

# 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 MATTHEAN DISCOURSE IN PARABLES,  
MT. 13 1-52

BENJ. W. BACON  
YALE UNIVERSITY

**I**N two preceding articles of the *JOURNAL* (XLV, i-ii, pp. 23-56, 1926, and XLVI, i-ii, pp. 20-49, 1927) the present writer has attempted to throw new light on the problem of the second Synoptic Source by critical analysis of the two chapters 11 and 12, which form a narrative introduction to the Discourse in Parables (ch. 13) of Matthew's Gospel, the three chapters together forming his third 'book.' For while the supposed corroboration of the critics' discovery of a Second Synoptic Source in Papias' witness to Matthew as containing "the logia" is pure delusion (and delusion far from harmless), the second century has lately yielded important corroboration for critical findings regarding Matthew on another point. The ancient versified prologue already mentioned (*JBL* XLVI, p. 21) which speaks of Matthew as having written "five books" against "the God-slaying people of the Jews" not only corroborates the general verdict of modern interpreters of the Gospel regarding its special animus against "the Jews," but shows clearly that the five-fold division of the Gospel, until now regarded as one of the achievements of critical analysis, was well known as early as the second century. It may well account for Papias' corresponding division of his *Interpretations* into "five books", if indeed it was not marked in the text of Matthew itself from the beginning.

The five 'Sermons' into which the evangelist has divided his record of Jesus' "commandments," each ending with a

stereotyped coupler verse connecting it at 7 28 f.; 11 1; 13 53; 19 1 and 26 1 with the succeeding narrative, were long since recognized as corresponding to the five 'codes' embodied in the Pentateuch. The discovery should bring better understanding of the relation of discourse to narrative in Matthew. Each 'book' consists of a section of narrative, usually taken from Mark, introducing a 'Sermon.' The first of these 'sermons' is on The Righteousness of Sons (cc. 5-7); the second on The Duty of Evangelists (c. 10); the third on Israel's Blindness (13 1-52); the fourth on Rulership in the Church (c. 18); the fifth on Judgment to Come (cc. 23-25). The five 'books' themselves as a whole are prefaced by an introduction telling of the birth and infancy of the Redeemer (cc. 1-2), and completed by a closing narrative (cc. 26-28) of the crucifixion and resurrection, making a sevenfold division of the gospel. The coupler verse five times repeated links each book in turn to the narrative thread by means of the formula "And it came to pass when Jesus had finished these . . . he (engaged in some other activity)." The clew thus furnished in the structural framework of the Gospel to the evangelist's conception of his task is of no small value. It is made the basis for the present discussion, whose field is limited to the third 'book,' that which concludes the first half of the Gospel, bringing the Galilean ministry to its close.

In several respects the critical problems of Book iii (Mt. 11-13) are peculiarly intricate, but for those whose interest lies in the extrication and reconstruction of the Second Source the perplexities are not unexpected. To eliminate the 'perturbations' occasioned by Matthew's adaptation of his Q material, whether as respects form or order, the indispensable first step is acquaintance with his editorial motives, design, and methods. These can be studied in his treatment of Mark. The results when applied to the Q material will help to decide between the Matthean or Lukan form. For it is of course understood that the editorial methods of R<sup>lk</sup> receive the same careful and dispassionate study as those of R<sup>mt</sup>.

The two preceding articles, which will be referred to herein respectively as I and II, have brought certain definite results

with respect to the narrative introduction of Matthew's third 'book.' Contrary to his procedure in Book i (cc. 3-7), where the greater part of the narrative introduction (cc. 3-4) is drawn from Mark, but the whole of the 'sermon' from the Second Source, in Book iii only a small part of the narrative introduction (cc. 11-12) rests on Mark, but nearly the whole of the 'sermon.' Our study of the narrative introduction has already led to certain important conclusions in I as to the nature of S, and in II as to the method of R<sup>mt</sup> in his adaptation of it. But our exemplification of the special critical method which in the writer's judgment should be applied to the problem of the Second Source will not be complete until we have covered Book iii in both parts, 'sermon' as well as narrative introduction. The 'implications' of the Q material in c. 11 have given us some further insight into the character of S, also the interweaving of Mk. and Q in c. 12 has thrown light upon the procedure of R<sup>mt</sup>. It remains to apply these results to certain acknowledged problems of the Discourse in Parables of c. 13.

To J. Weiss "one of the most striking proofs of the dependence of Matthew on Mark" was "the building out of the Markan substructure" so apparent in the Matthean Discourse in Parables. We find in fact scarcely any dissent from general recognition of this "Markan substructure." Allen, Klostermann, McNeile, agree that in c. 13 "Matthew follows Mark in arranging a collection of parables" (McNeile), and point out for us that the context and order in which these are placed, and the motive ascribed for Jesus' adoption of this mode of teaching are identical with those of Mark. In fact Matthew's unbroken following of the order of Mark which appears to begin with his fourth 'book,' continuing from 13 53 to the end, in reality begins already with Mt. 12 24-50 — Mk. 3 22-35, since all Matthew's Markan material follows from this point on in the Markan order, and without omission save such material as Matthew has already employed, or shortly after employs, in its Q context. The only exceptions to this rule we shall find to be apparent rather than real, confirming on the whole the general observation that the *bouleversement*

of Markan order in Mt. 3-13 is due to Matthew's attempt to form a more logical sequence by combining the "faith wonders" of Mk. 4 35-5 43 into a series of ten "mighty works" suitable to introduce the Mission of the Twelve and thus to constitute his second 'Book' (7 28-10 42). Apart from this Matthew scarcely varies at all from the order of Mark.

It is observable, however, that Matthew's resumption of the Markan order begins with an undoubtedly displaced Q section (Mt. 12 24-50 = Mk. 3 22-35 = Lk. 11 14-23), while the slight transpositions affect only Q material (Mk. 4 21-24 = Mt. 5 15 = Lk. 11 33; Mt. 10 26 = Lk. 12 2; Mt. 7 2 = Lk. 6 38) and usually result in a better context if not always the same connection given by Luke. The inference can scarcely be avoided that Matthew has simply given these Q *logia* where he found them in S, cancelling their equivalents (except for certain phrases used to enrich his parallel) when reached in the process of transcribing Mark. In the single instance Mt. 13 12 = Mk. 4 25 we have a very slight displacement obviously made to strengthen a desired application. In Mark the *logion* (for this too belongs to the group of supplemental *logia* loosely attached by Mark after the interpretation of the parable of the Sower) seems to be suggested by the "taking away" of the seed sown in unfruitful soil. Matthew attaches it slightly earlier to sharpen the contrast between those who do and those who do not receive the word. With this trifling exception Matthew's transpositions of Markan material after 12 24-50 can all be accounted for by simple cancellation of doublets. That is, when he reaches a passage in Mark which he has already given from S he leaves it untranscribed save for such clauses as he can use to enrich his parallel. Correspondingly, when at a later stage he finds embodied in material he is transcribing from S something he had previously copied from Mark he either turns back and cancels the duplicate, or (as has happened in some twenty-two instances) fails to notice the duplication and lets the doublet stand. We can easily follow the process when the material cancelled is Markan. Of course, since we have no more of S than our evangelists have chosen to transcribe, it is impossible to say

how much of S Matthew may have sacrificed through a preference for Mark. All we know is that throughout his fourth and fifth 'books,' dealing with the Judean ministry, crucifixion and resurrection, he has followed Mark without material omission or change of order to the end, merely supplementing with Q material or adding slight embellishments of unknown derivation.

