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INTRODUCTION

The Gospel of Matthew bears evidence of compilation from several sources. When Matthew is compared with Mark and Luke they are found to be very much alike. They have a similar structure. Many sections are identical in phraseology. There are also many differences. Matthew contains five long discourses; the others do not. The details of incidents differ in the three gospels. The grammar is more refined in one than in the others. These similarities and differences constitute the Synoptic Problem. Upon closer examination the material of the Synoptic Gospels may be divided into three classes. First, there is a body of narrative, historical material, comprising three-sevenths of the material of the three gospels, which is common to all three. This is called the Triple Tradition. In the second place, there is a body of material which is common to any two of the gospels, being found in three combinations, called the Double Traditions: the Matthew-Mark Double Tradition, the Matthew-Luke Double Tradition, and the Mark-Luke Double Tradition. The material comprising the Matthew-Mark Double Tradition is not extensive, but neither is it negligible. The Matthew-Luke Double Tradition is quite extensive and is of vital importance to this study. These two will be discussed at
some length in Chapter One. The Mark-Luke Double Tradition does not concern this study, therefore it will not be discussed. The third class of material is that which is peculiar to any one of the gospels, called the Single Traditions. There is the Single Tradition of Matthew, the Single Tradition of Mark, and the Single Tradition of Luke.

The two recognized main sources of Matthew are Mark and Q. That the editor had at his command a third main source is the theory commonly received of scholars. It is the purpose of this study to examine the material of the Single Tradition found in Matthew, especially with respect to a special source for this Single Tradition advocated by certain New Testament scholars and referred to as the Source M. This thesis is a survey of the theories concerning M. It is not intended that there shall be any new contribution to the study, but the problem may be clarified.
CHAPTER I

MATTHEW AND THE TRIPLE AND DOUBLE TRADITIONS

1. Matthew and the Triple Tradition.

That the Gospel of Mark is the oldest of the Synoptics is the view generally held today by New Testament scholars. There are several factors which indicate this. (1) Matthew reproduces ninety percent of the subject matter of Mark, either in exact words, or in language that is very similar. Luke reproduces fifty percent of the subject matter of Mark. Of the 661 verses in Mark "all but fifty . . . are reproduced in Matthew or Luke; 606 of Mark's 661 verses are in Matthew."\(^1\) In any average section of the Triple Tradition the majority of the actual words are reproduced by Matthew and Luke. (2) The order of incidents in Mark is followed by Matthew and Luke. Where either of them "deserts" Mark, the other actually supports him. "Of 1068 verses in Matthew, 816 follow the Marcan framework."\(^2\) (3) On examination it is discovered that the grammar in Mark is less refined than that in Matthew and Luke.\(^3\)

---

2 Ibid., p. 194.
3 These arguments based on Streeter, B.H., *The Four Gospels*, pp. 151, 152.
These arguments indicate that Mark is the earliest of the three. The reason for accepting the priority of Mark as set forth by Streeter is as follows:

The way in which the Marcan and non-Marcan material is distributed in Matthew and Luke respectively, looks as if each had before him the Marcan material in a single document, and was faced with the problem of combining it with material from other sources.\(^4\)

The authors of Matthew and Luke used Mark's gospel as a basis for their own compositions because they recognized Mark as "the mouthpiece of St. Peter, and because his gospel emanated (as is highly probable) from the great center of all kinds of interest -- Rome."\(^5\)

The greater part of the Triple Tradition is narrative material, hence it is apparent that the authors of both Matthew and Luke relied upon Mark for narrative material, and looked elsewhere for discourse material.

**EXAMPLES OF THE TRIPLE TRADITION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Luke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Baptism</td>
<td>1:9-11</td>
<td>3:16-17</td>
<td>3:21-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Temptation</td>
<td>1:12,13</td>
<td>4:1.2</td>
<td>4:1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Giving Tribute to Caesar</td>
<td>12:15-17</td>
<td>22:15-22</td>
<td>20:20-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The Names of the Twelve</td>
<td>3:16-19</td>
<td>10:2-4</td>
<td>5:14-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^6\) Based on a critical study of Huck's *Synopsis of the Gospels*.


The material comprising the Matthew-Luke Double Tradition consists of non-Marcan material found in both Matthew and Luke. One could conclude that the editor of Matthew used Luke's Gospel or vice versa. If this were true, Luke would clearly be the second main source of Matthew. That neither editor used the other gospel is set forth in two reasons by Sir John Hawkins:

(1) Matthew and Luke do not agree in inserting the same saying at the same point in the Marcan outline.

(2) Sometimes it is Matthew, sometimes it is Luke who gives a saying in what is clearly the more original form. This is explicable if both are drawing from the same source, each making slight modifications of his own; it is not so if either is dependent upon the other.7

The Matthew-Luke Double Tradition consists, for the most part, of discourse material. Matthew had a second main source, "The book is compiled from at least two sources and their different nuances are more than once unmistakable."8 From the above arguments it is evident that the second main source for Matthew was shared with Luke. This second source is conceded by most scholars to be Q. Q stands for the German word.

7 Quoted by Streeter, op. cit., p. 185.
8 Moffatt, James, Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, p. 344.
"Quelle", which means "source", and was chosen because the research done in this field was at first largely the effort of German scholars. In many of the older discussions this source is referred to as "The Logia".

**LIST OF MATERIAL COMPRISING THE MATThEW-**
**LUKE DOUBLE TRADITION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Luke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Baptist's Call to Repentance</td>
<td>3:7-10</td>
<td>3:7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Baptist's Messianic Prophecy</td>
<td>3:11a,12</td>
<td>3:16a,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Temptation of Jesus</td>
<td>4:1-11</td>
<td>4:1-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerning Loving One's Enemies</td>
<td>5:39a,40,42,</td>
<td>6:27-30,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44,46-48</td>
<td>32-35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Sermon on the Mount.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Luke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>5:2</td>
<td>6:20a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Beatitudes</td>
<td>5:3,4,6,11,</td>
<td>6:20b,21-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Introductory Comparisons</td>
<td>5:13b &amp; c,</td>
<td>11:33,34,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus' Attitude toward the Law</td>
<td>5:13</td>
<td>16:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplement: On Reconciliation</td>
<td>5:25,26</td>
<td>18:58,59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third example: Concerning Divorce</td>
<td>5:33b ff.</td>
<td>16:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth example: Concerning Vengeance</td>
<td>5:39c &amp; d,</td>
<td>8:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40,42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth example: Concerning Loving One's Enemies</td>
<td>5:44,46-48</td>
<td>6:27a &amp; b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23,32,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33,50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lord's Prayer</td>
<td>6:9,10a,11-</td>
<td>11:2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasures on earth and in Heaven</td>
<td>6:19-21</td>
<td>12:35,36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Inner Light</td>
<td>6:22,23</td>
<td>11:54-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerning Divided Service</td>
<td>6:24</td>
<td>16:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Sordid Anxiety</td>
<td>6:25-23</td>
<td>12:22-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Unwarranted Judgment</td>
<td>7:1,2b,3-5,</td>
<td>6:37a,38,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41,42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

