

The Arrangement of Materials in St. Matthew viii.—ix.

BY THE REV. CANON SIR JOHN C. HAWKINS, BART., M.A., OXFORD.

II.

SOME general considerations were put forward in the July number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES¹ as to the principles and purposes which seem to have influenced the compiler of our First Gospel in this portion of it. I wish now to make some more special suggestions as to his selection and arrangement of the miracles—ten in number—which constitute the main subject of this division of the Gospel (8¹–9³⁴).

I assume that my readers will be able to refer to the table printed in the first part of the article, in which the contents of this portion of St. Matthew were divided into thirteen sections, ten of which contain the miracles. And now, as before, I will refer merely by page and column (*e.g.* 281*a*) to Mr. Allen's 'Study' in vol. xi. p. 279 ff. of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, without naming it on each occasion.

Before entering upon the list of ten miracles, a preliminary question suggests itself. Why does Matthew omit altogether one miracle, and that the first one, of the six related by Mark in 1²¹–5⁴³—*i.e.* in that part of the Second Gospel which evidently formed the principal quarry of materials for the division of the First Gospel now before us? The miracle in question is the expulsion of the unclean spirit in the synagogue at Capernaum (Mk 1²¹⁻²⁸ = Lk 4³¹⁻³⁷). There must have been some reason for this omission. It is true that another piece of Marcan narrative is passed over by Matthew, namely, Mk 1³⁵⁻³⁹ = Lk 4⁴²⁻⁴⁴, but in that case no special explanation is needed, for the omission is sufficiently accounted for by the first evangelist's habit of leaving out matter, however picturesque and interesting, which does not supply direct information either as to the moral teaching of Jesus or as to His actual performance of miracles.

In the present case, two conjectures—they are hardly more than that—may be hazarded.

(*a*) Possibly the simple cause of the omission of this narrative may be that Matthew, having employed already some of its opening words

(‘they were astonished at his teaching,’ etc., Mk 1²²) in his description of the effects of the Sermon on the Mount (Mk 7^{28, 29}), regarded this Marcan section as used up and done with, and either forgot, or did not care, to turn to it again when entering upon this historical division of his Gospel.

(*b*) But more probably the cause of the omission lies, mainly or exclusively, in the similarity of this miracle to the more remarkable and outstanding one of the Gadarene demoniac or demoniacs (Mk 5¹⁻²⁰, Mt 8²⁸⁻³⁴, Lk 8²⁶⁻³⁹). Let us suppose that Matthew had before him among his materials the two Marcan leaves or pages on which these appeals to Jesus from demoniacs occur—

Mk 1 ²⁴ . ἀνέκραξεν λέγων Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; ἄλλοθι ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδά [W.H. marg. and Tisch. οἰδαμέν] σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἄγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ.	Mk 5 ⁷ . κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλη λέγει Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ υἱέ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου; ὀρκίζω σε τὸν Θεόν, μὴ με βασανίσῃς.
--	--

He would thus see that the only striking and distinctive feature of the earlier and shorter of these two miracles had a close parallel in the later and fuller of them. Would he not then be likely to omit the first of them, knowing that the second would have a place farther on in his list? I admit that it is Luke, whose general habit of *Sparsamkeit* would cause us to expect him to make such an omission on the ground of similarity; but, nevertheless, Matthew seems to be the compiler who made it here. Or perhaps it may be said that he combines the two Marcan narratives rather than that he leaves out either of them. For here may lie the explanation of there being two demoniacs mentioned in Matthew's narrative of the Gadarene miracle, while Mark and Luke respectively name but one. It may well have been the case that Matthew—or some previous teacher whose compilation he used—brought together these two similar though distinct miracles for the purpose of explaining them, and especially of explaining the two demoniacs' acknowledgment of Jesus, and that in the course of oral teaching

¹ Vol. xii. p. 471 ff.

the two events gradually came to be regarded as simultaneous. This process of combination would be helped by the occurrence of the plurals, *ἡμῖν*, *ἡμᾶς*, and perhaps *οἶδαμεν* in the account of the Capernaum miracle (Mk 1²⁴). The case may have been similar in Mt 20⁸⁰, where the blind man healed at Bethsaida (Mk 8²²⁻²⁶ only) may at first have had his cure described as an appendage or accompaniment to the better known cure of Bartimæus, and afterwards may have gradually come to be regarded as having been healed at the same time.

