JESUS AND THE LAW

A STUDY OF THE FIRST 'BOOK' OF MATTHEW (MT. 3–7)

BENJ. W. BACON
YALE UNIVERSITY

AN English scholar of deservedly wide and high reputation has this to say regarding our subject: "The question of Christ's relation to the Jewish Law is one of fundamental importance for the origin of Christianity, but at the same time of peculiar difficulty." Among the difficulties enumerated not the least is this: "When we consider how bitter was the strife which this question aroused in the primitive church the misgiving is certainly not unreasonable that this may have been reflected back into the life of the Founder, and sayings placed in His mouth endorsing one of the later, partisan views."

Intentional falsification is alleged by none. Unintentional misrepresentation, however, is only too easy after very few years of oral transmission, whether by translation, interpretation, or paraphrase and interpretative supplement. Comparative study of the Gospels proves, in fact, that wide differences on this point actually do exist in our Gospel records, and the fact that they exist is not merely a justification for critical comparison, but a providential summons to apply it in the effort to make the nearest possible approach to historical truth.

Mark will be generally conceded to exhibit the most radical point of view in its representation of Jesus' action and utterance in resistance to Jewish legalism. The Gospel of Matthew, on the other hand, in spite of its close dependence upon Mark, and its intense antipathy to the type of doctrine it describes as the "leaven of the scribes and Pharisees," exhibits the most con-

servative or Jewish-Christian point of view. In fact it would appear to be one of the main objects of Matthew[1] to counteract what he designates "lawlessness" (ἀνομία) by presenting the whole message of Jesus as a new and higher Torah with apocalyptic sanctions. This evangelist writes that he may "teach all men everywhere to obey all things whatsoever Jesus commanded" (Mt. 28 20), and he reenforces this new Torah of Christianity by a very exceptional emphasis on the rewards and penalties of the world to come.

We must begin with the Gospel of Matthew, comparing with it the Gospel of Mark which our first evangelist adapts and uses. Nor need we now say more to substantiate the generally accepted fact that Matthew presents the teaching in a more legalistic and Jewish-Christian way than Mark, or to prove his special fear and hatred of the current teaching of "lawlessness," beyond citing a few outstanding passages. Matthew's opinion of the "teachers of lawlessness" is expressed with great vigor and clarity in a special paragraph inserted in 7 15–23, immediately before the closing parable of the Sermon on the Mount[2]. His dread of their effect upon the Church is expressed in his parable of The Tares in the Wheat, with its added Interpretation depicting the fate of "those that cause stumbling and work lawlessness." The parable of the Tares is sometimes regarded as Matthew's *Sondergut*, sometimes as his revision of Mark's parable of The Patient Husbandman, its parallel in position (Mt. 13 24–30 = Mk. 4 26–29). Either way the testimony of this supplement is striking. It is borne out by a special addition in Mt. 24 10–12 to Mark's prediction of the great apostasy before the End, an addition which holds the teaching of "lawlessness" responsible for the chilling of the love of the many, and the "stumbling" of believers. The whole

[1] The common designation of our first evangelist is adopted, of course, without prejudice to questions of authorship.

[2] The original ending of the discourse in the parable of the Wise and Foolish Builders (Mt. 7 24–27; Lk. 6 47–49) in this instance dictated the insertion of Matthew's supplement just before it, instead of attachment at the end, as in the later discourses.

structure of the Gospel indicates the evangelist's motives and anxiety. Especially do its closing words set forth his remedy for the parlous conditions of his time. He would meet them with the "commandment" of Jesus, enforced by his authority as messianic Judge of the World.

The closing warnings of two out of the five great discourses of Jesus which constitute the distinctive feature of this Gospel have already been cited. Mt. 7 13–23 and 13 36–50 are perhaps sufficiently explicit in their depiction of the fate of those who teach and practice "lawlessness," and have no "good works" to plead in their behalf at the judgment-seat of the Son of Man in "the end of the world." Matthew's idea of the sanction of this commandment is made more unmistakable by the close of the fifth and last discourse, depicting this scene of judgment in Mt. 25 31–46. But this is not all. If the two remaining discourses terminate in pictures of future reward and punishment somewhat less lurid in style, rewards for those who show kindness to Christ's messengers in conclusion of The Mission of the Twelve (10 40–42), punishment for the unmerciful in the discourse on Government (18 23–35), the change of tone is a minor one scarcely affecting the general theme. Sanction and motive are still the same. Matthew, like his contemporary and ally, the writer of Jude, relies on the rewards and penalties of the world to come as motives for the "good works" to which he urges his generation. Every one of his 'five books' of the Torah of Jesus is supplemented at the close of the compilation with "Matthean" material directed to this end.

The providential survival of two earlier witnesses fortunately supplies us with the means for a critical estimate of Matthew's distinctive conception of Jesus' relation to the Law. Mark, so poorly supplied with the "commandments" sought for in the subapostolic, neo-legalistic age, was rewritten independently in two different quarters with similar objects. It was almost eclipsed when Luke's far more pretentious work appeared, and still more when Matthew was raised by some unexplained influence to the rank of a supposed apostolic compilation. Mark was saved only

by its reputed connection with Peter. Complete disappearance was the fate of that document known to critics as the Second Source, a catechetic narrative, which was drawn upon by both Luke and Matthew to supply the lack of teaching material in Mark. Unprotected by the aegis of any apostolic name this document disappeared. Only the coincident appearance of supplementary teaching material, commonly designated Q, in the mutually independent Gospels of Matthew and Luke, enables the modern critic to reconstruct it. However, this Q material, supplemented by such kindred material as may be considered derived from the same writing though present in only one extant Gospel (and even by some material used by all three), constitutes a real Second Source (S), applicable along with Mark to the problem before us.

If, then, we put the general question how far the great difference between Mark and Matthew in their representation of Jesus' attitude toward the Law may be due to "sayings placed in his mouth endorsing one of the later, partisan views" by our first evangelist, the answer given by every impartial critic must be that the amount of such addition to Mark and S is very small. Matthew undoubtedly uses a third source (for which Streeter has recently proposed the symbol M), drawing from it such material as the Prologue (chs. 1–2), the "Petrine supplements" in Book IV (14 28–33; 16 17–19; 17 24–27), and a few apocryphal touches in the Epilogue (chs. 26–28), such as Pilate's Wife's Dream, Judas' Suicide, Apparitions in Jerusalem at the Death of Jesus, and The Watch at the Sepulchre. *Prima facie* there would be no objection to supposing that some also of the unique *teaching* material of Matthew was drawn from this source rather than S. In reality it is not even certain that in "M" we are dealing with a document rather than mere oral tradition. If a document its affinities were not with the teaching material, but with the narrative of Mark, which it embellishes after the manner of the Jewish targums[3]. Matthew's *teaching Sondergut* shows no affinity

[3] Cf. Streeter, *Four Gospels*, p. 502f. If a designation were required we should prefer the symbol N, avoiding thus confusion with the names Matthew

with it. Our problem, accordingly, resolves itself into a comparison of Matthew with his two principal sources: Mark, which we know independently, and S, which we can compare only indirectly, through Luke. Only thus can a worth-while judgment be passed on the character and degree of participation by the first evangelist himself in shaping and supplementing his material. The question is one of degree and kind rather than of fact; for even modern writers, attempting under the impulse of strong religious interest and feeling to set forth the life and teaching of Jesus, use similar paraphrase, interpretation and supplement. R^{mt}, however, is not a wholly indeterminable factor of the first Gospel. The evangelist has not only a distinctive animus, but a distinctive phraseology of his own.

