

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 *The Evangelical Quarterly* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_evangelical_quarterly.php

MATTHEW'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

by NORMAN HILLYER

THIS paper, on "Some Aspects of Matthew's Use of the Old Testament," was prepared for a New Testament Study Group at Tyndale House, Cambridge.

THERE are some 65 references to OT in the Gospel of Matthew,¹ including 43 verbal citations, noticeably more than in the other gospels.

These quotations are of two kinds: (1) those which are said to point out the fulfilment of prophecy; (2) others which are introduced in the course of the narrative by various persons, particularly Christ Himself.

I.

The first group (concerning fulfilled prophecy) consists of eleven quotations. These are peculiar to Matthew, so far as the Synoptists are concerned, and are all introduced with such words as: "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet" (1: 23; 2: 6, 15, 18, 23; 4: 15, 16; 8: 17; 12: 18-21; 13: 35; 21: 5 (=John 12: 15); 27: 9, 10). Apart from 2: 23 ("He shall be called a Nazarene"), which cannot be readily traced to any single Old Testament passage, all these so-called formula quotations seem to be based on the Hebrew text.

The second group, on the other hand, generally follows the LXX, even in cases where the Greek version differs from the Hebrew (e.g. 3: 3, 14); and where there are deviations from the LXX, these do not usually carry the text closer to the Hebrew.

There is, however, an independence in dealing with citations throughout the First Gospel which among other things argues against the Gospel being the work of a mere translator, although the intense interest Matthew shows in the Old Testament has led some to suppose an original Aramaic version of his gospel. Certainly Matthew has Jewish readers in mind as his primary audience. Irenaeus, Origen and Jerome all speak of Matthew as writing "for the Hebrews", and internal evidence supports this.

For example, Matthew traces the Messiah's descent through the kingly line of David in his opening genealogy, and stresses

this point all through his gospel in the reiterated use of the title "Son of David" (1: 1; 9: 27; 12: 23; 15: 22; 20: 30, 31; 21: 9, 15). (In the other gospels the title occurs only in parallels to Matt. 20: 30, 31; 22: 41f.) Again the Hebrew element comes out in Matthew's interest in the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy and the Jewish law, and his assumption in his readers of a knowledge of Jewish customs.

Such is the Jewish character of the First Gospel that E. von Dobschütz (1928) suggested that the author could have been a rabbi and a catechist. The systematic arrangement of material and Matthew's preference for repeating coined words would point in the same direction. Von Dobschütz thought that Matthew's book was used as a manual of discipline for the local church and as a catechism of Christian behaviour.

If the author were a converted rabbi, we may have a hint about this in Matt. 13: 52 ("every scribe . . . is like unto a man that is an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old"), which would be on a par with Mark 14: 52, where the young man who fled away naked may well be Mark himself.

Form-criticism, which claims to define the *Sitz im Leben* of the different parts and units of biblical literature, has suggested, however, that individual authorship of the Gospels may be an oversimplification of the problem.

M. Dibelius, whose work *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (1919-33) has been most influential in New Testament research and reading on the Continent, once coined the expression *Im Anfang war die Predigt* ("In the beginning was the preaching"), and in his *Formgeschichte* he considers the whole gospel from the point of view of the preaching.

But it is striking how little in the gospels can be described as "preaching", even when Dibelius takes *Predigt* in a much wider sense to include all church activities which promote its message and doctrine.

No doubt the gospel stories were used as illustrations in sermons and thus homiletic interests left their imprint on the material. But from what source did the preachers derive their examples?

It is a well-known fact that little of gospel material is contained in other New Testament books or in other early Christian literature.

Both the awareness of the direct relation of the Holy Spirit and the eschatological outlook of the church made adherents less likely to look back to the details of the incarnate history of the Messiah.

It is curious indeed that no evidence survives of the use of the words and deeds of Jesus, if in the gospel so many stories with a moral were invented for homiletic purposes, in however broad a sense. Why, if the gospel sections were in constant circulation for homiletic purposes, do they survive only in non-homiletic form? Why do we have so many materials for one kind of sermon, but, in the early period, only sermons of another kind? ¹

Second-century literature underlines these questions. Melito of Sardis in his *Homily on the Passion* keeps strictly to OT as the basis of his preaching.

