

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jbl-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

## THE REDACTION OF MATTHEW 12

BENJAMIN W. BACON

YALE UNIVERSITY

IN an article published in the last volume of the *JOURNAL* under the title "The Q section on John the Baptist and the *Shemoneh Esreh*" I urged the larger employment of a method to be called "the method of implication" for determining the real nature and contents of the Second Synoptic Source, the document underlying Matthew and Luke in that portion of their contents in which they coincide, but which is not derived from Mark. This 'double-tradition' material, so-called, is properly designated Q, and is rightly used as a foundation in attempts to reconstruct the source, which might better be distinguished as S. The admitted failure of the many efforts to reconstruct S may be partly accounted for by ambiguity in the use of the term Q, sometimes consistently restricted to the 'double-tradition' material, sometimes improperly extended to cover such additional material out of Mark or the 'single-tradition' material of Matthew or Luke as the critic decides may be ascribed to the source. In part the failure may be accounted for by the delusion, existent in Germany since the time of Schleiermacher and still dominant among English-speaking critics, that the utterance of Papias regarding the Gospel of Matthew had reference to the source in question.

In the aforesaid article an example was made of the longest of the Q fragments, Fragment 15 in Harnack's list, or perhaps I should rather include the two consecutive longest fragments 14 and 15. These are the Question of John's Disciples,

and its sequel, Jesus' Complaint of the Generation which had rejected the messengers of the divine Wisdom. By comparison of the *Shemoneh-esreh* with fragment 14 and by the use of implications of the two Q fragments themselves it was shown how wrong a conception of the nature of S has become widely accepted. Something was done to correct this mistaken view; but the proviso was distinctly laid down that the method of Implication must be accompanied by critical study of the distinctive editorial purposes and methods of each of the Synoptic writers; otherwise attempts at reconstruction beyond the mere juxtaposition of the Q fragments in the order of either Matthew or Luke would prove fallacious.

Some examples of this study of redactional purpose and method were given, but only in the most general way. The accuracy of Papias' description of Matthew as a "compend" (*σύνταξις*) of the Lord's precepts was defended, showing that it does consist (as a recently discovered second-century prologue declares) of "five books,"<sup>1</sup> arranged like the five books of Moses in a sequence of five narrative introductions followed in each case by an agglutinated discourse of connected precepts (*λόγια*), each 'book' being concluded and its successor introduced by a stereotyped transition formula (Mt. 7 28; 11 1; 13 52; 19 1 and 26 1). A Prologue (Mt. 1—2) telling Jesus' ancestry and birth, and an Epilogue (Mt. 26—28) relating his death and resurrection make a full total of seven sections for the Gospel.

When taken together with the evangelist's description of the charge committed to the Apostles at the close of his work (to teach universal obedience to the "commandments" of Jesus), and his definition of the conditions of salvation (obedience to the Mosaic moral code *plus* the "new commandment" of Jesus, Mt. 19 17—19) this choice and arrangement of material leaves small room for doubt as to the general intention of R<sup>mt</sup>.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Expositor* for Jan. 1918 "The 'Five Books' of Matthew against the Jews."

<sup>2</sup> The symbol R (redactor) is used to designate the compiler or editor of a Gospel, the suspended letters *mt*, *mk*, *lk*, indicating where needful the particular Gospel meant.

He is a neo-legalist of the type and temper of Jude, equally concerned at the prevailing teaching of *ἀνομία*, and probably of about the same period. Closer study will reveal other important and equally well marked characteristics not merely concerned with choice of material and mode of treatment but distinctly coloring style and vocabulary. The twelfth chapter of the Gospel, immediately succeeding ch. 11, to which our attention was directed in the former discussion, and forming in conjunction with it the narrative introduction to its third discourse (Mt. 13 1-52), will serve as an example of what may be gleaned from such study.

In this connection we should not fail to observe the striking contrast presented by the earlier Gospel of Mark to both the later Synoptists. Its difference from Matthew's "compend of the precepts" was distinctly perceived even before the time of Papias, and a scarcely less striking difference in aim and mode of treatment is explicitly avowed in the Preface of Luke. It is an extraordinary example of the misguidance to which eminent critics subject themselves through the obsession of the Schleiermacher delusion that some, in their attempts to reconstruct the source common to Matthew and Luke have actually given an *a priori* preference to the obviously artificial order of an evangelist whose work is designed with this pragmatic object of grouping the "commandments," and whose rearrangement of Mark's whole story of the Galilean ministry does it ruthless violence in the interest of the system adopted for the book. It is hard to see how any critic could prefer this to the order of Luke, a careful writer whose design is to construct a history rather than a compend of the "commandments," and who explicitly avows his intention to present his narrative "in order" (*καθ' ἑξῆς*). Fortunately the most recent attempts to define the nature of S show a reaction against this aberration. We shall make no assumptions in favor of either order for the sections of Q material in Mt. 12, leaving it for the internal evidence to determine in each case whether Matthew's order or Luke's more nearly represents the source. In some cases it will be apparent that Luke rather than Matthew is responsible for transposition, just as Luke in a

very few cases and for easily recognizable reasons has undeniably transposed the order of sections transcribed from Mark. But it should be no surprise to the reader if by way of anticipation we assure him that in the greater number of cases it turns out to be Matthew who has changed the original order, the reasons for his transpositions being also for the most part easy to define after study of his redactional methods.

In one further respect the article already published involves a certain degree of anticipation of the present attempt to determine redactional propensities. Six additional instances from kindred material (presumably from S) were adduced to show that the stage setting of the Coming of John's Disciples, leading up to the Complaint against the Generation heedless of God's Messengers, is not exceptional but characteristic. In other words the Teaching Source, as it is sometimes called, used this editorial method for introducing its set discourses. Brief mention of some typical occurrence, such as Jesus' prayer in a certain place, or the appeal of a hearer in the synagogue for a division of property, or the exclamation or question of a bystander, gave the *mise en scène* for a moral or religious discourse, on Prayer, on Abiding Wealth, on the Great Supper, on the Urgency of Repentance, as the case might be. A similar method of composition characterizes the Petrine source employed by Luke in the first half of his second treatise, and a kindred one, more developed toward the form of the Platonic Dialogue, is used by the fourth evangelist; for in John also five discourses of Jesus, first at Passover, then Pentecost, then Passover, then Tabernacles and finally at Dedication, are severally introduced by "signs" corresponding in nature to the subject of the discourse.

This discovery of editorial method sheds important light on the nature and composition of S. But it must be followed up by further enquiry. We must scrutinize the grouping of Q material wherever it appears. The interwoven bits of broken melody form in each nexus a determinable theme of their own. May we not hope that the trained and attentive ear will at last detect a common undertone, the keynote of all reflected echoes, the theme of the vanished source? Ideas have their

related sequences as well as their more tangible verbal embodiments. Our application of the method described to Mt. 12 has such an object in view. It is to be regarded as no more than an illustration. It will suggest the possibilities here available, but should be followed by similar study of the parallel sections of Luke and Mark.