Mere rearrangement of the material, with such incidental editorial touches as are thus necessitated will accomplish much toward changing the impression produced; and Matthew, notoriously, has completely rearranged the Markan story of the Galilean ministry, almost eliminating the distinction between an earlier period of prophetic activity in continuation of the summons to repentance uttered by the Baptist, and substituting for it an immediate promulgation of the New Law of the Kingdom. This discourse of the Lawgiver, known as the Sermon on the Mount, is the first of the series of five, each prefaced by appropriate narrative, which make up the substance of Matthew's Gospel, and in it (as critics agree) our evangelist has used no less freedom in rearranging Q material than in rearranging the story of Mark. So eager, in fact, is Matthew to come to the new code of "righteousness" proclaimed from the mountain in Galilee, that in the introductory narrative (chs. 3–4) he takes barely six verses from Mark's story of the beginning of the ministry (Mt. 4 12–22 = Mk. 1 14–20) to cover the whole subject of the call of the disciples, proceeding at once to borrow, for the audience addressed in the

and Mark, and calling attention rather to the striking resemblances between this Matthean source and the *Gospel of the Nazarenes*, early in use among the Aramaic-speaking Christians of Aleppo.

Sermon, Mark's description of the assembled Syrian multitude (Mt. 4 23–25 = Mk. 3 7–12). The entire body of teaching on the New Law which follows in Mt. 5 1–7 27 is thus presented in one mass, and its effect decribed in terms borrowed from Mk. 1 21 f., declaring the wonderment of the people at Jesus' teaching "with authority," as if this were in fact Jesus' first public utterance! Thus rearrangement alone, without recourse to any addition not derived from sources other than those used by Mark and Luke, produces a picture of Jesus' opening ministry widely differing from what we should derive either from Mark's story of Jesus' first Sabbath at Capernaum and subsequent conflict with scribes and Pharisees, or Luke's account of the opening scene at Nazareth, followed by the call of the fishermen from their nets, and the early campaign in the synagogues of "Judea."[4]

In addition to the general structure of the first Gospel as a new Torah in five 'books' of the commandments of Jesus, this striking modification and rearrangement of Mark's "beginning of the gospel" confirms our judgment of the interest Matthew has most at heart. This evangelist seeks to create a different idea of Jesus as a Teacher of the Law from that which a reader acquainted only with Mark's Gospel would entertain. From the very outset Jesus comes forward as a second Moses, offering by divine authority a new and higher "commandment." True, the discourse itself sets the teaching of Jesus in contrast with that of other teachers of the Law, but in Matthew the difference arises not from any charge of laxity raised against Jesus by scribes and Pharisees, as in Mk. 2 1–3 6. Our evangelist postpones this scene of conflict. With him the relation is reversed. Jesus arraigns the scribes and Pharisees for laxity. The "righteousness" of his followers must exceed theirs, else they cannot enter the kingdom of heaven (5 20 ff.).

We shall better appreciate what this Jewish-Christian evangelist of the sub-apostolic age is trying to do for his generation through his revision of Mark and combination of it with the Teaching

[4] *Vera lectio.*

Source, if we try to realize how the Gospel of Mark would sound in the ears of a catechist of the Syrian church, of Jewish training, ca. 90 A.D. Such a writer would know that Jesus was really (as Paul himself allows) "a minister of the circumcision," "under the Law" and loyal to Moses and the prophets. He would know that Jesus was no iconoclast, but a teacher of the highest type of Jewish morality and religion. Such a writer, however strong in his support of Gentile missions, perhaps even supporting Paul's free gospel of grace without the burden of the Law for those not born to it, a "scribe fully instructed unto the kingdom of heaven," possessed of that great body of ethical teaching (Q) revealed to us by Luke's independent use of the same material, could hardly be satisfied with Mark. As we read his revised Gospel we can hardly escape the impression that an important factor in his determination to write was the desire so to restate the relation of Jesus to the Law as to do justice to the conception current in an environment conversant with the Second Source. Matthew's motive for writing must be similar to Luke's, at least in so far as both effect their purpose mainly by blending Mk. with S. What other factors enter in to differentiate the two revisions we may enquire later. First of all we must seek a clear definition of Mark's attitude toward the question of precept and law.

Mark has three main sections dealing with the question of Jesus and the Law, the first being the series of anecdotes in 2 1–3 6 which relate how Jesus iu his preaching of repentance came into collision with the synagogue leaders. These objected to his proclamation of forgiveness, his association with publicans and sinners, his disregard of the set fasts, and his laxity and that of his followers regarding sabbath observance. As noted above, Matthew postpones these scenes of conflict.

1. Mark, in this group of anecdotes, does not attempt to define Jesus' teaching, but treats the issue as one of bald authority[5]. Because he is the Son of Man, and can prove by miracle the

[5] The true text of Mk. 2 26ff. does not include verse 27.

divine source of his mission, the scribes have no right to object. The Son of Man has authority, even while on earth, to forgive sins, disregard the prescribed ordinances, and even, on occasion, to set aside the sabbath. This defiant attitude of Jesus toward the Law leads the Pharisees to conspire with the Herodians against his life.

2. The second of Mark's sections on Jesus and the Law deals with the subject more on principle, relating Jesus' reply to certain scribes from Jerusalem who took exception to his disregard of the Mosaic distinctions of "clean" and "unclean" (7 1–23). The story is prefixed to an account of Jesus' going among Gentiles with his blessings of healing and help, and imputes to him a drastic abolition of the "middle wall of partition" which in Paul's time had proved the chief barrier. The extraordinary supplement in Mk. 6 53–8 26 to the story of the Galilean ministry, a supplement which Luke omits in favor of a much fuller and more reliable account of how the gospel was carried to the Gentiles, rests in 7 1–23 on a Markan development of Jesus' saying about inward and external "cleanness" (Mt. 23 25 f. = Lk. 11 39–41). The supplement has the same pragmatic value as the legendary account in Acts 10 1–11 18 of how Peter was taught the same lesson by special divine revelation, and involves the same distinction between things which to God are "clean" but which the ordinances of men make "common."