How the New Testament was read in the early days is known from Justin's famous account (I Apol. 67). The exposition of the "memoirs of the Apostles", however, seems to follow the same line as that indicated in the use of the parables: the ethical implications of the text were extracted and underlined, as may already be seen in NT when facts of the *kerygma* are used as a model for Christian humility (Phil. 2: 5; 1 Peter 2: 21; Heb. 12: 3). The actual facts were not proclaimed in the sermon; they were referred to as well known.

The awareness of the limitations of Dibelius's view has brought many back to individual authorship for the gospels.

The problem of the compilation of the gospel is of course one of the major issues involved in such a subject as "Matthew's Use of the Old Testament".

G. D. Kilpatrick (*The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew*, 1946) suggests that by the time Matthew's gospel was produced Mark had been in liturgical use for some years, as had Q and M (the discourse-material peculiar to Matthew), while the narrative material peculiar to Matthew was first put into writing by the Evangelist himself.

The liturgical use of the Scriptures was the focus of the church's use of the gospel material. In expounding the texts read in the services the needs of the church would be related to the words and works recorded in the gospel. By repetition the exposition developed into a more or less fixed tradition, which in its turn was admitted into liturgical use. At this stage, the traditions of the Matthaean church were combined into a revised edition of the gospel.

Such is Kilpatrick's thesis, which he supports by quoting parallel liturgical uses in Judaism, in both Palestinian and Hellenistic forms. In Palestinian Judaism the Targums break down the sharp distinctions between Holy Writ and the interpretations of the

¹ See Appendix A (p. 25).

² R. P. Casey, in *Quantulacumque: Studies Presented to Kirsopp Lake* (1937), pp. 109-116.

Talmud. In Hellenistic Judaism, with its looser conception of the canon, the material used in the actual exposition becomes the literature admitted into liturgical use.

Krister Stendahl has pointed out two weaknesses in Kilpatrick's view:

1. A liturgical recitation of gospel material, parallel with the synagogue practice of reciting the Scriptures, is by no means an unchallenged fact in the period presumed by Kilpatrick (A.D. 65-100).
2. The fivefold structure³ of the Gospel of Matthew could certainly be an argument for its liturgical use, viz. that it was the Christian counterpart to the Torah which was read in the synagogues. But Stendahl considers that the structure of the five parts, with its systematic aims, points rather to a milieu other than the homiletic or liturgical one.

Kilpatrick defends his liturgical approach against the alternative suggestion that the purpose of the gospel is catechetical. One objection against the latter is that Matthew has directions suitable for all the classes within the church, and his book thus has a much wider audience in mind than the catechumenate.

Kilpatrick, in Stendahl's view, is right in denying that the catechetical function is the principal one in the gospel, and in laying stress upon the material intended for church leaders and upon its character as a manual of discipline. This latter point was the one emphasized by von Dobschütz.

No one, however, would say that Matthew is merely a handbook—as is the *Didache* or the *Manual of Discipline* of the Qumran sect. Of course, Stendahl says, Matthew is a gospel, and in literary form the gospel is unparalleled, an *ad hoc* creation of a church claiming a more absolute doctrine of incarnation than in any other religion, and a doctrine closely related to very recent historical facts.

Nonetheless the particular form in which Matthew casts his gospel is that of a handbook, although the material cannot be explained as merely catechetical or liturgical. Stendahl himself feels that the systematizing work (as contrasted say with Mark), the adaptation towards casuistry instead of broad statements of principle (e.g. statements on divorce, Matt. 5: 31, 32; 19: 9), and the reflection on the position of the church leaders and their duties, are all features pointing to a milieu of study and instruction in which the gospel was fashioned.

³ See Appendix B (p. 26).

If we owe the First Gospel to a "converted rabbi", we must suppose that he was not alone, but took an active share in the life of the church where he lived. This is a tantamount to saying that there was a school at work in the church of Matthew. (The function of the synagogue as both a place of worship and a school would of course provide a simple precedent.)

The Qumran scrolls give a recent illustration of the existence of such a school, preserving and expounding the doctrines and rules of its founder in its *Manual of Discipline*, and providing a sample of its scholarly work in its commentary on Habakkuk.

Stendahl seeks to demonstrate the close affinity between the type of Old Testament interpretation to be found in the formula quotations of Matthew and the way in which the sect of Qumran treats the prophecy of Habakkuk. He considers this an almost decisive argument in favour of the existence of a school in the early church.