Let us now take the ten Matthæan miracles in the order in which we find them in ten of our thirteen sections (see the table on p. 471).

Section i. Miracle 1. The Healing of the Leper, Mt viii. 1 (or 2)-4.

This miracle appears first in Matthew's list, not merely because, as we have just seen, Mark's first miracle is omitted altogether, but because his second miracle, the healing of Peter's wife's mother (1²⁹⁻³¹), is by Matthew postponed to this one, which stands third in Mark (1⁴⁰⁻⁴⁵), after some verses of other kinds (1³²⁻³⁹). Why was this change from Mark's order made?

I am disposed to reject, even more decidedly than Mr. Allen does (p. 281*a*), the likelihood that 'as a matter of fact the healing of the leper followed the Sermon' on the Mount, and is therefore placed next to it here. I believe that here, as in a few other places, not only the time-honoured divisions into chapters, but also the divisions into paragraphs in the R.V. and in W.H.'s text are misleading. With vv. 7²⁸⁻²⁹ should be read 8¹: these three verses combine to tell us the whole immediate result of the Sermon on the Mount, namely, that *οἱ ὄχλοι* were astonished at the teaching of Jesus, and that, consequently, when He was come down from the mountain those multitudes or a large portion of them—*ὄχλοι πολλοί*—followed Him. So ends that incident, and a completely fresh one, quite disconnected with what had gone before, begins in 8². Such is Tatian's way of regarding the matter; for he passes on from Mt 8¹, not to Mt 8² (the leper), but to Lk 7² (the centurion's servant), and reserves the healing of the leper for a much later place—indeed, an unaccountably late place—in his harmony (see *Diatessaron*, ed. Hamlyn Hill, pp.

84, 129). And in case it may be thought that the *καὶ ἰδοὺ* in Mt 8² necessarily implies some connexion with what had gone before, it may be well to point to some instances in which that phrase is used when there is apparently complete discontinuity with the preceding narrative, namely, Mt 19¹⁶, Lk 10²⁵ 23⁵⁰ 24¹³.

But, further, not only is there thus no authority, except that of modern chapters and paragraphs, for connecting the miracle before us with the first journey after the Sermon on the Mount, but the narrative itself contains internal evidence against that connexion. For is it not very difficult to understand how the command 'See thou tell no man, etc.,' could have been given by Jesus, if the miracle had been wrought at the time when 'great multitudes followed Him'? And, accordingly, Mark (1⁴⁵) ascribes the promulgation of the miracle, not to any bystanders, but only to the healed leper himself. And though Luke speaks of *ὄχλοι* (5¹⁵) they were evidently fresh crowds who then came together (*συνήρχοντο*) because of the report of this miracle, and not people who had previously been accompanying Jesus.

We have seen, then, as to Matthew, not only that he did not feel himself tied to the order of Mark (whom perhaps he knew to have written *οὐ τάξει*), but also that there is no reason to suppose that he thought of connecting this historical narrative with the foregoing record of the Sermon on the Mount. He was therefore free to commence his specimens and illustrations of Christ's power with any one of His early miracles. Why did he choose this one? Partly, perhaps, as has been suggested by Mr. Bartlet (Hastings' *D.B.* iii. 300*b*), 'because in Mark the healing of the leper comes between a reference to a general ministry in Galilee (1³⁰), in which Matthew sees the continuation of his own 4²⁵, and an entry into Capernaum.' The possibility of this influence need not be denied; but I have no doubt that it was mainly, even if it was not exclusively, the subject-matter of this miracle which disposed Matthew to give it the place of honour. For it would have a unique interest for him, and for the Jewish-Christians, whose habits of thought and whose needs he seems to have primarily regarded, both because of the prominence given to leprosy in Lv 13-14 and elsewhere in the Old Testament, and because of the illustration of the respectful attitude of Jesus towards the Mosaic

law (as in Mt 5¹⁷⁻¹⁹) which is supplied by the reference to the priesthood.

