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Abstract

This study examines the use of the Tanakh (the Jewish canon of the Bible) in the gospels of Mark and Matthew. At its core is a comparison of Tanakh references in these gospels which focuses on two central questions: Does Matthew raise the prominence of the Tanakh in his gospel? Is there a correlation between Matthean adaptations of Markan references and the strength of his Jewish identity?

First and foremost, this investigation focuses on Mark, Matthew and the books that comprise the Tanakh in Greek (LXX) and Hebrew (MT). The gospels are surveyed according to NA²⁸, the LXX according to the Göttingen Septuagint series, and the MT according to BHS. Additionally, all major variants of these three texts are considered.

The first methodological step in this comparison is the categorization of the 104 Tanakh references in Mark into three groups - explicit, implicit, and subtle references - with one chapter devoted to each. In each chapter, I open by pointing out the main focus of the Markan references. On a verse-by-verse basis, I then determine whether each Markan reference relies on the LXX or the MT, and if its Matthean version makes the Tanakh presence more or less prominent. Each chapter concludes with a concise summary of these individual comparisons.

A fourth chapter provides a discussion of the four Matthean omissions of the first verse of the Shema (Deut 6:4), an overview of scholarly understandings of these omissions, and my explanation for their elimination.
The main findings of this study are: 1) Matthew tends to make explicit Tanakh references more prominent in his gospel. This trend is present, albeit less evident, in the implicit references, and it is reversed in the subtle references. 2) Both Mark and Matthew were probably able to independently translate from the Hebrew text of the Tanakh. 3) The phrase “God is One,” which appears four times in Mark, is entirely eliminated from Matthew. 4) The primary effect of Matthean modifications of Markan references is the elevation of Jesus’ image rather than Law observance.

Thus, the primary conclusions of this study are: 1) that the Tanakh presence is enhanced in Matthew. 2) However, the evidence does not support the notion that this pattern stems from a Matthean Judazation of Mark but, rather, from an attempt to underscore the divine identity of Jesus.
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Introduction

Contemporary scholars largely agree that Matthew tends to bring Mark’s references to the Tanakh\(^1\) closer to that source, whether by augmenting or intensifying existing references, or by articulating implied associations in Mark more overtly.\(^2\) This assertion, which is tested in this study through a reference-by-reference comparison of Matthew and Mark, is usually presented as evidence of Matthew’s deep interest in Jewish matters and often as proof of his strong Jewish identity.\(^3\) For instance, Anne O’Leary writes:

---

\(^1\) In this dissertation the Tanakh represents the Jewish canon of the bible whether in Hebrew or in Greek.


It has long been recognized that Matthew’s gospel has a more strongly Jewish flavor than Mark’s. In fact it is this judaization that is the most distinctive hallmark of Matthew’s meticulous rewriting of his Markan source. Matthew, much more so than Mark (or Luke), reflects a far greater engagement with Judaism, Pharisaism and Rabbinism.\(^4\)

She defines judaization as “the literary process by which Matthew, in rewriting Mark, increases the density of explicit and implicit references to Judaism and OT scripture.”\(^5\)

Thus, according to O’Leary, it seems that the process of Matthew’s expansion or elevation of the prominence of Tanakh references reflects his stronger Jewish identity.

On the basis of significantly more detailed research, Davies and Allison reach a similar, albeit more nuanced, conclusion:

Matthew rarely if ever shortened or omitted the OT references from his sources while he frequently expanded allusions and added quotations. Matthew, obviously, knew and treasured the OT in a way Luke apparently did not.\(^6\)

---

\(^{4}\) O’Leary, *Judaization*, 118. She later modifies this claim by noting that since they narrate the story of Jesus, who himself was a Jew, the gospels should all be considered Jewish.

\(^{5}\) O’Leary, *Judaization*, 118.

This assertion plus evidence that Matthew was able to read the Tanakh in Hebrew play a central role in their contention that “the signs point in one direction: the author of the first gospel was a member of the Jewish people.”

Other scholars have gone much further in their claims regarding Matthew’s Jewish identity by reconstructing the Matthean community, including its Jewish beliefs and observance of the Law, as well as identifying its rivals. Although a detailed discussion of these reconstructions goes beyond the scope of the current study, throughout this work, I will examine whether Matthew’s treatment of Mark’s Tanakh references reflects a move toward or away from Judaism.

At each step in this comparison of the first two gospels, I will consider how Matthew’s choices affect Mark’s references to the Tanakh, whether he renders them more prominent, less prominent, or unchanged. In other words, for each pair of references, I will analyze their composition and, ultimately, pose the question: do Matthew’s editorial moves make these references more noticeable or less significant? Beyond just keeping a tally, I will also assess the various strategies that Matthew employs to modify the presence of Markan

7Idem, 58.

8 See for example A. O. Ewherido, Gospel, 1–26; Sim, Matthew, 1–2; Luz, Theology, 105–106; Stanton, Gospel, 89–107; Saldarini, Christian.

Tanakh references. For instance, the addition of a formal introduction can heighten the prominence of an explicit reference. Similarly, the status of a reference can be elevated through various strategies: replacing one of Mark’s words or forms with a substitute that is closer to the Tanakh; adding a word or a verse from that original source; or, omitting words that are not in the Tanakh. A change of context can also increase the prominence of a Tanakh reference. Conversely, a reference can become less prominent or even completely indiscernible through the omission of introductions or similar words or forms, or by adding words that are not found in the Tanakh source.

**The Synoptic Problem**

Over the past century, the great majority of scholars have deemed the two-source theory as the best solution for the Synoptic Problem.¹⁰ This theory is based on three claims: Mark is the earliest gospel and it was used by both Matthew and Luke;¹¹ Luke was not familiar

---


with the gospel of Matthew;\textsuperscript{12} and, Matthew and Luke drew from a lost source that scholars refer to as Q.\textsuperscript{13} Thus, Mark and Q are seen as the sources of Matthew and Luke. Recently, however, E. P. Sanders, Michael Goulder, William Farmer and Mark Goodacre have launched a renewed challenge against this scholarly consensus.\textsuperscript{14}

The debate concerning Markan priority is essential to this study and therefore will be discussed in detail; by contrast, questions regarding Q’s existence are not as central, thus only a brief overview of that debate is presented.


\textsuperscript{13} Streeter, \textit{Gospels}, 182-332; Tuckett, “State,” 45-50;

Markan Priority

This study accepts the dominant scholarly position that Matthew is dependent on Mark.\(^\text{15}\) Perhaps the strongest argument for Markan priority is that the second gospel does not include material that is featured in Matthew and Luke such as the infancy narrative (Matt 1-2; Lk 1-2), the Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5-7), the Lord’s prayer (Matt 6:6-13; Lk 11:2-4), and resurrection appearances (Matt 28:9-10; Lk 24:15-31). Given that intentional omission of these key passages would be very difficult to justify, the simplest explanation is that Mark was not familiar with these traditions.\(^\text{16}\)

Nevertheless, alternative reasons for these glaring omissions have been posited. For example, some scholars claim that the scandalous circumstances of Jesus’ birth were an embarrassment for early Christians and, thus, were omitted by Mark.\(^\text{17}\) A few scholars suggest that Mark originally included a resurrection appearance which was lost at a


preliminary stage of its transmission.\textsuperscript{18} Others argue that the Sermon on the Mount, with its focus on Jesus as the new Moses, conflicted with Mark’s understanding of Jesus and, therefore, was excluded. On the whole, these arguments are unconvincing; most significantly, none adequately explains why Mark did not incorporate content from the double tradition in his gospel, which is necessary for establishing a different order of composition. It would be nearly impossible to assemble a plausible counter-theory since, in most instances, it seems that this material would have been compatible with Mark’s theology and narrative (for example, the Lord’s prayer: Matt 6:6-13/Lk 11:2-4; cf. Mk 11:20-25).\textsuperscript{19}

Furthermore, it is generally easier to identify possible motivations for Matthew and Luke to have omitted the relatively minor selections from Mark that are absent from their gospels than it is to explain the huge chunks Mark would have omitted, according to the alternate theories.\textsuperscript{20} Two healing stories exemplify this pattern: Jesus’ attentions that

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{19} Davies and Allison, \textit{Matthew 1-7}, 120; Goodacre, \textit{Q}, 29-31.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{20} Streeter, \textit{Gospels}, 171-172; Davies and Allison, \textit{Matthew 1-7}, 104-106; Evans, \textit{Mark}, lvii.
\end{flushright}
reverse the afflictions of a deaf mute (Mk 7:33-36) and a blind man (Mk 8:22-26). These portrayals present a Jesus who heals using saliva, insists on secrecy, and whose success requires more than one attempt. These combined elements may have been problematic for Matthew and Luke, who tend to depict a less human Jesus. More simply, the enigmatic passage where a naked young man flees after Jesus’ arrest (Mark 14:50-51) was probably omitted because of its strange perplexing nature. Support for Markan priority is further strengthened by that gospel’s tendency to offer the version that is more challenging to Christian theology when its passages have parallels in Matthew or Luke. For example, in the narrative of mass healing (Mk 1:32; Matt 8:16-17; Lk 4:40-41), Mark states that many were healed by Jesus, but the other two accounts tell of Jesus healing everyone. It is difficult to explain why Mark would replace complete healing with partial healing. Likewise, according to Mark 6:5, Jesus was incapable of performing miracles or acts of power in the Nazareth synagogue, whereas, in Matt 13:58, his inability is attributed to the local people’s lack of faith in Jesus. Here too, it is highly improbable that Mark would have


replaced Matthew’s account with a description of Jesus’ inability to perform miracles.\textsuperscript{25} Moreover, Mark’s writing tends to be less polished, and even cryptic, while Matthew presents a clearer and more sophisticated style.\textsuperscript{26} Thus, it is difficult to find a reason why Mark would have “chosen to rewrite Matthew in a cruder and less polished form.”\textsuperscript{27}

Hints in Matthew and Luke that seem to imply knowledge of events after 70 CE offer additional evidence of Markan priority. For example, in Matt 23:37-39 and Lk 13:34-35, Jesus prophesies that the Temple will become desolate and forsaken—a prophecy that is absent from Mark. Analogously, a Matthean parable (Matt 22:4-8) makes reference to a king who dispatches troops to destroy a city of murderers; in this context, Jerusalem is almost certainly the object of that attack.\textsuperscript{28}

Finally, indications in Matthew and Luke of editorial fatigue (when a copyist makes changes at one point in a text but forgets to implement them consistently, resulting in minor errors and contradictions), as identified by scholars such as Goulder and Goodacre, also

\textsuperscript{*} Goodacre, \textit{Q}, 32-34; Evans, \textit{Mark}, liii.


\textsuperscript{*} Goodacre, \textit{Q}, 25-27.
contribute to the case for Markan priority.\textsuperscript{29} By way of illustration, according to Matt 8:1-4, Jesus heals a leper in front of a large crowd, but then asks these witnesses not to mention his action. This contradiction seems to stem from the insertion of “the crowds” that follow Jesus, which typifies Matthew (Matt 4:25; 13:2; 15:30; 19:2) but never appears in Mark. Thus, the first evangelist seemingly forgot to modify the narrative to fit this change while retaining the command to not say anything to anyone (Mk 1:34; 3:12; 5:43; 7:36; 8:30) that characterizes the Markan Jesus. Similarly, Matt 14:1 corrects Mark’s erroneous reference to Herod Antipas as king (throughout Mark 6) with Tetrarch, the accurate title. Nonetheless, later in that chapter (Matt 14:9), Antipas is referred to as “King Herod.” Again Matthew appears to have copied Mk 6:26 without adjusting for his earlier modification.

\textbf{Q?}

As noted above, the prevailing scholarly view asserts that Matthew and Luke independently relied on a lost source that scholars refer to as Q. The existence or absence of Q has some bearing on the comparison of Mark and Matthew since, if Matthew were relying on both Q and Mark, Matthean changes of Markan references to the Tanakh that seem original to the first gospel – whether omissions (Mk 12:29-30/Matt 22:37; Mk 12:32/Matt 22:40), additions (Mk 1:2b/Matt 11:10b), or modifications (Mk 4:32/Matt \textsuperscript{29}Goulder, \textit{Midrash}, 35; Goodacre, \textit{Q}, 41-43.
13:32; Mk 8:31b/Matt 16:21) – might be traced to Q. Moreover, in one instance (Matt 21:44), certain scholars reject a Matthean verse as original to the text in part because of its seeming indication of Lukan dependence on Matthew.\textsuperscript{30} However, with regard to Matthean omissions, this source-critical question is not crucial since, even if we assume that Matthew also used a non-Markan source, that would not detract from his familiarity with the Markan narrative and his decision to excise portions of it. Although determining the independence of Matthean additions would be more pertinent to this comparison, even if Q existed, only a few instances in this study could have originated from such a source.

**Mark by the Numbers**

Any comparison must begin with the data concerning the earlier text which, in this study, is the gospel of Mark. Unfortunately, this analysis is further complicated by the lack of scholarly consensus regarding the number of Tanakh references in Mark and their categorization into quotations and allusions. Thus, according to one scholar, Mark contains thirty quotations and 200 allusions,\textsuperscript{31} while another lists sixteen quotations and forty allusions.\textsuperscript{32} This wide range results from differing methods and criteria for identifying

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{See Davies and Allison, *Matthew 19-28*, 186 and the notes there.}
\end{footnotes}
references to the Tanakh, and for defining what constitutes a quotation versus an allusion.\textsuperscript{33} These disparate calculations also stem from distinct methods for counting references and associated issues:\textsuperscript{34} for instance, does a long reference from a single Tanakh source count as one reference, or should every word or phrase be counted separately? A related problem is posed by Mark’s occasional conflation of multiple Tanakh sources into a single reference. The most notable example is the triple quote in Mk 1:2–3, which could arguably be counted as one, two or three references, depending on one’s approach. The treatment of repeated references, such as “you are my son,” and “rising on the third day,” must also be taken into consideration.

My enumeration of Markan references follows three principles. First, composite references are counted as a single reference unless they are demarcated by a clear separation within the Markan verse. For example, the references to Ex 20:23 and Mal 3:1 in Mk 1:2 will be counted as one reference because the boundary between them is barely distinguishable. In contrast, the references to Is 56:7 and Jer 7:11 are counted as two references since Mark (11:17) clearly separates them. Second, long references are counted

\textsuperscript{33} See the detailed discussion below.

according to their distinct Tanakh referents, not by the number of words, sentences, or verses. Third, each instance of a recurrent reference is counted separately.
Defining Tanakh References

The methodological debate over the identification of scriptural references in the New Testament extends even to the verification of scriptural quotations. Some scholars have a strict definition of what constitutes a quotation: to qualify, the text in question must include an introductory formula and almost complete agreement in order.\textsuperscript{35} Others apply a more flexible standard that requires only three or four similar words which could not have come from an alternative source.

The debate regarding allusions is even more hotly contested. Views range from near total rejection of the ability to detect allusions to an inclusion of almost any possible allusion. In this study, I employ different terminology: rather than dividing references into quotations and allusions, I classify them into three groups according to the explicitness of their citation of their Tanakh source.

The first group, explicit references, is comprised of every Markan passage that presents a clear Tanakh reference. That is to say, those that either formally introduce the Tanakh

citation or that display extensive and unmistakable verbal correspondence to Tanakh material (at least four identical words in order). According to this standard, I have identified twenty-seven explicit references in Mark.

The references that are usually called allusions are categorized as implicit or subtle. Implicit references are Markan passages where material from the Tanakh is clearly implied by either a verbal correspondence of at least three similar words or a strong thematic similarity. For example, in Mk 1:12–13, Jesus is driven into the wilderness, where he is tempted by Satan for forty days. Even though these verses only share two words with Deut 9:18 (τεσσεράκοντα, ἡμέρας), with only one being identical, the description of forty days in the wilderness is associated with either Elijah (1 Kg 19:8) or Moses (Ex 34:28). Given that John, rather than Jesus, is depicted as Elijah in Mark (1:6; 9:13) and, in several instances, Jesus is depicted as the “new Moses” (9:2-3, 7, 15; 14:23-24), an implicit reference to Moses, and hence to Deut 9:18, is more probable.

Similarly, in the Markan depiction of the stilling of the storm (4:37–41), Jesus falls asleep in a boat and, after a great tempest begins, he is awakened by frightened disciples then quells it. Again, the verbal similarity to Jon 1:4–12 is recognizable but not definitive, but the combined elements of a storm that inspires fear for all but one, who sleeps unaware of the gale around him, and divine intervention that eventually calms the storm, are unparalleled in the Tanakh. Composite references that are comprised of three (or more) allusions, such as Mk 1:11 and 9:7, are also included in this category, since their aggregate
verbal and thematic correspondence is sufficient for this definition of an implicit reference. I have identified thirty-four implicit references in Mark.

The third group is comprised of *subtle references*. Passages in this category display minimal verbal agreement with their putative Tanakh sources, but their context, thematic similarity, or the rarity of a word that is shared with the apparent source provides a sufficiently convincing combination of factors to justify speaking of them as allusions.

In light of the speculative quality that is intrinsic to the identification of these references, I will briefly detail key aspects of my methodology. My criteria are based on the principles suggested by Richard Hays, Dale Allison, and Kelli O’Brien. Allison writes:

> An allusion will not be credible unless text and intertext share some combination of the following: common vocabulary, common word order, common themes, similar imagery, similar structure, similar circumstances. One of these alone will not suffice, and the greater the number of parallels, the more probable the allusion.  

Allison adds that such parallels only qualify as evidence when they are “not commonplace,” noting, “‘Thus says the Lord’ and collections of woes are recognizably biblical, but they appear too often to call to mind any particular passage.” On the other hand, if a word is highly unusual, its very presence may indicate a Tanakh reference.


37 Ibid.

O’Brien suggests three additional considerations. The first is “recurrence or clustering: is any particular allusion used more than once? Does the author tend to use a number of allusions from the same area of a biblical book?” For instance, as Joel Marcus, Raymond Brown, and others have noted, Ps 22 is incorporated several times in Mark’s passion narrative. Similarly, Mal 3 is explicitly and implicitly referenced in the second gospel. Consequently, the presence of other subtle references to Ps 22 or Mal 3 is more likely than it would otherwise be.

Thematic coherence is the second consideration: do the motifs in the Tanakh source resemble those in the Markan text? O’Brien notes that such correspondence might reflect “continuity or discontinuity. Themes may be used as they are understood in context, or they may be transformed.” For example, in Mk 14:7, Jesus refers to Deut 15:11, where the people of Israel are commanded to provide for the poor, for they will never cease to exist in the land. Thus, the Markan Jesus responds to critics who consider the anointing at


40 O’Brien, Use, 29.

41 Ibid.

42 Ibid.
Bethany to be a misappropriation of resources that should go to the needy with a paraphrase that inverts the meaning of Deut 15:11. The enduring presence of the poor, which Deuteronomy presents as the reason to provide for them, becomes the justification for favoring the woman’s generosity toward the human Jesus, whose life on earth will soon end. Benjamin Sommer defines this sort of usage as a polemic allusion: while it rejects or questions the older text, it also depends on the reader’s recognition of that earlier source to fully grasp its reversal in the New Testament.43

The third criterion suggested by Allison and O’Brien is early interpretation,44 which is particularly relevant for this study since Matthew is Mark’s earliest interpreter. According to this theory, if Matthew identified a Tanakh reference in Mark and elevated its prominence in his gospel, it becomes more probable that Mark was indeed drawing on the Tanakh.

It is possible, however, to argue that Matthew had an agenda that was distinct from Mark’s, or to contend that Matthew was more familiar with the Tanakh than Mark and,

---


44 Allison, Intertextual, 10; O’Brien, Use, 65.
accordingly, may have recognized more biblical background in Mark’s narrative than its author intended to include.45

Nevertheless, Matthew tends to follow Mark’s order and content and, in twenty-six instances, he enhances Mark’s explicit and implicit Tanakh references. Moreover, Matthew and Luke – and, in my opinion, John – were Mark’s only identifiable first-century readers; therefore, their capacity (or inability) to recognize Tanakh references in his gospel carries special weight. Although confirming such acknowledgement of a subtle Markan reference can be difficult, it can be achieved when a Matthean or Lukan reference is clearly based on Mark (Mk 2:23/Lk 6:1; Mk 4:11/Matt 3:11; Mk 5:34/ Lk 8:48; Mk 9:3/Matt 17:2; Mk 11:2b, 4/Matt 21:2, 4-5; Mk 16:3-4/Matt 28:2). Thus, while early recognition alone is insufficient evidence for verifying a reference, it can be a significant indicator.

Each of the forty-two subtle references identified here was weighed according to the above criteria.

Septuagint or Masorah?

Perhaps the most thoroughly researched and energetically debated topic in the study of Mark’s and Matthew’s references to the Tanakh is the extent to which each gospel drew on the Septuagint or the Masoretic text.Views on this subject range from the claim that both rely almost exclusively on the Septuagint, to the assertion that both (especially Matthew) also rely on the Masoretic version and other Semitic sources.

This debate is associated with several methodological issues. First, it is unclear to what degree our manuscripts of the Septuagint (LXX) preserve the Old Greek translation (OG) that would have been available to the evangelists. Second, it is difficult to ascertain how accurately the Masoretic Text (MT) reflects the first-century version. Third, scholars continue to debate the reliability of the major manuscripts of the LXX. For the purposes of

46 See Gundry, Use; D. S. New, Old Testament Quotations in the Synoptic Gospels, and the Two-Document Hypothesis (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 97; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholar’s, 1993); Davies and Allison, Matthew 1-7, 30-45 and the bibliography cited there.

47 For a detailed argument supporting Mark’s and Matthew’s reliance on Hebrew and Aramaic versions of the Tanakh, see Gundry, Use, 11-150. For the position that Matthew is the only evangelist who drew from non-Greek texts, see Davis and Allison, Matthew 1-7, 30-34, 44-46. For a concise survey concerning Luke, see D. W. Pao and E. J. Schnabel, “Luke” in: Commentary on the New Testament, 252.

this study, I generally follow the LXX text presented in the Göttingen series unless there are compelling reasons against it. Also, most major textual variants that pertain to scriptural references are mentioned here.

My method for assessing the probability of dependence on the Septuagint or Masorah systematically applies the following steps 1) each potential reference is compared to the LXX text in the Göttingen Septuagint series and to variants in major witnesses when relevant. If there is agreement in all relevant verbal components, that reference will be identified as reliant on the LXX. This assessment is made with acknowledgement of the possibility that, even when the gospels and the LXX are identical, they could both reflect an independent translation of the Hebrew original.49 But it seems improbable that they have attained such comprehensive agreement independently. 2) When verbal components that do not correspond with the LXX or any of its major variants are identified, they are compared to the text of the BHS. 3) When a word in Mark or Matthew seems to be based on the MT I try to explain the difference between the LXX and the MT, and to ascertain whether the Markan or Matthean word is a more accurate or, at least, a possible rendering of its MT equivalent.

49 McLay, *Use* 40-41.
In instances where a clear scholarly consensus deems that a reference originates with the LXX, I only present a challenge if my preliminary examination reveals a weakness in that evidence. If no contradictions arise, I simply note the main reasons for this identification. Similarly, in cases where evidence is insufficient or the OG cannot be determined, I briefly explain why I refrain from establishing reliance on the MT or the LXX. However, I mention each instance that shows an indication of possible Markan or Matthean reliance on the MT, with special emphasis on cases where Matthew assimilates a Markan reference from the MT to the LXX or from the LXX to the MT.
Mark, Matthew and the Tanakh in Current Research

To the best of my knowledge, Gundry’s The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew’s Gospel and Davies and Allison’s commentary on Matthew are the only two studies that comprehensively compare Mark’s and Matthew’s employment of the Tanakh and whose focus goes beyond an attempt to identify the textual version used by these gospels.

Even though nearly fifty years have passed since its publication, Gundry’s monograph remains the most influential and thorough investigation of Matthew’s use of the Tanakh. Gundry divides his systematic analysis of the references that are common to Mark and Matthew into two sections. The first discusses the text form of what he terms “formal quotations,” and the second addresses what he defines as “allusive quotations.” He then presents a summary of those reference-by-reference sections. According to this overview,

50 Gundry, Use; Davies and Allison, Matthew 1-7. Many others focus on quotations or on the versions that serve as sources for these references: M. E. Boring, ‘Matthew’ in: E. Keck et al. eds., The New Interpreters Bible (Nashville: Abingdon, 1995, Vol. VIII), 151–152; M. J. J. Menken, ‘Old Testament Quotations Inserted in Markan Contexts,’ in M. J. J. Menken ed., Matthew’s Bible: the Old Testament Text of the Evangelist (BETL, 173; Leuven: University Press, 2004); See also O’Leary, Judaization, 118 where the author repeatedly refers to Matthew’s tendency to add Tanakh references without providing data to support this argument. In several instances, she refers to Boring in the footnotes, but his study focuses on quotations.

51 Gundry, Use, 9-28, 29-65.

52 Idem, 147-150.
Mark and Matthew share sixteen formal quotations and forty allusive quotations. Gundry states that Mark’s “formal quotations are almost purely Septuagintal and the Matthaean parallels a little less so.” On the allusive quotations, he concludes that “eleven are based on the LXX while twelve are not. Eight mix the LXX and non-LXX form. Six display possible contact with the Targums and five with the Peshitta. In this overview of allusive quotations, the only differences between Mark and Matthew worthy of remark are the three instances where Mark diverges from the LXX but Matthew agrees with it. Gundry ends his summary by concluding that, apart from the near complete reliance on the Septuagint witnessed in Mark’s formal quotations, the Tanakh references in the Synoptic gospels “reflect a mixed textual tradition.” Thus, Gundry primarily focuses on the origins of the Tanakh references in Matthew, with far less attention to comparisons between Mark and Matthew. As a result, Gundry rarely notes how Matthew’s treatment of Mark’s Tanakh

53 Idem, 148.
54 Ibid.
55 Ibid.
56 Idem, 49.
57 Ibid.
58 Idem, 150.
references influences their level of prominence, and he hardly ever attempts to explain
differences between Mark and Matthew.

Moreover, while he seems to accept Markan priority in his treatment of formal
quotations, Gundry’s theory of an Aramaic or Hebrew Ur-Matthew as a common source
for the remaining references in the Synoptics seems to suggest a notion of Matthean
priority. This reading is strengthened by Gundry’s assertions that Jesus’ disciple
Matthew, who is the author of the Gospel, served as his own targumist and that he “was a
note-taker during the earthly ministry” whose written records served as the foundation for
much Synoptic material. Such rejection of Markan priority would explain why Gundry
does not consider differences between Mark’s and Matthew’s allusions as Matthean
changes to Mark. Thus, although Gundry’s study is invaluable for its close study of the use
of the Tanakh in Matthew and Mark, it does not fully address the main subject of this
dissertation: a comparison of the prominence of Tanakh references in Mark and Matthew
and the significance of these differences between the two gospels.

59 Idem, 179.
60 Idem, 181.
61 Idem, 182-183. Gundry was heavily criticized for this theory. For example, D. M. Hay,
Review of The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew’s Gospel, by R. H. Gundry, JBL
Moving on to Davies and Allison, in the first volume of their commentary, they summarize their view on Matthew’s treatment of Mark’s references as follows: “Matthew rarely if ever shortened or omitted the OT references from his sources while he frequently expanded allusions and added quotations.” They substantiate this claim by presenting a detailed table that compares the quotations and allusions shared by Mark and Matthew. Their concise summary of the analysis of quotations focuses on whether Matthew drew from the Septuagint or the Masoretic text, without discussion of their levels of prominence relative to their appearance in Mark.

Concerning allusions, Davies and Allison present these conclusions: (1) Matthew includes all Markan allusions; (2) in six instances, Matthew brings Mark’s references closer to the LXX (Matt 3:16; 17:11; 26:3–4, 64; 27:35, 46b); (3) in four, he brings them closer to the MT (Matt 24:21, 29, 31; 26:28); (4) in two, he brings them closer to targumic or other Jewish traditions (22:24; 24:31); and, (5) in six instances, he expands Markan references (13:32; 17:5; 24:30; 24:31; 26:3, 28). In sum, according to Davies and Allison,


63 Idem, 34–45.

64 Idem, 45. As we shall see in the discussion below (particularly in Chapter Three), this statement is inaccurate.

65 Idem, 45.
Matthew tends to bring the Markan references closer to the Tanakh and often expands them.

Nonetheless, even this excellent summary represents a mere fraction of their commentary on Matthew and, as a result, does not address some of the most compelling questions that could be explored. For example, its treatment of the quotations common to Mark and Matthew is limited to consideration of their potential reliance on the Septuagint or the Masoretic Text. Furthermore, no mention is made of the instances where Matthew weakens a reference’s resemblance to the Tanakh. Neither do its authors explore the means that Matthew engages to bring various references closer to the Tanakh.

The following pages attempt to fill this void by presenting the results of my comparison and analysis of this material, starting with Matthean changes to Mark’s explicit references, followed by his treatment of implicit references, and concluding with the subtle references. Each of these three sections provides an introduction to the main contextual aims of Mark’s references, followed by an analysis of each pair of Markan and Matthen references – a table with the relevant texts of Mark, Matthew, the LXX and the MT – in order of appearance in Mark. The results of this comparison are then presented in a chart. I then describe Matthew’s primary means for rendering Markan references more prominent, emphasizing

66 These choices are addressed in the context of a verse-by-verse commentary, but no attempt is made to present a general overview.
instances in which Matthew’s adaptation significantly changes Mark’s version. I then do the same with the references that Matthew makes less prominent.

On the basis of these three discussions, I conclude by pointing out the main differences and similarities between Matthew and Mark’s presentation of Tanakh references and by considering possible correlations between these approaches and each evangelist’s connection to Judaism. In addition, I also discuss what seems to be the most significant Matthean modification of Mark: the complete omission of “God is one” and “God alone” from the first gospel.
Chapter One: Explicit Tanakh References in Mark and Matthew

This chapter opens with a brief breakdown of the main concerns that pertain to explicit references to the Tanakh in Mark. It continues with a comparison of each Markan reference and its Matthean parallel. In each reference, I first discuss whether Mark and Matthew rely on the LXX, the MT or another version of the Tanakh and then determine whether Matthew’s account makes that Tanakh reference more or less prominent. Matthean treatment of Mark’s explicit references is then discussed in two stages: first, a general overview of Matthean changes; second, a summary of these changes in relation to corresponding Markan references.

A Breakdown of Markan Concerns: Explicit References

In this brief treatment of the primary Markan concerns in his use of Tanakh references, I apply the classification suggested by Rikk E. Watts, which divides the main Markan concerns into four categories: (1) references regarding Jesus’ identity and mission; (2) threats of judgment; (3) points of the Law; and, (4) warnings concerning discipleship.¹

As Watts cautions, such generalizations can be problematic, as some references fit more than one category and complex themes are often difficult to place in a single category.

category. These caveats being noted, such categorizations are effective for bringing order to large bodies of material, and Watts’s specific breakdown has proven useful in my comparison of Mark and Matthew.

**Identity and Mission**

Of the twenty-seven Markan explicit references: eleven are concerned with Jesus’ identity and mission (1:2–3; 4:12; 11:9–10; 11:17; 12:10–11; 12:36–37; 14:62; 15:24; 15:34); eleven are about points of the Law (2:25–26; 7:6, 10; 10:6, 7–8; 10:19; 12:19a; 12:26; 12:29–30; 12:31; 12:32–33); two convey threats of judgment or apocalyptic predictions (9:48; 13:14); and, two are warnings or reprimands concerning discipleship (8:18; 14:27). A few of these references are particularly difficult to categorize. For example, the reference in Mk 12:36-37 to Ps 110:1 could be understood as a statement about Jesus but it can also be seen as part of the debate over Jewish Law. Similarly, the reference to Dan 7:13–14 in Mk 13:26 may be seen as an apocalyptic vision or, as I categorize it, a statement about Jesus’ identity as the Son of Man. The references to Jer 7:11 and Is 56:7 in Mk 11:17 provide additional examples with possible overlap. While

\[\text{\(^2\) Watts, “Mark”, 111.}\]

\[\text{\(^3\) See Marcus, The Way, 130–132; Marcus, Mark 8–16, 846–848; Watts, “Mark”, 220–222.}\]

\[\text{\(^4\) Marcus, Mark 8–16, 903–909; Watts, “Mark”, 227–229.}\]
these can be understood as a threat of judgment, they are also connected to Jesus’ identity and mission. This ambiguity, however, provides a fruitful starting point for comparing Matthew with Mark, since it will be interesting to see if this dual emphasis carries over into Matthew or if there is an attempt to focus on a specific concern.

It is also important to consider the original context of these references in the Tanakh. Of the references concerning Jesus’ identity, eight are from the Psalms (22:2, 19; 110:1; 118:22–23; 26; 148:1); three are from Isaiah (6:9–10; 40:3; 56:7); two are from Daniel (7:13–14); and one each is from Jeremiah (7:11), Malachi (3:1), and Exodus (23:20). The referenced psalms represent a diverse combination of expressions of praise for God and divine power (e.g., 118:26; 148:1), royal psalms (110:1), and psalms that depict a righteous sufferer who is subject to such mockery that he suspects God of having forsaken him (22:2, 19). Psalm 118:22–23 integrates these themes of suffering and triumph by opening with the image of the stone that has been rejected and concluding with God’s


6 On Ps 22 in Mark’s passion, see Marcus, The Way, 180–182; Subramanian, Psalms, 64–69.
salvation when it becomes a cornerstone. By employing these psalms, Mark portrays Jesus as both a divine eschatological figure and a righteous sufferer, while imagery from Ps 118:22–23 (Mk 12:10–11) conveys not only suffering and death but also resurrection and the hope of salvation.

The remaining Tanakh references that focus on Jesus’ identity also display a mix of themes: diatribes against a lack of faith (Mk 4:12/Is 6:9–10) and corruption (Mk 11:17b/Jer 7:11) as well as prophecies of hope and salvation, such as Is 56:7 (Mk 11:17a). Thus Mark 4:12 alludes to Is 6:9-10 to explain why Jesus speaks in parables to anyone who is not a disciple, and Mk 11:17 refers to Jer 7:11 to highlight the corruption of the Temple cult. Conversely, Is 56:7 illuminates the contrast between the ideal “house of prayer for all nations” and the corrupt and exclusionary “den of robbers” which, for Mark, probably represents those who waged the Jewish Revolt against the Romans. Malachi 3:1 (Mk 1:2b) and Dan 7:13–14 (Mk 14:62) convey promises of salvation as well, but they also foretell

---

judgment and punishment to be inflicted by God, the Son of Man, or the angel of the covenant.  

**Points of the Law**

Of the twelve references concerning debates or teachings about the Law (Mk 2:25–26; 7:6, 10; 10:6, 7–8; 10:19; 12:19a; 12:26; 12:29–30; 12:31; 12:32–33): nine are from the Torah (Gen 1:27; 2:24; Ex 3:6; 20:12–16; Lev 19:18; Deut 4:35; 5:16; 6:4–5; 25:5); two are from 1 Sam (15:22; 23:1–6); and, one is from Isaiah (29:13). Two Genesis references are from the creation narrative, while the Exodus references are from the Ten Commandments (20:12–16/Mk 10:19) and the burning bush story (3:6/Mk 12:26). The sole reference from Leviticus is “Love your neighbor” (19:18/Mk 12:31), whereas Deuteronomy provides the Shema (6:4–5/Mk 12:29) and the obligation to marry a deceased brother’s childless widow (Deut 25:5/Mk 12:19). It is noteworthy that, in their original contexts, all of these verses (with the possible exception of Deut 25:5) relate to universal principles or foundation myths rather than controversial issues (such as dietary laws, the Sabbath, circumcision or Temple rituals). Nevertheless, the majority of these references are cited by the Markan Jesus in confrontations or discussions about observance or interpretation of the Law. For example, Genesis 1:27 and 2:24 are cited to argue against

---

divorce (Mk 10:6–8),

Ex 3:6 to prove the validity of the resurrection (Mk 12:26), and Deut 6:4-5 and Lev 19:18 (Mk 12:29-30) as the basis for all commandments. Similarly, the reference about David from 1 Samuel is used to defend the act of plucking grain on the Sabbath (Mk 2:25-26).

Although the original setting of Is 29:13 (Mk 7:6-7) harshly censures the leaders of Judah, it does not convey a debate over the letter of the Law but rather over the meaning of true observance.

Judgment

The two scenes of judgment are from Is 66:24 (Mk 9:48) and Dan 12:10-11 (Mk 13:14). The passage from Isaiah may initially have been drawn from memories of the destruction of the First Temple, when the corpses of rebels were strewn in the Ben Hinnom Valley,

---


11 In fact, this is the single reference that does not follow this pattern of presenting generic verses in Mk 12:33, which alludes to the words of Samuel: “Does the Lord take pleasure in whole-burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in hearing the words of the Lord? Behold, obedience is better than a good sacrifice, and hearkening than the fat of rams.” But even this reference doesn’t really discuss fine points of the Law.

proximate to Temple Mount in Jerusalem. The verses from Dan 12 depict the desecration of the Second Temple during the Hasmonean Revolt.

Mark took his two explicit references concerning discipleship from Jer 5:21 (Mk 8:18) and Zech 13:7 (Mk 14:27). In its original context, Jer 5:21 details God denouncing Israel for becoming yet another idolatrous nation. Thus, the words of reprimand against them resemble those used to mock idolatry. The initial setting of Zech 13:7 is less clear, especially with respect to the identity of the shepherd who may represent a king, a prophet, or another type of prominent leader.

**Levels of Prominence**

This study examines the levels of prominence in Markan and Matthean usage of Tanakh references. Thus, in this chapter and Chapters Two and Three, each of Mark’s 103 Tanakh references is systematically compared to its Matthean parallel, to consider whether Matthew has adjusted the prominence of this reference in his narrative.

---


The following editorial tools make references more or less prominent in Matthew:

1) **Formal introductions:** As the most explicit tool, this is also the most powerful, since such an introduction directly informs the reader to anticipate a Tanakh reference and, in some instances, it also illuminates the relevance of that reference to the gospel context. Moreover, these introductions often identify the source from which the reference was taken. For example, when Matthew (24:15) inserts τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου between Mark’s allusion to Dan 12:11 (Mk 13:14) and the enigmatic “let the reader understand,” Matthew tells his readers that this is a reference to Daniel, whose prophecies are being partially fulfilled through the events that Jesus is about to describe.

2) **Additions:** Matthew’s primary editorial tool for increasing the prominence of a Markan Tanakh reference is the addition of similar or identical words to a Tanakh referent from its original context. These insertions range from a minor addition consisting of a word or two, up to the addition of an entire verse.

3) **Omissions:** The removal of Markan words or clauses that are not part of the Tanakh referent also brings the text closer to the Tanakh, thereby rendering a more prominent reference. For example, in his adaptation of Mk 10:19, Matthew (19:18) omits Mark’s μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς, which is not part of the Ten Commandments, and thus brings the text closer to Ex 20:12-16. In contrast, the omission of words and
verses from a Tanakh reference may diminish its prominence or eliminate it altogether.

4) **Replacing words:** Another editorial tool is the replacement of a Markan word with another term from Mark’s Tanakh referent or from another Tanakh verse, which thereby moves the Matthean verse closer to the Tanakh. Conversely, the replacement of Mark’s words with vocabulary that is not included in Tanakh verse distances the Matthean passage from the Tanakh, thus reducing the prominence of the Markan reference.

5) **Modifying word forms:** At times Matthew, while preserving a word from a Markan reference, modifies it to match its corresponding form in the LXX. In contrast, Matthew also changes word forms in ways that distance his narrative from the Tanakh, rendering Tanakh references less prominent in his gospel.

6) **Word order:** When Matthew’s adaptation of Mark’s word order brings references closer to their Tanakh referent, the reference becomes more prominent. Conversely, if Matthew’s word order moves further from the Tanakh, that choice yields a less prominent reference.

7) **Corrections:** In cases where Matthew corrects mistakes in Markan references, the Tanakh verse is rendered more prominent.

8) **Greek more prominent than Hebrew:** Since Mark, Matthew and the LXX are all Greek compositions, Matthean assimilation to the LXX of references that are closer
to the MT in Mark render them more prominent in Matthew. A text that appears in both the gospel and the LXX can be identical, whereas the recognition of a reference to the (Hebrew) MT depends on a process of retroversion; thus, by definition, agreement between a gospel text and the MT cannot be as complete as agreement with the LXX.