9 Based on a critical study of Ruck's Synopsis of the First Three Gospels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Luke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement and Entreaty in Prayer</td>
<td>7:7-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Golden Rule</td>
<td>7:12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Straight Gate</td>
<td>7:13a,14</td>
<td>15:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Test of Piety</td>
<td>7:16,20,34</td>
<td>6:43-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning against Self-deception</td>
<td>7:22,23</td>
<td>6:26,27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Comparison</td>
<td>7:24-27</td>
<td>6:47-49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End of the Sermon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Centurion</td>
<td>8:5-13</td>
<td>7:1b-10;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John the Baptist's Inquiry</td>
<td>11:2-6</td>
<td>13:23-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Accusation of the Pharisees</td>
<td>9:32,33a</td>
<td>11:14-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b,24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus' Defense</td>
<td>12:27,28</td>
<td>11:19,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Seeking a Sign</td>
<td>12:39-42</td>
<td>11:23-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Against Relapse</td>
<td>12:43-45</td>
<td>11:24-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Blessed are Your Eyes&quot;</td>
<td>13:16,17</td>
<td>10:23b,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission of the Twelve</td>
<td>9:15,16a</td>
<td>10:3,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woes upon the Galilean Cities</td>
<td>11:21-24</td>
<td>10:13-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction of the Disciples' Fate</td>
<td>10:19</td>
<td>12:21,11,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summons to Fearless Confession</td>
<td>10:26b-33</td>
<td>12:2-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discord Among Neighbors</td>
<td>10:34-36</td>
<td>12:51-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions of Discipleship</td>
<td>10:37-38</td>
<td>14:26-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acclamation</td>
<td>11:25-27</td>
<td>10:21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Epileptic Boy</td>
<td>17:20</td>
<td>17:5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God's Solicitude for a Single Soul</td>
<td>16:12-14</td>
<td>15:4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternal Obligation</td>
<td>17:15</td>
<td>17:3b &amp; c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerning the Forgiving Spirit</td>
<td>16:19-22</td>
<td>17:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Followers</td>
<td>19:28</td>
<td>9:57-60a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sons of Zebedee</td>
<td></td>
<td>22:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fruits of John's Ministry</td>
<td>21:31b,32</td>
<td>7:29,30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parable of the Messianic Feast</td>
<td>22:1-10</td>
<td>14:15-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of the Speech Against Pharisism</td>
<td>23:4,7</td>
<td>11:46,45a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Seven Woes</td>
<td>23:18,23,25-36</td>
<td>11:39b-44,47,48,52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Epilogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;O Jerusalem, Jerusalem!&quot;</td>
<td>23:54-56</td>
<td>11:49-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Day of the Son of Man</td>
<td>23:37-39</td>
<td>13:34-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As in the Days of Noah</td>
<td>24:26,27</td>
<td>17:23,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24:28,37-39</td>
<td>17:26,27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39,41</td>
<td>34,37b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parable of the Watchful Servants</td>
<td>24:43-44</td>
<td>12:39,40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|
The Faithful Servant and His Counterpart  
Parable of the Ten Virgins  
Parable of the Talents  
Jesus and Barabbas  

Matthew  
24:45-51  
25:11,12  
25:14-30  
27:22b & c, 23a  

Luke  
12:42-43  
13:25  
19:12-27  
23:30b, 21  

b. The Nature and Extent of Q.

There are diverse opinions as to the nature and extent of Q. Moffatt lists sixteen reconstructions in "The Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament" and there are numerous others. Bacon believes that "Q is material common to Matthew and Luke and no more." Other scholars believe that Q consisted of more material than the Matthew-Luke Double Tradition, as an examination of the various reconstructions will reveal. A third view as to the limits of Q is stated by Filson:

If in different communities of the early church material known to the churches concerned but not previously included in Q was added to the document to make it a more complete record of Jesus' teaching, Matthew might come from a copy of Q which had been enlarged to contain passages, such as parts of Mt. 5:21-49, which were not in the form of Q used by Luke. ... We may add the observation that in using Mark, the authors of Matthew and Luke each omitted certain parts, and similarly in using Q, the author of Matthew might have used a saying or parable omitted by Luke, while Luke might have used a saying or parable omitted by the author of Matthew.

10 Moffatt, op. cit., pp. 197-203.  
11 Quoted by Jones, op. cit., p. 207.  
The opinion most widely held is that Q contained more material than that comprising the Matthew-Luke Double Tradition. That there is Q material in the Single Tradition of Matthew is probable. This will be discussed in a special section in Chapter Two.

The editor of Matthew used as his main sources, Mark and Q. He relied upon Mark for narrative material and upon Q for discourse material.

c. The Matthew-Mark Double Tradition.

The material comprising the Matthew-Mark Double Tradition is not extensive but deserves to be mentioned. This is narrative Marcan material which, doubtless, Matthew considered important and Luke did not. This is further evidence that Matthew relied upon Mark as the source for his narrative material.

LIST OF MATERIAL COMPRISING THE MATTHEW-MARK DOUBLE TRADITION.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John the Baptist</td>
<td>3:4-6</td>
<td>1:4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptism of Jesus</td>
<td>3:13</td>
<td>1:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call of the First Disciples</td>
<td>4:18-22</td>
<td>1:16-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus' Return from Galilee</td>
<td>4:17</td>
<td>1:14a,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healing and being Thronged</td>
<td>18:15c,16</td>
<td>3:10a,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to the Parables' Address (The setting)</td>
<td>13:1a</td>
<td>4:1a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on a critical study of Huck's Synopsis of the First Three Gospels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event/Event Group</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parable of the Sower: Applied to the Field with the Taxes</td>
<td>13:24-36</td>
<td>4:26-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of Instruction by Parables</td>
<td>13:34,35</td>
<td>4:23,34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection at Nazareth</td>
<td>13:55-57a,59</td>
<td>6:3,5a,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode of the Baptist's Death</td>
<td>14:4-12</td>
<td>6:18-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking on the Water</td>
<td>14:28-27,31,33</td>
<td>6:45-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to the Province of Gennesaret</td>
<td>14:34-36</td>
<td>6:55-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerning the Washing of Hands</td>
<td>15:1-11,15-20</td>
<td>7:1-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Canaanitish Woman</td>
<td>15:21,22,25-28</td>
<td>7:24-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tour of the North</td>
<td>15:29-31a</td>
<td>7:31-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding the Four Thousand</td>
<td>15:32-39</td>
<td>8:1b-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs from Heaven and Signs of the Times</td>
<td>15:1, 3a, 3a,4</td>
<td>8:11-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Leaven of the Pharisees</td>
<td>16:7-11</td>
<td>8:16-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of the Messianic Mysteries</td>
<td>16:22,23</td>
<td>8:33,33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utterances following the Transfiguration</td>
<td>17:9-12a</td>
<td>9:9-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerning Offenses</td>
<td>18:8,9</td>
<td>9:43,45-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Journey toward Judea</td>
<td>19:1,2</td>
<td>10:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pharisees Question about Divorce</td>
<td>19:3-6,9</td>
<td>10:2,3a,6-9,11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cursing the Fig Tree</td>
<td>21:18,19</td>
<td>11:18-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utterance concerning the Withered Fig Tree</td>
<td>21:20-22</td>
<td>11:21-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Apocalyptic Half</td>
<td>24:39a,39b</td>
<td>15:24-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Anointment at Bethany</td>
<td>25:6-13</td>
<td>14:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Betrayal Foretold</td>
<td>25:22,23</td>
<td>14:19,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter's Denial Foretold</td>
<td>25:50-52,52a</td>
<td>14:26-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gethsemane</td>
<td>25:41b-45</td>
<td>14:33b-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before the Sanhedrin</td>
<td>26:50-55</td>
<td>14:55-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ before Pilate</td>
<td>27:18-12,14</td>
<td>15:8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus and Barabbas</td>
<td>27:18-19</td>
<td>15:9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocking &quot;The King of the Jews&quot;</td>
<td>27:27-31</td>
<td>16:16-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Execution</td>
<td>27:37-40</td>
<td>15:25-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Death of Jesus</td>
<td>27:49,56</td>
<td>15:34-36,40b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Empty Tomb</td>
<td>28:8</td>
<td>16:9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER II

MATTHEW'S ISOLATED MATERIAL
(The Single Tradition of Matthew)

The editor of Matthew has incorporated 11/12ths of the Marcan material in his gospel which is more than one half (6/11ths) of the material in Matthew. The Matthew-Luke Double Tradition (Q) consists of approximately 200 verses or 2/11ths of the material in Matthew. These two sources account for approximately 800 verses or 8/11ths of the material. The remaining 280 verses comprise the Single Tradition of Matthew.

In addition to Mark and Q, the editor has used other sources, written and oral. From these were derived the narrative and discourse material of the Single Tradition of Matthew. The narrative sections contain the birth and infancy stories (Chap. 1 and 2), including a genealogical table, and descriptions of incidents which occurred in and around Jerusalem, from the time of Jesus' entry at the close of his ministry to the Resurrection.

There are several theories concerning the sources of the Single Tradition of Matthew. These are called the One, Two, Three, and Four Source theories of the Single Tradition of Matthew. We shall consider briefly each of these theories in an attempt to identify the sources.
1. Theories Concerning the Single Tradition.

