discussion of this title in 2.1.2. *The Genre of Mark*.

⁷ In both Luke and John we are provided with a motive (Lk 1:4, Jn 20:31); AUNE, *Literary Environment*, p.59: "Neither Mark nor Matthew provides an explicit statement of his literary intentions."

⁸ Papias (Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* III 39:15–17); Irenaeus (*ibid.* V 8:2–3); Origen (*ibid.* VI 25:4–5).

⁹ BECKER & RUNESSON, "Introduction", p.9: "One could perhaps even say that this literary and theological interaction created the phenomenon of what may be called 'Christian literary culture'. However, this fails to take into account the central position of Paul in early Christian literature."

¹⁰ ROBINSON, "Trajectory", p.122: "The future of synoptic criticism does in fact lie in moving forward upon the basis of the progress that has been made, not in returning to rightly discarded alternatives."

¹¹ DAVIES & ALLISON, *Matthew*, I, p.138; SIM, *Matthew*, p.40; LUZ, *Matthäus*, I, p.76; GNILKA, *Matthäusevangelium*, II, p.250; MEIER, *Antioch*, p.17; VIVIANO, *Matthew and his World*, p.4; O'LEARY, *Judaization*, p.106–107. Cf. BECKER, "Dating Mark and Matthew as Ancient Literature", for the most recent discussion.

¹² DAVIES & ALLISON, *Matthew*, I, p.143–147; SIM, *Matthew*, p.51–62; LUZ, *Matthäus*, I, p.73–75; SCHWEIZER, *Matthäus und seine Gemeinde*, p.138–140; BACON, *Studies in Matthew*, p.15–23; GNILKA, *Matthäusevangelium*, II, p.515; VIVIANO, *Matthew and his World*, p.4; STARK, "Antioch as the Social Situation for Matthew's Gospel".

this time, Matthew's community remains "within the orbit of Judaism".¹³ The originality of Mark is assumed on literary grounds, as I agree with LUZ: "Die Zwei-Quellen-Hypothese ist m.E. diejenige Grundhypothese, auf deren Basis sich die synoptische Frage am leichtesten lösen läßt."¹⁴ Even in a study which is generally critical of assumptions on the synoptic tradition, SANDERS admits, "Mark has most closely followed the sequence of events in the Ur-gospel."¹⁵ So Markan priority appears most probable.¹⁶ The task before Matthew¹⁷ is not inconsiderable, yet it is his ability as a scribe which determines the course of his Christian vocation.¹⁸ Matthew may be one of a small class of early Christian scribes (Mt 13:52). In New Testament literature the scribal profession is not in itself shunned, but is by no means honoured as a central ministry in the new Christian movement.¹⁹ Matthew thus betrays his identity in listing 'scribe' as among the valid ecclesial positions (Mt 23:34).²⁰ Finally, we must take care to distinguish between the evangelist and his traditions. 'Matthew' is for us the skilful redactional hand at work in the composition of the gospel.²¹

Once Mark's status as a source text for Matthew is generally accepted,²² we encounter a variety of studies which seek to explain the redactional work of the latter, especially since a key essay by BORNKAMM in 1946: "Matthäus ist nicht nur Tradent der Erzählung, sondern auch ihr ältester

¹³ SIM, *Matthew*, p.5–6; therefore, *ibid.*, p.25: "It is more appropriate to speak of Christian Judaism than of Jewish Christianity." VIVIANO, *Matthew and his World*, p.7–8; OVERMAN, *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism*; Senior, "Between Two Worlds". SALDARINI, *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*, p.7: "Israel is the concrete community of Jews from which Matthew has been banned, but to which he still thinks he belongs." However LUZ, *Matthäus*, I, p.89: "Hinsichtlich ihrer Grundrituale unterscheidet [...] sich [die Gemeinde] also nicht von den meisten anderen Jesusgemeinden, obwohl es zu diesen Grundritualen jüdische Konkurrenzrituale gibt." SIM, "Current State of Research", p.38–40, provides an overview of scholars who advocate either position on Matthew's community.

¹⁴ LUZ, *Matthäus*, I, p.49.

¹⁵ SANDERS, *Tendencies*, p.277.

¹⁶ Cf. STREETER, *Four Gospels*, p.149–332; TUCKETT, *Revival*, p.186–187; WOOD, "The Priority of Mark".

¹⁷ Discussion of a possible connection to the *disciple* Matthew is not necessary, nor is the *number* of *Matthews* at work on the gospel important. The thesis concerns the attitude of the redactor(s) towards Mark, whoever and however many they may have been.