Section ii. Miracle 2. The Healing of the Centurion's Servant, Mt viii. 5-13.

I do not deny that Mr. Allen's suggestion (p. 281*a*) of 'a group of three miracles of healing' may sufficiently account for the early place of this miracle and of the next one; even if Matthew did not start with the idea of triads, it may have occurred to him as he went on that he might make such a subdivision in at least the first part of his decade. But I should rather think that this miracle may be placed thus early, because Matthew found it in the *Logia* standing next to the Great Sermon, or to such parts of it as were already brought together in the *Logia*. It is in that position that Luke (7²) keeps it. And there is considerable ground for assigning this narrative—though it is a narrative—to the *Logia*. We have here, with the brief exception of Mt 12^{22, 23} = Lk 11^{14, 15} (which, however, may be said to be implied in Mk 3²²), the only miracle, and with the further exception of the Temptation, the only narrative, which is found in Matthew and Luke only, the whole of the rest of the matter common to them but not to Mark being discourse, with or without brief historical prefaces. Most modern writers attribute this common matter generally to the *Logia* (see, e.g., references in Moffatt's *Historical New Testament*, p. 642*f.*); need we except this miracle? I think not, if we take the most reasonable account of the term *Logia* to be that it implies not a complete history like our present Gospels, and, on the other hand, not merely sayings introduced by 'Jesus said,' or 'Jesus saith,' as in the so-called 'Oxyrhynchus *Logia*,' but *sayings of the Lord, together with notices of the occasions that led to their being delivered, when such notices are needed for the full understanding of them.* Then the name will cover this story. For in order to see the force of the saying, 'I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel,' it is necessary to have read the previous account of this non-Israelite, and especially of his recognition of power of Jesus to heal at a distance.

That Matthew had the Logian collection before him at this time is rendered additionally probable by the fact that while, according to his frequent custom, he otherwise abbreviates the narrative as

it is found in Luke (and as I am inclined to believe it originally stood), he nevertheless inserts into it two presumably Logian verses of discourse (8¹¹⁻¹²) which Luke has in a quite different but about equally appropriate setting (13^{28, 29}).

Section iii. Miracle 3. Healing of Peter's Wife's Mother, Mt viii. 14, 15.

Beyond the suggestion of the triad, the only thing to be said here is that Matthew now returns to take up the Marcan miracle which he had displaced for the (to him) more important and interesting one of the leper. He may have been reminded to do so by the fact that, like the miracle which he had placed second, it is connected with Capernaum.

Section vi. Miracle 4. The Stilling of the Storm, Mt viii. 23-27.

Why does Matthew here again desert the Marcan order, even when evidently deriving his materials from Mark? Why does he not take next the healing of the paralytic in the house at Capernaum (Mk 2¹⁻¹²), since that is the miracle which follows next upon those already drawn from Mark? As to the postponement of all the other matter between Mk 2¹⁸ and 4³⁴, the causes suggested by Mr. Allen (p. 281*b*) seem to me to be quite adequate. But why is this miracle postponed to two others which stand so much later in Mark? No doubt Matthew may have known that Mark wrote οὐ τάξει, and in that case he would require no very strong reasons for making such alterations. But some reasons he must have had. It is suggested (p. 281*b*) that there may have been in his mind the fear of seeming to 'confuse two visits' to Capernaum, that being the place where the healings of Peter's wife's mother and of the paralytic occurred, though at different times. But I doubt whether in this part of his Gospel he sufficiently cared, or expected his readers to care, about the times and places of miracles for this consideration to have influenced him. I should rather suggest (*a*) with Mr. Bartlet (*Hastings' D.B.*, p. 300*b*) that the mention of 'eventide' and of the gathering of crowds which he had lately adopted from Mark (Mk 1³²⁻³⁴ = Mt 8¹⁶) may have brought to his mind the somewhat similar occasion which Mark records much later (4^{35, 36}),

but which was none the less suitable for Matthew's non-chronological purpose here. (*b*) Again, Matthew may have thought it well, in this list of distinct specimens of Christ's various miracles, to keep the two accounts of the healing of paralysis (Mt 8⁶⁻¹³ and 9¹⁻⁸) at a distance from one another. (*c*) And this is the place where the suggestion of the ascending triad of three miracles (282*a*) 'illustrative of Christ's authority over forces natural (8²³⁻²⁷), demoniacal (8²⁸⁻³⁴), and spiritual (9¹⁻⁸)' should especially be borne in mind.

