

Dr. David Turner, Matthew

Session 1A – Introduction to Matthew I: Origins, Canonicity, Structure

Welcome to the course on the gospel of Matthew. This is David Turner, and this is Lecture 1A. The first lecture of the tape set on this gospel. As you work on all the tapes you want to have as a companion the supplemental materials, which you should have received from the Seminary. Lectures have in the supplemental materials and outline, which explains why he was going to most of them. They have some supplemental materials, which will help you follow and hopefully being able to do your own study of this wonderful book.

So, this is lecture 1 A we are dealing with some introductory matters. Not the most exciting material, but it's still helpful to understand the setting of The Gospel of Matthew. So please follow along on page 3. Take notes on that sheet if you so desire.

The origins of the Gospel of Matthew. The origins of the Gospel of Matthew is not easily ascertained as Matthew's Anonymous? As with the other three gospels, one can only make educated guesses about the author, the recipients, and the setting of this gospel. Such guesses are not hypotheses formed by noting the books, grammar, syntax, literary style, and by studying their distinctive themes by reading between the lines. So, to speak by noting Patristic Traditions, that is Traditions from the early church fathers, and such avenues of study.

These Traditions unanimously affirmed that the gospel of Matthew was the first gospel, which runs counter to modernity thinking in this respect. The gospel of Matthew was written by the Apostle Matthew

Well, let's think about the authorship for a moment. Though the gospel of Matthew is anonymous; it seems clear that it was indeed written by a scribe to Matthew the Apostle by the first quarter of the second century of the Common Era. When I use the term, was near. I use that to be the same as what most people mean, when they say a d or an odometer that year of Our Lord, you're at, is that rhyme with

just means they're the time, which began with Jesus when the Jews and Christians lived in the Common Era.

So, the gospel of Matthew was ascribed to Matthew the apostle, was the author by the first quarter of the second century of the Common Era. And notable ancient manuscripts have titles that are attributed to the Apostle. Matthew patristic, Traditions agree with this description in such places as Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, and 3.39 cites Papias from the early 2nd Century, Clement of Alexandria is cited by Eusebius. 614 Clement was from the early 3rd Century. Origen, cited by Eusebius and his Ecclesiastical History 6.25.4, points to Origen from the mid-third Century. All these individuals, the Papias, Clement of Alexandria and Origen, affirm that the Apostle Matthew is the author of The First Gospel.

The words of Irenaeus, from the late second century of the common era, agree with Eusebius. This additional fourth-century testimony to. This effect can be found in Jerusalem at the same. Yes, and the Jerome by the remarkable fact that this patristic tradition posits that Matthew was originally written in Hebrew will be discussed later under the note on canonicity and textual history.

The patristic testimony aside, most scholars are led by the Jewish orientation of Matthew to conclude that its author was a Jewish Christian, perhaps a Christian Jew a more historically accurate term. But there is a minority view, which asserts that Matthews Jewish trappings are the literary creation of a Gentile author's polemics against Judaism. I think that's a mistaken view, but there are those who hold it.

Now, it's the date of the book. It is very likely that there are allusions to Matthew in the Church. Father Ignatius, who lived in the late 1st and early 2nd Century of the Common Era. Also in a document called the Didache, a patristic document from the early 2nd Century of the Common Era. These early Illusions taken in conjunction with the Papias' testimony, which we mentioned the moment to go. Make it clear that Matthew was well known by the early 2nd Century accordingly. The turn must have written the gospel of the first century at the very latest. The current consensus, based on the Markan and priority view of gospel relationships, places Matthew's origin in the 80s or 90s of the Common Era. In some cases, this year is about to

buy into the idea that Matthew 24-25 constitutes a prophecy after the event about the destruction of Jerusalem.