¹⁸ For discussions of the nature of the title 'scribe' applied to Matthew, see ORTON, *The Understanding Scribe*; COPE, *Scribe*; GOULDER, *Midrash*, p.5 and p.13; BACON, *Studies in Matthew*, p.497.

¹⁹ Cf. e.g. 1 Cor 1:20, where Paul appears to mock the profession, and 1 Cor 12:28 // Eph 4:11, where the scribe is not listed among the early Christian ministries.

²⁰ Of course, scribes are nonetheless portrayed very much as among the opponents of Jesus in Matthew's Gospel.

²¹ As HAINES-EITZEN, *Guardians of Letters*, p.106, points out, while in Roman society scribes tended to be slaves, early Christian scribes were the very users of their own texts.

²² Usually, but not always, under the two-document hypothesis.

Exeget.”²³ Matthew is, according to *Redaktionsgeschichte*, the exegete or interpreter of the gospel of Mark and the Q and M traditions, and the study of this aspect of gospel criticism provides much useful insight into the question of Matthew’s attitude to his principal source.

1.3. *Forschungsgeschichte*

Nearly four decades of redaction critical studies have shown that Matthew has placed his own stamp firmly on the traditions he uses.²⁴

The considerable success of redaction criticism in determining the Matthean viewpoint provides the framework for this study; however the need for such an investigation is based on the apparent failure of previous attempts to determine the very nature of Matthew’s attitude to Mark. A brief outline of some major contributions towards a statement of the problem at hand will reveal the context of the issue and the current lack of a tenable solution.

ALLEN, in his 1907 commentary, begins with a lengthy analysis of Matthew’s adaptation of Mark,²⁵ yet provides no explanation of our redactor’s motivation. His approach, originally designed purely in support of the Two-Document Hypothesis,²⁶ allows a key insight into the mechanics of gospel redaction, involving the rôle of memory in the rearrangement of pericopae without recourse to the unrolling of scrolls.²⁷

VON DOBSCHÜTZ (1928) suggested that Matthew took the idea of composing a more comprehensive gospel from Luke:

Der Gedanke, die Darstellung der öffentlichen Wirksamkeit Jesu (Markus) durch das Voranschicken einer Jugendgeschichte zu einem Bios auszuweiten, entspricht ganz der Art des literarisch gebildeten Hellenisten Lukas. Es ist nicht eben wahrscheinlich, daß die beiden Evangelisten, die eine Kindheitsgeschichte bieten, ganz unabhängig voneinander auf diesen Gedanken gekommen sind. Matthäus dürfte die Anregung dazu von Lukas bekommen haben, wenn er in seiner Ausführung auch ganz eigene Wege geht. Auch der Gedanke, einer Erzählung des Markus den Redestoff von Q einzuarbeiten, scheint mir bei

²³ BORNKAMM, “Die Sturmstillung im Mattäusevanglium”, in *Idem*, *Überlieferung*, p.51. HELD, *ibid.*, p.155, describes Matthew as a “zielbewußter Interpret”. Indeed GOOD-ACRE, “Intertextual Reading”, p.73, remarks, “In a great deal of New Testament Scholarship, there is a love affair going on with Mark alongside a polite and patient disdain for his first interpreter, Matthew.”

²⁴ STANTON, *A Gospel*, p.326.

²⁵ ALLEN, *Matthew*, p.xiii–xl.

²⁶ ALLEN, *Matthew*, p.xxxv: “It is hoped that the facts collected above will be sufficient to convince the reader that of the two Gospels, that of S. Mark is primary, that of S. Matthew secondary.”

²⁷ See below, 3.2. *Matthew’s Use of Mark in Mt 3–11 and 5. A Conventional Scribe.*

Lukas seine erste Stelle zu haben [...] während Matthäus eine weit komplizierte Verarbeitung der beiden Quellen darstellt.²⁸

This position requires Matthew's familiarity with Luke, if not with his gospel content *per se*, then certainly with his approach.²⁹ However, it may be that Matthew's inspiration came from Mark alone. BACON, who views Matthew as five 'books',³⁰ argues, "Mt frames his gospel as though expressly [...] to supplement Mk as [...] an 'orderly' syntax of the Lord's logia."³¹ However, such a desire for an 'orderly' account again suggests more a Lukan concern (Lk 1:3) than a Matthean.³² The order of Matthew's gospel is essentially that of Mark, with a decoration of supplementary traditions, as STREETER observes, "The narratives peculiar to Matthew [...] stand to Mark as mistletoe to the oak."³³ Matthew often simply adds logia or teaching material to the Markan context. However this theory of 'supplementation' does not explain sufficiently Matthew's adoption of Mark, as he also edits the Markan content. He expands Mark, while not content to leave his major source in its received form.