The material employed in Mt. 12 is readily divisible into three parts: (1) Markan, (2) Q material, (3) such as we may designate P because peculiar to this Gospel. P material is of course not all of one kind. It may be derived from a source, S or other, or it may be merely editorial. In Mt. 12 verses 1-21 form a distinct division, being in the main transcribed from Mk. 2 23-3 12, with the usual Matthean abbreviation of Mark's diffuseness. Only in verses 5-7, 11 f., and 17-21 the paragraph has been supplemented by extraneous material, of which possibly 11 f. might be classed as Q from its resemblance to Lk. 14 5, but the other two sections are unknown elsewhere (P). Verses 31 f. are based on Q but colored by Mk. 3 28 f., and the last paragraph of the chapter (12 46-50) is transcribed from Mk. 3 31-35, forming there, as here, the introduction to the parable of the Sower, with which the Discourse in Parables (Matthew's Third Discourse) begins. The rest of the chapter (12 22-45) consists of Q material with touches of R. We may take the Markan, the Q and the P material in order, forming our judgment of R principally from the last.

1. The employment of Mk. 2 23-3 7 to form part of the narrative leading up to the Discourse in Parables illustrates the general purpose of R<sup>mt</sup>. Mark had conceived the parables as enigmas, a mode of utterance adopted to meet the obduracy of Israel; for Isaiah had complained of old that "having eyes they see not, and having ears they hear not." R<sup>mt</sup> simply takes over Mark's idea, thus making of the Markan group of Parables of the Kingdom (a group which Luke ignores but R<sup>mt</sup> enlarges from three to seven) a kind of preaching of judgment, so contrived that those who "have ears to hear" (Jesus' spiritual kin of the introductory paragraph) shall understand "the mystery of the kingdom of heaven;" whereas the "outsiders," his kindred according to the flesh, shall receive

nothing of the inward sense. Understood thus as a mode of discourse adopted purposely to hide "the mystery of the kingdom" from the wise in their own conceit, while conveying its true sense to "Wisdom's children," the parable chapter with its prefixed saying on Jesus' Spiritual Kin has a logical preamble in the narrative section Mt. 11 1—12 16. Jesus' Complaint of the Generation heedless of God's Messengers (Mt. 11 1—19), his Denunciation of the Cities which Believed Not (11 20—24), and his Thanksgiving for God's Choice of "Babes" as beneficiaries of Revelation (11 25—30) are drawn from the Q material. In 12 1—14 these sections are now supplemented from Mark by the two Sabbath Controversies of Mk. 2 23—3 6 leading to the Pharisees' Plot against Jesus' Life, the paragraph being closed by an abbreviated transcript of Mk. 3 7—12 and an Old Testament quotation (12 15—21). The Q material which occupies the remainder of the chapter develops the conflict, as Jesus denounces the Blasphemy of the Pharisees who accuse him of Exorcising by Beelzebub (12 22—37), and the "evil and adulterous generation that seeketh after a sign" while blind to signs such as brought the Ninevites to repentance and the Queen of Sheba to the feet of Solomon (12 38—45).

The third 'book' of Matthew thus forms a consistent whole on the general theme of the Stumbling of Israel. Following the lead of Mark every one of our evangelists takes over and improves upon this theme. It is in fact already the apologetic of Paul in Rom. 9—11, wherein we first find employment made of the complaint of Isaiah that he is sent to a people having "eyes that they should not see and ears that they should not hear" (Rom. 11 9). Mark is followed in this by both Matthew and Luke, the latter expanding the theme in his second treatise at the close of which he repeats and enlarges the proof-text (Acts 28 26 f.),<sup>3</sup> while John closes his account of the public

<sup>3</sup> The quotation from Is. 6 9 f. in Mt. 13 14—15 is a mere extension of that of verse 13. The formula introducing it varies from that employed in stereotyped phrase by R<sup>mt</sup> and the text is identical with that of Acts 28 26—27. We may probably regard it as the gloss of some early

ministry with appeal to the same prophecy (Jn. 12 39-41). We shall have occasion presently to enquire whether the theme was not suggested first of all by S. But our present concern is with the third "book" of Matthew. Let us return to the evangelist's handling of the material he draws from Mark in Mt. 12 1-16.

The first of the two Sabbath controversies merely transcribes Jesus' defense of his disciples' plucking the ears of grain as described in Mk. 2 23-26, omitting the mistaken dating "under Abiathar," but without other material change; for the non-appearance of Mk. 2 27 either in Matthew or Luke only shows that Codex Bezae, which also omits the verse, offers the more authentic text. As Dalman has seen,<sup>4</sup> we should read after Mk. 2 26 only "And he said unto them, The Son of man is lord even of the sabbath." The interpolated verse is an often quoted principle of rabbinic *halacha*, incongruous with Mark's line of argument, but highly acceptable to early Christian apologetic. The supplement to this Markan anecdote in Mt. 12 5-7 (P) is manifestly redactional. As in Jn. 7 23 R<sup>mt</sup> has another scriptural precedent to cite, and connects with it the same proof-text which he had previously cited in 9 13. To seek out any special "source" for such scraps of floating material would obviously be futile. At the same time it is interesting to observe here one of the many instances of this evangelist's adoption of phraseology from his material. The clause "I say unto you, A greater matter (*μείζον*) than the temple is here" (that is, a case of more importance than temple ritual), is clearly recast from the mould of verses 41 and 42, "a greater matter (*πλείον*) than Jonah," "a greater matter than Solomon, is here;" that is, a warning of greater solemnity than the Ninevites had from Jonah, an invitation of greater worth than the wisdom of Solomon. R<sup>mt</sup> is copying the phrase of S in a less appropriate case.

In 12 9-14 R<sup>mt</sup> continues his transcript of Mark, abbreviating slightly according to his habit the second sabbath controversy, but adding here also in 11f. a supplement in substance identical

transcriber. Our argument, however, is not affected by this question of text.

<sup>4</sup> *Worte Jesu*, p. 215.



with Lk. 14 5. If we follow the rule of classifying as Q all material common to Matthew and Luke not found in Mark we shall find ourselves faced immediately by the problem how to account for the wide differences of language exhibited in about one third of this material, whereas the other two thirds show closer agreement than the sections in which both later evangelists draw upon Mark. Will redaction on one side or both account for the divergence in Mt. 12 11 f. — Lk. 14 5? Clearly R<sup>mt</sup> is responsible for verse 12 b which merely adapts the supplement to its setting after the question of verse 10. On the other hand the differences between verses 11–12 a and Lk. 14 5 cannot all be accounted for by redaction, even when the propensities of both evangelists are taken into account. The simplest explanation of mingled resemblance and difference is that R<sup>mt</sup>, having preferred the Markan version of this sabbath controversy (Mk. 3 1–6), but being also familiar with that of Luke's source, has supplemented from memory without taking the trouble to transcribe verbally. The fact has a bearing on the general question above referred to. We note also that in the closing verse (12 14) Matthew omits the historically dubious clause *εἰθὺς μετὰ τῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν* to concentrate obloquy on his dearest foes "the Pharisees."<sup>5</sup>

Only the opening and final clauses of Mark's succeeding paragraph (Mk. 3 7–12) descriptive of the gathering multitudes are transcribed by R<sup>mt</sup>, for the manifest reason that he has already employed the remainder in 4 24 f. However, he brings this portion of his indictment to a close by one of his habitual citations of prophecy, a section of P material. Mk. 3 11 declared, in accordance with a theory propounded by this evangelist in Mk. 1 34, that "the unclean spirits whensoever they beheld him fell down before him and cried out, saying, Thou art the Son of God."<sup>6</sup> In 3 12 Mark continues: "And he charged them much that they should not make him known," repeating his statement of 1 34 that Jesus forbade the demons to reveal his identity.

<sup>5</sup> On "Pharisees and Herodians in Mark" see JBL for Dec. 1921.

<sup>6</sup> ZNW. 1906 "The Markan Theory of Demonic Recognition of the Christ."

