

EDWIN K. BROADHEAD

The Gospel of Matthew  
on the Landscape of  
Antiquity

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen  
zum Neuen Testament*

378

---

**Mohr Siebeck**

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen  
zum Neuen Testament

Herausgeber / Editor  
Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors  
Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford) · James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)  
Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL) · Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg)  
J. Ross Wagner (Durham, NC)

378





Edwin K. Broadhead

The Gospel of Matthew  
on the Landscape  
of Antiquity

Mohr Siebeck

EDWIN K. BROADHEAD, born 1955: 1977 B.A., Mississippi College; 1981 M. Div., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary; 1986 PhD, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary; 1991 Dr. theol., University of Zürich; 2005, 2013 Visiting Scholar, Wolfson College, Oxford University; additional studies at Bern, Tübingen; Basel; Professor at Berea College, Berea, Kentucky.

ISBN 978-3-16-154454-5 eISBN 978-3-16-154623-5

ISSN 0512-1604 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2017 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany. [www.mohr.de](http://www.mohr.de)

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was typeset by Martin Fischer in Tübingen, printed by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

dedicated to

Janet Broadhead Tidmore

strong advocate  
lifelong friend  
beloved sister

and to

Pat Tidmore  
friend and family



## Preface

Recent years have seen intense focus on the Gospel of Matthew, particularly in terms of redactional studies and narrative analysis. I have sought here to push out into broader streams of interpretation and to investigate the Gospel of Matthew within a much larger perspective and landscape. Here I have considered the Gospel of Matthew from the perspective of the normative compositional patterns in antiquity, and I have concluded that the claim of a privileged position for authorship of New Testament materials can no longer be presumed.

This means that I have interpreted the Gospel of Matthew not as the work of a single author in a limited time period that produced a foundational text, but rather, along with much of ancient literature, as an *oeuvre mouvante* – as a work in process. The key focus then falls upon the history of the tradition, both in terms of composition and transmission. Moreover, I will argue that this Tradition History not only tells us how this gospel was made, but it also defines what it is and what it does.

As with much of recent interpretation, I have sought to move beyond theological questions to ask as well about historical context, sociological dynamics, and patterns of identity formation at work in the literary construction of this gospel. Moreover, I have sought to look beyond the simpler, rather stereotypical descriptions of setting (within the church or between church and synagogue) described in early stages of scholarship and to locate the Gospel of Matthew amidst the broader lines of conflict and collaboration that characterized the ancient landscape. The result is a more dynamic and extensive concept of the identity and function of this gospel tradition. My hope is to sponsor among critical scholars a broader discussion and re-evaluation of how such texts were made and how they function – and thus of what they are.

I am grateful for those who helped me on my way. This research was done in a sabbatical at Oxford, primarily within Jewish Studies, and I am grateful to Berea College for granting a research semester. I am particularly grateful to hosts and colleagues within Oxford for their friendship and support. Martin Goodman, amidst a very busy schedule, provided invitations and introductions that were important. As a Visiting Fellow of Wolfson College, I found there a warm social circle and helpful facilities. I am particularly grateful to Hermione Lee, president of the college, for her interest in my work and my ideas.



I am grateful, of course, for the love and support of family. I learned the paths of scholarship while watching my father, Dempsey Broadhead, pursue his own career of scholarly research and publication. From my mother, Louise Graham Broadhead, I learned the habits and industry that sustain a life and a career. I have been blessed with a sister, Janet Broadhead Tidmore, who offers equal amounts of listening and advice, and both are treasured. Pat Tidmore, her husband, has followed my work with interest, questions, affirmation, and friendship.

As my career advances, so does my respect for the teachers who helped me on my way. I have been fortunate to study with a wide array of competent, concerned, and interesting mentors. Among these are Robert Shurden, Bradley Pope, Frank Stagg, Eduard Schweizer, Ulrich Luz, Hans Weder, Jean Zumstein, Martin Hengel, Peter Stuhlmacher, Jürgen Moltmann, Ulrich Gäbler. I add to this my continuing joy in the collegiality and the challenges offered by fellow members within the *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas*.

Special gratitude is due to my colleague and wife, Rev. Dr. Loretta Reynolds. She has listened to my theories and supported my research and shared with me in the ministry of the gospel through three decades of married life. She brings much joy and great adventure to our life together, and I am grateful for each day of that journey.

## Table of Contents

Preface .....	VII
How I Changed My Mind about Matthew: Theses for Consideration and Debate .....	XVII
Introduction .....	1
Chapter One: The History of Matthew .....	3
1.0 Matthew the Apostle .....	3
2.0 Matthew the Compiler (Source Criticism) .....	6
3.0 Matthew the Stage Manager (Form Criticism) .....	7
4.0 Matthew the Editor and Theologian (Redaction Criticism) .....	8
5.0 Matthew the Literary Genius .....	11
6.0 Overview: the History of Matthew .....	13
7.0 Contradictory Views of Matthew in Current Scholarship .....	13
7.1 Conflicting Answers to Current Questions about the Gospel of Matthew .....	13
7.1.1 Was Matthew Jewish or Gentile? .....	13
7.1.2 Was Matthew's Community Jewish or Gentile? .....	14
7.1.3 What is Matthew's View on the Law? .....	14
7.1.4 What is the Key Focus of Matthew's Christology? .....	15
7.1.5 Have Matthew and his Community Separated from the Synagogue? .....	15
7.2 Conflicting Views on Discipleship and Ecclesiology .....	17
7.2.1 W.D. Davies and Dale Allison, Jr. ....	17
7.2.2 Graham Stanton .....	18
7.2.3 Ulrich Luz .....	18
7.2.4 Matthias Konradt .....	19
7.2.5 David Sim .....	21
7.2.6 Paul Foster .....	21
7.2.7 Wolfgang Kraus .....	22
7.2.8 William Loader .....	22
7.2.9 Amy-Jill Levine .....	23
8.0 Conclusion .....	24

Chapter Two: Disjunction, Conflict, and Contradiction: The Narrative World of the Gospel of Matthew .....	25
1.0 Disjunction, Conflict and Contradiction: The Structural Framework of the Story .....	26
1.1 The Framing of the Story: Discourse Units .....	26
1.2 The Framing of the Story: Narrative Sequences .....	27
1.3 The Framing of the Story: Prologue and Conclusion .....	30
1.4 Summation .....	31
2.0 Disjunction, Conflict and Contradiction: The Conceptual World of the Story .....	31
2.1 Conceptualizing Discipleship .....	31
2.1.1 Discipleship: The Commission .....	31
2.1.2 Discipleship: The Composition .....	34
2.1.3 Summation .....	39
2.2 Conceptualizing the Teaching of Jesus .....	40
2.2.1 Tension between the Words of Jesus and his Deeds .....	40
2.2.1.1 Anger .....	40
2.2.1.2 The Law .....	41
2.2.1.3 Love of Enemies .....	41
2.2.2 Tension within the Teaching of Jesus .....	41
2.2.2.1 The Place of the Gentiles .....	41
2.2.2.2 The Revision of Torah .....	43
2.2.2.3 The Wicked and their Destiny .....	43
2.2.2.4 Commands to Secrecy .....	43
2.2.2.5 Contradictory Teachings .....	44
2.3 Summation .....	44
3.0 Disjunction, Conflict and Contradiction: The Linguistic Profile of the Story .....	44
3.1 Tension Caused by Jesus using the Same Term in Different Ways .....	44
3.2 Syntactical Problems Caused by Linkage of Appropriated Material .....	44
3.3 Deconstructing Parallelism .....	45
4.0 Summation: Disjunction in the Narrative World of the Gospel of Matthew	45
5.0 The Consequences of Chaos .....	46
6.0 Conclusion .....	46
 Chapter Three: Works in Process: <i>Mouvance</i> , Variability, Viability .....	 48
1.0 <i>Mouvance</i> , Variability, Viability .....	48
2.0 Text as an Object .....	50
3.0 Interpretation as Recovery .....	51
4.0 Transmission as Afterthought .....	52
5.0 The Text as Received Object .....	53

6.0 Primordially	54
6.1 Biblical Texts at Qumran	54
6.2 The Damascus Document	56
6.3 The Teachings of Jesus	57
7.0 The Gospel of Matthew as Living Tradition	59
Chapter Four: Beyond Matthew	61
1.0 Back to Matthew: From NA <sup>28</sup> to p <sup>64</sup>	61
2.0 Traditions in Search of an Author	66
2.1 Who wrote the <i>Iliad</i> ?	67
2.2 Who wrote <i>Brer Rabbit</i> ?	68
2.3 Who wrote <i>Satan in Goray</i> ?	71
2.4 Who wrote the Books of Moses?	73
2.5 Who wrote Isaiah?	74
2.6 Who wrote the letters of Paul?	75
3.0 Conclusion	76
Chapter Five: Revaluing the History of the Tradition	78
1.0 The Tradition (Work)	79
2.0 The Text	80
3.0 The Scripts and the Manuscripts	81
4.0 The Performances	81
5.0 Genre, Text, and Canon	82
6.0 Tradition History	83
7.0 Conclusion	84
Chapter Six: Sources, Traditions, Tradents	85
1.0 Sources employed in the Gospel of Matthew	86
1.1 The Gospel of Mark	87
1.2 The Sayings Tradition (Q)	88
1.3 Special Traditions in the Orbit of the Gospel of Matthew (M)	90
1.3.1 Searching for the Special Tradition (M)	91
1.3.2 W.D. Davies and Dale Allison	91
1.3.3 Stephenson Brooks	92
1.3.4 Reconstructing the Special Materials (M)	94
1.4 The Sermon on the Mount	96
1.5 The Lord's Prayer	98
1.6 The Scriptures of Israel	100
1.7 A Petrine Tradition	102
1.8 Structure, Style, Rhetoric as Received Tradition	103
1.9 Summation	104

