THE LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION

To All the Nations

Lutheran Hermeneutics and the Gospel of Matthew

To All the Nations
Lutheran Hermeneutics and the Gospel of Matthew

LWF Studies 2015/2

THE
LUTHERAN
WORLD
FEDERATION

To All the Nations

Lutheran Hermeneutics and the Gospel of Matthew

Edited by
Kenneth Mtata and Craig Koester

LWF Studies 2015/2

Bibliographic information published by the German National Library

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the internet at dnd.dnd.de

Printed in Germany · H 7981

This book was printed on FSC-certified paper

Cover: The Saint John's Bible. In 1998, Saint John's Abbey and University commissioned renowned calligrapher Donald Jackson to produce a hand-written, hand-illuminated Bible. Photo © LWF

Editorial assistance: Department for Theology and Public Witness
Layout: Department for Theology and Public Witness
Design: LWF-Office for Communication Services
Printing and Binding: Druckhaus Köthen GmbH & Co. KG

Published by Evangelische Verlangsanstalt GmbH, Leipzig, Germany, under the auspices of
The Lutheran World Federation
150, rte de Ferney, PO Box 2100
CH-1211 Geneva 2, Switzerland

ISBN 978-3-374-04233-3
www.eva-leipzig.de

Contents

Theology of the Cross, Liberation and Discipleship

Matthew, Judaism and Lutheran Tradition

Preface

Martin Junge

The Gospel of Matthew begins with the "account of the genealogy of Jesus the Messiah, the son of David, the son of Abraham" (Mt 1:1) and ends with the instruction to go to "all nations" (Mt 28:19) with the good news of the Messiah. This universal view is symbolized by Abraham and Sarah, leaving their own people to encounter people they did not know. This captures well what gospel means in Matthew.

Matthew not only includes the recognized and highly regarded patriarchs of Israel but also some "strange" women, namely Tamar, Rahab, Ruth and Bathsheba, in Jesus' family tree.

Theoretically, the stories of these women should have disqualified them as matriarchs of Jesus: Tamar was the victim of rape (Gen 38); Rahab a Canaanite harlot (Josh 2–6); Ruth a foreigner who accompanied her mother-in-law after they had both been widowed; and Bathsheba "the wife of Uriah" (2 Sam 11:3), the victim of a king, who abused his power and forced himself on her, and who, as a result, bore a son, Solomon.

The Gospel of Matthew places the birth of Jesus in an ambivalent context: a place of familiarity and strangeness. Jesus is presented as one who walks with both "insiders" and "outsiders." The message of the gospel in Matthew builds bridges between the nations and Israel.

Such apparent internal contradiction in Matthew merits serious study in community as has been happening within the LWF hermeneutics program since its inception in 2011.

First, bringing together Lutherans from all parts of the globe provides the opportunity to do more than simply to confirm the readers' diverse contextual experiences. Matthew shows us that by attentively reading together we encounter the good news that God has broken boundaries between people who were estranged from each other. Even those with less heroic or attractive histories are invited to hear the good news that Jesus brings.

Second, studying Matthew through this lens of ambivalence allows us to encounter the good news in the strangest of places. Good news comes from God but God chooses to appear there where we sometimes do not expect to find God. Hermeneutics therefore sharpens our eyes and ears to see and hear what God is doing.

Third, on the one hand, a hermeneutic informed by the Gospel of Matthew is comforting because certain features are familiar to us, while, on the other, it is uncomfortable since some features are strange to us. A critical, communal and attentive reading of the Gospel of Matthew allows us to recognize the good news, even in the most ordinary words and stories of God's action in the world.

In light of the 500th anniversary of the Reformation, which recalls the rediscovery of grace, we embrace this hermeneutic of an open invitation to the banquet (Mt 22:1-14) informed by the Gospel of Matthew. We encourage the churches of the Reformation to rediscover the grace that invites all in the story of Jesus' genealogy. When Jesus calls us to go and make disciples or learners "of all nations" (Mt 28:19), he opens up a possibility for us to go beyond that which is familiar to us, to build bridges from the known to the unknown. As we accept this invitation, this promise also becomes a reality for us: "I am with you always, to the end of the age" (Mt 28:20). I commend this book to you for study at home, in the churches, seminaries and universities. God is with you to the end of the ages.

Introduction to Matthew and Lutheran Hermeneutics

Introduction

Craig Koester and Kenneth Mtata

> Do not think that I have come to abolish the law or the prophets; I have come not to abolish but to fulfill (Mt 5:17).