The dependence of R<sup>mt</sup> on the entire section Mk. 3 22-4 34 being so unmistakable we may best conform to the rule of procedure from the relatively known to the unknown by examining first his changes by addition or otherwise in the successive paragraphs of his Markan model. Fortunately we have Luke at hand to determine whether any of these changes are due to parallels in S.

1. Mk. 3 22-35 = Mt. 12 24-32 = Lk. 11 14-23, 27 f.; 12 10.

This section of Matthew is preliminary, leading up to the Discourse. In II, pp. 30-38, enough has been said concerning the relation of the story of The Accusation of the Scribes, 'He Exorcizeth by Beelzebub,' to that relating Jesus' Denunciation of the Blind Generation to make it apparent that the unity of the group Mt. 12 22-50, which offsets the opposing "Pharisees" of 22-37 and the "evil and adulterous generation" of "scribes and Pharisees" of 38-45 by the obedience of Jesus' Spiritual Kin (46-50) is not of Matthew's manufacture. Matthew borrows the theme from Mk. 3 22-35, continuing the loan in the Discourse in Parables (13 1 ff. = Mk. 4 1 ff.). But Luke's equivalent combination, derived in 11 14-23, 27 f. from S unmingled with Markan material, proves decisively that the antithesis does not originate with either Mark or Matthew. The Accusation (Mt. 12 22-32), the Demand for a Sign (38-42), and the *logion* on Spiritual Kin (46-50), stood together in S. This is proved by Lk. 11 14-28. Matthew's additions to the group, as already shown, are partly supplements from S (sometimes transposed) partly embellishments of his own to heap further denunciation on the detested Pharisees (vv. 33-37), or to clarify the meaning by editorial touches in ver. 40 and

ver. 45 c. He also adds the words "blind and", "and saw," in ver. 22.

Luke is probably responsible for the slight transposition of 11 24-28 in front of instead of after 29-32, so that we need ascribe to R<sup>mt</sup> no more complicated task than simply the supplementation of Mark from S. As Mark seems originally to have derived the story from S, the task of R<sup>mt</sup> consisted simply of restoring elements omitted by his predecessor, precisely as in the case of the Temptations. However, the process was not quite so simple as the mere appending of the two paragraphs 33-37 (R) and 38-45 (Q). It included also the interweaving with the Markan context of the Q verses 22 f. (= Lk. 11 14-18), 27 f. (= Lk. 19 f.), 30 (= Lk. 11 23) and 32 (= Lk. 12 10). The greatly reduced abstract given in Mk. 3 22-30 is thus restored in Mt. 12 22-32, 38-45 to its original full proportions, Luke enabling us in addition to supply the closing paragraph on Spiritual Kin (Lk. 11 27 f.), where Matthew has followed the Markan form. For Luke fails to notice that he had already included this in his Markan material (Lk. 8 19-21 = Mk. 3 31-35). Luke's linking together of the Accusation 'He Exorcizeth by Beelzebub' with the Demand for a Sign (Lk. 11 14-18, 29-32) also gives invaluable corroboration to Matthew's grouping. In this also he truly reflects the connection of S.

But unfortunately for the historicity of Matthew's order the incident of the Blasphemy of the Scribes in Mk. 3 22-30 is one of the most flagrant instances in Mark's notoriously unchronological gospel of what we have designated his "that-reminds-me style." The parenthetic reference to the hostile utterance of "the scribes which came down from Jerusalem" (their coming down is not related until Mk. 7 1 ff.), interjected between the account of the more venial utterance of Jesus' kindred as they seek "to lay hold on him" in ver. 20 f. and Jesus' response in ver. 31-35, is manifestly one of Mark's frequent prolepses. The reference to teaching "in parables" is further evidence of the fact (cf. 4 10-12). Consequently R<sup>mt</sup>, while restoring the connected Q material omitted by Mark to the *Markan* context, has unwittingly done serious

violence to the order of S. In 13 1 he takes especial pains to enforce this wrong connection, introducing the words "that same day" and "when Jesus was come forth from the house" (i. e. the house implied in 12 46), to make it quite clear that he connects the Discourse in Parables with the time and locality indicated in Mk. 3 20-35.

From this dislocation of S in Matthew, produced by his dependence on Mark, let us turn to Luke. This evangelist is not misled, but divorces the whole section on the Dumb and Blind Generation from the Markan context. To Luke the Parable of the Sower with its Interpretation and connected *logia* is simply a Markan section available to form an appropriate close for his group of anecdotes illustrative of the two classes of hearers set forth in the closing parable of the discourse on The Righteousness of Sons (6 46-49). In 7 1-8 3 he groups a series of anecdotes derived mainly from S (the greater part is also found in Mt.), all tending to show how aliens, sinners, the poor and despised, gladly received Jesus' word. The Discourse in Parables, *as far as the Sower and its interpretation and appended logia*, is admirably adapted to complete this design, especially if the saying on Spiritual Kin is not used, as in Mark, to introduce the parable but transferred to the close. But Luke has no use for the remaining Markan parables at this point, and makes very little of Mark's idea (adopted by Matthew), that they were a means of hiding "the mystery of the kingdom of God" from the "outsiders." However, Luke too shows a certain degree of affinity with Mark and Matthew in introducing at this point, after the choosing of the Twelve from the "great multitude" of followers (Lk. 6 12-19 = Mk. 3 7-12, 13-19), first, with Matthew, the Discourse on the Righteousness of Sons (Lk. 6 20-49 = Mt. 5 1-7 27), then a section to illustrate the separation between fruitful and unfruitful hearers (7 1-8 21). As we have seen, Luke takes the first half of this section from S (7 1-8 3), the second half from Mark (8 4-21), and having brought the theme to a rhetorical close by transposing the *logion* on Spiritual Kin from its place before to a place after the parable of the Sower (Mk. 3 31-35 = Lk. 8 19-21), he continues to transcribe from



Mark down to the end of the Galilean ministry, omitting for reasons elsewhere explained the section dealing with the Gospel among the Gentiles (Mk. 6 45-8 26).<sup>1</sup>

The end of this division of Luke is very clearly marked at 9 50, for manifestly with the words which follow: "And it came to pass when the days were well-nigh come that he should be received up, he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem" a new division begins.