In this section we cannot wholly acquit Mark of anti-Jewish animus or of an unhistorical imputation to Jesus of the freedom later achieved by application of his principles. The tone of contempt for Jewish ritual in 7 3 f. quite out-Pauls Paul, and the two verses are naturally omitted by Matthew. Mark also strains the meaning of the *logion* into a repudiation of the whole Mosaic system of ritual "cleanness," a misstatement of Jesus' attitude as contrary to what even Paul concedes as the misstatement in Acts 10 1–11 18 of the actual position of Peter. Nevertheless the central *logion* of 7 15 is certainly authentic (cf. Mt. 23 25 = Lk. 11 39–41), and, what is most of all important to our enquiry, the citation of Is. 29 13 placed in Jesus' mouth in Mk. 7 6 f. is not

only authentic but touches the very heart of our problem. Its authenticity appears not merely from its affinity with the other teachings of Jesus, but from the fact that Paul also, when dealing with the same subject of "clean" and "unclean" meats, resorts to the same Isaian citation, in exactly the same peculiar reading (Col. 2 22). Its right to be called the key to our problem appears in the fact that it reveals the true attitude of Jesus, both on this occasion and in others similar. His attitude is that of the great prophets, particularly Isaiah.

The vital distinction made both in Mk. 7 6 and Mk. 9 10 between human ordinances and the unwritten law of the Creator has a certain affinity with the Stoic doctrine: "Follow Nature," and it is not impossible that this affinity was apparent to our Roman evangelist and his readers. But it would be absurd, in view of the far-reaching, deep connections of this distinction with other teachings such as the contrast between written ordinances and the living example of the heavenly Father in the Sermon on the Mount, to resort to Gentile philosophy for the source, when the prophets (and above all Isaiah) are constantly on Jesus' lips, and display a much closer affinity. If Jer. 31 31 deserves its designation "the gospel in the Old Testament," surely the great prophecy of "the consolation of Israel," whereof Is. 29 9–24 forms an organic element, both intrinsically and in the known resort to it of the early church in its conflict with the synagogue, has at least an equal right to be so called.

Is. 29 9–24 is a protest, appealed to more than once by both Jesus and Paul, by our canonical evangelists, and by the Nazarene Christians of Aleppo in the time of Apollinarios of Laodicea, against the vain pretensions of the champions of book religion, blind and deaf to the teaching of the living God of nature and providence. The date of the Isaian section cannot be determined with certainty, but it echoes the protest of Jeremiah against the futile attempts of his time to reform Israel by the enactment of codes and written covenants (Jer. 31 31 ff.). As such it offered to Jesus the best possible standing-ground in his resistance to "the leaven of the Pharisees," a legalistic tendency which he

cannot have failed to discern in the opposition so successfully brought by the scribes and Pharisees to his message of redemption, and which he would seem to have foreseen as a subtle menace to the right-thinking of his own disciples (Lk. 12 1; cf. Mk. 8 15 = Mt. 16 6). According to Mark this protest of Isaiah against "ordinances of men" was the very Palladium of Jesus in his conflict against the legalism of the scribes. It would seem to have been transmitted to Paul also in his struggle against converted (or should we not rather say half-converted) Judaizing Pharisees in the Church. As we have seen, the distinction of divine unwritten law and man-made ordinance was again invoked in the period of debate over the permissibility of Gentile missions. In spite of the explicit testimony of Gal. 2 1–21 to the contrary, Acts 10 1–11 18 even makes it a divine revelation to Peter, and this in days after Paul's victory had been won, notwithstanding Peter's vacillation. But in post-apostolic days no vision was considered too lofty or far-reaching for the chief apostle, while even Peter's name could not prevent the Church from returning to neo-legalism when threatened by the rising flood of antinomian laxity.

3. Mark's third group devoted to the question of Jesus and the Law is most explicit of all as regards the great issue of Law vs. Grace as the reliance of the Christian for "eternal life." It occupies Mk. 10 1–45 and groups together a series of anecdotes which we have elsewhere described as Mark's equivalent for the Sermon on the Mount.

The group begins with the story of an altercation between Jesus and the Pharisees in which Jesus once more, and with stronger emphasis, adduces the distinction between the unwritten law of the Creator, manifest in the primal instinct of monogamy, and the "ordinances of men" enacted to meet the hardness of unregenerate hearts.

Both Matthew and Luke make separate use of the *logion* on divorce (Mt. 5 18, 32 = Lk. 16 17f.), using it as an example of Jesus' attitude toward the Law, so that Mark does not stand alone in this application. The differences in treatment we must consider in due time. For the present only Mark's viewpoint is to be de-

termined. As already noted the emphasis of the story falls upon its closing word. Jesus ends the interview by contrasting divine and human law, placing the enactment of Moses in the latter class: "Faithfulness in marriage is the institution of God, divorce is an expedient of men." But the introductory dialogue also aims to show that Jesus does not disparage the expedient in its proper place. Moses' legislation is wise and humane, otherwise it would not be commended (v. 3). In very truth it does mark a great advance over the unlimited right of repudiation conferred on the husband by the primitive Semitic system of chattel marriage. The anecdote takes account of this in the implied commendation of Moses' requirement. But the direction Jesus himself has to give lifts us to a higher plane, that of the prophet, who voices not human but divine requirement: "Yahweh hateth putting away" (Mal. 2 14–16). Just as in Lk. 12 13 ff. Jesus refuses the function of the scribe, which hearers seek to thrust upon him, and demands the right to speak like a prophet in the name of Yahweh himself, for absolute values, so here. Moses is a lawgiver. He and his successors have their problem in the adjustment of the wrongs of man to man. Jesus refuses to be a lawgiver. He speaks as a prophet, one who in the name of the Creator demands faithfulness and mercy. The intrinsic sense of the story is obvious; it is less certain whether the evangelist who attaches the explanatory supplement Mk. 10 10–12 fully appreciated it.

Following immediately upon this anecdote illustrative of Jesus' attitude toward the religion of Law Mark gives another in 10 13–16 illustrative of the religion of Grace. All must come to the heavenly kingdom, if they come at all, in the spirit of little children, who receive what parental love supplies not as a wage, or reward of merit, but in simple trust and humility. Luke has a moral equivalent for this from his own independent source (L) in 17 7–10. In this *logion* also Jesus expresses his opposition to the legalistic conception of obedience and merit. There is almost a Pauline antipathy to the conception of "a righteousness of mine own, even that which is of the Law" in the words: "When ye have done all say 'We are unprofitable servants, we have done that which

it was our duty to do'." But the *logion* stands isolated so far as Luke himself is concerned. Its testimony is all the more important in support of Mark because it comes from L rather than from the third evangelist.