It should be noticed here, again, as at the beginning of Mt 8, that we should be on our guard against the influence of the arrangement of chapters and paragraphs. If we make our break after Mt 9¹ instead of before it, we can take that verse merely as the conclusion of the Gadarene incident and as the result of the request that He would depart, and not as the introduction to the subsequent miracle. And in that case all direct *contradiction* between Mark and Matthew disappears, though they still arrange their matter differently.

Section vii. Miracle 5. The Gadarene Demoniacs, Mt viii. 28-34.

This obviously follows the fourth miracle, both historically, as in Mk 5¹, and also in the ascending scale of the suggested second triad of miracles.

Section viii. Miracle 6. The Sick of the Palsy healed, Mt ix. 1-8.

The causes of Matthew's postponement of this miracle have already been discussed under the heading of section vi. It may perhaps be wondered why he did not still further postpone it, so as to relegate it, with Mk 2²³⁻²⁸ and Mk 3¹⁻⁶ (also a miracle), to the controversial or anti-Pharisaic division of his Gospel contained in chap. 12. It is just possible that at first he held it back from its Marcan place with that intention, but that afterwards, when it appeared to be an apt climax to the miracles which he had just recorded, he placed it in the list of miracles instead of the list of controversies. For, like the healing of the withered hand (Mk 3¹⁻⁶ = Mt 12⁹⁻¹⁴), it has its fitness for either list.

Sections x. and xi. Miracles 7 and 8. The Raising of Jairus' Daughter and the Healing of the Issue of Blood, Mt ix. 18-26.

Although, as was pointed out previously (p. 473), these two incidents must be reckoned as distinct miracles, it is well to consider them together.

The matter contained in Mark up to this point has (with two small omissions already noticed, p. 20), either been included by Matthew in this division of his Gospel or purposely reserved for other sections. 'This brings him to Mk 5²¹⁻⁴³' (p. 282*a*). But at this point there arises a more serious chronological difficulty than we have yet encountered. For here Matthew does not only, as in other cases (see above the closing remarks on section vi. as to the most doubtful and difficult of them) disregard Mark's order, but he certainly appears to contradict it. The request of Jairus, which Mark (5²¹⁻²³, followed as usual in Lk 8⁴¹) seems to locate on the shore of the sea of Galilee, immediately after the return from Gadara, is by Matthew said to have taken place at the time of the discourse on fasting after the call of Matthew (*ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος*, 9¹⁸). How did this difference arise? The suggestion of Matthew 'altering the beginning verse to suit his connexion' (p. 282*a*), implies a deliberate contradiction of Mark's express note of time and place which I am loth to accept, unless there are some undoubted instances of such contradiction elsewhere which can be brought forward as parallel to this one, and unless there is no other way of explaining the present passage except by the hypothesis of such a direct and intentional contradiction here. Perhaps the two following suggestions may be worth taking into account:—

(*a*) Is it not possible that Matthew—or some other compiler or copyist working upon the Marcan materials before or after him—may have accidentally misplaced the words *ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος*, by means of which the miracle now appears to be linked by him to the discourse on fasting? For it will be observed that in Mk 5³⁵ (and so in Lk 8⁴⁹), where the Jairus-story is resumed after the episode of the healing of the woman on the way, the recommencement is made by the use of the words *ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος*. But Matthew has no such words, and, indeed, no occasion for them in this later situation, though

So it seems as if the statement as made in IV. 23, 24

he has the very similar ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος at the commencement of the whole story. May he not, therefore, either through a slip of memory or through a too hasty glance at the Marcan MS. which he was using, have transferred this clause in substance from the recommencement to the commencement of the narrative. I venture to make this suggestion because the break in this miracle makes it more likely than others to be erroneously referred to; twice in the preparation of this article I found myself giving a wrong reference to the incident, because my eye fell upon the recommencement in Mk 5³⁵ when I was looking for the commencement in 5²¹.