9) **Introduction of new references within a Markan context:** When Matthew introduces a Tanakh reference to a Markan pericope that lacks such material, the Tanakh presence becomes more prominent.
Explicit Markan References to the Tanakh: A sequential analysis and comparison to Matthew

In this presentation of the verse-by-verse comparisons of Markan and Matthean Tanakh references, I have devised a system for color-coding the Greek and Hebrew texts to illuminate the similarities and differences between Mark and Matthew. Yellow indicates complete agreement between Mark and either Matthew or the Tanakh. Green signals a similarity between Mark and either Matthew or the Tanakh. Red highlights complete agreement between the Tanakh and passages from Matthew that differ from Mark. Blue points to passages from Matthean paseges and the Tanakh that share similarities, while they differ from Mark.
Legend:

**Yellow** = Agreement of Matthew and/or a Tanakh text with Mark

**Green** = Similarity of Matthew and/or a Tanakh text to Mark

**Red** = Agreement of a Tanakh text with Matthew that is not evident in Mark

**Blue** = Similarity of a Tanakh text to Matthew that is not evident in Mark

In the tables throughout this three-chapter analysis, Tanakh references in Greek follow the Göttingen Septuagint series and in Hebrew follow the BHS. For Mark and Matthew, I follow the NA. Each of the twenty-seven explicit references considered in this chapter are discussed in two stages: the first assesses whether Mark’s and Matthew’s references are derived from the LXX, the MT, or another source; and, the second describes the Matthean changes to Mark’s explicit references and whether these modifications render these references more or less prominent. These discussions acknowledge the significant

16 When Markan and Matthean words are identical they are colored in yellow even when the Tanakh text is only similar to Mark and thus colored green.

17 The Hebrew text will only be colored if it is assumed to be Mark and/or Matthew’s source.
text-critical problems and major textual variants when relevant. The results of these discussions are then summarized and presented in a chart.

1) Mk 1:2b/Matt 11:10b (Mal 3:1 LXX + MT; Ex 23:20 LXX)

|   | Mk: ἵδο [ἐγ] ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἀγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ἓς κατασκεύασε τὴν ὅδον σου. | Matt: ἵδο [ἐγ] ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἀγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ἓς κατασκεύασε τὴν ὅδον σου ἐμπροσθέν σου. | Ex: ἵδο [ἐγ] ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἀγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου ἵνα φυλάξῃ σε ἐν τῇ ὅδε | Mal: ἵδο [ἐγ] ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἀγγελόν μου καὶ ἐπιβλέψεται ὅδον πρὸ προσώπου μου | This is clearly an explicit reference to Ex 23:20, Mal 3:1, or both. The fact that Mark’s formal introduction refers only to Is 40:3, which is cited in the subsequent verse (Mk 1:3), is a complicating factor. Thus, the challenge at hand is to determine Mark’s source. As the chart shows, the first part of Mark’s quote is almost identical to Ex 23:20 LXX: Mark and Exodus share eight identical verbal components, six of which appear in sequence. Malachi 3:1 LXX is also close to Mark 1:2b; however, all but one of the identical components of Mark and Malachi are also found in Ex 23:20. In addition to following most of the word order in this verse from Exodus, as in Exodus, Mark uses ἀποστέλλω and not
Malachi’s ἐξαποστέλλω. Thus, the LXX evidence demonstrates that Mark is quoting Ex 23:20 LXX; there is significant doubt whether he is also making a reference to Mal 3:1.

A complicating factor arises as we examine other citations of the same Tanakh books: whereas Mal 3:22-24 is referenced in Mk 9:4, 12-13, this seems to be the only Markan reference to Ex 23:20. Here the MT may provide the missing evidence. If we look at the last clause of Mk 1:2, we can see that Mark diverges from both Malachi and Exodus LXX. Indeed, Ex 23:20 states that the angel will guard (φυλάσσω/שָׁמַר) on their way those being addressed, while Mark writes that the angel will prepare (κατασκευάζω) the way. Malachi 3:1 employs the word ἐπιβλέπω (“to survey” or “to watch”), which is a common equivalent of פנה (“to clear” or “to turn”), usually when the latter has the Kal stem (Lev 26:9; Num 12:10; Deut 9:27; Ps 25:16; etc.) but never when it has the Piel stem. In this instance, it seems that the LXX reflects either a misunderstanding or a different vocalization of the rare (Piel) form פנה (only in Mal 3:1), and reads it as פנה (Kal), which means “to turn one’s face forward” in this context.18 This possibility is strengthened by the fact that none of the four additional occurrences of the Piel stem of פנה are rendered as ἐπιβλέπω in the LXX (Gen 24:31; Is 40:3; 57:14; 62:10). In addition, in Gen 24:31, Is 40:3

18 For errors that stem from vocalization, see E. Tov, The Text Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research (JBS 8; Jerusalem: Simor LTD, 1997), 114-116. Gundry, Use, 11 recognizes that Mark reflects the MT but does not acknowledge that the LXX reading stems from a different vocalization.
and 62:10, the Greek equivalents of פִנָה are ὁδοποιέω (to clear a road) and ἑτοιμάζω (to prepare), which are much closer to Mark’s κατασκευάζω. Thus, Mark’s κατασκευάζω is actually a far more accurate translation of Mal 3:1’s unique פִנָה than the LXX’s ἐπιβλέψεται. This assimilation to Mal 3:1 is also evident in Mark’s use of the form ὁδόν, which occurs in Mal 3:1 LXX.

In sum, Mk 1:2b is primarily based on Ex 23:20 LXX, while Mark’s κατασκευάζω is probably an independent translation of פִנָה from Mal 3:1 MT. The Matthean addition of ἑγὼ brings this text even closer to Ex 23:20/Mal 3:1 LXX and, thus, makes this reference more prominent in Matthew.

---

2) **Mk 1:3/Matt 3:3b (Is 40:3 LXX)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripture</th>
<th>Greek Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mk:</strong></td>
<td>φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὀδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matt:</strong></td>
<td>φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὀδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is:</strong></td>
<td>φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὀδὸν κυρίου εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this instance, the almost complete agreement between Mark, Matthew and Is 40:3 LXX (a nearly identical sequence of fourteen verbal components), the omission of בָעֲרָבָה, and the connection of קוֹל קוֹר א to בַמִדְבָר leave little doubt that Mark is quoting the LXX. As we can see Mark and Matthew are identical; thus, there are no changes to discuss.
This reference is explicit on the basis of the shared language in Mark’s and Matthew’s introductory portions of these verses. The referenced phrase is identical with the LXX, but since the LXX and the MT renderings are very similar and this passage is only comprised of four components, it is not possible to determine whether Mark and Matthew are dependent on the LXX or the MT. Here Mark errs with regard to the name of the high priest: Abiathar was the son of Abimelech (LXX) or Ahimelech (in the MT, the π is switched with a ζ; see: 1 Sam 22:20; 23:6; etc.), the high priest who allowed David and his men to eat the Bread of the Presence. Matthew corrects this Markan inaccuracy by omitting Ἀβιαθάρ, and thus brings this reference closer to the Tanakh.

| **Mk:** | ἵνα βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ μὴ ἴδωσιν, καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούσσωσιν καὶ μὴ συνιῶσιν, μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἄφθη ἑαυτοῖς. |
| **Matt:** | καὶ ἀναπληροῦντί αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία Ἡσαίου ἢ λέγουσα: ἵνα ἀκούσσωσιν καὶ μὴ συνήτητε, καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ τοὺς μὴ ἴδοντας ἐπαναγεννήτερον γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου καὶ τοῖς ωσίν βαρέως ἠκούσαν καὶ τοὺς ὄφθαλμους αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν, μήποτε ἴδωσιν ταῖς ὄφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὑσίν ἀκούσσωσιν καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνιῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἱάσομαι αὐτοῖς. |
| **Is:** | ἵνα ἀκούσσωσιν καὶ μὴ συνήτητε καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ τοὺς μὴ ἴδοντας ἐπαναγεννήτερον γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου καὶ τοῖς ωσίν αὐτῶν βαρέως ἠκούσαν καὶ τοὺς ὄφθαλμους αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν, μήποτε ἴδωσιν ταῖς ὄφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὑσίν ἀκούσσωσιν καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνιῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἱάσομαι αὐτοῖς. |

Mark shares eight similar verbal components with the LXX, four of which are identical in form; thus, it is probable that Mark was using the LXX. Matthew agrees with the LXX in all but ὀτῶν, which is missing from his account; thus, he almost completely assimilated Mark’s text to the LXX. This assimilation is achieved by adding a word-for-word quote from Is 6:9-10 and adapting the forms of four Markan words to their forms in the LXX, as well as rearranging Mark’s word order according to the LXX. Matthew also adds a formal introduction, which renders this citation one of the longest and most explicit in his gospel.
Mk: Ἡσαίας…, ὡς γέγραπται [ὅτι] οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χείλεσιν με τιμᾷ, ἢ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ. μάθην δὲ σέβονται με διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων.

Matt: Ἡσαίας λέγων: ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χείλεσιν με τιμᾷ, ἢ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ. μάθην δὲ σέβονται με διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων.

Is: ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χείλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσιν με ἢ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ μάθην δὲ σέβονται με διδάσκοντες ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων καὶ διδασκαλίας

Here the LXX’s μάθην δὲ, which is preserved in the gospels, reflects the Hebrew word והנה (a result of mistaking the ' in יָהָה for a ר); therefore, the LXX is readily identified as Mark’s and Matthew’s source. Some Markan MSS (including B and D) have ὁ λαὸς οὗτος instead of οὗτος ὁ λαὸς. While it is difficult to determine the order of composition since both versions are well attested, it is easier to imagine scribes assimilating Mark to the LXX and Matthew by changing the word order to ὁ λαὸς οὗτος than to a scribal move away from the latter pair. If indeed οὗτος ὁ λαὸς in Mark is original, then the Matthean adaptation is


21 Gundry, Use, 14-16; O’Brien, Use, 206.
another example in which Matthew makes a reference more prominent by assimilating its order to the LXX.

6) Mk 7:10a/Matt 15:4 (Deut 5:16 LXX = MT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mk: Μωϋσῆς γὰρ εἶπεν: τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matt: θεός εἶπεν· τίμα τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deut: τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου ὁ πάπος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>εὐνείλατο σοι κύριος ῆ θεός</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mark shares an identical sequence of eight verbal components with the LXX and, thus, is probably dependent on it. Matthew omits σου twice, thereby moving slightly away from the LXX/MT. But by replacing Μωϋσῆς with θεός, Matthew moves slightly closer to Deuteronomy, wherein God issued the commandment to honor one’s father and mother.
7) **Mk 7:10b / Matt 15:4b (Ex 21:17 LXX + MT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Greek Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>ὁ κακολογῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα θανάτῳ τελευτάω.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>ὁ κακολογῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα θανάτῳ τελευτάω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>ὁ κακολογῶν πατέρα αὐτοῦ ἢ μητέρα αὐτοῦ τελευτήσει θανάτῳ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, both Mark and Matthew are very close to the LXX but use a different word order and a different form of the word τελευτάω. Indeed, in Ex 21:17, the LXX’s order in its rendering of ἀποκρινόμενος – with τελευτάω followed by θανάτῳ – is unparalleled, while Mark and Matthew’s θανάτῳ followed by τελευτάω matches all other LXX renderings (Ex 19:12; 21:12, 15-16; 31:14-15; Lev 20:2, 9-10, 15; 24:16-17; 27:29; Num 15:35; 35:16-18, 21, 31; Jud 21:5; Ez 18:13). Furthermore, both gospels diverge from the LXX when they use the imperative τελευτάω (let him die), a less common but existing rendering of ἀποκρινόμενος (Ex 21:16; 35:2; Lev 24:16), rather than the LXX’s future indicative τελευτήσει (shall die; cf: Ex 19:12; Am 7:11; Ez 6:12; 7:15; 12:13; 17:16; 18:17). Thus, it is probable that Mark’s and Matthew’s θανάτῳ τελευτάω relies on the MT. Since Mark and Matthew are identical, there are no Matthean changes to note.
8) Mk 8:18/Matt 13:13 (Jer 5:21)

| Mk: ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες οὐ βλέπετε καὶ ὡτα ἔχοντες οὐκ ἀκούετε; καὶ οὐ μνημονεύετε, |
| Matt: βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες οὐκ ἀκούουσιν οὐδὲ συνίουσιν |
| Jer: ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐ βλέπουσιν ὡτα αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐκ ἀκούουσιν |}

It is clear that Mark is referencing Jer 5:31 in this case, but it is very difficult to determine if he is dependent on the LXX or the MT. Matthew omits ὀφθαλμοὺς and thus moves further from the LXX; however, by using βλέπουσιν and replacing ἀκούετε with ἀκούουσιν, he moves closer to the LXX. In sum, the reference to Jeremiah is slightly more prominent in Matthew.
9) **Mk 9:48/Matt 18:9 (Is 66:24 LXX)**

| **Mk:** | ὅπου ὁ σκόλης αὐτῶν οὖ τελευτᾷ καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὓς σβέννυται. |
| **Matthew omits this reference** | |
| **Is:** | γὰρ σκόλης αὐτῶν οὖ τελευτήσει καὶ τὸ πῦρ αὐτῶν οὐ σβεσθήσεται. |

Here Mark shares nine similar verbal components in nearly identical order with the LXX, which is therefore probably his source. Matthew eliminates this reference. This is one of three significant Matthean omissions of explicit Tanakh references (the others are Mk 11:17/Matt 21:13 and Mk 12:29/Matt 22:37), and the sole instance where a Matthean omission completely eliminates an explicit Tanakh reference.

10) **Mk 10:6/Matt 19:4 (Gen 1:27 LXX = MT)**

| **Mk:** | ἀπὸ δὲ ἄρχης κτίσεως ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτοὺς: |
| **Matt:** | [οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε δοτὶ] ὁ κτίσας ἄπτ᾽ ἄρχης ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτοὺς: |
| **Gen:** | ἀρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτοὺς |

Here Mark and Matthew share an identical four-component string with the LXX; thus, they are probably dependent on the LXX. Matthew makes this reference more prominent.
by adding an introduction but, with the exception of this addition, these references are nearly identical.


Despite its absence from the text of Mark 10:7 in κ, B and a few other MSS, Metzger (Textual, 88-89) suggests that καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ is probably original since, without it, οἱ δύο might be understood as a reference to “his father and mother.” Similarly, Menken asserts that this phrase is original and explains that it was omitted because it is one of three successive clauses that begin with a καί. According to this explanation, the scribes skipped from καὶ τὴν μητέρα… to καὶ ἔσονται…

---

[a] Thus, also New, Quotations, 83; according to Gundry, “Use,” 16: it is not possible to determine which Markan version is the original.

The problem with Metzger’s and Menken’s argument is that the shorter reading in א and ב is more difficult and, thus, may be original. Moreover, it is easier to imagine a scribe assimilating his text to the LXX and partially to Matthew, by adding καὶ προσκολληθῆσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, than to conceive of an omission that moves away from the LXX.

Even if we eliminate καὶ προσκολληθῆσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ from the Markan text, Mark and the LXX still share two identical strings consisting of fifteen verbal components; thus it is likely that the LXX is Mark’s source. If, however, the shorter reading of the Markan passage is original, then Matthew makes the reference to Genesis more prominent by adding a missing phrase. By replacing ἑνεκεν with ἑνεκα, προσκολληθῆσεται with κολληθῆσεται, and τὴν γυναῖκα with τῇ γυναικί, Matthew moves away from the LXX, but these changes do not bring him closer to the MT. In sum, if καὶ προσκολληθῆσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ is original to Mark, then this is one of the few instances wherein Matthew makes an explicit Tanakh reference less prominent. If, however, καὶ κολληθῆσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ was added by Matthew, then his version of this Tanakh reference is more prominent. As noted above the latter is more plausible and thus, it is likely that the longer reading in Mark represents assimilation to Matthew and the LXX.
There are multiple variants in the LXX, the MT, Mark and Matthew regarding the order of the commandments but, if we follow the order in NA\textsuperscript{28} that is based on most of the major witnesses (\& A, B, C and many other MSS) and Wevers’ Göttingen volume (based on B, C and many miniscules), both Mark and Matthew are closer to the MT’s order than to the LXX. The main reason for accepting the authenticity of the order of LXX B over LXX A that is more similar to the MT, is that LXX B is considered relatively free from assimilations to the MT or the NT. Thus, it seems that the order in NA\textsuperscript{28} is authentic because it is easier to imagine a Markan scribe who would have assimilated his text to the LXX than to the MT.

For our purposes, the significant question is whether Mark’s μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς is original. Here we agree with the NA\textsuperscript{28}, UBS and several commentators, and conclude that

\[
\begin{array}{|l|}
\hline
12) \text{Mk 10:19/Matt 19:18–19 (Ex 20:12–16; Lev 19:18)} \\
\hline
\text{Mk:} & \text{μὴ φονεύσῃς, μὴ μοιχεύσῃς, μὴ κλέψῃς, μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσῃς, μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς, τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα.} \\
\hline
\text{Matt:} & \text{τὸ δὲ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, τίμα τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.} \\
\hline
\text{Ex:} & \text{τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα ... οὐ μοιχεύσεις οὐ κλέψεις οὐ φονεύσεις οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις κατὰ τὸ πλησίον σου μαρτυρίαν ψευδή οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὴν γυναίκα τοῦ πλησίον σου...} \\
& \text{καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]
it is indeed original. Metzger (Textual, 89) argues that this clause was omitted by copyists because it is not one of the Ten Commandments. By omitting μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς, which is neither part of the Ten Commandments nor a reference to a Tanakh verse, Matthew moves closer to Exodus and, thus, makes his reference more prominent. In addition, Matthew’s οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις is identical to the form in the LXX whereas Mark’s μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσῃς deviates from the LXX. Matthew also adds an explicit reference to Lev 19:18, which makes the presence of the Tanakh even more prominent in his narrative.

---

22 Gundry, Use, 17-19; B. M. Metzger, Textual, 89; Davies and Allison, Matthew 1-7, 34-35; New, Quotations, 72; Menken, “Old Testament,” 211; O’Brien, Use, 206-207.
This is another Markan conflation of two Tanakh verses into a single reference. It includes one word, ὡσαννά, which is clearly derived from Hebrew or Aramaic but, given that it is only one word that was probably already used as part of the Hallel and since the remainder of the Ps 118:25 reference follows the LXX, we must refrain from any decision regarding dependence upon the MT or the LXX. Again there are no Matthean changes to Mark’s Tanakh references.
Matthew and Mark share a string of eight identical components with Isaiah 56:7, which appears to be their source. The Jer 7:11 reference incorporates only five identical verbal components, three of which may have been drawn from Is 56:7 by Mark. Nevertheless, Mark’s use of the LXX’s ληστὴς, which only renders זרף in Jer 7:11, may indicate the LXX as his source. Matthew changes the interrogative structure of the Markan verse and omits πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, a modification that makes the Isaiah reference less prominent.

A variety of equivalents occur in the LXX: σκληρός (“rough” or “strong”) in Ps 17:4; θηρίον (a wild beast) in Is 35:9; ἀφυλάκτως (“unguardedly” or “wildly”) in Ezek 7:22; and, λοιμός (“a plague” or “pestilence”) in Ezek 18:10; Dan 11:14 Thd.

**Mk:** λίθον ὅν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὕτως ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας—παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη καὶ ἔστην θαυμαστὴ ἐν όφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν

**Matt:** λίθον ὅν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὕτως ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας—παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη καὶ ἔστην θαυμαστὴ ἐν όφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν—καὶ οἱ πεσόν ἐπὶ τὸν λίθον τούτον συνθλασθῆσαι· ἐφ᾽ ὅδε ἄν πέσῃ λικμήσει αὐτοῦ.

**Lk:** πᾶς οἱ πεσόν ἐπὶ ἐκεῖνον τὸν λίθον συνθλασθῆσαι· ἐφ᾽ ὅδε ἄν πέσῃ, λικμήσει αὐτὸν.

**Ps:** λίθον ὅν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες οὕτως ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας—παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη καὶ ἔστην θαυμαστὴ ἐν όφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν

**Dan:** καὶ λικμήσει πάσας τὰς βασιλείας καὶ αὐτή ἀναστήσεται εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ὅν τρόπον εἴδες ὅτι ἀπὸ δρόους ἐτμήθη λίθος ἄνευ χειρῶν καὶ ἐλέπτυνεν τὸ ὀστρακὸν

The complete agreement between Matthew, Mark and the psalm affirms the LXX as the source of this quote. There is an intense debate concerning Matt 21:44, which is extant in most major witnesses (including η, B, C, K, L, W, and Z), but is absent from Origen and Irenaeus. Some claim that the passage is not authentic because it is omitted in some

---


58
witnesses and Lk 20:18 has a similar reference that is better attested—the reasoning being that, if both are authentic, either Luke must have used Matthew, or Matthew used Luke.27 Conversely, others argue that the passage should be included, since it is attested by most of the major witnesses.28 They solve the issue of possible Lukan dependency by accepting it or by suggesting that Matthew and Luke acquired this reference independently from a collection of testimonia or from Q.29

I tend to side with those who include Matt 21:44 because the textual evidence is quite strong and I am not averse to assuming that Luke was familiar with Matthew.

27 Thus, Davies and Allison, Matthew 19-28, 186: If one were to regard both Matt 21:44 and Lk 20:18 as pristine, one would almost be forced to infer a literary dependence of Luke upon Matthew or of Matthew upon Luke—an inference for which there is otherwise insufficient evidence.

28 Gundry, Commentary, 430–431; Metzger (Textual, 47) explains the decision to include Matt 21:44 in the UBS text:
   Many modern scholars regard the verse as an early interpolation (from Luke 20:18) into most manuscripts of Matthew. On the other hand, however, the words are not the same, and a more appropriate place for its insertion would have been after ver. 42. Its omission can perhaps be accounted for when the eye of the copyist passed from αὐτῆς (Ver. 43) to αὐτόν. While considering the verse to be an accretion to the text, yet because of the antiquity of the reading and its importance in the textual tradition, the committee decided to retain it in the text, enclosed within square brackets.

If Matt 21:44 is indeed original, then Matthew introduced a reference to Dan 2:44-45. That added reference strengthens the threat of judgment that is already conveyed in Mark’s version of the aftermath to the parable of the vineyard and also makes Matthew’s version more prominent.
This reference probably would have been categorized as implicit if it were not introduced as part of the Torah. Here we have an intriguing situation in relation to Deut 25:5. On the one hand, Mark shares four identical components with the LXX (ἐὰν, ἀποθάνη, ἀδελφὸς and γυναῖκα), but none of these verbal components shows a significant difference between the LXX and the MT. On the other hand, by using the word τέκνον, which is often treated as the equivalent of זא in the Tanakh, Mark is closer to the MT. By contrast, the LXX relies on σπέρμα (“seed” or “offspring”) to render זא in over one hundred occurrences, whereas it only uses τέκνον in our verse. Nevertheless, σπέρμα is close in meaning to τέκνον and also occurs in Mk 12:19 as part of the reference to Gen 38:8. Thus its apparent substitution with τέκνον may stem from Mark’s reluctance to use σπέρμα twice in the same verse.
Matthew’s use of the plural τέκνα moves his text slightly away from the MT’s singular Ἰ, but his use of ἀνίστημι brings him closer to Gen 38:8 LXX. Thus, in their use of Deuteronomy, Mark and Matthew are closer to the MT than to the LXX, but we lack sufficient evidence to establish dependence. Conversely, the reference to Genesis seems to be based upon the LXX, but the three corresponding words could also be a translation from the MT; hence, we cannot determine their possible dependence upon the MT. In sum, the Matthean changes here render the Deuteronomy reference slightly less prominent and the Genesis reference slightly more prominent.

18) Mk 12:26/Matt 22:31-32a (Ex 3:6 LXX)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mk: οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῇ βιβλίῳ Μωϋσέως ἐπὶ τοῦ βατου πῶς εἴπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς λέγων· ἔγω ὁ θεὸς Αβραάμ καὶ [ὁ] θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ [ὁ] θεὸς Ἰακώβ;</th>
<th>Matt: οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε τὸ ῥηθὲν ύμῖν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ λέγοντος· ἔγω εἰμι ὁ θεὸς Αβραάμ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ἰακώβ;</th>
<th>Ex: καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ἔγω εἰμι ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πατρὸς σου θεὸς Αβραάμ καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ θεὸς Ἰακώβ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A nearly identical string of nine verbal components shared by Mark and the LXX suggests that this reference derives from the LXX. Matthew moves even closer when he adds εἰμι and, if authentic, slightly away when he adds ὁ to θεὸς in two instances. The textual evidence for these articles in Mk 12:26, however, is ambiguous. They are absent in B, D and W, though extant in א, A, C, K, L and many other witnesses. Despite the major
Markan witnesses that omit these articles, it seems probable that they were original, since it is easier to imagine a Markan scribe assimilating his text to the LXX by omitting the two instances of ὁ, than to imagine Matthew intentionally moving away from both Mark and the LXX. Thus, the reference is more prominent in Matthew.


Mk: ἀκούεις Ἰσραήλ, κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἰς ἑστίν, καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἱσχύος σου.

Matt: ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου.

Deut B: ἀκοῦεις Ἰσραήλ, κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἰς ἑστίν καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς δυνάμεως σου.

A & F: καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς δυνάμεως σου.

Here Matthew omits the citation of Deut 6:4, a significant alteration that is discussed in detail in Chapter Four. This treatment focuses on the Matthean changes to Deut 6:5 and possible assimilation to the MT. Scholars intensely debate Matthew’s possible dependence
Mark shares a string of thirty identical verbal components with the LXX; thus, this passage can be considered a quotation from that source. In contrast, Matthew replaces Mark’s ἐκ with ἐν, thereby converting all three elements of the Shema from the genitive to the dative case. Matthew also omits Mark’s ἵσχος and, as a result, his verse retains only three elements in the Shema, as with most MSS of the LXX and the MT. He also changes the form of Mark’s διανοιας to διανοια and, hence, moves away from LXX B. The textual situation regarding the four (or three) elements of the Shema is complicated by the multiple variants in Mark, Matthew and the LXX. LXX A and F which, in this instance, are accepted by Rahlfis as the OG, represent a literal translation of the Hebrew, with της καρδιας σου for קָרָבָּב, της ψυχης σου for נְפָשׁ, and της δυναμεως σου for מְאֹד. LXX B, M and many other MSS, which are recognized by Wevers as the OG, render נְפָשׁ as της διανοιας σου (your understanding). This translation is very common in the LXX (Gen 8:21; 17:17; 27:41; 34:3; 45:26; Ex 9:21; 28:3; 35:22; Lev 19:17; Num 15:39; Deut 4:39; etc.). Mark agrees with LXX A and F when he uses της καρδιας σου and, partially, with LXX B when he uses της διανοιας σου. In Mark, however, της διανοιας σου is placed as the third element of the Shema, whereas נְפָשׁ is placed third in the MT, not נְפָשׁ. As a

---

30 Supporting an MT origin, Gundry, Use, 22-24; Davies and Allison, Matthew, 35. For the view that Matthew used the LXX: Repschinski, Controversy, 218; Menken, “Old Testament,” 216-218.
31 Gundry, Use, 22-24.
result, some scholars suggest that διανοιας and ἵσχυος are both Markan renderings of מְאֹד. Yet, as I demonstrated above, in the LXX, διανοια is almost always an equivalent of בָב and it never renders נַפְשָׁ.

It is also possible that Mark’s διανοια is another rendering of בָב, along with καρδία. If this explanation is correct, Mark used the two common Greek equivalents for בָב, perhaps in an effort to convey two aspects of this Hebrew term, which could literally be translated as “a heart” (καρδία) or symbolically rendered as “a full understanding” (διανοια). The main problem with this explanation is, if Mark sought to provide two renderings of בָב, one would expect τῆς διανοιας σου to immediately follow τῆς καρδίας σου, rather than following τῆς ψυχῆς σου, which translates נַפְשָׁ. Further, it is difficult to explain why Mk 12:30 opens by following LXX A and F (with καρδία), then follows LXX B (with διανοια), then moves away from the LXX and the MT with ἵσχυος. In sum, it is very difficult to determine whether Mark’s four elements, instead of the Tanakh’s three, stem from a double translation of בָב or נַפְשָׁ, or from another aim altogether. But it does seem that Mark’s addition of ἵσχυος as the fourth element, which does not occur in any major witnesses of the LXX, is original and, thus, may be an independent Markan attempt to translate נַפְשָׁ.

Now let us turn to Matthew’s use of ἐν. In the LXX, there are thirty one instances where Matthew’s phrase ἐν ὅλῃ renders בְכָל, but only one (1 Kin 8:23) where ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ translates a combination of בְכָל and בָב, and, even in this example, בָב is a plural form rather than the singular. The phrase ἐξ ὅλης in Mark and Deut 6:5 LXX is a less common equivalent of בְכָל (eighteen occurrences), but their ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας renders כָלְבָב in nine instances. Similarly, while Matthew’s ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ never renders כָלְנַפְשֶׁה, the ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς of Mark and the LXX does so in nine instances. Thus if, as Gundry and others claim, Matthew translated directly from Hebrew, he preferred a unique rendering over the version in Mark and the LXX, which in Deuteronomy is always the Greek translation of כָלְןַפְשֶׁה and כָלְבָב. Nonetheless, it remains difficult to imagine that this unique Matthean translation is derived from Mark or the LXX; therefore, Matt 22:37 is probably based on a Hebrew version of the Shema. Despite these unresolved issues, the move away from the LXX makes this reference slightly less recognizable and, therefore less prominent.
20) Mk 12:31a/Matt 22:39 (Lev 19:18b LXX = MT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mk:</th>
<th>ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt:</td>
<td>ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev:</td>
<td>ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, complete agreement between Mark, Matthew and Lev 19:18b LXX suggests that this quote is based upon the LXX. Yet, since the LXX uses the most common equivalents for שָׁמַר, בָּשְׂת and וָּשֶׁנ, we cannot be certain that Mark and Matthew are using the LXX.
21) Mk 12:32-33/Matt 22:40 (Deut 4:35; 1 Sam 15:22; Deut 6:4-5 LXX)

**Mk:** εἶς ἔστιν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλλος πλην αὐτοῦ· καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν αὐτὸν ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς συνέσεως καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἵσχύος καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν τὸν πλησίον ὡς ἑαυτὸν περισσότερον ἔστιν πάντων τῶν ὑλοκαυτώματος καὶ θυσίων.

**Matt:** eliminates these references

**Deut 6:4-5:** ἄκουε Ἰσραήλ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἶς ἔστιν καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς δυνάμεώς σου

4:35: καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι πλην αὐτοῦ

1 Sam: εἰ θελήσει τῷ κυρίῳ ὑλοκαυτώματα καὶ θυσίαν ὡς τὸ ἄκοψαι φωνῆς κυρίου ἰδοὺ ἄκοψαι ὑπὲρ θυσίαν ἀγαθὴ καὶ ἡ ἐπακρόσεις ὑπὲρ στέαρ κριῶν

This reference from Deut 6:5 is dependent on the LXX; however, the other references do not have enough verbal correspondence to determine whether they were derived from Greek or Hebrew. Matthew omits these references, a change that is discussed later in this chapter.
22) Mk 12:36/Matt 22:43-44 (Ps 110:1 LXX)

| Mk: αὐτὸς Δαυίδ εἶπεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ· εἶπεν κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου· κάθου ἐκ
dezioν μου, ἐως ἅν θῶ τοὺς ἔχθρούς σου ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν σου. |
|---|
| Matt: πῶς οὖν Δαυίδ ἐν πνεύματι καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον λέγων· εἶπεν κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ
μου· κάθου ἐκ deziον μου, ἐως ἅν θῶ τοὺς ἔχθρούς σου ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν σου; |
| Ps: εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου κάθου ἐκ deziον μου ἐως ἅν θῶ τοὺς ἔχθρούς σου
ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου |

The nineteen identical verbal components common to Mark, Matthew and Ps 110:1 LXX seem sufficient to establish dependence on the LXX. There is no significant difference between Matthew and Mark.
This reference to Dan 12:11 has three identical components with the LXX which are not sufficient for determining whether it is dependent on the Greek or the MT. The reference to 12:10 is quite intriguing: Mark’s νοέω is closer to the MT’s διανοέομαι which is only treated as an equivalent of δια in the book of Daniel (8:5, 23, 27, etc.) – or to Thd’s συνήμι, which is a common rendering of δια (1 Chr 25:7; 2 Chr 26:5; etc.) but an even more common equivalent of שכל Deut 29:8; 1 Sam 18:14-15; 2 Kin 18:7; etc.). Mark’s νοέω is also a common rendering of שכל (over fifteen occurrences; cf. Prov 19:25; 20:24; 28:5; etc.) and a translation of שכל (Prov 1:3; 16:23). Thus, it is possible that Mark’s νοέω is an independent rendering of שכל.
But the words διανοέομαι/συνίημι and νοέω are close enough to each other that it is feasible that Mark’s νοέω is derived from the LXX or Thd. Nevertheless, it is more likely that Mark is translating ἃν with νοέω than that he is substituting it for διανοέομαι or συνίημι. In sum, the MT is a more probable source than the LXX.

Matthew’s addition of τὸ ῥηθέν διὰ Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου confirms this reference by rendering it explicit and tracing its origin to Daniel. This is the sole instance in the New Testament in which Daniel is identified as a prophet. This unique Matthean pronouncement may have been influenced by Dan 9:2 Thd., where Daniel claims that, by understanding (συνήκα/ḥīḵ) the books, he knew the number of years that would pass from the desolation (ἐρημώσεως) of Jerusalem to the fulfilment of God’s word to Jeremiah the prophet (τὸν προφήτην). Indeed, this verse shares four similar words with Matt 24:15 (Δανιὴλ, προφήτης, ἐρημώσεως and νοέω/ἵνα), and it is the only place in the Tanakh that mentions Daniel and a prophet in the same verse. Thus it is probable that the presence of Daniel and the prophet Jeremiah in one verse prompted Matthew to introduce Daniel as a prophet.
If we accept Ziegler’s text of LXX Zechariah (based mostly on B) then Mark’s (and Matthew’s) διασκορπισθήσονται is dependent on the MT since διασκορπίζω is often the equivalent of the root פוץ (Num 10:34; Deu 30:3; Neh 1:8; Ps 68:2; Jer 9:15; 10:21; 13:14), and there are no other instances where ἐκσπάω renders פוץ. Indeed, this is the sole instance in the LXX where ἐκσπάω (“to draw out” or “to save”) renders פוץ. This strange translation may stem from the sword that plays a central role in Zec 13:7, since ἐκσπάω is at times associated with drawing a sword or a weapon (cf. Jud 3:22; Ezek 21:8, 10).

There is, however, conflicting evidence from our main witnesses: LXX B, S, W, V have ἐκσπάσατε; like the gospels, A has διασκορπισθήσονται; whereas Q and L have different forms of διασκορπίζω. This evidence has led some scholars to suggest that Mark relied on an Ur-LXX A source that predates the Christian recensions of A.33 The problem

with this suggestion is that it is far more plausible that a Markan scribe would have replaced the uncommon ἐκσπάσατε with διασκορπισθήσονται, which provides a better rendering of the Hebrew and is extant in Mark and Matthew, than to imagine a scribe moving away from both the Hebrew and the NT. Thus, it seems more likely that Mark’s διασκορπισθήσονται is derived from the MT than that it is dependent on an Ur-LXX A source.

Matthew’s addition of ποίμνης bears some similarity to the LXX’s ποιμένας. Despite its absence from some minor MSS of the LXX, ποιμένας, according to Ziegler and the major MSS, is an original element of the LXX; if this is indeed true; its inclusion moves Matthew closer to the LXX. Even if we omit ποιμένας from the LXX, Matthew’s word order (διασκορπισθήσονται τὰ πρόβατα) is closer to the LXX than Mark’s (πρόβατα διασκορπισθήσονται). In sum, Mark probably used the MT, at least partially, and Matthew brought his text closer to the LXX through his use of word order and possibly content.
25) Mk 14:62/Matt 26:64 (Dan 7:13; Ps 110:1)

| **Mk:** | καὶ ὄψεσθε τὸν ὦν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ δεξιῶν καθήμενον τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐρχόμενον μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. |
| **Matt:** | ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς ὄψεσθε τὸν ὦν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. |
| **Dan:** | ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὀράματι τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ οἶδον μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς ὦν ἄνθρωπος ἦρχετο |
| **Thd.** | ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὀράματι τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ οἶδον μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς ὦν ἄνθρωπος |
| **Ps:** | εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου καθὼς ἐκ δεξιῶν |

This is another instance where Mark conflates two allusions into one reference, in this case, Ps 110:1 and Dan 7:13. Here again the available evidence is insufficient for determining whether this reference is based on the LXX, Thd., or the MT. Interestingly, Mark is slightly closer to Dan 7:13 Thd. through his use of μετὰ and Matthew is slightly closer to the LXX with ἐπὶ. In addition, by placing ἐκ δεξιῶν after καθήμενον, Matthew moves closer to the word order in Ps 110:1 LXX.
26) Mk 15:24/Matt 27:35 (Ps 22:19 LXX?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mk:</th>
<th>Matt:</th>
<th>Ps:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ διαμερίζονται τὰ ἰμάτια αὐτοῦ, βάλλοντες κλήρον ἐπὶ αὐτὰ τίς τι ἄρη.</td>
<td>διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἰμάτια αὐτοῦ βάλλοντες κλήρον.</td>
<td>διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἰμάτια μου ἐπὶ τὸν ἰματισμὸν μου ἐβαλον κλήρον.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case as well, there is no significant difference between the LXX and MT; thus, it is difficult to determine Mark’s source. The only difference between Mark and Matthew is the replacement of Mark’s διαμερίζονται with διεμερίσαντο, which appears in an identical form in Ps 22:19 LXX. This substitution brings Matthew closer to the LXX.
The intense scholarly discussion concerning the origin of Mark’s ελωι ελωι and Matthew’s ηλι ηλι is complicated by the multiple variants.\(^{34}\) In D, Θ, Eusebius and some minuscules, Mark (like Matthew) has ηλι ηλι instead of ελωι ελωι, but the vast majority of major witnesses transmit ελωι ελωι and, therefore, it is probable that these variants represent an assimilation to Matthew. Matthew’s ηλι ηλι seems to move closer to the MT but, as we can see in some MSS of the Targum, א לִי א לִי can also work in Aramaic.\(^{35}\) It seems that Mark aimed to present an Aramaic transliteration of this passage from Ps 22:2. This attempt may be based on the words of Jesus or it may represent a Markan


composition that reflects a common Aramaic rendering of שלא י TimeSpanן. Indeed, the only significant difference between Mark and the Targum is the Markan use of the word λεμα (or λαμα) while the Targum has מטול מה. The textual evidence regarding Mark’s rendering of לָמָה is perplexing: NA28 follows א, C, L, D and many other MSS that have λεμα – a transliteration of the Aramaic word that corresponds to לָמָה – which is also used in Matthew. However, B, N, Q and several minuscules have λαμα, which seems to be a transliteration of the Hebrew. The latter is probably authentic since it is easier to imagine scribes assimilating Mark’s text to Matthew and to Aramaic than a Markan scribe moving away from Matthew. If λαμα reflects the original Markan text, then Mark employs an unusual mixture of Aramaic (אֶלֶוֵה אֶלֶוֵה וּפָיָה) and Hebrew (לָמָה); by contrast, Matthew seems to move closer to the Hebrew with ηλι ηλι and to the Aramaic with λεμα.36 By using Θεέ μου Θεέ rather than Mark’s ὁ θεός μου ὁ θεός μου, Matthew moves away from the LXX but, with ivατι, he moves closer to the LXX.

The chart below presents the results of the above verse-by-verse comparison in a concise form.