The simplest theory is the One Source Theory which is adhered to by Streeter, Julicher and cone. According to Streeter all of the single material was derived either from a single written document, or from oral tradition. The entire material is designated M. The editor of Matthew therefore had three main sources from which he compiled his gospel. In his work, *The Four Gospels*, Streeter says,

Matthew, therefore, has three main sources, Mark, Q, and M. What is peculiar to Matthew, and what, while parallel with Lukan passages which come from Q, is so different from Q that it cannot be rightly regarded as coming from Q, was drawn from M.1

The theory of Julicher is similar to that of Streeter except that he definitely assigns most of the material of the Single Tradition to oral tradition and believes that it was a legendary product of later times.

Cone subscribes to the view that the isolated material all came from oral tradition. This, he says, is as true of Chapters 1, 2, and 28, as it is of material found in the main body of the Gospel.

The second theory in simplicity is the Two Source Theory which is held by Box, Scott, and Plummer. Canon Box believes that the Single Tradition is composed of (1) Palestinian

---

1 Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, introduction, p. 64.
traditions which Matthew has drawn upon, and which may or may not be in written form, and (2) "a Greek translation (probably) of an Aramaic version of certain proof passages and texts, collected from the Old Testament, but exhibiting a text which is independent of the Hebrew."\(^2\)

According to E. F. Scott the material came (1) from Q, and (2) from oral traditions of a legendary character (including chap. 1 and 2). "This material is so diverse that it cannot have been taken from any single document."\(^3\)

Flummer's theory is very similar to that of Box. (1) The Old Testament passages were from a collection of Messianic proof texts (Testimonia) and not from the writer's knowledge of the Old Testament. (2) Traditions current among the first Christians. "It is also possible that some of the many attempts at Gospels, mentioned by St. Luke in his preface may have been known to our Evangelist and used by him."\(^4\)

Turning from the simple to the complicated theories concerning the Single Tradition we deal first with the Three Source Theory. The adherents of this theory are Allen, Major, Burton, and Willoughby.

1. Allen. Sources:

(1) Independent traditions, but not documents.

\(^2\) Box, G. H., St. Matthew, Introduction, pp. 3 and 4.
\(^3\) Scott, E. F., The Literature of the New Testament, p. 68.
(2) Old Testament passages from a collection which were considered prophecies of events in the life of Jesus (Testimonia).

(3) Sections from Q.

2. Major Sources:
   (1) Proof texts (Testimonia).
   (2) A genealogy.
   (3) A body of apologetic material, possibly partly written and partly oral.

3. Burton and Willoughby. Sources:
   (1) Mark.
   (2) Q.
   (3) A special source (Perhaps the Logia).

It is not clear why some of this material should be considered as derived from Mark, as that should be included in the Matthew-Mark Double Tradition. He also allows for the possibility that the special source is the same as Q.

The Four Source Theory is subscribed to by Bacon, M'Neile, and Redlich.

1. Bacon. Sources:
   (1) Material from Q, but not as yet identified.
   (2) Material derived from other written sources such as L.
   (3) Material derived from oral tradition.
(4) Material supplied by the evangelist himself.  

2. M'Neile. Sources:

(1) Narratives of the Nativity and Infancy. These may have been current orally, but the evangelist probably knew them in written form, perhaps a Greek translation.  

(2) Reference to Old Testament (Quotations). It is possible that the source of these quotations was a translation of an Aramaic collection of testimonies.  

(3) Eight parables are assigned to M.  

(4) Two parables and other material assigned to Q.  

3. Redlich. Sources:

(1) Q.  

(2) M.  

(3) Special source for chapters 1 and 2.  

(4) Jerusalem legends and stories.  

The theories of two scholars are not such as can be classified with the above theories. Moffatt comments only on Chapters 1 and 2, and believes that they are oral traditions of Palestinian origin and are a free composition by the hand of the author. Goodspeed believes that the sayings of Jesus took form so as to be used in Christian preaching. They were not

---

5 Bacon, R. W., Studies in Matthew, p. 38.  
well organized and "were reduced to writing in Greek Christian circles, probably about Antioch."\(^7\)

The most elaborate theories are those of the last group, i.e., Bacon, M'Neile, and Redlich, unless Plummer's speculation as to the use of several of the gospels mentioned by Luke in the preface to his gospel is thought to mean more than four sources.

2. List of Material of the Single Tradition of Matthew.\(^8\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapters 1 and 2</th>
<th>An insertion in Mark's narrative. Editorial.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:14-15</td>
<td>Quotation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:23-25</td>
<td>Sermon on the Mount. v.1,2 editorial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:1,2,4</td>
<td>Sermon on the Mount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>Sermon on the Mount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:7</td>
<td>Sermon on the Mount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:8</td>
<td>Sermon on the Mount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:9</td>
<td>Sermon on the Mount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:10</td>
<td>Sermon on the Mount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:14</td>
<td>Sermon on the Mount. v.14a editorial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:16</td>
<td>Sermon on the Mount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:17</td>
<td>Sermon on the Mount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:19,20</td>
<td>Sermon on the Mount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:21-24</td>
<td>Sermon on the Mount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:25-28</td>
<td>Sermon on the Mount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:28</td>
<td>Sermon on the Mount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:32</td>
<td>Sermon on the Mount. v.33 editorial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:33-37</td>
<td>Sermon on the Mount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:36,39a</td>
<td>Sermon on the Mount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:41</td>
<td>Sermon on the Mount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:43</td>
<td>Sermon on the Mount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:1-7,8</td>
<td>Sermon on the Mount.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^8\) Compiled from a critical study of Huck's Synopsis of the First Three Gospels, in comparison with Allen's list which was based on Sir John Hawkins' *Horae Synopticae*. 
Let the document content be converted to plain text.
16:3b3 An insertion in Mark's narrative. Editorial (if genuine).
16:11b,12 Editorial.
16:17-19 St. Peter and the keys. Insertion in Mark's narrative.
16:22b Editorial.
17:6-7 Editorial.
17:13 Editorial.
17:24-27 The stater in the fish's mouth.
18:3,4 As a little child.
18:10 An insertion in Mark.
18:14 One of these little ones.
18:16-20 The Church.
18:22-35 The two debtors.
19:1a Editorial.
19:9
19:10-13 Nunncn. vv.10-11 editorial.
20:1-15 Laborers in the vineyard.
21:4-5 Quotation.
21:10,11 Insertion. Editorial.
21:15b,16 Insertion. Editorial.
21:19-end Editorial.
21:45 Editorial.
22:1-14 The marriage feast.
22:33-34 Editorial.
22:40
23:1-3 Demunciation of the Pharisees. v.1 editorial.
23:5 Demunciation of the Pharisees.
23:7b-10 Demunciation of the Pharisees.
23:15-22 Demunciation of the Pharisees.
23:24 Demunciation of the Pharisees.
23:29 Demunciation of the Pharisees.
23:32-33 Demunciation of the Pharisees.
24:10-12 False prophets.
24:30
24:30a Sign of the Son of Man. Editorial.
25:31-46 The sheep and the goats.
26:1 Editorial.
26:3,15,25 Editorial.
26:44 Editorial.
26:50
Several scholars⁹ believe that there existed a written collection of Messianic proof texts. These were Old Testament passages which were believed to be prophecies concerning the Messiah. It is not known how many passages were in the collection, but eleven are found in Matthew. They are all introduced by a stereotyped formula, "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet ..." It is, however, entirely possible that these texts were added from memory by the editor, who may have been well read in Old Testament Scripture. However, the majority of scholars suggest, or at least allow for the possibility, of their existence as a special document.