2.0 Sources as Traditions . . . . .	104
3.0 Traditions and Tradents . . . . .	106
4.0 Conclusion . . . . .	108

## Chapter Seven: The Gospel of Matthew as Living Tradition: Composition . . . . . 109

1.0 Text and Tradition . . . . .	109
2.0 Competing Traditions within the Gospel of Matthew . . . . .	110
2.1 A Markan Voice in a Matthean World . . . . .	110
2.1.1 Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark . . . . .	111
2.1.2 Ecclesiology in the Gospel of Mark . . . . .	113
2.1.3 Appropriation of Markan Discipleship . . . . .	114
2.1.4 Appropriation of Markan Ecclesiology . . . . .	116
2.1.4.1 The Scribes of the Kingdom (Mt 13.51–52) . . . . .	116
2.1.4.2 The Sons of the Kingdom (Mt 17.24–27) . . . . .	116
2.1.4.3 The Eschatological Discourse (Mk 13.1–37; Mt 24.1–44; Mt 10.17–22a) . . . . .	116
2.1.4.4 Eschatology Underway . . . . .	117
2.1.4.5 Cleaning up the Script . . . . .	118
2.1.5 Summation: A Markan Voice in a Matthean World . . . . .	118
2.2 A Prophetic Voice in a Matthean World (The Sayings Tradition) . . . . .	119
2.2.1 A Theology of the Sayings Tradition . . . . .	119
2.2.2 Summation: A Prophetic Voice in a Matthean World . . . . .	122
2.3 The Voice of Scripture in a Matthean World . . . . .	124
2.4 Local Voices in the Gospel of Matthew (M) . . . . .	126
2.4.1 A Variety of Voices within the Special Material . . . . .	127
2.4.2 Summation . . . . .	130
2.5 The Voice of Peter in a Matthean World . . . . .	130
2.6 Brackets: The Birth Narrative and the Post-Resurrection Commission . . . . .	133
2.7 Summation: The Confluence and Competition of Voices in the Gospel of Matthew . . . . .	134
3.0 A Jewish Voice in a Gentile World or a Gentile Voice in a Jewish World? . . . . .	135

## Chapter Eight: The Gospel of Matthew as Living Tradition: The Projected Context . . . . . 136

1.0 Projection of Place in the Gospel of Matthew . . . . .	136
1.1 The Representation of Sacred Space . . . . .	137
1.2 The Role of Mountains . . . . .	138
1.3 The Dynamics of Journey . . . . .	140
1.4 Summation . . . . .	142

2.0 Projection of Time in the Gospel of Matthew .....	142
2.1 The Representation of the Past .....	142
2.2 The Representation of the Present .....	144
2.3 The Representation of the Future .....	144
2.4 Summation: The Representation of Time in the Gospel of Matthew ...	145
3.0 Projection of Value in the Gospel of Matthew .....	145
3.1 Righteousness and Hypocrisy .....	145
3.2 Faith and its Opposites .....	147
3.3 Peter as Conflicted Model .....	148
3.4 Summation: Conflict and Values in the Gospel of Matthew .....	149
4.0 Overlap in Place, Time, Values .....	149
5.0 Summation: Conflict as the Projected Context for the Gospel of Matthew	150

## Chapter Nine: The Gospel of Matthew as Living Tradition:

### The Historical Context .....

1.0 Between the Wars .....	152
1.1 What is No More .....	153
1.2 What is Not Yet .....	153
2.0 Projections of the Landscape before 70 ce .....	155
2.1 A Rabbinic Perspective .....	155
2.2 The Sectarians of the Dead Sea Scrolls .....	157
2.3 Josephus .....	158
2.4 Philo .....	160
2.5 Apocalypses .....	160
2.6 New Testament Projections .....	160
2.7 A Counter to Acts: <i>Recognitions</i> 1.27–71 .....	163
2.8 Why the Temple Fell .....	169
2.9 Summation: Projected History in the Years Before the 1 <sup>st</sup> Jewish War ..	170
3.0 Projections of the Landscape after 70 ce .....	171
3.1 A Rabbinic Perspective .....	171
3.2 Josephus .....	171
3.3 Christian Perspectives .....	171
3.3.1 The Eschatological Discourse of Mark 13 .....	171
3.3.2 The Apocalypse: A Response to Domitian? .....	172
3.3.3 The <i>Apocalypse of Peter</i> : A Response to Bar Kochba? .....	174
3.3.4 Justin Martyr's Sources: Another Response to Bar Kochba? .....	175
3.3.5 Hegesippus in the Words of Eusebius: A Virgin Church Corrupted by Heresies .....	178
3.3.6 Irenaeus: A Cosmic Unity around the Gospels .....	179
3.3.7 The Letter to the Hebrews: A New Temple for a New Age .....	180
3.4 Summation .....	181

4.0 Scholarly Reconstructions	182
4.1 Formative Judaism	182
4.1.1 Common Judaism	182
4.1.2 Many Judaisms	183
4.1.3 From Monism to Pluralism	186
4.1.4 Grumbling Tolerance	187
4.1.5 The Truth is in the Details	189
4.2 Formative Christianity	190
4.2.1 The Peace of the Church	190
4.2.2 The Parting of the Ways	191
4.2.2.1 Patterns of Parting in New Testament Scholarship	191
4.2.2.2 The Parting of the Ways as a Paradigm for Christian Identity	196
4.2.2.3 Challenges to the Parting Models	197
4.2.3 Summation: Scholarly Reconstructions of Formative Christianity	199
5.0 Conclusion	199

## Chapter Ten: The Gospel of Matthew as Living Tradition:

### The History of Transmission

1.0 Transmission History: The Role of Tradition, Text, and Manuscript	201
1.1 Tradition, Text, Manuscript	202
1.2 Developments in Codex Sinaiticus	204
1.3 Some Manuscripts Generate New Texts	205
1.4 Summation	208
2.0 Manuscripts and the Gospel of Matthew: From NA <sup>28</sup> to p <sup>64</sup> and Back	208
2.1 The List	209
2.2 Nestle-Aland: <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i>	211
2.3 Codex Sinaiticus	212
2.4 Early Manuscript Fragments: p <sup>1</sup> and p <sup>64</sup>	213
2.5 The Manuscript Tradition From p <sup>64</sup> to NA <sup>28</sup>	218
2.6 Summation	221
3.0 Hebrew Matthew	222
4.0 MS 9381: The Gospel of Matthew and the Tradition of Forgiveness	224
5.0 Conclusion	233

## Chapter Eleven: Mapping the Ancient Landscape

1.0 Conflict and Collaboration: The Larger Mediterranean World	237
1.1 Culture	237
1.2 Political and Economic Relationships	238
1.3 The Peculiar Case of the Jews	238
1.4 Summation	239

2.0 Conflict and Collaboration: Palestine	239
2.1 Culture	239
2.2 Politics	240
2.3 Jews in Dialectical Relationship with other Jews	242
2.4 Samaritans	243
2.5 The Peculiar Case of the Christians	244
2.6 Summation	250
3.0 Conflict and Collaboration: The Local Context of the Gospel of Matthew	251
3.1 Antioch on the Axis of Graeco-Roman History	251
3.2 Antioch on the Axis of Jewish History	252
3.3 Antioch on the Axis of Christian History	255
3.4 Antioch on the Axis of Jewish Christian History	259
4.0 Conclusion	261

## Chapter Twelve: The Gospel of Matthew on the Landscape of Antiquity

1.0 The Gospel of Matthew as a Living Tradition	263
2.0 Competing Jewish Voices in the Gospel of Matthew	264
2.1 A Markan Voice in a Matthean World	265
2.2 The Voice of the Sayings Prophets in a Matthean World	267
2.3 The Voice of Scripture in a Matthean World	269
2.4 A Caustic Local Voice	271
2.5 The Voice of Peter	273
2.6 A Voice from the Margins	273
2.7 Summation: The Confluence and Competition of Voices in the Gospel of Matthew	274
3.0 A Gentile Voice in a Jewish World or a Jewish Voice in a Gentile World?	277
4.0 A Jewish Voice in a Jewish World	278
4.1 The Contours of the Narrative	278
4.2 The Final Vision	279
4.2.1 The Jewishness of the Final Vision	279
4.2.2 A New Vision Beyond Judaism?	284
4.2.3 The <i>Movance</i> of Matthew 28.16–20	285
4.2.3.1 The Fragility of the Tradition	286
4.2.3.2 Various Forms of the Final Commission	287
4.2.3.3 A Continuum of Traditions	289
4.2.3.4 Plausible Lines of Development	289
4.2.3.5 Evaluation	290
4.2.4 Gentile Counter Voices?	291
4.2.4.1 “His blood be upon us and upon our children”	291
4.2.4.2 The <i>Present Day</i> Tradition	292
4.2.5 Summation	295
5.0 Conclusion	296



Chapter Thirteen: The Transmission of the Gospel of Matthew Along Three Trajectories . . . . .	298
1.0 Reading a Jewish Voice in a Gentile World . . . . .	299
2.0 Reading a Jewish Voice in a Jewish World . . . . .	302
2.1 The Concept of Hebrew Matthew . . . . .	302
2.2 The Jewish Gospel Traditions . . . . .	303
2.2.1 The Gospel of the Ebionites . . . . .	304
2.2.2 The Gospel According to the Hebrews . . . . .	305
2.2.3 The Gospel of the Nazoreans . . . . .	306
2.3 A Jewish Christian Hermeneutic . . . . .	309
2.3.1 Matthew 10.24–25: A Servant Like the Master . . . . .	310
2.3.2 Matthew 10.5–6: The Lost Sheep of the House of Israel . . . . .	311
3.0 A Jewish Voice in a Medieval Debate . . . . .	311
4.0 Conclusion . . . . .	314
 Chapter 14: Conclusion . . . . .	 315
1.0 Overview . . . . .	316
2.0 The Gospel of Matthew as a Living Tradition . . . . .	319
3.0 A Jewish Voice in a Jewish World . . . . .	321
4.0 The Gospel of Matthew on the Landscape of Antiquity . . . . .	322
5.0 The <i>Aktionsart</i> of the Gospel of Matthew . . . . .	323
6.0 Conclusion . . . . .	324
 Bibliography . . . . .	 326
Ancient Texts . . . . .	333
Index of Authors . . . . .	347
Index of Subjects . . . . .	349

## How I Changed My Mind about Matthew: Theses for Consideration and Debate

1. Redactional criticism, which began as a *literary* science (focused on the reappropriation of tradition and source materials) has become increasingly focused on the *persona* of Matthew. Linguistic and literary operations have been interpreted more and more as markers for the psychological profile and theological intent of an individual author named Matthew. In recent studies, Matthew has become a conscious theologian and a literary genius.

2. The form of the narrative from the 4<sup>th</sup> century (primarily Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus) has been projected – in a largely uncritical and almost comprehensive way – back onto the desk of a 1<sup>st</sup> century author.

3. The same is true of the major traditions employed by the Gospel of Matthew (the Gospel of Mark and the Sayings Tradition), which also are known largely from 4<sup>th</sup> century texts.

4. Reference to the psychological profile, theological agenda, or literary skills of Matthew and to his (retrojected) 1<sup>st</sup> century text has failed to resolve the multiple layers of conflict and contradiction present in the narrative. This is reflected in the wildly divergent positions taken in current scholarship.

5. Reference to the psychological profile, theological agenda, or literary skills of Matthew has failed to clarify the contradictory markers for the social and theological setting of this gospel. This too is reflected in the wildly divergent positions taken in current scholarship.