**A Summary of the One by One Comparison of Explicit Markan and Matthean Tanakh References**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tanakh more prominent in Matthew</th>
<th>Tanakh less prominent in Matthew</th>
<th>Similar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk 1:2/Matt 11:10 (Mal 3:1 MT; Ex 23:20 LXX)</td>
<td>Adds ἐγώ, which corresponds to Ex 23:20 and Mal 3:1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 1:3/Matt 3:3 (Is 40:3)</td>
<td>Corrects the Markan inaccuracy by referring to Isaiah before the corresponding quotation rather than before the quote from Mal/Ex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 2:25–26/Matt 12:3–4 (1 Sam 23:1–6)</td>
<td>Corrects Mark’s mistake by omitting Αβιαθάρ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 7:6/Matt 15:7–8 (Is 29:13) Both LXX.</td>
<td>Positions οὗτος after ὁ λαός and thus moves closer to the LXX.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 7:10/Matt 15:4 (Deut 5:16). Both LXX and MT.</td>
<td>By replacing Μωϋσῆς with θεός, Matthew moves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
slightly closer to Deuteronomy, according to which God—not Moses—gave the commandment to honor one’s father and mother.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripture</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk 8:18/Matt 13:13 (Jer 5:21).</td>
<td>Matthew’s οὐ βλέπουσιν and οὐκ ἄκουοσιν are more similar to Jeremiah than are Mark’s οὐ βλέπεται and οὐκ ἄκουεται.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 10:6/Matt 19:4 (Gen 1:27). Both LXX and MT.</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 10:7–8/Matt 19:5 (Gen 2:24). Both LXX.</td>
<td>Matthew moves further from the LXX/MT by replacing ἐνεκεν with ἐνεκα, προσκόλληθήσεται with κολληθήσεται, and τὴν γυναῖκα with τῇ γυναικί.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 10:19/Matt 19:18–19 (Ex 20:12–16) Both follow the text of the LXX although the order of commandments does not follow the LXX.</td>
<td>By omitting μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς, which is neither in the Ten Commandments nor a reference to a Tanakh verse, Matthew moves closer to Exodus, thus making his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 19:19 also adds Lev 19:18 to his citations from the Ten Commandments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 11:9-10/Matt 21:8-9 (Ps 117:25-26 148:1) Both LXX (except for ὡσαννά).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 11:17/Matt 21:13 (Is 56:7; Jer 7:11). Both LXX</td>
<td>Omits πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν and thus moves away from Is 56:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 12:19a/Matt 22:24 (Deut 25:5 [MT?]; Gen 38:8).</td>
<td>In 22:24b, Matthew adds ἀὑτοῦ καὶ ἀναστήσει, which brings the text closer to Gen 38:8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 12:29–30/Matt 22:37 (Deut 6:4–5). Mark LXX, Matthew MT?</td>
<td>Omits Deut 6:4 and thus moves away from to Tanakh reference. In the remainder of this text, Mark = LXX while Matthew moves away from the LXX by replacing the Markan ἐξ ὀλης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 12:32–33/Matt 22:40 (Deut 4:35; Is 45:21; Deut 6:5) Mark LXX.</td>
<td>Does not preserve the references to Deut 4:35 and 6:5; also omits a reference to 1 Sam 15:22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 12:36–7/Matt 22:43–45 (Ps 110:1) Both LXX.</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 14:27/Matt 26:31 (Zec 13:7). Both LXX? with possible MT influence in διασκορπισθήσονται.</td>
<td>Adds ποίμνης and thus moves closer to Zechariah. By changing Mark’s order from πρόβατα διασκορπισθήσονται to διασκορπισθήσονται τὰ πρόβατα, Matthew moves closer to Zechariah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 14:62/Matt 26:64 (Dan 7:13; Ps 110:1)</td>
<td>By placing ἐκ δέξιῶν after καθήμενον, Matthew moves closer to the order of Ps 110:1 LXX. Matthew with ἐπὶ moves closer to Dan 7:13 LXX. Mark with μετά is closer to Dan 7:13 Thd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As this chart displays, in sixteen instances Matthew brings his text closer to the Tanakh or makes the connection more explicit.\(^{37}\) By contrast, in five instances, Matthew makes material from the Tanakh less prominent.\(^{38}\)

On nine occasions, Matthew simply adds a quotation of one or more words that bring his narrative closer to the Tanakh source.\(^{39}\) Twice Matthew adds a formal introduction to an explicit reference in Mark (Mk 4:12/Matt 13:14; Mk 13:14/Matt 24:15). Similarly, on two occasions Matthew transforms a single Markan introduction into a pair of introductions that form a direct connection between prophecies from the Tanakh and


John the Baptist (Mk 1:2/Matt 11:10; Mk 1:2/Matt 3:3). Matthew twice corrects Markan errors by omitting the incorrect name for the high priest and by attributing only the quote from Is 40:3 to Isaiah (Mk 1:2; 2:25). In three examples, Matthew modifies the forms of Markan words in a way that increases their similarity to the Tanakh (Mk 8:18; 10:19; 15:24). Analogously, the first evangelist omits a pair of Markan words that do not belong to the Decalogue (Mk 10:19), improves Mark’s transliteration (Mk 15:24), and restructures word order according to Ps 110:1 (Mk 14:62).

In sum, Matthew uses an array of editorial tools to amplify Mark’s explicit references. It seems, however, that these Matthean enhancements rarely alter Mark’s version significantly. For example, the addition of formal introductions to explicit references from Isaiah and Daniel, despite highlighting that these words originate in the Tanakh, does not fundamentally change the Markan message.⁴⁰ Similarly, adding or altering words that intensify the connection with Ps 22:2, 19 and 110:1, Jer 5:21, or Dan 7:13 does not significantly change the Markan narrative.⁴¹

In contrast, four (Mk 9:48; 11:17; 12:29, 32-33) of the five references that become less prominent in Matthew (all of which stem from omissions of words or verses) are significant.

---


⁴¹ Mk 15:24/Matt 27:35; Mk 13:26/Matt 24:30.
Thus, the majority of Matthew’s changes appear to be intended to clarify and amplify Mark’s message and, perhaps, to ensure that the Tanakh text will be presented with greater accuracy, but without attempting to offer a substantially different message.

Matthew’s Treatment of Explicit Markan References that focus on Jesus’ Identity, the Law, Judgment and Discipleship

As stated above, eleven of Mark’s explicit Tanakh references focus on Jesus’ identity and mission. On six of these occasions, Matthew makes the Tanakh reference more prominent (Mk 1:2–3; 4:12; 12:10–11; 14:62; 15:24), while he reduces its prominence only once (Mk 11:17). It therefore seems that Matthew seeks to ensure that his readers will not miss references that are concerned with Jesus’ identity. In only two instances (Mk 1:2; 11:17) do the Matthean changes significantly modify Mark’s original focus.

Matthew engages the twelve Markan references concerning the Law somewhat differently. In five instances, Matthew makes the Tanakh source more prominent (Mk 2:25–26; 7:10; 10:19; 12:19, 26); in three cases, less so (10:7–8; 12:29–30, 32–33). As noted above, most of the explicit references in Mark are related to universal principles or foundation myths, but not to controversial issues. Somewhat surprisingly, Matthew does not use Tanakh passages on specific aspects of the Law in his adaptation of Mark. Rather, in several instances, Matthew makes such Markan references even more generic. For example, Matthew adds a quotation from Lev 19:18 to Mk 10:19, while omitting μη
ἀποστερήσῃς, a possible reference to a specific social obligation. Elsewhere Matthew omits ἀκοῦε, Ἰσραὴλ, κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἰς ἔστιν (Mk 12:29/Matt 22:37) and, thus, deletes Israel, the most distinctive Jewish element of the Shema, and “God is one,” its exclusively monotheistic component. Additionally, in subsequent verses, Matthew omits references to Ex 8:6 and Deut 6:4, respectively.⁴²

As noted above, Matthew twice (or once, if we exclude Matt 21:44) adds references about judgment to Markan references that primarily focus on Jesus’ identity. He also inserts a formal introduction between references to Dan 12:10 and 11 (Mk 13:14) to be sure that his readers will “understand” that Jesus is quoting the words of Daniel, who Matthew specifically identifies as a prophet. Nevertheless, Matthew omits the reference to Is 66:24, with its strong theme of judgment, from Mk 9:48. Perhaps Matthew, though willing to enlist harsh language against Pharisees and other Jewish leaders who persecuted Jesus (Matt 3:7, 23:15, 27, 29–33), was reluctant to engage such vocabulary in a warning directed to the disciples.⁴³ In any case, this omission and that of Deut 6:4 are two rare examples where Matthew removes whole Tanakh verses that are explicitly referenced in Mark. As

⁴² See also Deut 4:35 and Is 45:21.

⁴³ On Matthew’s more favorable portrayal of the disciples, see Svartvik, Matthew and Mark, 43–45; Sim, Christen Judaism, 188–199; D. Senior, What are They Saying About Matthew? (New York: Paulist Press, 1996), 91–93.
we shall see in subsequent chapters, such omissions are more common in Matthew’s treatment of implicit and especially subtle references.

Finally, although Matthew raises the prominence of the two references concerned with discipleship, these enhancements do not affect Mark’s narrative or message.
Conclusion of Explicit References to the Tanakh

This examination of explicit Tanakh references in Mark and Matthew yields the following results: (1) Matthew tends to make Mark’s Tanakh references more prominent; however, in several instances he makes them less so, including two cases where he omits Tanakh verses in their entirety (Mk 9:4/Is 66:24; Mk 12:30/Deut 6:4). (2) The majority of Matthean changes adjust the prominence of a reference rather than qualitatively shift its focus or message. (3) Matthew makes extensive changes in six instances (Mk 1:2–3; 9:48; 10:19, 29–33; 11:17; 12:10–11. (4) Matthew seems to place special emphasis on judgment: Twice (or once, if we omit Matt 21:44), he adds or intensifies a threat of judgment to a reference whose Markan version focuses on Jesus’ identity (Mk 12:10–11/Matt 21:44; Mk 13:26/Matt 24:30); Matthew also adds a formal introduction to another reference that emphasizes judgment (Mk 13:14/Matt 24:15). (5) While Matthew’s treatment of Mark’s explicit references demonstrates considerable familiarity with the Tanakh, it does not seem to reflect a special interest in the Law per se. Indeed, none of the Matthean enhancements or omissions to explicit references regarding the Law increases their level of specificity or detail, and, in several instances (Mk 10:19/Matt 19:18–19; Mk 12:29–30/Matt 22:27; Mk 12:32–33/Matt 22:40), Matthew makes Markan references more generic. (6) Matthew intensifies confrontations between Jesus and his Jewish rivals twice (Mk 4:12/Matt 13:14–15; Mk 12:10–11/Matt 21:42–44) and, in one instance, he creates (or inserts) a confrontation that is not present in Mark (Mk 12:29–33/Matt 22:37–40). (8) In several
instances, Mark’s references seem to reflect the historical reality of the Great Revolt (9:48; 10:19; 11:17; 13:14); twice (or once, if we exclude Mk 9:48), Matthew omits material that forms the possible connection to Mark’s historical setting (Mk 9:48; 10:19). Some contemporary commentators argue that another significant omission (11:17) is best explained by differences in their historical settings. Moreover, through the insertion of a formal introduction, Matthew turns what Mark’s readers may have read as a Tanakh allusion related to their immediate historical context (Mk 13:14) into a prophecy from Daniel.
Chapter Two: Implicit References to the Tanakh in Mark and Matthew

**A Breakdown of Markan concerns: Implicit References**

We now turn from explicit references to the Tanakh to implicit ones. Here I present an overview of the main Markan concerns, followed by a verse-by-verse comparison of the implicit references in Mark and Matthew.

In total, Mark includes thirty-four implicit references to the Tanakh: twenty-one are concerned with Jesus’ identity;\(^1\) three relate to points in the Law (Mk 1:44; 6:18; 10:2-4); six convey threats of judgment or apocalyptic imagery (Mk 12:1, 9; 13:8, 19, 24, 25); and, two do not fit any of these categories (Mk 4:32; 6:22-23).

Of the references that focus on Jesus’ identity, twelve are from the Torah.\(^2\) Three come from Isaiah (Is 42:1; 50:6; 53:12). Five originate in Psalms (Ps 2:7 twice; 22:5, 7-8; 23:1; 11:2; 13:26, 27; 14:24, 34, 49-50; 15:29-30.\(^3\))

---

\(^1\) Mk 1:6, 11, 13; 8:31; 9:4, 7a, b, 11-12a, 12b-13, 31; 10:33b-34, 11:2; 12:6, 7-8; 13:26, 27; 14:24, 34, 49-50; 15:29-30.

\(^2\) Three occurrences of Gen 22:2; and one each of Gen 37:19-20; 49:11; Ex 20:10; 24:8 34:28; 40:34; Num 27:17; Deut 18:15; 30:4.
42:6). Mal 3:24 and Hos 6:2 are referenced together twice; and, 2 Kgs 1:8, Jon 1:1-6 and Jer 25:4 are each referenced once.

It is noteworthy that several of these references occur in Mk 1:11 and 9:7, a pair of similar verses. In Mk 1:11, a heavenly voice declares: σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα. The first five verbal components are an implicit reference to Ps 2:7, where the anointed king is described as God’s son; ὁ ἀγαπητός conveys a reference to the binding of Isaac (Gen 22:2); and, its closing phrase is a subtle allusion to Is 42:1. This three-fold reference in Mk 1:11 is nearly replicated in Mk 9:7, with the exception of a reference to Deut 18:15, which mentions “a prophet like Moses,” in place of the image of the Servant from Is 42:1.

Two additional implicit references to the Torah are found in Mk 12:6-8. Mk 12:6 alludes to the Akedah through the inclusion of ἀγαπητός, which appears in Gen 22:2, 12, and Mk 12:7-8 echoes the plan to kill Joseph (Gen 37:19-20). In their original context, the

3Ahearne-Kroll, Genesis, 37; Marcus, Mark 8-16, 803; Evans, Mark 8:27-16:20, 236.

remaining Torah references concerning Jesus’ identity describe God’s actions (Mk 13:24/Deut 30:4), Moses on Mount Sinai (Mk 1:13/Ex 34:28), and the inauguration of Joshua as Israel’s “shepherd” (Mk 6:34/Num 27:17), whereas another (Mk 9:7a/Ex 40:34) describes the cloud that covers the σκηνή τοῦ μάρτυρος. The final reference from the Torah (Mk 14:24/Ex 24:8) alludes to Moses sprinkling the blood of two young calves – which he calls “the blood of the covenant” – upon the people of Israel. In this last instance, Mark associates Jesus with the sacrifice rather than with Moses (Mk 14:24).

Of the five references from the Psalms, two depict a righteous sufferer (Mk 15:29-30/Ps 22:7-8; Mk 14:34/Ps 42:6), two originally refer to the Davidic king (Mk 1:11/Ps 2:7; Mk 9:7/Ps 2:7), and the other portrays God’s agency (Mk 13:27/Ps 105:43). The three Isaiah references (Mk 1:11/Is 40:2; Mk 10:33-34/Is 50:6; Mk 14:24/Is 53:12) speak of the servant who has been deserted and delivered “for our sins” (Is 53:6) or to “bear the sins of many” (53:12). The two Malachi references point to Elijah the prophet, who will be sent by God as a precursor of the day of the Lord. These Malachi references in Mk 9 (v. 4, 11) seem to imply that John, not Jesus, is associated with Elijah; thus John's presence presages

---


the day of the Lord. This link between John and Elijah is established by the reference in Mk 1:6 to 2 Kgs 1:8. Finally, the double reference to Hos 6:2 in the passion predictions ties the resurrection of Jesus to Hosea’s prophecy on the fall and rise of the people of Israel.

In sum, much like the explicit references on this theme, Mark’s implicit references concerning Jesus’ identity present allusions to suffering, humiliation, sacrifice and death, alongside references to great leaders of Israel and God. In these texts, however, we also see references whose original settings include covenantal elements (Gen 22:2, 12; Ex 24:8; 34:8; Is 42:1). Two other references that feature links to Jesus’ identity also convey threats of judgment (Is 5:1-2 and 60:2).

The three implicit references to the Tanakh that are concerned with the Law all come from the Torah (Lev 14:2-4; 20:21; Deut 24:1-2). Here, Mark does not shy away from Torah verses that specifically address the subjects of divorce, leprosy, forbidden sexual relations (i.e., with one's brother’s wife), and Temple ritual. Thus, in Mk 6:18, John the Baptist tells Herod, οὐκ ἐξεστίν σοι ἔχειν τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου. In Mk 10:2-

4, similarly, the Pharisees test Jesus by inquiring whether it is “lawful for a man to divorce his wife.” Jesus responds by asking, “What did Moses command you?” and, in return, they reply ἐπέτρεψεν Μωϋσῆς βιβλίον ἀποστασίον γράψαι καὶ ἀπολύσαι. The third reference occurs when the Markan Jesus, after healing a leper (Mk 1:44), instructs the man to appear before a priest, show his current condition and offer the appropriate sacrifice for one who has recovered from leprosy.⁸

Four of the six implicit references to threats of judgment are from Isaiah (Mk 12:9/Is 5:6-7; Mk 13:8a/Is 19:2; Mk 13:24/Is 13:10; Mk 13:25/Is 34:4), along with one each from Ps 81:5 (Mk 13:25b) and Dan 12:1 (Mk 13:35). Five of these references occur in Mk 13 (v. 8, 10, 24, 25ab, 35) in relation to the tribulations that will precede the arrival of the Son of Man. In their original settings, Is 13:10; 34:4 and Ps 81:5 describe stars melting or falling from the heavens and the foundations of the earth being shaken.⁹ Similarly, Dan 12:1 portrays a time of unsurpassed anguish, and Is 19:2 depicts a sweeping war whose destruction will include brother fighting against brother. The final reference is drawn from Is 5:6-7 (Mk 12:9), a prophecy that God will destroy Jerusalem and Judea in

---


response to their inequities. In sum, these references integrate scenes that probably arose during times of war and rebellion with prophecies of apocalyptic events on a cosmic scale.

**Implicit Markan References to the Tanakh: A sequential analysis and comparison to Matthew**

In this section, I offer verse-by-verse comparisons of implicit Tanakh references in Mark and Matthew. Each item begins with an attempt to identify the Markan reference and determine whether it relies upon the MT or the LXX. The Markan reference is then analyzed in relation to its parallel Matthean version.

**Legend:**

- **Yellow** = Agreement of Matthew and/or a text in the Tanakh to Mark
- **Light Green** = Similarity of Matthew and/or a text in the Tanakh to Mark
- **Red** = Matthean agreement with the Tanakh, not evident in Mark
- **Light Blue** = Matthean similarity to the Tanakh, not evident in Mark

1) **Mk 1:6b/Matt 3:4 (2 Kgs 1:8b MT and LXX)**

| Mk: τρίχας καμήλου και ζώνην δερμάτινην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ | Matt: εἶχεν τὸ ἐνδύμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τρίχας καμήλου και ζώνην δερμάτινην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ. |
| 2 Kgs: ἄνὴρ δασὺς καὶ ζώνην δερμάτινην περιεξοσμένος τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ |

Mark 1:6b shares six identical verbal components with the LXX version of 2 Kgs 1:8b, presented in nearly identical order; it is thus probable that the LXX served as Mark’s main source for this reference.
Mark’s θρίξ, however, is the most common rendering of the MT’s שער (over thirty occurrences). In contrast, the word δασύς is far less common in the LXX (four occurrences: Gen 25:25; 27:11, 23; 2 Kgs 1:8, each of which depicts a hairy man). This word choice in the LXX is a more literary (though equally accurate) translation of שער בעל in the MT. Therefore, the more literal θρίξ in Mark may have been influenced by the MT.

Matthew probably added ἔχω to Mark’s account in order to convey that John owned a (camel) hair garment. Thus, Matthew’s version is probably dependent upon שער בעל from the MT. Overall, Matthew slightly increased the prominence of this reference by adding ἔχω, thereby bringing his text closer to the MT.
When considered individually, these three references in Mark 1:11 are subtle but, taken as a group, they form an implicit reference. Let us consider them one by one. The reference to Ps 2:7 is widely recognized, albeit not universally; thus, the reasons for its inclusion merit attention here.11 Mark and the psalm share the phrase υἱός μου and also the two identical forms, εἰ and σῦ, a pairing that is unparalleled in the LXX and occurs only in direct quotations of Ps 2:7 in the NT (Ac 13:33; Heb 1:5; 5:5). In this psalm and in Mark, a heavenly voice declares “you are my son” when addressing the Davidic king and

---

describing Jesus, the son of David (Mk 10:47-48; 11:10), respectively. Thus, Mark is probably referencing Ps 2:7, but lexical correspondence is not sufficient to establish whether he is following the LXX or the MT. Matthew moves a little closer to the psalm with the addition of λέγουσα, but he also distances his writing by omitting Mark’s σὺ εἰ.

The possible allusion to the Akedah (Gen 22:2, 12, 16), similarly, has many supporters, though even more detractors. While lexical correspondence is comprised of two relatively common words (υἱός and ἀγαπητός) in the LXX, ἀγαπητός only appears with a possessive pronoun to describe υἱός in the Akedah. Another similarity is the heavenly voice (φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν) which may have reminded Mark’s readers of Gen 22:11-12, in which an angel commands Abraham from the heavens to spare his “beloved son.”

Furthermore, the notion that Jesus was sacrificed as God’s beloved son for the sake of humanity is expressed in Rom 8:32. In that verse, Paul integrates an allusion to the Akedah and a reference to Isaiah’s suffering servant which is quite similar to the one found in Mk 1:11 that draws on Gen 22:2, 12 and Is 42:1. Moreover, Mk 12:6 (discussed below)

---


references the Akedah and Mk 14:32, 46 may also refer to it. It is thus plausible that Mark is referencing Gen 22:2, 12 in the present verse. Here too, however, the verbal similarity is insufficient for determining whether this allusion is based on the LXX or the MT. In this instance, Matthew moves slightly closer to Genesis by adding λέγουσα and slightly away by omitting σῦ.

The possible reference to Is 42:1 is more difficult to establish since its version in the LXX shares no common vocabulary with Mark. The MT, however, may provide convincing evidence. Although the term προσδέχομαι (“to receive” or “to wait for”) is found in the LXX (2 Chr 26:31) as a rendering of the MT’s πάρε (“to be pleased with” or “to favor”), it cannot have been the source of εὐδοκέω (a common translation of the MT’s רצה in Lev 26:34, 41; 1 Chr 10:7 29:3; Ps 40:14; 44:4; 49:14; etc.), which appears in Mark and Matthew. Admittedly, a single word that derives from a possible rendering of the MT cannot provide sufficient lexical correspondence to establish the existence of a reference. However, three thematic links are evident: first, in Mk 1:10, the spirit (πνεῦμα) descends upon Jesus, just as God places his spirit (πνεῦμα) upon his Servant in Is 42:1; second, the Servant portrayed in Isaiah is referenced in verses from Mark, consistent in their relationship to Jesus’ identity (Mk 10:45/Is 53:10, 12; Mk 14:24/Is 53:12; Mk 14:65/Is 50:6; etc.); lastly, Is 42:1 is formally quoted in Matt 12:17-18. Thus, despite the weak verbal similarity, Mark and Matthew probably refer to Is 42:1, based on the MT.
When considering Mk 1:11, there is no need to choose between one of these three associations with the Tanakh, for Mark often conflates two or more allusions into a single reference (Mk 1:2/Ex 23:20/Mal 3:1; Mk 11:17/Is 56:7/Jer 7:11; Mk 14:62/Ps 110:1/Dan 7:13; etc.).

3) **Mk 1:13/Matt 4:2 (Ex 34:28)**

| **Mk** | καὶ ἦν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ σατάνα, | **Matt** | καὶ νησεύσας ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα καὶ νῦκτας τεσσαράκοντα, ὑπείνασεν. | **Ex** | καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ Μωυσῆς ἐναντίον κυρίου τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νῦκτας, ἵνα ἑφαγέναι καὶ ὕδωρ ἀρτον φαγέναι καὶ νῦκτας ἐναντίον κυρίου τεσσαράκοντα. |

In analyzing Mk 1:13, we find that two figures from the Tanakh could serve as the subject of this typology, for both are described as having sojourned forty days in the desert: Moses (Ex 24:18; 34:28; etc.) and Elijah (1 Kgs 19:8). However, several elements favor Moses for this reference: First, while Elijah walks in the desert for forty days, Moses, like Jesus, remains in one location throughout that period. Moreover, Mark depicts John as Elijah (Mk 1:10/1 Kgs 1:8b; Mk 9:12/Mal 3:22-24), but no such association is drawn between Jesus and Elijah; by contrast, in Mark, Jesus is sometimes portrayed as a new Moses (e.g., Mk 9:2-3/Ex 19:20; Mk 9:7/Deut 18:15). Furthermore, the Matthean additions suggest that he recognized Mk 1:13 as a reference to Moses. And whereas Elijah eats before his forty day sojourn, Moses, like the Matthean Jesus, refrains from eating during his forty days on Mount Sinai. In this case, the verbal similarity between Exodus and Mark is not sufficient
to determine whether Mark was using the LXX or the MT. By inserting νηστεῖον and νύκτας, Matthew moves closer to Exodus, where Moses fasts for forty days and forty nights; but, by placing ἡμέρας before τεσσεράκοντα, Matthew distances his narrative from the order presented in Exodus. Nevertheless, this reference to the Tanakh is more prominent in Matthew.

4) Mk 1:44/Matt 8:4 (Lev 13:49; 14:2)

| Mk: ἀλλὰ ὑπαγε σεαυτὸν δείξον τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ προσένεγκα περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου ὁ προσέταξεν Μωϋσῆς | Matt: ἀλλὰ ὑπαγε σεαυτὸν δείξον τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ προσένεγκαν τὸ δῶρον ὁ προσέταξεν Μωϋσῆς |
| Lev 13:49: λέπρας ἐστίν καὶ δείξει τῷ ἱερεῖ | Lev 14:2: οὗτος ὁ νόμος τοῦ λεπροῦ ἢ ἢν ἡμέρα καθαρισθῇ καὶ προσαχθῇ πρὸς τὸν ἱερέα καὶ προσέταξεν καθαρισθῇ καὶ προσαχθῇ πρὸς τὸν ἱερέα |

In Mk 1:44, too, verbal similarity and Jesus’ statement that the man who has been healed should act according to the instruction that Moses gave are sufficient for identifying a reference but not for ascertaining whether it is dependent on the LXX or the MT. Mark seems to be conflating Lev 13:49 and 14:2, verses that provide a directive to one who is afflicted with leprosy, and one who has just been healed of it, respectively.

Matthew omits Mark’s καθαρισμοῦ, thus moving away from the language of Lev 14:2. Therefore, the reference to Lev 14:2 becomes slightly less prominent in Matthew.
5) Mk 4:32/Matt 13:32 (Ezek 17:23b; Dan 4:11b -12 LXX and Thd.; Ps 103:12)

| Mk: | καὶ γίνεται μείζων πάντων τῶν λαχάνων καὶ ποιεῖ κλάδους μεγάλους. ὡστε δύνασθαι ὑπὸ τὴν σκιὰν αὐτοῦ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνοῦν. |
| Matt: | καὶ γίνεται δέντρον, ὡστε ἐλθεῖν τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ κατασκηνοῦν εἰς τοὺς κλάδους αὐτοῦ. |
| Ez: | καὶ ἔσται εἰς κέδρον μεγάλην καὶ ἀναπαύσεται ὑποκάτω αὐτοῦ πάν τηρίου καὶ πᾶν πετεινὸν ὑπὸ τὴν σκιὰν αὐτοῦ ἀναπαύσεται τὰ κλῆματα αὐτοῦ ἀποκατασταθήσεται |

| Dan: | καὶ ὑποκάτω αὐτοῦ ἐσκίαζον πάντα τὰ θηρία τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐνόσσεων ὁ καρπὸς αὐτοῦ πολύς καὶ ἀγαθὸς |
| Dat: | ἐμεγαλύνθη τὸ δέντρον... καὶ ὑποκάτω αὐτοῦ κατασκήνωσεν τὰ θηρία τὰ ἄγρια καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ κλάδους αὐτοῦ κατάκυκλον τὰ ὅρνεα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ |
| Ps: | ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκήνωσεν |

One of the most intricate Markan and Matthean mosaics is transmitted in Mk 4:32, where Mark conflates two or three different sources and, in Matt 13:32, where Matthew adds to the puzzle. I begin here by attempting to identify Mark’s references and then Matthew's. The reference to Ezek 17:23 in Mk 4:32 is quite clear, for these two verses share the words μέγας and πετεινός as well as an identical string comprised of four verbal components (ὑπὸ τὴν σκιὰν αὐτοῦ) that are unique to these passages. Mark conflates this reference to Ezekiel with allusions to Dan 4:12 (combining LXX and Thd.) or Ps 103:12 (or perhaps both). Mark and the psalm share a near identical string of six verbal components, but their subjects differ, describing a plant (Mark) and a body of water (Psalms), respectively. Mark closely resembles the language of Dan 4:12 in the LXX, which describes a tree that, like Mark’s
mustard seed, is a botanical image and, thus, Mark’s more likely referent. Dan 4:12 LXX lacks κατασκηνόω, which is in a similar position in both the psalm and in Mark; however, this verb does appear in the Thd. version of Dan 4:12. Thus we may conclude that Mark conflated references to Ezekiel and Daniel, while relying on the LXX with support from Thd. for the latter allusion.

Matthew (or Q, as some scholars would posit) omits Mark’s μεγάλην and υπό τὴν σκιάν αὐτοῦ, thereby eliminating the reference to Ezekiel. In contrast, Matthew enhances the similarity to Dan 4:11-12 Thd. by adding δένδρον and replacing κλάδους with κλάδοις, which is then framed by ἐν τοῖς and αὐτοῖς, two Matthean additions. Thus Matthew and Thd. share an identical string of four verbal components. Matthew also preserves τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, which is also in Dan 4:12 LXX. In sum, Matthew eliminates the Markan reference to Ezekiel, retains the Daniel LXX allusion, and makes the Thd. reference more prominent.
6) Mk 4:37-38/Matt 8:24-26 (Jon 1:4-6)

Mk: καὶ γίνεται λαίλαψ μεγάλη ἀνέμου καὶ τὰ κύματα ἐπέβαλλεν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, ὡστε ἡδὴ γεμίζεσθαι τὸ πλοῖον... ἐν τῇ πρώμη ἐπὶ τὸ προσκεφάλαιον καθεῦδον

Matt: καὶ ἰδοὺ σεισμὸς μέγας ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, ὡστε τὸ πλοῖον καλύπτεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων, αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκάθευδεν

Jon: ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν τοῦ κοινωνοῦσθαι ἀπ’ αὐτῶν Ιωνας δὲ κατέβη εἰς τὴν κούλην τοῦ πλοίου καὶ ἐκάθευδεν καὶ ἔρρεγεν

Jer: καὶ λαίλαψ μεγάλη ἐκπορεύεται

Mark’s λαίλαψ μεγάλη may derive from Jer 25:32 LXX, with which it shares this unique phrase, or it may be a Markan rendering of מַּעַרְגֶּה דָּבָרְגָּה in Jon 1:2 MT (this is also the Hebrew phrase in Jer 25:32). We can be certain that this Markan reference is not dependent on Jon 1:4 LXX, for that verse uses different words to describe the storm. These verses from Mark, Matthew and Jonah all depict a boat that is hit by a great storm while at sea. This life-threatening (ἀπόλλωμι) event awakens the protagonist, who had been asleep in the hold. From that point, the gospel narratives diverge from Jonah. The challenge is addressed in very different manners even though, in both cases, the people respond with fear and awe. As the textual comparisons in the table above indicate, the Markan reference to Jonah is based on thematic rather than verbal similarity. Matthew, however, significantly strengthens the lexical correspondence by adding θαλάσσῃ and ἐκάθευδεν; thus, in the Matthean version of this reference, the Tanakh becomes more prominent.
7) Mk 4:41a/Matt 8:27a (Jon 1:10a)

Mk: καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους
Matt: eliminates this reference
Jon: καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν οἱ ἄνδρες φόβον μέγαν καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτὸν τι τούτο ἐποίησας

The near identical series of eight verbal components shared by Mk 4:41a and Jon 1:10a implies that Mark is likely referencing the LXX. In contrast, Matthew omits these words entirely, thereby eliminating this reference. While Mark seems to emphasize fear on the disciples' part, Matthew, who depicts responses that capture amazement, may have been motivated to stress the subsequent clause, οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ ἡ θάλασσα αὐτῷ ὑπακούουσιν, which describes Jesus in divine terms, as the one whom the winds and the sea obey (Mk 4:41b/Matt 8:27/Ps 106:9; 107:29).

8) Mk 6:18/Matt 14:3b-4a (Gen 38:8; Lev 20:21)

Mk: ἔλεγεν γὰρ ὁ Ἰωάννης τῷ Ἑρῴδη διότι οὐκ ἔξεστί σοι ἔχειν τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.
Matt: γυναῖκα Φιλίππου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.
Gen: εἶπεν δὲ Ιουδας τῷ Αυναν εἰσελθεῖ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.
Lev: δὲ ἄν λάβῃ τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.

Mk 6:18 seems to be referencing Gen 38:8, a verse with which it shares a string of five identical verbal components. By comparison, Matt 14:3b-4a is slightly closer to Lev 20:21, although Matthew's agreement with Leviticus is less extensive than Mark’s with Genesis.
Thus, the Leviticus reference is somewhat less prominent in Matthew than the Genesis reference in Mark.
This verse from Mark shares two thematic elements with Esther: 1) a banquet where a dialogue takes place between a king and a woman;\textsuperscript{14} 2) the woman’s beauty (in Esther) or dancing (in Mark) inspires the king to offer her whatever she wishes, even “to half of my kingdom” (Mk 6:23/Est 5:3,6/7:2). Significant lexical correspondence is also evident. Mark shares a near identical string of six verbal components with Est 7:2 LXX, and he also follows its word order, in contrast with the word order in the MT. Mark’s δώσω σοι, however, may be a paraphrase of וְתִנִָ֣ת ֹֽן לָָּ֑ך from Est 7:2 MT. Indeed, in Jer 39:17 (46:17 LXX), δώσω renders וְתִנִָ֣ת ֹֽן and, in over ten instances, δώσω σοι represents similar combinations, such as נָתַתִִ֣י לְְ֠ך (Gen 17:8), אֶתֶן־לָך (Jer 3:19) and אֶתְנֵָּ֙ה לְ (Ex 24:12). Consideration of ἐστῶ σοι in the LXX, the equivalent of וְתִנִָ֣ת only in Est 7:2 LXX, increases the probability of Markan reliance on the MT. However, given that σοι occurs in Est 7:3 LXX, only δώσω can be read as a direct translation from the MT.

While this reference seems largely to be derived from the LXX, δῶσω (and perhaps σοι) is most likely a rendering of the MT. Matthew, however, omits σοι ἡμίσους τῆς βασιλείας μου, leaving only thematic associations.

10) Mk 6:34/Matt 9:36 (Num 27:17; 2 Chr 18:16)¹⁵

The descriptions of the people being like “sheep without a shepherd” in Mk 6:34 and Matt 9:36 probably echo a verse in the Tanakh, either Num 27:17 or 2 Chr 18:16. The lexical correspondence between Mark and 2 Chronicles is stronger, sharing four similar verbal components (ὁράω, ὡς πρόβατα and ποιμήν). Yet it is easier to imagine that Mark echoed Moses’s words about Joshua than that he was trying to evoke the less known Micaiah. It is also possible that Mark’s ὡς πρόβατα is a rendering of כַּצָּן in Num 27:17. Indeed, the formulation ὡσεὶ πρόβατα in the LXX is a rare translation of כַּצָּן (appearing here and in __________________

¹⁵Recognized by NA²⁸; Gundry, Use, 32-33; Meneken, Bible, 205-206; Marcus, Mark 1-8, 406.
Ps 80:2), whereas Mark’s ὡς πρόβατα is fairly common. The likelihood of Markan dependence on the Hebrew is supported by the unique phrase μὴ ἔχοντα in Mk 6:34 and Matt 9:36, which may be a translation of בניא from the MT and cannot have been derived from ὡκ ἔστιν in the LXX.

If Mark is indeed echoing Num 27:17 MT and if ὡσεὶ πρόβατα in Matthew is a very slight assimilation of language in the LXX, the latter reference would be slightly more prominent. However, if Mk 6:34 is an allusion to 2 Chr 18:16, then Matthew’s change simply increases the similarity to Numbers and distances his writing from 2 Chronicles.

---

n 2 Chr 8:16; Job 21:11; Ps 43:12, 23; 49:15; 77:21; 78:52; 107:41; Is 53:6; Ezek 36:37-38; Mic 2:12; Zec 9:16.
11) Mk 8:31b/Matt 16:21 (Hos 6:2b)

| Mk: καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήναι. |
| Matt: καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι. |
| Hos: ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ ἀναστησόμεθα καὶ ζησόμεθα ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ |

Taken in isolation, this reference is subtle; however, its recurrence in Mk 9:31 and 10:34 seems sufficient for it to be considered an implicit reference. Since the reference to Hos 6:2b in Mk 8:31b is not universally accepted, I will briefly argue for its inclusion.  

Mark and Hosea share three words (τρεῖς, ἡμέρα and ἀνάστημι); none are unique, but Hos 6:2 is the one place where they appear together in the Tanakh. This verse from Hosea is also the sole passage in the Tanakh that describes God raising (ἀνάστημι) something or someone on the third day. Furthermore, the first part of Hos 6:2 is echoed immediately before Mark’s passion narrative in Mk 14:1, which states that two days before the Passover … the chief priests and the scribes were formulating a plan to kill Jesus. Thus, Mk 14:1 shares the unique sequence μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας with Hos 6:2a (the sole occurrence of this clause in the LXX) and mentions chief priests and scribes, two of the groups that, according to Mk 8:31a, recognized by Marcus, Mark 8-16, 606; Collins, Mark, 405; Davies and Allison, Matthew 8-18, 657; W. L. Lane, The Gospel According to Mark: The English Text with Introduction Exposition and Notes (NICNT 2; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 302-303. Not acknowledged by Boring, Mark, 240-241.
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will participate in Jesus’ killing. Therefore it seems probable that Mk 8:31b alludes to Hos 6:2.

Matthew brings his text closer to Hosea by replacing the phrase μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας in Mark with τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. Matthew, however, also substitutes ἐγερθήνα for Mark’s ἀναστήνα, a change that reduces the relationship to the LXX. This latter choice may stem from assimilation to Paul’s confession in 1 Cor 15:3 or the tradition behind it, though it could also represent a direct translation of יְקִימוּ in the MT. Indeed ἐγείρω often appears as the Greek rendering of קום (Jud 2:16, 18; Is 14:9; 26:19; Jer 51:12 etc.) and, in one case, יִקְיָם (Gen 49:9). Especially relevant among these translations of קום as ἐγείρω is the description of the resurrection of the dead in Is 26:19: יְקִימוּ הָקִיצַו וְרַנְנִו שֹכְנ עָפֶר. This move away from the language of the LXX reduces the prominence of this version; thus, the two changes in Matthew heighten but then decrease the prominence of this allusion.
12) Mk 9:4/Matt 17:3 (Mal 3:22-24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mk: καὶ ὄφθη αὐτοῖς Ἡλίας σὺν Μωϋσεὶ</th>
<th>Matt: καὶ ἴδον ὄφθη αὐτοῖς Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἡλίας</th>
<th>Mal: καὶ ἴδον ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ύμῖν Ἡλίαν τὸν Θεσβίτην πρὶν ἐλθεῖν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Although no direct lexical correspondence links Mk 9:4 with Mal 3:22-24, the explicit inclusion of Elijah and Moses in both texts provides a thematic association. The mention of these key figures from the Tanakh in Mk 9:4 can likely be attributed to references to Moses at Sinai in Mk 9:2-3, 7 and the allusion to Elijah's appearance before the “day of the Lord” (Mal 3:22-24) in Mk 9:12-13. Matthew subtly raises the prominence of this reference by adding ἴδον. By reversing the order in which these characters are mentioned, Matthew may have been following a convention that an earlier Tanakh figure should be named first; however, this change has no bearing on the prominence of this reference.
13) Mk 9:7a/Matt 17:5a (Ex 40:34-35)

Taken in isolation, this is little more than a subtle reference but, given the three additional references in Mk 9:7, this Exodus reference merits consideration here. While the three similar words in Mk 9:7a and Ex 40:34-35, including the rare ἐπισκίαζω (one of its four occurrences in the LXX), are sufficient to identify this as a reference to Ex 40:35, this evidence cannot confirm whether it is based on the LXX or the MT. Since there are no significant differences between Matthew and Mark, no comparison will be made.

14) Mk 9:7b-c/Matt 15:5b-c (Gen 22:2; Ps 2:7b; Is 42:1 Deut 18:15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tekst</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk: οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ γιός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.</td>
<td>Gen: καὶ εἶπεν λαβέ τὸν υἱόν σου τὸν ἀγαπητὸν ὃν ἡγάπησας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt: οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ γιός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ὧν ἑυδόκησα ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.</td>
<td>Deut: προφήτην ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου ὡς ἐμὴ ἀναστήσας σοι κύριος ὁ θεός σου αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps: κύριος εἶπεν πρὸς με νῦν μου εἰ σύ</td>
<td>Is: ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς μου προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἡ ψυχή μου ἔδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mark 9:7b is very similar to Mk 1:11, except for its inclusion of a reference to Deut 18:15 rather than Is 42:1. Consequently, “a prophet like Moses” replaces the Servant imagery. This change seems to be part of the Sinaitic scene of the Transfiguration and the use of Moses typology throughout Mk 9:2-7.18

Matthew fully replicates his baptism theophany (3:17) but, like Mark, he adds ἀκούετε αὐτῶν. By adding the Isaiah reference, Matthew heightens the presence of the Tanakh, which becomes more prominent in his account.

15) Mk 9:12-13/Matt 17:11-12a (Mal 3:22-23)

Here again we lack sufficient evidence to determine whether Mk 9:12-13 relies on the LXX or the MT. Matthew’s changes, however, quite clearly assimilate the text to the LXX by using Ἡλίας rather than Ἡλίας, ἐλθεῖν in place of ἐλθὼν, and ἀποκαταστήσει over...
ἀποκαθιστάνει. As a result of these changes, Matthew shares three identical words with Malachi, which renders the Tanakh reference in his account more prominent.