We wish to quote from four scholars in order to establish the claim of the existence of the proof texts:

⁹ Box, Plummer, Allen, Major, M'Neile, Micklem.
(1) Box:

Another source for Matthew seems to have been a collection of proof texts, drawn from the Old Testament and made for apologetic purposes and for the use of Jewish Christians. It was a kind of Messianic florilegium. . . . Probably such a florilegium was used by Matthew, which appears to have been written, in its original form in Aramaic, for the use of Jewish-Christians in Palestine.10

(2) Micklem:

It is highly probably that the author had by him a written collection of Old Testament excerpts, drawn up in accordance with the Rabbinic usage of the time for the apologetic purposes of the Judaeo-Christian community, and in his great plea for the Messiahship of Jesus wove them into the texture of his work.11

(3) Major:

There is a collection of proof texts from the Old Testament which are cited as being fulfilled in the life and ministry of Jesus.12

Major does not make it explicit that they were documentary but implies such.

(4) Allen:

It seems . . . that the quotations . . . were already current when the editor compiled his work in Greek form. They may come from a collection of Old Testament passages regarded as prophecies of events in the life of the Messiah.13

We conclude that the Old Testament proof texts in the

10 Box, St. Matthew, p. 24.
Single Tradition came from a document of Messianic proof texts.

The Old Testament proof texts are:

Chapter 1:22f.
Chapter 2:5f., 15,17,23.
Chapter 4:13-16.
Chapter 6:17.
Chapter 12:17-21.
Chapter 13:35.
Chapter 21:4f.
Chapter 27:9.

4. The Editorial Material.

It is evident that there exists in the Single Tradition a body of material which is the work of the editor. This material would be necessary if he were making a compilation from various sources, in order to give continuity to the thought and smoothness to the construction. Because of the places into which certain phrases and clauses have been inserted, usually in a story from the Marcan source, in the Matthew-Luke Double Tradition, or as an introduction or conclusion of an incident or teaching, it is hardly probable that they were taken from a source, hence we believe that they are indicative of the work of the editor. Certain sections which have been assigned by scholars to the editor we question. However, it is not possible to separate the strands from all the sources, consequently there is a considerable amount of material which remains undetermined as to origin.
LIST OF THE EDITORIAL MATERIAL

Chap. 3:14,15; 4:24,25; 5:1,2,13a,14a,33; 7:26a,29;
8:1,52; 9:13a,26,27-32,34,35b,36; 10:2a; 11:1,14,20; 12:22,23;
13:14,15,35a,36; 15:23-25,30-31; 16:3b,3,11b,12,33b; 17:5-7,13;
19:1a,10,11; 20:16; 21:14,15b,16,19,43,44; 22:33,34; 23:1;
24:30a; 26:1,44,52-54; 27:36,43; 28:1 end, 2-4.

The editorial material may be divided into four classes.

Examples are:

(1) Connecting links.

Chapter 8:1,5a.
Chapter 10:2a.
Chapter 11:20.

(2) Introductions (May be a connecting link in the
larger meaning).

To the Sermon on the Mount: Chapter 5:1,2.

(3) Insertion in the Marcion outline.

Chapter 3:14,15.

(4) Revisions of Mark.

Chapter 17:6-7.
Chapter 21:14.
Chapter 24:1 end to 4.

The following material has been classified as editorial
by Allen, but we question the validity of such assignment.

(1) Discourse Material.

---

(a) Chapter 3:14,15.

But John would have hindered him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? But Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness. Then he suffered him.

Allen assigns this to the editor as an insertion in the Marcion outline, but from the setting it appears to be from a source.

(b) Chapter 5:33.

Again, ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, "Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shall perform unto the Lord thine oaths."

This is in the Sermon on the Mount, and as the Sermon is a compilation, it does not seem that such a saying of Jesus should be the creation of the editor. It appears to be from a source.

(c) Chapter 21:43.

Therefore say I unto you, the Kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.

The verse appears to be misplaced as it breaks the continuity of thought in verses 42 and 44. It does not bear the marks of editorial creation.

(d) Chapter 26:52-54.

Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword. Thinkest thou that I cannot
now pray to my Father, and He shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?

The same reasons as given before may be stated for this verse.

(2) Quotation from the Old Testament (Isaiah).

(a) Chapter 13:14,15.

And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, which saith, "By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive: For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them."

The editor has inserted this at this point because of the similarity of Jesus' statement and that of Isaiah. It may possibly have come from the "Testimonies", although it is not introduced by the regular formula.

(3) Narrative Material.

(a) Chapter 9:27-34 - The Healing of Two Blind Men and of a Dumb Man.

This is assigned by both Allen and Redlich to the editor, the latter on the grounds that they "are meant to take the place of similar cures in Mark. These Marcan miracles were passed over by Matthew because they were not instantaneous
The Marcan parallels referred to by Redlich are:
(b) Chapter 13:22,23 - The Healing of One Possessed of a Demon, Blind and Dumb.
This narrative is of the same type as the preceding one although there is no Marcan parallel.
(c) Chapter 21:14
And the blind and the lame came to him in the Temple and he healed them.
This statement infers the kind of healings as described in the two narrative sections discussed above. From its nature, it appears to be derived from a source, i.e., the same source from which the above sections were taken.
When the editorial passages and the "Testimonia" are extracted from the Single Tradition, the remainder is found to consist of both discourse and narrative material.

5. Q in the Single Tradition.

We have stated that the majority of scholars believe that Q consisted of more material than the Matthew-Luke Double Tradition. If this is true, then there may be Q material

15 Redlich, E. B., The Student's Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels, p. 89.
16 See page 14 of this thesis.
present in the Single Tradition of Matthew. There are as many opinions as to the extent of Q in the Single Tradition as there are reconstructions of Q. Some scholars assign all of the teaching material of the Single Tradition to Q, some assign a portion of it, and others assign none of it. The factor determining the amount of Q material present is the reconstruction of Q which is accepted. If Q is material found in portions of the Triple Tradition and all of the Matthew-Luke Double Tradition and no more, or if it is the material of the Matthew-Luke Double Tradition only, then the problem is settled. If all of the teaching material of Matthew's Single Tradition is assigned to Q, there is also no problem. If, however, as the majority of scholars believe, Q contained more material than that found in portions of the Triple Tradition and the Matthew-Luke Double Tradition, and yet did not consist of all the discourse material of the Single Tradition as the various reconstructions reveal, a problem arises. Which reconstruction of Q shall we use and how much material of the Single Tradition shall we assign to Q?

There are four scholars who assign the entire discourse material in the Single Tradition of Matthew to Q.

The statement of Burton and Willoughby:

If they (Matthew and Luke) had only a common source, that source was in all probability the Logia of Matthew spoken of by Papias. If in addition to this the first evangelist had a peculiar source,
this latter was probably the Logia spoken of by Papias. The hypothesis of a source or sources used in common by both, plus a source peculiar to Matthew, seems better to account for the facts than that of a common source only. 17

Their statement is confusing. Q is named as the common source for Matthew and Luke and also as the special source for Matthew. We may infer from this that all of the discourse material of Matthew's Single Tradition came from Q, and was material to which Luke did not attach enough significance to use, did not accept its validity, or did not deem it necessary for his purpose.

The statement of Allen is given on pages 57-59 of the introduction to his Commentary on Matthew, where he lists the material which he assigns to Q. Upon examination this list is found to contain all of the discourse material of the Single Tradition. Canon Box also assigns all of the teaching material in the Single Tradition to Q. 18

Another group of scholars assign only a portion of the discourse material in the Single Tradition to Q. M'Neile definitely assigns two parables: "The Mustard Seed" and "The Leaven". 19

The following is material which Bacon believes was de-

rived from Q.

Chapter 6:1-8,16-18,34.
Chapter 7:6
Chapter 10:5f., 23.
Chapter 11:28-50
Chapter 12:5f., 36f.
Chapter 15:12f.
Chapter 18:10,17,23-35.
Chapter 19:10-12.
Chapter 21:23-32.
Chapter 23:2,3,5,14-22,32f.

In writing about the Single Tradition Scott says, "Some of it almost certainly consists of portions of Q which do not appear in Luke."21 Gaster believes that this is not more than 50 verses.22 Patton's theory leaves only 48 verses of discourse material not accounted for by Q.