P. Carrington (*The Primitive Christian Catechism*, 1940) had spoken of a "Matthaeian School" whose teachers were to be compared with the elders of contemporary Judaism. Now Krister Stendahl combines this suggestion with the recent discoveries about the activities of the Qumran sect, and develops the thesis in his book *The School of Saint Matthew* (1954).

If Stendahl's proposals are correct, the so-called formula quotations in Matthew are examples of a special type of *peshet* rendering (i.e. an interpretative translation), in which interpretation or exposition is incorporated into the body of the text itself, thereby determining its textual form.

Earle Ellis (*Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, 1957, p. 141) points out that the method, as found in the Dead Sea commentary on Habakkuk (DSH) and in the New Testament, has an apocalyptic feature in which the prophetic passage is viewed as "fulfilled" in the present time and is applied to contemporary events. As Matthew's formula quotations view the Old Testament as fulfilled in Christ, so DSH applies Hab. 1 and 2 to the Teacher of Righteousness and the events surrounding him.

B. J. Roberts ("Some Observations on the Damascus Document and the Dead Sea Scrolls", *Bulletin of John Rylands Library*, 34, 1951-52, pp. 367ff.) regards this factor as the chief link between the Scrolls and the New Testament.

It is striking that we have two types of quotation side by side in the same gospel, both the liturgical and the *peshet* (interpretative) type. The introductory formula of the quotations might here be something of a technical term which Matthew uses to distinguish

the *pesher* type of quotation, for it is to be noted that it is just those quotations which differ from all texts known to us which are prefaced by the formula expressing fulfilment. At all events the *pesher* rendering of texts presupposes an advanced study of the Scriptures and familiarity with both the Hebrew text and the traditions of interpretation known to us from the Versions.

W. Soltau, writing in 1900, thought the formula quotations were part of a larger collection with Jewish-Christian trends (especially the Peter and Pilate "legends") which was mechanically merged into a previously existing Matthew at a much later stage.

On the other hand, according to B. W. Bacon (*Studies in Matthew*, 1930) formula quotations are of the very essence of a supposed Jewish-Christian source which he calls "N" (the Nazarene Targum), and which he thinks was worked into the gospel when it was compiled. The compiler himself, however, was using the LXX.

Both these views are rejected by G. D. Kilpatrick (*op. cit.*, pp. 37-55), whose analysis of the narratives peculiar to Matthew gives good reason for taking them to be the product of the evangelist himself. Especially in the texts dealing with Peter, Kilpatrick shows that often the text of Matthew can be derived only from Mark, and in the longer independent passages, such as Matt. 1 and 2, the phraseology is that of Matthew.

Kilpatrick therefore maintains that this material should not be considered as coming from one or more sources (e.g. Bacon's "N"), but that Matthew was acquainted with a number of oral traditions which he handles freely.

The quotation material convinces Stendahl that Kilpatrick is right. Bacon's alleged N-source was built up around the formula quotations, which can be divided into two kinds:

1 The quotations in the Nativity story, where the whole context seems to be constructed with a quotation as its nucleus—and as its germ from the point of view of growth.

2. Quotations added to Marcan material. These Old Testament texts do not give the impression of being picked up from a source which happened to contain a suitable quotation. In at least six cases (8: 17; 13: 35; 21: 5, and to a certain extent 4: 15; 26: 15; 27: 9) the Marcan passage was the starting point of a quotation. For example, Matt. 8: 16 (=Mark 1: 32) speaks of the sick being healed. This suffices for Mark, but Matthew goes on: "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities and bore our sicknesses" (Isa. 53: 4).

Kilpatrick's view on the peculiar narratives in Matthew is thus strengthened. The formula quotations arose in a situation where the gospel of Mark was being used and studied.

Since the two groups of formula quotations just mentioned have to be considered as a unit, the quotations in Matt. 1 and 2 surrounded by their own context in no way lessen the impression that this material is not taken from a source, but is the result, according to Stendahl, of school-activity in the church of Matthew.

Kilpatrick himself, however, does not come to these conclusions when he deals with the formula quotations. He finds that their non-LXX form shows that Matthew must have taken over these quotations from a source not so dependent on the LXX, and thinks this source was oral.