Matthew's Gospel has always had a central place in the life of the church. This is the gospel that gives us the Sermon on the Mount and the version of the Lord's Prayer that is most commonly used in Christian worship. It contains the story of the magi visiting the infant Jesus, which figures prominently in the celebration of Christmas and Epiphany. Matthew's version of the passion narrative has inspired such musical compositions as Johann Sebastian Bach's Saint Matthew Passion, which continues to be performed each year during Holy Week.

Yet, Matthew's Gospel has also had a peculiar relationship to Lutheranism. In Luther's Preface to the New Testament of 1522, he commented that John's Gospel, Paul's letters, and 1 Peter far surpassed Matthew and the other gospels in their importance for the church's proclamation. Among Lutheran interpreters of the Bible, a common hermeneutic has involved the contrast between law and gospel. Those categories were drawn from Paul's letters, and the practice of contrasting them has contributed to negative perceptions about the law. Yet, Matthew has a much more positive perspective on the law, emphasizing that Jesus came not to abolish it but to fulfill it.

In 2014, Lutheran scholars from around the world met at the Lutheran School of Theology in Chicago, to consider Matthew's Gospel from perspectives that are informed by the Lutheran tradition and the contexts of the church globally. This was the third in a series of hermeneutics consultations organized by the Lutheran World Federation in anticipation of the 500th anniversary of the Reformation in 2017. Like the previous consultations that focused on the Gospel of John and the Psalms, this one included scholars

from LWF member churches, Jewish scholars, ecumenical partners and related institutions. The essays in this volume were initially presented at the consultation in Chicago.

The first part considers the way in which interpretive frameworks inform how we read the biblical text. Current scholarship on Matthew's Gospel has often focused on historical questions, including theories about the way in which the Gospel preserves and adapts traditions about the life and message of Jesus, and how it relates to first-century social contexts. The most common view among scholars is that Matthew developed Mark's basic narrative, which means that Matthew is seen as secondary and less significant. Yet, contributors to this volume ask whether attention to the theological aspect of Matthew might help us to reclaim the value of this Gospel.

Matthew's attitude toward the Jewish Law or Torah is different from that of Paul, and these essays point out that the distinctiveness of Matthew's perspective needs to be recognized. They also call for greater clarity about how the Lutheran categories of law and gospel are to function. Some interpreters have used those categories to divide up biblical books according to content, but for Luther and Melanchthon they had to do with the way in which texts function in proclamation. Law and gospel have to do with the effect of the preached word on the listener, and whether the message indicts the listener or brings assurance and comfort. The same biblical passage can function as either law or gospel, depending on its effect. Returning to this dynamic understanding of law and gospel holds promise for contemporary preaching.

The second part focuses on the Sermon on the Mount, which is one of the best known and yet most disputed parts of Matthew's Gospel. This is where Jesus says that those who are angry with someone will be subject to divine judgment (Mt 5:21–22). He says that people are to love their enemies (Mt 5:44) and to "turn the other cheek" when someone strikes them and not resist those who are evil (Mt 5:39). Yet, many interpreters recognize that acting thus would soon lead to a breakdown in civil society, because those with power would oppress those who are more vulnerable.

The Sermon on the Mount also presents distinctive challenges for Lutheran interpreters. Whereas some might want to emphasize justification by faith alone, these chapters give specific directives concerning the living of life, and such directives seem more like law than gospel. Accordingly, a common pattern for Lutheran interpreters has been to treat the demands in the Sermon on the Mount as a means of revealing human shortcomings, so that people become aware of their need for the gospel.

It is surprising that Luther's own interpretations of these chapters in Matthew assume that the directives are intended to shape the living of

life. Since the Sermon on the Mount begins with the Beatitudes, which proclaim that people are "blessed," Luther reads the entire passage under the assumption that it offers good news rather than law to the listeners. Yet, he takes the ethical dimension seriously. On the one hand, he does not want to restrict its rigorous character to a select group of people, like those who retreat from secular life by going to a monastery. On the other, he does not take it as a straightforward design for civil society, as some of the radical reformers did. Instead, he considers the idea of love for the enemy in light of the need for people in positions of authority to order society for the sake of its members. The essays included here explore these dimensions and their implications for contemporary readers.

