CHAPTER TWO

EXPLANATION OF THE TEXT-FORM

DOCUMENTARY-REDACTIONAL VIEWS

Various hypotheses about the origin of Mt and the quotations in Mt have been advanced.¹ Purely documentary-redactional views are not so much in vogue now as they used to be,² but they continue to be proposed.

According to Resch, Mt 1 and 2 derives from a pre-canonical source, a Greek document translated from Hebrew.³ Canonical Mk was taken over and a Hebrew Urevangelium for the discourse material, to which were added bits of Petrine-Jerusalem tradition. The twelve formula-quotations were added by the final redactor.⁴

Soltau sees Mt as a combination of Mk and an Ur-Matthaean gospel based on Q, with the formula-citations mechanically inserted.⁵

Bacon sees the same combination of Mk and "S" by a compiler who had Greek as his mother-tongue and relied on the LXX. The formula-citations are part and parcel of "N," an Aramaic Targum of Mk to which scripture fulfiments and the nativity narratives had been added. Quotations in "S" display various stages of assimilation to the LXX.⁶

According to P. Parker, Mt and Mk utilized an early Jewish-Christian gospel (K). Mk excised seemingly anti-Gentile portions

¹ Some do not deserve consideration, e.g., Deissmann’s view that Mt diverges from the LXX only when he failed to find the passage in the LXX or could not identify the quotation (Bible Studies, 162f.).
² For reactions against purely documentary-redactional hypotheses, see E. Hirsch, Frühgeschichte des Evangeliums (Tübingen, 1941), II, 290-301; Kilpatrick, Origins, 1.
³ That these chapters belong to the hand of the evangelist because of expressions characteristic of Mt, see Burkitt, Evangelion da-Mepharreshe, II, 259; Hawkins, op. cit., 4-10; J. G. Machen, The Virgin Birth of Christ (London, 1930), 170ff.
⁶ Studies in Mt, 13-17, 20, 21, 156-164, 475, 476.
and revised the remainder in the interests of Gentile Christianity. Mt combined K and the pro-Gentile Q. Material peculiar to Mt (M) is simply what Mk omitted in K. (Lk combined Mk and Q.) The compiler of Mt or the author or translator of K in his own comment has depended on his own recollection of the Jewish OT, but in quotations on the lips of Jesus has conformed to the standard of the LXX.¹

As far as the quotation material is concerned, these redactional theories have two basic faults. First, they treat the formula-citations in Mt as a special group homogeneous in text-form. The assumption is erroneous. It cannot be emphasized too much that the only thing which binds the formula-citations together is the fulfilment-formulae with which they are introduced. In text-form they are no more non-Septuagintal than the rest of the synoptic quotation material, outside Marcan formal quotations, and they range from the purely Septuagintal to the wholly non-Septuagintal. Second, the redactional theories fail to recognize the large non-Septuagintal element in the allusive quotations throughout the synoptic tradition.² Thus, from the textual standpoint no need exists to posit a separate redactional stage for the formula-citations or for the citations in Mt 1 and 2. It is not the non-Septuagintal element in the synoptics, but the pure Septuagintal form of the Marcan formal quotations which stands out and calls for explanation.

**Torrey’s Metrical Hebrew**³

C. C. Torrey holds that in Aramaic Mt and Mk the quotations stood in metrical Hebrew and that the Greek translator of Mt took over Greek-Mk in the quotations common to both gospels, but elsewhere rendered the Hebrew independently and accurately.⁴

---

² The exception is Bacon, who recognized the non-Septuagintal element in “S.” But then he has no reason to draw the line between S-quotations and N-quotations. Nor can we agree with Bacon that the final redactor of Mt was restricted to the LXX, in view of assimilation of Mk to the Hebrew OT, such as occurs in Mt 27:57. Parker’s view that quotations on the lips of Jesus are conformed to the LXX is simply not true, for the majority of the allusive quotations which diverge from the LXX represent words of Jesus.
³ Inasmuch as Torrey’s theory has not received general acceptance and was refuted in detail by S. E. Johnson (*op. cit.,* 135-153), I confine myself to several general criticisms.
⁴ *Documents*, 41-90.