Matthew, who does not accept the theory, gives the clause Mk. 3 12 in his transcription a different application: "Many followed him, and he healed them all, and charged them (that is, *the healed*) that they should not make him known." This withdrawal from publicity—and perhaps also from controversy such as that described in verses 1–14—Matthew considers to have been predicted in the verses which he now inserts from Is. 42 1–3, 4 c:

Behold my servant whom I have chosen,  
My beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased:  
I will put my Spirit upon him,  
And he shall declare judgment to the Gentiles.  
He shall not strive, nor cry aloud;  
Neither shall anyone hear his voice in the streets.  
A bruised reed shall he not break,  
And smoking flax shall be not quench,  
Till he send forth judgment unto victory.

The lines up to this point are taken from the Hebrew, with slight adaptation.<sup>7</sup> A succeeding line (separated from the foregoing by 4 a b) is given in the widely divergent rendering of the LXX.,

And in his name shall the Gentiles hope.

We have two reasons for believing that the quotation is borrowed and expanded by the addition of the closing line. (1) R<sup>mt</sup> makes all his own quotations (in distinction from those he finds in his sources) from the LXX, even conforming some of those transcribed from Mark to the LXX text.<sup>8</sup> Quotations in Matthew based on the Hebrew are incorporated from some source, usually S. (2) This quotation, the most extensive of the Gospel, and certainly based on the Hebrew text, has no appropriate application here. Its true application leaps to the eye the moment it is placed alongside the story of Jesus' vision at his baptism in Jordan, a story undeniably contained in the Second Source. In fact the story itself is scarcely more than a dramatization of the lines:

<sup>7</sup> On the derivation of the quotation see Dittmar, *Vet. Test. in Novo. Comparison of LXX and Hebrew text will amply verify the statement of our text.*

<sup>8</sup> *E. g.* 19s and 18f.

Behold my Servant whom I elected,  
 My Beloved, on whom my soul's choice was fixed:  
 I will put my Spirit upon him,  
 And he shall teach true religion to the Gentiles.

It is not unreasonable to infer that this quotation, at least to the extent of these four lines, stood originally in S in connection with its story of the Baptismal Vocation.<sup>9</sup> Mark, who also changed the term *παῖς* to *υἱός* to agree with his Christology (1 34 etc.) would naturally drop the quotation,<sup>10</sup> and our evangelists in turn follow Mark. Only Matthew preserves the quotation for a different application.

As regards the only other Markan element of Mt. 12, the saying on Spiritual Kindred which is used (as in Mark) to introduce the parable of the Sower (12 46-50; 13 1-9 = Mk. 3 31-35; 4 1-9), it should suffice to place over against it in a parallel column the incident which in Lk. 11 27 f. follows at precisely this point, that is, after the parable of the House Swept and Garnished (Mt. 12 43-45 = Lk. 11 24-26):

Mt. 12 46-50 (= Mk. 3 31-35).

While he was yet speaking to the multitudes, behold his mother and his brethren stood without, seeking to speak to him.<sup>11</sup> But he answered and said unto him that told him, Who is my mother? and who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand towards his disciples, and said, Behold, my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, he is my brother, and sister, and mother.

Lk. 11 27-28.

And it came to pass, as he said these things, a certain woman out of the multitude lifted up her voice, and said unto him, Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the breasts which thou didst suck. But he said, Yea rather, Blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it.

<sup>9</sup> The immediately succeeding lines, Is. 42 1-3, are also based on the Hebrew. They are not likely therefore to have been added by the same hand as verse 4 c of which Mt. 12 21 gives the widely variant LXX. If verses 19-20 were part of the quotation in the Source this may warrant the inference that it stood at a later point, perhaps the conclusion of a section descriptive of the ministry such as fragments 14-15.

<sup>10</sup> To retain the quotation would of course suggest to the reader the "servant" doctrine of Deutero-Isaiah rather than the Son-of-God doctrine of Mark.

<sup>11</sup> Inferior texts supply at this point verse 47, a mere expedient to

Luke, it appears, is consistently following S. R<sup>mt</sup> at the same point in the narrative takes in preference the Markan version of the saying, because its more explicit identification of the inner circle of Spiritual Kin formed a better introduction to the Discourse in Parables which Mark regards as intended to reach only these chosen ones. Whether the parable of the Sower, with its closing word "He that hath ears to hear let him hear" really followed in S at this point cannot be decided on the witness of Mark alone, but the connection has at least the support of this closing word.

2. We have next to consider the Q elements of Mt. 12, the chief problem in their case being the question of order. Was their sequence in S that of Luke, where nearly all appear in the great discourse of 11 14-36 as parts of Jesus' reply a) to the charge "He casteth out by Beelzebub" b) to the demand for a Sign from Heaven? Or shall we follow Mt. 12 22-45, which includes the two replies in the same order, but introduces several supplements of Q material found elsewhere in Luke, transposes several of the sections, and contains several explanatory clauses not found elsewhere? At least we shall meet no objection to following the Q order where both witnesses coincide.

The first inference as to the structure of S derivable from this doubly witnessed Q order is that the Source presented an extended discourse in two parts, the first in reply to the charge "He casteth out by Beelzebub," the second in reply to the Demand for a Sign. In the simpler version of Lk. 11 14-16 the interlocutors are not named. They are merely "some of the crowd." R<sup>mt</sup> puts the blame as usual on his foes "the Pharisees," Mark on "the scribes who had come down from Jerusalem" (Mk. 3 22). It is of course the simpler form of Luke which represents S. Again Matthew and Luke agree in declaring the occasion to have been the exorcism of a Dumb Devil, at which "the multitude were amazed." Mark has a different setting, obviously secondary. The further data supplied in Matthew's description, that the demon was "blind" as well as

make good what the glossator considered the excessive abbreviation of R<sup>mt</sup> in the clause  $\tau\hat{\omega}\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\ \alpha\iota\omega\tau\hat{\omega}$ .

dumb, and that the amazement of the multitude was expressed in the cry "Is not this the Son of David?", are also editorial. But it does not follow that these additions had no basis in the Source. On the contrary a whole series of parallels in Mark and elsewhere go to show that Matthew has more than one form of the story, and that in one of these the opening of deaf ears introduced a discourse against a generation deaf to the messengers of the divine Wisdom and was followed (or preceded) by an opening of blind eyes introductory to a discourse against the spiritually blind. Luke, it is true, has no account of this healing of the blind. His only miracle of this nature is the story of Bartimaeus, which he transcribes from Mark without material change beyond omission of the name (Mk. 10 46-52 = Lk. 18 35-43). But even in Luke Jesus' reply to the Demand for a Sign includes a warning against Spiritual Blindness (11 33-36). May not the nonappearance of the miracle in Luke be due to his conscientious avoidance of duplication?<sup>12</sup>

Our confidence that in S the opening of deaf ears was accompanied by a corresponding miracle of the opening of blind eyes is based not alone upon the conjoining of these two in the answer to John's Enquiry (Mt. 11 5 = Lk. 7 22), where Jesus points to the fulfilment of Isaian prophecy (Is. 29 18; 35 5; 61 1) in his own healings, but also on passages in all the Gospels which if not directly derived from this S nexus appear at least to be suggested by it.