16) Mk 9:31b/Matt 17:22-23 (1 Chr 21:13)

This allusion to 1 Chr 21:13 in Mk 9:31b is a subtle reference which, together with the allusion to Hos 6:2 in the third part of the Markan verse, forms an implicit reference. The sequence εἰς χείρας ἀνθρώπων only occurs in 1 Chr 21:13 and Is 19:4. The lexical correspondence between Mark and Isaiah is stronger since they also share the verb παραδίδωμι. But in Isaiah it is the Egyptians that will be placed in human hands and it seems unlikely that Mark would portray Jesus by means of a reference that originally described Israel’s enemies. In contrast, in 1 Chr 21:13, εἰς χείρας ἀνθρώπων is included in David's statement that he would rather “fall into the hands of God” than into “the hands of men.” Thus, it is probable that the identical accounts in Mark and Matthew refer to this verse from 1 Chronicles.
17) Mk 9:31c/Matt 17:23 (Hos 6:2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mk:</th>
<th>καὶ ἀποκτανθεὶς μετὰ τρεῖς ημέρας ἀναστησεται.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt:</td>
<td>καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτὸν, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ημέρᾳ ἐγερθῆσται.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hos:</td>
<td>ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ ἀναστησόμεθα καὶ ζησόμεθα ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See discussion of Mk 8:31.
The attribution to Moses and the presence of five similar verbal components (including three identical forms) are sufficient to establish the dependence of Mk 10:2, 4, 11 on Deut 24:1-3. These similarities, however, are not sufficient for determining whether Mark worked from a Greek or a Hebrew original.

In his adaptation of Mk 10:2, 4, 11, Matthew makes numerous changes: 1) ἄνδρι is replaced with ἀνθρώπῳ, thereby inserting the word from Gen 2:24 – which appears in the Markan version of Jesus’ rebuttal – into the Pharisees’ question as well (Matt 19:5). 2) γυναῖκα is moved from a position that precedes ἀπολύσαι to one immediately following it. 3) The phrase κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν (for every reason) is added to the Pharisees’ question. 4) The word order is rearranged, with Jesus becoming the first to refer to the Torah. 5) Mark’s

---

See my discussion of the reference to Gen 2:24 in Chapter One. On the text-critical problems with this verse, see Gundry, Commentary, 376-377; Fitzmyer, Advance, 85; Menken, Bible, 208-209.
τί ὑμῖν ἐνετεύλατο Μωϋσῆς is omitted and Mark’s γράψαι is replaced by δοῦναι, which more closely resembles δώσει (Deut 24:1). 6) Matthew adds αὐτήν, which further enhances the similarity to Deut 24:1. 7) Mark’s ὑμῶν ἐγραψεν ὑμῖν τὴν ἑντολὴν ταύτην is replaced with ἐπέτρεψεν ὑμῖν ἀπολύσαι τάς γυναῖκας ὑμῶν. 8) In Matt 19:9, Jesus addresses the Pharisees in his closing statement whereas, in Mk 10:11, he speaks to his disciples.

The omission of Mark’s γράψαι and the replacement of ἀνδρί distance the Matthean passage from Deut 24:1-3, but the addition of δοῦναι and the change in word order bring Matthew’s version closer to Deutonomy. Moreover, the insertion of ἀνθρώπῳ forms a double connection with Gen 2:24, and this foreshadows that verse’s presence in Matt 19:5. Another possible Matthean enhancement is the addition of αὐτήν which, while present in B, C, K, N, W, G and D, is absent from א, D, L, Z and Q and could thus represent a scribal assimilation to the Tanakh or an omission resulting in harmonization with Mark. 21

20 Mark’s γράψαι also occurs in Deut 24:1, where this term refers to writing of a bill of divorce, which could only go into effect once it had been received by the woman being divorced. This too is an example of Matthew’s tendency to ensure that his readers get the exact message, namely, that the Pharisees refer to Deut 24:1 but Jesus bases his argument on a text that occurs earlier in the Bible.

21 Metzger (Textual, 47) asserts that, since the evidence is balanced, a decision regarding originality cannot be reached. Gundry (Use, 38) argues that αὐτήν is original and that its omission stems from assimilation to Mark.
overall reliability of B leads me to prefer that version and, therefore, accept the originality of ἀυτῆν.

Perhaps the most significant Matthean alterations are the addition of “for every reason” to the Pharisees’ question and “except for unchastity” to the concluding words of Jesus. In these two instances, Matthew appears to augment the specificity of a Markan reference regarding the Law. As we will see below, the Matthean words attributed to Jesus closely resemble the language of early rabbinic debates on the interpretation of Deut 24:1-4.

Before delving into such comparisons, however, let us first examine the construct form (§מיכות עֶרְוִַ֣ת דָבֶָ֔ר), which seems to occupy the heart of this debate. The only other occurrence of this construct in the Tanakh is in Deut 23:14, where the people are warned against defecating within their military encampment and are instructed to cover excrement with dirt. These demands are justified by the status of a site that God accompanies; therefore, it must be kept holy and free from עֶרְוִַ֣ת דָבֶָ֔ר.

The LXX renders עֶרְוִַ֣ת דָבֶָ֔ר as

---

ἀσχημον πράγμα (Deut 24:1) and ἀσχημοσύνη πράγματος (Deut 23:15). The only other occurrence of ἀσχημον πράγμα in the LXX is Sus 1:63 (Thd.), which describes a shameful sexual act.24 In total, the word γυνη, in all of its forms, appears forty seven times in the Tanakh; it refers to a sexual act or to nakedness in all but four of these. Thirty-one of those occurrences are in the construct form γυνη, of which twenty-seven describe an illicit sexual act or behavior.25 Thus, the construct γυνη is almost always associated with illicit sex or improper sexual behavior.

The form ἀσχήμον occurs twice more in the LXX: in Sus 1:63 and Gen 34:7, in the story of Dina, where ἀσχήμον is used to describe Dina’s rape by Shechem as “an abominable act.”26 Here too this word is associated with illicit sex. Another form of this term also appears twice in the LXX, simply meaning “shameful,” without a connotation of sexual relations (2 Mac 9:2; Wis 2:20). The Greek word that is most commonly used to render γυνη is ἀσχημοσύνην, which is related to sex in the majority of cases but also means,

24 Sus 1:63: καὶ μεταστήσας αὐτὸν ἐκέλευσεν προσαγαγεὶν τὸν ἔτερον καὶ ἔπεν αὐτῷ σπέρμα Χανααν καὶ οὐκ Ιουδα τὸ κάλλος ἐξηπάτησέν σε καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία διέστρεψεν τὴν καρδίαν σου.

25 Gen. 9:22-23; 42:9,12; Lev. 18:7-17; 20:11,17, 19-21; Deut. 23:15; 24:1; 1 Sam. 20:30; Is 19:7; 20:4; Ez 22:10; 23:29; Hab. 3:13.

26 Gen 34:7: οἱ δὲ νιότες Ιακωβ ἠλθον ἐκ τοῦ πεδίου ὡς δὲ ἤκουσαν κατενύχθησαν οἱ ἄνδρες καὶ ὁμηρών ἦν αὐτοῖς σφόδρα ὅτι ἄσχημον ἐποίησεν ἐν Ἰσραηλ κομιθείς μετὰ τῆς θυγατρὸς Ιακωβ καὶ οὐχ οὕτως ἐσται.
“shameful” or “bare.” This survey of terminology suggests that the most common definition of עֶרְוִַ֣ת is related to illicit sexual behavior.

As noted above, the two most significant Matthean additions are κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν (Matt 19:3) and μὴ ἔπι πορνείᾳ. The great majority of scholars concur that these additions introduce a debate over the interpretation of Deut 24:1 which closely parallels a rabbinic discussion in Mishnah Gittin 9:10. In that dispute, the school of Shammai underscores the first term עֶרְוִַ֣ת, and thus reads עֶרְוִַ֣ת דָבֶָ֔ר as illicit or improper sexual conduct. Conversely, the rival school of Hillel focuses on the root of the second term, דָבֶָ֔ר, and consequently interprets דָבֶָ֔ר עֶ as anything that a husband dislikes about his wife. The resonance between these Matthean and mishnaic texts is often noted as an exemplar of Matthew’s tendency to bring Markan texts closer to Judaism and Jewish law. Thus, scholars have posited that Matthew reframed his narrative “to coincide with the Pharisaic

27 Thirty-four of its 41 occurrences are related to limitations on sexual relations.


29 As demonstrated above, this understanding is supported by the use of עֶ in the MT.

30 See Sigal, Halakhah, 101-104; Instone – Brewer, Divorce, 110-114; Tomson, Divorce, 311-317. For the position that the views of Shammai and Matthew differ significantly, see I. Ben Shalom, The School of Shammai and the Zealots’ Struggle Against Rome (Jerusalem: Yad Ben Zevi, 1993 Hebrew), 216-219.
schools dispute” so it would be more acceptable to a Jewish or Judeo-Christian audience. Others have similarly suggested that this reformulation is framed as a halakhic discussion which therefore presents Jesus as “a rabbi and a teacher” of the Law.

It is also possible, however, that the similarities between Matthew and the school of Shamai represent another Matthaean attempt to elevate the prominence of a reference from the Tanakh. Thus, while the Pharisees in Mark simply ask if divorce is lawful, in Matthew they add κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν. At first glance, this addition does not seem related to Deut 24:1. A closer look, however, suggests that this Matthean modification may represent a possible (and perhaps even a common) interpretation of the difficult phrase רֵ֖שׁׁת דָּבָר. The rarity and ambiguity of this phrase led ancient interpreters to focus upon one of its two components. By way of comparison, let us examine another contemporaneous example: Josephus (Ant. 4:253), writing in Greek during the same century as Matthew, explains Deut 24:1 as follows: γυναῖκας δὲ τῆς συνοικίας βουλομένος διαζευγθῆναι καθ᾽ ἀσόδημοιν αἰτίας πολλαὶ δ᾽ ἂν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις (He that wishes to be divorced from

31 Tomson, Divorce, 324

32 For example, see Jackson, Essays, 203; Amram, Divorce, 35; Rosen Zvi, Analysis, 51; Collins, Divorce, 115; W. Loader, Jesus’ Attitude towards the Law (WUNT 97; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 509-524; Kazen, Scripture, 272-273.

his wife for any reason whatever, and many such reasons occur among men). Hence, like the school of Hillel and the Pharisees in Matthew, Josephus directs his attention to the word דָבֶָ֔ר and reasons that a man can divorce his wife καθ᾽ ἁσδηπτοῦν αἰτίας (“for any cause whatsoever”). It is noteworthy that, in his discussion of polygamy in Ant. 4:249, Josephus lists reasons why a man might prefer one of his wives over another, then adds κατ᾽ ἀλλήν αἰτίαν (“for some other reason”). Thus, in these two related instances, Josephus employs words that closely resemble both Matt 19:3 and m. Git. 10:9. Accordingly, by adding μὴ ἐπὶ πορνεία, Matt 19:9 becomes closer to Deut 24:1 than Mk 10:11, since the word πορνεία, though not identical, is close to עֶרְוִַ֣ת which, as discussed above, is typically associated with illicit or improper sexual behavior.

There is an intense scholarly debate regarding the exact meaning of πορνεία. The three most common renderings are: “fornication,” “incest” and “adultery.” For the purposes of this study, there is no need to determine which of these is most precise since all are related to improper sexual conduct and thus could be a substitute for or a rewrite of עֶרְוִַ֣ת. Indeed, fifty-three of the fifty-five occurrences of πορνεία in the LXX are related to sexual conduct. Moreover, Matt 5:32, a verse that is probably derived from Mk 10:11, is

---

even more similar to Deut 24:1 with λόγον πορνείας, a possible Matthaean rendering of נָדָרְוִת דָבֶָ֔ר.\footnote{Thus Davies and Allison, \textit{Matthew}, 528.}

In sum, these two significant Matthean modifications of Mark create a narrative that closely resembles a debate regarding divorce in the Mishnah. But these Matthean changes probably also reflect an attempt to amplify references to Deut 24:1-4. Therefore, despite some movement away from the Tanakh text, these changes heighten the prominence of the references to Deut 24 in Matthew’s narrative.
19) Mk 10:33b-34/Matt 20:19 (Hos 8:10; Is 50:6)

In this passage, Mark conlates two subtle allusions to form an implicit reference. Hos 8:10 is the only verse in the LXX that uses παραδίδομι to describe being handed over to οίς ἥθεσιν. If this is indeed a reference, it could only be based on the LXX since the MT has יִתְנֶׁוּ בַגוֹיִָם, which, in this context, would mean “to negotiate” or “to have dealings with the nations,” unlike the LXX’s παραδοθήσονται (“handed over” or “delivered”). This Greek rendering probably resulted from the similar sound of וֶּׁיִתְנ (active from the stem נכה) and וּיִתְנ (passive from the stem ננת), which led the to the rendering of יִתְנ in Hos 8:10 MT with παραδοθήσονται. Therefore, since Mark and Matthew use παραδίδομι, they are probably dependent on the LXX.

The lexical correspondence with Is 50:6 LXX is minor, with one similar word (ἐμπτύω/ἐμπτυσμα). But, notably, this single term is omitted by Matthew. The plausibility of this reference in Mark is somewhat augmented by the MT’s קַלֹּק (from the stem חָלַק), which is frequently rendered by Mark’s μαστιγώ (Ex 5:14, 16; Deut 2:2; 25:3; 2 Chr
25:16; etc.). Overall, this is a marginal reference in Mark that depends in part on the Hebrew and has been accepted by scholars as an allusion on account of other Markan references to this Isaiah verse (Mk 14:65; 15:19); this faint reference becomes even weaker in Matthew.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mk: αμπελώνα ἄνθρωπος ἐφύτευσεν καὶ περιέθηκεν ψραγμόν καὶ ὄρυξεν ὑπολήγιον καὶ ὄκοδόμησεν πύργον</th>
<th>Matt: ἐφύτευσεν ἁμπελώνα καὶ φραγμόν αὐτῷ περιέθηκεν καὶ ὄρυξεν ἐν αὐτῷ ληνόν καὶ ὄκοδόμησεν πύργον</th>
<th>Is: μου ἁμπελών ἐγενήθη τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ ἐν κέρατι ἐν τόπῳ πίονι καὶ φραγμόν περιέθηκα καὶ ἑραράκωσα καὶ ἐφύτευσα ἁμπελον σωρηκαὶ ὄκοδόμησα πύργον ἐν μέσῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξολήνιον ὄρυξα ἐν αὐτῷ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Eight similar words are shared between Mk 12:1 and Is 5:1-2 LXX; thus, the LXX is Mark’s probable source. But, in the LXX, Mark’s ὑπολήγιον always represents גֻּפְנָּה (Joel 4:13; Hag 2:16; Zec 14:10; Is 16:10; see also Aq. and Sym. for Is 5:2), whereas this is the sole occurrence of Is 5:2 LXX’s προλήγιον. Matthew’s ληνός is actually the most common rendering of גֻּפְנָּה (Num 18:27, 30; Deut 16:13; Prov 3:10; Hos 9:2; etc.), but this term also translates מָיָה. It is thus possible that Mark and Matthew translated גֻּפְנָּה from the MT. However, since only this word prompts this assertion, the evidence is insufficient for establishing dependence on the MT. With his insertion of ἐν αὐτῶ, Matthew assimilates this reference to the LXX and hence raises its prominence.
### 21) Mk 12:2-5/Matt 21:34-35 (Jer 7:25; 25:4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bible Version</th>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mk</strong></td>
<td>καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄλλον δοῦλον</td>
<td>and sent another slave to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matt</strong></td>
<td>ὦτε δὲ ἤγγισεν ὁ καιρὸς τῶν καρπῶν, ἀπέστειλεν τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>And when the time came for the harvest, he sent his slaves to the owners of the vineyard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jer 7</strong></td>
<td>καὶ ἔστελεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς πάντας τοὺς δούλους μου τοὺς προφήτας ἡμέρας καὶ ὀρθῶν καὶ ἀπεστείλα</td>
<td>He sent me all his servants at one time and prophets, and at the right time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though Mk 12:2-5 and Jer 7:25 only share three similar words, their order and thematic resonance are sufficient to demonstrate a reference. By replacing δοῦλον in Mark with τοὺς δούλους, Matthew brings his text closer to the Tanakh and, thus, makes this reference more prominent.

### 22) Mk 12:6/Matt 21:37 (Gen 22:2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bible Version</th>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mk</strong></td>
<td>ἔτι ἕνα εἶχεν υἱὸν ἀγαπητὸν ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν ἐσχατὸν πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγων ὅτι ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου</td>
<td>at one time he had a beloved son whom he sent last to them saying that they would entrap him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matt</strong></td>
<td>ὦτε δὲ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ λέγων· ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου.</td>
<td>And when he sent his son to them, saying, They will entrap him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lk 20:13</strong></td>
<td>εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος· ἤγαπησας τὸν υἱὸν μου τὸν ἀγαπητὸν· ίσως τοῦτον ἐντραπήσονται.</td>
<td>And the owner of the vineyard said to his slaves, I have loved my son and have sent him to you. Perhaps they will entrap him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the LXX, ἀγαπητός is used to describe υἱός only in Gen 22:2. Its other occurrence in the NT is the Lukan parallel of this Markan verse. Indeed, Luke seems to enhance this reference incrementally by adding τὸν to υἱός and ἀγαπητός, and by assimilating its word order toward the LXX. In contrast, Matthew omits this reference.
23) Mk 12:7-8/Matt 21:38 (Gen 37:19-20)

| Mk: πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς ἔπαυν ὅτι οὐτὸς ἐστὶν ὁ κληρονόμος: δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτὸν, καὶ ἡμῶν ἔσται ἡ κληρονομία. καὶ λαβόντες ἀπέκτειναν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἐξω τοῦ ἁμπελῶνος. |
| Matt: ἰδόντες τὸν υἱὸν ἔπον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς· οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος· δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτὸν καὶ σχῶμεν τὴν κληρονομίαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ λαβόντες αὐτὸν ἐξέβαλον ἐξω τοῦ ἁμπελῶνος καὶ ἀπέκτειναν. |
| Gen: ἔπαυν δὲ ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἦδον τὸ ἐνυπνιαστὴς ἐκεῖνος ἔρχεται νῦν οὖν δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτὸν καὶ ῥίψωμεν αὐτὸν εἰς ἕνα τῶν λάκκων. |

An identical string of four verbal components (δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτὸν καὶ) is present in both Mk 12:7-8 and Gen 37:19-20 LXX, which is sufficient to establish a reference but not to determine dependence on the LXX. Whereas Gen 37:20 LXX uses ῥίπτω (“to throw away” or “to cast aside”), Mark has ἐκβάλλω. Although ῥίπτω is a common rendering of יָשָׁה (Gen 21:15; Ex 1:22; 4:3; 7:9; Deut 9:17; etc.), in four instances, Mark and Matthew’s ἐκβάλλω is also used as a translation for יָשָׁה (Ps 49:17; Ec 3:6; Is 2:20; Jer 22:28). Thus, this may be a case where Mark independently translated from Hebrew.

Matthew brings this reference closer to the Tanakh by adding ἰδόντες but moves away by altering the form of Mark’s εἶπαν to εἶπον and reversing the sequence of events from killing then casting out (Mark and Genesis) to casting out then killing.

As mentioned above, in Mk 12:8, after the son approaches the tenants λαβόντες ἀπέκτειναν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἐξω τοῦ ἁμπελῶνος. Similarly, in Gen 37:24, the brothers alter their original plan – to kill (ἀποκτείνωμεν) Joseph then cast him into a pit –
to simply seizing (λαβόντες) him before casting him into a pit. Thus, in Mark, the son is first seized (like Joseph), then killed and cast out.

The inversion of events in Matthew decreases its thematic similarity with Genesis 37, creating an odd sequence where the son is cast out of the vineyard and then killed. This Matthean reversal is most commonly explained as foreshadowing for Jesus’ death outside of Jerusalem. For example, Luz argues:

… they drag him out of the vineyard and murder him outside the walls. The vineyard, whose metaphorical meaning has thus far been fluid, here becomes Jerusalem. Jesus died on Golgotha, outside the city. 36

Indeed, the Matthean reversal of events could represent an attempt to align this parable with the death of Jesus.

It is also possible, however, that Matthew altered Mark’s order for another reason, namely, to avoid any inference that Jesus, the son in that narrative, was left unburied. As Hengel and others have shown, victims of crucifixion were often denied the dignity of interment. 37 Even though the Matthean order does not affirm burial, it avoids any

36 Luz, Matthew 21-28, 41. A similar claim is found in: Gundry, Commentary, 427-428; Davies and Allison, Matthew 19-28, 183; France, Matthew, 813; Marcus, Mark 8-16, 804-805; but see Nolland, Matthew, 875 who questions this explanation.

implication of a body lying unattended in an open place. Moreover, Matthew is the sole gospel that contains the depiction of guards at the tomb, which attempts to preclude any conjecture that Jesus’ body might have been stolen by his disciples. Consistent with this, any doubts about Jesus’ burial had to be refuted; hence, perhaps, the change in order.

Whether Matthew’s movement away from the Tanakh ordering was an attempt to align his parable with Jesus’ death or an attempt to negate any inference that Jesus’ body remained unburied, both reasons seem to reflect a Matthean tendency to elevate or protect Jesus’ image.

24) Mk 12:9/Matt 21:40-41 (Is 5:5-7; Ps 1:3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mk: τί συνειδάσκεις ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελώνος; ἔλευζεται καὶ ἀπολέσει τοὺς γεωργοὺς καὶ δώσει τὸν ἀμπελώνα ἄλλος.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt: ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελώνος, τί συνειδάσκεις… κακοὶ κακοὶ ἀπολέσει αὐτοὺς καὶ τὸν ἀμπελώνα ἐκδώσεται ἄλλοις γεωργοῖς, οἵτινες ἀποδώσουσιν αὐτῷ τοὺς καρποὺς ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς αὐτῶν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is: τί συνειδάσκεις τὸ ἀμπελώνι μου ἀψωφῶ… καὶ ἀνήσω τὸν ἀμπελώνα μου… ὁ γὰρ ἀμπελών κυρίου σαβαωθοῦ ὁ Ἰσραήλ ἐστίν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps: καὶ ἐσται ὡς τὸ ξύλον τὸ περιπτευμένον παρὰ τὰς διεξόδους τῶν ὑδάτων ὃ τὸν καρπὸν αὐτοῦ ἰώθη ἐν καιρῷ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here Mk 12:9 and Matt 21:40-41 share four similar words with Isaiah, as well as a strong thematic connection that includes descriptions of God as the “Lord of the vineyard” and motifs of destruction and judgment. With the insertion of τοὺς καρποὺς ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς αὐτῶν, Matthew adds a reference to Ps 1:3; this change heightens the presence of the Tanakh in this passage from Matthew.
Mk 13:8 conflates two allusions from the Tanakh into a single implicit reference. Thus 2 Chr 15:6 furnishes the image of a war of “nation against nation” and Is 19:2 LXX has a compounded form of the verb ἐγείρω. The Markan phrase βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν is probably a translation of מַמְלָכָה בְּמַמְלָכָה (cf. 2 Chr 9:19; 13:5; Jer 18:7; etc.) in the MT. Whereas βασιλεία is almost always the equivalent of ממלכה (over 200 instances), this is the sole use of νομὸς for this purpose in the LXX. It thus seems highly unlikely that Mark somehow derived βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν from νομὸς ἐπὶ νομὸν; Mark or his tradition must have had contact with a Hebrew version of 2 Chron 15:6. Since Mark and Matthew are identical, there are no changes to discuss.
Another conflation of two allusions into one reference appears in Mk 13:19, where Mark begins with an apparent reference to Dan 12:1 Thd., with which the Markan verse shares an identical string of four verbal components (ὅλης οὐ γέγονεν), followed by ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἥν ἐκτισεν, where Mark echoes Ex 9:18 LXX. Another possible similarity is Mark’s ἐως τοῦ νῦν, a common rendering of ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας in Ex 9:18 MT (cf. Deut 12:9; 2 Sam 19:8; 2 Kgs 8:6). In contrast, Ex 9:18 LXX has ἐως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης, the typical translation of ἕως της ἡμέρας ἕως της ἡμέρας ταύτης (sixty-nine instances), uniquely used here for ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας. This rare translation may stem from the phrase ἕως της ἡμέρας ταύτης (“from the day”) that begins Ex 9:18. In two instances (2 Kgs 21:15; 1 Chr 17:5), this phrase is followed with ἕως της ἡμέρας ταύτης (“until this day”); thus the presence of ἕως της ἡμέρας ταύτης in Ex 9:1 may have prompted the translator to adapt the second component of this verse to its first component and to translate ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης (“until now”) with ἐως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης, which would render ἕως της ἡμέρας ταύτης. On this basis, it is likely that Mark translated directly from the Hebrew. Matthew is almost identical to Mark,
though his addition of μεγάλη interrupts the verbal string common to Mark and Daniel, thus moving slightly away from Daniel.

27) Mk 13:24 / Matt 24:29a (Is 13:10; Joel 4:15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mk:</th>
<th>Matt:</th>
<th>Is:</th>
<th>1Qlsa:</th>
<th>Jo:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθῆσαι, καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος αὐτῆς</td>
<td>ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθῆσαι, καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος αὐτῆς</td>
<td>οἱ γὰρ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ὁ Ὄριον τὸ φῶς οὐ δύσωσιν καὶ σκοτισθῆσαι τοῦ ἥλιου ἀνατέλλοντος καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φῶς αὐτῆς</td>
<td>לא יאיר אור</td>
<td>ὁ ἥλιος καὶ ἡ σελήνη συσκοτάσουσιν καὶ ἡ ἀστρα δύσωσιν τὸ φέγγος αὐτῶν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case, Mk 13:24 and Matt 24:29a are probably based on Is 13:10 possibly conflated with Joel 4:15. Gundry (Use, 52) claims that ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθῆσαι (“the sun will be darkened”) in Mark is based on χάσις ήλιος (“the sun will be darkened”) from the MT, rather than from σκοτισθῇσαι τοῦ ἥλιου (“it will be dark when the sun…””) in the LXX. However, the use of an identical form (σκοτισθῇσαι) by Mark and the LXX and the general similarity between Is 13:10 LXX and Mk 13:24 pose significant challenges to Gundry’s claim. Mark and Matthew agree with δώσει in the LXX, which renders ἡλίαμ. While this translation is technically correct, this is the only instance where ἡλίαμ is rendered as δίδωσι. Thus, the use of δώσει indicates that Mark probably followed the LXX rather than the MT.

In contrast, the use of φέγγος in Mark and Matthew (as compared to φῶς in Is 13:10 LXX) may be traced to Joel 4:15 LXX which, like the gospels, describes a darkening of
the sun and the moon. In Joel, however, ϕέγγος represents the light of the stars but not the moon. Alternatively, ϕέγγος may be based on יָרַח לֹא־יַגִֶׁ֥יהַ אוֹר (“the moon will not shine its light”) in Is 13:10 MT. Indeed, ϕέγγος is a common rendering of the stem נִַָֽ֣גַֹֽ֣הּ אֹֽוֹר (Am 5:20; Joel 2:10; Hab 3:4, 11; etc.); also, in Job 22:28 LXX, נִַָֽ֣גַֹֽ֣הּ אֹֽוֹר is rendered by ϕέγγος. It is therefore possible that Mark followed Is 13:10 LXX by using δώσει but then rendered with νάος the term ϕέγγος, which also reflects the missing יַגִֶׁ֥יהַ (from נִַָֽ֣גַֹֽ֣הּ אֹֽוֹר). In this case, Mark and Matthew are identical, so there are no changes to discuss.

28) Mk 13:25/Matt 24:29b (Is 34:4 LXX + MT Ps 81:5)

Both πίπτοντες in Mk 13:25 and πεσοῦνται in Matt 24:29b agree with the LXX’s πίπτει, as opposed to the MT’s יִבוֹל. This Hebrew term was probably read as יוּל = πίπτει (LXX) due to the visual and phonetic similarities between יוּל and πίπτει. Therefore, πίπτο in Mark and Matthew is probably derived from the LXX. In contrast, Mark’s καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν τοῖς...
οὗρανοῖς is absent from the LXX (although segments are extant in Eusebius and Origin, they seem to be insertions); thus, Mark is working from כָל־צְבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם in the MT.

Another conundrum is posed by σαλευθήσονται in Mark: is this term influenced by the fig tree mentioned in Is 34:4 LXX? Does it represent an attempt to render the difficult וּנָמַק or וּנָגֶֹׁל? Or might it be derived from Ps 81:5 (82:5 LXX), which describes people walking in darkness (Mk 13:24) and the foundations of the earth being shaken? The latter alternative seems most plausible because Mark, Matthew and Ps 81 share the rare form σαλευθήσονται (its only other occurrence is in Am 8:12). Moreover, both of the LXX verses which include this form describe darkness and the shaking of the earth, as mentioned in the catastrophe detailed in Mk 13:8. Thus, in this verse, Mark seems to draw from Is 34:4 in its MT and LXX versions, with a possible influence from Ps 81:5. Given the lack of significant differences between these verses in Matthew and Mark, there are no changes to discuss.

*Ziegler, Isaias, 243; Gundry, Use, 52.*
29) Mk 13:26/Matt 24:30 (Dan 7:13–14; Zec 12:10; Gen 28:14)

Mk: καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν οὐνὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης.

Matt: καὶ τότε κόψονται κάσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ὄψονται τὸν οὐνὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς.

Thd.: ἐθεώρουσιν ἐν ὀράματι τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ ἰδοὺ μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν του οὐρανοῦ ὡς ὑιὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενος ἦν καὶ ἠς τοῦ παλαιοῦ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἔφθασεν

LXX: εἴδατον ἐν ὀράματι τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς ὑιὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐρχέται

Gen: καὶ τοὺς καταραμένους σε καταράσσωσι καὶ ἐνυιολογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πάσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου

Zec: καὶ ἐκεῖδε ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Δαυίδ καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας Ιερουσαλήμ πνεῦμα χάριτος καὶ οἰκτικμοῦ καὶ ἐπιβλέψονται πρὸς με ἀνθή ὀν καταρχήσαντο καὶ κόψονται ἐπὶ αὐτῶν κοπετόν ὡς ἐπὶ ἄγασιν καὶ ὀδυνηθήσονται ὀδύνην ὡς ἐπὶ πρωτοτόκῳ

Matthew assimilates this reference to the LXX by adding ἐπὶ and τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, as well as by replacing Mark’s ἐν νεφέλαις with τῶν νεφελῶν. Matthew further augments the presence of the Tanakh by inserting πάσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ, a six-component string that appears in this exact form in Gen 28:14. Matthew then seems to add a reference to Zec 12:10, 14 via the word κόψονται (“to mourn”). In this passage from Zechariah, God pours a spirit of grace and compassion over “the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem,” who mourn (κόψονται) for the one that they pierced. Another possible connection between these passages is that, in Zec 12:14, “all the families…” (πάσαι αἱ φυλαὶ) mourn separately, which closely resembles “all the families of the earth.
mourn” in Matt 24:30. In sum, here Matthew intensifies the correspondence with Daniel and seems to add allusions to Genesis and to Zechariah.

30) Mk 13:27/Matt 24:31 (Deut 13:8; 30:4; Zech 2:10 LXX; Ps 105:43; Is 27:13 )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mk: καὶ ἐπισυνάξει</th>
<th>τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς [αὐτοῦ] ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων ἀπ’ ἀκρού γῆς ἐως ἄκρου οὐρανοῦ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt: μετὰ σάλπιγγος μεγάλης, καὶ ἐπισυνάξουσιν τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων ἀπ’ ἄκρον οὐρανοῦ ἐως [τῶν] ἄκρων αὐτῶν.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zec: διότι ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ συνάζω ύμᾶς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 30:4b: τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐως ἄκρου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐκείθεν συνάζει σε</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps: τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is: ἐκεῖνη σαλπιγγίσειν τῇ σάλπιγγι τῇ μεγάλῃ καὶ ἐξουσίων οἱ ἀπολόγομενοι ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mark 13:27 conflates four Tanakh verses into one reference and Matt 24:31 adds a fifth. ἐπισυνάξει in Mark and ἐπισυνάξουσιν in Matthew are derived from Zec 2:10 LXX, which replaces פֶּרֶשְתִי ("dispersed” or “scattered”) with συνάζω ("gathered"). The second element of the Zechariah reference is a string of four identical verbal components: ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων. Mark combines this reference with the insertion of a possible allusion to Ps 105:43, τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ, language which is unique to this psalm in the Tanakh. The evidence regarding Mark’s use of αὐτοῦ is ambivalent, for it is absent in ἡ, A, C, K and many other MSS, though extant in B, D, L and W. Nevertheless, even without taking αὐτοῦ
into account, the verbal and thematic correspondence between Mark and Ps 105:43 seem sufficient for detecting an allusion. First, the combination τοῦς ἐκλεκτὸς is found in only five verses in the Tanakh (Gen 41:7; 2 Kgs 8:12; Ps 77:31; 105:43; Is 22:8), of which only Ps 105:43 seems to be an adequate referent. In addition, this psalm, like Mark, describes God’s deliverance of his elect. Furthermore, Matthew’s use of αὐτοῖ is well attested; thus, it seems that, if Mark only included τοῦς ἐκλεκτὸς, Matthew recognized this reference and made it more prominent.

Mark’s ἀπ’ ἄκρον γῆς is from Deut 13:8, and ἔως ἄκρον οὐρανοῦ comes from Deut 30:4; thus, four allusions have been conflated into one reference. With his addition of σάλπιγγος μεγάλης, Matthew seems to introduce a reference to Is 27:13. But by changing the singular forms of ἄκρον and οὐράνος into plurals, Matthew moves slightly away from Deut 13:8 and 30:4 in the LXX.

Overall, this is another example in which Matthew raises the presence of the Tanakh in some respects while lowering it in others.
It is widely recognized that Mk 14:24 and Mat 26:28 allude to Ex 24:8, with which they share three identical words and an identical string of four verbal components. In contrast, there is an intense debate as to whether or not Mark references Is 53:12, a debate that centers on whether or not ἐκχέω in Mark and Matthew is a rendering of הֵרָע in that Isaian verse. Eleven of the fifteen occurrences of the stem הֵרָע (in its various forms) in the MT mean “to lay bare” or “to uncover.” Of the remaining four, in one it means “to empty” (2 Chr 24:11), twice “to pour out” or “to pour down” (Gen 24:20; Is 32:15), and, in Is 53:12, it should probably be rendered as “poured out” (his soul, life or body), though it could also be understood as “to lay bare (or expose) his life.” In the LXX, Mark’s ἐκχέω never renders הֵרָע, but is nearly always the equivalent of שָפַך (“to spill” or “to pour”; e.g, in Gen 9:6; 37:22; Ex 4:9), which is very similar in meaning to הֵרָע. The only instance in the LXX

---

where הָעָרָה is rendered by παραδίδωμι (“deliver” or “hand over”) is in Is 53:12. Therefore, this seems to be a less suitable translation than Mark’s ἐκχέω.

But if Mark is indeed rendering הָעָרָה, why didn’t he use ἐκκενόω, which translates this Hebrew stem in three instances (Gen 24:20; 2 Chr 24:11; Ps 136:7), or one of the other verbs that renders הָעָרָה in the LXX? One possible explanation is that ἐκχέω/抻常 often describes the shedding (lit: spilling) of blood (Gen 9:6; 1 Kgs 18:28; Ezek 18:10; 22:6. 9; etc.). Thus, since the Markan Jesus states that the wine is his blood, ἐκχέω/抻常 was the most appropriate lexical option.

In sum, if we follow this interpretation, Mk 14:24 would be most accurately translated as “my blood of the covenant which is shed for many.” But even if this reasoning were not to be found convincing, Mark’s choice of ἐκχέω offers a more precise rendering of הָעָרָה than the παραδίδωμι of the LXX. In addition to this probable use of the MT, Mark’s and Matthew’s πολλῶν, which appears in an identical form in Isaiah, appears to be an element of this reference. Matthew further enhances the similarity to Isaiah by adding ἁμαρτίων and thus makes this reference more prominent.
In Mk 14:34, we see another reference which is comprised of conflated allusions, this time to Ps 42:6 and Jon 4:9. The first element is a reference to Ps 42:6, 12 which shares two identical forms with Mark and Matthew (περίλυπός, ψυχή). Indeed, the only instances in the LXX in which περίλυπός describes ψυχή are in these psalms. The second reference is to Jon 4:9, which shares four similar verbal components with these verses from Mark and Matthew (λέγω, ἐγώ and ἐως θανάτου). Furthermore, in Jonah and the gospels, the protagonist states that he is deeply grieved “even to death.” Therefore, in these identical verses, Mark and Matthew conflate two allusions into one reference.
33) Mk 14:49b-50/Matt 26:56 (Is 53:6?)

The introduction in Mk 14:49b-50, which becomes even more explicit in Matt 26:56 with the addition of προφητῶν, seems to imply that this is a Tanakh reference. But there is hardly any lexical correspondence between these gospel verses and the Tanakh. It seems, however, that their most likely referent is Is 53:6, in which the Servant’s suffering for the collective sins of all others is linked to their straying and ultimate dispersal. It is also possible that Mark’s and Matthew’s words about the promise of Scripture refer to Is 53:6-12, which would be fulfilled from the moment that Jesus is handed over to the Jewish authorities. Overall, these verses probably include a reference to Is 53:6, but the lexical correspondence is very weak.
Lamentations shares four similar words with Mark and Matthew (παραπορευόμενοι, κινέω, κεφαλή and αὐτόν) and a similar order. The second part probably alludes to Ps 22:7-8 which, like the verse from Lamentations, describes people wagging their heads, but also describes those who mock the Righteous Sufferer by saying “he hoped in the Lord: let Him deliver him, let Him save him,” words echoed by the bypassers who tell Jesus to save himself (σώσον σεαυτόν). The evidence here is insufficient to determine whether Mark relies on the LXX or the MT, nor are there significant Matthean changes to discuss.
A Summary of the One-by-One Comparison of Implicit Tanakh References in Mark and Matthew

The following chart concisely summarizes the results of this verse-by-verse examination of implicit references to the Tanakh in Mark and Matthew.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implicit References</th>
<th>Matt is More Prominent</th>
<th>Matt is Less Prominent</th>
<th>Similar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk 1:6/Matt 3:4 (2 Kgs 1:8)</td>
<td>By adding εἶχεν, Matthew moves slightly closer to the MT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 1:11/Matt 3:17 (Gen 22:2; Ps 2:7; Is 42:1 MT)</td>
<td>By adding λέγουσα, Matthew moves closer to the psalm and Genesis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 1:13/Matt 4:2 (Ex 34:28)</td>
<td>By adding νηστεύσας and νύκτας τεσσεράκοντα.</td>
<td>By placing ημέρας before τεσσεράκοντα, Matthew’s order is less similar to Exodus.</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 1:44/Matt 8:4 (Lev 13:4 9; 14:4)</td>
<td>By omitting καθαρισμός, Matthew moves away from Lev 14:2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 2:26/Matt 12:4 (Ex 40:23; 1Sam 21:7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 4:32/Matt 13:32 (Ez 17:23; 31:6; Dan 4:11-12)</td>
<td>By adding δένδρον, moves closer to Dan 4:11 Thd. and, by adding ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ, moves closer to 4:12 Thd.</td>
<td>By not retaining the reference to Ezek 17:23 and omitting ὑπὸ τὴν σκιὰν.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 4:37-38/Matt 8:24-26 (Jon 1:1-6)</td>
<td>Closer to Jon 1:5 by replacing καθεύδον with ἐκύθευδεν and by adding θαλάσση.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 4:41/Matt 8:27 (Jon 1:10, 16)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminates the reference by omitting ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 6:18/Matt 14:4 (Gen 38:8; Lev 20:21)</td>
<td></td>
<td>By inserting Φιλίππου after γυναῖκα, Matthew makes his order less similar to Gen 38:8 and Lev 20:21.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 6:22-23/Matt 14:6-7 (Est 5:3, 6; 7:2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>By omitting ἡμίσους τῆς βασιλείας μου, Matthew eliminates this reference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 8:31/Matt 16:21 (Hos 6:2)</td>
<td>By replacing μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας with τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.</td>
<td>By replacing ἀναστῆναι with ἐγερθῆναι, Matthew moves away from the LXX and closer to the MT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 9:4/Matt 17:3 (Mal 3:22-24)</td>
<td>With the addition of ἰδοῦ. There is also a change of order in Matt: Moses is mentioned first.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 9:7a/Matt 17:5a (Ex 40:34)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 9:7a/Matt 17:5a (Gen 22:2; Ps 2:7; Is 42:1; Deut 18:15)</td>
<td>By adding ἐν ὃ εὐδόκησα.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 9:11-12a/ Matt 17:10-12a (Mal 3:24)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 9:12b-13/Matt 17:12b (Is 53:4; Mal 4:24; Ps 22:6)</td>
<td>By explicitly stating that John was Elijah.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 9:31/Matt 17:22-23 (2Sam 24:14; Is 53:6, 12; Hos 6:2)</td>
<td>By omitting καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν.</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 10:2-4/Matt 19:3, 7 (Deut 24:1-2)</td>
<td>By replacing ἀνδρί (with ἀνθρώπῳ and thus including one of the words that appear in Gen 2:24. Also by adding τήν and αὐτοῦ to γυναῖκα. By replacing Mark’s γράψαι with δοῦναι, Matthew’s text becomes more similar to Deut 24:1. Matt’s order is more similar to Deut 24:1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 10:33b-34/Matt 20:19 (Ps 105:41; Hos 8:10; Is 50:6; Hos 6:2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit References</td>
<td>Matt is more Prominent</td>
<td>Matt is less Prominent</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 12:2-5/Matt 21:34-36; (Jer 25:4)</td>
<td>By replacing Mark’s δοῦλον with τοὺς δούλους.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 12:6/Matt 21:37 (Gen 22:2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>By omitting ἁγαπητόν, Matthew eliminates this reference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 12:7-8/Matt 21:38-39 (Gen 37:19-20)</td>
<td>By adding ἰδόντες τὸν υἱόν.</td>
<td>By replacing εἶπον with εἶπαν; and, by changing the order from killing and then casting out, to casting out and then killing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 13:8a/Matt 24:7-8 (Is 19:2; 2 Chr 15:6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 13:19/Matt 24:21 (Dan 12:1; Ex 9:18; Joel 2:2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 13:24 / Matt 24:29a (Is 13:10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 13:25/Matt 24:29b (Is 34:4)</td>
<td>By adding πεσοῦνται, Matthew moves closer to Isaiah.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 13:26/Matt 24:30 (Dan 7:13–14)</td>
<td>Matt’s ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ is identical to Dan 7:13 LXX. Matt also adds κόψονται, which may refer to Zec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12:10, and also πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς, which may refer to Gen 28:14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk 14:34/Matt 26:38; (Ps 42:6)</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 15:29-30/Matt 27:39-40 (Ps 22:7-8; Lam 2:15)</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The trend that was evident in the previous chapter continues but is not as clear here. Eleven of Matthew’s references are more prominent than their Markan parallels, while six are less...
so.\textsuperscript{40} It is evident that, in some instances, Matthew uses more than one tool to create this effect.\textsuperscript{41} In each case where the Matthean reference is more prominent, that change results from the addition of a word or phrase that more closely reflects the language of the Tanakh.\textsuperscript{42} In one instance, Matthew also changes Mark’s word forms, which makes his version more similar to the original text (Mk 10:2-4/Matt 19:3, 7). In another passage, Matthew increases the prominence of the reference by adding a formal introduction (Mk 11:2/Matt 21:4-5). Interestingly, in six instances Matthew employs editorial moves that make references more prominent but also others that make the same references less so.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{40} Matthew’s references are more prominent in Mk 1:6/Matt 3:4; Mk 1:13/Matt 4:2; Mk 4:37-38/Matt 8:24-26; Mk 9:4/Matt17:3; Mk 9:7a/Matt 17:5a; Mk 11:2/Matt 21:4-5; Mk 12:1/Matt 21:33; Mk 12:9/Matt 21:40-41; Mk 13:25/Matt 24:29b; Mk 13:26/Matt 24:30; Mk 14:24/Matt 26:28. Matthew’s references are less prominent in Mk 1:44/Matt 8:4; Mk 4:41/Matt 8:27; Mk 6:18/Matt 14:7; Mk 6:22-23/Matt 14:7; Mk 12:6/Matt 21:37; Mk 12:7-8/Matt 21:38-39.