As a tentative explanation of the two types of quotation existing side by side, Kilpatrick suggests a different background for each, the more LXX group deriving from lectionary associations, and the other group of freer citations coming from the stock quotations of the sermon. Kilpatrick in short combines a homiletic-liturgical view of Matthew with the hypothesis of "testimonies". Stendahl however denies that the theory of testimonies solves the problems of the formula quotations.

Stendahl agrees that the formula quotations with their freer renderings would certainly have been included in sermons, but argues that they originated as the fruits of creative activity of Matthew's church, and are pointed out by the special type of introductory formula.

To Stendahl's mind the formula quotations worked in side by side with other types of quotation emphasize the nature of Matthew's gospel as a handbook and a storehouse for teaching, preaching, and church government. He claims that Matthew's interpretation of these quotations and the manner in which they came into the gospel constitute an almost conclusive argument for a "School of Matthew".

II.

Apart from the formula quotations, which occur only in Matthew, there are other quotations common to Matthew and Mark, or to Matthew and Luke. In the Matthew-Mark quotations, Matthew agrees more with the LXX in certain cases than Mark does, but the differences are in any case only in details, and concern but a few instances (Matt. 19: 18 = Mark 10: 19; Matt. 21: 9 = Mark 11: 9, 10; Matt. 22: 32 = Mark 12: 26; Matt. 24: 30 = Mark 13: 26). The close agreement between Matthew and Mark in the majority of their common quotations, even where they

differ from every other Old Testament text known to us, together with a slight but obvious tendency to greater fidelity to the LXX, shows that Matthew took over his material from Mark (Matt. 4: 3 = Mark 1: 3; Matt. 11: 10 = Mark 1: 2; Matt. 22: 44 = Mark 12: 36; Matt. 26: 31 = Mark 14: 27). This LXX revision does not have to be considered a single process. That the tendency is not without ambiguity speaks against this. It is more likely that Mark was in use in the Matthaean church, and had thereby been gradually conformed to the church's Greek Old Testament.

The quotations common to Matthew and Luke present the same picture as those common to Matthew and Mark. The matter peculiar to Luke gives an even stronger LXX impression, though it consists chiefly of allusions. Thus we find that the material peculiar to Luke, and that common to Luke and Matthew, is of the same nature as the Mark quotations, though with a somewhat greater fidelity to LXX in the cases of the strict quotations in the passages on the Temptation.

The Q and other material common to Matthew and Luke has thus been found in a consciously LXX milieu, and the small variations there are do not point to a direct influence from a consistent tradition of Semitic quotations.

One would rather expect the Q material to contain more survivals of quotations from Semitic writings than from any other material, this already from a more general point of view, but especially if one equates Q and Papias's Logia. Nevertheless the case is just the opposite, so that precisely those quotations which consist of the words of Jesus are most clearly LXX in their nature.

III.

If it were the case that quotations in Matthew with parallels in the other Synoptic gospels agreed between themselves and with LXX, but that Matthew's peculiar material showed striking deviations from LXX or even no acquaintance with Greek translations of the Old Testament, we should get a clear picture of Matthew's quotation technique and the growth of his gospel.

Such is not the case, however, on two scores. First, Matthew's formula quotations show enough familiarity with LXX to make it necessary to assume a LXX interpretation for their form. Second, Matthew's peculiar material includes other quotations of purely LXX type. For example, Matt. 21: 16 ("Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise") depends upon the LXX form of Ps. 8: 3 for being useful, and at the same time it occurs in a context where the evangelist himself gave the material its shape.

Furthermore the genealogy of Jesus is likewise LXX in the form of the names, and the allusions in Matt. 1 and 2 prove dependence upon LXX beyond the bounds of fortuitous agreement.

Similarly Matthew's adaptation of Mark's quotations to a closer agreement with LXX points in the same direction. Not only the material he has taken over but also Matthew's own material gives evidence of a church milieu familiar with the LXX as the workshop when Matthew's gospel took shape. Thus, quite naturally, it is not least in quotations from Psalms, familiar through the liturgy, that the LXX text appears in its purest state.

There is a remarkable boundary between the Matthaean formula quotations and other quotations in the First Gospel. Quotations in Matthew with parallels in Mark and/or Luke keep near to the LXX, while the formula quotations, which are all without Synoptic parallel, have a text differing noticeably from the LXX. At times the closeness of the formula quotations to the Massoretic text is striking, but often they deviate from all Greek, Hebrew and Aramaic texts known to us, while at the same time they appear to reflect influences from one or more of these.