For many chapters from this point Luke seems to drop Mark entirely. To the end of chapter 10 we have purely non-Markan material, largely Q, but not connected (unless for a few displaced *logia*) with the group concerned with the Blind and Dumb Generation (Mt. 11-12). Only when we reach 11 14-36 do we find Luke again paralleling this section of Mark and Matthew. But he groups the material otherwise. In 1 1-13 he has transcribed a Discourse on Prayer from S, for most of which Matthew has found place in his first 'sermon' (6 9-13; 7 7-11). Luke has changed the wording at the close from "give good things" (so Mt. 7 11) to "give the Holy Spirit", and in so doing has supplied us with the key to his grouping. Down to the full stop at 12 12, he is concerned with the Gift of the Spirit. ("He that blasphemeth against the Holy Spirit" . . . "The Holy Spirit shall teach you in that hour".) To Luke the significance of the section comprising the Accusation 'He Exorciseth by Beelzebub', Jesus' answer denouncing the Blind Generation, and the *logion* on Spiritual Kin lay in its record of *opposition to the Spirit*. Whether he found in S at this point the Woes on Pharisees and Scribes (11 37-54) and the Warning of Coming Persecution (12 1-9), or supplied them from some other connection because they seemed to him an appropriate addition to the Denunciation of the Blind Generation (11 29-36), we have yet to enquire. At least the evangelist has made clear his general motive in the grouping. All the more so that in 11 20, in spite of his predominant purpose, he has retained the authentic reading of S "the finger of God", where Matthew substitutes "Spirit of God".

<sup>1</sup> See Bacon, *Gospel of Mark*, 1925, p. 163 f.

However, the parallel is so unmistakable between Lk. 11 15-22 and Mk. 3 22-27, that we are not surprised to find this paragraph of Mark omitted after Lk. 6 19. On the other hand Luke makes almost the same supplements to Mark as we find in Matthew, and in coincident language (Lk. 11 14 = Mt. 12 22 f.; Lk. 11 18 b-20 = Mt. 12 27 f.). The inference is unavoidable that both later evangelists are drawing from Mark's original, even restoring the true setting (Exorcism of the Dumb Devil—omitted by Mark as needless for his parenthetic comparison). In coincident portions such as Mt. 12 25 = Lk. 11 17 Luke thus enables us to identify the editorial changes of Mark. Particularly striking is the case of Mk. 3 28 f., which Matthew transcribes from Mark at this point, but combines with S. This appears from comparison of Mt. 12 32 with Lk. 12 10. The latter verse is not drawn from Mark. Luke has merely permitted himself one of the transpositions in the order of S which he seems to have considered more allowable in discourse material than in the narrative of Mark. The *logion* on Blasphemy against the Spirit of God must be restored to the context of the Accusation 'He Exorciseth by Beelzebub' and must be interpreted in the light of the portion omitted by Mark but supplied coincidentally by Matthew and Luke: "If I exorcize by the Spirit (Lk. 'finger') of God".

Much less easy to identify was the equivalence between Mark's adapted version of the *logion* on Spiritual Kin (Mk. 3 31-35 = Lk. 8 19-21) and that of S transcribed by Luke in 11 27 f. No wonder he failed to notice the duplication and left the S form uncanceled, to our immense advantage. He allowed himself again, as already noted, a slight transposition, placing the parable of the Exorcized Demon with its sequel Spiritual Kin (11 24-28) immediately after the Charge 'He Exorcizeth by Beelzebub' (14-23) instead of after ver. 32 at the close of the discourse (so Mt. 12 38-45), because he took the saying about the Exorcized Demon in a literal sense. But the sequence of 11 27 f. after 24-28 is certainly authentic. A third point of contact between Mark and the source Luke is now following is the *logion* on Inward Light (Mk. 4 21 = Lk. 8 16). Once more Luke has failed to observe (or at least to remove) the duplication 8 16 = 11 33. But here the case is altered. Two

sayings of quite different bearing about shedding light are here combined. The Markan *logion* about placing the lamp where its light will be of most service (Mk. 4 21 = Lk. 8 16 — 11 33) is applied by Mark to the saying about Hiding the Mystery of the Kingdom from "outsiders" (Mk. 4 11 f.; cf. 21-23). In Mt. 5 15 it is applied to the duty of setting an example of good works. Its utter lack of relation to the *logion* on Inward Light, or Singleness (that is, Liberality) of Judgment as the Condition of Spiritual Clarity (Lk. 11 34 — Mt. 6 22 f.) is made doubly apparent by the awkward attempt to bring the two together in ver. 38. Is this verse indeed from the skilful writer Luke? Or has some earlier hand attempted a combination of the two Q *logia* Mt. 5 15 = Lk. 11 33 and Mt. 6 22 f. = Lk. 11 34? Surely if Luke were responsible for the combination he would not have allowed the duplication between 8 16 and 11 33 to remain.

A fourth point of contact occurs in the next verse of Mark, Mk. 4 22 = Lk. 8 17. Again Luke appears to have overlooked his previous transcription from Mark and transcribes the same *logion* from S in 12 2. The context, however, is utterly different. The agreement of Matthew with Luke on this point (Lk. 12 2 = Mt. 10 26) makes it obvious that Mark is responsible for the disconnection. The eschatological saying about the secrets of all hearts being revealed (cf. Rom. 2 16) may perhaps have come to the mind of Mark because of the eschatological turn he has given to the *logion* about the "coming" of the Lamp, but intrinsically it is wholly out of place in his setting.

For the present we need not attempt to account for this series of contacts between Mk. and S. We merely note for the ultimate task of reconstruction that all forms of the Synoptic tradition bring in at this point a differentiation between the worthy and unworthy following. Matthew follows Mark closely, but with large additions from S. Luke in 7 1-8 21 uses first S, then Mk., to construct a group descriptive of those who "hear and do the word of God." His S material only partly coincides with Matthew's (7 18-35 = Mt. 11 2-11, 16-19), but into this he interjects a displaced Q section (ver. 29 f. — Mt. 21 32) to sharpen the contrast between Pharisees and scribes on the one hand and "all the people" on the other. From Mark he

takes only the parable of the Sower and such portions of the connected material as bear upon the importance of hearing and bringing forth fruit. He closes with the *logion* on Spiritual Kin, in which Jesus takes as his true mother and brethren "these which hear the word of God and do it." The pragmatic motive is apparent and has doubtless controlled in Luke's selection of material also. But we must postpone the question of Lukan sources and redaction to revert to that of R<sup>mt</sup>.

Both in the formation of a Discourse in Parables and in the attachment of it to the *logion* on Spiritual Kin as illustrative of how Jesus drew about him a body of worthy disciples repelling the light-minded and denouncing the aggressively hostile, Matthew is completely dominated by the conception of Mark, though he has freely supplemented from Q material. Chronologically he has placed the material of his third 'book' at the close of the Galilean ministry, continuing thenceforth the unbroken sequence of Mark from the Rejection in Nazareth (13 53-58 — Mk. 6 1-6) to the end. In this way he has largely counteracted the effects of Mark's prolepsis of S material. However, he has clung stubbornly to the minor notes of Markan sequence in 12 46 and 13 1, thus binding together the two strands of his third 'book' into an artificial unity. Having already employed Mk. 4 35-5 43 in his second 'book', a change which "makes the sequel to the first stay at Capernaum what Mark makes the sequel to the second" (McNeile), he is able to proceed without further breach of Mark's order.