\textsuperscript{41} Mk 1:6, 11, 13; 4:37; 9:4, 7b; 10:2-4; 11:2; 12:1, 7-8, 9; 13:25, 26, 27; 14:24, 49-50.

\textsuperscript{42} Mk 1:6/Matt 3:4; Mk 1:13/Matt 4:2; Mk 4:37-38/Matt 8:24-26; Mk 9:4/Matt17:3; Mk 9:7a/ Matt 17:5a; Mk 11:2/Matt 21:4-5; Mk 12:1/Matt 21:33; Mk 12:9/Matt 21:40-41; Mk 13:25/ Matt 24:29b; Mk 13:26/Matt 24:30; Mk 14:24/Matt 26:28.

In five of the six cases where the Matthean reference is less prominent, the modification results from an omission (Mk 1:44/Matt 8:4; Mk 4:41/Matt 8:27; Mk 6:22-23/Matt 14:7; Mk 12:6/Matt 21:37; Mk 12:7-8/Matt 21:38-39); in the sixth, a change in word order creates the shift (Mk 12:7-8/Matt 21:38-39). It is noteworthy that, in three of these instances, Matthew completely eliminates a Markan reference to the Tanakh, bringing the number of such erasures to five (including the two noted in the analysis of explicit references); this number will increase considerably when subtle references are taken into account.

As in the case of explicit references, most Matthean changes do not significantly alter their Markan parallels. For instance, when Matthew (4:2) adds νηστεύσας, νύκτας τεσσεράκοντα and ἐπείνασεν to Mk 1:13, he renders the implicit reference to Moses at Sinai more explicit, though this allusion to Ex 34:29 would likely have been recognized by Mark’s readership even without this change. Similarly, the addition of ἰδού to Mk 9:4 brings the narrative closer to the prophecy of Mal 3:22-24 without affecting Mark’s message. Other relatively insignificant Matthean adjustments include his insertions of ἐν

---

αὐτῷ in Mk 12:1 and πλανῆσαι in Mk 13:22. Even the addition of a reference to Ps 1:3 in Matt 21:40-41 enhances the allusion to Is 5:6-7 in Mk 12:9 without a dramatic impact.45

45 Gundry, Commentary, 428.
Matthew’s Treatment of Markan References Focused on Jesus’ Identity, the Law, Judgment and Discipleship

As noted above, there are twenty-one implicit Tanakh references focused upon Jesus’ identity and mission; in seven of them, Matthew’s references are more prominent than Mark’s, while in two they are less so. As in the explicit references, Matthew works to prevent his readership from missing references concerning Jesus’ identity and seems reluctant to make any change that would diminish the clarity of these allusions.

Even though these Matthean changes do not shift the Markan focus on Jesus’ identity, some results of these adaptations are worthy of mention. For example, in three instances, Matthew enhances or creates references to Isaiah’s Servant. Hence, in his adaptation of Mk 9:7b, Matthew adds the phrase ἐν ὧν ἐυδόκησα, which forms a reference to Is 42:1. Similarly, in his account of the Last Supper, Matthew introduces εἰς ἁμαρτίαν ὑμῶν, wording which amplifies an implicit reference to Is 53:12.

The implicit references to Jesus’ identity and mission that Matthew augments are not limited to the themes of suffering and death. These adaptations also apply to passages that relate to leading figures and divine action. Thus Jesus’ connection to Moses is

---

46 More prominent: Mk 1:6/Matt 3:4; Mk 1:13/Matt 4:2; Mk 4:37-38/Matt 8:24-26; Mk 9:4/Matt 17:3; Mk 9:7a/Matt 17:5a; Mk 11:2/Matt 21:4-5; Mk 14:24/Matt 26:28. Less prominent: Mk 4:41/Matt 8:27; Mk 12:6/Matt 21:37.

47 Davies and Allison, Matthew 8-18, 700-701, 706; Gundry, Commentary, 344-345; Gundry, Use, 44-45.
strengthened (Mk 1:13/Matt 4:2), as is the parallel to Joshua in Num 27:17 (Mk 6:34/Matt 9:36). Similarly, the reference to Zec 9:9 that describes the arrival of the Davidic king becomes explicit when supplemented with a formal introduction and an almost verbatim quotation (Mk 11:2/Matt 21:4-5). Matthew also highlights acts of divine deliverance and punishment (Mk 12:1/Matt 21:33; Mk 13:27/Matt 24:31). Finally, two Markan depictions of John as Elijah are expanded in Matthew (Mk 9:4/Matt 17:3; Mk 9:12b-13/Matt 4:12b).48

Taken as a whole, Matthew seems equally committed to raising the prominence of the majority of references that could exalt Jesus’ identity, whether Jesus is on the one hand, portrayed as the Servant or the righteous sufferer, or on the other, symbolized by great leaders, the messianic king or even God.

In one of the two references focusing upon Jesus’ identity that Matthew makes less prominent, Matthew (8:27a) eliminates the allusion to Jon 1:10 that is used in Mk 4:41a to describe the disciples’ fear. This omission emphasizes the second part of the verse (Mk 4:41b/Matt 8:27b), which implies that Jesus, like God, has divine authority over the wind and the sea. In the other instance, a Markan reference to Gen 22:2 is omitted.

In four references concerned with Jesus’ identity, Matthew makes changes that raise and lower certain aspects of the prominence of a Markan reference. Two are especially intriguing. In his version of the first prediction of the Passion (Mk 8:31/Matt

48 Joynes, “A Question” 15-29; Goodacre,“Elijah,” 76.
16:21), Matthew heightens the prominence of a reference to Hos 6:2 by replacing Mark’s μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας with τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. Yet he also diminishes the profile of this same reference by replacing ἀναστῆναι with ἐγερθῆναι. As stated above, this undulation toward and away from the Tanakh may have been influenced by 1 Cor 15:3 or the tradition behind it, but it might also represent a direct translation of יְקִמ in the MT.

Similarly, in the adaptation of Mk 12:6-8, Matthew first eliminates a reference to Gen 22:2 by deleting υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν (Matt 21:37). He continues by adding ἰδόντες τὸν υἱὸν, which makes the allusion to Gen 37:19 more prominent. But he then reverses direction with two changes that reduce the prominence of this same reference by replacing Mark’s εἶπαν with εἶπον and changing the order of the tenants’ actions from killing then casting out, as in Mark and Genesis, to casting out then killing. As noted above, this reversal is often explained as a Matthean attempt to align this parable with Jesus’ death. Matthew may also, however, have sought to avoid any presumption that the son had not been buried.

As noted above, Mark has three implicit references to the Tanakh that are concerned with points of the Law. In two of them, Matthew’s version is slightly less prominent (Mk 1:44/Matt 8:4; Mk 6:18/Matt 14:4), and the remaining one is more prominent (Mk 10:2-4/Matt 19:3, 7). This single instance, however, is perhaps the first example in our study where Matthew takes a reference to a controversial point in the Law and augments its level of specificity.
In five of the six references to the theme of judgment, the level of prominence between Matthew and Mark does not differ. In the exceptional case, the reference in Matthew becomes more prominent (Mk 12:9/Matt 21:40-41) as an outcome of Matthew adding a subtle reference to Ps 1:3 to his version. This introduction of harvest imagery is a repeated motif for Matthew (3:8-10, 12; 7:16-20; 12:33), who tends to use it to describe the coming of God’s kingdom and the judgment of the wicked at that time. Matthew similarly brings this text closer to Deut 13:6 by adding πλανήσαι, a rare form whose sole occurrence in the LXX is in Deut 13:6.

Two other implicit references in Mark do not easily fit into any of these four broad categories. Matthew omits an allusion to the book of Esther in one (Mk 6:22-23/Matt 14:6-7) and, in the other, the conclusion of the Parable of the Mustard Seed, Matthew distances his text from Ez 17:23 and moves it closer to Dan 4:11-12.

---

49 Mk 13:8a/Matt 24:7-8; Mk 13:8b/Matt 24:8; Mk 13:19/Matt 24:21; Mk 13:24/Matt 24:29a; Mk 13:25/Matt 24:29b.

50 Its only other NT occurrence is in Rev 20:8.
Conclusion of Implicit References to the Tanakh

This survey of implicit references in Mark and Matthew generally agrees with the conclusions regarding explicit references. 1) There is a Matthean trend to make changes that increase the prominence of Markan references to the Tanakh. However, there appears to be a correlation between the prominence of the references in Mark and their degree of prominence in Matthew. Thus, Matthew tends to amplify the more explicit references in Mark, but this tendency diminishes when we consider references that are less explicit. In addition, in several instances, Matthew expands one component of a Markan reference while reducing the prominence of another.51 2) In most cases, Matthean changes do not significantly alter Markan references. 3) Matthew typically amplifies references that relate to Jesus’ identity. 4) As with the explicit references, Matthew’s amplification of references concerning the Law are generally incremental in scope, with the exception of one reference (Mk 10:2-4, 11/Matt 19:3, 9; 5:32), where Matthew presents material that closely reflects a halakhic debate and significantly alters Mark’s message.52


52 Even this change may stem from an attempt to make the reference more pronounced.
Chapter Three: Subtle References

Having examined the explicit and implicit Tanakh references, we now turn to the subtle references in Mark and Matthew.

A Breakdown of Markan Concerns: Subtle References

Mark incorporates forty-two subtle Tanakh references. Among them, twenty-two concern Jesus’ identity and mission;¹ six focus (at least partially) on points in the Law (Mk 2:7; 2:23, 27; 5:25; 10:5; 14:7);² one conveys a threat of judgment (Mk 13:12); and, three relate to disciples or followers of Jesus (Mk 9:49; 16:3-4, 8).

Identity and Mission

Eleven of the references concerning Jesus’ identity are from the Torah (Gen 1:2; 7:11; 18:14; 26:24; Ex 17:2; 24:15-16; 34:29; Lev 2:2; 15:25; Deut 6:4 twice; 15:11). They include one reference that depicts God in its original context (Mk 12:15/Ex 17:2) and others that seem to imply that God the father is distinct from and greater than Jesus (Mk 2:7/Deut 6:4; Mk 10:18/Deut 6:4; Mk 10:27/Gen 18:14).


² Five references concern the Law and Jesus’ identity: Mk 2:7; 23, 27; 5:25; 14:7.
A pair of allusions from Genesis, describing the beginning of creation (Gen 1:2) and the flood (Gen 8:11), are conflated into one reference as part of the theophany of Jesus’ baptism (Mk 1:10). Two others value the devotion of the woman who anoints Jesus (Mk 14:7) over the commandment to provide for the needy in Deut 15:11 and equate her gesture to the bringing of aromatic memorial offerings to the temple’s altar as detailed in Leviticus (Chapters 2 and 5).

Three subtle references to Isaiah also focus on Jesus’ identity. Two evoke the Suffering Servant (Mk 10:45/Is 53:10, 12; Mk 14:65/Is 50:6) and the third refers to men who, having been possessed by demons, live in tombs and eat swine (Mk 5:3, 11/Is 65:4). Of the three references to Psalms, two describe God’s actions (105:9; 106:29) and one depicts the agony of the righteous sufferer (Ps 41:9). The sole reference to Zechariah (14:4) describes the final battle between God and gentiles, and the splitting of the Mount of Olives, as part of this eschatological event. This verse links Jesus with God while also conveying a strong element of judgment.

**Points on the Law**

The references that are concerned with the Law are all from the Torah. In contrast to the explicit references, here Mark does not refrain from alluding to specific legal material. For example, Deut 23:24-25 (Mk 2:23) regulates what may be eaten and taken when traversing another’s field; Ex 16:29 (Mk 2:27) states that Shabbat was given to the people of Israel; Lev 15:25 (Mk 5:25) describes the ritual impurity that is associated with a woman who
experiences a flow of menstrual blood that persists for several days; and, Deut 15:11 (Mk 14:7) commands the people of Israel to provide for the poor.

It is noteworthy, however, that only two of these allusions (Mk 2:27; 14:7) are attributed to the Markan Jesus and that they seem to question the validity or the primacy of these Torah requirements. Thus, in Mk 14:7, Jesus uses the first half of Deut 15:11, which states that there will always be poor people in the Land of Israel, to invalidate the significance of its second half, which commands its inhabitants to care for the needy. Thus, the very reason for this commandment in the Tanakh becomes a reason for prioritizing the woman’s act of anointing Jesus over adherence to a command in the Torah. Similarly, in Mk 2:27, the Markan Jesus uses the statement that God gave Shabbat to the people of Israel to explain that Shabbat observance should not take precedence over addressing basic human needs, such as hunger. Somewhat similarly, in Mk 5:25-30, the menstruant performs every action that Lev 15:25-28 explicitly prohibits; then, upon touching Jesus’ cloak, she is immediately healed. There are also two Law-related references that are too general to link to a specific commandment (Mk 2:7, 10:5).

**Discipleship and Following Jesus**

Two of the three references concerning discipleship discuss the three women who remained loyal to Jesus and attempted to go to his burial place and anoint him on Easter Sunday. Thus, in Mk 16:3, the women’s lament about their inability to remove the stone that seals Jesus’ tomb echoes the concerns expressed by shepherds in the story of Jacob and Rachel,
who assume that they cannot individually remove the stone which seals the well (Gen 29:8, 10b). In Mk 16:4, the women’s fear is resolved when they see that the stone has been rolled away, just as the shepherds’ resignation is challenged when Jacob lifts the stone from the well. The terror and amazement that seize the women and prompt them to flee from the empty tomb (Mk 16:7-8) echoes the description in Dan 10:7 (Thd.) of men who flee in response to a terrifying vision.

**Subtle Markan References to the Tanakh: A sequential analysis and comparison to Matthew**

Because the identification of many of these allusions is contested more attention is paid to establishing each reference. Thus, each entry begins with a list of identical and similar words between Mark and the proposed reference and in a footnote I mention all of the studies that recognize this reference.
1) Mk 1:10a/Matt 3:16; Is 63:19

| **Mk:** εὐθὺς ἀναβαίνον ἑκ τοῦ ὕδατος εἶδεν σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιστεράν καταβαίνον εἰς αὐτόν. |
| **Is 63:19:** εὰς ανοίξῃς τὸν οὐρανὸν κορίτσις σφίλι πληθε | 63:11: ποῦ ἐστίν ὁ θεὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγιόν ἡ σύμπτωσις | Ezek: ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ Χοβαρ καὶ ἤνεῴχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ εἶδον ὅρασις θεοῦ, ποῦ ἐστίν ὁ θεὸς κορίτσις σφίλι πληθε | Is: καὶ ἀναπαύσεται ἐπʼ αὐτὸν πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ σύμπτωσις |

Whereas most scholars agree that Mk 1:10 and Matt 3:16 include Tanakh references, there is little agreement concerning their actual identifications. For example, several competing suggestions regarding the provenance of Mark’s σχιζομένους have been proposed; this is also the case regarding his use of πνεῦμα and καταβαίνον; and, sixteen distinct explanations have been argued for περιστεράν. Therefore, this discussion is divided into two parts, each with its own entry (1 & 2). The first considers the possibility of Markan references to Is 63 and a Matthean reference to Ezek 1:1. The second focuses on the possible provenance of Mark’s and Matthew’s references to the hovering dove.

---

The verb σχίζω appears eight times in the Tanakh and three more times in LXX books that are not part of the Tanakh. Of these eleven, the only one that seems related to Mk 1:10 is Ex 14:21, where Moses stretches out his arm and the water (ὕδωρ) is split (ἐσχίσθη). Thus, this verse shares two similar words and some contextual similarity with Mk 1:10. Both describe revelations of God’s power, rending, and water. Moreover, Moses is alluded to in Mk 1:13. Further, these verses each seem to depict inaugural events: for the people of Israel in Exodus and for Jesus in Mark. However, Ex 14:21 describes the splitting of waters, not the heavens, and it lacks any reference to God or the descent of the spirit; therefore, Is 63:19 MT seems to be the more likely source for Mk 1:10.

Indeed, Gundry and others suggest that Mk 1:10 draws its imagery from two verses in Is 63. According to this analysis, σχιζομένους is referencing Is 63:19 MT, the only verse

4 Gen 22:3; Ex 14:21; 1 Sam 6:14; Ec 10:9; Zec 14:4; Is 36:22; 37:1; 48:21; 1 Macc 6:45; Wis 5:11; Sus 1:55.

5 Ex 14:21: ἐξέτεινεν δὲ Μωϋσῆς τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ ὑπῆγαγεν κύριος τὴν θάλασσαν ἐν ἀνέμῳ νότῳ βιαίῳ διλή τὴν νύκτα καὶ ἐποίησεν τὴν θάλασσαν ξηρὰν καὶ ἐσχίσθη τὸ ὕδωρ.

6 M. S. Rindge, “Reconfiguring the Akedah and Recasting God: Lament and Divine Abandonment in Mark,” JBL 131 (2012): 755–74, suggests that Mark’s σχιζομένους is a reference to Gen 22:3, where Abraham splits wood. This is an intriguing suggestion but, aside from that similar word, nothing else connects these two verses.

7 I. Buse, “The Markan Account of the Baptism of Jesus and Isaiah 63,” JTS 7 (1956): 74-75; Gundry, Use, 28-29; Guelich, Mark 1-8, 32; Marcus, Mark 1-8, 165; Boring, Mark, 45.
in the Tanakh with the phrase קָרֵַ֤עְתָ שָמֵַּ֙יִם. The MT is recognized as Mark’s source because קָרֵַ֤עְתָ שָמֵַּ֙יִם, like σχιζομένους, means “to tear” or “to rend,” whereas the LXX uses the form ἀνοίξης, which is usually translated as “to open,” for this same verb. In fact, the phrases σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανούς/קָרֵַ֤עְתָ שָמֵַּ֙יִם are limited to these verses in the Tanakh and the NT. In addition, the Hebrew includes the word יָרֶַ֔דְתָ ("you descended" or "you came down"), whereas the LXX lacks an equivalent to יָרֶַ֔דְת or σχιζω. Furthermore, σχιζω appears as the equivalent of קָרֵַ֤עְתָ twice in the LXX (Is 36:22; 37:1); thus, this reference in Mark is probably derived from the MT.

A strong thematic similarity to a theophany, involving the rending of the heavens and the descent of God (or his spirit), is also common to Mk 1:10 and Is 63:19. Moreover, Mark’s ἀναβάινω and πνεῦμα may be derived from Is 63:11, which asks “Where is the one who brought (ἀναβήσω) his people out of the sea and put his spirit (πνεῦμα) in them?” In sum, Mark 1:10 is probably based on both Is 63:19 MT and 63:11 LXX, two verses that could be the source of elements in this reference, with the exception of the dove.

Before examining Matthean changes, I first attempt to determine the source of Mark’s and Matthew’s dove.

8 Gundry, Use, 29.
2) Mk 1:10b/Matt 3:16b (Gen 1:2; 8:11; Ezek 1:1)⁹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mk:</th>
<th>ἐκ τοῦ ὄδατος εἶδεν... τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιστερὰν καταβαίνον</th>
<th>Matt:</th>
<th>καὶ εἶδεν [τὸ] πνεῦμα [τοῦ] θεοῦ καταβαίνον ὡςεὶ περιστερὰν [καὶ] ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ αὐτόν.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen 1:2:</td>
<td>καὶ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὄδατος</td>
<td>8:8:</td>
<td>καὶ ἀπέστευεν τὴν περιστερὰν ὑπὸσώ αὐτοῦ ἤδη εἰ κεκόπακεν τὸ ὄδωρ ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Words similar to those in Gen 1:2 include 1) ὄδατος; 2) πνεῦμα; and, perhaps, 3) ὑπὸσώ of περιστερὰν. Words similar to those in Gen 8:8 include 1) περιστερὰν; 2) ὄδωρ; and 3) ὄραω.

Two of the sixteen suggestions that have been noted by Davies and Allison as potential sources for this reference seem most plausible, thus meriting discussion here.¹⁰

As we can see, both verses from Genesis (listed above) have some lexical correspondence

---


with Mk 1:10b. Gen 1:2 shares two identical words with Mark, and ὡς περιστεράν could be a Markan paraphrase of νῆρας. Two difficulties arise, however: πνεῦμα could be based on Is 63:11, and the form ὃδατος is very common (106 occurrences in the Tanakh). Furthermore, the root רחם is only used once to describe a bird hovering over its “young” (Deut 32:11) and, in that instance, the bird being described is an eagle, not a dove. Hence, the link between “like a dove” and νῆρας leaves something to be desired.

The other option (Gen 8:8-11), however, lacks clear verbal similarity: ὅδωρ and ὁράω are both very common, and their forms in Mark and Gen LXX are not identical. Neither does the function of ὁράω in Mark correspond with its role in Gen 8:8. Thus, while the Markan Jesus witnesses the rending of the heavens, in Genesis, Noah dispatches the dove to verify whether the waters have begun to recede.

By contrast, however, the form περιστεράν has only four occurrences in the Tanakh (Gen 8:8, 10, 12; 15:9), three of which are in the flood narrative. Also, there is a thematic similarity: much as Noah is enabled to see that the flood has ended by means of a dove flying over the water, so Jesus’ ministry begins when he sees the spirit descending upon him like a dove. Furthermore, a connection between Jesus’ baptism and Noah’s flood was made as early as 1 Pet 3:20-21, which states ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε κατασκευαζομένης κιβωτοῦ εἰς ἣν ὅλης, τούτ᾽ ἐστιν ὁκτὼ ψυχαί, διεσώθησαν δὲ ὃδατος. ὃ καὶ ὡμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν
Thus, if they were mutually exclusive options, the case for Gen 8:8-11 would be more persuasive; however, it is also possible that Mark used both Gen 1:2 and 8:8-11. The probability of their dual influence is strengthened when we consider that the flood narrative itself is likely based on the creation narrative. Thus, while the creation story begins with God’s spirit hovering over the water, in the flood story, water becomes a divine instrument for purging the world of human wickedness and creating humanity anew from one righteous family. In that account, the image of the dove hovering over the water symbolizes the completion of this re-creation as well as the end of God’s wrath. In sum, Mark may have combined allusions to these two inaugural Genesis narratives in the baptismal story that marks the start of Jesus’ ministry.

Let us now turn to Matthew’s modifications of Mk 1:10: 1) in Matthew, εἶδεν is directly connected to πνεῦμα [τοῦ] θεοῦ while, in Mark, it is connected to σχίζομένους τοὺς οὐρανούς. Matthew also adds ἰδοὺ substituting it for εἶδεν in Mk 1:10. 2) Matthew replaces σχίζομένους with ἠνεκθήσαν. He also 3) replaces Mark’s singular form for heaven with the plural; 4) adds [τοῦ] θεοῦ; and, 5) replaces ὡς with ὡσεὶ.

11 1 Pet 3:20b-21a: “In the days of Noah, during the building of the ark, in which a few, that is, eight persons, were saved through water. And baptism, which this prefigured, now saves you…”
The most apparent result of these Matthean changes is that Matt 3:16 shares significant verbal similarities with Ezek 1:1:


This similarity has led commentators to suggest that Matt 3:16 refers to Ezek 1:1. Indeed, the lexical correspondence and thematic similarity are so strong that it seems likely that Ezek 1:1 is the source for some of Matthew’s changes. By using the plural οὐρανοὶ instead of Mark’s singular “heaven” and by repositioning εἶδον, Matthew assimilates his narrative to Ezek 1:1 LXX. The similarity between these verses is further intensified by the replacement of σχιζομένους with ἡνεῴχθησαν and the addition of τοῦ θεοῦ. These last two changes, however, bring to mind other verses in the Tanakh as well.

As noted above, Mk 1:10 is probably derived from Is 63:19 MT. Whereas Matthew’s choice of the plural οὐρανοὶ instead of Mark’s singular “heaven” makes this reference slightly less prominent, the replacement of σχιζομένους with ἡνεῴχθησαν moves Matthew’s text closer to Is 63:19 LXX.


The addition of τοῦ θεοῦ provides another interpretive challenge. First, the text-critical evidence is ambivalent: τοῦ is absent from א, B and Irenaeus, but present in C, D, K, L, P, W and many other MSS. If this is a scribal omission, it could indicate assimilation to Mark, Ezek 1:1 or Gen 1:2; alternatively, if it were an insertion, it could have been influenced by Is 11:2. Second, the inclusion or omission of τοῦ also affects our considerations of Matthew’s referent: without τοῦ, Matthew’s addition is closer to Ezek 1:1 and Gen 1:2, but with τοῦ, there is stronger agreement with Is 11:1b-2. This verse from Isaiah speaks of πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ resting upon the “shoot of Jesse.” This is the sole LXX verse that shares πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ with Matt 3:16 (also in 1 Cor 2:11; 3:16; 1 Jn 4:2); more significantly, these verses display thematic similarity in their descriptions of the spirit of God resting or alighting upon the “shoot of Jesse.” As we have seen above, Matthew tends to enhance or insert references from Isaiah; following that pattern, in Matt 3:17, he echoes Is 42:1, which is quite similar to 11:2. The other possible source of this addition is Gen 1:2 (discussed above), now expanded by the inclusion of θεοῦ. Without factoring in the somewhat tenuous connection to the dove, Is 11:2 seems a more likely source. On the whole, text-critical evidence seems to favor the omission of τοῦ but, on the other hand, the context supports an allusion to Is 11:2. If this understanding is accurate, Matthew

---

15 Davies and Allison, Matthew, 330-331.
assimilated the Is 63:19 reference to the LXX and added both an implicit reference to Ezek 1:1 and a subtle reference to Is 11:2.

3) **Mk 2:7b/Matt 9:3/Deut 6:4b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mk:</th>
<th>τις δύναται ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt:</td>
<td>καὶ ίδοὺ τίνες τῶν γραμματέων εἶπαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς· οὕτος βλασφημεῖ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut:</td>
<td>ἀκούει Ἰσραήλ κύριος ὁ θεός ἡμῶν κύριος εἰς ἐστίν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Common words: εἰς and θεός

The lexical correspondence between Mk 2:7 and Deut 6:4, represented by two very common words, εἰς and θεός, is not particularly strong. But, as Marcus notes, εἰς is not necessary for expressing the sentiment that God alone is able to forgive sins. He adds that μόνος would be a more suitable adjective in that context; thus, the choice of εἰς seems to form a connection with Deut 6:4. Moreover, the context of Mk 2:7, where Jesus is accused of blasphemy, seems appropriate for a reference to the Shema. Additionally, Deut 6:4 is directly quoted by Jesus in Mk 12:29 and seems to be subtly referred to in Mk 10:18. Thus, a reference to the Shema is quite plausible in Mk 2:7. Matthew omits τις δύναται ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός, thereby eliminating this reference.

---


Common word: στάχυς Mk 2:23 and Deut 23:25 share a single word (στάχυς) which is not particularly rare (thirteen additional occurrences in the LXX). However, the strong thematic similarity between these verses suggests that Mark structured 2:23 on the basis of Deut 23:25. In Mk 2:23b, the disciples follow exactly what is permitted according to Deut 23:25, when passing through a field of grain that belongs to another, one is allowed to pluck ears of grain by hand (that is, without a sickle). Mark thus implies that the disciples are not stealing; rather, the controversy regarding their actions concerns what is permissible on Shabbat. Luke notices this distinction and adds τοὺς στάχυς ψώχοντες ταῖς χερσίν;


20 This has been noted by two commentators on the Tanakh, D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12* (WBC 6B; Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2002), 556; Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 219-220.
thus, in Luke, the disciples rub the grain with their hands before eating it. Indeed, Lk 6:1 and Deut 23:25-26 are the only verses in the LXX and the New Testament that combine χείρ and στάχυς. In sum, this thematic similarity, bolstered by Lukan recognition, suffice to establish a reference.

Matthew’s version is quite similar to Mark’s but his addition of ἐσθίειν brings his narrative closer to Deut 23:25. This insertion, however, probably stems from an attempt to strengthen the analogy between Jesus’ disciples and David (1 Sam 21:2-6); therefore, it may not necessarily be related to these Deuteronomistic verses.

---

5) *Mk 2:27/Matt 12:5-6 (Ex 16:29; Gen 1:26–31; 2:1–3)*\(^{22}\)

| **Mk 2:27:** τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐγένετο καὶ ό̄ ἄνθρωπος διὰ τὸ σάββατον. |
| **Ex 16:29a:** ἵδετε ὁ γὰρ κύριος ἐδωκεν ύμῖν τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην τὰ σάββατα διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸς ἐδωκεν ύμῖν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ... |

Matthew eliminates this reference but adds both a reference to Num 28:9-10 and a quotation from Hos 6:6.

The lexical similarity between Mk 2:27 and Ex 16:29 is slight, for even though Ex 16:29 is the only verse where διὰ immediately follows σάββατον, in this case, διὰ is connected to “the bread of two days,” not Shabbat.\(^{23}\) However, the idea that is expressed in Ex 16:29a, namely that Shabbat was given to the people of Israel, closely resembles the notion that is expressed in Mk 2:27.\(^{24}\) Although the Markan Jesus speaks of “humankind” rather than the people of Israel, Ex 16:29 is still relevant since Jesus, his disciples, and the Pharisees are all members of Israel. The absence of lexical links, however, leaves the presence of an intended reference in doubt. Nevertheless, the concept of Ex 16:29a probably underlies the message of Mk 2:27.


\(^{23}\) On this verse, see Sarna, *Exodus*, 91; Childs, *Exodus*, 290-291.

\(^{24}\) In Jewish interpretations of this verse, Shabbat is described as a special gift that God bestows on his people. Sarna, *Exodus*, 91.
Another possible source for Mk 2:27 is the creation narrative in Genesis 1-2, where God first creates Adam (Gen 1:27) then sanctifies Shabbat (Gen 2:3). The lexical correspondence is not strong in this case either; however, the way that Mark frames his argument and later uses creation to override the Torah (Mk 10:2-11) suggests a possible allusion here. Furthermore, as Marcus argues, the form ἐγένετο appears frequently in the creation narrative (with twenty-one occurrences).

Thus, Mk 2:27 seems to be based on the creation narrative and, perhaps, on Ex 16:29. Matthew eliminates this reference but adds an allusion to Num 28:9-10 (Matt 12:5) and a quotation from Hos 6:6 (Matt 12:7). These modifications each elevate Jesus’ stature. Indeed, the allusion to Num 28:9-10 is followed by a statement which implies that Jesus is greater than the Temple (Matt 12:6). Similarly, the omission of Mark’s reference to the order of creation, with the creation of mankind preceding Shabbat (Mk 2:27), which could have been understood to imply that Jesus is not divine, highlights the proclamation that immediately follows: Jesus, like the God of the Tanakh, is the lord of the Shabbat (Mk 2:28/Matt 12:8).

25 Marcus, Mark 1-8, 242; Gundry, Mark, 142; Boring, Mark, 91.

26 Repschinski, Controversy, 99-100; Gundry, Commentary, 223-224; Davies and Allison, Matthew 8-18, 315.

27 Ex 16:23, 25, 31:13-15; 35:2; Lev 19:3, 30; 23:3, 38; 26:2; Deut 5:14; Ezek 20:20 are all verses that describe God as Lord of the Sabbath. See Gundry, Commentary, 223-226; Davies and Allison, Matthew 8-18, 315-317.
On the one hand, Matthew omits a subtle reference, but, on the other hand, he also adds explicit and implicit references that render the Tanakh more prominent in his version.

7) Mk 2:28/Matt 12:8 (Ex 20:10; Deut 5:14b-15)²⁸

| Mk: ὥστε κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου. |
| Matt: κύριος γάρ ἐστιν τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. |
| Deut: δὲ ημέρα τῇ ἔβδομῃ σάββατα κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ σου οὐ ποιήσεις ἐν αὐτῇ πᾶν ἐργόν … κύριος ὁ θεός σου ὦστε φυλάσσεσθαι τὴν ημέραν τῶν σαββάτων |
| Ex: τῇ δὲ ημέρᾳ τῇ ἔβδομῃ σάββατα κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ σου |

There is no specific reference here, but Mark and Matthew both claim that Jesus holds authority which, according to verses such as Ex 20:10 and Deut 5:14-15, belongs exclusively to God.

²⁸ NA²⁸.

Common words with Dan 2:27-28: μυστήριον, λέγω and θεός

At first glance, the lexical correspondence between Mk 4:11 and Dan 2:27-28 seems weak, but, in the Septuagint, the form μυστήριον only occurs in Daniel, specifically in Chapter 2 (Dan 2:19, 27, 30, 4:9). In addition, a strong thematic correspondence is evident. First, in both instances, the speaker is responding to a question about a matter that others are incapable of comprehending. Second, each answer is related to revelation or understanding mysteries. Third, both describe these occurrences in relation to God. Fourth, in each case, a contrast is drawn between those who understand and those who do not. Fifth, in Dan 2:28, Daniel tells the king that God will reveal mysteries that will take place at the “end of days” (ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν); similarly, in Mk 4:11, Jesus refers to the “kingdom of God,” which is an eschatological term. Sixth, throughout Daniel 2, the king describes God

29 Recognized by NA28; Kee, Community, 47; Guelich, Mark, 206; Marcus, Mark 1-8, 298.
as ruler and king; thus, to some extent, we could say that he, like Jesus, refers to God’s sovereignty. Finally, the book of Daniel plays a central role in Mark, and is especially influential in references related to eschatology and Jesus’ identity (Mk 13:14/Dan 11:31; 12:11; Mk 13:26/Dan 7:13–14; Mk 14:62/Dan 7:13-14). Therefore, Mk 4:11 probably alludes to Dan 2:27-28.

Matthew’s added form ἀποκριθεὶς is often the equivalent of Dan 2:27 MT’s יַּעַ֪ה (Dan 2:5, 26; 4:30; 5:13; 6:13; 7:16) and, thus, may be a direct translation from the Aramaic of Daniel. Matthew’s replacement of Mark’s τὸ μυστήριον with τὰ μυστήρια moves him slightly away from Dan 2:27 and closer to 2:28, whereas his substitution of οὐρανῶν for θεοῦ slightly decreases the similarity to Daniel. In general, Matthew’s references to the Tanakh are incrementally more prominent than Mark’s.
9) Mk 4:39/Matt 8:26b (Ps 105:9)\(^\text{30}\)

| Mk: καὶ διεγρήθεις ἐπετίμησεν τῷ ἄνεμῳ καὶ εἶπεν τῇ θαλάσσῃ· σιώπα, πεφύσο. καὶ ἔκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ ἔγενε ταλήνη μεγάλη. |
| Matt: τότε ἐγρήθεις ἐπετίμησεν τοῖς ἄνεμοις καὶ τῇ θαλάσσῃ, καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη. |
| Ps 105:9: καὶ ἐπετίμησεν τῇ ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ |

Words identical with Ps 105:9: ἐπετίμησεν and θαλάσσῃ

Two identical terms link Mk 4:39 and Ps 105:9, and the form ἐπετίμησεν only appears one other time in the LXX (Gen 37:10); however, in that context, it is not related to a body of water. Ps 105:9 is the sole verse in the LXX where ἐπετίμησεν and θαλάσσῃ appear together. But whereas, in Mark, Jesus rebukes the wind, in the psalm, God rebukes the sea. Nevertheless, contextual similarity is also evident 1) both verses present a divine act of deliverance. 2) Each takes place on or near a body of water that responds to a divine command. 3) Both verses convey a question regarding the faith of those who are saved. Ps 105:7 describes the failure of the Israelites in the desert to understand God’s wonders, yet God saves them “for his name's sake that he might cause his mighty power to be known.”

\(^{30}\) NA\(^{28}\).
Throughout Mark’s gospel, similarly, the disciples are unable to understand Jesus’ message; even after the stilling of the storm, Jesus asks them “Have you still no faith?” (4:40).

In sum, the rare appearance of the verb ἐπιτιμάω in this specific form along with the thematic similarities seems sufficient to establish a subtle reference. There are no significant differences between Mark and Matthew.

10) Mk 5:3, 11/Matt 8:28, 31 (Is 65:4)31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mk: δέ τὴν κατοίκησιν εἶχεν ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν</th>
<th>Matt: eliminates this reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ver. 11: ἀγέλα ξούρων μεγάλη βοσκομένη.</td>
<td>Is: καὶ ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν καὶ ἐν τοῖς σπηλαίοις κοιμῶνται δι᾽ ἐνύπνια οἱ ἔσθοντες κρέα δεικνύοντες.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar words: Identical sequence ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν and κατοίκησις/בַּקְבָּר

Even though the lexical correspondence between Mk 5:3, 11 and Is 65:4 is far from impressive, the only two additional occurrences of μνήμασιν in the LXX are part of a place name (Num 33:2; Deut 9:22) and the single additional occurrence in the NT (Lk 8:27) is a parallel to our verse. The same is true for the rare sequence ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν. There may also be another common word from the MT: while Mark’s noun κατοίκησις (“dwelling”)

31 NA28, Pesch, Mark 1-8, 186; Guelich, Mark, 277.
is distinct from the verb κοιμάομαι (“to sleep”) in the LXX, the Hebrew ìšî (“to dwell”) shares the root with ìšî, the Hebrew equivalent of κατοίκησις.\textsuperscript{32} In two instances (1 Kin 8:30; 2 Chr 6:21), the verb forms of ìšî are rendered with forms of κατοίκησις. Thus, it is plausible that Mark borrowed this word from the MT. This evidence is compounded by thematic similarity, in both verses, men dwell in tombs. In Isaiah these men are described as those who rebelled against God by offering “incense to demons” (δαιμονίων).\textsuperscript{33} Somewhat similarly, Mark describes a man who has been possessed by an “unclean spirit” (πνεύματι ἁκαθάρτῳ) as one who cannot be restrained. The swine to which spirits are sent in Mk 5:11 may be similarly linked with Is 65:4, which depicts the men in the caves eating swine. Overall, the verbal and thematic similarities seem sufficient to affirm this reference. Matthew eliminates it.