That it is impossible to designate as final the Q material in the Single Tradition of Matthew is conclusive. The document Q, if such a document did exist, has been lost. The entire matter is a point of conjecture. "It is hardly possible on grounds of the Palestinian character of Q to decide clearly what part of the non-Markan sections of Matthew belong to Q and what came from other sources."23

For our purpose we do not deem it necessary to choose a reconstruction of Q. It will suffice to allow for the

20 Bacon, B. W., Matthew, p. 123.
22 Gaster, J. D., Matthew's Sayings of Jesus, p. 188.
presence of an undesignated amount of Q material in the Single Tradition.
CHAPTER III

THE SPECIAL SOURCE M

In the preceding chapter we have recognized the presence of proof-texts, editorial and Q material in the Single Tradition of Matthew, and have assigned definite material to the first two. The remainder consists of narrative and discourse material. At this point we wish to call attention to the suggestions, in the theories concerning the sources of the Single Tradition of Matthew, of a special source M defined as a written document by Streeter, M'Neile and Redlich. Bacon also allows for M in his statement "other written sources such as L."\(^1\) T. W. Manson also projects the theory of M. There is the possibility of the existence of one or several documents that may be called M. Our task is to examine the narrative and discourse material of the Single Tradition of Matthew in order to define M.

1. The Plan and Structure of Matthew.

A brief survey of the plan and structure of Matthew will clarify somewhat the location of the narrative and discourse material of the Single Tradition and may have some bearing

---

\(^1\) Bacon, op. cit., p. 38.
upon the relation of each type to the other.

Matthew used Mark's gospel as a framework into which he has fitted non-Marcan material.

Whenever he finds in a non-Marcan source teaching which would elaborate or illustrate a saying or incident in Mark, he inserts that particular piece of non-Marcan matter into that particular context in the Marcian story.

The construction of the first thirteen chapters seems to be a peculiarity of Matthew. From Chapter 3:1 to 4:23 Matthew follows the exact order of Mark 1:1-20. From there it diverges until Chapter 13 when he gives an account of an incident which occurred in the synagogue (Chap. 12:9). In the latter part of the gospel Matthew has only occasionally inserted material of his own. "The teaching proper is all contained in chapters 5 to 25 and is mostly arranged topically." The longer discourses all show evidence of being built up from sayings and inserted in large blocks. They number five, four of which have been formed by adding non-Marcan material into a short discourse in Mark. The Sermon on the Mount was handled similarly.

The Plan of Matthew

1. Chapters 1 and 2 The Birth and Infancy.
2. Chapters 3-4:11 Preparation for the Ministry.
   A. Chapter 3:1-12 John the Herald.

2 Streeter, The Four Gospels, p. 106.
3 Major, Manson, and Wright, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 314.
4 Based on Streeter, The Four Gospels, pp. 166-167.
The five discourses and their points of insertion in the Marcan framework are:

3. Chapter 13  Mark 4, containing 3 parables is the basis of Matthew 13, containing 7 parables. Parables.
4. Chapter 16  Mark 9:33-37, 42-48 increased to 35vv. in Matthew 16. Offenses and Forgiveness, or the "Nature of the Christian Fellowship."
5. Chapter 25  Mark 13 (The Little Apocalypse) is expanded in Matthew 25 by adding 3 parables and apocalyptic sayings. Last Things (Eschatology).

A comparison of Mark and Matthew thus proves that the latter is upon the whole secondary, and that he had no independent chronological tradition or information to guide him in placing either sayings or incidents.5

List of Narrative Material6

Excluding the Testimonia and Editorial Material.

1. Chapters 1 and 2  Birth and Infancy Stories.
   A. 1:1-17  Genealogy.

5 Moffatt, op. cit., p. 247.
6 Based on Allen, Redlich, and personal comparison of these with Huck's Synopsis of the First Three Gospels.
C. 2:1-12  The Visit of the Magi.
D. 2:13-18  The Flight into Egypt, and the
            Massacre of the Innocents.
E. 2:19-23  The Return to Palestine.

2. Healings and Cures.
   A. 9:26-34  Healing of Two Blind Men and of
               a Dumb Man.
   B. 12:22,35  Healing of One Possessed of a
               Demon, Dumb and Blind.

   A. 14:28-31,35  Peter walking on the Sea.
   B. 17:24-27  The Coin in the Fish's Mouth.

4. A Question and Answer
   A. 21:10b,11  Allen lists this as an insertion
                 in the Marcan Outline.

5. The Passion and Resurrection.
   A. Details:
      (1) 26:3  The Plot to kill Jesus planned at the
             Court of Caiaphas.
      (2) 26:15  The price of the Betrayal, 30 pieces
                 of Silver.
      (3) 26:25  Judas asks, "Is it I?"
      (4) 26:50  Jesus says to Judas after the Kiss of
                 Betrayal, "Friend, do that for which
                 thou art come."
   B. Short Narratives Complete in Themselves.
      (1) 26:52  Peter Commanded to Sheath his Sword.
      (2) 26:53-54  Jesus' Question and the Implied Answer
                      concerning Legions of Angels.
      (3) 27:3-10  The Death of Judas (v.9 from the
                    Testimonial).
      (4) 27:19  The Dream of Pilate's Wife.
      (5) 27:24,25  Pilate Washes his Hands.
      (6) 27:51b-55  The Resurrection of the Saints.
      (7) 27:62-66  The Earthquake and the Descent of an
                     Angel.
      (8) 28:9-10  The Appearance to the Two Marys.
      (9) 28:11-15  The Guard Bribed to Spread a Rumor.
      (10) 28:16-20  The Appearance to the Eleven in Galilee.

2. The Narrative Material.

The narrative material is classified into five groups.⁷

⁷ See list on page preceding, and above.
From the nature of these various groups it is apparent that they are from various sources. We shall deal separately with each of the groups.

a. Birth and Infancy Stories.

There are diverse opinions as to the origin of these stories. It is probable that Matthew desired to write a complete biography of Jesus, so he incorporated the birth and infancy stories in his compilation. A second reason for their inclusion in the gospel is that Matthew wished to demonstrate that Jesus was the Messiah, and the fulfilment of Jewish prophecy. A third reason for their existence as part of the gospel was to refute the Jewish slanders concerning the birth of Jesus. These stories were included in the Gospel, no doubt, when the editor first compiled it.

Few scholars of the present day would contend that the first gospel ever circulated without these chapters (1 and 2). In style, vocabulary, and in mode of treatment, they are of a piece with the rest of the book.

The most widely accepted theory of the birth and infancy stories is that they were oral traditions and were first put into writing by the editor of Matthew. Testimony of various scholars follows:

---

9 Moffatt, op. cit., p. 92.
1. Moffatt:

Chapters 1 and 2 represent the author's version of a Palestinian tradition . . . none of its three sections (1:1-17, the genealogy; 1:18-25, the birth; 2:1-23, the childhood), not even the first need be anything else than a free composition. 10

2. Julicher:

The birth stories (1 and 2) bear a particular stamp and must have had their special origin. . . . This is manifestly the legendary product of later times. 11

3. Cone:

It is not necessary to suppose that written sources were employed in the writing of Chapters 1 and 2. . . . The genealogy bears so plainly the stamp of the writer's doctrinal point of view that there can be little doubt of its origin with him in its essential features. 12

4. Box:

Of the other possible sources used by Matthew we may put in the first place certain Palestinian traditions which were probably known to him in oral form. The most conspicuous example is the Nativity narrative (Chapters 1 and 2). Here the genealogy (1:1-17) seems to be a composition made by the editor himself. 13

5. Micklem:

In connection with the list of Palestinian traditions Micklem says,

This material will include the incidents connected with the birth and infancy of our Lord (Ch. 1:18-2). 14

10 Moffatt, op. cit., p. 249.
12 Cone, Gospel Criticism, p. 186.
13 Box, op. cit., p. 24.
6. Allen:

The narratives . . . all . . . look like Palestinian traditions. . . . Evidence is insufficient to prove the existence of a special written source for this part of the Gospel. 15

7. Scott and Bacon also subscribe to the view that Chapters 1 and 2 came from oral traditions.

We have discovered only one scholar who believes that the birth and infancy stories were documentary, and he allows for the possibility of oral tradition. The statement of M'Neile:

These may have been current orally but the evangelist probably knew them in written form. . . . If the genealogy is not his own composition it may have come from a written source. 16

The genealogy seems too long to be an oral tradition, and scholars, for the most part, believe that it was the compilation of the editor as we have seen in the statement above. It therefore probably did not exist in any written form. It has marked characteristics of editorial compilation.