6. The Gospel of Matthew, as it is available to us, does not reflect a single redactional process leading to one text. It rather reflects multiple stages of redactional activity and an evolving text. This is true as well of the sources and traditions employed in the production of this text. This complexity makes it difficult to identify a unified line of editorial design or intent or to describe a single social setting for this gospel.

7. Scholarly construction and retrojection of a fixed gospel text (usually in the form of the Nestle-Aland 28<sup>th</sup> edition from the 21<sup>st</sup> century) tends to reify the dynamics of the compositional process of this narrative tradition.

8. The Gospel of Matthew has been evaluated in stark contradiction to what is known of the compositional process at work in the larger environment from which it emerged (exemplified in Qumran materials, the Pauline corpus, Johan-

nine writings, rabbinical materials). This privileged position can no longer be presumed.

9. This projection of a fixed and final text consciously shaped by an author in control of his sources (whether as apostle, evangelist, theologian, or literary genius) functions in an apologetic role: it generates an aura of authority for the author, for the text, and for the interpreter.

10. Since reference to a singular author or to a unified redactional strategy or to a fixed form of the text cannot account for the narrative profile of the Gospel of Matthew and has failed to clarify its social and theological location, the narrative profile and social/theological location of the Gospel of Matthew are best explained by its larger history of composition and transmission.

11. The characterization of the Gospel of Matthew as a Living Tradition (a term developed and explored throughout this work) generates a starkly different image of the composition, setting, and transmission of this gospel. I will argue that the Gospel of Matthew emerges from a dialogical and dialectical process of competing traditions within Judaism.

12. These qualities of flexibility and fluidity are not simply anecdotal; they are essential and generative in nature. They are central to what this gospel is and to how it operates.

13. These traits suggest the Gospel of Matthew, which has been read as a personified and punctiliar text, is more properly understood in light of the collective and durative process (Tradition History) through which it was produced. The Gospel of Matthew represents the dialectical engagement and appropriation of competing traditions sponsored by differing communities within the early Jesus movement.

14. The Gospel of Matthew is thus an example of *oeuvre mouvante* – a work in process. This process explains how this text was produced, but it also clarifies what it is and how it functions. I will argue that the Gospel of Matthew emerges in a conflicted environment that is wholly Jewish and that it engages this environment through a strategy that is both reflective and prospective in nature.

## Introduction

The text of the Gospel of Matthew is, in its own right, a worthy object of investigation. At the same time, however, a critical analysis of this gospel can provide a window through which to observe the construction and transmission of ancient texts and traditions and to raise key questions about the dynamics of that process. Such an investigation can also bring to the foreground the dynamics involved in the construction of identity, and it can provide insight into the process by which a group of people establish their place on the map.

Who wrote the Gospel of Matthew? When and where was it composed? Why was it penned? To whom was it written and for what purpose? These questions, asked long before the modern era, are the concerns at the heart of current scholarship on the Gospel of Matthew. Recent scholarship shares in common, almost without exception, a focus on the author Matthew as the key to understanding this text and its social and theological location. Despite this nearly universal focus on the role of Matthew, every major question is answered in contradictory ways, and this by competent scholars citing supportive evidence from the same text.

This narrow approach to the composition of the text not only leads to contradictory answers; it also flattens out the underlying question of social and cultural dynamics, transmission of tradition, and construction of identity. If Matthew is a conscious author in control of the text, he has, for the most part, taken care of these complexities.

Here I wish to explore a different understanding of how the Gospel of Matthew was produced. I will suggest that the primary dynamic behind the construction of this gospel is not its author, but other factors. If this is shown to be the case, the conflicting answers to the key questions raised by scholars may be seen in a different light. Furthermore, as the image of Matthew the author moves to the background, other key dynamics move to the foreground of investigation.

I wish to suggest that the *primary* key to the identity and strategy of the Gospel of Matthew lies not in some form of authorial intent or design, but in a two-way conversation, even negotiation, between community and composer – or communities and composers. Beyond the issue of “who wrote Matthew”, this suggestion goes to the heart of the question about the dynamics for the development of early Christianity, particularly in relationship to the historical Jesus and to its Jewish matrix. In particular, I wish to challenge, once again, the myth

of an incipient orthodoxy – an early church driven toward unity and orthodoxy by literature forged under the didactic hand of apostles or evangelists. I also wish to challenge the myth that Christianity defined itself primarily against external challenges from groups such as rabbinic Judaism and Gnosticism.

I will argue that the Gospel of Matthew is a Living Tradition – a debate among competing voices – both in its composition and in its endurance. This developmental process provides the key to its identity, and this identity explains the disjunctive nature of both its presentation and its history of interpretation. I also wish to argue that the process observed in the Gospel of Matthew gives insight into the way in which ancient groups sought to establish their place and identity on the map of antiquity.

At the heart of this story is a world run by Rome, with its armies and roads and its Hellenistic mindset. In the aftermath of the Roman destruction of the Temple (70 ce), various groups are seeking to recover the heritage of conquered Israel and to posit themselves as its continuing voice. Two of these groups, both with imperial patronage, will eventually impose their grand narrative upon the ideological map of antiquity. The rabbis will begin to record their traditions in the form of the Mishnah and eventually gather it into the Talmud. In this act they lay claim to be the sole authentic voice and the face of Judaism – and thus the continuation of the story of Israel. Christian orthodoxy will also claim to speak with one voice as the authentic bearer of the tradition of Jesus, the Jewish messiah – and thus to be the fulfillment or the replacement of Israel.

In the last decades of the first century of the common era, those voices are not yet established, but the race has begun. I will argue here that the Gospel of Matthew stands at the crossroads – in temporal, geographical, and ideological terms – of that developmental process. I will argue that the Gospel of Matthew not only stands at the crossroads of that debate, but that it already contains within itself the voices of competing traditions that will eventually redraw the landscape of antiquity. These voices will prove louder, more important, and more enduring than any of the myriad reconstructions of Matthew the author.

## Chapter One

# The History of Matthew

Who wrote the Gospel of Matthew? When and where was it composed? Why was it penned? To whom was it written and for what purpose? Such are the concerns at the heart of current scholarship on the Gospel of Matthew. These questions were raised, however, long before the advent of critical study of the Bible in the 16<sup>th</sup> century.

### 1.0 Matthew the Apostle

The church historian Eusebius (4<sup>th</sup> century ce), concerned with the distinction between the gospels, quotes Papias, the bishop of Hieropolis (from c. 110–125 ce). Papias said that

Matthew made an ordered arrangement of *logia* of the Lord in the Hebrew dialect, and everyone interpreted them as they were able.<sup>1</sup>

For Papias, Matthew's collection of the *logia* (sayings) of Jesus distinguishes it from the Gospel of Mark.

Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately whatever he remembered of the things said and done by the Lord, but not however in order. For neither did he hear the Lord, nor did he follow him, but afterwards, as I said, Peter, who adapted his teachings to the needs of the hearers, but not as though he were drawing up a connected account of the Lord's *logia*.<sup>2</sup>

Papias, as reported by Eusebius, seems to defend the Gospel of Mark for its lack of order in relation to the Gospel of Matthew. For Papias, Mark is not an eyewitness, but one who interprets the memories of what Peter adapted for "the needs of his hearers." Papias also distinguishes between the "ordered arrangement of *logia*" in the Gospel of Matthew and the fact that Mark was not "drawing up a connected account of the Lord's *logia*." Papias credits this, in part, to the fact that Mark is not a witness to the teaching of Jesus, and this probably means that Papias thought Matthew was a firsthand witness. Is the difference for Papias simply a matter of organization – both wrote *logia* but Matthew's account was

---

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, *HE*, 3.39.16

<sup>2</sup> Eusebius, *HE*, 3.39.15

in order? The saying could also mean that Matthew wrote the *logia* (sayings) of Jesus, but Mark did not. Mark, says Papias, wrote down what Peter remembered of “the things said and done by the Lord.”

While this may appear to be something of an apology or explanation for Mark’s work, what Papias says about the Gospel of Matthew is equally important. First, Papias says that this work is a gospel, suggesting this term is recognized early in the 2nd century – in some places at least – as a written version of the story of Jesus. Secondly, Papias seems to describe a carefully arranged account. Thirdly, Papias says this account centers on the sayings (*logia*) of Jesus. If these descriptions are not pressed too much, then they are in basic agreement with how the Gospel of Matthew is typically seen in modern scholarship. Almost no scholars, however, accept that the Gospel of Matthew, as currently known, was written in Hebrew and then translated.

While Eusebius says that Papias was talking about the Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel of Mark, it appears that Irenaeus, in the second half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century ce, first speaks of all four of the New Testament gospels. A great deal of scholarship has sought to find citations of the Gospel of Matthew in the apostolic fathers and even within the New Testament itself. While early traditions are certainly used, this evidence is ambiguous and inconclusive. Hans Dieter Betz concludes that “An influence of the entire Gospel of Matthew, as we have it at present, is impossible to demonstrate up to and including the time of Justin Martyr (died c. 163 or 167).”<sup>3</sup>

Among the early writers to comment on the Gospel of Matthew are Irenaeus (died c. 200); Clement of Alexandria (c. 140 or 150 to 215?); and Tertullian (c. 160–220). For these and the stream of commentaries and sermons that followed, the key issues were: 1) how Matthew had conveyed to the church the central teaching of Jesus, and 2) how this contrasted with Jewish ideas and practices.

Differences and contradictions within the Gospel of Matthew were generally not an issue. Many noticed, however, the differences between the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5–7) and the Sermon on the Plain (Lk 6.20–49). Among early interpreters, Origen, Chrysostom, Euthymius, and Theophylactus believed Jesus had given two versions of the same speech.<sup>4</sup> Augustine, in contrast, argued there were two speeches: the Sermon on the Mount is esoteric instruction for the apostles only, while the Sermon on the Plain is shorter, clearer, and intended for the public.<sup>5</sup> It was likely John Calvin (1509–1564) who first recognized the composite nature of the material. Calvin saw that both accounts are collections that seek to bring together things Jesus taught on various occasions and thus provide a guide for discipleship:

<sup>3</sup> Hans Dieter Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), p. 7.

<sup>4</sup> This is discussed by Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 17,20.

<sup>5</sup> Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, p. 20.

Both evangelists had the intention of gathering into one single passage the chief headings of Christ's teaching .... It should be enough for reverent and humble readers that here, before their eyes, they have set a short summary of the teaching of Christ, gathered from many and various discourses ...<sup>6</sup>

Two questions are consistent in this developing line of interpretation. The first concern is with what Jesus taught – especially in contrast to Judaism. The second interest is how Matthew conveyed Jesus' teaching to the church. Thus, the Gospel of Matthew was seen as an apostolic text that faithfully records the teaching of Jesus and transmits it to the church.