Luke is much less under the influence of Mark. He transcribes Mk. 4 12 in abbreviated form, omitting the clause "lest they should repent and be forgiven," but reserves the use of the Isaian proof-text as a whole for the conclusion of his second treatise (Acts 28 26 f.), where its application is far more acceptable. For the Markan formation of a Discourse in Parables Luke has so little interest that he brings the discourse to a close after the interpretation of the first parable with the Markan form of the *logion* on Spiritual Kin, omitting entirely the second parable and leaving the third to stand at a later point in its Q form and context. However, the fact that Luke also uses the parable of the Sower to form the

climax of a group whose object seems to be the contrasting of fruitful and unfruitful hearers, in line with the closing parable of the discourse on The Righteousness of Sons, goes to show that the common source (S) had some similar motive. The notion of Mark (adopted by Matthew but not by Luke) that the parables were riddles, an enigmatic method of teaching employed by Jesus for the purpose of "hiding the mystery of the kingdom" from the "outsiders," may reasonably be ascribed to the apologetic theory of the Roman evangelist himself, with or without suggestion from Rom. 11 8-10. Matthew's expansion of the theme to include all that he can find of Markan or other material showing the bitter opposition between Jesus and the unbelieving elements of Judaism may, or may not, have formed part of the S connection. But the intrinsic adaptation of the parable of the Sower to a situation where separation is made between such as "hear and do the will" and such as reject it, the manifest artificiality of the Markan order, which attaches two further parables of somewhat different type after the multitude have dispersed, after the inner circle have gathered about Jesus for explanations, and various *logia* have been cited, finally the successive contacts of Mark with elements of S and Q from 3 20-4 34, all go to show a certain primary connection. The closing words of the parable (Mk. 4 9, repeated in ver. 23) "He that hath ears to hear let him hear" seem intended to reenforce its application and have no little affinity with the theme of the Q material Matthew and Luke agree in prefixing, Denunciation of the Evil Generation blind and deaf to the signs of divine redemption. Matthew's location of the Q *logion* "But blessed are your eyes for they see, and your ears for they hear" etc. cannot well be original, it is true, because the reference to things longed for by "prophets and kings" (Mt. "righteous men") shows that the speaker has in mind the evidences of God's redemptive work as in 11 4 f., but it adds to the evidence that the source contained at this point some antithesis between Wisdom's children who receive the message and the spiritually blind and dumb who reject God's messengers and vainly clamor for "a sign from heaven". Beyond this possibility of original connection in S we cannot yet proceed.

## 2. Mk. 4 1-35 = Mt. 13 1-35 = Lk. 8 4-18 (10 23 f.; 13 18-21).

The parable of the Sower (Mk. 4 1-9 = Mt. 13 1-9 = Lk. 8 4-8) supplies one of the best possible examples of transcription from Mark quite unaffected in the case of Matthew by any extraneous parallel, in the case of Luke almost wholly so. Matthew reproduces almost verbally. As above noted he has made the connection closer in ver. 1 and slightly abbreviated in ver. 3, 7 and 8. His other changes merely improve the style. Luke cancels the whole graphic setting of Mk. 4 1-3 with no better substitute than the commonplace "And when a great crowd was gathering, besides those who came to him from every city, he said in parable". The obvious reason is that he has already given the graphic setting (from S?) in 5 1-3. His estimate of the reliability of Mark in such descriptive matter appears to be considerably lower than that of some moderns.

In the following section of Mark giving the disciples' question about the parables (plural) Luke changes the form of the question to correspond with the *second* answer (Mk. 4 13-20 = Lk. 8 11-15). His other changes are for the most part slight abbreviations and improvements of style. Matthew changes the ambiguous "asked of him the parables" in accordance with the sense of Mark's *first* answer (Mk. 4 11 f.) and proceeds to make several drastic changes. Of these the transfer of ver. 12 from the end of the group of appended *logia* in Mk. 4 21-25 may be counted a mere stylistic improvement. The rest of the group Matthew had already given in 5 15; 10 26 and 7 2. This *logion* he also gives in its S connection (25 29) apparently overlooking the fact that he had already transcribed it from Mark in 13 12. More significant doctrinally is the minute change of *ἴνα* to *ἵνα* in ver. 13, which removes the harshness of the representation that the truth was purposely concealed. But it is perhaps a later hand (though too early to affect the textual transmission) which adds ver. 14 f., taking the text exactly from LXX as in Acts 28 26 f.

The most important change of all is the addition of ver. 16 f. — Lk. 10 23 f., sharpening the contrast between the Twelve and the dumb and blind "outsiders". As already noted Matthew's

location of the saying cannot be original, but that of Luke is not wholly satisfactory. The things which prophets and kings longed to witness can only be the redemptive blessings appealed to in Jesus' answer to the Messengers of John (Mt. 11 2 ff. — Lk. 7 18 ff.). Its true sense would appear if located after Mt. 11 19 — Lk. 7 35, but the location in Lk. 10 21–24 only preserves its connection with the *logion* on the "hiding of the mystery". The latter *logion* does in fact appear in this connection in various forms: Mt. 11 25–27 = Lk. 10 21 f.; for Mk. 4 11 f. is only a variant of the same.

The interpretation of the parable (Mt. 13 18–23 = Mk. 4 13–20 = Lk. 8 11–15) is a further example of transcription from Mark entirely unaffected by outside influence in either Matthew or Luke. At the beginning (Mt. 13 18 = Mk. 4 13 f. = Lk. 8 11) each forms a slightly different connection, the context being different. Thereafter we have the usual slight abbreviation and stylistic improvement. Otherwise the copy is made *verbatim*.

The appended *logia* of Mk. 4 21–25 are cancelled by Matthew because given elsewhere in their Q context. As already noted Mt. 13 12 = Mk. 4 25 is a slight exception in that R<sup>mt</sup> has transposed instead of cancelling it, its Q context (Mt. 25 29 — Lk. 19 26) being much later. Luke also fails to notice his double employment of this, and in addition that of the *logion* Mk. 4 21 both in 8 16 and 11 33. But the forced interweaving of the latter with the unrelated *logion* on Inward Light (11 34) is not ascribable to the same editor who so shortly before, in 8 16, had transcribed it from Mark. We must therefore infer that R<sup>lk</sup> found the interweaving in this case already existing and simply transcribed 11 33 f. as he found it. The same is doubtless true of Mk. 4 22 = Lk. 8 17 = 12 2. Finding the *logion* in its S context in the latter passage Luke simply transcribed it as it stood, not noticing his previous transcription of the same from Mark. Thus of the five appended *logia* of Mk. 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 the only two which Luke recognizes as paralleled in his non-Markan sources are ver. 23 = ver. 9 and ver. 24 = Mt. 7 2 = Lk. 6 88. Matthew cancels all but one. As a rule duplication is much more common in Matthew than in Luke.

At this point Luke brings his transcription from Mark to a close by inserting the *logion* on Spiritual Kin, slightly transposed from before the parable. Matthew continues. But his version of the second parable varies so widely from the Markan that many refuse to admit a common origin. As Luke is here silent we have but one means of answering the question whether the difference is indeed due to difference of source, or whether R<sup>mt</sup> has taken unusual liberties with the text of Mark. We must decide by what we can discover of the interests, aims and practice of R<sup>mt</sup> in parallel cases. If we find other passages of his Gospel similar in interest which appear to have been similarly treated, an *a priori* probability can be established that the differences from Mark are redactional. If in addition the special phrases, style, and vocabulary characteristic of this evangelist are found here in marked accumulation, the case will admit of little further doubt, we shall have in hand an important key, an open sesame not to this problem alone, but to a whole series of similar problems throughout the Gospel. Whence, then, does Matthew obtain his parable of the Tares in the Wheat?