In all cases a knowledge of the Hebrew text can be supposed, but in the interpretation Matthew shows great freedom and a tendency to make use of readings which could be supported from many documents—the various LXX versions, later Greek versions, Targums, or even Old Testament Peshitta.

Certain of the formula quotations would not have made sense in the LXX form of the text (2: 15; 4: 15; 8: 17; 27: 9). Yet even in some of these cases there is obviously a knowledge of the LXX interpretation of the Old Testament text. For example, Matt. 4: 15 speaks of "Galilee of the Gentiles" in quoting Isaiah 9: 1, 2. This phrase occurs in the LXX rendering of this passage, but the rest of the sentence as given in the LXX would not have made sense in Matthew's context. So Matthew gives a version of Isaiah's words which is based on the Massoretic text but makes use of a LXX phrase which is not available in the Hebrew.

In six other cases the LXX version of the formula quotations would have been satisfactory, and yet is not used (1: 23; 2: 6, 18; 12: 18-21; 13: 35; 21: 5). As the rendering of the text in the formula quotations is not characteristic of the material peculiar to the gospel of Matthew in its entirety, there must be some connection between the nature of formula quotations as such and the remarkable freedom in rendering the texts—a freedom which seemingly contrasts with the explicit reference to the word of prophecy.

If such is the case, this quotation technique should constitute a significant feature in Matthew. For its quotations cannot be assigned to a special source inserted into Matthew's gospel, but, as a striking feature in the composition of the gospel, they may be considered a key to its character and milieu.

Stendahl concludes from these points that Matthew wrote originally in Greek and freely rendered Old Testament quotations in the formula texts along the lines of various traditions and methods of interpretation. This reflects a targumizing procedure which demands much of the knowledge and outlook of the scribes. In distinction from the other Synoptics and the epistles, with what seems to be their self-evident use of LXX, Matthew was capable of having, and did have, the authority to create a rendering of his own.

When we call this type of citation in Matthew a targumizing procedure and are faced with its great freedom when adapting the texts to their fulfillment in Christ, the question arises as to how these texts could claim the authority they must have had to be accepted and used. The Targums did not obtain that authority in Judaism.

IV

The unique character of the so-called formula quotations has of course been noted since at least the time of Jerome in the fourth century. The quotations peculiar to Matthew are comments upon the narrative; the quotations in Matthew which are common to one or more of the other gospels are mostly in the words of Jesus.

A possible explanation of this phenomenon is that one of Matthew's own sources was a "Book of Testimonies", which he used to explain the course of events in the life of Jesus by references to Old Testament prophecy.

The earliest evidence for the use of testimonies is that mentioned by Eusebius. At the request of one Onesimus, Melito (c. 165) compiled six books of "Extracts from the Law and the Prophets concerning the Saviour and concerning our faith". These Old Testament quotations are furnished with headings showing whence they had been taken, and what they served to elucidate and prove. Tertullian (c. 150-230) and Cyprian (c. 200-258) made use of such books, and theirs may well have been based upon more primitive collections.

Such a theory fits into the picture of early Christian preaching, built as it was upon Old Testament Messianic material, especially when one considers the poverty of congregations and the travelling conditions of missionaries (e. g. 2 Tim. 4: 13: "bring . . . the

books, especially the parchments”).

B.P.W.S. Hunt (*Primitive Gospel Sources*, 1951, p. 281) remarks that it cannot be accidental that all the Greek and Latin Dialogues (except Justin's *Trypho*, which is in a slightly different class) should put forward the same arguments in the same fashion, supported by the same proof texts.

“Testimonies” might also explain the appearance of composite quotations, and of readings which differ from editions known to us, especially if these differences are found to be consistent within the testimony tradition. This not unreasonable supposition might account for Matthew (27: 9, 10) ascribing to Jeremiah a prophecy recorded in Zechariah (11: 13); perhaps Matthew was quoting from a section of testimonies which began with a passage from Jeremiah.

The first in modern times to propose that testimonies were behind quotations in the New Testament seems to have been E. Hatch (*Essays in Biblical Greek*, 1889). To him the hypothesis showed why there were quotations in the New Testament which varied from the LXX and the Massoretic Text, and yet agreed with parallel New Testament and patristic citations. Over the following thirty years his suggestion gained wide support.