Even at the beginning of the Enlightenment, scholars still defended the idea that Matthew, in the Sermon on the Mount, had presented the words of Jesus. Johann Jakob Hess (1741–1828) said:

The main purpose of it was to hand over to his (not yet completed number of) devotees a religious doctrine and ethics, thoroughly anti-Pharisaic in nature, which took the form of easily memorable maxims and sayings arranged under certain main rubrics. And this was done in such a practical manner and presented in a form so completely adaptable to their situation at that time, as well as in the future, that it could shape their religious minds completely in accordance with his.<sup>7</sup>

The emphasis on the distance from Judaism also continues:

No synagogue, not even the temple in the capital, could make a solemn impression such as this. Nothing in this circumstance belonged to the formalities that accompanied the customary lecturing of Jewish teachers.<sup>8</sup>

Even when scholars began to recognize redactional intrusions into the Sermon on the Mount, some argued that these did not diminish this text as a direct account of the teaching of Jesus.<sup>9</sup> This line of interpretation, despite the critical standards of the Enlightenment, would encourage the 19<sup>th</sup> century lives of Jesus. These writers believed their task was to separate out the true images of Jesus from the accoutrements of the culture and the worldview of the writers.

Before this movement, however, Thomas Jefferson made an extraordinary attempt to isolate the true teaching of Jesus. Jefferson believed that Jesus was the greatest moral teacher of all history. While the lives of Jesus typically construct a social and psychological profile, Jefferson sought to separate out Jesus' true teaching. To do so, he produced the Jefferson Bible. Trained in classics, Jefferson compared six accounts of the Bible, including French, Latin, Greek, and the English King James Version. He cut out what he considered the authentic teaching of Jesus and pasted the various versions side by side to create a new text.

---

<sup>6</sup> Cited by Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, p. 17. Betz notes that Augustine took the position that Jesus delivered two addresses.

<sup>7</sup> Cited and discussed in Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, p. 19.

<sup>8</sup> Cited and discussed in Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, p. 20.

<sup>9</sup> Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 21–22.



For Jefferson, these authentic teachings, when removed from the superstitious additions of the apostles, contained “the most sublime and benevolent code of morals which has never been offered to man.”<sup>10</sup>

While various lines of development may be seen, there is a strong common cord. Almost without exception, Matthew was seen as an apostolic figure who is giving direct testimony to the teaching of Jesus.

## 2.0 Matthew the Compiler (Source Criticism)

In the 19<sup>th</sup> century Heinrich Julius Holtzmann and others opened a new stage in scholarship.<sup>11</sup> The quest for Jesus’ first speech was redirected to the sources employed in the presentation of those words.<sup>12</sup> The Sermon on the Mount and the Sermon on the Plain were seen not as variations of each other, but as different appropriations of a common source. Beyond the fact that both were constructed, this further meant that neither was a direct account of the teachings of Jesus – they were revisions of a common text.

The focus thus shifted from Jesus to the traditions about him, but it also shifted from Matthew the Apostle to Matthew as a compiler, arranger, and manager of early Christian tradition. In the era that followed, it was Matthew who was in charge of the Sermon on the Mount: he had expanded an earlier source, organized it around a new theme, and relocated it to the beginning of Jesus’ ministry to illustrate his teaching.<sup>13</sup> Holtzmann believed that Matthew still retained the teaching of Jesus: “To Matthew, therefore, belong the disposition and association of ideas, to Jesus the individual apophthegmata that fill out the plan of composition.”<sup>14</sup>

This focus quickly moved to the question of how Matthew had done this. The first answer was sought in the sources employed. The relation between the two versions of the Sermon was considered, but also the relationship among the gospels themselves.

Scholars soon realized there was some form of interdependence between the first three of the gospels and that the Gospel of John stood in a category by itself. Extensive time and effort was given to the interrelationship of the three synoptic gospels, with Markan priority winning the day.

<sup>10</sup> “How Thomas Jefferson created his own Bible,” <http://www.smithsonianmag.com/arts-culture/how-thomas-jefferson-created-his-own-bible-5659505/>. The 1804 version, now lost, contained some 46 pages of what Jesus said and was entitled *The Philosophy of Jesus of Nazareth*. The 1840 version was entitled *The Life and Morals of Jesus of Nazareth*. It was 84 pages long and contained both words and deeds of Jesus that Jefferson thought authentic.

<sup>11</sup> Holtzmann’s work appeared in 1863: *Die synoptischen Evangelien, ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter* (Leipzig: Engelmann, 1863). See the discussion in Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 22–24.

<sup>12</sup> Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, p. 22.

<sup>13</sup> Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, p. 24.

<sup>14</sup> Cited in Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 24–25.

Once Markan priority was established, the material shared between the Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel of Luke suggested a common written source. Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (1752–1827) argued that Matthew and Luke drew their common material from two different forms of a written source; thus, this source was already edited before they received it and deployed it in their own gospels. Eichhorn further argued that the version used by Matthew was a redactional work that addressed the needs and interests of Jewish Christianity.<sup>15</sup>

This tradition, composed primarily of the sayings of Jesus, would come to be labeled as the Sayings Source and designated by the letter Q. The recognition of Q goes back to the work of Christian Hermann Weisse (1801–1866).<sup>16</sup> Scholars would eventually concede the point of Eichhorn by designating two forms of the Sayings Tradition (Q<sup>mt</sup> and Q<sup>lk</sup>). Even these give no direct access to the words of Jesus, since they are written Greek translations of what was originally oral material in Aramaic.

Scholars thus came to the realization that most of the issues about the interrelationship of the three synoptic gospels could be explained by a reference to two sources. The Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel of Luke each based their work on the Gospel of Mark, but supplemented this framework by inserting the sayings of Jesus, drawn from their own versions of the Sayings Tradition (Q). Eventually, scholarship would designate the special materials unique to the Gospel of Matthew as M and those unique to the Gospel of Luke as L. Scholars presumed that sources were also employed in the Gospel of Mark, but these remained largely beyond the reach of scholarship.

These new insights realigned the interpretive grid. The key to the Gospel of Matthew was now found in the way ancient traditions had been preserved, then expanded and shaped into a distinct narrative to address a specific audience. For many, these ancient traditions contained, at least at some level, the teaching of Jesus. Matthew was thus seen as the mediator of these primitive traditions of Jesus. In the eyes of the Form Critics, however, the issue was more complicated than that.

### 3.0 Matthew the Stage Manager (Form Criticism)

For Form Critics, another stage stood between the reader and the teaching of Jesus. They argued that the gospel material had circulated in specific forms and according to standard rules among early followers of Jesus.<sup>17</sup> The key to this

<sup>15</sup> Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, p. 25.

<sup>16</sup> See the discussion by Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, p. 26, especially note 199.

<sup>17</sup> Hermann Gunkel used Form Criticism to categorize the components and the dynamics of the Psalms. Rudolf Bultmann, Karl Schmidt, Martin Dibelius and others developed Form Criticism for New Testament materials, especially the Synoptic Gospels.

process was the formal shaping of the texts and their use in specific life settings such as worship, debate, missions. Thus, the teaching of Jesus had already been adapted – in its use within early Christian communities – before it was passed on to the gospel writers.<sup>18</sup>

This impacted how the tradition was seen in two significant ways. This was no longer considered the direct teaching of Jesus, and it was now seen as a Christian tradition operating mostly in isolation from Judaism. This view also changed the role of Matthew. Matthew was no longer simply passing on the words of Jesus; he was instead charged with the task of sorting out and arranging the various traditions into a coherent narrative. This was done through selection, ordering and arranging, but also through the construction of narrative frameworks, introductions, transitions, and conclusions.<sup>19</sup>

For Form Critics, the traditions followed definitive patterns and had a specific setting in the life of the early churches. Having isolated these traditions within the gospels, Form Critics were primarily interested in the role these smaller traditions played in primitive Christianity. They gave less attention to the larger framework of the gospel narratives. That task would be taken up by the proponents of redaction criticism, and a new understanding of Matthew would emerge.

#### 4.0 Matthew the Editor and Theologian (Redaction Criticism)

Redaction critics gave attention to the language and style of the Gospel of Matthew and to the framing of the blocks of material. Redaction critics also investigated ways in which editorial activity might be a tool of theological construction by the evangelists. They did this by focusing on patterns and changes within the narrative that could portray the evangelist's interests and designs.

The groundbreaking study of Bornkamm, Barth, and Held<sup>20</sup> developed and applied the model to the Gospel of Matthew.<sup>21</sup> Noting the work of the source

---

<sup>18</sup> This was already seen by Carl Georg Friedrich Heinrici (1844–1915), who argued that the Sermon on the Mount and the Sermon on the Plain are not reproductions of the teaching of Jesus, but rather reconstruction. Furthermore, there is no one source common to the two. Both are secondary “reconstructions of a foundational speech of Jesus, in two versions, and not dependent on a common source.” Heinrici believed the Sermon on the Mount belongs to a Jewish and Palestinian ethos, while the Sermon on the Plain does not. This is cited and discussed in Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 27–28.

<sup>19</sup> Luke, for example, was said to have moved the sermon at Nazareth to the beginning of Jesus' ministry in order to make it a paradigmatic account of who Jesus was and what he taught. Matthew moved the acclamation of Jesus as one who “teaches with authority” from its Markan connection to miracles and (re)associated it with the words of Jesus – a more natural connection.

<sup>20</sup> Gunther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz Joachim Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963).

<sup>21</sup> The Gospel of Luke was analyzed by Hans Conzelmann, and the Gospel Mark was analyzed by Willi Marxsen.

critics in separating tradition and redaction, Bornkamm, Barth, and Held argued that form-critical work must be “continued in a new direction.”<sup>22</sup> This is because the Synoptic writers show – all three and each in his own special way – by their editing and construction, by their selection, inclusion and omission, and not least by what at first sight appears an insignificant, but on closer examination is seen to be a characteristic treatment of the traditional material, that they are by no means mere collectors and handers-on of the tradition, but interpreters of it.<sup>23</sup>

Bornkamm, Barth, and Held saw Matthew consciously shaping the the narrative for theological purposes:

... Matthew presents Jesus at the beginning of his Gospel not only as the ‘Messiah of the word’ and the ‘Messiah of deed’ but also as the one who commissions, who gives his disciples authority to do the same Messianic work.<sup>24</sup>

The theological contribution of Matthew is also described:

... Matthew has collected the miracle narratives of Jesus in only one passage (Matt. 8–9). In light of the evangelist’s composition it is easy to see why he has proceeded in this way. The similarly worded verses in Matt. 4.23 and 9.35 show by their contents ... and their position ... that Matthew’s purpose in the chapters enclosed by these verses is to portray the double office of Christ: his teaching and his healing activity. His collection of the miraculous deeds of Jesus thus has a Christological function. The evangelist presents Jesus at the beginning of his Gospel not only as the Messiah of the word (in the Sermon on the Mount) but also as the Messiah of deed (by his miraculous deeds). ... The conclusion of the collection of miracles also shows that the evangelist has arranged them under the theme of Christology.<sup>25</sup>

Redaction critics eventually began to ask why Matthew made such changes and what audience or situation the evangelist addressed with this construction. W.D. Davies opened a new era of investigation in *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*.<sup>26</sup> Davies argued, along with many others, that the Gospel of Matthew was written in the period after the fall of the Temple (70 ce) – a period in which Judaism was in disarray. Taking his clues from Josephus and later rabbinic works, Davies noted that Pharisaic Judaism was establishing itself through the synagogues as the new norm and authority for Jewish identity. While Essenes, Sadducees, and Zealots were largely a thing of the past, the Pharisaic forms of Judaism were exerting their authority through rabbinic codes later found in the Mishnah. The center of this authority, says Davies, was the academy of rabbis in Jamnia. From here rabbis could assert their authority as interpreters of Jewish

<sup>22</sup> Bornkamm, Barth, and Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, p. 11.