It has been shown in my recent volume *The Gospel according to Mark* that the section of Mark omitted by Luke (Mk. 6 45-8 26) consists, at least from 6 53 to the end, of a group of anecdotes dealing with the abolition of the distinctions of meats, the Mosaic barrier between Jew and Gentile, preparatory to work among Gentiles. After the controversy with "the scribes from Jerusalem" who complained that Jesus' disciples ate with unwashed hands (7 1-23; cf. Lk. 11 37-41) and the subsequent incident of the Syrophenician in "the borders of Tyre and Sidon," Mark encloses between two companion miracles a

<sup>12</sup> As in the omission of Mk. 11 19-14 and 14 3-11; cf. Lk. 13 6-9 and 7 26-50.

parallel to the Miracle of the Loaves already given in 6 30-44 followed by a version of the Demand for a Sign and another of the Warning against the Leaven of the Pharisees (7 24-8 26). The two companion healings are an Unstopping of Deaf Ears (9 31-37) and an Opening of Blind Eyes (8 22-26). The therapeutic method of the Healer is similarly elaborated in each, with other traits so peculiarly Markan that this evangelist is certainly responsible for their form. But at least the second of the pair has been transposed away from its original setting.<sup>13</sup> The main point to be observed, however, is that the whole section is elaborated along the lines of Is. 29 9-24 from Jehovah's "closing of the eyes" of Israel's leaders to his "marvellous work" wrought among the poor and meek, causing "the deaf to hear the words of the book, and the eyes of the blind to see out of obscurity and darkness," so that in amazement men "sanctify the Holy one of Jacob, and fear the God of Israel." R<sup>mk</sup> explicitly quotes the Isaian passage in Mk. 7 6 f., and it apparently suggests his symbolic elaboration of the two healings, the Unstopping of Deaf Ears and the Opening of Blind Eyes.<sup>14</sup>

But Matthew also in his parallel to this section of Mark shows plainly his appreciation of its relation to the Isaian prophecy. It is true that he omits in 15 29-31 Mark's description of the specific miracle of the Unstopping of Deaf Ears, for the excellent reason of having already given its authentic substance (in immediate sequence to its companion miracle, the Opening of Blind Eyes) in a previous group (Mt. 9 27-32). Nevertheless in transcribing Mk. 7 31 f. R<sup>mt</sup> mentions specifically (as Mark does not) the "blind and dumb" among the healed, and adds to the Markan description of the "extreme" (*ὀπερπερισσῶς*) amazement of the multitudes that "they glorified the God of Israel" (15 31). This expression, attached at the end of the parallel and completely unique in the New Testament, can hardly have any other origin than Is. 29 23. Either, then, R<sup>mt</sup> has discovered the obscure relation of

<sup>13</sup> *The Gospel of Mark* (1925), p. 163 f.

<sup>14</sup> The duplicate character of Mk. 7 1-8 26 is recognized by A. H. Mc Neile. See his excellent *Commentary on Matthew* pp. 237 f.

Mk. 7 31-37 to Is. 29 18 f., or (as will appear more probable) he has independent access to Mark's source which used the Isaian term.

Again, Matthew's omission of the Opening of Blind Eyes in Mk. 8 22-26 is no more real than his apparent omission of the companion miracle. Having already introduced in 9 27-31, immediately before his account of the Unstopping of Deaf Ears, an Opening of the Eyes of *two* Blind Men, and having utilized in this connection the distinctive features of the Markan Bartimaeus narrative, R<sup>mt</sup> could hardly be expected to further introduce here as a *fifth* healing of the blind a parallel to Mk. 8 22-26.

But we have still another witness to the original association of an exorcism of a Dumb Devil and amazement of the multitude with an Opening of Blind Eyes followed by Rebuke of the Pharisees for Spiritual Blindness. We have in Jn. 9 1-41 (elaborated at great length in the typical Johannine manner) an unmistakable parallel to Mark's story of the Opening of Blind Eyes. Its close is a Rebuke of the Pharisees for Spiritual Blindness (verses 35-41). But this is not all. The closing words "Now ye say, We see: your sin remaineth," so strongly reminiscent of the rebuke of those who said "He casteth out by Beelzebub" (the sin "which hath never forgiveness"), are followed almost immediately (Jn. 10 19-21) by a description of "division among the Jews because of these words" and the singular charge from some: "He hath a devil, and is mad," while others say: "These are not the words of one possessed with a devil. Can a devil open the eyes of the blind?". Nowhere in John save 8 48 f. and 10 20 f. is demon-possession referred to. The verse is an echo of the Blasphemy of the Scribes (cf. Mk. 3 30), inseparable in S from the Exorcism of the Dumb Devil.

In spite of the non-appearance of the Opening of Blind Eyes in the context of Lk. 11 14-36 (perhaps to avoid duplication with 18 35-43 = Mk. 10 46-52) it is hard to resist this cumulative evidence that the Source from which all have drawn in common presented (in association with its Dumb Devil episode but without the Markan elaborations in either

case) an account of Jesus' Opening of Blind Eyes from which Mark has drawn at least his Blind Man of Bethsaida (8 22-26), if not (with the use of a parallel source) his Healing of Bartimaeus as well (10 46-52).<sup>15</sup>

From this long digression to explain why R<sup>mt</sup> supplements his stage-setting for the rebuke of those who said "He hath Beelzebub," with the clauses "blind and," "and saw," "Is not this the son of David?" (cf. 9 27 and 20 30 f.), we return to the question of order as between Matthew and Luke. We find a probability that in S a double introduction served to introduce a double rebuke. There were (1) those who turned a deaf ear to the warning of Wisdom's messengers, including in the first instance according to both Matthew and Luke those who said "He Exorciseth by Beelzebub," and there were (2) others who in spite of signs greater than those which turned the Ninevites to repentance, and an invitation more winning than that which drew the Queen of Sheba from the ends of the earth, blindly asked for a Sign from Heaven. The inter-relation of the two discourses, not only with one another but also with the rebuke of the Generation which Rejects God's Messengers (Mt. 11 7-19 = Lk. 7 24-35), already shows the nature of the message for which divine authentication was demanded. The issue was not drawn, as even Jülicher assumes, over the personal authority of Jesus. It concerned his declaration that the Kingdom of *God* (even Matthew in this signal instance desists from his habitual alteration to "Kingdom of heaven") was at hand, supported by his appeal to the visible tokens of God's "visiting" his people. More exactly, Jesus maintained that the divine sovereignty (*mal'kuth*) had "overtaken" (*εἰσέλασεν*) this blind and dumb generation unaware. God's redeeming power was at work in their very midst, but they had neither eyes to see nor ears to hear.

We have noticed that at the very beginning of the Q section of ch. 12 R<sup>mt</sup> has given the rebuke of Jesus a more specific target than Luke. Just as in the preaching of the Baptist he changes the Lukan form of the address from "the

<sup>15</sup> See *Beginnings of Gospel Story* (1909), p. 146.



multitudes" to "Pharisees and Sadducees" (Mt. 3 7 — Lk. 3 7) so in 12 23 he alters "some of them" to "Pharisees" and in verse 38 changes "others" to "scribes and Pharisees." In every case Luke's simpler form is more authentic. The rebuke in S was general. It was directed against *all* who were displaying the spiritual dulness of which Isaiah had complained. R<sup>mt</sup>, however, was not first to improve upon S by giving it a more specific direction. He had had a predecessor in Mark. Just as Mark introduces circumstantial description of the situation into his version of the saying on Spiritual Kin (Mk. 3 31-35) in order to make the application to the inner circle of disciples unmistakable,<sup>16</sup> so in the connected utterance against those who said "He casteth out by Beelzebub" R<sup>mk</sup> not only specifies "the scribes who had come down from Jerusalem" as the guilty parties, but appends a Q saying given by Luke in a different connection (Lk. 12 10; cf. Jn. 16 1-11). The scribes are denounced as having committed an unpardonable sin "because they said, He hath an unclean spirit." R<sup>mt</sup> is not satisfied with Mark's pointing of the denunciation. In 12 31-37 he adds a whole agglutination of sayings partly repeated from his own version of the Sermon on the Mount (ver. 33 — 7 10), partly clauses from other contexts of the Source (34 a — 3 7; cf. 23 33), partly material transposed hither from the Discourse on the Righteousness of Sons (34 b, 35 — Lk. 6 45), partly current proverb (verses 36 f.). The nexus recalls his agglutination of Woes on Scribes and Pharisees (Mt. 23), and exemplifies that special animus of this evangelist which led our second-century prologue writer to describe his Gospel as written "against the God-slaying people of the Jews."