In Mk. 4 26-29 we have, in the same relative place, a comparatively brief parable closely related in character and bearing to that of Jas. 5 7, an exhortation to patient waiting for divine deliverance by the example of the husbandman, whose quiet faith in the processes of nature keeps him from the hurry and worry of the "murmurers" who cannot wait for the Lord's harvest day. Its proper designation, therefore, both in Mark and James would be 'The Patient Husbandman. The Epistle of James is in fact distinguished by its many points of contact with the *logia* of S. This parable, if derived from S, would furnish an appropriate answer to the Demand for a Sign from Heaven. For whether originally connected or not with the parable of the Sower, so strangely separated from it in Mark by the digression of ver. 10-25, it is quite in line with the teaching of Jesus regarding divine intervention. It might stand appropriately in the context of Lk. 17 20-18 8, or of the parable of the Entrusted Talents (Mt. 25 14-30 — Lk. 19 12-27), whose close is the *logion* "From him that hath



not", which here appears prefixed in Mk. 4 25. Its moral is: Have faith in God. Fear not, little flock, it is the decree of your Father to give you the kingdom. Signs from heaven are not needful for you, because you rest on One whose word "Seedtime and harvest shall not fail" has been verified through all the generations since Noah, and has its application also in the moral world. If the parable of the Sower follows well as a sequel to the Denunciation of the Evil Generation that has turned a deaf ear to God's messengers, the parable of the Patient Husbandman is equally pertinent after the Demand of a Sign from Heaven.

The parable of the Tares in the Wheat which in Mt. 13 24-30 occupies the place of Mark's parable of the Patient Husbandman deals with another subject, a subject as remote from Jesus' concern as it is peculiarly dear to our first evangelist, the danger of the Church from the teachers of *ἀνομία*. This subject has led R<sup>mt</sup> to a complete alteration of that section of the discourse on the Righteousness of sons which in Lk. 6 43-46 immediately precedes the final parable on hearing and doing the word. In Luke the test of genuine righteousness is that "bearing of good fruit" which can come from nothing else than whole-hearted goodness, the spontaneous outflow of kindness of heart, as vines and fruit-trees yield their natural product. This is the logical application of the discourse, impossible to place otherwise than as it stands in Luke between the exhortation to follow the loving-kindness of the Father in heaven (6 27-42 = Mt. 5 39-48; 7 1-5) and the closing parable on Hearing and Doing (6 47-49 = Mt. 7 24-27). We witness a characteristic transformation of it in Mt. 7 15-23 where the mention of "good fruits" as the test of righteousness leads to a typical warning against the teachers of *ἀνομία*, who are to be known by their lack of "good works". Beginning with a general warning against the depredations of the "false prophets which come unto you in sheep's clothing but inwardly are ravening wolves", R<sup>mt</sup> first applies in its Q setting the test which he afterwards repeats with special application to the scribes in 12 33. Next he combines with the Warning against Profession without Practice (Mt. 7 21 = Lk. 6 46) the warning

of Lk. 13 26 f. against reliance on special favor with the messianic Judge, transforming it into a definite depiction of the Judgment in the last day by Jesus himself seated on the throne, as in the closing Judgment scene, 25 31-46, declaring (contrary to Mk. 9 38-40) to those who have exorcized and done miracles in his name without belonging to the body of true disciples: "Depart from me, ye that work *ἀνομία*" (Lk. *ἀδικία*).

This is only the beginning of R<sup>mt</sup>'s special supplements in denunciation of the false teachers. The denunciation of the scribes in 12 22-32 gives another opportunity, as above noted, to threaten judgment to come against those whose evil words are the fruit of an evil nature (12 33-37). Next come the twin parables of the Tares in the Wheat and the Worthless Fish added to the Markan Discourse in Parables. The former is even supplied with a special Interpretation in ver. 36-43, to make sure the reader shall not mistake the application. Lastly, among the warnings against "false Christs and false prophets" in the Markan Doom-chapter (Mk. 13 5-8 = Mt. 24 4-8) R<sup>mt</sup> inserts a special addition in ver. 10-12 predicting the stumbling and apostasy of the last times because "many false prophets shall arise and lead many astray, and because of the multiplication of *ἀνομία* the love of the many shall grow cold". R<sup>mt</sup> certainly does not leave the attentive reader in the dark regarding his own particular *bête noire*.

Neither need we be in the dark regarding his special mode of combating this danger, nor the style and phraseology distinctive of his warnings.

R<sup>mt</sup> contends against the "false teachers who pervert the precepts of the Lord to their own lusts" after the sledge-hammer style of Jude. Objurgation, denunciation and threats of everlasting fire reserved for the Devil and his angels are his weapons of argument. Favorite phrases drawn from the *logia* of his sources are repeated in stereotyped fashion and directed against those who in the great Judgment are found wanting in the "good works" which constitute his uncompromising standard of "righteousness" (*δικαιοσύνη* in this sense is exclusively Matthean). For "good works" are the test of discipleship (25 30, 31-46), as well as the means of spreading the gospel (5 16). In this

"righteousness", which consists in teaching and doing the commandments of Jesus (19 17 f.; 28 20), the Christian must "exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees". His first aim must be God's kingdom (a treasure laid up in heaven) and His "righteousness" (6 33), by which Matthew intends not so much the gift as the verdict of God. For this "righteousness" is not done before men to be seen of them but before the eyes of Him who seeth in secret. It merits, therefore, that heavenly reward which is the one object worthy of human endeavor (6 1, 4, 6, 18, 19 ff.). This, for Matthew, is the narrow way that leads to life. The great danger to be guarded against is the teaching of the "false prophets" (7 13-23).

As above noted the false teachers are to be known by their lack of "good fruits". They profess the name of Christ, and claim great gifts of prophecy, exorcism, and miracle, but are not really his, and in the Judgment will be bidden by him to "begone" as workers of *ἀνομία*. The phrase is borrowed from S (cf. Lk. 13 26 f.) but conformed in this significant word *ἀνομία* (Lk. *ἀδικία*) to the LXX (Ps. 6 9). For the question of provenance it is worth noting that the Nazarene Gospel (*τὸ Ἰουδαϊκόν* in J) and II Clement 4 5 give the same *logion* in widely variant form, but with the same application and the same conformation to LXX.