<sup>23</sup> Bornkamm, Barth, and Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, p. 12.

<sup>24</sup> Bornkamm, Barth, and Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, p. 252.

<sup>25</sup> Bornkamm, Barth, and Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, pp. 246–47.

<sup>26</sup> W.D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964).

Law and as the regulators of daily life. As such, they could sanction those who disagreed or opposed them.

Davies argued that Jewish Christians were seen as heretics by the rabbis and they, along with other groups, were expelled from the synagogues. One of the ways of doing this, said Davies, was imposition of the *birkhat ha minim*, a curse against heretics, into the synagogue liturgy.<sup>27</sup> This had the effect of requiring followers of Jesus to identify themselves and made them subject to expulsion.

Davies argued that the Gospel of Matthew, and especially the Sermon on the Mount, is “a Christian response to Jamnia.”<sup>28</sup> While various aspects of Davies’ position would be challenged, it provided a new way of reading the Gospel of Matthew. Matthew’s redactional strategy was no longer simply one of personal style or ideas; it was no longer simply theological reflection upon traditional material. Instead, Matthew was manipulating the story of Jesus to address a specific historical crisis, and he was doing so in behalf of a specific community of Christians. This connection to historical situation and to community interests would prevail through the next decades of scholarship on the Gospel of Matthew. Matthew would become the theologian speaking for his community, particularly in its struggle with Judaism.

This move beyond the questions of personal style and tastes into the historical setting of the larger narrative was accompanied by wider thinking about Matthew’s interaction with the traditions. If Matthew was seeking to counter the Pharisaic authority and to explain the Christian movement, then he might be less a handler of tradition and more a theologian in his own right. New attention was given to Matthew’s constructive theology: to Matthew’s Christology, to Matthew’s view of salvation history, to Matthew’s attitude to the Law, to Matthew’s view of discipleship and church,<sup>29</sup> and other theological issues.

Matthew the apostle and evangelist had now become, in redaction criticism, a competent author with a theological agenda. Redaction critics attended to the language and style of Matthew and to his manipulation of traditions through techniques such as framing, omissions, introductions, summaries, and allusions. They also investigated ways in which editorial activity might be a tool of theological construction by the evangelists. They gave less attention, however, to the ways such traditions and editorial changes operated within the larger narrative world, and they rarely considered issues such as plot and characterization. That task would be undertaken by proponents of narrative criticism.

---

<sup>27</sup> For discussion of the whether such a curse plays a role in this period, see Edwin Broadhead, *Jewish Ways of Following Jesus*, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), pp. 290–96.

<sup>28</sup> Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, p. 315. This is cited and discussed in Donald Senior, *What are they Saying about Matthew?* (New York: Paulist Press, revised and expanded edition, 1996), pp. 8–10.

<sup>29</sup> All titles of chapters in Donald Senior’s *What are they Saying about Matthew?*

## Ancient Texts

### New Testament

Gospel of Matthew		2.18	34, 143
1.1–28.20	202	2.19–23	146
1.1–13.58	87	2.19–21	34
1–11	29	2.19	34
1–9	146	2.20	140
1.1–4.22	30, 31	2.23	34, 101, 124, 140, 143
1.1–2.23	133	3.1–12	35, 143
1.1–9	213, 218	3.1	35
1.1–17	34, 142	3.3	35, 140, 243
1.1	202	3.5–6	140
1.2–16	20	3.13–17	35, 37
1.2	140	3.13	140
1.5–6	41	3.14–15	125, 143, 146, 270
1.5	30	3.14	35
1.12	213	3.15–16	43
1.14–20	213	3.17	35
1.16	146	4.1–16	35
1.17	140, 142	4.1–12	44
1.18–2.23	34, 91, 94, 140	4.1–11	89, 140, 143
1.18	142	4.1	45, 140
1.19	44, 146	4.3–4	140
1.20	34, 146	4.4	35, 143
1.22	101, 124, 142	4.5–7	140
1.23	34, 38	4.5	35, 306, 309
1.24–25	146	4.6	143
2.1–12	20, 30, 41	4.7	35, 143, 144
2.1–6	125	4.8–11	140
2.3	291	4.8	35, 138, 139
2.5–6	140	4.10	35, 143, 285
2.6	34, 101, 124, 125, 143	4.12	35, 37, 51, 140
2.12	34	4.12–16	30, 45
2.13–15	34, 140, 146	4.13	140
2.13	34	4.14–16	20
2.15	34, 101, 124, 125, 143	4.15–16	33, 35, 42, 101, 124, 143
2.16–18	34, 125, 140	4.15	141
2.17	101, 124, 143	4.16	142

4.17	26, 29, 37, 45, 138, 141	5.33–37	43, 92, 94, 95
4.18–25	34	5.33–35	93
4.18–22	36, 37, 284	5.36	93
4.18	35	5.37	93
4.19	34	5.38–42	43
4.21	34	5.39–42	44, 89
4.22	34	5.41	95
4.23–11.30	28, 29, 30, 31, 45	5.43–48	43, 89
4.23–25	36, 37	5.44	41
4.23	9, 28, 98, 138, 141, 142	5.45	43, 44
4.24–25	33	5.46	42
5–9	98	5.47	30, 42, 117
5–7	4, 26, 28, 29, 36, 98, 114, 139, 141, 146, 208	6	146
5–6	32, 128	6.1–18	92, 94, 95, 97, 98
5.1–7.29	96	6.1–6	92
5.1–2	27, 96, 98, 284	6.1	43
5.1	36, 37, 114	6.2	
5.2–27	37	6.2–4	43
5.5	92	6.3–4	95
5.6	146	6.5–8	100
5.7	92, 95	6.5–6	43, 219
5.8	92, 95	6.5	129, 146
5.9	92, 95	6.6	95
5.10	33	6.7–8	93
5.11	34	6.7	30, 42
5.12–17	40	6.8–10	219
5.12–16	37	6.9b–13	98, 99, 100
5.14	306	6.10	138
5.16	43	6.11	306, 307
5.17–48	97	6.13–15	219
5.17–20	43, 115, 122, 146	6.16–18	43, 44, 92
5.17–19	21	6.16	102, 146, 276
5.17–18	41, 50, 114	6.17–18	95
5.17	95, 128	6.17	95, 219
5.18–22	40	6.32	30, 42
5.18	89, 128	6.54	138
5.19	44, 93, 128	7.6	93, 95
5.20	128, 146, 147, 284	7.28–29	36, 96, 98
5.21–6.34	128	7.28	27, 45, 89, 116
5.21–48	43	7.29	138
5.21–24	94, 95	8–9	9, 15, 28, 29, 98, 141, 146
5.21–22	93	8.5–13	20, 33, 44, 123, 147, 282
5.22	40, 306, 308	8.5	35
5.23–24	93	8.10–13	282
5.23	284	8.10	20, 141, 147
5.24–25	141	8.11–12	89, 147
5.27–28	92, 93, 94, 95	8.11	142
		8.12	138

8.13	20, 147	11.13–14	143
8.17	101, 124, 143	11.17	144
8.21–22	41	11.20–24	41, 292
8.23–27	28, 148	11.21–22	41
8.28–34	20, 34	11.23–24	41, 143, 294
9.1–8	233	11.23	292
9.8	148	11.25	30, 45, 307, 308
9.9	13	11.28–30	95
9.13	44, 101, 126, 130, 270, 304	11.28	142
9.15	44	12–28	28, 29, 31, 45
9.18–26	42	12	30, 45
9.25	138, 141, 142	12.1–8	41, 43
9.27–31	29	12.7	101, 126, 130, 270, 304
9.29	148	12.8	43
9.35	9, 28, 98, 138	12.9–14	41, 43, 138
10	26, 28, 144	12.9	138
10.1–23	142	12.17–21	20, 34, 101, 124, 143
10.1–15	284	12.18–21	42
10.1–14	107	12.33–42	40
10.1–4	29, 114, 115, 131	12.36–37	93
10.1	27	12.38–42	89, 143, 281
10.2	102	12.38–39	283
10.5–15	42	12.39	144
10.5–14	29	12.41–42	143
10.5–8	95	12.41	282
10.5–6	32, 42, 96, 123, 311	12.42	281, 282
10.5	30, 32	13	220
10.6	19, 95, 142	13.1–53	26, 28, 31, 40
10.14	42, 118	13.1–3	27
10.15	122	13.14–15	125, 143, 270
10.16–23	29	13.14	101, 113, 124, 143
10.17–22	30	13.16–17	89, 279
10.17–22a	116	13.17	44, 144
10.17	138	13.24–30	44, 91, 95
10.18	117, 118, 279	13.24	95
10.23	94, 122, 144	13.35	101, 124, 143
10.23b	92	13.36–43	44, 115
10.24–25	89, 222, 302, 310	13.36	115
10.24	29, 310	13.38	44
10.26–38	29	13.39	280
10.34	44, 143	13.42	43
10.35–36	29, 43	13.43	44
10.41	44	13.44–46	91, 95, 115
11	29, 220	13.44	95
11.1	27, 141	13.45	95
11.2–6	89	13.47–50	91, 95, 115
11.10c	124	14.47	95
		13.49	44