Written after the destruction of Jerusalem, the excuse me, Common Era 70, that's a mistake put on the lips of Jesus. But there are those who argue that the situation of the developing church that emanated from Jamnia after the destruction of Jerusalem,

On the other hand, if one accepts the patristic testimony to Apostolic authorship of the date, it will probably need to be said earlier, that is, only if one takes Matthew 24-25 as I do as an authentic tradition from Jesus and not as a prophecy after the event, there is no need to date the Gospel after 70. Therefore, if one is not convinced that Matthew is dependent upon Mark, and I'm not. There's another reason for an early date. There are noteworthy scholars who favor a pre-70 AD from Matthew, and these would include such scholars as Craig Blomberg. Don Carson, Robert Gundry, Gerhard Meyer, Beau Ryka, and J.A. T. Robinson, but all in all, Scholars are not dogmatic about the date of the book.

Now the recipients and the occasion of the Matthew. Matthew's characteristics. Fulfillment formula quotations from the Hebrew Bible, and his presentation of a Jesus who came to destroy, but to fulfill the law and the prophets, are but two of the reasons why every student of Matthew must come to some conclusion about the relationship of these gospels recipients of Judaism. Scholars are divided on this issue, with some convinced that Matthew's Community. Contains many Gentiles and is already separated from the synagogue, Gundry and Stanton come to this conclusion. Others hold the opposite view that Matthew's Community is largely Jewish and is still connected with the synagogue, folks like Harrington, Overman, Salvareny, Seagal, and Sym.

And there are those who occupy a sort of middle ground between these two. Opponents argue that Matthew can be satisfactorily explained only when it is viewed against the background of an embattled minority, that is, Matthew's people, in the process of leaving the synagogue, that is the ones to whom Jesus is attacking. Hagner is one who takes that view.

In this course, the view that Matthew's Community is still engaged with the synagogue has been adopted. Scholars such as Overman Salverany and Sym have argued to get my mind conclusively to this effect, and the commentary probably takes this most clearly and consistently is the massive three-volume work by W. D. Davies and Dale Allison, in the International Critical Commentary series. That book is indispensable for anyone who wishes to really study Matthew in depth.

While many series have been proposed, the location of Matthew's Community will likely, never be known with anything approaching certainty. The city of Antioch has many advocates, but others suggest Tyre or Sidon, Kilpatrick; Galilee, Overman, or even Pella in the Transjordan, fellow named Slingerland came to that conclusion. It's a happy fact that grasping the message of this book does not depend on knowing the location of its original recipients.

The occasion of the gospel's writing and its purpose are, of course, not explicitly stated anywhere in it, and can only be approximated by hypotheses inferred from Matthew. Assuming that the audience is a Christian-Jewish Community, as I do, it is evidently a community that needs to understand how the life of Jesus, the Messiah, fulfilled the Hebrew Bible.

And how Jesus' teaching interpreted the Torah of Moses, 5:17, and falling. This community also needed to know why the entrenched non-Christian Jewish leaders were no longer to be followed, chapter 23.

The community also evidently needed to expand its horizons to the word Gentile mission. Matthew regularly portrays Gentiles in a positive light, as when the Gentile women are mentioned in Jesus's genealogy, 1:3, 5 and 6, and the face of Gentiles is stressed, 8:10, 15:28 and 27:54.

Such details from the narrative prepare the reader for the climactic commission that the community takes Jesus' message to all the nations 28:19. The following discussion, a Matthews theological emphasis, provides additional implications about the original purpose of the Gospel.

Now we move on to the matter of canonicity and history our second main issue here, in lecture 1A,

First, we need to consider the testimony of Papias. Foundational question in the textual history of Matthew is as possible. Origen is a Semitic text which was only later translated into our present Greek, Matthew patristic sources, which take this position. I've been sighted in the previous discussion of authorship. The earliest text is Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History 3.39.16, which cites Papias to the effect that Matthew collected the oracles about Jesus in the Hebrew language. And each one interpreted them as best he could

At first glance Papias. Excuse me, at first glance, Eusebius, citation of a Papias seems to say that Matthew had originally been composed in Hebrew and that later people, perhaps translated from that Hebrew original, translated it into our Greek gospel. Since our present, Greek Matthew does not read like a translation of a Hebrew original. Some argue that Matthew wrote both the gospel and a Greek Gospel. Others think that the Papias are oracles or sayings of Jesus which modern Source critics call you, or even the discourses of Jesus which are found in our Greek Matthew

But there seems to be no manuscript switch exemplified. This says some so-called Hebrew. Matthew is mentioned by Papias for these and other reasons, such as Gundry.