BORNKAMM takes steps towards a more thorough description. He describes Matthew's work as a "charakteristische Abwandlung des überlieferten Stoffes".³⁴ In the same publication, HELD explains the dual nature of Matthew's redaction, viz. 'tradition and interpretation' (*Überlieferung und Auslegung*):

Der Interpret ist hier sozusagen zugleich Tradent. Er bringt nicht eigentlich einen neuen Gedanken an die Überlieferung heran, vielmehr beweist er sich im genauen Sinn des Wortes als ihr Exeget, der ausführt, was in ihr enthalten ist.³⁵

We now see that Matthean redaction reflects at the same time a desire to impart the tradition and a perceived need to provide correct interpretation. Thus BONNARD notes the paradox of Matthew's use of Mark:

²⁸ VON DOBSCHÜTZ, *Matthäus als Rabbi und Katechet*, p.345–346.

²⁹ Cf. e.g. HENGEL, *Vier Evangelien*, p.274–353, who argues for Matthew drawing on both Mark and Luke.

³⁰ BACON, *Studies in Matthew*, p.82: "No attempt to define the nature and purpose of Mt's revision of Mk is adequate which does not bring into true perspective this constructive feature of the work."

³¹ BACON, *ibid.*, p.80. Cf. GOULDER, *Midrash*, p.27.

³² I am inclined to agree with GUNDRY, *Matthew*, p.10: "We should avoid imposing an outline on Matthew. It is doubtful that the first evangelist thought in terms of one." Cf. the review in BAUER, *Structure*, p.136–142, where various colourful attempts to define the structure of the gospel are outlined.

³³ STREETER, *Four Gospels*, p.502.

³⁴ BORNKAMM, *Überlieferung*, p.11.

³⁵ HELD, *Überlieferung*, p.284.

Même là où il y a eu dépendance littéraire directe d'un évangile par rapport à un autre, cette dépendance s'est effectuée dans un esprit étonnant de profonde fidélité en même temps que de grande liberté. C'est ce deuxième point qui nous a surtout frappés.³⁶

He continues:

Nous pensons qu'il est incontestable que Mat. a utilisé Mc. (et que Mc. n'a pas connu un proto-Mat. araméen); mais il l'a précisément utilisé; il ne l'a pas recopié; il ne le considérerait donc pas comme un texte sacré, intouchable, [...] le rendant plus clair [...] le reproduisant parfois mot pour mot (surtout lorsqu'il s'agit d'une déclaration de Jésus).³⁷

This surprising use of Mark demands some explanation. DAVIES and ALLISON note Matthew's conservative tendencies and his desire to replace his source:

The author of Matthew does, in our judgement, deserve the label 'conservative redactor'. This is because the vast bulk of his book was to hand in the tradition[. However] Matthew found it did not suffice to be simply a channel for tradition: he had to become a source.³⁸

One alternative is provided by GOULDER, who, in his *magnum opus* 'Midrash and Lection in Matthew' (1974), suggested that Matthew was "adapting Mark by midrash and through lection".³⁹ This has been the most comprehensive effort to answer the key question of Matthew's attitude to Mark; while it proves for many somewhat unsatisfactory, especially in its reliance upon the Farrer Hypothesis,⁴⁰ an analysis of GOULDER's proposals will be necessary for the present investigation.⁴¹

A further contribution is provided by BAUCKHAM, who observes, "No one imagines all three evangelists belonged to the same local Christian community."⁴² Mark's gospel clearly circulated, and Matthew, in his attempt to supersede Mark, presumably also wrote his gospel with a view to quite widespread circulation.⁴³ It seems unlikely that the new edition would

³⁶ BONNARD, *Matthieu*, p.8.

³⁷ *Ibid.*.

³⁸ DAVIES & ALLISON, *Matthew*, I, p.95–96. Cf. HECKEL, *Vom Evangelium des Markus zum viergestaltigen Evangelium*, p.76,79 and SIM, "Matthew's Use of Mark: Did Matthew intend to supplement or to replace his primary source?"