As Luke has nothing here of this outburst against "the Pharisees," but proceeds direct from verse 30 — Lk. 11 23 ("He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth") to the parable of the House swept and Garnished (Lk. 11 24-26 — Mt. 12 43-45) we may disregard the fulmination of verses 31-37 in our attempt to determine

<sup>16</sup> See *Beginnings of Gospel Story* (1909), pp. 36 and 44.

the order of S and ask ourselves next whether Luke is correct in this connection, and if so why R<sup>mt</sup> has transposed.

The exegetical clause appended by R<sup>mt</sup> to verse 45 (it fails to appear in Lk.) "Even so shall it be also unto this evil generation" has small claim to derivation from S. But it is probably near the truth in its application of the parable; for it is fairly certain that the recorded utterance of Jesus offered something more than mere therapeutic experience. The parable really serves to justify the seemingly hard saying of verse 30: "He that is not with me is against me, and he that gathereth not with me scattereth."

The thought of the whole context revolves around the conception of sovereignty in the "dwelling." In the devout thought of the prophets Israel is God's "dwelling." He "walks" and "tabernacles" among them. As Paul reminds the Corinthians, moral purity is expected of them because God had said "I will dwell among them and walk among them" (2 Cor. 6 16). The name Beelzebub is taken to mean in Mt. 10 25 "Master of the House."<sup>17</sup> At least it suggests the parabolic comparison. The argument from the exorcisms that a Stronger than the "strong man armed" has triumphed over him and swept away his bond-slaves is based upon Is. 49 24-26. It does not, as so often wrongly maintained, present *Jesus* as the Deliverer of the captives. That is not the point to be proved. The point to be proved is that the scribes have spoken against *God*. It is God himself, who by his own "finger" (Mt. "Spirit") has brought Satan's domination to an end. This is correspondingly the point of the Isaian parallel: "I Jehovah am thy Savior, and thy Redeemer the Mighty One of Jacob." But if Satan's claim to be "Lord of the Dwelling" is now proved false by the release of his captives through the "finger" of God it still remains to be

<sup>17</sup> Whatever the true derivation of the name R<sup>mt</sup> clearly takes it to be the equivalent of *Zebē Oipānos*, or "Lord of the (heavenly) Dwelling" = *Baal-zebul*. In Mt. 10 25 Jesus is "the Master of the House" as compared with his disciples. In the Q context Satan vainly attempts the role, but is overcome by the Mighty One of Jacob, a Stronger than he who liberates his captives.

seen whether Israel will follow God's messengers or its own blind leaders. Will that divine sovereignty which has come so visibly near be welcomed by Jehovah's people? Many deny it. "Some" are willing even to declare the works of redemption to be from Beelzebub. Therefore Jesus is forced to make the issue: For or against; gatherers or scatterers? "Gathering" is the figure which he applies to his own work in restoring the "lost sheep." It is that which he had implicitly applied in summoning his first followers from their nets. Their work is that of the Redeemer in the *Amidah* prayer (Blessing 10), to "gather together the elect from the four corners of the earth." Jesus can only treat as opponents those who set themselves to frustrate this God-given work of gathering the scattered flock.

And the opposition he has most to dread is from those who have no ideal but to sweep and garnish the house. Pharisaism was all for purification, withdrawal, and quiescence. One perfectly legal sabbath, one day in which every true son of the law should faithfully observe every Mosaic precept down to the tithe of mint and anise and cummin! On such external obedience they counted to bring divine intervention and the dominion of Israel, forgetful of judgment, mercy and the weightier matters of the law. It was not "hypocrisy" as Luke assumes (Lk. 12 1) which constituted an invisible menace to Jesus' disciples. They were not tempted to imitate the Pharisees in this. But they did sorely need, and they continued for a hundred years and more to need, a warning against the external legalism of the Pharisees, the conception of "righteousness" as the merit acquired by obedience to rules, whereby God is obligated to bestow "reward." From beginning to end of his teaching Jesus sets himself against this externalism, insisting that nothing but a new spirit, an inward disposition of God-like loving-kindness can bring the "indwelling." We may assume, therefore, that while Matthew is right in applying the parable of the House Swept and Garnished in a spiritual sense, and to "this evil generation," he is wrong in transposing it to the end of the paragraph addressed to the "evil and adulterous generation." It belongs where Luke has placed it, as a sequel to the rebuke of those who said "He casteth out

by Beelzebub" and the challenge: "He that gathereth not with me scattereth." The warning "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees," which Luke and Mark (Lk. 12 1 expanded in Mk. 8 14-21 — Mt. 16 5-12) bring into close connection with it, may, or may not have preceded, but the inherent lesson of the parable of the Empty Dwelling claims for it the place which it occupies in Lk. 11 24-26 as a sequel to the denial of "the finger of God."

The parable of the House Swept and Garnished carries with it, on the testimony of Luke, the S version of the saying concerning Spiritual Kin (Lk. 11 27 f.), for which R<sup>mt</sup> has substituted the Markan in Mt. 12 46-50. But where must we place that Opening of Blind Eyes presupposed by the discourse of Lk. 11 29-36 and indicated for this connection by so many parallels?

The place given it in Mk. 8 22-26 has already been characterized as artificial. Mark's setting only suffices to indicate an original location of this healing in the vicinity of its companion miracle of the Unstopping of Deaf Ears (Mk. 7 31-37) and the Demand of a Sign from Heaven (8 11-13). The question may perhaps be left for the present undetermined, since the only remaining traces in Mt. 12 are the clauses attached editorially to verse 22.<sup>19</sup> However, the Markan version of the Demand for a Sign followed in Mt. 16 1 ff. (Mk. 8 11-13 — Mt. 16 1-4) can by no means be disregarded, because in the Western interpolation of Mt. 2 b-3 we obtain an independent text of Lk. 12 54-56, a passage which for all its separation in Luke from the connection of the Demand for a Sign compels us by its subject-matter to follow the placing of Mt. 16 1-4  $\beta$  text. A single glance at the two versions of the saying will suffice to show that neither is copied from the other.

Mt. 16 1-4 ( $\beta$  text).

And the Pharisees and Sadducees came up, and tempting him asked him to show them a sign from heaven. But he answered and said

Lk. 12 54-56.