Proposed that the term in my Hebrew dialect actually does not mean the Hebrew language, but I submitted a style of writing or a rhetorical style, and that when it's the pious, each one interprets that it does not mean translation. But each one interpreted those as they saw fit. If this is the case, that Papias says that Matthew's style of composition was Jewish, and the subsequent individuals interpreted this Jewish style of writing to the best of their ability.

Perhaps such features as Matthews' genealogy and the stress on form are indicative of his Jewish compositional style.

As far as Greek manuscripts, go to textual history of Matthew is exemplified in a great number of them there more than 20 Uncial manuscripts, which contain complete or nearly complete text of Matthew among them Sinaiticus and Vaticanus abbreviated by Aleph

and B also codex, C, D & W, Codex Sigma additional ones, are 0211, I, k, m, u v, Delta Beta, Pi and Omega.

These are just some, and there are other manuscripts that contain portions of Matthew, including P 64 and P 67, P 77, P 1, P 45, P 53, and P 70 and on it goes, these manuscripts are somewhat earlier than the Uncial manuscripts just a mention, though. They are more fragmentary in addition to these Papyrus and unsealed manuscripts. So there are hundreds of minuscule switches that testify to the text. The Matthew is, of course, abundantly cited in patristic sources and often used in the church's lectionary, and it's translated into other early versions by the Christians in the early days. So there are a great many manuscripts available in the textual history of Matthew.

As far as the canonicity of Matthew goes, it was the most popular Gospel of the early church. And there was no doubt about its canonicity among the Orthodox, and he's in the eastern or western regions of the church. However, the heretic, Marcion, in the middle of the second century, along with his followers, he held to a Canon, which did not include Matthew, not to mention the Old Testament, Mark, John, and the general Epistles. Marcion affirmed a sort of Gnostic dualism between the Old Testament and New Testament as Revelations of two different gods. So Matthews' insistence on the fulfillment of the Old Testament by Jesus was Unthinkable to Marcion.

Marcion accepted only an edited version of Luke's gospel and the Pauline Epistles as his Canon. Evidently, his attack upon the early Orthodox canon was a major factor in the process that led to the formalization of the canon in the days to follow. In addition to the patristic sources already cited. The so-called Anti-Marcionite prologue to Luke and John, as well as the moratorium fragment, is dope. Both speak of the undisputed four-fold Gospel, the tradition of the church. We can also look at Irenaeus in his book Against Heresies. 3.11.8 Cyrilian, his Epistles 73:10 Clement of Alexandria 3.13, and other patristic sources to confirm the candidacy of Matthew.

I'm sure you've had enough of this, and this time to get into something a bit more interesting than the matter of how Matthew is put together as a piece of literature. So, we now move to our third main aspect of this lecture, literary matters, is the first aspect of the illiterate question: what kind of book is Matthew? What is a gospel?

What do we mean by the genre of the gospels as books, which have both history and theology

Due to apologetic concerns related to the need to affirm the historicity of the Gospel stories about Jesus, conservative evangelicals have at times been reluctant to view the gospels as theologically motivated. This occurs in response to Liberal scholarship, which tends to view the gospels as imaginative documents produced to meet the church's needs rather than to transmit reliable Traditions about Jesus. Such scholarship finds the gospel stories which in reality, reflect situations and controversies faced by the church after AD 70, rather than by the historical Jesus. An example of this type of thinking is the commentary by F.W. Bair in our bibliography. Evangelicals have rightly responded in the defense of the historical reliability of the gospels such people as Craig Blomberg's work by that title 1987a, but in doing sometimes the theological import of the gospels has been eclipsed.

Others have argued at times from misguided dispensational views that the gospels simply give us history in that we get theology from the New Testament Epistles, especially those of Paul. However, this history versus theology dichotomy, is false; the gospels narrate what really happened but do so, for theological reasons. According to Luke's Prologue Luke did careful historical research in order to ascertain the reliability of the oral and written tradition so, that Theophilus might be taught reliable truth about Jesus when they extrapolate from Luke's prologue to the gospel. It would seem that their procedure was to transmit the Jesus Traditions. They had received with a view to meeting the spiritual needs of their audiences.