Part three considers aspects of Matthew's Gospel in light of contemporary theological understandings of liberation and the strong emphasis on a theology of the cross in the Lutheran tradition. Each essay works with a keen sense of the reality of suffering as it is experienced in different social contexts. Matthew's Gospel tells of Mary, Joseph and the child Jesus moving to Egypt in order to seek refuge from persecution (Mt 2:13–18). Given the current movements of migrants, who now seek places of safety outside their homelands, the story in Matthew can contribute to a theologically informed response, which highlights Christ's identification with those who are vulnerable and displaced. Similarly, the final chapters of Matthew recount the crucifixion, in which Christ undergoes suffering and marginalization. The Lutheran emphasis on the theology of the cross points to the way in which Christ identifies with those who suffer, and that makes it possible for people to identify with Christ. The challenge noted in this volume is to construe the message of Jesus' suffering in a manner that does not end with the acceptance of oppression but includes the prospect of change.

The fourth part turns to the difficult question of the relationship of Matthew's Gospel and the Lutheran tradition to Judaism. Matthew's account of Jesus' trial depicts the Jewish leaders declaring that Jesus' blood should be on them and on their children (Mt 27:25). That passage contributed to the idea that Jews are the killers of Christ, which fueled Christian anti-Semitism. The negative attitude toward "law" in Lutheran theology and Luther's own pointedly anti-Jewish statements have been associated with tragic consequences in violence against Jews.

The essays in this section take the troubled history of relationships between Jews and Christians—especially Lutherans—as an occasion for dialogue that can lead to a better understanding of one another and of our own traditions. Joint reflection on Matthew's Gospel is a factor in that it includes a positive appreciation of Jewish law and tradition. At the same time, attention to Jewish tradition calls for a more nuanced view of the

Pharisees than is apparent in Matthew's narrative. It involves recognizing that Jesus' disputes with his opponents, as depicted by Matthew, reflect differences between members of the Jewish community, who share a common tradition while differing over its interpretation. The process is a dynamic one that can lead to new insights and relationships among Jews and Christians today.

Together, these essays are an invitation to consider Matthew's Gospel in ways that are theologically engaged and attentive to contemporary social contexts. The contributors come from various parts of the globe and their perspectives are informed by the situations in which they live and work as well as by a theological tradition rooted in the Reformation. In the sixteenth century, the Lutheran movement was shaped in major ways by the interpretation of Scripture. These essays show some of the ways in which engagement with Scripture continues to be a central and enlivening aspect of Lutheran communities today.

Contemporary Approaches to Matthew: A "Lutheran" Critique

Eve-Marie Becker

The rise of the status quo

In synoptic studies, the Gospel of Matthew frequently appears to be of secondary importance only. Matthew tells us something about the early reception of Mark rather than revealing to us how the concept of early Christian gospel writing originated. This perspective on Matthew is the result of around 200 years of research during which the assumption of the so-called Markan priority has been generated: Mark is regarded as the earliest gospel and was later used as a source, or *Vorlage*, by such gospel writers as Matthew and Luke. As Mark's successor, Matthew preserved and only slightly revised the Markan gospel outline.

The hypothesis that Mark was the first gospel to be written has a history of its own. Karl Lachmann among others posits that it is motivated by what we could call the scholarly optimism of philologically reconstructing Christianity's literary origins. In nineteenth-century Protestant theology, this hypothesis constituted a significant paradigm shift from how, from patristic times onwards, interpreters such as Jerome, Augustine and John Chrysostom[1] up to Luther and even Gotthold Ephraim Lessing have read and understood the Gospel of Matthew: According to its position in the New Testament canon as the first and, probably, most original gospel writ-

[1] Cf. Peter Widdicombe, "The Patristic Reception of the Gospel of Matthew. The Commentary of Jerome and the Sermons of John Chrysostom," in Eve-Marie Becker and Anders Runesson (eds), *Mark and Matthew II, Comparative Readings: Reception History, Cultural Hermeneutics, and Theology*, WUNT 304 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 105–19.

ing and, last but not least, because of its direct historical affiliation to a disciple figure[2] it was thought most authentically to lead its readers back to the actual beginnings of the gospel proclamation, originally in Hebrew.[3]

After such a long reception history of privileging Matthew, the nineteenth-century's prioritizing of Mark has persistently challenged gospel exegesis. Redefining the "historical order" of the gospels has qualitative implications: Matthew is only number two then. This scholarly view had and continues to have an impact on exegetical work,[4] mainly with regard to preparing scholars for approaching Matthew in terms of redaction criticism: Matthew only rearranges the outline of Mark's Gospel. In the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the premise of the Markan priority has been further developed and modified. Still, in contemporary scholarly debates it widely reflects a major consensus among exegetes: it mostly appears as the so-called two-source hypothesis. We assume that Matthew is built on expanding Mark and incorporating a second source, the source Q:[5] The Gospel of Matthew obviously contains a vast amount of sayings (Q; QMt) that are transmitted independently of Mark. As is the case in crucial parts of the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5–7), the sayings material can refer back to the historical Jesus and thus is of elementary meaning for reconstructing the historical Jesus figure and its message.