\textsuperscript{32} See Gen 10:30; 27:39; Ex 12:40; Num 15:2; 2 Sam 9:12; 2 Kin 2:19.

\textsuperscript{33} This word is absent from the MT.
11) Mk 5:25a/Matt 9:20 (Lev 15:25a)\(^{34}\)

| **Mk**: Kai γυνή οὖσα ἐν ρύσει αἵματος δώδεκα ἔτη    | **Matt**: Kai ἰδοὺ γυνὴ αἵμορροούσα δώδεκα ἔτη προσελθούσα ὤπισθεν ἠματο τοῦ κρασέδου τοῦ ἴματίου αὐτοῦ. |
| **Lev**: καὶ γυνὴ ἐὰν ρέῃ ρύσει αἵματος ἡμέρας πλείους οὐκ ἐν καιρῷ τῆς ἀφέδρου αὐτῆς ἐὰν καὶ ρέῃ μετὰ τὴν ἀφέδρον αὐτῆς πᾶσαι αἱ ἡμέραι ρύσεως ἀκαθαρσίας αὐτῆς καθάπερ αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς ἀφέδρου ἀκάθαρτος ἔσται |

Identical words in near identical order: γυνή and ρύσει αἵματος.

The lexical correspondence between Mk 5:25a and Lev 15:27 is significant, three identical forms appear together, almost in sequence. Additionally, the combination ρύσει αἵματος only occurs in our verse in the LXX and in one additional NT verse, its Lukan parallel (8:43). Furthermore, Mk 5:25-34 and Lev 15:25-28 share a strong thematic correspondence: Mark describes the woman with the blood discharge performing each action that is forbidden in Leviticus. For example, while Lev 15:25 states that a menstruant should avoid contact with other people, in Mk 5:27, she walks through a crowd. Similarly, according to Lev 15:26-27, whoever comes into contact with furnishings on which a menstruant sat or lay should wash his clothing and be considered unclean until evening. In Mk 5:28, however, this woman touches Jesus’ garment and is immediately healed; thus,

her complete disregard for the laws of purity is rewarded. In this case, both verbal and thematic similarities are strong.

Matthew eliminates the lexical correspondence by replacing ῥύσει αἵματος with αἷμορροέω. His word choice is a rare verb that is unique to Lev 15:33.

12) **Mk 5:34/Matt 9:22/Lk 8:48 (1Sam 1:17)**

Identical sequences: εἶπεν αὐτῇ and εἰς εἰρήνην

Both εἶπεν αὐτῇ (thirty-one occurrences in the Tanakh) and εἰς εἰρήνην (twenty-six occurrences) are common sequences, but they only appear together in one other verse (1Sam 25:35). It seems, however, that 1 Sam 1:17 is a more suitable match for this reference. Thus, πορεύομαι in 1:17 seems to come a bit closer to Mark’s ὑπάγω than ἀναβαίνω in 1 Sam 25:35. In addition, Hannah, the heroine of 1 Sam 1:17, is a more likely model for the woman with the blood discharge in Mk 5:34. First, both women are depicted

---

35 NA²⁸, France, *Mark*, 238.
with physical concerns, infertility and menstruation, respectively. Second, Hannah demonstrates her faith through petitionary prayer to God, much as the woman in Mark displays her faith by trusting in Jesus’ healing power. Another possible indicator for this reference is Luke (8:48), who seems to recognize and enhance this reference when he replaces Mark’s unique ὑπαγε with πορεύομαι, and thus shares five identical words with 1 Sam 1:17 in a similar order. Nevertheless, even though Mark is probably employing terminology from the Tanakh, this is one of our least assured subtle references.

By omitting εἰς εἰρήνην, Matthew eliminates this possible reference.
This is another instance in which Mark weaves several Tanakh references into his narrative. Its common denominator is the story of Moses on Mt. Sinai. In place of verse-by-verse comparisons, the chart below thematically presents the most notable references:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common themes</th>
<th>Mk</th>
<th>Matt</th>
<th>Exodus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A high mountain or a mountain peak</td>
<td>9:2: ὀρος ὑψηλόν</td>
<td>17:2: ὀρος ὑψηλόν</td>
<td>19:20: κορυφήν τοῦ ὀρους</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three people ascend with the central figure 9:2: ὤ Ησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην</td>
<td></td>
<td>24:1: σὺ καὶ Ααρων καὶ Ναδαβ καὶ Αβιουδ καὶ ἐβδομήκοντα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An event that occurs after six days 9:2: Καὶ μετὰ ἡμέρας ξ</td>
<td>Καὶ μεθ᾽ ἡμέρας ξ</td>
<td>24:16: καὶ ἐκάλυψεν αὐτὸ ἡ νεφέλη ξ ἡμέρας</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A change in the central figure’s appearance 9:2: καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἐμπροσθεν αὐτῶν,</td>
<td>καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἐμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐλαμψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος</td>
<td>34:29: ὅτι δεδόξασται ἡ ὄψις τοῦ χρώματος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

36 NA²⁸, Allison, New Moses, 243-244; Evans, Mark, 34-35; Marcus, Mark 8-16, 636-637; Boring, Mark, 261.

37 Based on Allison’s suggestions in New Moses, 243-244.

38 In the LXX, these three ascend with seventy elders, but only Moses and three others are mentioned by name.
Despite the absence of lexical correspondence, these five common elements are too significant to be considered anything other than a reference to Moses at Sinai. In addition, Mark incorporates other explicit references to Sinai in his account of the transfiguration, such as allusions to the cloud that appeared above the tabernacle of the covenant (Mk 9:7/Ex 24:15-18) and the voice that spoke from that cloud (Mk 9:7/Ex 24:16). Moreover, Moses appears in Mk 9:4 and converses with Jesus. Thus, this reference frames Mark’s account of the transfiguration on the basis of descriptions of Moses at Sinai.

Matthew increases the prominence of the reference to Ex 34:29 by adding καὶ ἔλαμψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος; he also inserts a reference to Ps 103:2 by inserting ὡς τὸ φῶς, and he omits Mark’s στίλβοντα and λίαν.
Common words: πᾶς and ἁλισθήσεται.

The lexical correspondence in this case is minimal, but the form ἁλισθήσεται only occurs in this verse in the Tanakh and in one additional verse in the NT (Matt 5:13). Furthermore, Mark’s reference to “fire” (πῦρ) is probably an element in this reference since the offerings that, according to Lev 2:13, must be salted, would also have been burned or roasted (Lev 2:14). The addition of Lev 2:13 to Mk 9:49 in a few manuscripts (D being the most prominent) may indicate that early scribes also recognized this reference. Moreover, this salt is described as the “salt of the covenant with your God” (ἅλα διαθήκης κυρίου) and, therefore, is the ultimate sign of faith in and loyalty to God. This may be related to Jesus’ words about the absolute imperative to avoid stumbling (Mk 9:43, 47-48), even if it requires cutting off one’s own hand or tearing out one’s eye. Thus, like the salt that symbolizes everlasting faith in God, the disciples must remain steadfast in their covenant with Jesus, even if that commitment entails life-threatening trials. On the whole, this highly

39 NA²⁸, France, Mark, 383; Marcus, Mark 8-16, 692; Watts, “Mark,” 194-196.
unusual vocabulary and the pertinence of Lev 2:13 to Mk 9:42-49 seem sufficient for this reference to be established.

Matthew omits Πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ άλλοθήσεται, thereby eliminating this allusion.

16) Mk 10:5b/Matt 19:8a (Deut 10:16a; Jer 4:4?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mk: πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ύμῶν</th>
<th>Matt: τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ύμῶν</th>
<th>Deut: καὶ περιτεμεσθε τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ύμῶν</th>
<th>Jer: καὶ περιτέμεσθε τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ύμῶν ἄνδρες Ἰουδα</th>
<th>Identical sequence: τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ύμῶν.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Here too the lexical correspondence is not particularly strong, but this sequence only appears in these two verses in the LXX and its sole additional occurrence in the NT is in the Matthean parallel (Matt 19:8). It is difficult, however, to determine which Tanakh verse is being referenced. Yet because, in Mark (10:2, 4), the Pharisees base their argument on Deuteronomy, it would be logical for Mark to draw Jesus’ rebuttal from that same book. Though I lean toward Deut 10:16, the lexical correspondence seems sufficient for either

---

40 NA²⁸, Evans, Mark, 84.
Jeremiah or Deuteronomy; in fact, Jer 4:4 may well be a reference to Deuteronomy. There are no differences between Matthew and Mark in this case.

17) Mk 10:18/Matt 19:17 (Deut 6:4)\(^{41}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mk: οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matt: εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀγαθὸς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lk: οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deut: ἀκουε Ἰσραηλ κύριος ὁ θεός ἡμῶν κύριος εἰς ἐστὶν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted above (in the discussion of Mk 2:7), Mk 10:18 is probably referencing Deut 6:4. Matthew adds ἐστὶν, thus moving a bit closer to Deut 6:4, but his omission of ὁ θεός significantly weakens the similarity. These changes render this Tanakh reference less prominent in Matthew than in Mark.

---

18) Mk 10:45/Matt 20:28 (Is 53:10, 12)\

Mk: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονήσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχήν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.

Matt: ὥσπερ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονήσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχήν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.

Is: εὰν δῶτε περὶ ἁμαρτίας ἡ ψυχὴ ύμων… εὐ δουλεύοντα πολλοῖς καὶ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν αὐτὸς ἄνοιξει

… καὶ αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήγιγκεν καὶ διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη

Similar words: δίδωμι, ψυχή and πολλῶν.

To these three terms we might add Mark’s διακονέω (“to serve”) which, in this context, is probably an allusion to the figure of the servant in Isaiah. Some read λύτρον as a loose translation of ψυχή; yet this suggestion is dubious, for λύτρον never appears as a translation for the forms of ψυχή (forty-eight occurrences) in the LXX. In addition, ψυχή is either “guilt” or “a guilt offering” while λύτρον is usually “redemption” or “release through payment.”

However, a closer look at λύτρον and its Hebrew equivalents may suggest that Mark is using a different verse. In the Tanakh, λύτρον can translate כֹּפֶר (“ransom”), פדה (“to

42 This Isaiah reference is recognized by many, for example NA28; Gundry, Use, 39-40; Davies and Allison, Matthew 19-28, 35; Hagner, Matthew 14–28, 582-583; Evans, Mark, 122-124; Marcus, Mark 8-16, 757.

release”), גאל (“to save” or “to redeem”), and מְחִיר (“price”). Of these four terms, כֹפֶר (six occurrences) and פדה (eleven occurrences) are most relevant to our discussion because they are linked to נֶפֶש in seven instances. This association is significant since אָשָם and נֶפֶש are directly connected in Isaiah (וֹתִים אָשָם נַפְש). In Mark, ψυχή is similarly related to λύτρον (ψυχήν αὐτοῦ λύτρον). Indeed, two of these verses resemble Mk 10:45b so closely that they merit a fresh consideration to discern the source of Mark’s reference.

44 For two concise discussions of this interpretive conundrum, see Childs, Isaiah, 417-419; Goldingay, Isaiah 40-55, 318-321.
Mk 10:45/Ex 21:30/30:12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mk: καὶ δῶναι τὴν ψυχήν αὐτοῦ λύτρον</th>
<th>Ex 21:30: δώσει λύτρα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30:12: καὶ δόσουσιν ἐκαστὸς λύτρα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar words: δίδωμι, ψυχή, αὐτοῦ and λύτρον.

Judging from lexical correspondence alone, Ex 21:30 or 30:12 initially appear more apt than Is 53:10, 12 as the referent for Mk 10:45. First, these verses from Exodus each share four common words with Mark, in contrast to Isaiah, in which this similarity is distributed over two non-consecutive verses. Second, in the LXX, these four words appear together only in these two verses from Exodus. Third, as the only rare word in Mk 10:45, the occurrence of λύτρον in these two verses from Exodus is significant.

Nevertheless, Ex 21:30 or 30:12 on their own are unlikely to be Mark’s referent for this echo. Thus, in contrast to Isaiah’s servant, a central typology in Mark, the content of these passages from Exodus is not especially relevant for the gospel. Neither do these verses account for Jesus’ statement about coming to “serve” (διακονέω) and “giving his life as a ransom for the many” (πολὺς). These two elements in Mark’s account are probably derived from Isaiah.

How, then, might we explain the seeming reference to Exodus that is sandwiched between references to Is 53? One possibility is that Mark’s use of λύτρον is independent of its usage in Exodus, despite their ostensible similarities. According to this
understanding, Mark, like many modern interpreters, found נַפְשֵׂים אָשָם to be a highly challenging phrase to render; he therefore selected λότρον over the Septuagint’s ἁμαρτία as a translation for אָשָם. This proposal is weakened by the absence of any instance where λότρον is presented as an equivalent of אָשָם. It seems, rather, that this may be another instance where Mark refers to both Isaiah and Exodus. This practice is most clearly illustrated by Mk 1:2-3, where Mark introduces quotes from Ex 23:20, Mal 3:1 and Is 40:3 while attributing all three to Isaiah. In that instance, the latter two verses are based on Ex 23:20. Likewise, while it is unlikely that Is 53:10 is based on Ex 21:30 (or 30:12), the similarity between those two verses may have led Mark to conflate them into a single reference. In sum, this is probably a reference to Is 53:10, 12 combined with Ex 21:30 or 30:12. There are no differences between Mark and Matthew.
19) Mk 11:2b, 4/Matt 21:2, 4-5 (Zec 9:9; Gen 49:10-11)\(^45\)

| **Mk:** | εἰς αὐτὴν εὐρήσετε πῶλον δεδεμένον ἔφ’ ὄν οὐδεὶς ὀὔπω ἀνθρώπων ἐκάθισεν· … καὶ ἀπῆλθον καὶ εὐροῦν πῶλον δεδεμένον πρὸς τὸν ἀμφότερον |
| **Matt:** | εὐρήσετε δόνων δεδεμένην καὶ πῶλον μετ’ αὐτῆς· λύσαντες ἁγάγετε μοι. τοῦτο δὲ γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥήθην διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος· ἕιπάτε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιών· ἵνα ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἐρχεται σοι πραύς καὶ εἰπερβηκὼς ἐπὶ δόνων καὶ ἐπὶ πῶλον ὑπὸν ὑποζυγίου. |
| **Zec:** | χαίρε σφόδρα θύγατερ Σιὼν· δοῦ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἐρχεται σοι δίκαιος καὶ σύζων αὐτός· πραύς καὶ εἰπερβηκὼς ἐπὶ υποζυγίου καὶ πῶλον νέον |
| **Gen:** | δεσμεύων πρὸς ἁμπελόν τὸν πῶλον αὐτοῦ καὶ τῇ ἐλική τὸν πῶλον τῆς δούναν αὐτοῦ |

Similar words: πῶλον

Although Mk 11:2b shares only one identical form (πῶλον) with these Tanakh verses that form is limited to Gen 49:10-11 and Zec 9:9. Another possible verbal similarity is that Mark’s description of the colt as “one that has never been ridden” (ἐφ’ ὄν οὐδεὶς ὀὔπω ἀνθρώπων ἐκάθισεν), is perhaps influenced by the reference in Zec 9:9 to a colt as “young” (νέον). The broader Markan context (11:2-4) also seems to invoke the prophecy of Zec

thus, much like that anticipated Davidic king, the Markan Jesus enters Jerusalem riding a colt and is received with shouts of joy. Mk 11:2 also seems to have a word similar to one that occurs in Gen 49:11 MT. While the LXX renders אֹסֵר with a highly unusual equivalent, δεσμεύω (with one additional use in Jud 16:11), Mark uses the more common δέω (over thirty occurrences: Gen 42:24; Jud 15:10, 12-13; 16:5; 2 Sa 3:34; 2 Kin 25:7; 2 Chr 36:6; Is 22:3; etc.).

Furthermore, Matthew clearly recognized the Zec 9:9 reference, as signaled by his addition of a formal introduction (Matt 21:4) and an almost verbatim quotation (21:5). This therefore seems to be another Markan reference that subtly echoes two verses from the Tanakh which, in turn, become an explicit quotation of Zec 9:9 in Matthew (21:4-5), who also retains Mark’s reference to Gen 49:10-11.

21) **Mk 12:15b/Matt 22:18 (Ex 17:2b)**

Identical words: εἶπεν, αὐτοῖς and πειράζετε

While the sequence εἶπεν αὐτοῖς is very common, the form πειράζετε is unique to Ex 17:2; by extension, the combination of τί and πειράζετε is also unique to this verse. The structure of this Markan verse and Ex 17:2 are also quite similar: in each, an individual is addressed by people who lack faith in God and he replies with one or more questions about temptation. Furthermore Ex 17:7, which concludes this passage from the Tanakh, states that Moses named this place “temptation” because “the people tempted the Lord,” thereby asking “Is the Lord among us or not?” This narrative, which concentrates on the question of God’s authority and presence, seems similar to the central theme of Mk 12:13-17, in which Jesus’ opponents try to compel him to choose between piety toward God and loyalty to the emperor. Indeed, Jesus’ reference to temptation may imply that the question itself reveals a lack of faith on his interrogators’ part. Moreover, in Ex 17:5, Moses fears that those who tempt God might stone him, much as those who tempt Jesus are involved in the conspiracy to kill him. Overall, there seems to be sufficient verbal and thematic
correspondence to establish this reference. There are no relevant differences between Mark and Matthew.

20) Mk 12:40/Matt 23:13 (Is 10:1a–2b)\textsuperscript{47}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mk</th>
<th>οἱ κατεσθιόντες τὰς οἰκίας τῶν ἡρῴδων ... οὗτοι λήμψονται περισσότερον κρίμα.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt: eliminates this reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>οὐαὶ τοῖς γράφουσιν πονηρίαν ... ἁρπάζοντες κρίμα πενήτων τοῦ λαοῦ μου ὡστε εἶναι αὐτοῖς ἔχραν εἰς ἁρπαγήν καὶ ὀρφανόν εἰς προνομὴν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Common words: χήρα and κρίμα.

In this case, the verbal similarity is not strong and both words are very common. In the LXX, however, χήρα and κρίμα only occur together in Is 10:2. Their only additional paired occurrence in the NT appears in the Lukan parallel to our verse (Lk 20:47). Verbal correspondence alone does not not suffice to demonstrate this reference since, in Isaiah, κρίμα is the “justice” that is taken away from the needy, whereas, in Mark, it is the “judgment” to be imposed upon scribes.

Nevertheless, the thematic similarity presented here is significant: Is 10:1 warns against those who write with iniquity (γράφουσιν), and Mk 12:38-40 describes immoral acts carried out by scribes (γραμματέων). Furthermore, in Mark, Jesus speaks of scribes

\textsuperscript{47} Is 10:1-4 is recognized by NA\textsuperscript{28}; Marcus, \textit{Mark 8-16}, 855.
who “devour widows’ houses” and, in Isaiah, widows are described as prey for those who “write iniquities.” In addition, the Markan Jesus concludes his diatribe by threatening to condemn the scribes, while Isaiah (10:3-4) refers to future judgment. Thus, it seems that Mark is indeed referencing Isaiah.

The best and earliest MSS of Matthew (א, B, D, L, Z, etc.) lack this verse but it appears in a small number of witnesses (K, W, Γ, Δ). Its inclusion, however, is probably not original, given its absence from many types of early witnesses and its insertion in various locations. It is more likely that later scribes added this reference, which is extant in Mark and Luke (20:47).48

23) Mk 13:3a/Matt 24:3 (Zec 14:4a)49

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mk:</th>
<th>Καὶ καθημένου αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν ἱερόν</th>
<th>τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν κατέναντι</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt:</td>
<td>Καθημένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους τῶν ἐλαιῶν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zec:</td>
<td>καὶ στήσονται οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους τῶν ἐλαιῶν τὸ κατέναντι ἱερουσαλήμ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Near-identical sequence: τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν κατέναντι.

48 Metzger, Textual, 60.

49 Evans, Mark, 304; Boring, Mark, 354; Marcus, Mark 8-16, 869,873.
This lexical correspondence is significant even though it most notably focuses on a place name; however, the inclusion of a nearly identical five-component string can hardly be coincidental. In addition, we find a very strong thematic correspondence. First, Mark describes Jesus sitting opposite (κατέναντι) the Temple, much as Zechariah describes God standing on the same mountain, opposite (κατέναντι) Jerusalem. These descriptions each follow a prophecy about war and destruction. Furthermore, both are set in an eschatological context: Zechariah 14 describes the ultimate battle between God and his enemies and, in Mark 13, Jesus describes the arrival of the Son of Man. Moreover, they each depict a series of natural and supernatural catastrophes. Finally, Mark elsewhere references Zechariah, both explicitly and implicitly, especially in chapters 11-14. Taking all of this evidence into account, this is probably a reference to Zechariah 14.

By replacing τὸ ὄρος with τὸῦ ὄρους and omitting Mark’s κατέναντι, Matthew significantly reduces the similarity to Zec 14:4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk: καὶ εἰς συναγωγάς διαρήσασθε καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνον καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσασθε ἐνεκεν ἐμὸν εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.</td>
<td>“Come to the assembly, and when the time comes, speak before kings and rulers.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt: καὶ ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν μαστιγώσουσιν ὑμᾶς. καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας δὲ καὶ βασιλεῖς ἀχθήσεσθε ἐνεκεν ἐμὸν εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἐθνεῖσιν</td>
<td>“They will beat you in their synagogues and when the time comes, before rulers and kings.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps: καὶ ἐλάλουν ἐν τοῖς μαρτυρίοις σου ἐναντίον βασιλέων καὶ οὐκ ἤσχησαν</td>
<td>“They will testify before kings against you.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correspondence with Zep 3:8: identical combinations: εἰς συναγωγάς and εἰς μαρτύριον; similar word: βασιλεύς.

Correspondence with Ps 118:46: identical word βασιλέων; similar word: μαρτύριον.

It is clear that significant lexical correspondence is found with Zep 3:8, including two identical combinations (εἰς συναγωγάς and εἰς μαρτύριον) that only occur together in Zep 3:8 and Mk 13:9. These verses also share a similar word (βασιλεύς), presenting a lexical correspondence that should be sufficient for an implicit reference. However, whereas Zephaniah states that God will rise as a witness to judge the assembly of nations (συναγωγάς ἐθνῶν) and will then gather kings (βασιλεύς according to the LXX) or kingdoms (ἵλλαχας according to the MT), in Mark (13:9), the disciples will be beaten in synagogues (συναγωγάς) and testify (εἰς μαρτύριον) before rulers and kings. Thus, it is very difficult to see an actual allusion to Zephaniah in Mark. Nevertheless, the verbal similarity is significant enough to posit a possible influence of Zep 3:8 on Mk 13:9.
The lexical correspondence with Ps 118:46 is comprised of one identical form (βασιλέων) and one similar word (μαρτύριον); both are common (with eighty and 200 occurrences, respectively). Only in this psalm does the word μαρτύριον appear with the form βασιλέων, and this is the sole instance where testimony is presented before or against kings. Thus, Mark’s description of the disciples standing to testify before kings could plausibly be based on this psalm’s description of testimony ἐναντίον (“in sight of” or “in front of”)/נֶֶַֽׁ֥גֶד (“against” or “before”) kings. Moreover, thematic similarity is evident between Psalm 118 and Mark: in this gospel, the disciples are expected to give testimony regarding Jesus in front of kings, much as the righteous sufferer promises to speak of God’s testimonies before kings. Consequently, Ps 118:46 seems to be a more likely referent for Mk 13:9 than Zep 3:8.

By replacing Mark’s βασιλέων with βασιλεῖς, however, Matthew moves closer to Zep 3:8 and away from Ps 118:46. The first evangelist also increases the similarity to Zep 3:8 by adding καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, while distancing his text from that same verse by replacing ἐις συναγωγὰς with ἐν τοῖς συναγωγαῖς. Thus Matthew makes changes that both increase and decrease the similarity with Zep 3:8, without seeming to recognize Ps 118:46 as a reference.
As this chart indicates, there are a number of significant differences between the Hebrew and Greek versions of Is 66:5. For our Markan verse, these contrasting versions are most relevant: “Your brothers who hate you and exclude you for the sake of my name, say, let the Lord be honored…” in the MT, and “Speak our brothers to those who hate you and abhor you, so that the name of the Lord will be glorified…” in the LXX. Since the Markan Jesus tells the disciples that they “will be hated by all for the sake of my (Jesus’) name,” it is unlikely that Mark would be referencing the Greek text. The Hebrew, however, offers a more promising source: Mark’s διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου may be a rendering of לְמֵַ֤עַן שְמִי (cf. Jer 14:21 and 2 Chr 6:32 for similar translations) and μισοῦμενοι could be based on שֹנְא יכִֶ֜ם.

The idea of being hated for the sake of God’s name is unique to Is 66:5, as is the combination of לְמַעַן, שִנּוֹ, and שְמִי. In addition, Isaiah’s words about being hated by one’s

50 Davies and Allison, Matthew 19-28, 187.

51 For an overview of these differences, see Goldingay, Isaiah, 56-66.
brothers bring Mk 13:12 to mind, where Jesus describes brothers betraying each other “to
death.” Moreover, in both Isaiah and Mark, those being addressed are a small group that is
hated by their peers on account of God’s name. This is likely another example where Mark
independently drew from the Hebrew text (Mk 1:10/Is 63:19; Mk 5:3/Is 65:4). Here
Matthew and Mark are identical.

25) Mk 13:13b/Matt 10:22b; (Dan 12:12-13 Thd. and MT)\textsuperscript{52}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mk:</th>
<th>ὅ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt:</td>
<td>ὅ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thd:</td>
<td>μακάριος ὁ ὑπομένων καὶ φθάσας εἰς συντέλειαν\textsuperscript{53} ἡμερῶν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Common words with Thd.: ὑπομένω

With the MT: ὑπομένων/ἐπι, εἰς τέλος/γῆ,

The single lexical correspondence between Mk 13:13b and Dan 12:12-13 is fairly common
(with fifty additional occurrences) and, while συντέλεια and τέλος are similar, they are
certainly not synonymous. The language of the MT, however, is a little more promising.
Mark’s εἰς τέλος is a rare but extant translation of γῆ (Dan 9:26; 11:13) and ὑπομένω often

\textsuperscript{52} NA\textsuperscript{28}; Gundry, Use, 57.

\textsuperscript{53} In miniscule 239, we find the variant εἰς τέλος.
renders ḫהך (nine instances). But these two similarities, which stretch over two verses, are not sufficient to justify accepting this reference on the basis of lexical correspondence alone. Nevertheless, Daniel 12 is referenced explicitly and implicitly in Mark 13 (Mk 13:14/Dan 12:10-11; 13:19/Dan 12:1), including a reference to Dan 12:11 in Mark’s next verse. Thus, despite the comparatively weak verbal similarity, this is probably a reference.

Matthew’s version is identical.
26) Mk 13:22/Matt 24:24 (Deut 13:1-3; Jer 36:8)54

Mk: καὶ ψευδοπροφήται καὶ δώσουσίν σημεία καὶ τέρατα πρὸς τὸ ἀποπλανᾶν, εἰ δυνατόν,

Matt: καὶ ψευδοπροφήται καὶ δώσουσιν σημεία μεγάλα καὶ τέρατα ὅστε πλανῆσαι, καὶ δώσουσιν σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα 3 καὶ ἐξομήνυσιν τὸ σήμειον καὶ τὸ τέρας...

Deut: ἐὰν δὲ ἀναστῇ ἐν σοὶ προφήτης ἢ ἐνυπνιάζομενος ἐνύπνιον καὶ δῶσον σοί σημεῖαν καὶ τέρας 3, ἐξομήνυσιν τὸ σήμειον καὶ τὸ τέρας,...

Jer: μὴ ἀναπειθέωσαν ὑμᾶς οἱ ψευδοπροφήται οἱ ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ μὴ ἀναπειθέωσαν ὑμᾶς οἱ μάντεις ὑμῶν καὶ ἐξοδοὺες εἰς τὰ ἐνύπνια ὑμῶν ἢ ὑμεῖς ἐνυπνιάζεσθε

Similar words with Deut 13:2-3: σημείον, τέρας, δίδωμι and προφήτης.

With Jer 36:8: ψευδοπροφήται

Deut 13:2 is the only verse in the Tanakh that describes a prophet who gives (δίδωμι) signs (σημείον) and wonders (τέρας) to the people; in Deut 13:3, he then attempts to lead the them astray to worship other gods. Thus, Mk 13:22 and Deut 13:2-3 share lexical as well as thematic correspondence: each describes false prophets, whether explicitly (Mark) or implicitly (Deuteronomy). Second, in both, these false prophets display signs


55 Missing from D but extant in all other major witnesses.

56 Replaced in some MSS but present in א, ב, כ, ק, ל, ו, etc.

57 Gundry, Use, 51 notes that ψευδοπροφήται agrees with the Targum of Deut 13:2 לְבָנִי הָנַעַר but, as we have seen, Mark’s source for this word could be Jer 6:34 LXX.
and wonders followed by an attempt to divert the people from following the words of God or Jesus. Mark (13:21), who probably based his verse on Deut 13:2-3, might have borrowed the unique form ψευδοπροφήται from Jer 36:8 (cf. 33:7-8, 11), which itself is a likely reference to Deut 13:2-3.

Matthean alterations here do not affect the level of prominence of this reference.

27) Mk 13:31/Matt 24:35 (Is 40:8; 51:6; Ps 119:89-90)\(^{58}\)

| Mk: ὁ οὐρανός καὶ ή γῆ παρελεύσονται, οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου οὐ μὴ παρελεύσονται. |
| Matt: ὁ οὐρανός καὶ ή γῆ παρελεύσεται, οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου οὐ μὴ παρέλθοσιν. |
| Ps: οὐ πέλαξεν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κύριε οἱ λόγοι σου διαμένει ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ εἰς γενεάν καὶ γενεάν ἡ ἀλήθεια σου ἐθεμελίωσας τὴν γῆν καὶ διαμένει |
| Is 40:8: έξηράνθη ο χόρτος καὶ τὸ άνθος έξέπεσεν τὸ δὲ ρήμα τοῦ θεου ἡμῶν μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα |
| 51:6: οτι ο οὐρανός ως καπνός ἐστερεώθη καὶ δὲ γῆ ώς ιμάτιον παλαιωθήσεται... δέ σωτήριον μου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἔσται δὲ δικαιοσύνη μου οὐ μὴ ἐκλήσῃ |


\(^{58}\) NA\(^{28}\); Evans, Mark, 335; Marcus, Mark 8-16, 916-918.
With regard to lexical correspondence, Ps 119:89-90 seems closest to Mk 13:31. However, in the psalm, the word of God abides forever in heaven whereas, in Mark, the heavens will pass away. Also, in Mark, the earth will pass away, while, in the psalm, it stands firm. It is possible, however, that the Markan Jesus intentionally reversed the content of these verses from Psalm 119. Such a modification could have stemmed from the context of Mk 13:31, which is part of an apocalyptic prophecy. Therefore, the psalm's depiction of stability and continuity was adapted to fit the Markan setting.

In contrast, if we consider the two verses from Isaiah as a possible composite reference, their combined elements may override each verse’s weakness in terms of lexical correspondence. Thus, Is 40:8 MT may be the source for the divine word that will never pass away and Is 51:6 LXX for οὐρανὸς and γῆ. At this point we must turn to Is 51:6 MT for נפשוּ נֶפֶלָה (“evaporated like smoke”), a far more likely source for Mark’s παρελεύσονται than ὡς καπνὸς ἐστερεώθη (“strengthened” or “darkened like smoke”).

While lexical correspondence is still lacking, the contextual similarity is strong. Thus, both Is 51:6 and Mark contrast the eternal nature of the divine against the temporal nature of physical creation; and, Is 40:8, like Mark, emphasizes the eternity of the divine word. Moreover, the apocalyptic imagery of Is 51:6 fits well within Mark 13, which is replete with similar depictions.
It is also conceivable that Mk 13:31 combines Ps 119:89-90 with Is 51:6. According to this scenario, the psalm was supplemented with material from Is 51:6, which provides apocalyptic imagery. While it is difficult to determine which of these three possibilities is more likely, a composite allusion of Ps 119:89-90 and Is 51:6 has a slightly stronger verbal correspondence with Mark and, thus, should be preferred.

The differences between Mark and Matthew do not affect the prominence of these possible references.

28) **Mk 13:35b-36a/Matt 24:42 (Mal 3:1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mk: ὁ κύριος τῆς οἰκίας ἔρχεται... μὴ ἐλθὼν ἐξαίφνης εὐρη ὑμᾶς καθεύδοντας.</th>
<th>Matt: eliminates this reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX: καὶ ἐξαίφνης ἤξει εἰς τὸν ναὸν ἑαυτοῦ κύριος ὅν υμεῖς ζητεῖτε καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος τῆς διαθήκης ὅν υμεῖς θέλετε ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Common words with the LXX: κύριος, ἔρχεται and ἐξαίφνης; with the MT: κύριος/κύριος, ἐξαίφνης/ἐλθὼν ἐξαίφνης

The verbal similarity between Mk 13:35-36 and Mal 3:1 is not significant and their two similar words are not rare.\(^{59}\) Additionally, Matthew and Luke both omit the adverb

---

\(^{59}\) The adverb ἐξαίφνης has eight occurrences in the Tanakh and five in the NT; the form κύριος has over 3500 occurrences in the Tanakh and hundreds in the NT.
ἐξαίφνης, effectively eliminating this possible reference. However, the sole use of ἐξαίφνης to describe the “coming” of a κύριος occurs in Mal 3:1 and Mk 13:35-36. A difficulty appears, for in Mal 3:1 the verb ἔρχομαι is used for the coming of the angel of the covenant, whereas a different word (ἡκω) depicts the arrival of the Lord. Here too the MT may provide a solution. In over 400 instances, ἔρχομαι is the equivalent of בוא. ἡκω, which appears in Mal 3:1 LXX, is also a very common translation of בוא, with more than 200 occurrences. Therefore, if Mark is referring to Mal 3:1, he is adopting the more common equivalent. Indeed, if we assume that Mark used the MT here, this contextual difficulty is resolved.

Another possible similarity between Mark and Malachi is the phrase κύριος τῆς οἰκίας. In 191 instances, the Temple is described as the “house of the Lord” (בית יהוה) and, in the great majority of these occurrences; the Greek translation combines κύριος and οἰκία. This does not necessarily imply that Mark’s “master of the house” is a translation of Malachi but, within the Markan context, it strengthens the likelihood of a reference to Mal 3:1. Furthermore, both Mark’s parable and Mal 3:1 are set in eschatological contexts.

Another reason to consider Mk 13:35–36 as a subtle reference is the significance of Mal 3 in Mark’s gospel. By employing a quote from Mal 3:1 in the opening verses of his text, Mark signals that this composition will describe the fulfillment of Malachi’s prophecy. Accordingly, immediately after the quotes in Mark 1:2–3, John the Baptist arrives, fulfilling the role of the messenger preparing the Lord’s way. John’s appearance,
clothing, and call for repentance resemble Elijah the prophet (Mk 1:6/2 Kin 1:8) and strengthen the connection to Malachi 3, in which God promises, “I will send to you Elijah the Tishbite, before the great and glorious day of the Lord comes” (MT 3:28/LXX 4:5). Then, following a description of John’s actions and his proclamation of the greatness of the one who will soon come, Jesus arrives. This immediate appearance and the emphasis on Jesus’ greatness both strengthen his association with Malachi’s “Lord” and “angel of the covenant.” Later, Mark affirms John’s role as “Elijah who has come” with references to Mal 3:22–24.⁶⁰

Numerous scholars, therefore, see Mal 3 as an important Tanakh text for Mark; Watts goes even further, claiming that Mal 3 is a key to understanding Mark’s message.⁶¹ While Watts may have overestimated the centrality of this passage, its significance for Mark is difficult to overlook.

As noted above, Matthew omits ἐξαίφνης and, thus, eliminates this possible reference.

---

⁶⁰ Mk 9:4, 11–12.

Identical sequence: μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας

Although the terms common to Hos 6:2 and Mk 14:1 are not particularly rare, this sequence is unparalleled in the LXX and, in the NT, it only occurs in our Markan verse and its Matthean parallel. In addition, Hos 6:2b is referenced in Mark’s predictions of the Passion (8:32; 9:31; 10:34). Furthermore, by referencing Hosea, Mark reminds his readers that the events anticipated by Jesus in his Passion predictions are beginning to unfold. This evidence seems sufficient for a reference.

There are no significant differences between Matthew and Mark.

---

Although Mark 14:7 shares no common vocabulary with Deut 15:11, the words ascribed to Jesus in this verse are probably based on the Deuteronomic instruction to be generous by providing for the poor, since the Land of Israel will never lack poor inhabitants. Thus, the Markan Jesus responds to the critics—who regard the anointment in Bethany as a waste of funds that should have gone to the needy—with a paraphrase that reverses the meaning of Deut 15:11. The permanent presence of the poor, the very reason to provide for them in Deuteronomy, justifies that woman’s generosity toward the human Jesus, whose earthly presence will soon come to an end. This is another case in which acts by or for Jesus supersede commandments from the Torah (Mk 2:18-20, 23-28; 3:2-4). Unlike previous examples, where Jesus’ divine authority overrode normative observance of Shabbat and approaches to healing, here love or faith toward Jesus takes precedence.

---

over a commandment. Thus, despite its almost complete lack of verbal similarity, this is probably a reference.

By omitting Mark’s καὶ ὅταν θέλητε δύνασθε αὐτοῖς εὗ ποιήσα, Matthew weakens the similarity with Deut 15:11 and diminishes the prominence of this reference.

31) Mk 14:9b/Matt 26:13 (Lev 2:2b)

| Mk: καὶ ὃ ἐποίησεν αὐτὴ λαληθήσεται eἰς αὐτῆς | μνημόσυνον |
| Matt: λαληθήσεται καὶ ὃ ἐποίησεν αὐτῇ eἰς αὐτῆς | μνημόσυνον |
| Lev: σὺν τῷ ἐλαιῷ καὶ πάντα τὸν λίβανον αὕτης καὶ ἐπιθήσει ὃ ἑρεύς τῷ | μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον θυσιὰ ὀσμὴν ἐνυσίας τῷ Κυρίῳ. |

Identical sequence: μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς.

Although these verses only share two common words, in the Tanakh this combination always refers to a specific type of sacrifice (Lev 2:2, 9, 16; 5:12; 6:8; Num 5:26). In the LXX, μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς is always the equivalent of ἀζερα, a portion of the grain offering (Μίνα). The exact meaning of the ἀζερα is debated but, for the purposes of this study, it is

64 Marcus, Mark 8-16, 937.

sufficient to describe it as a fistful (חֲפָרָה קֻמְצָה) that was taken from each grain offering, to which frankincense was then added; this “reminder” (or token portion) was then burned on the altar. This mixture is often described as an “offering by fire of a pleasing fragrance to the Lord” (Lev 2:2, 9).

Thus Mk 14:9 and Lev 2:2 share a number of common elements. First, the anointing at Bethany, like the אַזְכָרָה, can be seen as an offering of a pleasing fragrance. Second, in Mark, Jesus is often described as “the Lord”; therefore, it can be argued that both Mark and Leviticus detail an offering to the Lord. Further, the woman’s modest offering of a token portion foreshadows Jesus’ ultimate sacrifice two days later. In addition, as shown above, Mk 9:49 refers to Lev 2:13, which also describes a grain offering. Overall, these verbal and thematic correspondences seem sufficient.

Here again there are no significant differences between Matthew and Mark.

66 Idem, 10.
32) Mk 14:18/Matt 26:21, 23 (Ps 41:9)⁶⁷

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mk: ὅτι ἔξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με</th>
<th>ὁ ἐσθίων μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt: εἶς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με... ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· ὁ ἐμβάψας μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ τὴν χεῖρα ἐν τῷ τρυβλίῳ οὗτός με παραδώσει.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps: καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς εἰρήνης μου ἐφ᾽ ὄν ἠλπίσα ὁ ἐσθίων ἄρτους μου ἐμεγάλυνεν ἐπ᾽ ἐμὲ πτερνισμὸν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Common word: ἐσθίων

Even though these verses share just one common word (ὁ ἐσθίων), it only occurs in one additional Tanakh verse (Lev 11:40), whose context bears no connection to Mk 14:18. By comparison, Ps 41:9 has significant commonalities with Mk 14:18: both portray a trusted member of the speaker’s inner circle who has betrayed (or will betray) that speaker. Furthermore, in each case, the close bond between the traitor and the speaker is emphasized by a reference to them eating together. Moreover, Psalm 41, like Mark 14, has numerous descriptions of wicked individuals who conspire to kill its main protagonist. Furthermore, Marcus notes that the awkward sequence “one of you will betray me, the one eating with me,” rather than the more straightforward “one of you who are eating with me will betray

⁶⁷ NA²⁸; D. J. Moo, The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives (Eugene: WIPF & Stock Publishers, 1983), 353; Gundry, Mark, 827; Marcus, Mark 8-16, 950; France, Mark, 566.
me,” implies that this is an allusion.\textsuperscript{68} In sum, despite the weak lexical correspondence, this is probably a reference.