And he said to the multitudes also, When ye see a cloud rising in the west straightway ye say, There cometh a shower; and so it

<sup>19</sup> I. e., the clauses *τυφλοὶ αὐτῶν καὶ βλεπεύω*, and *καὶ ἔλεγον· μήτι οὗτοί ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Δαυὶδ*.

unto them, When it is evening ye say, It will be fair weather: for the heaven is red. And in the morning, It will be foul weather today: for the heaven is red and lowring. Ye know how to discern the face of the heaven; but ye cannot discern the signs of the times.

cometh to pass. And when ye see a south wind blowing ye say, There will be a scorching heat; and it cometh to pass. Ye hypocrites, ye know how to interpret the face of the earth and the heaven; but how is it that ye know not how to interpret this time?

Unmistakably the theme of the saying is Spiritual Blindness. The occasion should be that to which the  $\beta$  text of Matthew attaches it. How then account for its displacement in Luke and the independence of the two versions?—One can only surmise that the source itself was two-fold. As this whole division of Mark is full of duplicate material, as Mt. 16 1-4 itself repeats Mt. 12 38 f.,<sup>19</sup> so in the corresponding section of Luke the lack of proper connection is to be accounted for by the fact that this evangelist is drawing from two overlapping sources, one of which, if not unknown to Matthew, is at least rarely employed by him. For in spite of its correct placing we cannot regard the supplement of the Western transcribers as belonging to the authentic text of Matthew. The true text of Mt. 16 1-4 is derived from Mark alone.

We shall again be transcending the strict limits of Mt. 12 if we bring into the discussion Jesus' Congratulation of those who have Seeing Eyes and Hearing Ears, Mt. 13 16 f. — Lk. 10 23 f.; yet its sense forbids exclusion. This Q fragment is attached by R<sup>mt</sup> to the quotation of Isaiah's complaint against the people that "hear but understand not, and see but perceive not" which Mark appends to the parable of the Sower (Mk. 4 12 — Mt. 13 13 f.). Thus placed Allen justly classes it with the long series of Matthean supplements which compensate for Mark's utterances derogatory to the Twelve. But the Congratulation has a wider circle in view. Mark's setting is manifestly artificial, since his quotation from Is. 6 9 would seem to be based on Rom. 11 8 rather than S. At first sight the setting of R<sup>lk</sup>, which makes the Congratulation refer to the fruits of the Mission of the Seventy seems equally unreal. To make Jesus refer to the work

<sup>19</sup> See McNeile on *Matthew*, pp. 237 f.

of his disciples as "things which many prophets and kings desired to see and saw not" is hardly in keeping with the actualities of the situation. On the other hand this congratulation of those who have spiritual sight and hearing is just what we look for to offset Jesus' complaint of the generation deaf to God's messengers and heedless of the marvels of redeeming mercy taking place in their midst. He is speaking of "the finger of God," visible to those who have eyes to see. And if we look again at Lk. 10 21-24 this is in reality the very place the Congratulation really occupies. It follows the Hymn of Thanksgiving for the Revelation to Babes; only, R<sup>lk</sup> has removed the whole section to bring its opening clause "He rejoiced in the Holy Spirit" into connection with the statement that the Seventy returned with "joy" and were bidden not to "rejoice" that they had power over demons but to "rejoice" that their names were on the register of heaven. Transposing the Hymn R<sup>lk</sup> has displaced the Congratulation along with it. If we take the cue offered by the Wisdom hymn, which R<sup>mt</sup> places after Jesus' complaint against the generation which despised God's messengers, and the Galilean cities which were unmoved by the mighty works (Mt. 11 15-24), we shall see its appropriateness. The S discourse in its former part will now conclude with this Congratulation of those that have eyes to see and ears to hear, instead of with the added strophe of the Wisdom hymn which R<sup>mt</sup> attaches in 11 28-30. The order of S was: Mt. 11 15-19, 25-27; 13 16 f. but with something like Luke's clause "turning to his disciples" (Lk. 10 23) to differentiate the hymn from the utterance to the disciples.

With the inclusion of this link between the great discourse on John of Mt. 11 and the Q discourse of Mt. 12 on spiritual insensibility we are ready to pass to the final Q paragraph of the chapter, Jesus' reply to the Demand for a Sign (Mt. 12 38-42 — Lk. 11 29-32). Fortunately Mark comes to our aid with a version simpler than that of either parallel. The mere refusal of the demand without any reference to Jonah in Mk. 8 11 f. is indeed too great a simplification. It sacrifices part of the record for the sake of avoiding complication of the sense; for Mark having omitted the saying comparing "this generation" with "the men of Nineveh" his readers would have found a reference to

Jonah unintelligible. The Matthean parallel (Mt. 16 1, 2 a, 4) therefore naturally supplies the clause "save the sign of Jonah," a true element of S. On the other hand the two inconsistent attempts of R<sup>mt</sup> and R<sup>lk</sup> to explain what was "the sign of Jonah" are neither one successful, though R<sup>lk</sup> is not far from the truth.

The point the Speaker upholds is his condemnation of the "adulterous" generation for their senseless demand. The Ninevites and the Queen of the South are adduced as examples which condemn by exhibiting more appreciative response to far inferior opportunity. The argument is similar to that of Mt. 11 20-24 — Lk. 10 12-15, where "Tyre and Sidon," and even "the land of Sodom," are cited as putting to shame the unbelief of the Galilean towns. The Ninevites "repented at the preaching of Jonah," whereas those who are now calling for "a sign" have had "a greater matter (*πλεῖον*) than Jonah" and yet have disobeyed the call. Both evangelists, it is true, take this "greater matter" to be something connected with the coming of *Jesus*. Either it is his resurrection (regarded by R<sup>mt</sup> as the "sign of the Son of man" *par excellence*) or his personal presence (regarded by R<sup>lk</sup> as a parallel to the sudden appearance of Jonah among the Ninevites). If, however, we observe how *Jesus* elsewhere treats "the baptism of *John*" (that is, the reformatory movement of the Baptist) as the great portent of the times, a fulfilment of Malachi's prophecy of the coming of *Elijah* to effect repentance before the Day of *Jehovah*, which therefore indicates that the great dénouement is close at hand, we shall find it difficult to believe that the Speaker had not the same great Sign in mind in this case. This inference will be confirmed when we observe that the Demand for a Sign of Mk. 11 27-33, which *Jesus* answers by citing "the baptism of *John*" is supplemented by R<sup>mt</sup> in his transcription (Mt. 21 23 ff.) by the Q saying which *Luke* introduces here in 9 29 f., after the discourse about *John the Baptist*, and between it and the Rebuke of the Perverse Generation (Lk. 7 31-35). At the same point R<sup>mt</sup> introduces the reference to *Elias* and the Men of Violence (Mt. 11 12 f. — Lk. 16 16) and the comparison of the Baptist to "Elias that was for to come" (Mt. 11 14 f.). So many references

to the appearance of John as the herald of the kingdom prophesied by Malachi, all clustering about this same nexus of sayings, cannot well be accounted for if Jesus did not mean, here as elsewhere, that this "coming of Elias" to effect the Great Repentance was "a sign from heaven," a foregleam of the great Day of Jehovah.