(b) Though it is highly probable, I should not admit it to be absolutely certain, that Mark intended to fix the date of this miracle immediately after the return from Gadara. No doubt it is the next incident that he records after that return and after the gathering of a multitude round Jesus when He was on the seashore (Mk 5^{21. 22}). But since he was writing without any special attention to order (for οὐ τάξει must mean at least as much as this), he may only have entered it in this place as being a Galilean miracle. And it is to be observed that καὶ ἔρχεται (used in v.²²) and καὶ ἔρχονται often form in Mark the beginning of the record of a new incident, with little or no reference to what has gone before; see, e.g., Mk 1⁴⁰ 3²⁰ 8²² 10⁴⁶ 11^{15. 27} 12¹⁸. But even granting that Mark did mean to express that he was recording the miracle in its exact chronological place, it is quite possible that Matthew may not have noticed that this was the case. For here again it is probable that there would be no marked commencement of a paragraph at Mk 5²¹ as there is in our Greek Testaments; and therefore it may well be that the compiler of the First Gospel, when his eyes fell upon the very familiar Marcan opening καὶ ἔρχεται, might rush to the conclusion that here was the beginning of a new incident, without looking backward to see whether there were any previous words of connexion to be found. He would thus ignore, without intentionally throwing over, the Marcan order of events.

Sections xii. and xiii. Miracles 9 and 10. The Healing of Two Blind Men and the Healing of a Dumb Demoniac, Mt ix. 27-34.

It is very difficult, as I have previously said

(p. 474), to explain the insertion of these two brief records of miracles, unless it was with the purpose of making up the number ten. Not only are they 'comparatively colourless and uninteresting' (A. B. Bruce *in loc.*) as contrasted with even Matthew's other narratives of miracles, but they are so very similar to two of those narratives that it is almost impossible not to regard them as doublets. (They are so exhibited in *Horæ Synopticæ*, pp. 75-78.)

(a) The former of them (Mt 9²⁷⁻³¹) is closely parallel to the triple narrative of the healing of the blind man or men at Jericho (Mk 10⁴⁶⁻⁵², Mt 20²⁹⁻³⁴, Lk 18³⁵⁻⁴³), where the Marcan account seems most likely to be the original one; observe especially in proof of this parallelism υἱός (or υἱέ) Δαυεὶδ, ἐλέησον, ἤφατο; also the less important use of the verbs κράζειν and ποιεῖν. It is true, indeed, that instead of the phrase, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε, which is used by Mark and Luke (but omitted by Matthew) in the Jericho miracle, we have here κατὰ τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν γενηθήτω ὑμῖν; but this is only an instance of Matthew's employment of a favourite formula of his own, as in 8¹³ to the leper, ὡς ἐπίστευσας γενηθήτω σοι, and in 15²⁸ to the Syrophenician woman, μεγάλη σου ἡ πίστις γενηθήτω σοι ὡς θέλεις. And in the account given of the disobedient promulgation of this miracle we seem to find Matthew, here as elsewhere, transferring the familiar language of Mark from one place to another, as may thus be seen—

Mk 1^{43ff.} καὶ ἐμβριμησάμενος αὐτῶ . . . λέγει αὐτῶ . . . Ὅρα μηδενὶ μηδὲν εἴπης . . . ὁ δὲ ἐξελθὼν ἤρατο κηρύσσειν πολλὰ καὶ διαφημίσει τὸν λόγον.

Mt 9^{30f.} καὶ ἐνεβριμήθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων Ὅρατε μηδεὶς γινωσκέτω. Οἱ δὲ ἐξελθόντες διεφήμισαν αὐτὸν ἐν ὄλῃ τῇ γῆ ἐκείνῃ.