F. C. Burkitt in 1906 (*The Gospel History and its Transmission*, pp. 124-128) explained the special form of the quotations in the material peculiar to Matthew by saying that the evangelist might have compiled and used a group of testimonies with marked Semitic traces. This, he suggested, was what Papias (c. 130) meant when he declared: “Matthew wrote the Logia in Hebrew (i.e. Aramaic) and each man interpreted them as he was able”.

The main objection to the use of a book of proof-texts by Matthew is that some of his quotations would not have much meaning in a list apart from the narratives in which they appear in the First Gospel. For example, Hosea 11: 1 and Jer. 31: 15 are applied to the Flight into Egypt and the Massacre of the Innocents (Matt. 2: 15, 18), whereas it is difficult to imagine these particular Old Testament citations being included in a list of proof texts.

The conception of testimonies is principally connected with the name of Rendel Harris (*Testimonies*, two vols., 1916, 1920). He pointed out the agreements between the collections of Old Testament quotations used by Tertullian and Cyprian and earlier writings so rich in quotations: the Epistle of Barnabas (c. 100), II Clement (c. 130), Justin's *First Apology* and his *Dialogue* (c. 150), Irenaeus's *Epideixis* (c. 180), and so on. Harris attempted to

trace these quotations to a stage behind the New Testament writings.

Stendahl feels that the rapid and outstanding success of the First Gospel in the early church, and the well-known fact that the religious atmosphere of this gospel is most nearly akin to post-apostolic Christianity, is hard to explain if what Matthew did was a unique feature in the life of the early church.

It is much more probable, in his view, that "the First Gospel was the product of closer affinity to the centre of early church life than could have been the case if it were the outcome of the unusual chance fact that there happened to be a converted rabbi who succeeded in combining the old forms with the new faith". (It would appear that Stendahl has overlooked the "unusual chance" of a Saul of Tarsus arising.)

Stendahl suggests therefore that the gospel of Matthew arose out of the labours of a group of Christians, and his Matthaean school must be understood as a school for teachers and church leaders with their literary work assuming the form of a manual for teaching and administration within the church.

The Matthaean type of midrashic interpretation is not principally that favoured by the rabbinic schools, but closely approaches that of the Qumran sect in which Old Testament texts were not primarily the source of rules but the prophecy which was shown to be fulfilled.

J. Moffatt (*Introduction to Literature of NT*, 1918, p. 258), who is attracted to the idea of testimonies, points out that two types of testimonies must be presumed in Matthew—the LXX type (which Hatch counted) and that coloured by Semitic wording (which was Burkitt's assumption). The conception of a homogeneous Book of Testimonies is thereby rendered less likely. Accordingly, most later scholars who make use of testimonies do not speak about a single collection.

When, however, the theory of a Book of Testimonies is tested in the case of quotations in Matthew which occur in other New Testament writings, Stendahl shows that the differences in wording and in the order of words rule out the existence of such a book.

For example, Matt. 22: 44 has great significance for the Christian interpretation of the Old Testament. This is a quotation from Psalm 110, and when used in Acts 2: 34 and Hebrews 1: 13 was treated with the same method of interpretation as in the gospels, viz., a *deductio ad absurdum*: it is shown that the words of the psalm had no significance if they did not point to Jesus the Messiah. But as to the form, the passages in Luke, Acts, and Hebrews

did not retain the peculiar ὑποκάτω found in Matthew and Mark, as would have been the case if the quotation was taken from the Book of Testimonies.

J. A. Findlay (*The First Gospel and the Book of Testimonies*, 1933, pp. 57-71) has demonstrated that subsequent collections of testimonies do not follow Matthew's model either in order or in language. Both Justin and Cyprian prefer LXX wording, and on the whole Matthew's peculiar quotations are not much used in this type of literature. He concludes that the First Evangelist is "not in the main Testimony-stream". The supposition of Burkitt which led Rendel Harris to link his Book of Testimonies so closely with Matthew has been brought to a dead end.

Stendahl points out that the methods of the synagogue in dealing with Old Testament texts, both in liturgical reading and in teaching, account for most of the features Rendel Harris wanted to explain by his Book of Testimonies. This is not to deny that the early church used testimonies, oral and written; but testimonies are not responsible for the quotations in Matthew, least of all the formula quotations.