³⁹ GOULDER, *Midrash*, p.475.

⁴⁰ I.e. Luke's familiarity with Matthew, see FARRER, "On dispensing with Q", p. 55–88.

⁴¹ See below, 6.2. *Matthew's Development of Mark*.

⁴² BAUCKHAM, "For whom were the gospels written?", p.12.

⁴³ BAUCKHAM therefore contests the entire notion of a gospel addressing directly and uniquely the concerns of a local community, *ibid.*, p.28: "[I]t seems unlikely that anyone would expect a *bios* to address the very specific circumstances of a small community of people [...] its relevance would be pitched in relatively broad terms for any competent reader." He provides as evidence the shift from oral to written testimony, *ibid.*, p.30: "[T]he very act of writing a book would naturally suggest the possibility of communicating with Greek-speaking Christians everywhere.". The theory is supported by

serve only 'the Matthean community'. Its resemblance in both form and content to its predecessor would allow it in turn to travel and influence other Christian communities, as an improved and more comprehensive gospel. Such similarity allows STANTON to describe Matthew as "inspired by his sources"⁴⁴ and LUZ stresses Matthew as "eine Neufassung des Markusevangeliums"⁴⁵, "eine Neuausgabe des Markusevangeliums",⁴⁶ a "neues Markusevangelium".⁴⁷ It is also LUZ who comes closest to posing the question at the heart of this thesis:

Wichtiger als die Frage, welche Quellen der Evangelist benutzt hat, ist die Frage, wie er sie benutzt hat. Die Analyse des Aufbaus ergab, daß der Evangelist kein freier Schriftsteller war, sondern sich in hohem Maß vor allem von seiner Hauptquelle Markus bestimmen lassen wollte. Die Analyse der Einzeltexte wird zeigen, daß Matthäus das Markusevangelium sehr gut kennt, auch vorausschauend redigiert und in vielen Fällen Worte aus weggelassenen Markusversen an anderer Stelle wiederverwendet. Es ist, als ob der Evangelist trotz seiner erheblichen Kürzungen soviel Markustext wie möglich verwenden wollte!⁴⁸

Matthew goes to great length to include as much of Mark as possible, and thus renders it no longer necessary.⁴⁹ LUZ then provides a fitting background account for the generation of the gospel, as Q communities fled to

BURRIDGE, "Gospel Genres and Audiences", p.126: "Unlike static communities, authors move around, collecting ideas and developing their understanding. Their ideas get refined by wider experience and by the collection of source material [...]. This process is acknowledged by Luke in the preface to his Gospel." Also, FREYNE, "Jewish Contexts", p.179: "The idea espoused by some scholars that behind every text there is a discreet community, hermetically sealed from all others and thus free to engage in its own myth-making in glorious isolation, is patently false." However, later he qualifies this, advising against the idea of general publication for all Christian communities as early as the first century (*ibid.*, p.194). LAST, "Communities That Write", considers the issue with particular interest in the collective process of writing in ancient associations, and concludes, p.195–196, "[W]riters intending to publish would want to ensure that their names were firmly associated with their works. [...] The gospels [...] were not originally meant to be released from their community's control, or, in other words, published." Cf. ESLER, "Community and Gospel in Early Christianity".

⁴⁴ STANTON, "Origin and Purpose", p.1900. Cf. NEIRYNCK, "La rédaction matthéenne", p.71: "[L]e rédacteur pouvait s'inspirer de ses sources."

⁴⁵ LUZ, *Matthäus*, I, p.80, and *ibid.* "nicht eine Neufassung von Q". Cf. GOULDER, *Midrash*, p.34: "It is neither a free paraphrase of Mark, nor a mere commentary, but a free re-writing, a second edition."

⁴⁶ LUZ, *Jesusgeschichte*, p.19.

⁴⁷ LUZ, *ibid.* SIM, "Matthew's Use of Mark", p.192, suggests that Matthew saw Mark as "an inadequate prototype of the Jesus story that had exceeded its use-by-date". I will however argue that Matthew's adoption of Mark reflects a far more positive attitude than this.

⁴⁸ Luz, *Matthäus*, I, p.78.

⁴⁹ FRANKEMÖLLE, *Matthäus*, p.126–127, posits, "[W]enn die Leser gleichsam in der linken Hand die Bibel hielten und in der rechten Hand das MtEv" as a suggestion of "eine angemessene Lektüre seines Werkes mittels der Heiligen Schrift". This again leaves no hand free for Mark!