The grouping of the genealogy in sets of 14's, i.e., in multiples of seven, points to the information having been arranged by the editor himself for it is the editor who has grouped sayings in threes, fives, and sevens. 17

We must take into consideration that the editor was writing about 85 A. D., when Jesus had become so great in the faith of his followers that such stories could credibly be

15 Allen, op. cit., Introduction, p. 61.
17 Redlich, Introduction to the Synoptic Problem, pp. 89-90.
told about him.

We are convinced by the work of many scholars in this field that the birth and infancy stories came to the editor of Matthew through oral tradition. The genealogy may be assigned to the editor, but was doubtless also based on oral tradition.

b. Narratives in the Passion and Resurrection Story.

The narrative passages of the Single Tradition in the Passion and Resurrection story are believed by the majority of scholars to be Palestinian traditions of an oral form. Each story seems to have been created for a definite purpose.

Julicher expressed this when he said,

Much of this is manifestly the legendary product of later times, like the story of Judas and the guarding of the sepulcher. As a rule, the object of each story is unmistakable: that of guarding the sepulcher (Matthew 27) arose out of the desire to refute and retaliate upon the slander spread by the Jews that the disciples of Jesus had stolen his body in order to proclaim him risen from the tomb.18

It is difficult to attempt to formulate any of these narratives into a documentary source. Matthew based most of the story of the Resurrection on Mark and the interepersed narratives appear to be oral traditions which the editor has incorporated. This may be considered almost unmistakable in 28:9-10 (the

18 Julicher, op. cit., p. 361.
appearance to the two Marys), and in 28:16-20 (the appearance to the eleven in Galilee). We may remember, too, that the last twelve verses of our present Mark are a later addition, the original ending having been lost. What the original ending contained is a matter of conjecture.

As a point indicating oral tradition as the source for these narratives we call attention to the phrase "in a dream" in the story of Pilate’s wife’s dream. This same phrase is found in the birth and infancy narratives. This indicates the same source, i.e., oral tradition, at least for that particular narrative, unless each statement of the phrase is the work of the editor.

That the stories came from oral tradition is the opinion of Box, Robertson, Micklem, Scott, Jülicher, Van Soden and Cohn.

The following sections are specifically assigned to oral tradition by scholars as indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Robertson</th>
<th>Box</th>
<th>Micklem</th>
<th>Scott</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:3-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:24-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:31b-53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:62-66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:9-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:11-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. Other Narratives Peculiar to Matthew.

   This is an insertion in the Marcan outline and was probably oral tradition. The story of Jesus walking on the water parallels so closely the words in Mark that it seems highly probable that it was a tradition current in the community which the editor added.

2. Chapter 17:24 - The Coin in the Fish's Mouth.
   The nature of the tale is such that we may call it a myth. As a myth it doubtless reached the editor of Matthew as oral tradition. There may have been some foundation for the story, but that it had been reduced to writing is improbable. It is our conviction that it should be assigned to oral tradition.

d. A Question and Answer.

The question and answer in 21:10b,11 is merely listed by Allen as an insertion in the Marcan outline. It follows immediately a section of the Triple Tradition concerning the entrance into Jerusalem and appears to be the work of the editor.

e. Healings and Cures.

The healings and cures in 9:26-34 and 12:22,23 were men-
tioned in Chapter II in the section on editorial material. The first is based on Marcan parallels: Mark 7:32-37 and 8:22-26. The last has no Marcan parallel. While Redlich and Allen believe that these narratives are the work of the editor, based on the Marcan parallels, we believe that they possibly were taken from a special source, probably one which dealt with the healings and cures of Jesus. It is hardly probable that the editor would have invented these stories, basing them merely on similar cures in Mark. It is much more probable that they had a source other than Mark or M.


We have already stated that most of the discourse material has been inserted in five large blocks into the Marcan framework. The remainder is fragmentary and is found in Chapters 11-12, 15-17, 19-24.

a. List of Material. 19

Chapter 5:4-5, 7-10, 14b, 16-17, 19-24, 27-30, 31, 32a, 34-37, 38, 39a, 41, 45.
  6:1-3, 10b-12b, 16-18, 34.
  7:6, 12b, 15, 19-22.
  10:6b-8, 14b, 23, 25b, 36, 41.
  12:8-7, 11, 12a, 36-37, 45-50.
  13:24-30, 36b-52.
  15:12, 13.

19 Comparison of Allen's and Redlich's lists and a study of Hask's Synopsis.
Chapter 16:17-19.
17:20.
18:5-4,10,14,16-20,23-35.
19:9,12,20.
22:1-14,40.
23:1,2,5,7b-12,15-22,24,28,32-33.
24:10-12,20.
25:1-12,14-34b,50.

b. Classifications According to Type.

The discourse material may be arranged according to characteristics or "type".

(1) Classification by Allen. 20

(a) Parables:
Chapter 13:24-30,36-45,44,45-46,47-50.
13:24-35.
20:1-16.

(b) Anti-Pharisaic:
Chapter 5:8.
9:13a.
10:25b.
12:5-7.
21:43.

(c) Jewish-Christian:
6:10b.
7:6,13b,15,22.
10:5b-8,23,41.
13:52.
18:16.
19:9,28.
24:20.

(2) Classification by Redlisch. 21

(a) Sermons.
(b) Parables.
(c) Ecclesiastical sayings.
(d) Woes to the Pharisees.
(e) Anti-Pharisaic sayings.
(f) Verses that seem anti-Gentile.

4. The Special Source M.

The discussion concerning the narrative material reveals that scholars assign it to oral tradition and to the work of the editor, with the possibility of a special source for the two short narratives concerning healing and cures. (Matthew 9:26-34; 12:22,23). This, together with an undeterminable amount of Logia in the discourse material, reduces considerably the amount of material which was derived, doubtless, from the special source M. M consisted only of discourse material. We shall consider the various theories concerning M and the other possibilities of its existence.

a. Theories Concerning M.

(1) Streeter on M.

Those who support the Two-Document hypothesis assign most of the discourse material of Matthew to Q. Streeter, with several other scholars, believes that Matthew had, besides

21 Redlisch, Student's Introduction to the Synoptic Problem, p. 78.
Mark, two other main sources, viz., Q and M. This he projects in his Four-Document hypothesis. This third main source contained "all discourse peculiar to Matthew, and also that part of the material usually assigned to Q which differs so much from its Lukan parallels as to have suggested the need of the Q-Matthew hypothesis." Streeter argues for the existence of M from the standpoint of apparent conflation of sources. He assigns all discourse material of the Single Tradition of Matthew to M and then calls attention to two types of overlapping: Matthew and Luke, and Mark and M.

There is evidence of the overlapping of the parables in Matthew and Luke. Of fifteen parables in Matthew, eleven are peculiar to Matthew, and of twenty-three in Luke, nineteen are peculiar to that gospel. However, three of them overlap, the Lost Sheep, the Marriage Feast (the Great Supper, in Luke), and the Talents (the Pounds, in Luke). They are so different in statement that it is evident they were derived from different sources, and that the difference is not due to the editors. Of these thirty parables, twenty-seven were from two different sources, hence there is a high probability of the two cycles overlapping.

In the Great Sermon, which is called the "Sermon on the

22 Streeter, The Four Gospels, p. 231.
23 Ibid., pp. 243-244.
24 Ibid., p. 245.
Mount" in Matthew, and the "Sermon on the Plain" in Luke, there is evidence of conflation of Q and M. First there are close parallelsisms which came from Q. These are: Matthew 5:11,12 with Luke 6:22,23; Matthew 6:22-35 with Luke 11:34-56, 16:13, and 12:22-31; and Matthew 7:11 with Luke 11:9-13. Hence Matthew 6:22-7:12 is from Q. There is no difficulty here. In the Beatitudes there is a difference. Of the nine in Matthew and the four in Luke, there is one in which the wording is almost identical. Streeter believes that M contained four Beatitudes and Q contained four. These were all added to Matthew with the addition of "the Meek" which is an interpolation from Psalm 37:11. The Beatitude "Blessed are ye when men shall reprove you" (Matthew 5:11,12) stood in Q and is a doublet of "Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness sake" (Matthew 5:10) which was in M. Two other examples of verbal disagreement in the Sermons are (1) The saying "Lord, Lord" (Matthew 7:21 = Luke 6:46), and "Resist not evil. . . . Love your enemies" (Matthew 5:38-48 = Luke 6:27-36). A variation in order is found in "Loving one's enemies" (Matthew 5: 38-48 and Luke 6:27-36). There are too many verbal differences to allow for editorial manipulation. This is best explained by allowing for the conflation of two sources, Q and M.