Currently, both types of research quests—Matthew's reception of Mark and Matthew's value as a special source to the historical Jesus—widely define scholarly work. They even function as a rationale for Matthean exegesis, whenever contemporary studies either (a) try to identify Matthew's literary and/or socio-religious profile, or (b) take Matthew in its special transmission of Jesus sayings as a historical document for first-century Judaism.

Profiling Matthew in literary, socio-religious and theological terms

Based on Graham N. Stanton's earlier survey, which was rooted in redaction criticism,[6] David C. Sim points out that in Matthean studies the "defining

[2] Cf. Eusebius, Historia ecclesiastica 3:39.5.

[3] Ibid., 3:24.6; 5:8.2f., cf. also Irenaeus, Adversus haereses 3:1.1.

[4] Cf. J. Andrew Doole, *What was Mark for Matthew? An Examination of Matthew's Relationship and Attitude to his Primary Source,* WUNT 2.344 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013).

[5] It is claimed that Matthew has made use of a third type of source: the so-called special material ("M") which is unique, i.e., it is not shared by Luke. Cf. e.g., Ulrich Luz, "Art. Matthäusevangelium," in RGG[4] 5 (2002), 916–20, here 918; Ulrich Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. 1. Teilband Mt 1-7*, EKK I/1 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlagshaus, [5]2002), 47–52.

[6] Cf. Graham N. Stanton, "The Origin and Purpose of Matthew's Gospel: Matthean Scholarship from 1945–1980," in *ANRW* 2.25.3 (1985), 1890–1951; cf. David C. Sim,

issue for the past two decades has been the social setting of the Gospel and its underlying community."[7] Sim emphasizes how the debate is actually about "whether this Christian community was still within Judaism or had separated from it, both physically and ideologically."[8] Accordingly, the questions to be discussed are, Where did the Gospel of Matthew "stand in relation to the broader Jewish community? Where did it stand in relation to the variety of viewpoints in the emergent Christian movement? How did it relate to the Gentile world and the issue of Gentile converts? What was the attitude towards Rome, and how were these views expressed in the Gospel narrative?"[9]

In his survey of more recent research, Sim evaluates Matthew's relation to Judaism and the Gentile world and from there reflects on its standing in earliest Christianity.[10] A variety of scholars make the case for an intra muros conflict (e.g., David Sim, Warren Carter, Boris Repschinski and Anders Runesson) according to which "the Matthean community was engaged in an internal Jewish conflict," while another, meanwhile possibly minor group of scholars, tend to support Stanton's extra muros position (e.g., Roland Deines, Ulrich Luz).[11] As we can see here, the Gospel of Matthew is closely related to Judaism—more precisely, it is possibly even of Pharisaic provenience.[12] Sim guesses that especially the "question of Matthew's position within the very broad first century Christian movement will significantly increase in importance."[13] He claims that "Matthew's Christian Jewish theology was to a large extent opposed to some fundamental aspects of the Pauline Gospel"—he calls it: Matthew's "anti-Paulinism."[14] This appraisal is similar to how especially Gerd Theißen reads the speech parts in Matthew as hidden polemics against Paul (cf. e.g., Mt 5:19).[15]

"Matthew. The Current State of Research," in Eve-Marie Becker and Anders Runesson (eds), *Mark and Matthew I, Comparative Readings: Understanding the Earliest Gospels in their First-Century Settings,* WUNT 271 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 33–51, here 48.

[7] Ibid., 35f.

[8] Ibid., 36.

[9] Ibid., 36.

[10] Cf. on this Warrant Carter, "Matthew: Empire, Synagogues, and Horizontal Violence," in Becker and Runesson, op. cit. (note 6), 285–308.

[11] Cf. the references in Sim, op. cit. (note 6), quote 38.