In Mk. 10 17–31, which follows next, we have the central anecdote of the anti-legalistic section. Jesus is plainly asked by a typical Pharisee filled with the Pharisean idea of eternal life as a reward for obedience to commandments, one of those whom the Talmud describes as going from teacher to teacher asking some new precept to observe: "Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" Jesus answers that obedience to the written precepts of the Law, commendable as it is ("he looked upon him and loved him"), gives no claim to this reward. To enter into life there is no other way than that which Jesus and his followers are now treading, renunciation of all earthly goods and setting the face toward Calvary. The point of difference between the "righteousness of scribes and Pharisees" and the Way of Jesus is made all the clearer by the refusal of the Pharisee to follow. The spirit which Paul describes as animating Christians whom he had himself known, leading them not only to "give all their goods to feed the poor" but even, like the Maccabean martyrs, to "give their bodies to be burned," was beyond the reach of this enquirer. The Pharisee turned away; for he had great possessions.

The affinity of this Markan anecdote illustrative of the difference between the religion of Law and the religion of Grace with the Q discourse on the Righteousness of Sons was so apparent to the primitive compiler of the *Gospel of the Naassenes* that he weaves together Mt. 5 45 and Mk. 10 18 in the *logion*: "Why callest thou me 'good'? One alone is 'good', my Father who is in heaven, who causes his sun to rise upon just and unjust, and sends rain upon saints and sinners." For some reason it appears difficult for moderns to see that in both utterances Jesus is indeed contrasting book religion with the ethic of sonship. His *halacha* ("walk") is to be an imitator of God and to 'walk' in love as beloved children; for Paul also, in Eph. 5 1, seems to have a similar idea of "the Law of Christ." 'Goodness' is simply to be kind

as God is kind. Religion is the pursuit of the divine ideal in a hope that knows no limit and a trust that knows no fear.

Just as in Mt. 6 19–34 our first evangelist follows up his presentation of the new Torah of Jesus by a long discourse on Treasure in Heaven paralleled by Lk. 12 22–36, interjecting only a section on Acceptable Acts of Righteousness (6 1–18), so Mark also proceeds, after the mention of "treasure in heaven" in the story of the Pharisean enquirer, to deal with this question of Heavenly Reward. The narrative proceeds with Peter's self-seeking demand on behalf of himself and the Twelve: "Lo, we have left all and followed thee," which Matthew does not hesitate to complete: "What then shall we have?" Jesus' reply is: For this world you have the hundred-fold compensation of a welcome into the brotherhood of the persecuted, and for the world to come eternal life (10 28–30). Consistently with his reply to the Pharisean Enquirer, Jesus could say no less; but the manifest impossibility of literal fulfilment of the earthly promise (omitted by Matthew and Luke) and especially the significant clause "with persecutions," makes clear that reward, in the sense that Matthew has given to the *logion* by combining with it that of Lk. 22 28–30, is remote from Jesus' mind.[6]

To Jewish and early Christian thought the supreme example of eternal life as a reward of special merit was martyrdom. And in primitive church circles the two sons of Zebedee, James (beheaded by Agrippa in 42) and John (probably martyred in 62 along with the other James, brother of the Lord) were regarded as the martyrs *par excellence* of the apostolic group. As the climax of his section on the religion of Grace vs. the religion of Law and Merit Mark relates the Ambitious Request of James and John, prefacing it by reiteration of Jesus' Prediction of the Cross (10 32–34, 35–45).

Luke's parallel to this anecdote is drawn from a different source, perhaps older than Mark, and is differently placed. Mat-

[6] On the possibility that the source followed by Mark attached at this point the parable of the Dissatisfied Wage-earners (Mt. 20 1–16) see below.

thew shows only his usual softening down of Mark. But we are now concerned only with the motive of Mark, and this is made distinct enough in his version of the *logion* of Lk. 22 25f. Jesus' exemplification of the principle *ministrare non ministrari* is seen not in his attitude at the Supper, where Luke and John place it, but in his martyr death, which was a λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, as the eucharistic ritual *in the Markan and Pauline form* declares (Mk. 14 24 = Mt. 26 28. So 1 Cor. 11 24, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν; but cf. Lk. 22 15—19a, 21 ff., omitting the Pauline interpolation). Mark criticizes the disposition to treat the martyrdom of the two "sons of thunder" as entitling them to positions of special glory in the messianic kingdom. Jesus is not a distributor of heavenly rewards. That is in the hand of God. He can only bid his followers tread his own path of service and suffering in the same fearless faith that it is the path of eternal life.

Certainly there is a marked difference between this Markan group of anecdotes repudiating the principles of Pharisaism, whether as respects obedience to written precept or the reward expected for it, and the neo-legalism of Matthew supplemented by his elaborate pictures of an apocalyptic Son of Man distributing heavenly rewards and punishments from his "throne of glory" (cf. Mt. 7 22f.; 13 40—43; 16 27; 18 23—35; 25 31—46).

The group of anecdotes in Mk. 10 1—45 on The Law, Law and Grace, Eternal Life not won by Obedience to Commandments, Renunciation not giving Claim to Reward, Martyrdom itself only Participation with Christ, certainly stands much nearer to the teaching of Paul (it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the 'Paulinism' of Mark is not a matter of words, or literary dependence à la Werner) than the revision of Matthew; but as a revelation of the evangelist's conception of Jesus' relation to the Law it would not be complete without his closing example of the public teaching of Jesus. For in Mk. 12 28—34 Jesus' reply to the Enquiring Scribe is a counterpart to the story of the Enquiring Pharisee, and stands at the close of Jesus' public teaching, at the threshold of the story of his martyr fate, giving the summing-up of his whole conception of man's duty to God and to his fellow-man.