That's what we have in the gospels, theological interpretations of selected Traditions, which the authors believe to be genuine historical events, which occurred during the life and ministry of Jesus.

This notion that the gospels contain theologically interpreted history is particularly important. When one notes the distinctive emphasis of each gospel. The gospel of John. This is made clear in chapter 20 verses 30 and 31, where the Evangelist states that he knew many things about Jesus, which you did not write about. But that he wrote about certain things, so that his audience might believe and have life.

So we come to the conclusion that the gospel authors did not write simply to satisfy the intellectual curiosity of the readers by piling historical data. Rather they wrote to disciple those respective communities by bringing selected episodes from the life of Jesus to bear on their respective needs. Thus the gospel narratives teachers, even today by showing a theological, an existential implications of reliable words of Jesus.

Source criticism and the synoptic problem. Even a cursory reading of the gospels reveals. The fundamental similarity is known as the synoptic problem. What are the first three gospels? So similar in some respects and so different in others. All Evangelicals believe in such matters solely through the Holy Spirit's leading of the Gospel. The author's reflection on Luke's prologue will take us beyond naive pietistic answers. It seems clear that Luke was aware of previously written. That counts 1:1 of his gospels, which in turn were based on reports circulating from early disciples and eyewitnesses, for this reason, this brief discussion of the synoptic problem is important.

Theories of a synoptic origin in relationships can be divided into two main groups: those that emphasize the literary independence of each gospel and those that posit, on the other hand, there is some literary interdependence among the gospels. As far as literary Independence, some scholars point out the prevalence of oral transmission of sacred tradition in the ancient Near East, the phenomenon of the gospels may be explained by their individual editing of readily available oral tradition without any necessity of them borrowing from each other, on a literary level.

Such an approach may account for the differences between the synoptics with some degree of success. But it seems the falter is a satisfying explanation of the synoptic agreements, which at times involve identical wording of extended passages.

Literary. Interdependence has seemed to have won the day and most scholars. Hold to the fact that Matthew was involved in utilizing a Mark when he wrote his gospel, and this literary interdependence. It was turned on its head from the modern back to the ancient because, as held by Augustine in any of the church fathers, they believe that the canonical order of the gospels represented the order of literary dependence. In more recently, the patristic approach to Matthean

priority was revised somewhat in the so-called Griesbach hypothesis, which posited that the market uses both Matthew and Luke.

While some still hold to the Matthean priority, this scholarly consensus today favors Markan priority with Matthew. And Luke composing, their gospel's independence of one, Mark and another hypothetical Source, known as Q which reportedly contained a collection of the sayings of Jesus. Sometimes, this view is known as the Two Source Theory, but it has been further developed into a Four Source theory with Mark and you are supplemented by an additional hypothetical Source M for Matthew and L for Luke.

As far as the position of this course goes, we are stressing a narrative approach to Matthew, not a documentary hypothesis approach as we will now, explain.

Narrative Criticism. The utility of arriving at anything approaching certainty in solving the synoptic problem, coupled with the atomizing tendencies of the source. Critical studies have led some to adopt another approach, a literary method, commonly known as narrative criticism. Narrative criticism views each gospel as a whole and draw conclusions about meaning, in theology, by comparing the parts of each gospel to the whole, rather than to these so-called hypothetical sources.

Powell in his book Narrative Criticism states that in order to read the gospels, like this "it is necessary to know everything that the text says. As soon as the reader knows, and to forget everything that the text does not assume the reader knows," that's on page 20 of his book. This approach seems fitting, that the gospels are viewed as theologically interpreted history written for the edification of Christian communities. One would think that the gospels function as wholes within these communities, not as overlays to be spread upon previous gospels as other sources. Modern Scholars have been understandably preoccupied with uncovering the history of the traditions, they find in the synoptics, but such an approach seems unlikely for the ancient Christian communities.