The rarity of the verb διαφημίσειν, which is used only three times in the N.T. and never in LXX, adds a special probability to the supposition of such a transference of Marcan language. And if that view is accepted, there remains nothing distinctive and unparalleled in the narrative now before us except the fact of the entry into the house. For the substance of the question, 'Believe ye that I am able to do this,' and of the affirmative answer, is undoubtedly implied in the Marcan and Lucan saying, 'Thy faith hath made thee whole.'

Unless we are to assume that Matthew had some special chronological information of his own, which on general grounds does not seem likely in this division of his Gospel, we must suppose that

the words παράγοντι ἐκεῖθεν (9²⁷) were added by him or some other editor as an inference from the juxtaposition of the Jairus-miracle and this one. Possibly the two incidents had been placed next to one another among the ten, merely because they set forth so similarly the spread of the fame of the miracles of Jesus. Compare the concluding words of the two—

Mt 9²⁸. καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἡ φήμη : Mt 9³¹. οἱ δὲ ἐξεληθόντες
 αὐτῆ εἰς θλην τὴν γῆν ἐκείνην. : διεφθίμωσαν αὐτὸν ἐν ὄλη τῇ
 γῇ ἐκείνῃ.

(β) The tenth and last miracle (Mt 9³²⁻³⁴) shows no more independence than the ninth. Whether we accept v.³⁴ as original or reject it as being of the nature of a 'Western non-interpolation' (see W.H., *Introd.* p. 176; the verse is omitted in Syr^{sin}), the narrative is closely parallel to, and appears to be a doublet of, Matthew's later account in 12²²⁻²⁴ of the exorcism which gave occasion to the great 'defensive discourse' in chap. 12^{25ff}. (It is curious, by the way, that in 12²² Matthew speaks of the demoniac as blind as well as dumb, and uses the title υἱὸς Δαυεὶδ, thus suggesting links of connexion with both the miracles which we find together here.) But the narrative now before us is even more closely parallel to Luke's record (11^{14, 15}) of the miracle, which leads to the defensive discourse; this appears in the use of the verb ἐκβάλλειν, of the genitive absolute, and of the verb θαύμασαν, where Mt 12²³ has ἐξίσταντο. These similarities seem to point to a Logian origin of the incident. It will be remembered that in Mk 3²² no account of the expulsion of a demon is prefixed to the defensive discourse, though it is assumed that such expulsion had previously occurred. There is indeed one point in which this record does not merely reproduce the description of the later miracle, namely, the exclamation of the multitudes, Οὐδέποτε ἐφάνη οὕτως ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ. But here an explanation suggests itself which is analogous to that which

we applied to a sentence of our ninth miracle; Matthew seems here, as in other cases, to have adopted Marcan words from another context, namely, Οὕτως οὐδέποτε εἶδαμεν (Mk 2¹²), and to have blended them with his favourite verb φαίνομαι, and with the name Ἰσραήλ which occurs to him much more frequently and naturally than to Mark (he uses it twelve times, and Mark but twice).

In both divisions of this article, and especially in this second one, we have been occupied with a department of the Synoptic Problem, in dealing with the details of which, positiveness of assertion is singularly out of place. For anything like certainty concerning them is unobtainable. The compiler of these two chapters has left us no rationale of his plan and procedure, and therefore we can only say—as I have been saying or implying so often here—that he *may have* been influenced by such and such considerations in the selection and arrangement of his materials. For of course he may have been also influenced by other considerations—by his own information or lack of information, or by the special needs of those for whom he wrote—in ways at which we cannot even guess. So all that is really practicable, and I think all that is really important, is to point out some fairly probable causes, by some or all of which he may have been guided in his compilation, and which support, or at least harmonize with, the chief conclusion which seems to be resulting with a fair amount of certainty from the study of the Synoptic Problem, namely, the conclusion that our First and Third Gospels rest mainly on a constant though sometimes a free use of our Second Gospel, with the insertion of supplementary matter drawn from various sources, but especially from a second documentary source which consisted mainly of sayings of Christ, and which is usually identified with the *Logia* of Matthew.