13.51–52	115, 116	16.28	144
13.51	38	17.1–9	102, 139, 143
13.52	39, 271, 284	17.1–8	38, 114, 131
13.53	27	17.5	276
13.54–58	138	17.6	148
13.54	138	17.9	131, 276
14.28–34	148	17.10–13	143
14.28–33	114, 131	17.14–21	40
14.28–31	115, 131	17.17	144
14.30	148	17.20	89, 148
14.31	148	17.24–27	91, 95, 115, 116, 131
15.1–20	115	17.24	102
15.1–9	40	18	26, 31, 220
15.1–2	137	18.1–3a	27
15.8–9	125, 143, 270	18.15–20	277
15.8	148	18.15–17	138, 218, 279
15.15	102	18.17	30, 42, 116, 117, 145
15.16	148	18.18–20	138
15.17	122	18.18	93, 233
15.21–29	147	18.19–20	93
15.21–28	20, 32, 40, 141, 282	18.21–22	115, 131, 233
15.22	32, 282	18.21	102
15.23–25	95	18.23–35	95
15.24	19, 32, 42, 95, 96, 123	18.23–25	91
15.25	30, 32	18.23	95
15.26	30, 42	19.1	27
15.28	20, 32, 147, 148, 282	19.8	143, 148
16.1–4	282, 283	19.12	93
16.4	144	19.27–30	102
16.5–12	43	20.1–16	91, 95
16.8	148	20.1	95
16.11	148	20.17–19	42
16.12	115	20.17	137
16.13–20	114, 115, 131, 139	20.29–34	29, 30
16.13–14	245	21.1–11	45
16.16–17	131, 148	21.4	104, 124, 143
16.16	102, 276	21.5	45
16.17–19	95, 102, 115, 132, 276	21.7	45
16.18–20	148	21.10–11	291
16.18–19	138, 145	21.12	143
16.18	116, 138, 148	21.23	137
16.19	138, 233	21.24	137
16.20	138	21.28–32	91, 95
16.21	137, 291	21.33–46	296
16.22–23	102	22.1–14	91, 95
16.22	148	22.2	95
16.23	148	22.13	43
16.27–28	144	22.18	146

22.29	57	24.1-44	30, 116
22.37	125	24.1	137
22.44	143	24.2	137
23-25	26, 28, 31, 40, 63	24.3-25.6	139
23	22, 220	24.3-51	139
23.1-36	40	24.3	26
23.1-22	92	24.6	116
23.1-3	92, 94, 95	24.8	116, 144, 276
23.1-2	272	24.9	42, 279
23.1	27, 127, 129, 272	24.13	276
23.2-3	43, 92, 95	24.14	42, 117, 123, 144, 145,
23.2	128		276
23.3	95, 127, 129	24.15	137
23.4-12	127	24.17	117
23.4	40, 89	24.20	43
23.5	40, 92, 94, 95	24.27	122
23.6	129	24.29-31	144
23.7b-10	92, 94, 95	24.29	143
23.8-12	95	24.30-31	145, 283, 285
23.8-10	93	24.32-35	175
23.8	129	24.37-39	89, 122
23.10	129	24.36-39	143
23.13	40, 41, 89, 127, 147	24.51	43, 137
23.15-22	92, 94, 95	25.1-46	139
23.15	93, 127	25.1-13	91, 95
23.16-22	93	25.1	95
23.16-21	129	25.14-30	89, 91, 95, 133, 307
23.16	41, 127	25.31-46	91, 95, 133
23.22	129	25.37	44
23.23	40, 89, 127, 128, 129, 147	25.46	44, 137
23.24	93	26	63, 64, 220
23.25	41, 127, 147	26.1	26, 27
23.27	41, 127	26.5	291, 292
23.28	44, 147	26.9	276
23.29-39	143	26.25	292
23.29	44, 127, 147	26.29	293
23.31	41	26.31	143
23.33	41, 93	26.32	117
23.34-36	144	26.33-35	148
23.34	138	26.33-34	102
23.35	41, 44, 128, 306, 308	26.47-56	37
23.36	128	26.61	137
23.37-39	89, 137, 291	26.64	293
23.38	128	26.69-75	148
23.39	293	27-31	148
24-25	26, 114	27	220, 293
24.1-25.46	137	27.1-10	292
24	30, 117, 133	27.3-10	37, 92, 95

27.4	44	1.21–38	36
27.5	137	1.21–29	35, 112
27.8	292, 294, 295, 296, 320	1.21–28	35
27.9–10	101, 124, 143	1.27–28	36
27.19	44, 92, 95	1.29–31	35, 112
27.24–25	16, 92, 95, 291, 292	1.32–39	112
27.24	291, 292	1.32–34	35
27.25	291, 292, 293, 294	1.32–33	118
27.51b–53	92, 95	1.40–9.50	36
27.51	306, 308	1.41	118
27.57	38, 39, 283, 284	1.43	118
27.62–66	16, 92, 95	1.45	118
27.65	307, 309	2.1–13	112
28.2–4	92, 95	2.12–4.34	28, 29, 31
28.7	117	2.27	122
28.9–10	92, 95	3.1–7	112
28.10	117, 276	3.5	118
28.11–28	30	3.10	118
28.11–15	16, 92, 95, 286, 292	3.13–19	29, 114, 115, 131
28.11	292, 295, 296	3.16–19	102, 114, 115
28.15	286, 292, 294, 295, 320	3.19b–21	33
28.16–20	20, 21, 29, 30, 31, 33, 37, 38, 42, 43, 63, 90, 96, 117, 123, 131, 142, 145, 148, 149, 205, 221, 234, 276, 279, 280, 283, 285, 286, 287, 289, 295	3.21 4.35–5.43 5.1–20 5.9 5.30 6.1–16.8	118 28 34 118 118 28, 29, 31
28.16–17	37	6.5	118
28.16	139	6.6b–13	42, 107
28.17	37, 148	6.6	118
28.18b–20	19	6.7–13	29
28.18	132	6.11	42
28.19	19, 37, 39, 283, 283, 287	6.14–16.8	87
28.20	202, 276, 284, 286	6.38	118
		6.47–53	112, 114
Gospel of Mark		6.48	118
1.1	107, 266	7	32
1.1–8	35	7.15	122
1.2–2.22	28, 31	7.19	115, 122
1.2–6	35	7.24–30	32
1.3	35	7.24	118
1.9–11	35	7.26	282
1.11	35	8.12	118
1.12–13	35	8.22–27a	113
1.14–15	35, 37	8.23	118
1.14	35	8.27–30	114, 115, 131
1.16–20	35, 36	8.27	102
1.21–39	35	8.29	130

8.30	130	14.58	118
9.2–8	114, 131	14.66–72	131
9.6	102, 130	15.42–46	246
9.9	131	16.1–8	206, 207, 276
9.16	118	16.7	113, 117, 131, 206
9.21	118	16.8	46, 131, 206
9.33	118	16.9–20	206, 207
9.49–50	33	16.14	206
9.49	33	16.15–18	288
9.50a	33	16.15	289
9.50b	33	16.17–18	207
10.14	118		
10.18	118	Gospel of Luke	
10.21	118	2.1–7	125
10.28	131	6.17–49	96, 99
10.46–52	29, 113	6.20–49	4
10.52	113	7.18–23	88
11.13	118	9.51–18.14	99
11.27–28	244	9.1–6	42
11.30–31	245	9.20	102
13	29, 30, 42, 113, 170, 171, 174, 276	9.33	102
13.1–37	116	10.2–16	32
13.1–4	172	10.25–37	99
13.3–5	113	11.1	100
13.5–37	171	11.2b–4	99
13.5	113	12.53	29
13.7–8	113	15.11–32	99
13.7	116	18.1–8	99
13.8	116, 276	18.9–14	99
13.9–13	30	21.29–33	175
13.9–10	117	21.33	51
13.9	42, 117, 138	24.44	73
13.10	117, 131, 276	24.44–46	51
13.11	113		
13.12	42	Gospel of John	
13.13	113, 117	1.4–8	286
13.14	113, 172	1.19–22	244
13.18	43	1.20–24	286
13.28–30	175	3.1–2	246
13.37	113	3.19	246
14.9	276	3.39	246
14.14	118	5.39	51
14.27	113	16.13–15	51
14.28	113, 117	17.17	51
14.29–31	131	18	202, 203, 211
14.33	118	18.31–33	210
14.51–52	114	18.37–38	210
		19.38	246

Sayings Tradition (Q)		7.54–8.1	162
3.7–9	119, 120	8.1–4	249
3.16–17	119, 120	8.3	162
6.20–23	120	8.4–13	249
6.47–49	120	8.14–25	249
7.18–35	119	8.16	288
7.18–23	88	8.26–40	249
7.31–35	121	9.31	161
10.2–16	32	9.32–10.48	249
10.9	120	10.1–48	161
11.2–4	120	10.45	161
11.9–13	120	10.48	288
11.39–42	121	11.19–21	249
11.47–51	120	11.19	259
11.49–51	120	11.20	259
12.8–10	120	11.22–24	249
12.22–31	120	11.27–30	249
12.39–59	120	13.1–5	261
13.18–21	120	13.44–52	162
13.23–30	120	13.46–49	259
13.34–35	120	13.46–47	168, 261
14.5	89, 121	13.46	194
14.16–24	120	14.1	162
16.16	119	14.21	39, 284
17.23–37	120	14.24–28	259
17.23–24	89	15	193
17.26–30	120	15.1–35	161
17.33–35	120	15.1–15	259
17.37	120	15.6–29	260
19.12–27	120	15.22–29	249
		15.32–35	251
Acts		15.36–41	251
1.8	32	17.11	51
2.5–13	249	18.4–6	162
2.14	245	18.6	168, 194, 261
2.16	51	18.19	162
2.22	245	18.22–23	251
2.36	245	19.5	288
2.38	288	28.23–28	162
2.43–47	161	28.25–28	261
4.7	244	28.25	194
5.1–11	162	28.28	168
5.17–18	162	28.30–31	161, 162
5.33–39	246		
6.1–6	259	Romans	
6.7	168	6.3	288
6.8–8.1	164, 168	15.4	51
6.12	162	16.7	205

16.22	75	1.1–2	51, 180
16.25–26	51	1.5–2.18	180
		3.1–6	180
1 Corinthians		4.12	51
9.5	249	4.14–7.28	180
15.3–7	105	8.1–10.39	180
16.21	75	9.15	180
		10.10	180
2 Corinthians	323	10.23–25	181
		11.1–12.2	181
Galatians		13.7–8	181
1.6	163	13.17	181
2.1–10	193		
2.9	193	1 Peter	
3.1	163, 288	1.25	51
3.27	288		
3.28	162	2 Peter	
5.12	163	1.19–21	51
6.11	75		
		3 John	
Ephesians		7	117
1.20–23	280		
		Revelation	
Philippians		1.4–3.22	172
2.5–11	105	1.4	172
3.4–6	245	1.5–6	172
		1.5	172
2 Thessalonians		2.1	172
3.17	75	2.9	172
		2.13	172
1 Timothy		3.9	172
4.13	81	12.10	280
		13.10	174
2 Timothy		17.3–6	174
3.15–17	51	17.18	174
4.13	105	20.4	323
		22.1–7	174
Hebrews			
1.1–3	180		

## Hebrew Bible

Genesis		Exodus	
49.10–11	176, 177	19.3–6	280
49.10	177	24.4	50, 51
		33.13–23	280
		34.1–28	280