By omitting ὅ ἐσθίων, Matthew eliminates the slight lexical correspondence with this psalm.

34) \textit{Mk 14:32/}\textit{Matt 26:36 (Gen 22:5a)}\textsuperscript{69}

| **Mk** | καὶ λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καθίσατε ὃδε ἔως προσεύχομαι. |
| **Matt** | λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς καθίσατε αὐτοῦ ἔως [οὐ] ἀπελθὼν ἐκεί προσεύχομαι. |
| **Gen** | καὶ ἔπευ Αβρααμ τοῖς παισίν αὐτοῦ καθίσατε αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῆς ὄνου ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ τὸ παιδάριον διελευσόμεθα ἔως ὃδε καὶ προσκυνήσαντες |

Similar words: in the LXX: λέγω, αὐτοῦ καθίσατε, ὃδε and ἔως; in the MT: ὃδε/πῆ.

The lexical correspondence between Mk 14:32 and Gen 22:5a is significant, for these verses not only share five lexical components but they also include an unparalleled sequence: αὐτοῦ καθίσατε. Mark’s ὃδε may render πῆ, since the LXX uses the uncommon adverbial αὐτοῦ (ten occurrences). Indeed, αὐτοῦ does not appear in Mark, and his choice of ὃδε is the more common translation of πῆ (more than thirty instances in the LXX).

\textsuperscript{68} Marcus, \textit{Mark 8-16}, 950.

Dependence upon the MT, however, is far from certain, since Mark, like the LXX, omits לָכֶם.

The order of events within these verses from Genesis and Mark is quite similar, as is their context. In both, the speaker instructs his subordinates (servants or disciples) to “sit here,” while he goes to “worship” (or “pray to”) God elsewhere. In addition, both narratives describe a person who faces an ultimate test of faith, as expressed by his willingness to offer a precious life, whether his beloved son’s or his own. Furthermore, both narratives portray a father who offers his son’s life and, in each case, the son questions his father about his intended sacrifice (Mk 14:36/Gen 22:7).

A difficulty arises, however, for if this reference to the Tanakh alludes to Abraham rather than Isaac, one might wonder why Mark would employ a typology comparing Abraham to Jesus. Nevertheless, in the Akedah, Abraham, like the Markan Jesus, suffers and is willing to give God what is dearest to him which, in his case, is the life of his beloved son; by contrast, Isaac is neither a willing nor an active participant (unlike later Jewish developments of the Akedah tradition). Furthermore, the covenant between Israel and God is sealed through Abraham’s act of ultimate faith, his readiness to sacrifice the life of his son, much as the New Covenant is based on Jesus’ willingness to suffer and offer his life. Moreover, Mark includes at least three additional references to the Akedah in his gospel (1:11; 9:7; 12:6), which strengthens the probability of this reference. Thus, the verbal and thematic correspondence seems sufficient to establish an allusion to Gen 22:5.
Matthew enhances this reference by inserting the adverbial ὧτοῦ: this usage is relatively unusual and the occurrences of καθίσατε ὧτοῦ are limited to Gen 22:5 and Matt 26:36.70 Furthermore, while Mk 14:32 includes ὧτοῦ καθίσατε, a sequence whose only other occurrence is in Gen 22:5, in both Matthew and Genesis, ὧτοῦ is adverbial, whereas Mark’s ὧτοῦ is possessive. Matthew’s modified word order thus brings him closer to the LXX.71 Despite this enhancement of the reference, however, Matthew also lessens its prominence, for Mark shares one additional word (ὧδε) with Genesis that Matthew omits. Nevertheless, Matthew’s account seems to be slightly more prominent.

---


71 Ibid.
33) Mk 14:55/Matt 26:59 (Ps 37:32)$^{72}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mk</th>
<th>τὸ συνέδριον ἐξήτουν κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μαρτυρίαν εἰς τὸ θανατῶσαι αὐτὸν.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ τὸ συνέδριον ὅλον ἐξήτουν ψευδομαρτυρίαν κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὡς αὐτῶν θανατῶσωσιν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>κατανοεῖ ο λάμαρτολός τὸν δίκαιον καὶ ζητεῖ τοῦ θανατῶσαι αὐτὸν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Common words: ζητέω and θανατῶσαι αὐτὸν

The lexical correspondence here is not significant, but the phrase θανατῶσαι αὐτὸν with the verb ζητέω only appears in Ps 37:32. In addition, this psalm’s description of a wicked man who seeks to slay the righteous resonates with Mark’s emphasis on wickedness among the Jewish leaders who plan to kill Jesus. Furthermore, Mark consistently alludes to Psalms of the Righteous Sufferer in his passion narrative; thus, this is probably a reference.

Matthew moves away from this allusion to the psalm by changing the order of Mark’s θανατῶσαι αὐτὸν to αὐτὸν θανατῶσωσιν.

$^{72}$ Gundry, Mark, 884; O’Brien, Use, 252; Marcus, Mark 8-16, 1013.
36) Mk 14:56/Matt 26:59b-60 (Ex 20:16)\textsuperscript{73}

| Common words: ψευδομαρτυρέω and κατά |

Although this lexical correspondence is small, ψευδομαρτυρέω only appears in the Decalogue (also Deut 5:20); therefore it seems unlikely that its occurrence in Mk 14:56 is coincidental. This reference to the Decalogue presents Jesus’ trial as a mockery and indicts the Jewish leaders seeking to convict Jesus according to the Law are disregarding the Law’s very core. Moreover, in Mk 10:19, Jesus quotes Ex 20:16, perhaps foreshadowing the breach of this commandment in his trial. Thus, the rarity of ψευδομαρτυρέω, strengthened by its thematic significance, and a quotation from this same verse in Mk 10:19 are sufficient to identify an allusion.

Matthew’s replacement of Mark’s verb ψευδομαρτυρέω with the noun ψευδόμαρτυς weakens the prominence of this reference.

\textsuperscript{73} O’Brien, \textit{Use}, 252; France, \textit{Mark}, 605.
37) Mk 14:58/Matt 26:61 (Dan 2:34, 44-45)\textsuperscript{74}

| **Mk:** | ὅτι ἐγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ναὸν τούτον τὸν χειροποιητὸν καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλον χειροποιητὸν οἰκοδομήσω. |
| **Matt:** | eliminates this reference |
| **Dan 2:34:** | ἕως ὧτοῦ ἐτμήθη λίθος ἐξ ὀροῦς ἄνευ χειρόν καὶ ἐπάταξε τὴν εἰκόνα ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας τοὺς σιδηροὺς καὶ ὀστρακίνους καὶ κατήλεσεν αὐτὰ |
| **Dan 2:44b-45a:** | ἐάσῃ πατάξει δὲ καὶ ἀφανίσει τὰς βασιλείας ταύτας καὶ αὐτὴ στηρισται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καθάπερ ἔωρακας ἐξ ὀρους τιμήθηναι λίθον ἄνευ χειρόν καὶ συνηλόσε τὸ ὀστρακὸν τὸν σιδηρὸν καὶ τὸν χαλκὸν καὶ τὸν ἄργυρον καὶ τὸν χρυσὸν |

Common words with the MT: χειροποιητὸν/ἀχειροποιητὸν and χειροποιητὸν/χαλκὸν

Despite a complete absence of common vocabulary with the LXX, the MT includes the rare phrase ἅνευ χειρον, which only occurs here and in Dan 2:45 (which is nearly identical to 2:34). Mark’s χειροποιητὸν is an adequate translation of this difficult expression. Another possible commonality is Mark’s χειροποιητὸν, which may be derived from Daniel’s χαλκὸν. The word χειροποιητὸν is not a possible rendering of χαλκὸν (“iron”) or any

of the other materials from which the images—which will ultimately be destroyed by the rock—are comprised; rather, this term almost always describes idols and, thus, could be an attempt to render אֹתוֹ. Furthermore, in Dan 5:4, 23, the word χειροποιητὸς is added to describe idols that are cast from iron, gold and silver, the same materials from which the images (or idols) in Dan 2:45 are made.

O’Brien suggests that Mark’s καταλύσω renders שָׁבַד. But, in Dan 2:34, שָׁבַד is accurately rendered as κατήλεσεν (LXX) or ἐλέπτυνεν (Thd.), meaning “to grind,” not “to destroy.” Moreover, שָׁבַד occurs nine times in the Tanakh which, in each case, is rendered with either λεπτύνω or καταλέω. Nevertheless, κατήλεσεν looks very similar to Mark’s καταλύσω and, while a direct translation in Mk 14:58 is unlikely, there is some similarity in meaning between שָׁבַד (“to grind” or “to make into dust”) and καταλύσω (“to abolish” or “destroy”).

The thematic similarity between Mk 14:58 and Dan 2:34, 45 is significant. First, both describe the destruction of man-made idolatrous objects. Second, each verse draws a contrast between temporal items crafted by human hands and the divine, which cannot be physically altered by hands. Third, these verses assert that the entity that was not made by hand will replace the one that was.

75 O’Brien, Use, 254.

76 שָׁבַד occurs nine times in the Tanakh, all in Daniel. In each appearance, this word is rendered by either λεπτύνω or καταλέω in the LXX/Thd.
Furthermore, throughout his gospel, Mark makes explicit and implicit references to Daniel, especially in relation to judgment and Jesus’ identity. Mark (12:10-11) also presents the stone mentioned in Ps 118:22-23 as a symbol for Jesus. In Luke and, perhaps, in Matthew, that stone becomes associated with the stone in Dan 2:34, 44-45 (Matt 21:44; Lk 20:18).

Matthew omits the Markan contrast between the Temple that is made with human hands and the one that is not, resulting in the elimination of this reference.

38) Mk 14:65/Matt 26:67-68 (Is 50:6)⁷⁸

| Mk: | Καὶ ἠρξάντο τινες ἐμπύειν αὐτῷ καὶ περικαλύπτειν αὐτὸν τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ κολαφίζειν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ· προφήτευσον, καὶ οἱ υπηρέται αὐτὸν ἔλαβον. |
| Matt: | Τότε ἐνέπτυσαν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκολάφισαν αὐτὸν, |
| Is: | τὸν νῦν ὑμῶν μου δέδωκα εἰς μάστιγας τὰς δὲ σιαγόνας μου εἰς βασίλειαν τὸ δὲ πρόσωπον μου οὐκ ἀπέστρεψα ἀπὸ αἰσχύνης ἐμπυτυσμάτων |

Common words: ῥάπισμα and πρόσωπον

Although these verses share only two words, in the LXX ῥάπισμα is unique to Is 50:6. In addition, Isaiah and Mark both depict slapping and spitting in another’s face. Another

---

⁷⁷ NA²⁸; Gundry, Use, 61; Moo, Passion, 352; O’Brien, Use, 262; Marcus, Mark 8-16, 1017; France, Mark, 617-618.
possible similarity is that some of Jesus’ tormentors cover his face (περικαλύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον). The act of covering or concealing Jesus’ face may echo כל לא חפרח in Is 50:6, since the verb סתר always means “to hide” or “to conceal” (117 instances). If these Markan words are part of the reference, they are probably derived from the Hebrew, since Mark’s περικαλύπτω cannot be from the LXX’s ἀποστρέφω (“to turn away”).

Furthermore, Isaiah’s servant plays a significant role in Mark’s narrative (Mk 1:11/Is 42:1; Mk 10:34/Is 50:6; Mk 10:45/Is 53:10,12; Mk 14:24/Is 53:12; Mk 15:19/Is 53:12). Two additional references to Is 50:6 are also included in Mark (10:34; 15:19). Thus, it is probable that this is a reference.

By replacing Mark’s ῥαπίσματι (noun form, as in Is 50:6) with the verb ἐράπισαν, Matthew diminishes the similarity with Isaiah and renders this reference less prominent. This change may be a Matthean attempt to depict Jesus fulfilling his own instruction (Matt 5:39), by turning the other cheek in response to being slapped. To be sure, this teaching from the Sermon on the Mount also references Is 50:6. The omission of Mark’s περικαλύπτειν could also be seen as a movement away from Is 50:6, but it could also be a Matthean attempt to bring the text closer to the Tanakh, where the servant does not shield

79 Although, in Is 50:6, the servant’s face is not covered.
his face from spitting and blows. While the latter suggestion may be valid, this Matthean omission of περικαλύπτειν lessens the lexical correspondence between Matthew and Isaiah, thus making the allusion less prominent.

38) Mk 15:33/Matt 27:45 (Is 60:2; Am 8:9)

Identical words with Is 60:2: σκότος, γῆ

Similar words with Am 8:9: ἐπὶ, γῆ; similar meaning: ὥρας ἔκτης/μεσημβρίας (םִּנְחָנָה)

As this chart indicates, Mark has some verbal similarity with Is 60:2 and almost none with Am 8:9. Thus, the form σκότος (“darkness”) that lies over the form γῆ (“land”) only has parallels in Ex 10:22, Is 60:2, and Ezek 32:8. The Exodus verse seems less relevant since it describes darkness over the land of Egypt, whereas Mk 15:33 by using ὀλὴν and not

80 Brown, Death, 578-579; Davies and Allison, Matthew 19-28, 535.

81 Am 8:9 is recognized by NA²⁸; Evans, Mark, 506; D. C. Allison, Studies in Matthew: Interpretation Past and Present (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic Press, 2005), 80-81; Marcus, Mark 8-16, 1062.
naming a specific geographical area seems to imply that the darkness has spread over the whole earth.\textsuperscript{82} Similarly, Ezek 32:8 focuses on the land of Egypt (32:2), so neither is its darkness universal. Conversely, Is 60:2 contrasts the divine light that will shine upon Jerusalem to a universal darkness that covers the earth, as a thick darkness (עֲרָפֶל/γνόφος) that covers the nations. This context seems to correspond with Jesus’ death, which ushers in a great darkness but also carries the promise of salvation. Thus, it is possible that Mk 15:33 is influenced by this Isaiah verse.

As noted above, lexical correspondence between Mk 15:33 and Am 8:9 is weak. Nevertheless, they share a strong thematic correspondence. Hence, Marcus notes that the sixth hour for Mark correlates to noon for Amos.\textsuperscript{83} According to Am 8:10, feasts will turn into times of mourning, just as Jesus’ crucifixion falls during the Passover feast, and Amos equates this mourning to grief for the loss of an only or beloved (יָחִיד/ἀγαπητός) son.\textsuperscript{84} While these contextual similarities coupled with recognition by many early interpreters is significant,\textsuperscript{85} the relative lack of lexical correspondence makes it difficult to affirm this as

\[\text{__________________________}\]

\textsuperscript{82} Gundry, \textit{Mark}, 964.

\textsuperscript{83} Marcus, \textit{Mark 8-16}, 1062.

\textsuperscript{84} Ibid.

an intentional allusion to Am 8:9. Nonetheless, Mk 15:33, which seems to draw some of its vocabulary from Isaiah, was probably shaped in light of Am 8:9-10. There are no significant Matthean alterations to discuss here.
39) Mk 15:36/Matt 27:48 (Ps 69:21)\(^{86}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk: δραμόν δὲ τις [καὶ] γεμίσας σπόγγον ὄξος περιθεὶς καλάμῳ ἐπότιζεν</td>
<td>Mark: And a man filled with spittle spat upon him and cried with a loud voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt: καὶ εὐθέως δραμόν εἰς ἑξ αὐτῶν καὶ λαβὼν σπόγγον πλήσας τε ὄξος καὶ περιθεὶς καλάμῳ ἐπότιζεν αὐτόν.</td>
<td>Matthew: And straightway a man filled with spittle spat upon him, and taking a sponge filled with myrrh, he cried with a loud voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps: καὶ ἐδόκασα εἰς τὸ βρῶμα μου χολὴν καὶ εἰς τὴν δίψαν μου ἐπότισαν μὲ ὄξος.</td>
<td>Psalms: And my soul they gave up to bitterness and to thirst they filled.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar words: ποτίζω and ὄξος.

Although the lexical correspondence between Mk 15:36 and Ps 69:21 is small, ὄξος has only three additional occurrences in the Tanakh, and these two words (ποτίζω and ὄξος) only occur together in our verse. In addition, this psalm, which emphasizes the unjust suffering of a righteous person, is apt in the context of Mark’s passion narrative. Finally, the figure of the Righteous Sufferer plays a major role in Mark’s passion narrative; thus, it is probable that this is indeed a reference.\(^{87}\) Again, there are no significant differences between Matthew and Mark.

\(^{86}\) NA 28; Gundry, Use, 66; Marcus, Mark 8-16, 984, 1065; O’Brien, Use, 285.

\(^{87}\) Mk 14:1/Ps 10:7-9; Mk 14:18/Ps 41:9; Mk 14:34/Ps 42:5; Mk 14:41/Ps 140:4, 8; Mk 14:55/Ps 37:3; Mk 15:24/Ps 22:18; Mk 15:29/Ps 22:7; Mk 15:34/Ps 22:1; Mk 15:40/Ps 38:11.
40) Mk 16:2 (2 Sam 23:4)⁸⁸

**Mk:** καὶ λίαν πρωὶ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ἐρχονται ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον ἀνατελάντος τοῦ ἡλίου.

**Matt:** eliminates this reference

**2 Sam:** καὶ ἐν θεῷ φωτὶ πρωὶας ἀνατέλλαι ἡλίος τὸ πρωὶ οὗ παρῆλθεν ἐκ φέγγος

Similar words: πρωὶ, ἀνατέλλω and ἀνατέλλω.

Although this lexical correspondence is not strong, these three words only appear together in two additional verses in the Tanakh (Jud 9:33; 2 Kin 3:22), where they describe an early morning battle.

Conversely, in 2 Sam 23:1-4, David’s last words praise God, who elevated him to become his anointed (ὅν ἀνέστησεν κόριος ἐπὶ χριστόν). A description immediately follows, linking the just rule of the Davidic king to the rising of the early morning sun. Thus, there is a strong thematic correspondence between these two passages. First, both connect the rising sun to the ascent of a messianic figure. Second, both describe anointing. Third, throughout his gospel, Mark uses references to David to enhance his depiction of Jesus as a messianic figure (2:25; 10:47-48; 11:10; and, 12:35-37, implying that Jesus is greater than David). Fourth, even though these are David’s last words, they point toward a new beginning, as symbolized by the rising sun, much as the women who assume Jesus to

---

⁸⁸ Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 1084.
be dead soon discover that he has been raised. The main difference between these two narratives is that the women go to the tomb with the intention of anointing Jesus’ corpse, not with an expectation of seeing the risen Messiah (though that is exactly who they encounter in the Matthean parallel). In sum, these thematic and verbal similarities seem sufficient to identify an allusion.

Matthew eliminates this reference as part of his complete transformation of the empty tomb narrative.

41) Mk 16:3–4/Matt 28:2 (Gen 29:8, 10b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mk: τίς ἀποκυλίσαι ἦμιν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου; καὶ ἀναβλέψασιν θεωροῦσιν ὅτι ἀποκυλίσται ὁ λίθος.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen: οὐ δυνησόμεθα ἐως τοῦ συναχθῆναι πάντας τοὺς ποιμένας καὶ ἀποκυλίσωσιν τὸν λίθον ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ φρέατος καὶ προσελθὼν Ιακώβ ἀπεκύλισεν τὸν λίθον ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ φρέατος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 28:2: ἀγγελος γὰρ κυρίου καταβας εξ οὐρανου καὶ προσελθὼν ἀπεκύλισεν τὸν λίθον.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Common words: ἀποκυλίσω and identical combination τὸν λίθον.
The verbal similarities between Mark and Genesis are slight, and the combination τὸν λίθον has fourteen identical occurrences in the Tanakh. Nor is the story of Rachel and Jacob referenced in any other Markan passage. At first glance, therefore, it is difficult to see a thematic connection between this love story and Mark’s narrative of the empty tomb.

Nevertheless, the verb ἀποκυλίω appears only three times in the Tanakh, all in the story of Jacob and Rachel (Gen 29:3, 8, 10). Similarly, each of its NT occurrences are in the empty tomb narratives (Mk 16:3–4; Matt 28:2; Lk. 24:2). Moreover, the use of ἀποκυλίω with τὸν λίθον is unique to Mk 16:3–4, its Matthean and Lukan parallels, and Gen 29:3, 8, 10. Furthermore, the two narratives have significant parallels: in both, a small group expresses their inability to remove a great stone that is then moved with divine help.

Moreover, this reference was probably recognized by Matthew, who raises its prominence by stating that an angel καταβὰς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ προσελθὼν ἀπεκύλισεν τὸν λίθον. Matthew replaces Mark’s ἀποκυλίσει with ἀπεκύλισεν, and adds καὶ προσελθὼν. As a result, Matt 28:2 shares five identical components with the Genesis story and presents them in nearly the same order. These Matthean modifications are clearly dependent upon Mark’s narrative, which strongly suggests that Matthew detected and expanded on a

---

89 Gen. 28:18; 29:3, 8, 10; Ex. 28:10; 35:33; 2 Ki. 3:25; Zec 3:9; 4:7,10; 5:8; Is. 54:11; Jer. 3:9.

90 The verb προσκυλίω occurs in both Mark’s and Matthew’s accounts of Jesus’ burial (Mk 15:46; Matt 27:60).
Tanakh reference in Mark, rather than independently introducing this material. Thus, the rare verbal and thematic similarities between Mark and Genesis, coupled with what appears to be Matthean recognition and enhancement of this reference, are sufficient to accept this as a subtle reference.

As noted, Matthew makes this reference more prominent.
42) Mk 16:8/Matt 28:8 (Dan 10:7 Thd.)

**Mk:** καὶ ἔξελθον αὐτῶν ἔφυγον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου, εἶχεν γὰρ αὐτὰς τρόμος καὶ ἐκστασίς· καὶ οὐδὲν οὐδὲν εἶπαν· ἔφοβοντο γὰρ.

**Matt eliminates this reference**

**Dan:** καὶ εἶδον ἐγὼ Δανιὴλ μόνος τὴν ὀπτασίαν καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ οὐκ εἶδον τὴν ὀπτασίαν ἀλλ᾽ ἐκστασίς μεγάλη ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ αὐτούς καὶ ἔφυγον ἐν φόβῳ.

Common words: ἔφυγον, ἐκστασίς similar words: φοβέω/φόβος

This lexical correspondence is significant: it includes a pair of identical forms (ἔφυγον and ἐκστασίς) that only occur together in Dan 10:7 (Thd.) and Mk 16:8, and one similar word (φοβέω/φόβος). However, the thematic correspondence is even more impressive: in Dan 10:7 Thd., Daniel’s companions fail to see the vision, but a great ἐκστασίς descends upon them and like the women in Mark they flee in fear. In sum, this is probably a reference.

Matthew eliminates this reference.

---

The following chart summarizes the comparison of subtle references in Mark and Matthew:

**A Summary of the One by One Comparison of Subtle Tanakh References in Mark and Matthew**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtle References</th>
<th>Matt is More Prominent</th>
<th>Matt is Less Prominent</th>
<th>Similar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk 1:10a/Matt 3:16a (Gen 7:11; Ezek 1:1; Is 11:2; 69:13 MT)</td>
<td>Closer to Ezek 1:1: by using the plural οὐρανοί, by repositioning εἶδεν, and by replacing σχιζομένους with ἤνεφθησαν and inserting τοῦ θεοῦ. Closer to Is 11:2 by adding τοῦ θεοῦ to πνεῦμα.</td>
<td>Further from Gen 7:11 and Is 24:18 by using the plural “οὐρανοί.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 1:10b/Matt 3:16b (Gen 1:2; 8:10-12; Is 11:2)</td>
<td>Closer to Gen 1:2 by adding θεοῦ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 2:7/Matt 9:3 (Deut 6:4)</td>
<td>Closer to Deut by adding ἐπείνασαν and ἐσθήσαν.</td>
<td>Eliminates the reference by omitting τίς δύναται ἄφιέναι ἀμαρτίας εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 4:11/Matt 3:11 (Dan 2:27, 47);</td>
<td>Closer to Dan by adding γνῶναι.</td>
<td>Further from the Ps by omitting παραβολαῖς.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Note</td>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 4:39; Matt 8:26b (Ps 105:9)</td>
<td>By omitting ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν.</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 5:3,11; Matt 8:28, 31 (Is 65:4)</td>
<td>Further from Lev 15:25 by replacing ῥύσει αἵματος with αἵμορροοῦσα.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 5:34/ Matt 9:22 (1Sam 1:17)</td>
<td>Closer to Ex by adding καὶ ἠλάμψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος and to Ps 103:2 by replacing Mk’s στύλβοντα λευκά λίαν, οία γναφεύς ἔπι τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται οὕτως λευκάναι with λευκὰ ὡς τὸ φῶς.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 9:2/Matt 17:1 (Ex 24:15-16)</td>
<td>By omitting πυρί.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 9:49/Matt 5:13; (Lev 2:13-14)</td>
<td>By adding ἐστιν. By omitting θεός.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 10:5/Matt 10:8a (Deut 10:16)</td>
<td>By replacing αὐτοῖς with αὐτῶν and changing the order of εἶπεν αὐτοῖς to αὐτῶν εἶπεν.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 12:15/Matt 22:18 (Ex 17:2)</td>
<td>Eliminates the reference by omitting κατεσθίοντες τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χηρῶν.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 12:40/Matt 23:14 (Is 22:10:1-2; Ez 22:5; Deut 26:3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>By adding ἐπί.</td>
<td>Further from Zec by replacing τὸ οἴρος with τοῦ οἴρους and by omitting κατέναντι and ἱεροῦ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 13:3/Matt 24:3 (Zec 14:4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 13:13a/Matt 10:22a (Is 66:5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 13:35b-36/Matt 24:42 (Mal 3:1)</td>
<td>Eliminates the reference by omitting ἔξαίφνης.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 14:7/Matt 26:11 (Deut 15:11)</td>
<td>By omitting καὶ ὅταν θέλητε δύνασθε αὐτοὶς εὑρίσκει.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 14:9/Matt 26:13 (Lev 2:2; 5:12)</td>
<td>Matt moves away by omitting ἐσθίον and by adding χεῖρα.</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 14:18, 20/Matt 26:21,23 (Ps 41:9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 14:58/Matt 26:61 (Jer 7:34; Is 10:11; Dan 2:34)</td>
<td>Further from Daniel by omitting ἄλλον ἀχειροποίητον.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 14:65/Matt 26:67-68 (Is 50:6)</td>
<td>By replacing ἰππίσμασιν with παίσας.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 16:3-4/Matt 28:2 (Gen 29:8-10)</td>
<td>Closer to Gen by adding καὶ προσελθόν and replacing ἀποκεκύλισται ὁ λίθος with ἀπεκύλισεν τὸν λίθον.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 16:8/Matt 28:8 (Dan 10:7 Thd.)</td>
<td>Further by omitting ἔφυγον and τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις and changing the order.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These results differ from the patterns of explicit and implicit references: the Tanakh references in Matthew are more prominent in only seven instances whereas, in Mark, nineteen of these references are more prominent. Moreover, Matthew completely eliminates ten Markan references. The seven instances where Matthew is more prominent result from textual additions; in three of these passages, Matthew further enhances the similarity to the Tanakh by replacing Mark’s words with terms that more closely reflect the Tanakh. Sixteen of the nineteen instances in which Matthew’s version is less prominent arise from omissions; in ten of them, Matthean omissions eliminate Tanakh references. In two other instances, Matthew replaces words that are closer to the Tanakh; and, in another two, he changes the forms.

The most immediate explanation for this reversal in tendency is that, in many of these instances, the Markan reference is so slight that Matthew may not have noticed it. This explanation is sufficient for several of the omitted references (Mk 5:3/Matt 8:28; Mk

\[\text{Mk 2:7/Matt 9:3; Mk 2:27/Matt 12:5-7; Mk 5:3,11/Matt 8:28, 31; Mk 5:25/Matt 9:20; Mk 5:34/Matt 9:22; Mk 9:49/Matt 5:13; Mk 10:18/Matt 19:17; Mk 12:40/Matt 23:14; Mk 13:3/Matt 24:3 ;Mk 13:35b-36/Matt 24:42; Mk 14:7/Matt 26:1; Mk 14:18, 20/Matt 26:21,23; Mk 14:58/Matt 26:6; Mk 16:2/Matt 28:1-2; Mk 16:8/Matt 28:8.}\]

\[93\text{ Mk 2:7, 27; 5:3, 11, 25, 34; 12:40; 13:35b-36; 14:18, 20, 58; 16:2, 8.}\]
examples where Matthew not only recognizes subtle references but makes them more prominent. For instance, in his adaptation of Mk 1:10, Matthew preserves subtle references to Is 63:19 MT and Gen 1:2 (or 8:11), adds an implicit reference to Ezek 1:1 and, perhaps, another to Is 11:2. Similarly, in his version of the transfiguration, Matthew (17:2) augments a slight reference to Moses (Ex 34:29) and makes it implicit. In that same verse, what may or may not be a Markan reference to Mal 3:1 becomes an implicit reference to Ps 103:2. Matt 28:2 provides another example; here a subtle Markan (16:3-4) allusion to the story of Rachel and Jacob (Gen 29:3, 8, 10) is made into an implicit reference. Furthermore, in some of these instances, Matthew omits or weakens the subtle reference but amplifies or adds an explicit or implicit reference (Mk 2:27/Matt 12:5-7). Finally, in several instances, Matthew lessens or omits part of one reference while increasing the prominence of another; therefore, it seems that he did recognize some of the references in Mark.

Another explanation for the Matthean tendency to increase the prominence of most more explicit Markan Tanakh references and to diminish the majority of the less explicit references is that Matthew was attempting to both clarify and amplify what he understood as the main message by omitting less significant allusions and by supplementing and bolstering what he might have deemed the more relevant references. Thus, the omission of a possible allusion to the creation narrative (Mk 2:27) eliminates a qualifier to Jesus’ divine authority (Mk 2:28/Matt 12:8) and adds references to Num 28:9 and Hos 6:6, which help
explain why the disciples were justified in desecrating Shabbat. Likewise, the omission of the enigmatic Markan contrast between a Temple that is made by human hands and one that is not and, with it, the allusion to Dan 2:44-45 (Mk 14:58), may represent a Matthean attempt to more clearly portray Jesus as a replacement for the Jerusalem Temple (Matt 26:61; cf. 12:6).

In a few instances, the Matthean movement away from Markan allusions to the Tanakh occurs where a Matthean periope differs significantly from its analogue in Mark. For example, the Matthean omission of the adverb ἐξαιρήσ (Mk 13:35b-36a/Matt 24:42), which leads to the elimination of the possible Markan reference to Mal 3:1, is part of a completely different Matthean context in which Matthew inserts a verse about a thief (Matt 24:43). Similarly, the omission of both the possible allusion to David’s last words (Mk 16:2/Matt 28:1-2/2 Sam 23:1-4) and the reference to Daniel 10:7 (Mk 16:8/Matt 28:8) are elements of a complete transformation of the empty tomb narrative that includes the addition of guards at the tomb, an earthquake, and a resurrection appearance (Matt 27:65-66; 28:1-9).
Matthew’s Treatment of Markan References that focus on Jesus’ Identity, the Law, Judgment and Discipleship

As noted above, twenty-nine of Mark’s forty-two subtle Tanakh references are concerned with Jesus’ identity and mission.⁹⁴ Five (Mk 1:10a-b/Matt 3:16; Mk 4:11/Matt 13:11; Mk 9:2-3/Matt 17:1-2; Mk 11:2b, 4/Matt 21:2, 4-5) of these references are more prominent in Matthew, while eleven are less so.⁹⁵

Three of the five references that are more prominent in Matthew seem to elevate Jesus’ status. Thus, the addition of τὸ ὄνειρον to Mk 1:10b not only creates a possible reference to Is 11:2 but also may suggest a Trinitarian context. Similarly, the Matthean (Matt 17:2) description of Jesus’ face shining like the sun strengthens the analogy to Moses, and the insertion of an additional reference to Ps 103:2 introduces a description of Jesus in divine terms. Similarly, the addition of a formal introduction and an explicit reference to

⁹⁴ Mk 1:10a-b/Matt 3:16; Mk 2:7/Matt 9:3; Mk 2:28/Matt 12:8; Mk 4:11/Matt 13:11; Mk 4:39/ Matt 8:26b; Mk 5:3, 11/Matt 8:28, 31; Mk 5:25/Matt 9:20; Mk 5:34/Matt 9:22; Mk 9:2-3/Matt 17:1-2; Mk 10:18/Matt 19:17; Mk 10: 45/Matt 20:28; Mk 11:2b, 4/Matt 21:2, 4-5; Mk 12:15b/ Matt 22:18; Mk 13:3 /Matt 24:3; Mk 13:13a/Matt 10:22; Mk 13:31/Matt 24:35; Mk 13:35b-36a/Matt 24:42; Mk 14:1a/Matt 26:2; Mk 14:7/Matt 26:11; Mk 14:9/Matt 26:13; Mk 14:18/Matt 26:21,23; Mk 14:56/Matt 26:59b-60; Mk 14:58/ Matt 26:61; Mk 15:36/Matt 27:48; Mk 16:2/Matt 28:1.

⁹⁵ Mk 2:7/Matt 9:3; Mk 5:3, 11/Matt 8:28, 31; Mk 10:18/Matt 19:17; Mk 13:3/Matt 24:3; Mk 13:35b-36a/Matt 24:42; Mk 14:7/Matt 26:11; Mk 14:18/Matt 26:21,23; Mk 14:56/Matt 26:59b-60; Mk 14:58/Matt 26:61; Mk 14:65/Matt 26:67-68; Mk 16:2/Matt 28:1.
Zec 9:9 replaces Mark’s subtle allusion (11:2) with a clear proclamation of Jesus as the Davidic Messiah.

This Matthean tendency to enhance Mark’s Christology is also evident in several less prominent references in the first gospel. For example, as explained in detail below, the omission of references to Deut 6:4 (Mk 2:7; 10:18) ensures that Matthew’s readership will not take Jesus as being other than divine. Similarly, the Matthean omission of Mark’s allusion to the creation narrative in Mk 2:27 intensifies Jesus’ assertion of divine authority (Mk 2:28/Matt 12:8) over the Sabbath and avoids a possible implication (from Mk 2:27) that Jesus is human rather than divine.

As noted below, Matthew’s omission of καὶ ὅταν θέλετε δύνασθε αὐτοῖς ἐν ποιήσα from Mk 14:7 lessens the similarity to Deut 15:11, but it also underlines the contrast between the poor who will always be part of the people of Israel and Jesus, whose death is impending.96 Thus, Matthew omits part of an allusion to the Tanakh to focus on a message that is already implied in Mark, namely, that Jesus’ presence trumps even the commandments of the Torah. In sum, we see that one of the main results of Matthean alterations of Markan references is a higher Christology.

One of the references that focuses (at least partially) on the Law is more prominent in Matthew (Mk 2:23/Matt 12:1), whereas three are less so (Mk 2:27-28/Matt 12:8; Mk 5:25/Matt 9:20; Mk 14:7/Matt 26:11). As noted above, with the addition of ἐσθίειν, Matthew (12:1) enhances the similarity to Deut 23:25, but this insertion probably represents an attempt to strengthen the analogy between Jesus’ disciples and David (1 Sam 21:2-6); thus, it is not necessarily related to the Law.

Two of the Tanakh references that focus on discipleship are eliminated in Matthew (Mk 9:49; 16:8), while another (Mk 16:3-4/Matt 28:2) becomes more prominent. In all three instances, the Matthean alterations are elements of a larger change in context.
Summary of the Survey

Thirty-four of Mark’s Tanakh references become more prominent in Matthew (sixteen explicit, eleven implicit, and seven subtle) while thirty become less so (four explicit, seven implicit, and nineteen subtle). Matthew employs the following editorial techniques in his adaptation of Mark’s references to the Tanakh:

**Formal introductions:** The most powerful tool used by Matthew to enhance Markan references is his use of formal introductions which explicitly signal a Tanakh reference and, in some instances, also illuminate its relevance to the context of that gospel. Often these introductions also identify the book from which the reference was drawn.

**Additions:** Matthew’s most frequently used editorial strategy toward Mark’s references from the Tanakh is his addition of quoted verses or words to a Markan reference (thirty occurrences). These additions are sometimes minimal, consisting of a quoted word or two (Mk 1:2/Matt 11:10; Mk 13:26/Matt 24:30; Mk 12:1/Matt 21:33), but, in several instances, Matthew inserts a phrase or even a whole verse (Mk 4:12/Matt 13:14–15; Mk 10:19/Matt 19:18–19).

**Omissions:** In certain cases, Matthew’s omission of Markan words or strings of words that are extraneous to the Tanakh referent also brings the text closer to the Tanakh and, thus,

---

heightens the prominence of the reference itself. For example, in his adaptation of Mk 10:19, Matthew (19:18) omits Mark’s μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς, which is not included in the Ten Commandments, and thereby brings the text closer to Ex 20:12-16. By contrast, in twenty-five instances, Matthean omissions of words and verses from the Tanakh diminish the prominence of a Markan reference or eliminate it altogether.

**Replacing words:** In five instances, Matthew replaces one Markan word with another term from Mark’s Tanakh referent or from another Tanakh verse and, thus, moves closer to the Tanakh (Mk 1:10a/Matt 3:16a; Mk 7:10/Matt 15:4; Mk 8:31/Matt 16:21; Mk 10:2/Matt 19:3; Mk 12:26/Matt 22:31-32). Conversely, only once does Matthew replace Mark’s words with language that is not part of that Tanakh verse and, hence, moves away from the Tanakh (Mk 8:31/Matt 16:21).

**Changing word forms:** In seven instances, while preserving a word from a Markan reference, Matthew changes its form from the one in Mark to its referent in the LXX (Mk 4:37-38/Matt 8:24-26; Mk 8:18/Matt 13:13; Mk 12:2-5/Matt 21:34-36; Mk 13:26/Matt 24:30; Mk 15:24/Matt 27; Mk 15:34/Matt 27:46; Mk 16:3-4/Matt 28:2). In some instances, Matthew’s changes in word form move his narrative away from the Tanakh.

**Word order:** At times, Matthew’s adaptation of Mark’s word order brings his references closer the Tanakh (Mk 7:6/Matt 15:7–8; Mk 14:62/Matt 26:6). Conversely, in two instances, Matthew’s modification of word order moves his narrative further from the Markan Tanakh referent (Mk 12:8/Matt 21:39; Mk 12:15/Matt 22:18).
Corrections: In two instances, Matthew corrects Markan mistakes and, thus, brings the
text closer to the Tanakh (Mk 1:2/Matt 3:3; 11:10; Mk 2:25–26/Matt 12:3–4).

On the whole, it seems that Matthew tends to make explicit Tanakh references in
Mark more prominent; however, this approach is less consistent with regard to implicit
references, and it is reversed in his treatment of subtle references. Indeed, while Matthew
only occasionally weakens or omits explicit references, he often diminishes implicit and
subtle references, whether partially or completely. In total, Matthew completely eliminates
seventeen Markan references to the Tanakh.98

A Summary of Matthew’s Treatment of Markan References
that focus on Jesus’ Identity, the Law, Judgment and
Discipleship

Matthew makes nineteen of the references that focus on Jesus’ identity more prominent
while reducing the strength of thirteen.99 As will be discussed in detail below, fifteen of

20, 58; 16:8.
99 More prominent: Mk 1:2/Matt 11:10; Mk 1:6b/Matt 3:4; Mk 1:10/Matt 3:16; Mk
1:13/Matt 4:2; Mk 4:12/Matt 13:14-15; Mk 4:37-38/Matt 8:24-26; Mk 8:18/Matt 13:13;
Mk 9:3/Matt 17:2; Mk 9:4/Matt 17:3; Mk 9:7b-c/Matt 15:5b-c; Mk 9:12-13/Matt17:11-
12a; Mk 12:2-5/Matt 21:34-35; Mk 12:6/Matt 21:37; Mk 13:26/Matt 24:30; Mk 13:27/Matt
24:31; Mk 14:24/Matt 26:28; Mk 14:27/Matt 26:31; Mk 15:24/Matt 27:35. Less prominent:
Mk 2:7/Matt 9:3; Mk 2:27/Matt 12:5-7; Mk 4:41/Matt 8:27; Mk 5:34/Matt 9:22; Mk
10:33b-34 /Matt 20:19; Mk 12:6/Matt 21:37; Mk 12:15/Matt 22:18; Mk 13:3/Matt 24:3;
Mk 13:35b-36 /Matt 24:42; Mk 14:58/Matt 26:61; Mk 14:65/Matt 26:67-68.
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the Matthean changes to these references elevate the divine aspect of Jesus’ identity, thus reflecting a higher Christology.\textsuperscript{100} The first evangelist makes eight of the references focused on the Law more prominent and five less so.\textsuperscript{101} As noted above, only once (Mk 10:2-4, 7/Matt 19:3, 7, 9) does the Matthean modification bring a reference closer to the Law or increase its specificity. In the other six instances, the Matthean alteration either moves the text further from the Law (three times in Mk 2:27/Matt 12:5-7; Mk 12:29-30/Matt 22:37) or results in a more generic version (three times, e.g., Mk 10:19/Matt 19:18–19; Mk 12:29–30/Matt 22:37; Mk 12:32–33/Matt 22:40). With regard to the references focused on judgment, five become more prominent in Matthew (Mk 12:1/Matt 21:33; Mk 12:2-5/Matt 21:34-36; Mk 12:10–11/Matt 21:42–44; Mk 13:14/Matt 24:15; Mk 12:9/Matt 21:40-41; Mk 13:25/Matt 24:29b) while only one (Mk 9:48) becomes less so. Three references concerned with discipleship become more prominent in Matthew (Mk 14:27/Matt 26:37; Mk 16:3-4/Matt 28:2) while three (Mk 9:48-49; Mk 16:8) become less so.