Narrative criticism seems much more appropriate than Source criticism for the study of the gospels in a church context, given the genre of the gospels as theologically interpreted history and the

canonical function of the Gospel as Holy Scripture. Therefore, this commentary will be a narrative critical study. All those Source critical matters will occasionally be noted

A weakness in literary criticism in general and criticism in particular is that the historical reference of the literary documents are usually ignored, as being beside the point. But when Holy Scripture is studied within an evangelical context the historical events interpreted by the literary sources must be held together.

Now, finally, the literary structure of Matthew's gospel. Grasping the structure of Matthew, is crucial in the narrative critical approach, which attempts to articulate the whole of the parts in framing the whole of the gospel.

Although some scholars such as Gundry and Harrington despair of outlining Matthew the following approaches are commonly found. Please look at the next page in your notes and compared to what I'm saying with the three approaches listed on page four. In the Markan outline, Matthew has frequently been analyzed along the chronological and geographical lines with seem to work well, in analyzing Mark, such an approach that typically yields and Analysis, which begins with Matthew as in Mark, having Jesus' public ministry in Galilee, leading him on a journey to Jerusalem, with his final days. His sad, betrayal, arrest, crucifixion, resurrection, and commissioning of the disciples.

In these cases, we have a sort of historical biographical approach to Jesus, but it does not at all engage Matthews' distinctive pattern of alternating narrative and discourse blocks of material.

A second approach to the structure of Matthew keys in on the phrase in 4:17 and 16:21, "from then on Jesus began." This is the approach of Jack Kingsbury and his writings, as well as David Bauer on the structure of Matthew. They have called this phrase, which occurs at two crucial junctures at 4:17, just after the account of the arrest of John the Baptist. Jesus' public Ministry begun with the words "from then on, Jesus began to preach" (16:21, just after Peter's confession that Jesus is the Messiah, Matthew says that from that point on, Jesus put his face towards Jerusalem and began to tell his disciples that he would be killed there. So, it's clear that these two verses 4:17 in

16:21 report even though they are important, the question seems to be more of a biographical marker than a literary device. In other words, these are key events in the biography of Jesus in the stages of his life and Ministry. But are these all that important to the structure of Matthew? I think not. I think that this is not all that different from the previous, the chronological geographical approach as stressed in the gospel of Mark. It doesn't really help us get into the matter, of how Matthew alternates narrative and discourse.

So, this moves us on to the third position, which is the view that is taken here throughout the scone about the, our lectures didn't say, Matthew have long noted, the unique juxtaposition of narrative, discourse material, signal by the phrase, "after Jesus had finished," at the end of the major narratives.

Acknowledging this Matthean structural pattern does not necessitate accepting Bacon's, you that Matthew sets up five books of Jesus, which answer the five books of Moses in the Pentateuch.

The outline based on this unique form is found in your supplemental materials, there on page four, and a more detailed version of it. It is also found later in the supplemental materials, where you can see it in a nutshell there on page four. It seems that this shows us clearly that Matthew was trying to tell us, not simply what Jesus did, but primarily what he said. And this is the unique feature of Matthew, which distinguishes it from Mark.

Matthew, if you compare it with Mark on, just about any given pericope or episode you'll find that Matthew has the event, condensed Mark's narrative details, but has expanded the teaching of Jesus. The teaching of Jesus, then is featured in Matthew's gospel in the unique discourses, which occur, of course, in chapters 5 through 7, notice on the outline on page 4, section, 2 B the discourse on Mission Section 3. B Chapter 10, the discourse on the parables, 4 B chapter 13, the discourse on relationships in the Kingdom, Chapter 18, that's section 5 B in the outline. And finally, the discourse, which is called the Olivet Discourse or the Eschatological Discourse of Jesus. After this eschatological discourse in chapter 26:1 Matthew says that after Jesus had finished, all these words. That may be significant, and that he is calling our attention to the fact that this is the final public teaching of Jesus. In The Gospel of Matthew, and "all these words"

are probably calls back to mind, the previous four discourses, as well as the fifth and final 1 in chapters 24 and 25.

So, please tell, look at the outline on page four the bottom half of the page based on the phrase, "after Jesus finished," look that up and pay attention to that because it seems that is a marker of how we need to understand the way the gospel of Matthew fits together.

This is the end of the first lecture. We'll see you around the corner in lecture 1 B.