The heavenly reward which Matthew's first 'sermon' makes the sole aim of the Christian (6 19 ff. after 1-18) is again emphasized at the close of the second 'book' (10 40-42); but as only the Twelve are here concerned, the "false prophets" and "workers of *ἀνομία*" receive no attention. In Book iii, however, this omission is amply compensated. The theme of the good tree bearing good fruit returns in 12 33-37 *à propos* of the scribes who have spoken evil out of their evil hearts. R<sup>mt</sup>'s vocabulary of "the day of judgment" (36) and his Q phrases of denunciation ("offspring of vipers" ver. 34; cf. 3 7 — Lk. 3 7 and 23 35) begin to find scope. But it is not until the subject of false teaching is reached in the parable of the Tares in the Wheat (13 24-30) and especially in its Interpretation (36-49) and the companion parable of the Worthless Fish (47-50), that R<sup>mt</sup> displays their full capacity. In the parable itself the

gathering of the tares into bundles to be burned while the wheat is "gathered into my garner" may be suggested, like the cutting of the barren tree, by the warning of the Baptist (Mt. 3 12 — Lk. 3 17), but in the Interpretation the Q phrases begin to abound. Here we meet first "the end of the world" (ver. 39, repeated in 40 and 49, 24 3 and 28 20, exclusively Matthean), then "workers of *ἀνομία*" already noted (ver. 41), then "cast them into the furnace of fire" (ver. 42, repeated in ver. 50), then (from 8 12 — Lk. 13 28,<sup>1</sup> a great favorite) "there shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth." At the close (ver. 41) the clause from Mk. 4 9, 23 = Lk. 8 8 and 14 35 — Mt. 13 9 seems to be added from pure love of phrase-making (cf. 11 15).

Rmt's fondness for the rewards and punishments of the world to come and the scenes of the Day of Judgment (a Matthean expression), when "the Son of Man shall sit upon the throne of his glory" hardly needs further illustration. Still we may add his supplements to Mark in 16 27 — Mk. 8 38 extended by his quotation from Ps. 72 13 "and then shall he render to every man according to his works". But the characteristic is still further emphasized by the *position* given to his supplements. Every one of his five 'sermons' closes on this keynote, Reward and Punishment on the basis of a man's works. We have seen how this is the case in 7 13-27, with special warning against the teachers of "lawlessness". The second 'sermon' ends on the same note of "reward". The third has besides its parable of the Tares an elaborate extension in ver. 36-50, given wholly to this one subject, the priceless Reward of the kingdom (Hid Treasure, Goodly Pearl) and the Separation of Righteous from Wicked in the Judgment (Interpretation of Tares, Sorting of the Fish). The fourth 'sermon' (on Right Treatment of Brethren) closes with the elaborate depiction of the fate of the Unforgiving Servant "delivered to the tormentors" (18 23-35). The last

<sup>1</sup> The phrase is appropriate only to its Q context, where the excluded "sons of the kingdom" gnash their teeth with rage and envy when they see aliens taking their place at the banquet table, but is applied by Rmt to descriptions of eternal punishment in general in 13 42, 50; 22 18; 24 51 and 25 20.

'sermon,' wholly devoted to eschatology, piles one picture of the judgment upon another, and after exhausting material of this type supplied by the evangelist's sources, closes with his own conception of the Last Judgment.

For Mt. 25 31-46 is quite improperly spoken of as a "parable". The comparison "as a shepherd separateth sheep from goats" is merely incidental, and no more justifies the depiction of the Judgment of the Son of Man being called a parable than the phrase "so as no fuller on earth can whiten" justifies the application of the term to the Transfiguration vision. The grandiose scene with which the Gospel closes its series of 'sermons' of Jesus paints "the end of the world" as R<sup>mt</sup> sees it. The paragraph derives little more than the phrase "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren ye did it unto me" from authentic sources, a phrase already used for substance in Mt. 10 42, where it forms part of the expansion of Mk. 9 37, 41. The rest is just the evangelist's own expectation of the Coming to Judgment of the Son of Man, depicted as closely as he can to his expectation of what must actually take place. In short R<sup>mt</sup> here speaks out his whole mind and heart as regards the gospel message. And he speaks it out not merely in the mode characteristic of him, but in phraseology so stereotyped as to leave no question of its origin. All his five 'sermons' close with these characteristic editorial supplements.

To show that these supplements at the close of the five 'sermons', especially the third, are indeed from the hand of R<sup>mt</sup>, and no other, we must take account also of supplements within the substance of a parable or similar teaching where a parallel version enables us clearly to define the nature and limits of his editorial activity; for comparison on the smaller scale between transcript and original will furnish a measure of R<sup>mt</sup>'s capacity, limitations and sense of propriety.

A well known example is the parable of the Slighted Invitation (Mt. 22 1-14 — Lk. 14 15-24). So wide is the divergence in this case that many critics question the identity of the two, or at least suggest that the Matthean supplement concerning the man without the wedding garment may be an independent parable not elsewhere known, which Matthew has found and

united to that of the Slighted Invitation. Part of the divergence is demonstrably due to Luke, but Luke's slighter changes do not now concern us. In the body of the parable little question exists regarding the Matthean addition of verses 6 f., which fail to appear in Luke. The added traits are incongruous with the picture, they treat the parable as allegory, and they betray a desire to connect it with the fate of Jerusalem in the year 70. Ill treatment and murder of servants whose only offense is that they bring an invitation to dinner is not an occurrence known to human psychology. Also the sending forth of "armies" to destroy such unmannerly guests and to "burn up their city" may reasonably be classed as a cruel and unusual form of punishment. It has its explanation, and its only real explanation, in the desire of R<sup>mt</sup> to turn the parable he is transcribing into an allegory predicting the calamity which befell the Jews at the hands of the Romans in consequence of their rejection of the gospel message.

What then shall we say to the supplement of R<sup>mt</sup> at the end of the same parable, equally absent from the Lukan form and equally incongruous? Here we encounter precisely the same allegorization of the parable, the same reflection of later conditions, and, in addition, support of a favorite interest of R<sup>mt</sup> in phraseology which we can now begin to identify as characteristic of this particular evangelist. It is not congruous with the picture that the guest swept in willynilly from the street-crossings should be expected to have on a wedding garment. Moreover, if he must expiate his unpreparedness the "king" certainly inflicts a cruel and unusual form of punishment by directing his servants to "bind him hand and foot and cast him forth into the outer darkness". The refrain "there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth" repeated five times in Matthew (13 42, 50; 22 13; 24 51; 25 30) besides its occurrence in the original Q context (8 12 — Lk. 13 28), is appropriate to describe the rage of the "sons of the kingdom" as they see their places taken by aliens, but here, combined with its companion phrase "cast him into the outer darkness," repeated from Mt. 8 12 — Lk. 13 28 here and again in 25 30, it serves only to depict R<sup>mt</sup>'s stereotyped conception of future punishment.

In short the phraseology, the special emphasis on good works as the only salvation in the day of judgment, and the features of the punishment inflicted, combine with the absence of the supplement from Luke, and the incongruity with the parable picture, to prove the closing supplement to the parable of the Slighted Invitation, as well as the insertion of ver. 8 f., a personal contribution from the hand of R<sup>mt</sup>.