Just as the enquirer for commandments to observe in 10 17–22 is selected and pictured as a *typical*[7] Pharisee, lovable because his efforts to have the righteousness which is of the Law have brought him to the verge of discipleship without quite attaining it, so the scribe of Mk. 12 28–34, who asks: "Master, what is the great commandment of the Law?" and gives approval to Jesus' answer, is typical of many scribes of whom it could be said that they were "not far from the kingdom of God." The Gamaliel of Acts and the Nicodemus of John were not the only examples known to the early church. Possibly Mark could have told more of the further career of the enquiring scribe, or of the enquiring Pharisee, but he and his readers alike have no more interest in this than Luke or John in the further careers of Gamaliel or Nicodemus after the examples have served the narrator's purpose. And the narrator's purpose is not biography or history, but religion, and more especially the differentiation of the religion of

[7] Neither ancient nor modern homilists can be satisfied to believe this. Targumic interpreters in the *Gospel of the Nazarenes* interject into Mark's story midrashic clauses intended to show that the claim of this enquirer to have "kept the Law and the Prophets" was after all not justified, because the Law and the Prophets call for almsgiving also as an act of "righteousness." The Aramaic evangelist is no better satisfied than the canonical Matthew to admit that if a man really had kept them he was not entitled to "eternal life" (cf. Mt. 19 17). He also therefore rewrites Mark, adding after verse 21: "But the rich man began to scratch his head, and it did not please him. And the Lord said to him, How sayest thou, I have kept the Law and the Prophets? For it is written in the Law: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself; and lo, many of thy brethren, the sons of Abraham, are clothed with filthy garments, dying of hunger, and thy house is full of good things, yet nothing at all goeth forth from it to them." Comparison with the rewriting done by canonical Matthew is instructive. Pulpit interpreters in modern times also interject alleviative fancies of their own, to show, in spite of Mark, that the case after all was *not* typical. Jesus, they tell us, had as searcher of hearts, discerned that the besetting sin of this particular young man was avarice. To meet this he imposed (perhaps only as a test) the exceptional requirement. Etc., etc. Ancient and modern *midrash* are alike blind to the fact that by as much as the example chosen is made exceptional the evangelist's case against Pharisaism is weakened.

Christ from types of religion which, however "not far", require for this reason all the more to be distinguished from it.

When we turn from the testimony of Mark as to Jesus' attitude toward the Law to compare with it the testimony of Luke we find it necessary, as in Matthew, to distinguish Luke's personal conception from that of the source he employs. For our third evangelist, writing at about the same period as Matthew, and undertaking in general the same task of supplementing Mark by means of teaching material from S, might be expected to show, as he actually does, the same neo-legalistic animus, though he uses quite different expedients. Thus he manifests the same desire as Matthew to avoid antinomian misuse of the parable of the Slighted Invitation (Lk. 14 15–24 = Mt. 22 1–10). But to counteract misapplication of the closing words "Go forth into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in, that my house may be filled" the two evangelists use different expedients. Luke adds the two parables of the King unprepared for War and the Builder unable to Finish, prefacing these by the warning against attempts to follow without readiness to renounce all, and following them up with the *logion* on Savorless Salt (Lk. 14 25–35). Matthew attains a similar result by adding a supplement to the parable itself, describing how the "king" came in to view the guests at the "marriage" supper, and, finding there one not furnished with a wedding garment (cf. Rev. 19 8), gave the order "Bind him hand and foot, and cast him out into the outer darkness." For one who had been brought in without the possibility of obtaining a "wedding garment" (which only the pulpit commentators find the means of furnishing) the punishment might be regarded as cruel and unusual. However, we are left in no doubt as to who is responsible for it, because the phrase which follows is too unmistakably Matthean: "There shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth."[8] Both Luke and Matthew are neo-legalists,

[8] This phrase, like "the outer darkness" which precedes it, is borrowed by Matthew from S (Mt. 8 12 = Lk. 13 28). In this original occurrence it meets the requirement of the context, the excluded guests gnashing their

and both include older material of different type. In the case of Luke this pre-Lukan source has been designated L. It is highly instructive to see how L meets the question of Jesus' relation to the Law, in distinction from Luke's view.

It is noticeable that of the group of six anecdotes by which Mark in 10 1–45 and 12 28–34 has set forth his idea of this relation Luke has cancelled approximately half, substituting more or less complete parallels from L. Instead of the subordination of the Mosaic law of divorce to the divine, unwritten law of mercy and good faith in Mk. 10 1–12 we are given in Luke only the fragment Lk. 16 18, though the context (vv. 16f.) betrays Luke's consciousness that the passing of "the Law and the Prophets" is involved. Apparently Luke takes the saying to be a rebuke of the Pharisees for permitting divorce at all.

The saying on receiving the kingdom as a little child is transcribed without material change in Lk. 18 18–23, and the same is true of the story of the Rich Enquirer with comment addressed to the twelve which follows in 18 24–34. Luke merely abbreviates slightly and assimilates the quotation from the ten Commandments to the original by cancelling the Markan addition "Defraud not." We note, however, that Luke omits the statement of Mk. 10 21 that Jesus "looked upon the youth and loved him," and the symbolic promise of Mk. 10 30, indicating that he does not see the bearing of the anecdote on the question of Jesus' relation to the Law, but takes the whole paragraph merely as requiring the sacrifice of worldly goods.

For the remainder of the Markan section Luke is satisfied to supply material from L. True, no significance can be attached to the parallelism between Mk. 10 38b and Lk. 12 50 beyond the fact that Mark (or perhaps, since the clause is also wanting in Matthew, some early transcriber of Mark) has enriched the original "Are ye able to drink my cup?" by adding an allusion

teeth with rage and envy as they see their places taken by outsiders. Matthew, after his habit, stereotypes the phrase and repeats it in no less than five later, and inappropriate, contexts.

to the other sacrament, "or to be baptized with my baptism." But in 22 24–27 Luke gives from L a wholly different version of the *logion Ministrare non ministrari*, making it part of the Supper Teaching; and the story continues with the Q *logion* (based on Ps. 122 5) "Ye shall sit upon thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." As Mt. 19 28 attaches the same *logion* (thoroughly rewritten in Matthean phraseology, *παλιγγενεσία, ὅταν καθίσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ*) in similar connection we can only infer that both draw from S. Moreover the placing in S can only have been as Luke represents; for the phrasing *διατίθεμαι, καθὼς διέθετο*, is surely chosen with reference to the *διαθήκη* Jesus is instituting. Psychologically and historically Mark's placing of the anecdote may well be preferred, nor need we doubt that his order may often be chronologically better than that of the older source. Nevertheless priority certainly belongs to the Q material, and we must be content to accept the result. In S, the older source, the story of the quarrel for Rank and Reward was not connected, as in Mk. 10 (32–34), 35–45, with the group on Law and Grace, but appeared as part of the Supper Teaching. Jn. 13 1–17 follows this tradition. Matthew's substitution of *ἀκολουθήσαντές μου* for *διαμεμενηκότες μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου*, and Mark's addition of *καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν*, are obviously secondary. Matthew assimilates to the new context (v. 27, *ἠκολουθήσαμεν*), Mark to that of the Source. The relation of this Q version of the *logion* to that of Mk. 9 35=Lk. 9 48b we need not here investigate.