Another example of apparent conflation is in the section "Woes to the Pharisees" (Matthew 23:1-36 = Luke 11:37-52). There are seven woes in Matthew directed against the Pharisees.
In Luke are three woes against the Pharisees and three woes against Lawyers. The Lukian version is in the middle of a Q section. This fundamental difference in structure and the divergence in wording, which is above average, bears evidence of the conflation of two sources.

There is evidence of overlapping of Mark and M. This is seen in the following:

1. On divorce Matthew 19:3-12 Mark 10:2-12.

The difference between Matthew 12:9-13 "Sheep in a Pit", and Luke 14:1-6 "Ox in a Pit" is held by Streeter to be due to conflation of Mark and M rather than to editorial expansion.

When the Q material is removed from the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew, "the remainder reads like a continuous and coherent discourse." Streeter states that in order to believe that both the Sermon in Matthew and the Sermon in Luke came from the same source one must "postulate an almost incredible amount of editorial material in rewriting portions of the original." He believes that these likenesses and differences running throughout the discourse material of Matthew are indicative of the presence of a special source M.

25 Ibid., p. 251.
26 Ibid., p. 250.
His argument for $M$ is best stated in his comment on the Great Sermon,

All the phenomena . . . can be satisfactorily explained by the hypothesis that Matthew is conflating two separate discourses, one from $Q$, practically identical with Luke's Sermon on the Plain, and the other from $M$, containing a much longer sermon.\footnote{Ibid., p. 351.}

\section*{(2) Manson's Theory of $M$.}

A theory concerning $M$, which is somewhat different from that of Streeter, is held by Manson. All of the discourse material of the Single Tradition of Matthew is assigned to the special source $M$, and on the basis of parallelisms between $Q$ and $M$, he postulates the theory of a teaching scheme, written or oral, which was older than either $Q$ or $M$, to which both conformed. The parallelisms are found at four main points: \footnote{Manson, T. W., The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 314.}

1. Jesus Preaching
   - Matthew 5:7
     - a. Beatitudes 5:7-10  6:20-23
     - d. Deceivers 7:31-83  6:46

2. Mission Charge
   - Matthew 10:7f.
b. Matthew 10:40f.  
Luke 10:16

3. Against Phariseism

a. Matthew 23:7b  
Luko 11:43
b. 23:27f.  
11:44
c. 23:30  
11:47f.
d. 23:24  
11:48

4. Eschatology (no references given).

There is also a parallelism with Mark: Matthew 5:27-30 and Mark 9:43-48; and an overlapping with Mark. The latter is the parable of the "Wheat and Tares" (Matthew 13:24-30), which is an adaptation of Mark 4:26-29, "The Seed Growing Secretly".

The argument for the existence of M is not based upon conflations of sources, as with Streeter, but upon the method of simply assigning all of the discourse material of the Single Tradition of Matthew to M and accounting for the parallels with Q as due to both documents being based on an earlier document or oral teaching scheme.

(3) Redlich and M.

Closely related to the theory of Streeter is that of Redlich. M is a document containing only discourse material of the Single Tradition of Matthew. It contains numerous parallels with Q, divergent versions of Mark and Luke (Q), and reveals other overlapping of sources. Redlich does not
stress the conflation of sources to the extent that Streeter does. Redligh sees, as does Streeter, a coherent discourse in M. "When all parallels are removed, but the divergent and overlapping passages are retained, we get a coherent discourse in M." The contents of the sayings in M are divided into five groups:

1. Sermon to the Disciples.
2. Mission address to the chosen Twelve (The second sermon).
3. The Church.
5. Parables.

The Contents of M:

Chapter 3:14-15.
5:1-2, 4-5, 7-10, 13a, 14, 16-17, 19-24, 27-29, 33-39a, 41, 43, 48.
6:1-3, 9-13, 16-19, 34.
7:3, 12b, 15-17, 19-25.
9:15a.
10:2-3, 16b, 23, 25b, 36, 41.
12:5-7, 11-12a, 36-37, 40.
13:24-30, 36-52.
15:12-13, 23-25.
16:12b-3, 11b-12, 17-19.
18:3-4, 10, 14-35.
19:9-10, 28a.
21:10-11, 15b-16, 28-32, 43.
22:1-14, 40.
24:10-12.

29 Redligh, Student's Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels, pp. 75-76.
(4) Bacon and M.

Bacon postulates the special source M but is not very certain about it. Several of his arguments seem to be confused and contradictory. In Chapter XI of his Commentary, in classifying sources of the Single Tradition he allows for M thus, "Material derived from other written sources such as L, or a possible M." He thus, while not defining M, he does suggest its possible existence as a documentary source. In another place he discusses

the expansion of the Q parables of Watchfulness (Luke 12:35f.) and the Closing Door (Luke 15:25) into the Ten Virgins (Matthew 25:1-13), and the composition of the closing depiction of the Judgment of the Son of Man (Matthew 25:31-46) with only Mark 9:41 as an authentic text.

and argues for the use of oral tradition by the editor. The estimate as to the extent of oral tradition used by the editor is fundamental to the question whether another document "M is really required to account for the variations of Matthew from Luke's version of Q." He believes that this is an argument against an M source, and if there is such a document it consists only of the Sermon on the Mount. Bacon leaves us uncertain as to his acceptance or rejection of M.

30 Bacon, Studies in Matthew, p. 38.
31 Ibid., p. 130.
32 Ibid., p. 130.
33 Ibid., p. 130.
(5) M'Neile and M.

M'Neile believes in the existence of a special source M but does not define it, except to assign a group of eight parables to it. 34 These are:

1. The Tares  
   Matthew 13:24-30, 36-43.
2. The Hidden Treasure  
   13:44.
3. The Pearl of Great Price  
   13:45-46.
4. The Drag Net  
5. The Unmerciful Servant  
   16:23-25.
6. The Laborers in the Vineyard  
   20:1-16.
7. The Two Sons  
8. The Sheep and the Goats  
   25:31-46.

(6) Goodspeed and M.

Goodspeed does not mention M as a special source but his statements and discussion of various sources are as revealing of M as the various theories in which M is mentioned. He believes that the editor of Matthew had access to traditions of sayings of Jesus which were written, and which may have been combined into a document or may have existed separately. They had been reduced to writing somewhere in Greek Christian circles. 35

34 M'Neile, op. cit., p. 67.
(7) Filson and M.

In his work, The Origin of the Gospel, Filson discusses Streeter's theory of M and apparently subscribes to it. Filson mentions the special source M as a source for Matthew.36

b. Other Arguments for the Existence of M.

That the special source M may have been one of the earlier Gospels or other Christian writings may be inferred from the preface to Luke's Gospel. Luke states that many have written the things which the earlier Christians believed.37 This includes the teachings of Jesus. The editor of Matthew doubtless would have known these documents as well as Luke and he may have had one or several of them at hand. If these included the sayings of Jesus, which they surely did, then it is quite possible to believe that the editor used one or several of these gospels that seemed to him to be the most authentic.

An argument for the existence of M may be made from the disagreement of assignments of material to different sources by various scholars. An example of disagreement concerning assignments is seen in Chapter 11:28-30, "Wisdom's Invitation", or "Come Unto Me", as it is more popularly called. Bacon assigns this to the editor, Wernle to Q, Allen to Q, Radich to

M, and Streeter to M. Disagreements such as this make the possibility of M all the greater because it may be considered as a document containing discourse material existing side by side with Q, and perhaps supplementing the latter. There are various assignments that appear to be erroneous. An example of this is 5:13a, "Ye are the salt of the earth" and 5:14a, "Ye are the light of the world", which are assigned by Allen to the editor. They bear on their surface the marks of a source. Other such instances may be sighted. From this it may be possible to believe that much that Allen assigns to the editor may be M or oral tradition.