Still another confirmation of this understanding of "the sign of Jonah" may be found in the antithetic form in which Jesus propounds his condemnation of the Perverse Generation. They are equally deaf to the appeal of God's messengers, whether it be addressed to their fears or their hopes. Like sulky children who will play neither funeral nor wedding they reject John because he lives an ascetic life and Jesus because he brings a message of hope and cheer, and is genial and kindly toward all. The reply to those who Seek a Sign has the same two-fold condemnation. The "wisdom" (understood in the sense of Prov. 2—5, 7—9 as the winning appeal of God's redeeming Spirit) which drew the Queen of Sheba "from the ends of the earth" corresponds to Jesus' gospel of forgiveness to the penitent as the wedding song corresponds to the funeral dirge in the earlier comparison. As the Perverse Generation are reproached for rejecting *both* God's messengers, whether of warning or of forgiveness, so the "adulterous generation" that demands a sign is *doubly* obdurate. It has had more warning than was given the Ninevites, who repented at the mere threat of Jonah wholly unaccompanied by miracle: "Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be destroyed." Nevertheless when John (who "did no miracle") comes like Elias crying "Repent! After me cometh he whose fan is in his hand to thoroughly purge his floor, gathering the wheat into his garner, and burning up the chaff with unquenchable fire," they give no heed. Nay more. Even when they saw the publicans and sinners meeting the summons of God, fulfilling thus the prophecy of the Great Repentance, "they did not even repent themselves afterwards." Equally blind are they to the gracious proofs of God's redeeming presence attendant on Jesus' "glad tidings to the poor." A greater matter than the 'wisdom' which brought the Queen of Sheba to the feet of Solomon (πλείον Σολομώντος) takes place before their eyes and



ears, and they cry: "Give us a sign from heaven!" If there be force in the double form of the condemnation, then in Jesus' mind "the sign of Jonah" was "the baptism of John," just as his own message was that of "the Wisdom of God."

It follows that neither of the attempted explanations of R<sup>mt</sup> or R<sup>lk</sup> is correct, though both reappear in John. The fourth evangelist follows the lead of Matthew when relating the Sanhedrin's demand for a sign (Jn. 2 18-22). Here the sign from heaven is the resurrection after three days as in Mt. 12 40. In 6 30-40 he follows the lead of Luke. In the synagogue at Capernaum the Jews demand a sign and receive the answer that Jesus is himself the sign, the bread of life, which like the manna given by Moses in the wilderness, "cometh down from heaven and giveth life to the world." This is the interpretation of Lk. 11 30. All are later attempts to solve the reputed enigma, whose solution after all requires nothing more than to ask, What does Jesus himself treat as the great "sign of the times?"

3. After completion of our survey of the Q material of Mt. 12 it remains to consider the P material. Some of this we have already assigned to S in spite of its failure to appear elsewhere. The quotation from Is. 42 1-3 is an example of such material which there is strong reason to connect with the Second Source, and which will shed no little light on the vital question of its Christology.<sup>20</sup> On the other hand we have small reason to connect with any written source R<sup>mt</sup>'s supplements to Markan narrative in 12 5-7, and to Q material in 12 36f. Even the supplement in 12 11f. seems to be a mere memoriter reproduction of the substance of Lk. 14 5. What remains is the addition of a single line (verse 21) to the prophecy of Is. 42 1-3 quoted from the Hebrew in 12 17-20, a few touches suggested by the Source as elsewhere used in 12 22f., definition of the indefinite subject in verses 24 and 38 ("the Pharisees", "the scribes and Pharisees"), and the explanatory clauses in verses 40 and 45 b, whose value and significance has already been made clear.

Manifestly the work of R<sup>mt</sup> was mainly directed to the task of interweaving his sources, of which S and Mark were by far

<sup>20</sup> *HTAB*. Oct. 1916: "The Son as Organ of Revelation."

the most important. His personal idiosyncracies appear most clearly in his occasional supplements, of which the most notable in ch. 12 is his outbreak against the "brood of vipers" in verses 33-37, where source material (Q) and supplements (verse 33 repeated from 7 18, verses 36f. from current proverb) are intermingled. Both motive and method are characteristic. The special animus of R against the Pharisees, sometimes associated with "scribes" sometimes with "the Sadducees" is exhibited repeatedly throughout this Gospel. The method is the same interweaving of phrases from different contexts of S which we have on the grand scale in the Sermon on the Mount. R<sup>mt</sup> loves to avail himself of phrases from his sources, particularly S, and does not hesitate to repeat or transpose wherever the lesson in view requires.

Transposition on the larger scale is undeniable in his employment of the entire Markan story of the Galilean ministry, and will be admitted by all who have studied the composition of the five Discourses, particularly the first, the so-called Sermon on the Mount, for the Q material. In fact, so far as dislocation is concerned S would appear to have suffered even worse than Mark. The remark of Papias that Matthew, unlike Peter, who "had no design of making a compend of the precepts" (*οὐχ ὡς περ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λογίων*), had "made a compend of the precepts" (*συνέταξεν τὰ λόγια*), is fully justified. R<sup>mt</sup> is at the opposite pole from Luke as regards "order." Luke writes his *διήγησις* with special reference to this admitted lack in his principal narrative source (Mk.), and yet does not venture upon transposition except where the reason is obvious and cogent, as in Lk. 3 19f., where the parenthetic story of Mk. 6 14-29 is brought back (in much abbreviated form) to a position better agreeing with Mk. 1 14. Strange indeed that Luke should be assumed to be less faithful to the order of S than the notorious transposer R<sup>mt</sup>! No such judgment could ever have been passed upon Luke by any competent critic but for the fact that Luke's problem was also complicated by the necessity of combining parallel sources, as Mark's had been before him. And Luke's problem was apparently more complicated than R<sup>mt</sup>'s, inasmuch as L (to use Streeter's symbol for the long admitted "special

source of Luke") does not seem to have been accessible to our first evangelist. It may indeed be true, as Streeter contends, that the combination of L with S had preceded, so that Luke is not himself responsible for the dislocations undeniably present in his Q material. But this, while exonerating the writer of the Preface from disregard of his promise to write "in order," only removes the critic's problem a stage further back. The "proto-Luke" who combined L and S must be held responsible for changes both of order and wording if comparison with R<sup>mt</sup>'s version of the Q material has any value.

Our present study, restricted as it is to a single section of his work, and independent of the phenomena of Luke, goes to show R<sup>mt</sup> has taken at least as large liberty with the order of S as with that of Mark. Disregarding other changes of wording, which speak for themselves, we note that the opening and closing lines of the agglutinated paragraphs give unmistakable evidence of such adjustment. A frequent, almost stereotyped beginning is *τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς*, almost to be rendered "Then it was that Jesus" etc. This is varied by *ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ* "It was on that occasion that." As this phrase appears in 12 1, where it attaches to Q material a Markan section certainly not intended by Mark for this connection, it clearly represents conjecture on the part of R<sup>mt</sup>, and nothing more. The *τότε* of 12 22 certainly represents no more, and perhaps that of verse 38 is equally valueless. The opening clause of the Markan section 12 46-50 "While he was yet speaking to the multitude" of course takes the place of Mk. 3 20, 32 a, although the multitude in question is not the same. It serves to link up this version of the saying on Spiritual Kin with the Q paragraph preceding. But the linking up is justifiable, because in S the saying really did follow on the parable of the House Swept and Garnished (Lk. 11 22 f.).

R<sup>mt</sup> also forms connecting links by alteration of the wording of the source at the close of paragraphs. Thus Luke is certainly correct in closing the Q paragraph against the Perverse Generation with the clause "And Wisdom is justified by her *children*." Mt. 11 19 changes to "justified by her *works*," because the paragraph next inserted (with the typical *τότε*) is an "upbraiding" of "the cities where most of his *mighty works* were done"

(11 20-24). Luke, as we have seen, gives this latter paragraph a different setting (Lk. 10 13-15), but R<sup>mt</sup> had too much regard for Jesus' appeal to his mighty works in his message to John (11 4f.) to be willing to consider any other setting for the "upbraiding." Hence the change to "works" in 11 19 which forms an easier transition.