[12] Anders Runesson, "Rethinking Early Jewish–Christian Relations: Matthean Community History as Pharisaic Intragroup Conflict," in *JBL 127* (2008), 95-132; Anders Runesson, "Building Matthean Communities. The Politics of Textualization," in Becker and Runesson, op. cit. (note 6), 379–408.

[13] Sim, op. cit. (note 6), 51.

[14] Ibid., 45.

[15] Cf. Gerd Theißen, "Kritik an Paulus im Matthäusevangelium? Von der Kunst verdeckter Polemik im Urchristentum," in Oda Wischmeyer and Lorenzo Scornaienchi (eds), *Polemik in der frühchristlichen Literatur. Texte und Kontexte,* BZNW 170 (Berlin/

When contextualizing Matthew within the Christian movement of the first century, questions regarding the literary genre and the specifics of Matthean theology appear on the scene: Some scholars see Matthew in close relation to ancient biography (e.g., David E. Aune);[16] others—by proceeding from the narrative pragmatics of conflict language—define the Matthean Gospel as an "inclusive story" (e.g., Ulrich Luz).[17] When it comes to a theological profiling of Matthew, three types of accentuations are assessed: first, Matthew provides a shift in his portrayal of the Jesus figure (especially Christology, Mt 1:23; the empowered teacher, Mt 5–7), secondly, a more elaborate concept of discipleship and community (e.g., Mt 18; 28:16–20), and thirdly a comprehensive reflection on ethics (e.g., Mt 5–7).[18]

It is by no means accidental that the Sermon on the Mount is at the center of interpretation: As it is an example par excellence for the Matthean composition technique, it is pivotal for Matthean theology and ethics and thus inspires political readings[19] as much as liberation theology. However, hermeneutical interests largely depend on exegetical premises: while a theological inspired reading of Matthew appraises his dealing with the two sources, Mark and Q, current contributions to feminist criticism tend to focus on text passages which are unique for Matthew ("M"), such as the genealogy in Matthew 1.[20] Migration or immigration studies can easily join in (cf. Mt 2:13–23). Such a scientific aim can be of value: while since patristic times gospel exegesis has tended to harmonize the different gospel stories,[21] modern readings—informed by historical-critical exegesis—are more ambitious in uncovering specific sources

New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2011), 465–90. In a general sense, Sim analyzes Matthew's polemics against scribes and Pharisees, false Christians, Gentiles and the Roman Empire. David C. Sim, "Polemical Strategies in the Gospel of Matthew," in ibid., 491—515. On polemics, cf. also Lorenzo Scornaienchi, "The Controversy Dialogues and the Polemic in Mark and Matthew," in Becker and Runesson, op. cit. (note 6), 309–21.

[16] David E. Aune, "Genre Theory and the Genre-Function of Mark and Matthew," in Becker and Runesson, op. cit. (note 6), 145–75.

[17] Luz, "Art. Matthäusevangelium," op. cit. (note 5), 917f. Luz, "Das Evangelium nach Matthäus," op. cit. (note 5), 46f. The history of Jesus (Jesusgeschichte) "stellt ihnen, die in ihrer eigenen Geschichte und in der matthäischen Jesusgeschichte die Feindschaft von Israels Führern und die Trennung von Israel (vgl. 24,1f) erlebt haben, vor Augen, daß der Konflikt in und mit Israel der weg ist, den Gott selbst Jesus geführt hat. *Die von Matthäus erzählte Jesusgeschichte… stabilisiert die christliche Identität der Gemeinde"* (47).

[18] Luz, "Art. Matthäusevangelium," op. cit. (note 5), 919f.

[19] Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, op. cit. (note 5), 288f.

[20] J. Capel Anderson, "Mark and Matthew in Feminist Perspective: Reading Matthew's Genealogy," in Becker and Runesson, op. cit. (note 1), 271–88.

[21] Cf. e.g., how Eusebius (e.g., Historia ecclesiastica 1:7.1ff.) intends to harmonize the Lukan and the Matthean version of the genealogy.

and materials in Matthew in order to mark differences between various gospel accounts possibly caused by religious or theological conflicts.