Numbers		6.9	270
24.17	176, 177	7.14	176
		8.23–9.1	35
Deuteronomy		8	33
4.1–2	50	9.1–2	34
6.13	139, 285	9.5	176
10.20	285	11.1	176
17.19	50	11.10	280
32.43	285	29.13	148, 270
		34.16	50
Joshua		35.3–5	176
8.34	50	40–66	74
		40–48	74
1 Kings		40.8	50
10.1–10	281	42.1–4	34, 74
10.9	281	44–55	74
19.4–21	280	44.28	74
		45.1	74
2 Chronicles		49–55	74
9.1–9	281	49.1–6	74
30.16	73	50.4–11	74
		50.6–8	176
Psalms		51.5	176
1	177	52.13–53.12	74, 176
2	177	54.1	177
3.6	176	56–66	75
19.3–6	177	56–59	75
19.7–10	50	56	280
22.8–9	176	56.3–8	141
22.17	176	56.7–8	280
22.19	176	58.2	176
24.7–8	177	60–62	75
40.6–8	270, 278	60.1–11	141
72	280	60.3	30
91.11	143	63–66	75
96	177	65.2	176
110.1–3	177	66	297, 318, 321
119.11	50	66.18–24	281
119.89	50	66.18–21	283
119.105	50	66.24	177
119.140	50		
		Jeremiah	
Isaiah		9.26	177
1–39	74	15.16	50
1.9	177	18	293
2.2–4	280	18.1–2	293
2.2–3	39	18.18	291
2.3–4	177	20.1–2	291

26.7–11	291	4.1–4	141
32	293	5.1	125, 176
32.6–44	293	5.3	125
32.9	293	6.6–8	126, 129, 270
36.1–32	50	6.8	129
		7.6	143
Daniel		Habakkuk	
7.13–18	280	2.4	147, 157
Hosea		2.5–6	157
6.6	101, 126, 129, 130, 270, 271, 278, 304, 305	2.7–8a	157
		2.8b	158
Amos		Zechariah	
5.21–24	126, 270	9.9	45, 176
5.23–24	129	12.10–12	177
5.23	278		
5.24	278	Malachi	
Micah		3.1	35, 124
1.1–2	141		

## Other Ancient Texts

Apocalypse of Peter		Clement	
	174–75, 177	Eclogae propheticae	
Apocalypse of Zephaniah		41.2	175
	160	Cyril of Alexandria	
Apocryphon of Ezekiel		The Discourse on Mary Theotokos	
	160		288, 289
Book of Nestor (Sefer Nestor ha-Komer)		Diataxis	257
	223, 303, 311	Didache	
Chrysostom		1.1–6.1	99
Homily 1	292, 300	1.3b–2.1	99
1.1	258	6.3	100
1.3	258	7.1–4	100
1.6	258	7.1	287, 289
2.3	258	7.3	287, 289
4.7	258	8.1–3	100
8.4	258	8.2–3	100
Exp. in Ps 109.2	257	8.2	99
		9.1–10.7	100
		9.5	287, 289



11.1–12	107	De mens.et pond.	
11.4–9	268	15	250
12.1–8	268		
13.1–4	269	Demonstratio Evangelica	
15.1–2	269	240.136	287
15.2	107		
		Theophania	
Didascalia	257	4.22	306, 307
		4.12	306, 307
Epiphanius			
Panarion		1 Enoch	160, 280
28.5.1	222, 302	2 Enoch	160
29.7.7	223, 250, 260		
29.9.4	222, 223, 260, 302	Even Bohan	223–224, 303, 312
30.2.7	250		
30.3.7	222,302	Ezra, Esdras	
30.13.2–3	304	Fourth Book of Ezra (2 Esdras)	
30.13.6–7	222, 302		160, 280
30.14.3–4	222, 302		
30.16.5	305	Filaster	
30.22.4	302	div. her. liber 36	302
30.26.2	310		
Haer.		Gospel of the Ebionites	
70.10	257		304–05
De mens. et pond		Gospel according to the Hebrews	
15	250		305
Eusebius		Gospel of the Nazoreans	
Church History			306–09
2.23.17–18	169	Gospel of Thomas	
3.5.3	250	Saying 82	33
3.11.1	169		
3.24.6	223, 303	Ignatius	
3.27.2	310	Philadelphia	
3.39.15	3	6.1	255, 299
3.39.16	3, 223, 303	8.2	255, 299
4.5.1	250		
4.22.1	179	Magnesians	
4.22.4–5	178	8.1–2	300
4.22.6	178	10.1	299
4.22.7–8	178		
6.2.1	259	Smyrneans	
6.14.1	175	8.2	299
6.25.4	223, 303		
6.32	170		

Irenaeus		Antiquities (Ant.)	
Adversus Haereses		4.201	183
3.1.1	223, 303	12.119	253
3.11.7	179, 180	13.138–139	252
3.11.8	179	18.116–119	245
		20.199	245
Jerome		20.200	246
De vir. ill	222	23–24	159
2	260	25	159
3	222, 260, 302		
		Contra Apionem	
In Matt	222	2.179–181	158, 188
6.11	306, 307	2.39	253
12.13	222, 302		
23.35	306, 308	Milhamot HaShem	
27.16	306, 308		223, 303, 312
27.51	306, 308		
		Mishnah	
Epistles		Sanhedrin	
112.13	260	10.1	190
		Nizzahon Vetus	223, 303
Against the Pelagians		Odes of Solomon	
3.2	306, 308	23.31–32	287
Justin Martyr		Origen	
Dialogue		in Matt.	
39	288	5.14	306
47.1	175	15.14	307, 309
53	288	79	310
1 <sup>st</sup> Apology	176–77, 287, 285	De prin. 4.3.8	311
Josephus		Philo	
Jewish Wars		De Migratione Abrahami	
2.118	159		187
2.119	159	Pirke Avot	51, 106, 155, 156
2.457–459	253	Pseudo-Clementines	
2.585–646	159	Recognitions 1.27–71	
4.560	241		163–69, 177, 182, 246,
7.44–45	252		290, 322
7.44	253	Pseudo-Hieronymus	
7.45	259	Indic. de haer 10	310
7.46–49	253		
7.47	254		
7.50–51	253		
7.58–61	253		
7.100–111	253		
7.109	254		
7.111	254		

Pseudo-Tertullian adv. omn. haer. 3 310	Sepher Joseph Hamekane 223, 303
Q (see Sayings Tradition)	Shepherd of Hermas Similitude 9.17.4 288
Quissat Mujadalat al-U <sub>s</sub> quf 311, 312	Syballine Oracles 154
Qumran 4QMMT 56, 57, 328	Tertullian De Corona 3 287
1QpHab 8–11 147	Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs 177
8 157	Theophilus Apologia ad Autolyicum 256
9 158	1.12 257
Recognitions (see Pseudo-Clementines)	
Sefer Nestor ha-Komer (see Book of Nestor)	

## Index of Authors

- Alexander, Philip 197, 326  
Allison, Dale 15, 16, 17, 40, 44, 87, 88, 90,  
91, 92, 94, 95, 100, 103, 104, 118, 124,  
269, 326, 327  
Anderson, Bernhard 74, 326
- Bacon, Benjamin 15, 326  
Barth, Gerhard 8, 9, 15, 326, 328  
Bauckham, Richard 174, 326  
Beaton, Richard C. 11, 85, 326  
Becker, Adam 185, 197, 326  
Benson, L.D. 50, 326  
Bauer, Walter 305, 326  
Betz, Hans Dieter 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 15, 96, 97,  
98, 99, 326  
Bornkamm, Günther 8, 9, 15, 326, 328  
Boyarin, Daniel 185, 326  
Broadhead, Edwin 10, 25, 28, 42, 82,  
102, 111, 112, 117, 123, 126, 150, 153,  
197, 206, 248, 261, 265, 270, 304, 326,  
327  
Brooks, Stephenson 92, 93, 94, 327  
Brown, Raymond 102, 327
- Carleton Paget, James 304, 327  
Cohen, Shaye 182, 186, 187, 190, 327  
Conzelmann, Hans 8, 192, 327  
Culpepper, R. Alan 11, 32, 106, 327
- Davies, Philip R. 56, 327  
Davies, W. D. 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 87, 88, 90,  
91, 92, 94, 95, 100, 103, 104, 118, 124,  
153, 186, 269, 327  
Donfried, Karl 102, 327  
Dunn, James D. G. 192, 194, 195, 327,  
331
- Ehrman, Bart 304, 306, 307, 328
- Foster, Paul, 21, 328  
Frankemölle, Hubert 12, 14, 328  
Frey, Jörg 305, 306, 328
- Garland, David 16, 328  
Gerhardsson, Birger 15, 328  
Globe, Alexander 52, 328  
Gold, Victor 74, 328  
Goodman, Martin VII, 158, 187,  
188, 189, 240, 241, 242, 328  
Grant, Robert 256, 328  
Gundry, Robert 15, 328
- Hammerton-Kelly, Robert 15, 328  
Hare, Douglas 14, 16, 328  
Harnack, Adolf von 191, 328  
Havener, Ivan 121, 328  
Held, Heinz Joachim 8, 9, 15, 326, 328  
Hempel, Charlotte 56, 328  
Hengel, Martin VIII, 192, 193, 329  
Holtzmann, Heinrich 6, 329  
Howard, George 223, 224, 288, 289, 302,  
303, 313, 329  
Hummerl, Reinhart 13, 329
- Kelber, Werner 54, 55, 57, 58, 60, 103,  
265, 329  
Kingsbury, Jack 15, 16, 329  
Klijn, A. F. J. 304, 305, 306, 329  
Kloppenborg, John 88, 119, 329  
Konradt, Matthias 19, 20, 291, 292, 295,  
329  
Kosmola, Hans 288, 329  
Kraus, Thomas J. 219, 329  
Kraus, Wolfgang 22, 329  
Kümmel, Werner 91, 329
- Lake, Kirsopp 52, 329  
Lampe, Peter 205, 329