With this example of Matthean redaction before us, let us return to the Parable of the Tares. Professor Arthur Wright in his comment *ad loc.* (*Greek Synopticon*<sup>1</sup>, p. 221) defends the view that the trait which differentiates this parable from its Markan parallel, the Patient Husbandman (Mt. 13 24-30 — Mk. 4 26-29), viz, the sowing of evil seed in the field, is not a new feature added by R<sup>mt</sup>, but that the Tares in the Wheat is an independent and authentic parable of Jesus, preserved by no other evangelist. He accounts for the incongruity by the statement: "Though our Lord's parables, as a general rule, are perfectly true to nature, there are cases where the spiritual thought is uppermost to the neglect of the natural. This is one of them." The other alleged instances of incongruity are not specified, but it is safe to say that they consist of precisely those which we have just adduced from the Matthean version of the Slighted Invitation, or similar material which Professor Wright classes as authentic, but which we (for this *in addition to other important reasons*) hold to be likewise supplements of R<sup>mt</sup>. The incongruity is as apparent in the case of the sowing of tares in a neighbor's field as in the instances previously cited. The parable of the Patient Husbandman is one of several instances where R<sup>mt</sup> *allegorizes* by the insertion of incongruous traits to make the parable fit the later experiences of the Church. In the case of the Tares in the Wheat the added allegorizing trait has the special interest characteristic of R<sup>mt</sup>, and in addition the stereotyped phraseology borrowed from Q which this evangelist habitually employs for similar purposes. It is in fact so heaped up in this parable and its accompanying special interpretation (ver. 36-43) that toward the end scarcely a line appears not thus constructed. We adduce only "things that cause stumbling and they that work ἀνομία", "cast them into

the furnace of fire", "there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth" "the righteous shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father", "He that hath ears let him hear".

On these grounds we cannot hesitate to assign to the individual hand of R<sup>mt</sup> the incongruous trait which differentiates the Matthean form of the second parable in the Discourse in Parables from the Markan. So far from there being hesitation on the part of early evangelists to alter or add to the sacred utterances of Jesus, early evangelists of Jewish training, as R<sup>mt</sup> very obviously was (cf. 13 52), are keenly alive to the distinction made by the Synagogue between halachic and haggadic teaching. The *mashal*, or parable, is typically haggadic. The liberty of the teacher in such material is bounded only by the rule: "Let all things be done unto edification." And early church teachers avail themselves repeatedly of this liberty. The gospel cited by Eusebius in his *Theophania* (Mai, *Nova Patr. Bibl.* IV, 1, p. 155) as "written in Hebrew script" expands the parable of the Entrusted Talents (Mt. 25 14-30 — Lk. 19 12-27) by an added feature showing the punishment of the servant who "devoured his master's substance with harlots and flute-players" (cf. Lk. 15 13). The Nazarene Gospel (perhaps the same writing) expands the story of the Rich Enquirer (Mt. 19 16-30 — Mk. 10 17-31) by a colloquy aiming to show that the enquirer's claim to have "kept the law and the prophets" was false, since he had not given alms of his abundance. It had also a story of "another rich man" prefixed to this, doubtless of similar bearing. It is therefore a misstatement of the case to maintain that our canonical evangelists must have refrained from elaboration of the parables because they show unusual care to transcribe exactly the Master's utterances when reporting teachings not belonging to the category of illustrative fiction.

Consideration of the parable of the Tares and the question whether its variation from the parable of the Patient Husbandman in Mark is due to recasting by R<sup>mt</sup> or to his substitution of another source at this point has led us to anticipate in some measure the discussion of later elements in Matthew's Discourse in Parables. The interpretation of the Tares subjoined in ver. 36-43 could hardly be separated from the parable itself.



But before passing to our third division, the portion of the Discourse appended after the conclusion of Mark's parallel report, we have still to deal with the parable of the Mustard-seed (Mt. 13 31 f. = Mk. 4 30-32 = Lk. 13 18 f.), that of the Leaven (Mt. 13 33 = Lk. 13 20 f.), and the closing summary Mt. 13 34 f. = Mk. 4 34 f. There being practically no dispute among critics as to the dependence of Matthew on Mark throughout this material save for the slight modification of the language of Mark by assimilation to S in the Mustard-seed, and the addition of the Leaven after it because of the collocation of the pair in S, little remains to be said. The motive for the modification of language is chiefly stylistic, that for the inclusion of the additional parable is partly further illustration of the topic to make up a total of four parables addressed to the multitude and three to the Twelve ( $4 + 3 = 7$ ), partly fidelity to the source. R<sup>mt</sup> further exhibits his interest in Scripture fulfilments by attaching a quotation of his own in ver. 35, though if the reading "spoken through *Isaiah* the prophet" be correct, not without blundering in his reference.

### 3. Mt. 13 36-52.

R<sup>mt</sup> completes his version of the Discourse in Parables by attaching a section quite unparalleled elsewhere. The Interpretation of the parable of the Tares (ver. 36-43) we have already considered in substance, agreeing with the majority of critics that it is purely the redactor's own work, exemplifying in high degree his peculiarities of motive, method and language. For the closer determination of these characteristics the paragraph is highly important. On the question of source it gives no aid.

Availing himself of the situation created by ver. 36a (a method imitated from Mark) Matthew now attaches three parables intended for the Twelve only. These, accordingly, require no interpretation, although the lesson contemplated in that of the Sorting of the Fish (ver. 47-50) is still so near the evangelist's heart that he cannot forbear to explain how the principle will be carried out "in the end of the world" (ver. 49 f.). The phrase-

ology of these last two verses is so unmistakably that of R<sup>mt</sup> (see above, p. 23, for "the end of the world", "cast into the furnace of fire", "there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth") that their composition by him is generally admitted. But conservative scholars are slow to admit that the actual comparisons of "the kingdom of heaven" to hid treasure (ver. 44), a costly pearl (ver. 45 f.), and a net full of fish of various sorts, could have been supplied by the evangelist personally, without the use of any written source.

To determine the limits of R<sup>mt</sup>'s capacity in this line we have already adduced his supplements to the parable of the Slighted Invitation. We have also called attention to his disposition, evinced in every one of the five 'sermons', to append at the close some further teaching along the particular lines of Reward and Punishment in the "end of the world", warning against the inroads of false teaching, and (as we may now add) the duty of forgiveness to one's fellow-man in order to secure mercy in the day of Judgment. The parable of the Unmerciful Servant, appended at the close of Matthew's next 'sermon' (18 23-35), illustrates the interest last named, and is at the same time an example of the degree of originality to be expected from the evangelist; for surely the parable does nothing more than expand the figure in the Lord's Prayer (Mt. 6 12 — Lk. 11 4), a teaching already commented on by him there in a characteristic addition (6 14 f.; cf. Eccles. 28 1-7). Nor can it be maintained that more of originality is required to turn the comparison of heavenly reward to "treasure laid up in heaven" (Mt. 6 20 — Lk. 12 33) into the parable of Treasure hid in the Field (13 44), or the pearls reserved for the worthy of Mt. 6 7 into the parable of the Costly Pearl. The morality of the former parable is by no means unimpeachable, even if we restrict its teaching to the main point: Make it your sole aim to secure at all costs the superior rewards of the heavenly inheritance (cf. Mt. 6 18, 19, 22 f., 24). That of the latter, it is true, does not call upon us to close our eyes to any distinctly immoral act on the part of the agent presented as an example, but its general level is no higher. Such purely utilitarian motives for "righteousness" accord but ill with the teaching "He that would save his life shall lose it,

and he that will lose his life for my sake and the gospel's shall save it unto life eternal". Both motive and teaching in the case of these two brief parables point to the evangelist himself as their creator, and, as we have seen, neither calls for any originality of thought transcending his very limited capacity.