The L source of Luke is strongly in evidence in his combination of the parable of the Good Samaritan with the last of the Markan anecdotes illustrative of Jesus' relation to the Law (Mk. 12 28–34 = Lk. 10 25–37). Mark's story must again be taken not as exceptional but as typical. Just as the Enquiring Pharisee illustrates Pharisaism at its best, so the Enquiring Scribe illustrates how scribism at its best can be "not far from the kingdom of God." Indeed Jesus' teaching on the whole subject of the Law is brought most effectively to a climax by just this means. The question regarding the Law, Jesus' answer, the scribe's expression of whole-

hearted approval and Jesus' reply: "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God" suggest to the reader as the very climax of the teaching, that if the scribes would only use the Law as here exemplified they might be the means of bringing Israel to repentance.

Luke has made two changes in this Markan anecdote. He has (a) revised the form in a way to express his own neo-legalism, (b) he has added a supplement from L of opposite bearing, that is, one which displays the anti-legalism of the older sources, among which we include Mk., as well as S and L. The inconsistency between L revised and L unrevised constitutes one of the strongest objections to Streeter's view of the relation, viz, that Luke himself, our third evangelist, is the writer of both, the present Gospel being only an expansion of Luke's own earlier work prepared before he had become acquainted with the Gospel of Mark.

In rewriting Mk. 12 28–31 Luke gives it the same neo-legalistic twist that Matthew has given to Jesus' answer to the enquiring Pharisee, viz, the assurance that observance of the Christianized Law *does* entitle to "eternal life." Having drawn from the scribe (who is represented in v. 25 as asking not in good faith but "to tempt him," or "put him to the test") the desired passage from the Law Jesus is made by Luke to say in so many words: "Thou hast answered well; *this do and thou shalt live.*" Surely there is little difference to be found between this conception of the gospel message and that of Mt. 19 17 b–19.

The story of the Enquiring Scribe in Lk. 10 25–28 is either a Lukan adaptation of Mk. 12 28–31, or a pre-Lukan adaptation of pre-Markan material, this latter being a decidedly complicated theory to maintain. Either way the use of it as a framework for the parable of the Good Samaritan produces an egregious misfit. The parable does *not* answer the question it is supposed to answer, "Who is my neighbor?" To make it do so Samaritan and victim would have to exchange parts, so as to teach the extension of the term "neighbor" even to one who in Lk. 17 18 is called an "alien" (ἀλλογενής). On the contrary the parable intrinsically answers the question, "Who is the true exponent of divine law?" And the answer is based on the same 'prophetic'

principle which we have seen in Mk. and Q to be characteristic of Jesus. Its real teaching is that not the priest or Levite, who in the O.T. is the official expounder of the Law, is worthy to be so regarded unless he shows mercy. Even the "alien" is a better teacher if he be an imitator of God and walk in love toward his fellow-man. He who conceived the parable of the Good Samaritan had the same attitude toward the Law as he who uttered the great discourse on the Righteousness of Sons. He stands with Isaiah against mere book-religion. But the application of it made in Lk. 10 25–28 is as far from this as Matthew's application of Jesus' saying about divorce. Jesus with Malachi regards mercy and good faith as laws of God capable of holding together marital relations which human ordinances put asunder. Matthew reports the great saying as if Jesus were merely taking sides with Shammai against Hillel.

We have referred above to another *logion* of L in Lk. 17 7–10, which if not at odds with its context is out of all relation to it, and which reflects the same doctrine of 'grace' in opposition to legalism as our Gospel of Mark. Perhaps these two, taken together with the famous example of the Elder Brother of the parable complaining of the undeserved favors extended to the repentant prodigal (Lk. 15 11–32), and the equally conspicuous instance of the Thief on the Cross (Lk. 23 39–43), should suffice to show that whatever the attitude of the third evangelist himself to this question of merit vs. grace, L, the peculiar material which Luke uses but which is not traceable elsewhere, has the same anti-legalistic animus as Mark.

But if it be true of Luke that his source sometimes displays a less legalistic attitude than his own this is even more conspicuously the case with Matthew. The parable of the Dissatisfied Wage-earners (Mt. 20 1–16) does such violence to the traditional feeling of merit as the only proper basis for God's treatment of men that we are surprised to find it admitted to any of the canonical Gospels, most of all to the pages of Matthew, with whose doctrine of reward proportioned to "good works" it ill consorts. The explanation of its admission would seem to be that to Matthew the

parable merely illustrates the *logion* which he places before it and again repeats at its close, "The last shall be first, and the first last." To Matthew (if we may judge by 21 43) the parable was simply a prediction of the substitution of a new people of God after the original heirs of the promise had proved their unworthiness. Its intrinsic bearing is as obviously opposed to the neo-legalism of Matthew as the bearing of the parable of the Good Samaritan to the neo-legalism of Luke. As a shaft aimed at the heart of the Pharisaic doctrine of salvation by merit it goes hand in hand with the parable of the Prodigal Son. Its closing word, "Is thine eye evil because I am good?" might have been addressed by the father in Luke's parable to the grudging elder brother.

The placing of this parable of the Dissatisfied Wage-earners is also significant. It forms in Matthew the close of the Markan group whose purpose we have defined to be The Religion of Grace vs. the Religion of Merit. At least, then, Matthew has given it the place belonging to it, though he seems blind to its true significance.

But perhaps it will be said that this alleged blindness is unproved. There may even be those who regard it as a slander to ascribe to this evangelist a neo-legalistic animus. The question can only be decided by consideration of all the evidence. We have three ways of determining what Matthew's propensity really is on this all-important question of the apostolic age: (1) By the general structure and composition of his Gospel, taken together with peculiarly Matthean expressions, such as the closing parable attached to the seven-fold group of Parables of the Kingdom constituting his third 'Sermon', and the closing words of his Gospel (Mt. 28 20). To most critics these phenomena suffice to show that to Matthew's mind the Christian message is a promulgation of the *nova lex*, i. e. the Torah of Moses amplified and spiritualized by Jesus. On this point agreement of expositors is so general that we need hardly expatiate upon the points already adduced, fear and hatred of the teachings of "lawlessness" from which the Church is suffering in his time, reiteration with redoubled emphasis of the doctrine of rewards and penalties in the world

to come, where "good works" are to be the sole basis of judgment. That Matthew's Gospel is distinctively Jewish-Christian in these particulars hardly calls for further demonstration.

(2) A second means of determining the distinctively "Matthean" viewpoint is comparison with Mark; for in addition to the general supplementation shared with Luke from the Second Source, wherein Matthew evinces a clear sense of Markan deficiencies on the side of teaching material, we have a series of detailed changes particularly affecting those portions of Mark where the more radical representations of the Roman evangelist come into the foreground. It will conduce to clarity if we consider these in the reverse order of their occurrence in Mark.