All of the discourse material of the Single Tradition of Matthew is of the same nature as that part of it which is recognized as coming from Q. Because of these characteristics it is logical and easy to conclude that all of it was derived from Q. This is the opinion of Allen, Box, Burton and Willoughby. Against this theory there are several arguments. First, if all of this material came from Q, it is unlikely that Luke, who had a fondness for Q, would have omitted so much of it. Luke, doubtless, would have incorporated much more of it in his gospel, thus increasing the extent of the Matthew-Luke Double Tradition, and reducing substantially the Single Tradition of Matthew. This would result in reducing the possibility of the existence of M. As it is, there is a
wide margin in which to postulate the existence of a special source M.

The second argument against the assignment of all the teaching material to Q is that it is the expected thing for several documents to exist, each containing the teaching material of Jesus. It is not logical to believe that the Apostle Matthew had a monopoly on the sayings and was the only one who committed them to writing. Luke states that many had written. While Matthew wrote the Logia at Antioch, and Mark wrote Peter's remembrances at Rome, is it not possible that other apostles and disciples also wrote the sayings at the other great Christian centers? Streeter, in his Four-Document Hypothesis, projects the idea. In addition to those named, L came from Caesarea, Luke composed his gospel at Corinth, and M came from Jerusalem.

c. Origin, Author, and Date of M.

The Special Source M reflects Judaistic tendencies. This may have been due to the various factions in the Jerusalem Council about 50 A.D., and have been the misquoting of Christ "to find a justification for their disapproval of the attitude of Paul." Streeter believes it is anti-Pharisaic. Streeter believes

---

39 Streeter, op. cit., p. 256.
that the Judaistic sayings are found only in contexts which he has other reasons for assigning to M.

Examples of Judaistic but anti-Pharisaic tendencies:

The Special Source M reflects the pride of Christ in His kingdom. The theme is that "Jesus founded a new church with a new law on a new mountain." 40


M. came from Jerusalem, from the party of James, is the view of Streeter, Redlich, Filson, and Manson. The author was "an unknown disciple of Jerusalem . . . a lover of peace and of the church." 41

40 Redlich, op. cit., p. 83.
41 Ibid., p. 85.
M. is dated 47 A. D., just before the Council at Jerusalem, by Redlich, and considerably later, 65 A. D., by Streeter.
CHAPTER IV

RESUME AND CONCLUSIONS

In this study we have recognised the various theories concerning the sources of the Gospel of Matthew. We have recognised the priority of Mark's gospel and the use made of it by the editor of Matthew as a framework for his gospel and as a source of narrative material. We have discussed the editor's use of Q as demonstrated by the Matthew-Jude Double Tradition, and also allowed for the presence of Q material in the Single Tradition of Matthew. Q was a source for discourse material.

After disposing of the editor's use of Mark and Q we are left with the Single Tradition in Matthew. We have surveyed the theories concerning the sources of the Single Tradition and found that they may be classified into the One-Source, Two-Source, Three-Source, and Four-Source Theories of the Single Tradition of Matthew. We found the presence of eleven proof texts and evidence sufficient to allow for their derivation from a documentary "Testimonia."

When a piece of literature is compiled such as the Gospel of Matthew, it is necessary for the compiler to make additions and changes in order to have continuity and smoothness. We
have therefore recognized the presence of a considerable amount of editorial material which has been divided into four groups, e.g., (1) connecting links, (2) introductions, (3) insertions in the Marcan outline, and (4) revisions of Mark.

We were therefore left with narrative and discourse material and it was necessary to examine these two groups in order to define M. The narrative material was divided into five sections: (1) birth and infancy stories, (2) healings and cures, (3) a question and answer, (4) narratives peculiar to Matthew, and (5) passion and resurrection stories. The birth and infancy stories were assigned to oral tradition with the exception of the genealogy table which bore the marks of the editor enough to assign it to his creative ingenuity. The second, third, and fourth groups were recognized as having been derived from sources which we were unable to determine. The passion and resurrection stories were assigned to oral tradition. This study revealed that M did not contain the narrative sections of the Single Tradition, therefore it consisted only of discourse material.

We have surveyed the major theories concerning M, the minor ones which recognize or suggest M but do not define it, and other possibilities as to the existence of M as a special source. The most logical and most valid, in our thinking are the closely related theories of Streeter and Redlich who insist
upon the existence of M as a special written document which
served the editor of Matthew as a source for the discourse
material peculiar to his gospel. It seems that Jerusalem, the
center of the early Christian Church, would produce one or
more documents of the teachings of Jesus. This is the stand
taken by these two scholars. The editor of Matthew probably
possessed this copy and a copy of Q, along with Mark, and with
a good stock of oral traditions in mind he doubtless went to
work. Perhaps Streeter has emphasized the overlapping of
sources too much. One of his main arguments for the existence
of M from the standpoint of overlapping is the difference in
Lukan and Matthean accounts which he claims is too great to be
assigned to the editor, and therefore must have been taken from
the third source. This may be true. On the other hand, the
editor may have heard a story aside from having read it, and
therefore constructed his own story on the fundamentals of the
differing versions.

There seems to me to be a strong argument in favor of the
existence of M in the coherence and continuity which run
through his discourse material after the Q material has been
extracted. This, of course, depends upon the acceptance of
Streeter's and Redlich's reconstruction of Q. If another
reconstruction is used, this argument does not stand.

The theory of Manson seems to go to the limit of assump-
tion. It would be necessary, if accepting this theory, to have more evidence than four parallelisms in order to postulate an earlier teaching scheme. Where did it originate? What was its character and purpose? How did the authors of Q and M come to possess it at so early a date?

We must bear in mind the possibility of the presence of oral tradition in the discourse material of the Single Tradition of Matthew. That all of the sayings of Jesus were never recorded is evident. One such saying which never found its way into the Gospels is recorded by Luke in Acts 20:35, where Paul quotes Jesus, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." How much allowance must be made for oral tradition in the discourse material we are unable to state. The leading theories concerning M do not allow for it. Perhaps there is a verse or two, perhaps more.

The question arises, "Was M one or several documents? The leading scholars allow for one. Several things must be considered. The five blocks of discourse bear marks of compilation. Although Streeter and Redlich see a continuity running through the discourse material of the Single Tradition in Matthew when the Q material or certain other parallelisms are extracted, it is nevertheless true that the remainder, which they call M, may still be taken apart and put together in many combinations and have continuity.
In the second place, accepting the statement in Luke’s preface, we may safely assume that there were many documents containing the sayings of Jesus. Whether the editor used several of these documents or only one as his third main source is a matter of opinion. Because of the editor’s great dependence on Mark for the framework of his gospel, and for narrative material, and on Q for much of his discourse material, but not all of it, it seems highly probable that he would have made the most possible use of a third main document, using the one which suited his taste and which he believed was the most authentic. In addition to these three, the editor would, then, have added the proof texts, drawn from minor documents for a few sayings and perhaps for the two narratives peculiar to his gospel, and then completed his work by the use of a few oral traditions.

We conclude that there was such a document as we have been trying to set up, that it had been reduced to writing, and that it served the editor of Matthew as one of his main sources for discourse material not found elsewhere. This document is called M. Our study is a survey of the existing theories concerning M, therefore we cannot make definite textual assignments to M. This is a field for more specialized study. M contained a variety of discourse material, including parables, anti-Pharisaic and Jewish-Christian sayings. We are justified
in stating that M contained the following material:

1. Part of the Great Sermon which did not come from Q.
   Chapters 5-7.


M did not contain a Resurrection story. M was similar to Q in structure and content, but Q was more extensive than M.

Because of the Judaistic tendency of M, as well as its anti-Pharisaic phrasing, M is thought to be the product of the Church at Jerusalem which was headed by James, the Lord's brother. The author is unknown. The date is placed at 47 A.D. by Redlich, and 65 A.D. by Streeter.
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