- Levine, Amy-Jill 23, 329  
Levine, Lee 183, 229  
Lieu, Judith 197, 329  
Lüdemann, Gerd 196, 197, 198, 329  
Lührmann, Dieter 119, 121, 329  
Luz, Ulrich VIII, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19,  
24, 26, 28, 29, 51, 53, 91, 98, 102, 103,  
104, 268, 278, 329
- Manson, T. W. 120, 329  
Meeks, Wayne 251, 253, 254, 256, 257,  
259, 300, 329  
Meier, John 14, 19, 330  
Millet, Bella 49, 51, 52, 59, 330  
Moore, George F. 186, 330  
Müller, C. Detlef G. 174, 330
- Nepper-Christensen, Paul 14, 330  
Neusner, Jacob 184, 185, 186, 246, 247,  
330  
Niklas, Tobias 219, 329
- O'Leary, A. M. 266, 330  
Ochs, Christoph 311, 312, 313, 314, 330  
Overman, Andrew 16, 330
- Parker, David 52, 58, 78, 79, 80, 81, 107,  
109, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207,  
208, 209, 213, 330  
Piper, Ron 119, 330
- Rackman, Emmanuel 183, 184, 330  
Reed, Annette Yoshiko 185, 197, 326  
Reumann, John 102, 192, 327  
Reynolds, L. D. 52, 330
- Saldarini, Anthony 16, 330  
Sand, Alexander 15, 330
- Sanders, E. P. 182, 183, 187, 327, 330  
Schiffman, Lawrence 183, 330  
Schlatter, Adolph 104, 191, 331  
Schneemelcher, Wilhelm 174, 330, 331,  
332  
Schweizer, Eduard VIII, 113, 331  
Shaberg, Jane 288, 331  
Snodgrass, Klyne 15, 331  
Senior, Donald 10, 13, 16, 22, 23, 28, 115,  
329, 331  
Sim, David 14, 16, 21, 331  
Simon, Marcel 257, 258, 331  
Skarsaune, Oskar 163, 174, 176, 177, 331  
Stagg, Frank VIII, 323, 331  
Stanton, Graham 12, 16, 18, 163, 164, 174,  
326, 331  
Steck, Odil Hannes 120, 331  
Strecker, Georg 14, 16, 305, 306, 331, 332  
Streeter, B. H. 91, 331  
Stuhlmacher, Peter VIII, 192, 331  
Suggs, Jack 15, 331
- Theissen, Gerd 107, 196, 331  
Tuckett, Christopher 119, 120, 121, 332
- Van Tilborg, Sjeff 16, 332  
Van Voorst, Robert E. 164, 332  
Vidas, Moulie 60, 332  
Vielhauer, Philipp 305, 306, 332
- Wace, Henry 256, 332  
Weeden, Theodore 112, 332  
Wilken, Robert 251, 253, 254, 256, 329  
Wilson, N. G. 52, 330  
Wrede, William 111, 112, 332
- Zetterholm, Magnus 251, 252, 253, 332  
Zumthor, Paul 48, 49, 332

## Subject Index

- Alexandria 4, 154, 160, 184, 198, 203, 241, 249, 250, 288, 289, 305
- Antioch 39, 64, 161, 191, 194, 198, 203, 249, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 264, 275, 299, 300, 301, 303
- Bezea (D) 78, 219, 284, 285  
*birkhat ha minim* 10
- Calvin, John 4
- Chrysostom 4, 254, 257, 258, 292, 300, 301
- Clement of Alexandria 4, 175, 305
- Clement of Rome 163, 164, 166, 167
- Constantine 63, 153, 170, 190, 221, 234, 247, 254, 258, 301, 319
- Damascus 286
- Damascus Document 56, 57, 168
- Didache 99, 100, 107, 260, 267, 268, 269, 287, 289, 290
- Discipleship 4, 10, 17, 21, 26, 29, 31, 34, 36, 37, 38, 47, 96, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 118, 121, 130, 131, 132, 142, 148, 149, 265, 266, 267, 273, 279, 284
- Essenes 9, 159, 178, 186, 188, 189, 193, 243, 245
- Eusebius 3, 4, 13, 169, 170, 175, 178, 206, 220, 222, 223, 250, 259, 287, 288, 289, 290, 302, 303, 306, 307, 309, 310
- Form Criticism 7, 8, 9, 79, 83, 103
- Gamaliel 106, 155, 156, 167, 168, 169, 246
- Hebrew Matthew 222, 223, 224, 234, 289, 290, 295, 302, 303, 314, 318
- Hegesippus 178, 179, 291, 309
- Ignatius 254, 255, 258, 261, 299, 300
- Iliad 67, 68, 81, 82, 85
- Irenaeus 4, 178, 179, 180, 223, 303
- Jefferson, Thomas 5, 6
- Jerusalem 19, 29, 35, 36, 39, 45, 74, 75, 76, 87, 91, 99, 100, 112, 113, 128, 136, 137, 138, 140, 141, 152, 153, 155, 158, 159, 161, 163, 164, 166, 167, 168, 169, 172, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 198, 238, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 254, 259, 260, 265, 280, 281, 283, 291, 292, 293, 295, 296, 300, 308, 317, 321
- Jewish Christianity 7, 10, 12, 13, 14, 17, 21, 92, 94, 98, 99, 101, 116, 119, 126, 163, 164, 174, 175, 176, 177, 191, 193, 194, 195, 198, 222, 223, 224, 248, 249, 250, 255, 259, 260, 261, 270, 288, 289, 290, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 318
- Jewish Gospels 303, 308, 309
- Jewish Wars 19, 152, 153, 154, 156, 158, 160, 162, 163, 169, 170, 171, 172, 181, 182, 183, 186, 188, 189, 190, 191, 193, 194, 195, 199, 200, 242, 243, 248, 250, 252, 253, 254, 260, 275
- Josephus 9, 39, 53, 105, 154, 158, 159, 160, 169, 170, 171, 181, 183, 185, 188, 189, 190, 193, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 251, 252, 253, 254, 259, 283, 291

- Justin Martyr 4, 175, 176, 177, 287, 288, 289
- L* (special tradition) 99
- Lord's Prayer 79, 98, 99, 100, 104, 120
- M* (special tradition, *Sondergut*) 7, 29, 30, 32, 44, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 104, 115, 122, 123, 126, 127, 130, 134, 271, 272, 320
- mishnah 2, 9, 106, 128, 153, 156, 171, 183, 190, 246, 248, 319
- Mouvance, oeuvre mouvante* VII, XVIII, 48, 49, 50, 52, 57, 58, 59, 154, 285, 286, 290, 314, 315, 316
- Origin 4
- Palestine 92, 137, 153, 154, 193, 198, 237, 238, 239, 240, 248, 249, 250, 251, 254, 260, 262, 317
- Papias 3, 4, 13, 24, 65, 108, 220, 221, 222, 223, 232, 233, 302, 303, 305, 314, 323
- Parting of the ways 12, 16, 18, 153, 154, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 298
- Paul 23, 38, 39, 75, 76, 103, 105, 153, 161, 162, 163, 164, 168, 169, 180, 181, 182, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 205, 245, 249, 261, 274, 275, 299, 318
- Paul of Samosata 257
- Peter 3, 4, 34, 36, 38, 98, 102, 105, 108, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 118, 130, 131, 132, 134, 139, 148, 149, 151, 153, 161, 164, 166, 167, 168, 175, 206, 233, 245, 248, 249, 266, 273, 276, 279, 284, 296, 304, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322
- Pharisees 13, 16, 17, 19, 26, 40, 43, 92, 95, 96, 99, 101, 115, 121, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131, 135, 137, 138, 143, 144, 146, 147, 148, 149, 159, 162, 167, 170, 178, 185, 186, 187, 189, 193, 243, 245, 246, 267, 268, 270, 272, 277, 278, 294, 320
- Philo 39, 53, 154, 160, 181, 187, 256, 283
- Q (see Sayings Tradition)
- Qumran, Dead Sea Scrolls XVII, 54, 55, 56, 57, 60, 75, 147, 153, 157, 158, 170, 182, 188, 243, 271, 291, 316, 319
- reception history (*Wirkungsgeschichte*) 53, 73, 225
- Redaction Criticism VII, XVII, XVIII, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 17, 24, 32, 33, 46, 56, 90, 91, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 101, 103, 126, 127, 164, 270, 315, 321
- Rome 2, 153, 155, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 170, 171, 174, 179, 190, 198, 199, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 246, 247, 248, 249, 252, 255, 318
- Sadducees 9, 43, 115, 153, 159, 162, 167, 178, 186, 189, 190, 193, 243, 245
- Samaritans 31, 32, 42, 123, 167, 178, 189, 243, 244, 311
- Sayings Tradition (Q) XVII, 7, 11, 14, 21, 29, 30, 32, 58, 85, 88, 90, 93, 95, 96, 97, 99, 101, 103, 104, 105, 107, 114, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 134, 207, 233, 234, 260, 265, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 290, 320
- scribes 16, 19, 38, 40, 43, 46, 49, 50, 52, 55, 58, 92, 107, 115, 116, 127, 128, 129, 146, 147, 149, 167, 184, 202, 204, 206, 207, 213, 243, 244, 271, 272, 284, 295
- Sermon on the Mount 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 24, 26, 28, 29, 36, 37, 44, 45, 86, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 104, 114, 120, 139, 141, 146, 147, 153, 186, 208, 294
- Sermon on the Plain 4, 6, 8, 24, 96, 97, 99
- Sinaiticus XVII, 62, 63, 64, 65, 78, 152, 203, 204, 205, 208, 212, 213, 214, 215, 219, 220, 221, 222, 224, 234, 285, 286, 287, 323
- Singer, I. B. (Yitskhok Zynger) 71, 72, 73
- Source Criticism 6, 86, 92, 127
- synagogue VII, 5, 10, 12, 15, 16, 18, 21, 23, 24, 92, 93, 94, 104, 116, 129, 136, 137, 138, 146, 162, 172, 173, 192, 193, 194, 196, 252, 258, 264, 265, 271, 272, 274, 277, 278, 279, 292, 300, 301, 311, 318
- Temple 2, 5, 9, 11, 32, 40, 41, 54, 55, 87, 111, 116, 122, 129, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 143, 146, 152, 153, 154, 155, 157, 158, 161, 165, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 173, 174, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 186, 187, 188, 189, 192, 193, 194, 238, 239,

- 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 246, 248, 250,  
251, 252, 253, 254, 268, 270, 272, 292,  
300, 301, 308, 317
- Tertullian 4, 287, 310
- textual criticism 52, 58, 66, 76, 78, 201,  
202, 204, 205, 207
- textus receptus* 53, 54, 55, 77, 323
- Torah 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 43, 74, 93, 94, 106,  
114, 115, 121, 122, 128, 134, 155, 156,  
171, 177, 184, 188, 193, 194, 246, 247,  
271, 277, 278, 284, 290, 311, 312, 318
- Tradition History (*Traditionsgeschichte*)  
VII, XVIII, 58, 66, 77, 78, 83, 84, 85, 86,  
92, 93, 98, 99, 100, 105, 108, 126, 152,  
164, 201, 202, 205, 224, 225, 236, 263,  
274, 289, 290, 291, 294, 298, 315, 316,  
318
- Vaticanus XVII, 62, 203, 212, 219, 220,  
221, 224, 285, 286, 287, 323
- Zealots 9, 153, 156, 170, 184, 189, 193