Formerly C. H. Dodd was in general agreement with Rendel Harris's hypothesis (cf. *Romans*, pp. 32, 221), but on investigating the whole problem more deeply in his *According to the Scriptures* (1952, p. 26) he decided that the New Testament evidence points not to a "testimony book" as such, but to a method of Bible study which found literary expression only sporadically, though later it issued in the composition of "testimony books". Dodd views the process as growing out of an "original coherent and flexible method of biblical exegesis" whose beginnings lead back to the very birth of the Christian church. "This is a piece of genuinely creative thinking. Who was responsible for it? The early church, we are accustomed to say. And perhaps we can safely say no more. But creative thinking is rarely done by committees"—or, we might add, by schools such as Stendahl postulates.

Dodd goes on:

Among Christian thinkers of the first age known to us there are three of genuinely creative power—Paul, the author of Hebrews, and the Fourth Evangelist. We are precluded from proposing any one of them for the honour of having originated the process, since even Paul, greatly as he contributed to its development, demonstrably did not originate it. . . . But the NT itself avers that it was Jesus Christ Himself who first directed the minds of His followers to certain parts of the Scriptures as those in which they might find illumination upon the meaning of His mission and destiny. . . . To account for the beginning of this most original and fruitful process of rethinking the

OT we found need to postulate a creative mind. The gospels offer us one. Are we compelled to reject the offer?⁴

Earle Ellis reminds us⁵ that λέγει Κύριος ("saith the Lord") is the badge of prophetic pronouncement in the Old Testament. Its appearance in the New Testament no doubt has an equivalent significance and may be a clue to understanding the rôle which the New Testament exegete—or, better, the New Testament prophet—considered himself to fill.

The gift of prophecy was highly regarded in the apostolic age. It was a specific appointment of the Holy Spirit, and was not bestowed generally but confined to certain individuals.

Could it not be that in the unique formula quotations of the First Gospel we have further select examples of spiritual interpretation and application which are familiar in the Fourth Gospel? And indeed the whole book of Revelation may well come in this category, for the Apocalypse claims to be a prophecy, and while it contains no direct quotations it is steeped in Old Testament language and allusions.

The source of Matthew's peculiar texts, therefore, may well be a consecrated spiritual mind with the New Testament gift of prophecy, rather than a Book of Testimonies or a School of Christians.

NORMAN HILLYER.

Hertford.

APPENDIX A

OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS IN MATTHEW

1: 23* ; 2: 6*, 15*, 18*, 23* ; 3: 3 ; 4: 4, 6, 7, 10, 15* ; 5: 5, 21, 27, 31, 33, 38, 43 ; 8: 4, 17* ; 9: 13 ; 10: 35 ; 11: 5, 10, 14 ; 12: 3, 5, 7, 18*, 40, 42 ; 13: 14, 35* ; 15: 4, 8 ; 17: 2, 11 ; 18: 15 ; 19: 4, 5, 7, 18 ; 21: 5*, 9, 13, 16, 42, 44 ; 22: 24, 32, 37, 39 ; 44 ; 23: 35, 37, 39 ; 24: 15, 29, 37 ; 26: 31, 52, 64 ; 27 : 9*, 35, 43, 46.

* "formula" quotations.

⁴ *According to the Scriptures*, p. 110.

⁵ Cf. his article "Saith the Lord," *THE EVANGELICAL QUARTERLY* 29 (1957), pp. 23ff.

APPENDIX B

THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW IN ITS FIVE PARTS

Preamble 1: 1-2: 23

| | | |
|------------|---|--|
| PART ONE | 3: 1-4: 25 | narrative material |
| | 5: 1-7: 27 (concluding remarks 7: 28, 29) | Sermon on the Mount |
| PART TWO | 8: 1-9: 35 | narrative material |
| | 9: 36-10: 42 (concluding remarks 11: 1) | discourse on Mission and Martyrdom |
| PART THREE | 11: 2-12: 50 | narrative & debate material |
| | 13: 1-52 (concluding remarks 13: 53) | teaching on kingdom of Heaven |
| PART FOUR | 13: 54-17: 21 | narrative & debate material |
| | 17: 22-18: 35 (concluding remarks 19: 1) | discourse on church administration |
| PART FIVE | 19: 2-22: 46 | narrative & debate material |
| | 23: 1-25: 46 (concluding remarks 26: 1, 2) | discourse on eschatology Farewell address |

Epilogue 26: 3-28: 20