Almost the same must be said of the last parable of the group. The Parable of the Unsorted Fish inculcates with special emphasis the lesson our evangelist has nearest at heart by applying to the classic comparison of the disciples' work as "fishers of men" (Mk. 1 17 — Mt. 4 19 — Lk. 5 10) the same qualification as before in the case of the comparison of it to the sowing of seed, a qualification evoked by later experience of heresy. As we have seen, the closing verses (ver. 49 f.) of the paragraph are unmistakably from R<sup>mt</sup>, if only because of their phraseology. Verses 47 f. have the same derivation because of their motive, their position and their relation to the work of R<sup>mt</sup> in ver. 24-30 and 36-43. This parable too calls for no originality beyond the most mediocre. Its standpoint and interest alike are those of the evangelist, not those of Jesus as otherwise known.

Few will claim for the closing Summary (sometimes counted as an eighth in the series of parables of the kingdom, though it lacks the distinctive Matthean formula "The kingdom of heaven is like unto") any higher origin than the evangelist's own motive and conception. Verses 51 f. are of editorial origin, like the rest of the appended material from the point where Mark was left behind. In the whole of Mt. 13 36-52 there is not a line which suggests a source outside R<sup>mt</sup>'s very limited range of thought. The addition of these seventeen verses supplies little enough to enlarge our conception of the teaching of Jesus; but it is all the more invaluable as a self-portraiture of the Nazarene evangelist. His interests and motives, his conceptions of the gospel and its foes, his methods and style of composition are here clearly exemplified. It remains only to carry to completion in the minuter study of his vocabulary that partial view of his style which can be gained by observing his tendency, already so conspicuous, to phrase-making. Our determination of the characteristics of R<sup>mt</sup> from the structure, style, and interests

of his third book will then have reached its goal. It will be no small contribution to the extrication of the underlying source or sources, if we can thus refine away the incrustations of later ecclesiasticism, and lay bare the more primitive records of Jesus' life and teaching.

Standard philological commentaries on Matthew such as Klostermann's, Zahn's, or McNeile's define for us with greater or less exactitude the peculiarities of diction characteristic of our first evangelist. By the further use of New Testament grammars and concordances tables can be constructed on the plan of Professor B. S. Easton's in his admirable recent commentary on Luke, showing the distinctive diction and vocabulary of the evangelist. Such word studies are indispensable, but are always dry and sometimes misleading. They would be obviously out of place in a study *exempli gratia* of a mere section of the Gospel. Not merely the third 'book' but the entire Gospel of Matthew must be carefully sifted with this object in view, especially the unique prefatory chapters on the Birth and Infancy, and the narrative Epilogue introduced by the fifth and last rubric (26 1). But such word studies lose half their value when they degenerate into mere word-counting. Of how much use is it to know how many times the word "throne" and the word "glory" occurs in Matthew as compared with other parts of the New Testament? But if we note that they occur together in the technical rabbinic phrase "the throne of glory," and observe further that R<sup>mt</sup> alone associates it habitually with the title "the Son of Man" in his representations of the last judgment (19 28; 25 31), precisely as in Daniel and Enoch, this same "throne of glory" being one of the seven preexistent things which talmudic teaching represents as stored up along with "repentance", "heaven" and "hell" for the great Day of Judgment "in the end of the world", if in addition we notice that this peculiar trait in R<sup>mt</sup>'s conception of "the Son of Man" forms part of a whole series of descriptions of this great Day of Judgment with its rewards and penalties specially characteristic of Matthew, then the occurrences of the words "throne" and "glory" in Matthew begin to take on significance.

It is for this reason that the phrase-making of R<sup>mt</sup> is of more significance than the number of occurrences of particular words, and has been treated separately in our discussion. Indeed even the stereotyped phrases are not in most cases strictly peculiar to R<sup>mt</sup>, because they appear to be mere repetitions of expressions or clauses which occur singly in the sources. "The end of the world" may be called strictly Matthean so far as the New Testament is concerned, but the phrase was unquestionably current in contemporary rabbinic teaching. The phrase "He that hath ears let him hear", the epithet *ἀλιγόπιστος* (from Mt. 6 30 — Lk. 12 28 imitated in 14 31), and the use of *καὶ ἐγένετο* in the five times repeated rubric (imitated from 7 28 — Lk. 7 1, β text) are stereotyped from R<sup>mt</sup>'s sources. Elsewhere, with one exception, he avoids the Semitic form of connection so extraordinarily common in Luke. His formula "The kingdom of heaven is like" is an other example of this phrase-making bent, for in the series of parables it frequently does violence to the meaning and has to be taken in an accommodated sense. Here again the change from "kingdom of God" found in the parallels is not uniformly carried through. In four instances R<sup>mt</sup> found this impossible without doing violence to the manifest meaning implied in the context—a proof that his conception of "the kingdom of heaven" is not always the same as that of "kingdom of God" in his sources. In point of fact in such parables as the Hid Treasure and the Costly Pearl the phrase "kingdom of heaven" is manifestly used by R<sup>mt</sup> as equivalent to "reward in heaven", quite a different sense from that reflected in many certainly authentic *logia*. As regards the phrases coined from the S parable of the Halfshut Door (Lk. 13 23-29 — Mt. 7 13 f., 22 f., 8 11 f., and 25 10-12), "Depart from me, ye that work *ἀνομία*" (Lk. *ἀδικία*), "cast into the outer darkness", "there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth", with others similar, coined from other sections of S, we have spoken already at sufficient length.

There remain the strictly "Matthean" words and expressions which only such tabulation as already described will fully reveal. Examples are the use of "kingdom of heaven" as equivalent to "reward in heaven," already spoken of; "righteousness" in

the sense of meritorious action, as in the section on Pharisaic "righteousness" interjected in Mt. 6 1-18 between the exhortations to imitate the goodness of God and to avoid censoriousness, which in Lk. 6 27-42 are continuous; redundant *ἀθροιστος* found in 11 19 — Lk. 7 34 but repeated by R<sup>mt</sup> in 13 28, 45, 52; 18 23; 29 1; 21 33; 22 2. The cases will not be tabulated here for reasons already stated, but a general principle may be laid down to govern our interpretation of such statistics. Two considerations are vital: a) the relation of the term or expression which mere statistics show to be numerically distinctive to the dominant ideas reflected in the evangelist's work as a whole; b) the location of the salient terms and phrases. The heaping up in some limited section of a great number of distinctively "Matthean" expressions is of course a more important matter than the mere occurrence of a given term a given number of times in the Gospel as a whole, especially when the paragraph thus characterized stands in a salient position, or evinces by its interest and motive the special proclivities of the editor.

The three articles now brought to a close on the redaction of Mt. 11-13 are intended to serve the purpose of illustration rather than determination of ultimate results. Something, it is hoped, will have been brought to light by the critical analysis of this third 'book' of Matthew which will determine more closely than hitherto the stand-point, purpose, and methods of this evangelist; for since early in the second century the Gospel of Matthew obtained a fateful predominance in the Church catholic. To understand better the adaptations and applications which the traditional teaching of Jesus underwent at the hands of this evangelist is to take an important step forward in the problem of reconstructing that teaching in its most authentic form. In conjunction with further application of the same, or of still exacter methods to the remaining 'books' of Matthew, and of similar methods to the editorial work of Luke, we may well have hope of contributing to our generation our share toward the extrication of the authentic teaching of Jesus from the tangled web of apostolic and post-apostolic tradition.