Matthew and the transmission of Jesus traditions

Somewhat in continuity with patristic exegesis according to which Matthew was an apostle who preached in Hebrew (Eusebius), current studies treat Matthew as a source that can most authentically provide access to the (original) teachings of the historical Jesus in their Jewish setting(s). Here, studies in the history of motifs and traditions that are especially collected within the sayings material (Q) and its Matthean adaption (QMt) are crucial. Once scholars see Matthew in close relation to Judaism—or even in an intra muros position—attempts are made to correlate Matthew to a group of (early Christian) writings that share the literary interest of transmitting Jesus traditions close to their Jewish origins. Hereby, the Gospel of Matthew as well as the Letter of James and the Didache, the teachings of the twelve apostles, are read as texts that possibly belong to the same Jewish–Christian milieu and contribute to similar ideological and religious discourses.[22]

Since, in accordance with the so-called "third quest" and its succeeding scholarly debate, historical Jesus research has highlighted Jesus' Jewishness, the Gospel of Matthew has continuously been moved into the sphere of first-century Judaism. This applies to the method of tradition history as much as redaction criticism: either the Matthean Gospel as a whole leads us back to the origins of the Jesus traditions or even to the historical Jesus or Matthew, as a literary author, is seen as significantly contributing to the formation of Jewish-Christian literature which adheres more explicitly to its Jewish roots. Both types of research quests impact the interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount. In a final step we will reflect on these paradigms in light of a Lutheran hermeneutical critique.

The Sermon on the Mount as a case study

Together with the missionary commission (Mt 28:16–20), the Sermon on the Mount functions formally and materially as a hermeneutical key. In the formal sense, Matthew 5–7 reflects Matthew's composition technique since here the author extensively combines the Markan narrative outline with Q and "M" material as much as redactional interests. In a material sense, Jesus continu-

[22] Cf., e.g.: Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen Zangenberg (eds), *Matthew, James and Didache: Three Related Documents in their Jewish and Christian Settings* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008); David Sim and Boris Repschinski (eds), *Matthew and His Christian Contemporaries* (London: T & T Clark International, 2008).

ously appears as a teacher and interpreter of the Torah in Matthew so that Jesus' final commissioning (Mt 28:20, *didáskontes*) de facto leads back to his previous teachings and sermons, such as chapters 5ff. (cf. Mt 5:2, *edídasken*).

We cannot have a look at Matthew 5–7 in its totality here, nor can we reflect in detail on the disposition of the Sermon on the Mount where the "Lord's Prayer" (Mt 6:5–13) has, without a doubt, a central position.[23] I will rather focus on Matthew 5:17–20 where Jesus' role as a lawgiver according to the Jewish tradition becomes most explicit.

> v. 17 Do not think that I have come to abolish the law or the prophets; I have come not to abolish but to fulfill.
> v.18 For truly I tell you, until heaven and earth pass away, not one letter, not one stroke of a letter, will pass from the law until all is accomplished.
> v.19 Therefore, whoever breaks one of the least of these commandments, and teaches others to do the same, will be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but whoever does them and teaches them will be called great in the kingdom of heaven.
> v. 20 For I tell you, unless your righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven.

In his careful exegesis of the text, Ulrich Luz presents a most complex analysis by distinguishing between tradition and redaction.[24] He largely sees verse 17 as a redactional element, possibly based on a traditional saying (cf. Mt 10:34); he relates verse 18a either back to Q or to a special Jewish–Christian tradition; and he defines verse 18b as a redactional addition; also verse 19 is identified as a mixture of tradition—deriving eventually from "strict Jewish-Christian Torah observant circles" or QMt—and Matthean redaction. Verse 20, on the contrary, is seen as a purely redactional addition.[25] Regardless of whether especially verses 18 and 19 can be traced back to tradition or have to be identified as Matthean redaction—both verses raise the question of how to interpret Matthew's ideas about the continuing validity of Jewish law. Accordingly, Luz concedes that especially verses 18f. are a *crux interpretum*. Since Luz himself sees Matthew as a substantial redactor at work here, he concludes his interpretation by stating that Matthew, in fact, means what is written: Jesus says, that the Torah and the prophets should be observed according to his own example.[26]

---

[23] Cf. Ulrich Luz, "Art. Bergpredigt I. Neues Testament," in *RGG*[4] 1 (1998), 1309–11, here 1310.
[24] Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, op. cit. (note 5).
[25] Ibid., 307f. (quote): "streng judenchristlich-gesetzestreue(n) Kreise(n)."
[26] Ibid., 321: ("[Matthäus meint] das, was da steht, wirklich...: Die Torah und die Propheten sollen nach der Meinung und gemäß dem Vorbild Jesu erfüllt, d.h. ganz, ohne jeden Abstrich, gehalten werden... ."