Mt. 19 16–22 gives a typical 'reversed vision' of the story of the Rich Enquirer, which, as we have seen, occupies the central place in Mark's group of anecdotes illustrative of Law and Grace. The method used combines Jesus' answer to the enquiring Pharisee of Mk. 10 17–22 with his answer to the enquiring scribe of Mk. 12 28–34. The result may best be shown by placing the two versions in parallel columns. In so doing we reverse the misleading habit of traditional practice, restoring to Mark that position in the left-hand column to which it is entitled by priority of date, and indicate by italics the changes introduced by Matthew.

Mk. 10 17–22	Mt. 19 16–22
17 And as he was going forth into the way a man ran up and kneeled to him and asked him: Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life? 18 And Jesus said to him, Why callest thou me 'good'? There is none 'good' save God only. 19 Thou knowest the commandments: Commit no adultery, no murder, no theft, bear no false witness, defraud not, honor thy father and thy mother. 20 But he said to him, Teacher, I have observed all these from my boyhood. 21 And Jesus looked upon him and	16 And lo, a man came up to him and said, Teacher, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life? 17 But he said to him, *Why askest thou me concerning that which is good?* One alone is 'good'. *But if thou wouldest enter into life, keep the commandments.* 18 *He saith to him, Which?* And Jesus said, The law "Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not bear false witness. 19 Honor thy father and thy mother," *and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."* 20 The

loved him, and said to him, One thing thou lackest, Go, sell all that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven, and come, follow me. 22 But he was downcast at the saying, and went away grieved, for it happened that he had great wealth.

young man saith to him: I have kept all these, wherein am I still lacking? 21 Jesus saith to him, *If thou desirest to be complete*, Go, sell all that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven, and come, follow me. 22 And when he heard it the youth went away grieved, for it happened that he had great wealth.

Matthew has rewritten the story in such a way as to answer the question, What is the way of eternal life? in a sense almost opposite to Mark's. Disregarding his minor modifications, such as the avoidance of Jesus' apparent deprecation of the designation 'good' in application to himself, we note his change of Jesus' answer from a denial that obedience to the Mosaic commandment gives claim to eternal life, to a positive affirmation that it *does* give such a claim, if in addition to the Mosaic decalogue one observe also the Christian Law of Love. There remains, after this change, no more room for the inculcation of self-surrender in the dedication of goods and life save as a counsel of perfection. But Matthew does not shrink even from this, carrying further the double standard advanced in verses 10–12. The very expression *εἰ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι* recalls the writer of 5 48. The neo-legalistic conception of the gospel as an addition of new to old also recalls the writer of 5 17–20 and 13 51 f.

Continuing with the same Markan group we find the phraseology of Matthew still more conspicuous in his recast of the Q promise Mt. 19 28 = Lk. 22 28–30 by which he supplements Mark's assurance of reward to the apostles for their following (Mk. 10 28); cf. Mt. 25 31. The motive of the addition is self-evident. But it has no direct bearing on the question of Law vs. Grace.

More important is it for our purpose to observe Matthew's rearrangement of Mark's story of the Question concerning Divorce (Mk. 10 1–12 = Mt. 19 1–12). By transposition to the end (vv. 7–8) of the verses which Mark had prefixed (vv. 3–5), and by addition of the clauses *κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν* in v. 3 and *μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ* in

v. 9, Matthew completely changes the picture. Jesus is no longer the prophet upholding the eternal divine principle of marital fidelity against the written ordinances of men, no longer a Malachi crying by the authority of conscience, "Jehovah hateth putting away," but is made to descend into the arena of scribal casuistry. In Matthew Jesus becomes a second Moses, pronouncing on the moot point of the two contemporary schools of scribal interpretation. He favors the strict constructionists of Dt. 24 1.

The treatment of Mk. 7 1–23 in Mt. 15 1–20 resembles that of Mk. 10 1–12 in Mt. 19 1–12. We expect, of course, omission of Mark's somewhat contemptuous description of Jewish ritual purifications in verses 2–4; but this is followed by a transposition of verses 9–13 placing them before verses 6–8. The effect is to rebuke the scribes and Pharisees for having constructed a hedge about the Law which instead of bearing it out is contrary to its spirit. Verses 12–14 add a prediction that such additions will be "rooted up" and the blind Pharisee will follow his blind guide, the scribe, into the ditch. The comment of Mk. 7 19b on the *logion* about inward cleanness, that Jesus thus abolished the Jewish 'distinctions of meats' also is of course omitted by Matthew. For to Matthew the distinction to be made is not that of Mark between the unwritten, inward law of God, and the imperfect attempts of men to codify it in "ordinances." To him the distinction is between a divine written Torah given to Moses, a "planting of the heavenly Father," and an unwritten Mishnah, a tradition of men which must be "rooted up" because it conflicts with the "commandment of God." Matthew has no disapproval even for the institution of official interpreters giving authoritative *halacha* from "Moses' Seat," if it be a *halacha* which is both correct and sincere (23 1–3). In fact that is to be the chief function of the Twelve. They are to be "scribes well instructed unto the kingdom of Heaven," so combining the former revelation with "the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven" as to be able to bring out of their storehouses things both new and old (13 51f.). At the head of this apostolic company stands Peter, endowed with the scribal authority of "the keys of the kingdom of heaven." He presides

over the group, like a *Tanna* over the college of scribes, and his pronouncements as to what is obligatory and what is not have even greater authority. "Whatsoever thou shalt 'bind' on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt 'loose' on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (16 19). This goes a step beyond even the Lukan attempt to endow the college of "apostles and elders" in Jerusalem with authority to "bind and loose" for the church at large (Acts 15 22–29).

(3) Our third means of determining the view-point of Matthew is his treatment of the Second Source. The question is a delicate one, since our only evidence for change is the witness of Luke, who himself may not always reflect the original. However, since both Luke and Matthew are affected, as we have seen, by the neo-legalistic tendencies of their age, differing only in degree in their precautions against moral laxity, we are not likely to go astray if we follow in each case the witness who displays less of this tendency. Moreover we have now the invaluable guide of Matthew's treatment of Mark. Observing how passages from Mark's Gospel bearing on this moot point of Jesus' relation to the Law have been rewritten we have every reason to expect that passages taken from the Second Source have undergone the same process. In cases where Matthew departs from Luke in the form he gives to the Q material, if the motive appears to be the same, if in addition the style, phraseology and standpoint are the same as in his departures from Mark, it will be safe to say that the Jewish-Christian evangelist himself, not some hitherto unknown source or form of the Second Source, is responsible. Such appears to be the case in marked degree in the so-called Sermon on the Mount, the great discourse of the first 'book' of Matthew, whose object is to present the whole duty of the Christian disciple in a new Torah, higher than that of Moses. The whole discourse consists of non-Markan material.