A similar change is made in 12 28. Luke, who on all possible occasions (and some impossible ones) brings in references to the Holy Spirit (cf. 11 13; Acts 1 2; 4 25), would certainly have reproduced the reference if he had found it in the Source in Lk. 11 20. R<sup>mt</sup> changes "the finger (or, as we should say, "the hand") of God" to "the *Spirit* of God" to make better connection with the paragraph on Blasphemy of the Spirit, which (on the authority of Mark) he makes to follow in verses 31 f.

In like manner R<sup>mt</sup> retouches the Q parable of the House Swept and Garnished (12 43-45 = Lk. 11 24-28) at beginning and end to fit it for a changed connection. At the beginning no more was required than the addition of a simple *δέ*, but at the close the application which R<sup>mt</sup> (correctly) believes the parable should have is made clear by his addition of the clause "Even so shall it be also unto this evil generation." As an interpretation this is substantially correct; but the phrase "this evil generation" is taken (after R<sup>mt</sup>'s manner) from verses 39, 41, 42. The connection is artificial. The parable belongs where Luke found it and has left it. Rightly understood it supplies a worthy sequel to its companion parable of the Strong Man Armed. Both are concerned with Israel as God's "dwelling" (*mishkan*).

Our exemplary study of the redactional method of R<sup>mt</sup> in Mt. 12 will serve to show something of the process which must supplement the "method of implications" to make the reconstruction of gospel sources truly scientific. Its primary interest lies in the interpretation of the first Gospel in its transmitted form. Even the minute changes this evangelist allows himself in the text of his sources suffice to a remarkable degree to impress upon the material the stamp of his own individual interpretation and application. To a far greater degree R<sup>mt</sup> accomplishes the desired result by simple choice and arrangement of material. The effect of transposition in the hands of an editor who knows

his sources practically by heart is greater than most students realize. And the process of combination exemplified in Mark, R<sup>mt</sup>'s principal source, shows to how large an extent this grouping of material had already been carried. The writer of Jude is a kindred spirit to R<sup>mt</sup>, writing under conditions closely similar. This will appear more and more clearly as the study of his special aims and propensities is extended beyond the limits of a single section of the Gospel, and will be of no small service in determining the problem of its date and historical significance.

But the ultimate and supreme interest of our study lies elsewhere. The gospel critic and the Christian world are concerned above all with the question of the Q material and its source. Determination of the editorial method of our extant Gospels has principal value as a step toward determination of the nature, purpose, and content of the Teaching Source; for only as the changes effected in process of transmission are clearly identified and subtracted can the groundwork be brought to light. Here, as we have seen, the question of order is peculiarly vital. At the same time it is also peculiarly difficult, because our extant Gospels, whether because their compilers found this material already disjointed or because their own requirements led them to radically rearrange it, had already in Matthew's time reduced the original buildings to masses of broken masonry.

Study of Markan and Lukan editorial method must be applied no less careful than that bestowed on Matthew before our final inferences are drawn; but something may perhaps even now be gleaned from the foregoing scrutiny of Mt. 11 and 12. Study of the former has led to the inference that the Second Source was not a mere formless list of *logia*, but a true gospel narrative, albeit constructed on the plan of ancient accounts of the careers of teachers such as Apollonius of Tyana, romances such as the later and legendary Clementine *Homilies* and *Recognitions*, or "Acts" such as the *Preaching of Peter*, and its canonical counterpart preserved in the first half of Luke's second treatise. A series of examples mainly drawn from Luke, more conservative than Matthew of the narrative form of his sources, even justified the inference that the typical *mise en scène* for the individual

discourse of S was some briefly described incident, a healing of Jesus, an interruption from the crowd, a question from disciples or opponents, or the like. The theme of the discourse would thus be determined.

Our study of Mt. 12 has proved complicated because of the many parallels in all four of our Gospels; but it has led to the inference that the common basis of the various arrangements of the material was a discourse in S on Spiritual Sight and Hearing, a discourse whose original setting was the healing of a blind man accompanied (perhaps we might say followed) by the exorcism of a "dumb devil." The discourse was broken by the interjected cry of a woman, to which Jesus replied with the saying on Spiritual Kin, perhaps adding the blessing on Seeing Eyes and Hearing Ears (Mt. 13 16 f. = Lk. 10 23 f.). After this followed the Demand for a Sign with the upbraiding of the Evil and Adulterous Generation and a connected Discourse on Spiritual Blindness (Lk. 11 33-36 and parallels).

It would carry us far beyond the limits imposed to attempt to trace further possible connections in Luke and Mark. There is no small incentive to further study, however, in the phenomena of Mk. 1 40-4 34. The section corresponding to Mt. 12 1-14 viz., Mk. 2 23-3 6, is an intrusion. Mark attaches it to his own greatly condensed account of Jesus' appeal to the "mighty works" and reply to the charge "He eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners," to obtain a premature and exaggerated account of the growth of opposition. If this be set aside we find next a brief statement of Jesus' withdrawal to the sea accompanied by "a great multitude from Galilee" (Mk. 3 7 a = Mt. 12 15). R<sup>mk</sup> expands the description of the crowd (3 7 b-12 = Mt. 12 16) with material drawn from the narrative (7 24; 4 1; 5 1 π., 24 π.), and introduces after it the Choosing of the Twelve (3 13-19) preliminary to their Mission (6 7-13). The intervening material (3 20-6 a), a conveying of "the mystery of the kingdom of God" in parables to this chosen circle and a display of the power of faith in five consecutive narratives of wonder-working, thus paves the way for the Mission of the Twelve. What then if we remove the Markan adaptation leaving the material to fall into its own unadapted sequences? The remainder (carrying our analysis

no further than the beginning of Mk. 4) will consist of the following sections: (1) The accusation "He casteth out by Beelzebub" and Jesus' reply; (2) parable of the Strong Man Armed; (3) Blasphemy against the Spirit; all three being enclosed in a variant of (4) the saying on Spiritual Kin (Mk. 3 20-35). But this is just the sequence of S after the appeal of Jesus to the Mighty Works (Mt. 11 1-10) paralleled in Mk. 2 1-23! The next section, introduced by a description of the multitude by the sea-side taught by Jesus from the boat, is the Parable of the Sower, closing with the saying "He that hath *ears to hear* let him hear." Was this parable a continuation in S of the discourse on Eyes that see not and Ears that hear not? If so, we have still another link in the chain of S sections. And there is the more reason to believe it, because immediately following the parable R<sup>mk</sup> introduces an abbreviated form of the Hymn of Wisdom giving thanks for the revelation to babes (Mk. 4 11; cf. Mt. 11 25-27 = Lk. 10 21 f.). Moreover the paragraph which R<sup>mk</sup> appends to the interpretation of the parable (Mk. 4 21-25) is an agglutination of Q sayings including those on Shedding of Light (4 21 = Lk. 11 33), Hidden things brought to Light (4 22 = Lk. 12 2), and Ears to Hear (4 23 = Mt. 11 15). At the conclusion of the discourse Jesus enters the boat with his disciples and crosses to the other side of the lake (4 35; cf. 8 10-12).

The possibility of continuing the original connection of S beckons the critic on. The perplexities are great, perhaps too great to permit more than plausible conjecture. Nevertheless the hope is surely justified that by sufficient care in the application of the two methods of "implication" and "determination of redactional type" some further steps may be made toward reconstruction of the precanonical Source.