The variations of Matthew from Luke in reporting the discourse on the Righteousness of Sons have been studied individually in my own volume *The Sermon on the Mount* (1902), that of Professor C. W. Votaw of similar date and title, and the excellent

recent work of Marriott. The changes can only be enumerated here, but detailed study will show a consistent viewpoint and will more and more justify the conclusion, that a much larger responsibility for changes devolves upon this evangelist personally than Streeter and others are willing to grant. Viewed in comparison with the entire body of editorial material attributable to R^{mt}, the additions do not seem to exceed in amount and character what appears in similar connections from his hand elsewhere. No occasion therefore appears for recourse to a hypothetical outside source.

1. Matthew changes the Eight Congratulations and Woes of Lk. 6 20–26 into Eight Promises to those who fulfil the New Law. Two of the added promises are drawn from the Old Testament (Mt. 5 5 = Ps. 37 11; 5 8 = Ps. 24 4), the other two introduce a precept of peculiar importance to this particular evangelist (with 5 7 and 9 cf. 5 23 f.; 6 14 f.; 18 21–35 and Sirach 35 1–3). The Q Beatitudes in verses 3 f., 6 and 10 receive verbal modifications adapting them to the Matthean conception (*δικαιοσύνη* in v. 10 is Matthean).

2. Matthew prefixes to the comparison of the Righteousness of Sons with current ethics an elaborate agglutination in two parts: a) an Exhortation to Disciples to set an example of "good works" (5 13–16); b) a Defense of Jesus against the charge of "loosing" the Law and the Prophets (17–20, note *δικαιοσύνη* in v. 20).

3. Matthew appends after the comparison two long sections which deal with Reward in Heaven: a) a Warning against Externality in acts of worship (6 1–18, note *δικαιοσύνη* in v. 1 and the refrain "Thy Father . . . shall reward thee"); b) an Exhortation to lay up Treasure in Heaven (19–34, note the addition *καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ* in v. 33). As in 5 13–20 the material is drawn from authentic sources (largely Q), but the adaptation and, in part, the wording are Matthean.

4. Matthew has three additions to close this section: a) a Deprecation of too great zeal to win converts among the heathen (7 6; cf. 10 5 f.); b) an Assurance of answer to prayer (7–11, the

unused part of the Q section interjected in 6 9–13); c) the displaced summary v. 12 = Lk. 6 31 expanded by the editorial clause, "For this is the Law and the Prophets;" cf. 5 17.

5. Matthew prefixes to the closing parable of the discourse on The Righteousness of Sons a sure Foundation (7 24–27 = Lk. 6 47–49) a long Warning against the teachers of "Lawlessness" (*ἀνομία*), using as an authentic nucleus the plea of the discourse for radical change of nature instead of merely external reform (v. 17 f. = Lk. 6 43 f.), and expanding by a complete rewriting of the Q discourse on the urgency of immediate repentance (7 13 f. = Lk. 13 23–25).

A careful study of these five main changes made by our first evangelist in adapting the Q discourse on the Righteousness of Sons to his conception of the whole duty of the Christian disciple will certainly confirm the opinion we should draw from the closing verse of his Gospel regarding his view of the nature of the Christian message as a new and higher Torah. It will also make clearer than before his strongly neo-legalistic propensities, as reflected in the changes made by him in Mark's story of the Enquiring Pharisee. Finally it should go far to remove the scruples felt by many critics, especially English critics, against ascribing the rewriting of such a parable as Mk. 4 26–29 in Mt. 13 24–52 to the individual initiative of the Jewish-Christian evangelist, or the actual composition (not of course without an authentic nucleus) of such supplements to the discourses as Mt. 13 34–52; 18 23–35; and 25 31–46. The changes are too consistent in purpose and uniform in style to have been drawn in from outside sources. Aside from minute nuclei of traditional material they are the work of the evangelist himself.

The net result of our enquiry is that Matthew's attempt to counteract the antinomian laxity of the times and to correct the radicalism of the Roman evangelist has overshot the mark. He is far from doing justice to the historic Jesus by depicting him as a second Moses, laying down commandments for a higher righteousness enforced by rewards and penalties of the world to come. Matthew's age is the age of the Pastoral Epistles, James

and Jude; his special mode of combatting the common evil stands closest to Jude, while Luke's stands closer to James. It is true that Jesus was no iconoclast, that from the Gospel of Mark alone we might reach a false conception of his attitude; but the neo-legalism of Matthew goes much further astray. It misses the essential point, the vital sympathy of Jesus with the protest of the great prophets of the post-Deuteronomic age against the substitution of book-religion for the present teaching of the living God of goodness and truth. Missing this we miss the main clue to the conversion of Paul and his devotion to the Way of Jesus. Led back to it as we shall be when Gospel criticism shall have brought home to us the necessary inferences from its first great accepted result, the priority of Mark, we shall have begun to undo something of the damage and misunderstanding which for eighteen centuries have flowed from the false assumption that in this relatively late and Jewish-Christian Gospel the Church had the record of the life and teaching of Jesus in its most authentic and authoritative form.

It would be rash for one who in the field of Prof. Geo. F. Moore's *Judaism in the First Christian Centuries* (1927) is scarcely more than an amateur to express a judgment. Yet our attempt to go behind the later Synoptists to sources which more nearly express the attitude of Jesus and Paul on the great question of the relation of Law and Grace involves the necessity of forming such a judgment. If we are right in thinking the rewriting of Mark by Matthew and Luke to be due in no small degree to the effort of the post-apostolic Church to resist the growth of anti-nomian laxity, and that the real standpoint of Jesus was nearer than they represent to the standpoint of Paul, nearer still to that of Isaiah and the prophets, it involves support for the criticism of Moore's monumental work offered by an honored colleague under the title "Judaism in New Testament Times" in *The Journal of Religion* VIII. 1 (Jan., 1928, p. 61). Prof. F. C. Porter therein expresses as follows his sense that Jesus and Paul are essentially at one in their revolt against the tendencies of Judaism in their time to become a religion of the book:

> The Mishnah is the classical expression of a religion of a book, a religion of authority. The New Testament is the classic of a religion of a person, a religion of inwardness and freedom. I may be permitted to express my own conviction—it may seem just now a historical heresy—that this difference goes back to Jesus and was made by him, and that Paul is fundamentally right in his understanding of what the difference was and of what it signifies. In these statements I have gone outside of the region in which a discussion of Moore's *Judaism* should move. It is not, however, beyond the range of this discussion to express the two opinions that Jesus was not orthodox, and that Paul was not ignorant of Judaism.

If our study of the neo-legalism of Matthew lends confirmation to Professor Porter's well chosen words this alone would suffice to justify its publication.