\textsuperscript{100} Mk 1:10/Matt 3:16; Mk 2:7/Matt 9:3; Mk 2:26/Matt 12:6; Mk 2:27/Matt 12:5-7; Mk 4:11/Matt 13:35 (the addition of Ps 77:2); Mk 4:41/Matt 8:27; Mk 9:3/Matt 17:2; Mk 9:4/Matt 17:3; Mk 9:12-13/Matt 17:11-12a; Mk 12:7-8/Matt 21:39; Mk 12:29-30/Matt 22:37; Mk 13:26/Matt 24:30; Mk 13:27/Matt 24:31; Mk 14:58/Matt 26:61.

\textsuperscript{101} More prominent: Mk 2:23/Matt 12:1; Mk 2:27/Matt 12:5-7; Mk 7:6/Matt 15:7–8; Mk 7:10/ Matt 15:4; Mk 10:19/Matt 19:18–19; Mk 12:26/Matt 22:31-32; Less prominent: Mk 1:44/Matt 8:4; Mk 6:18/Matt 14:4; Mk 12:29–30/Matt 22:37; Mk 12:32–33/Matt 22:40.
Nineteen of Mark’s Tanakh references are completely dependent on the LXX, \(^{102}\) while twenty-four are at least partially based on the MT.\(^ {103}\) Matthew brings six of the wholly LXX references closer to the Greek (Mk 1:2/Matt 11:10; Mk 4:12/Matt 13:14-15; Mk 7:6-7/Matt 15:7-8; Mk 10:7-8/Matt 19:5; Mk 12:1/Matt 21:33; Mk 12:26/Matt 22:31-32) and he makes one more similar to the MT (Mk 12:30/Matt 22:37). In four instances, Matthew omits a significant portion of the Markan reference and does not replace it with one that is closer to the MT (Mk 4:41; 9:48; 11:17; 12:31).

Of the twenty-four Markan references that rely at least partially on the MT, only one (Mk 1:6b/Matt 3:4) becomes more similar to the Hebrew in Matthew; three move away from the MT and closer to the LXX (Mk 1:10b/Matt 3:17b; Mk 6:34/Matt 9:36; Mk 12:19/Matt 22:24); three others are eliminated by Matthew (Mk 5:3, 11; 6:22-23; 14:58); and, the remaining references show no significant differences between Matthew and Mark.


In three instances, Matthew brings Markan references whose reliance on the LXX or the MT cannot be determined with confidence closer to the MT (Mk 4:11/Matt 13:11; Mk 8:31b/Matt 16:21; Mk 10:4,11/Matt 19:3, 9; 5:32).

In sum, it seems that both Mark and Matthew used not only the Septuagint but also the Masoretic text. In addition, our comparison upholds the position of scholars who claim that Matthew had a good command of Hebrew; however, this study also seems to indicate that Mark was capable of independently engaging with the Hebrew text.
Chapter Four: The Omissions of “God is One” from Matthew

Perhaps the most intriguing Matthean omission of Markan references to the Tanakh appears in his adaptation of Mk 12:29–33, where a scribe asks Jesus, “Which commandment is the first of all?” He replies by quoting the Shema (Deut 6:4–5), then stating that the second most important commandment is Lev 19:18, which he also quotes. In response, the scribe praises Jesus, cites a reference to Deut 4:35, restates portions of the verses that Jesus has quoted, and closes with περισσότερον ἐστιν πάντων τῶν ὀλοκλαυμάτων καὶ θυσιῶν, which echos 1 Sam 15:22 and Hos 6:6.

Matthew modifies the content of this exchange by: (1) omitting ἄκουε, Ἰσραήλ, κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἰς ἐστίν, καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου εἰς ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ εἰς ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ εἰς ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου καὶ εἰς ὅλης τῆς ἱσχύος σου. (2) replacing ἐξ with ἐν. (3) adding αὕτη ἐστίν ἡ μεγάλη καὶ πρώτη ἐντολή; 4) replacing δεύτερα αὕτη with δεύτερα δὲ ὁμοία αὕτη; 5) replacing μείζων τούτων ἄλλη ἐντολή οὐκ ἐστιν with ἐν ταύταις ταῖς δυσὶν ἐντολαῖς ὅλος ὁ νόμος κρέμαται καὶ οἱ προφῆται; and, 6) omitting the scribe’s reply. Furthermore, he shifts its context from a cordial discussion between Jesus and the scribe into a confrontation.
between Jesus and the Pharisees. Matthew situates this interaction after Jesus silences the Sadducees, where he describes the Pharisees conspiring against Jesus by devising the question about the “greatest commandment” as a test. This altered setting may explain Matthew’s omission of the scribe’s amicable reply and references to the Tanakh, features that are incompatible with the confrontational character of the Matthean version. Nonetheless, the omission of the Shema, the central Jewish statement of faith, is more difficult to explain.¹

Before discussing these Matthean changes in greater depth, I will provide an overview of the controversy regarding the sources of Matt 22:35-39, which is primarily rooted in the parallels between the Matthean and Lucan versions, in contrast to Mark. The commonalities in Matthew and Luke are: 1) a νομικός (lawyer or teacher of the Law) asks Jesus to name the most important commandment; 2) this query represents a test (Matt 22:35: πειράζω, Lk 10:25: ἐκπειράζω); 3) Deut 6:4 is absent; 4) Deut 6:5 is quoted, but Mark’s ἔξ has been replaced with ἐν; and, 5) the interrogator’s reply has been omitted.

¹ Hagner, Matthew, 645; Gundry, Commentary, 449–450.
These points of agreement have led to numerous suggestions regarding Luke’s and Matthew’s sources.² Many scholars claim that both depend on Q,³ some point to Lucan dependence upon Matthew,⁴ and still others argue for Luke’s reliance on material from L.⁵ This source-critical question is not central to this comparison of Mark and Matthew for, even if we accept that Matthew may have drawn from a source in addition to Mark, that possibility does not contradict evidence of his familiarity with the Markan narrative and his decision against the inclusion of Deut 6:4.


⁴ Gundry, Commentary, 448; Goulder, Luke, 484-487.

Scholarly Explanations for the Omission of Deuteronomy 6:4

One explanation for this omission is that Matthew, as a Christ-believing Jew, saw little need to emphasize monotheism; therefore, he focused on the commandment itself.⁶ According to this view, Matthew excluded the first verse of the Shema because, as law-observant Christians, he and his readers took monotheism for granted and they would primarily have been concerned with countering antinomianism.⁷ This position is problematic for two reasons: First, the absence of “Hear, O Israel” seems to pivot from a Jewish perspective, transforming Jesus’ response into a universal statement. Neither does the Matthean version seem to emphasize specific points of the Law. Furthermore, as the first chapter of this study demonstrates, Matthew often increases the explicitness of Markan references from the Tanakh that most Jews would have recognized readily; thus, it seems unlikely that he would have omitted part of the Shema because it was obvious to his audience.

Another explanation for this Matthean choice posits that Matthew, who prioritizes Law observance, portrays Jesus responding to the question “Which is the greatest commandment in the Law?” (Matt 22:36) with the opening phrase of the actual


⁷ Gundry, Commentary, 449.
commandment “You shall love” (Matt 22:37). However, this claim overlooks the fact that Deut 6:4 begins with an imperative ἀκούε (שְמַע), which marks the beginning of the commandment. This imperative (ἀκούε/שְמַע) is arguably at the core of the covenant between God and his people, and is often directly connected to observance of God’s commandments. Thus, God tells Isaac that he will “multiply his offspring” and make him a great nation because Abraham listened (שָמֶַע) to his voice and followed his commandments (Gen 26:4-5). Similarly, in Deut 4:1, the people of Israel are commanded ἀκούε τῶν δικαίωμάτων καὶ τῶν κριμάτων ὡσα ἐγὼ διδάσκομεν ὑμᾶς σήμερον ποιεῖν; thus, the destiny of the people and their ability to inherit the Land of Israel depends on whether they hear and follow God’s statutes and ordinances. Analogously, Deut 6:4 immediately follows a verse where Israel is instructed to hear and observe all of God’s commandments and ordinances (ἀκούσον Ἰσραήλ καὶ φύλαξαι ποιεῖν).


9 See also Ex 23:21-22; Deut 5:1; 8:20; 11:13; 27:9; etc.
Moreover, Josephus (Ant. 3:89-91) explains that Moses brought the people close to Mount Sinai so they could hear (ἀκούσαίεν) the Ten Commandments directly from God, particularly the First Commandment, which teaches ὅτι θεὸς ἐστὶν εἶς. This early link between the Shema and the Ten Commandments is also evident in the Nash Papyrus, phylacteries from Qumran, and the Mishnah (Tamid 5:1). Indeed, as Weinfeld and others argue, Deut 6:4 seems to be a paraphrase of the first commandment (Deut 5:6-7). Although the Samaritans and some early Christian interpreters view Deut 5:6-7 as an introduction to the Ten Commandments rather than as a commandment per se, both Philo (Dec 65) and Josephus (Ant. 3:90-91) explicitly identify this pair of verses as the First Commandment. Philo writes: “[T]his is the first and most sacred of commandments, to acknowledge and honor the one God.” Two early rabbinic sources also recognize “I am the Lord your God…” as part of the Ten Commandments (Mek. Bahodesh 5; Sifre Num. 112).


Consequently, Greenberg concludes his discussion of the First Commandment as follows: “[T]he First Commandment should be defined as the imperative to recognize the Lord as the sole God.”\textsuperscript{14} If this conclusion – which is strongly supported by first-century evidence – is correct, then Deut 6:4 conveys a message that strongly resembles the First Commandment. The link between Deut 5:6 and 6:4 is even more robust in the LXX version of 6:4a, which adds: “[T]hese are the regulations and the judgments which the Lord commanded to the sons of Israel in the wilderness as they were coming out of the Land of Egypt.” This passage closely reflects Deut 5:6b: “I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt.” In sum, “Hear, O Israel…” can be construed not merely as an introduction to the commandments that follow, but rather as the commandment that sets forth the foundation for adhering to all of God’s commandments.

In an alternate explanation for Matthew’s omission of Deut 6:4, Schweizer claims that this modification enables the first evangelist to equate love for one’s neighbor with love of God, thereby distinguishing the Pharisees’ legalism from Jesus’ commandment of love.

Thus Matthew underlines the fundamental difference between Pharisaic observance of the Law and Jesus’ call to love one’s neighbor. Not through legalistic observance of particular

\textsuperscript{14} Greenberg, “The Decalogue,” 99.
commandments but through a sense of love for one’s neighbor, expressed in concrete actions and embracing all of life, is the Law fulfilled.\textsuperscript{15}

While Schweizer’s observation regarding the equation of the command to love God with the command to love one’s neighbor is correct, his assertion that it highlights the difference between legalism and love is less convincing. Although this omission does emphasize love as the focal point in Jesus’ quotation of Deut 6:5 and Num 18:19, to define a call that Israel recognize “God is one” as a “legalistic” instruction seems problematic.

Let us now turn to the implications of this Matthean omission of Deut 6:4. Most significant is the elimination of a direct quotation of the central Jewish creed. This absence becomes even more glaring in the context of the Matthean tendency to raise the prominence of Mark’s explicit references to the Tanakh and the dominant scholarly opinion that Matthew was a Law-observant Christian who was writing for an audience of religious peers.\textsuperscript{16}

Another implication of this omission is its equation of the commandments to love God and to love one’s neighbor. Indeed, in the absence of Deut 6:4, the remainder of the

\textsuperscript{15} Schweizer, Matthew, 426.

\textsuperscript{16} see Goulder, Midrash, 17-18; Levine, Social; Stanton, Gospel, 89–107; Saldarini, Christian; Luz, Theology, 105–106; Sim, Matthew, 1–2, 302; Murphy, “Jewishness,” 377-403; Ewherido, Judaism, 1–26; O’Leary, Judaization, 118-119.
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Shema strongly resembles “You shall love your neighbor as yourself,” as quoted in verse 39:

| Matt 22:37: ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου. |

These passages both open with ἀγαπήσεις, and τὸν πλησίον σου is parallel to κύριον τὸν θεόν σου. By enhancing this correspondence and omitting “Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God, the Lord is one,” Matthew emphasizes the centrality of love to the two instructions which Jesus identifies as the “greatest commandments.”

Moreover, shortening the Shema is congruent with Matthew’s attempt to present these two commandments that focus on love as equal rather than giving primacy to the Shema. This attempt is evident when Matthew adds ὁμοία to Mark’s statement about Lev 19:18. Matthew’s modifications shift Lev 19:18 from holding secondary importance to having equal standing with the Shema. This elevation of Lev 19:18 is also evident when Matthew affixes it to the Ten Commandments, thus conferring it commensurate status with them (Mk 10:19/Matt 19:18-19).

\[\text{Schweizer, Matthew, 425-426.}\]

Additional Matthean Omissions of “God is One”

Interestingly, Matt 22:37 is not the sole instance where Matthew eliminates Markan references to the Shema. Let us now consider the other three cases where this occurs.

Mk 2:7/Matt 9:3

After Jesus tells a man that his sins have been forgiven, Mark 2:7 provides this response from the scribes: βλασφημεῖ τίς δύναται ἁφιέναι ἁμαρτίας εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός. The three closing words in this passage are a reference to Deut 6:4. In Matt 9:3, the parallel statement reads οὗτος βλασφημεῖ,19 omitting this reference to the Shema and possible references to Is 43:25 and Dan 9:9. In contrast, Lk 5:21 moves slightly away from Deut 6:4 by replacing the semantically awkward εἷς with μόνος; however, he essentially retains the Markan reference.20

19 Mk 2:7: τί οὗτος οὗτος λαλεῖ; βλασφημεῖ· τίς δύναται ἁφιέναι ἁμαρτίας εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός;
Matt 9:3: καὶ ἰδοὺ τίνες τὸν γραμματέων εἶπαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς· οὗτος βλασφημεῖ.
Lk 5:21: τίς δύναται ἁμαρτίας ἁφεῖναι εἰ μὴ μόνος ὁ θεός.

20 Luke replaces the word εἷς with μόνος; however, the combination “God alone” is retained.
France attributes this omission to the fact that Matthew’s readers would not have needed Mark’s explanation to understand why the scribes considered Jesus’ words to be blasphemous.\footnote{France, \textit{Matthew}, 181.} In a similar vein, Luz claims:

His Jewish-Christian readers, who are convinced that God himself acts in Jesus and who perhaps already are familiar with the Mishnah’s very restrictive regulations about blasphemy, will no longer have understood why Jesus’ granting forgiveness of sins should be blasphemy.\footnote{Luz, \textit{Matthew 8–20}, 28.}

The assertion that Matthew would have eliminated references to the Tanakh because of his readers’ high degree of knowledge has been refuted in the comparison of explicit references in Mark and Matthew (see Chapter One). It seems unlikely that a writer who held the three assumptions expressed by Luz, and who sought to avoid stating the obvious, would have raised the prominence of sixteen explicit Markan references to the Tanakh. Furthermore, Luz’s claim that this omission can be ascribed to the theological outlook of Matthew’s audience and their presumed familiarity with the Mishnah seems highly speculative.

Gundry offers the following explanation for this Matthean omission:
Omission of the question implying that God alone can forgive sins forestalls any inference that Jesus is not God. To the contrary, Matthew has been accentuating the deity of Jesus.\(^{23}\)

Gundry’s claim that Matthew is “accentuating the deity of Jesus” seems convincing, as it is supported by instances where Matthew describes Jesus in divine terms (1:23; 8:25; 9:6; 12:8; 17:2; 24:35) and by further evidence (detailed below) which suggests that Matthew’s Christology was higher and more pronounced than Mark’s.

Davies and Allison, however, offer a sound critique of Gundry’s explanation for the omission of “the Lord is one.” In discussing Matt 9:3-8, they argue that, by retaining the scribes’ statement that God alone can forgive sins, Matthew could have bolstered the notion that Jesus is God, since Jesus’ pronouncement that the paralytic’s sins have been forgiven is immediately validated by the man’s healing.\(^{24}\) While this reservation weakens Gundry’s assertion that, for Matthew, Jesus is synonymous with God, the idea that Matthew’s Christology may be the reason for this omission is compelling (and, thus, is treated more fully below).

\(^{23}\) Gundry, *Commentary*, 163.

\(^{24}\) Davies and Allison, *Matthew 8-18*, 91.
Mk 10:18/Matt 19:17

In Mk 10:18, Jesus responds to a man who calls him “good teacher” by stating: τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ ἔις ὁ θεός. As in 2:7, Mark uses εἰς ὁ θεός, but here the Markan Jesus seems to imply that he himself is not good. This surprising statement has received extensive scholarly attention; however, our concern is not with Jesus’ comment about who is good but with the recurrent phrase “God alone.”

A different account of this episode appears in Matt 19:17, where the Markan Jesus’ question “Why do you call me good?” becomes “Why do you ask me about what is good?”

This version seems to diminish the implication that Jesus is not good by focusing on the man’s question and critiquing his line of inquiry. The Matthean Jesus then asserts that only one is good, bringing Matthew close to stating that “God is One,” but he omits θεός. This fits a Matthean pattern: although Matthew inserts θεός into several Markan traditions, his omissions of or substitutions for this term are more common.

25 Matt 19:17: ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; εἰς ἔστιν ὁ ἀγαθός.

26 Davies and Allison, Matthew 19-28, 42-43.

27 Mk 1:10/Matt 3:16; Mk 7:10/Matt 15:4; Mk 8:29/Matt 16:16; Mk 14:58/Matt 26:61; Mk 14:61/Matt 26:63.

28 Mk 1:14/Matt 4:12; Mk 1:15/Matt 4:17; Mk 3:35/Matt 12:50; Mk 4:11/Matt 13:11; Mk 9:1/Matt 16:28; Mk 10:14/Matt 19:14; Mk 10:15/Matt 18:3; Mk 11:22/Matt 21:21; Mk 14:25/Matt 26:29; Mk 15:43/Matt 27:57.
Many omissions of θεός appear when Matthew eliminates this term from Markan statements about the “kingdom of God” (Mk 1:15/Matt 4:17; Mk 4:11/Matt 13:11; Mk 10:14/Matt 19:13; Mk 10:15/Matt 18:3 etc.); in these cases, θεός is often replaced by οὐρανός. It is noteworthy that, in a few other instances, θεός is replaced by a phrase that is directly connected to Jesus. For example, Mk 3:35 states that “whoever does the will of God” is part of Jesus’ family whereas, in Matt 12:50, “God” is replaced by “my father who is in heaven” (τὸν πατρός μου τὸν ἐν οὐρανοῖς).

Similarly while Mk 15:43 describes Joseph “waiting expectantly for the kingdom of God,” in Matt 27:57, he is depicted as a disciple of Jesus. Matthew goes even further with this tendency when a statement by the Markan Jesus about the kingdom of God (Mk 9:1) is replaced language about the Son of Man coming to his kingdom (Matt 16:28).

Indeed, Gundry explains this omission of “God is One” (Mk 10:18/Matt 19:17) as another example of Matthew’s attempt to present Jesus as God: “God’s name vanishes. The result is a broad hint that Jesus is the good one—Jesus rather than God or, better, Jesus as God.”29 Gundry’s suggestion that Matthew’s choice here is related to Christology is probably correct, since an assertion that God alone is good would imply that Jesus is not; however, if Matthew’s intention were to present Jesus as the “one who is good,” Jesus’

29 Gundry, Commentary, 385; for a similar, albeit more nuanced view, see Banks, Law, 161; E. F. F. Bishop, “εἰ μὴ εἶς ὁ θεός,” ET 49 (1937-38): 363-366.
question would only complicate that message. Wouldn’t it be appropriate to ask the sole “good one” about “the good”?

By contrast with Gundry, Nolland suggests that Matthew recognized the Markan reference to Deut 6:4 and strengthened it by adding ἔστιν.\textsuperscript{30} While Matthew indeed preserves this reference to Deut 6:4, nevertheless, he omits the mention of God.

\textbf{Mk 12:32/Matt 22:40}

According to Mark 12:32, the scribe who questioned Jesus about the greatest commandment reaffirms Jesus’ response with by stating ἐπ’ ἀληθείας ἐπες ὅτι ἔστιν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος πλὴν αὐτοῦ. This verse refers to Deut 6:4 and additional material from the Tanakh that appears to be based on it (Deut 4:39; Is 44:8; 45:5–6, 14). In this instance, Matthew’s redaction (Matt 22:40) is easier to explain than in the previous instances, since it is related to the prior omission of “Hear, O Israel…” (Mk 12:29/Matt 22:37). Given that Matthew eliminates the Markan Jesus’ initial declaration of the Shema, for the scribe to affirm it here would cause confusion.\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{30} Nolland, \textit{Matthew}, 789–790.

\textsuperscript{31} Luke, like Matthew, omits the scribe’s answer to Jesus; this minor agreement contributes to the intensive debate over the provenance of this Matthean narrative and its possible dependence on Q. As noted above, this debate has little relevance for the current discussion since, even if Matthew drew from Q or some other unknown non-Markan source, he chose a version that omitted “God is one” or “God alone.”
Explaining the Four Omissions of “God is One”

The significance of these four Matthean omissions of Markan proclamations that "God is one" is amplified by Luke’s preservation of two of these references (Mk 2:7/Lk 5:21; Mk 10:18/Lk 18:19). Thus, although Mark and Luke both write “God is one,” the first gospel does not include this statement. Surprisingly, this Matthean pattern has received scant scholarly attention; it is also noteworthy that even scholars who claim that Matthew was a gentile have not attempted to use his omission of “God is one” to support their hypotheses.  

Neither is this absence discussed in studies which posit that Matthew represents a more Jewish or Law-observant perspective than Mark.

---

32 For example, these omissions are not even acknowledged in K. W. Clark, “The Gentile Bias in Matthew,” *JBL* 66/2 (1947): 165-172. Similarly, Strecker (*Weg*, 26-29) bases his assertion that Matthew is a gentile on the form of the Matthean quotation of Deut 6:5 but he ignores Matthew’s omission of four Markan allusions to Deut 6:4. Meier’s sole mention of Matt 22:37 (*Law*, 15) is in a footnote that refers to a debate over Matthew’s use of the MT.

As we have already seen, Matthew’s omission of these references has been explained by his desire to eliminate content that would have been redundant for his well-informed and Law-observant readers. But, we know little of Matthew’s audience; moreover, Matthew’s consistent intensification of explicit references seems to suggest that he seldom avoided such reiterations. It has also been posited that, since Matthew primarily focused on the Law, he eliminated references to Deut 6:4 that did not pertain to specific commandments. Nonetheless, Matt 9:3 is set in a debate over Jesus’ authority; thus, even if Matthew did not consider the Shema to be a legal instruction (despite the evidence provided here to the contrary), it would have been relevant to his argument. While the suggestion that Matthew omitted the first part of the Shema (Deut 6:4) to equate its second part (Deut 6:5) with the command to “love your neighbor;” it cannot explain the three additional omissions of Deut 6:4 in Matthew.

Only one of these theories is applicable to all four Matthean omissions, albeit with certain adjustments: namely, Gundry’s suggestion that, for Matthew, Jesus is God and, therefore, this evangelist refrained from any statement which could challenge that theological position. Admittedly, Gundry does not apply this reasoning to the omission of “Hear, O Israel…” in Matt 22:37, though it provides a plausible justification. However, as presented above, the premise that Matthew equates Jesus with God does not seem to fit the context of Mk 2:7/Matt 9:3 or Mk 10:18/Matt 19:17. Furthermore, in several instances,
Matthew presents Jesus and God as separate entities (3:16; 9:8; 23:9; 24:36; 28:19). Thus, an absolute Matthean identification of Jesus with God does not seem feasible.

A more nuanced approach, however, wherein Matthew does not equate Jesus with God the Father but indicates that Jesus should be venerated as a divine entity, might provide an adequate explanation for these omissions.

Matthew’s Higher Christology as a Possible Reason for the Omissions of “God is One”

Matthew often emphasizes Jesus’ divine identity (1:23; 8:25; 9:6; 11:27; 12:8; 17:2; 24:35; 25:31; 28:18) and, despite the ongoing debates over the nature and degree of Matthew’s Christology, the dominant scholarly view concurs it is higher and more pronounced than Mark’s.\(^{34}\) Thus, many scholars agree that Matthew often alters Markan descriptions of the “human Jesus” that could be construed to present Jesus in a less than favorable light.\(^{35}\) Bauckham and Hurtado argue for a Matthean emphasis on the worship of Jesus due to his

---

\(^{34}\) For a detailed survey that lists twenty-eight studies which support this view, see P. M. Head, *Christology and the Synoptic Problem: An Argument for Markan Priority* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 17-23.

extensive use of the verb προσκυνέω. Several other scholars stress the intensified use of κύριος and “Son of God” in Matthew. The motif “God with us” (1:23; 18:20; 28:20) is another element in Matthew’s higher Christology. Similarly, scholars have noted Matthew’s elevation of Jesus’ divine sovereignty and authority (11:27; 28:18). Barth, Conzelmann, Senior and others suggest that Matthew’s adaptation of Mark’s passion


39 Luz, Matthew 21–28, 620-622; Bauckham, Jesus, 176-177.
narrative is mainly the result of “an effort to paint a glorified faith portrayal of Jesus.”

Finally, several interpreters suggest that Matthew presents a Trinitarian Christology (3:17; 28:19).

Matthew's intensive use of Christological titles to address or describe Jesus is also relevant to this discussion. As Bornkamm famously noted, in Matthew, speakers consistently address Jesus with the vocative κύριε, a form that appears once in Mark (7:21).

Thus, Matthew adds κύριε to Markan passages (Mk 1:40/Matt 8:2; Mk 6:50/Matt 14:30; Mk 7:25/Matt 15:22; Mk 8:32/Matt 16:22; Mk 14:19/Matt 26:22) or uses it as a substitute for “teacher” or “rabbi” (Mk 4:38/Matt 8:25; Mk 9:5/Matt 17:4; Mk 9:17/Matt 17:15; Mk 10:51/Matt 20:33).

Matthew also adds references to and descriptions of Jesus as the “Son of God” (2:15; 4:3, 6; 11:27; 28:19) or inserts them in Markan passages (Mk 6:51-52/Matt 14:33; Mk 8:29/Matt 16:16; Mk 14:61/Matt 26:63; Mk 15:29-30/Matt 27:40; Mk 30-33/Matt 28:18-20).


42 Bornkamm, “Storm,”; Head, Christology, 166-167.
This tendency to emphasize Jesus’ identity as God’s son is often linked to the motif of God the Father and, thus, is compatible with what Hurtado terms Binitarian Christian theology.

“Son of Man” is another title that Matthew uses more frequently than Mark (thirty occurrences in Matthew versus fourteen in Mark). Matthew adds this title to ten eschatological predictions (10:23; 13:41; 16:28; 19:28; 24:27, 30, 37, 39, 44; 25:31), to three verses that depict suffering (8:20; 12:40; 26:2), and four additional references that lack thematic connections (11:19; 12:32; 13:37; 16:13). The two instances where Matthew seems to consider the kingdom of God as equivalent to the kingdom of the Son of Man are especially noteworthy: As mentioned above, in 16:27, Matthew replaces a Markan statement about the coming of the kingdom of God (Mk 9:1) with one about the Son of Man coming to his kingdom. Analogously, Matt 13:41 describes the Son of Man sending angels to expel all evildoers from his kingdom.

As noted by Luz, in several instances, Matthew portrays the Son of Man as a heavenly judge. Matthew explicitly articulates what is implied in Mark (8:38): “when he comes in his father’s glory,” the Son of Man will judge and bring justice to all who caused him to suffer (16:27). Similarly, Matt 19:28 describes the Son of Man seated “on his throne

---

of glory” accompanied by the twelve apostles and judging the tribes of Israel, much as Matt 25:31-32 describes the Son of Man sitting in judgment on a heavenly throne.

Thus, although Matthew does not entirely identify Jesus with God the Father, he often depicts Jesus in divine terms. Therefore, while Gundry is imprecise in his assertion that Matthew omitted “God is one” in order to equate Jesus with God, the notion that Matthew’s elimination of “God is one” or “God alone” is related to a higher Christology, in which Jesus and God the Father are venerated, seems to present a sound basis for my attempt to formulate an adequate explanation for his omissions of “God is one.”

Perhaps the greatest challenge to the claim that Matthew omitted “God is one” lest that statement be construed to diminish Jesus’ divinity are the verses in which Matthew depicts God the Father as superior to Jesus. In other words, if Matthew did not refrain from accentuating the primacy of God the Father, why would he hesitate to incorporate allusions to “God is one” that are drawn from the Tanakh?

The next task, then, is to examine the Matthean verses that challenge this explanation and to determine why they were not omitted. In his version of the baptismal narrative, Matthew (3:16) adds the word θεός to the Markan account.44 As a result, Matt 3:16 presents a clear distinction between Jesus and God, where God’s superiority is made

44 On this verse, see Gundry, Use, 29; Gundry, Commentary, 52-53; Davies and Allison, Matthew, 330; Luz, Matthew, 143; France, Matthew, 121.
plain: God is in heaven and his spirit comes down to Jesus. Furthermore, like Abraham (Gen 15:4-5; 18:1), Jacob (Gen 32:2), and Ezekiel (1:1), Jesus is a human being who has to lift his gaze to see the rending of the heavens and behold the spirit of God. This stark distinction is mitigated in the subsequent verse (Mk 3:17), where a heavenly voice acclaims Jesus as God’s beloved son. Despite the separation between God the Father and Jesus, this pronouncement affirms Jesus’ closeness to God without negating his divine identity.

Another Matthean passage that elevates God the Father above Jesus is Matt 11:25-27a (cf. Lk 10:21-22).45 Here Jesus thanks God the Father and describes him as the Lord of heaven and earth (Matt 11:25); he then states that “All things have been handed over” to him by his father (11:27). These two statements, which articulate the hierarchy of the “Father” over Jesus the “Son,” appear in almost identical forms in Lk 10:21-22; consequently, many scholars attribute these passages to Q.46 Just to reiterate, even if this passage originated from a non-Matthean source, it documents Matthew’s decision to include an uncompromising depiction of Jesus as subordinate to God the Father. Here, too, however, a potentially problematic description is immediately qualified: in this instance,


Matt 11:27b offers a counterbalance by portraying the intimate connection between “Father” and “Son,” and implying that Jesus alone truly knows God.

An even stronger statement about God the Father is found in Matt 23:9: “Call no one your father on earth, for you have one Father - the one in heaven.” Here the Matthean Jesus describes the unique nature of the “Father,” and he may even be echoing Deut 6:4. Even here, however, Matthew writes that the “the Father” - rather than God - is one. In this case, the statement about the oneness of the father is immediately followed by a parallel affirmation that there is but one instructor, Jesus the Messiah (Matt 23:10).

The concept of the Matthean Jesus’ divine identity is most significantly challenged when he says: Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης καὶ ὃρας οὐδεὶς οἴδεν... οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ μόνος (24:36). Thus, Matthew retains a Markan verse (Mk 13:32) that presents God the Father as superior to Jesus and denies Jesus’ knowledge of the eschatological future. Indeed, this relativizing statement about Jesus was unacceptable to numerous Matthean copyists (it is absent in K, L, W, G, D, etc.), who excised it from the First


Gospel.\textsuperscript{49} However, it immediately follows Matt 24:35 (cf. Mk 13:31), where the words of Jesus are afforded equal status with the eternal words of God (Ps 119:89-90; Is 40:8). Furthermore, even in Matt 24:36, Jesus is presented as the Son, who is second only to the Father.

Similarly, in the Great Commission (28:19), the disciples are instructed to baptize in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{50} The Father is named first but Jesus is his Son, with the Father as his sole superior.

This brief survey yields the following results; first, these passages all unambiguously present God the Father as unique and supreme even, in relation to Jesus. Second, in each instance, God is referred to as the Father, never as θεός. Moreover, the words θεός and εἷς (or μόνος) never occur together. In addition, even Matt 11:25, the only one of these verses that includes κύριος to describe God the Father, makes no link between κύριος and the concept of oneness.

Third, while the primacy of the Father is articulated in each of these cases, Jesus' closeness to God is consistently depicted, in four instances, Jesus is described as God’s son (Matt 3:17; 11:27; 24:36; 28:19) and, in another, (23:9-10) he is the Christ – the one and

\textsuperscript{49} Metzger, \textit{Textual}, 62.
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only instructor (or leader) – much as there is only one Father in heaven. Furthermore, these passages each underline the power and uniqueness of Jesus. Hence, in 3:17, a divine voice declares that Jesus is God’s beloved son. In 11:27, he is the sole being to know the “Father,” and he is the one to whom God’s mysteries will be revealed. Similarly, in 24:35, the Matthean Jesus speaks of himself in terms that echo an Isaian passage (40:8) and a psalm (119:89-90) that, in their original contexts, speaks of God’s eternal word. An even stronger affirmation of Jesus’ divine authority is conveyed in 28:18, where he states “All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me.”

Fourth, although only two of these passages include the three components of the Trinity (3:16-17; 28:19), each seems to present Jesus as the Son and God as the Father. As a result, we can say that these statements regarding the superiority of God the Father neither exclude nor diminish the divine status of Jesus as his Son. In general, these tendencies seem consistent with Bauckham’s characterization of the development of New Testament Christology from Jewish monotheism:

… the intention of New Testament Christology… is to include Jesus in the unique identity as Jewish monotheism understood it. The writers do this… comprehensively by using precisely those characteristics of the divine identity on which Jewish monotheism focused characterizing God as unique. They include Jesus in the unique divine sovereignty over all things… In this way they develop a kind of Christological
monotheism which is fully continuous with early Jewish monotheism but distinctive in the way it sees Jesus Christ himself as intrinsic to the identity of the unique God.51

Hurtado identifies this as the “Binitarian shape of early Christian devotion,”52 a phenomenon which he describes thus:

It is this accommodation of Christ as an additional figure along with God (the Father) within a strong concern to maintain a monotheistic religious commitment that I refer to as the “Binitarian” shape of Christian worship.53

Thus, although Jesus is not synonymous with God the Father, he is an inextricable part of the godhead.

With this in mind, let us revisit the Matthean omissions of “God is one” (or “God alone”). At first glance, it seems that the contexts for two of them (Mk 2:7-10/Matt 9:3-6; Mk 12:29-33/Matt 22:37-40) closely resemble the verses discussed above. For example, Jesus’ quotation of Deut 6:4-5 in Mark is followed by an explicit reference to Ps 110:1 (Mk 12:36-37/Matt 22:43-45), which seems to imply that Jesus is the lord who sits on a throne


at God’s right hand.\footnote{J. Marcus, “Authority to Forgive Sins Upon the Earth: The Shema in Mark,” in Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel, 200.} Thus here, as in the examples noted above, a quotation of Deut 6:4 is counterbalanced by Jesus being situated at the most trusted position next to God.

Mk 2:7-10/Matt 9:3-6 seems to include even stronger mitigating elements. First, Mk 2:10/Matt 9:6a states that, as the Son of Man, Jesus, like God, has the authority to forgive sins. Second, as noted above, the scribes’ statement that only God can forgive sins may actually reinforce the notion that Jesus is God. Since the paralytic's full healing effectively verifies Jesus’ pronouncement that his sins have been forgiven, the scribes’ words can be taken as an affirmation (contrary to their intention) that Jesus is God. This last element seems to pose a major challenge to my claim these omissions are motivated by a higher Christology; thus, it is addressed in my concluding remarks on this chapter.

Nevertheless, it is evident from this analysis that there are significant differences between the passages that Matthew omitted and those that remain in his gospel. In the latter, God is referred to as the Father and Jesus is depicted as his Son, whether implicitly or explicitly. Consequently, they do not exclude Jesus from the godhead. By contrast, the unambiguous Markan statements about God’s oneness, which are not part of a “Binitarian” context, could be perceived as an exclusion of Jesus that diminishes his divine identity.
Conclusion of the Matthean Omissions of Deut 6:4

The omissions of “God is one” in Matthew might have been prompted by concerns that this assertion could be construed as excluding Jesus. By contrast, Matthew was willing to include the notion that God the Father is one (23:7; 26:34), for it retained a place for Jesus without casting doubts on his divine identity. Conversely, “God is one” without a Binitarian framework could have compromised Jesus’ divinity. Unlike Mark, for whom “God is one” was not perceived as a threat to Jesus’ divine identity, Matthew, with his higher Christology, was unable to tolerate such a statement. Yet, as noted above, by omitting “God is One” from Mk 2:7/Matt 9:3, Matthew eliminates a statement that could have further established Jesus’ divine identity. Therefore, it seems that Matthew was no longer willing to incorporate “God is One,” even when this assertion was compatible with his message. Such an aversion may have stemmed from the preception that uttering or writing these words would undermine the venerated figure of Jesus, or from the possibility, however slight, that these might lead his readers to conclude that Jesus is excluded from the godhead.

Another possibility, which is compatible with the position presented above, is that Matthew omitted “God is one” or “God alone” from his gospel because, by the time of its composition, this proclamation was too closely identified with his rivals within
Judaism.\textsuperscript{55} Indeed, significant evidence seems to indicate that Deut 6:4 had practically become a Jewish creed toward the end of the first century.\textsuperscript{56} Furthermore if, as several scholars have suggested, Matthew viewed the veneration of Jesus as a divine entity\textsuperscript{57} as a central point of conflict between the Church and Judaism, “God is one” would have epitomized the position of his Jewish opponents. Therefore Matthew, and possibly his community, would no longer have been willing to say or write, “God is one.”

\begin{itemize}
\item Daube, \textit{Rabbinic}, 249 mentions this as a potential reason for the omission of Deut 6:4 but rejects it on the basis of Matthew’s early date.
\item Idem, 248; Weinfeld, \textit{“Shema,”} 144-146; Miller, \textit{“Word,”} 17-29; Waaler, \textit{Shema}, 120-121.
\end{itemize}
Conclusion

This study yields the following results:

I. As noted in the Introduction, there are two central scholarly assertions about the First Gospel’s use of the Tanakh: Matthew consistently intensifies and enhances Tanakh references in his adaptation of Markan references; and, this tendency is indicative of his stronger Jewish identity. The findings of this study support the general accuracy of the first claim. On the whole, the presence of material from the Tanakh is more prominent in Matthew than in Mark. This tendency, however, diminishes in correlation to the explicitness of Markan references; thus, while sixteen explicit references are more prominent in Matthew, this generalization only applies to eleven implicit references and seven subtle references. The inverse pattern holds true: whereas four explicit references are made less prominent in the First Gospel, seven implicit and nineteen subtle references are diminished. Moreover, Matthew’s approach to eliminating references to the Tanakh follows this trend of diminution: he completely removes two explicit references, three implicit ones, and ten subtle ones. Therefore, while earlier claims that Matthew expands and strengthens allusions to the Tanakh have validity; my research suggests that this Matthean pattern is slightly less evident among implicit references and inapplicable to subtle references.

II. The claim of a correlation between Matthew’s adaptation of the Markan references and his (or his community’s) more robust relationship to Judaism and the Law is based on
three presumed indicators: a) Matthew’s intensified references to the Tanakh in
general;\textsuperscript{1} b) his emphasis on and enhancement of citations and allusions that relate to
observing the Law;\textsuperscript{2} and, c) his direct use of the Hebrew version of the Tanakh.\textsuperscript{3}

The evidence in this study, however, challenges all three of these assertions. First,
Matthew’s inclination to enhance explicit references, while weakening or even
eliminating subtle references, does not seem compatible with the notion that he or his
assumed readers had a stronger connection to Judaism and the Tanakh than Mark and
his readership. Rather, by intensifying explicit allusions, it appears that Matthew sought
to ensure that even his most recognizable references to the Tanakh would be readily
grasped. Accordingly, the weakening and elimination of more subtle references
suggests that Matthew either did not recognize certain allusions in Mark, or that he was
concerned that his readers might fail to comprehend them.

Second, as noted above, Matthew’s treatment of references associated with the Law
in the Tanakh does not seem to reflect a specific interest in or prioritization of Jewish
Law. Indeed, only once does a Matthean adaptation bring a reference closer to the Law

\textsuperscript{1} Goulder, \textit{Midrash}, 125-129; Davies and Allison, Matthew, 30–33, 35–45; O’Leary,

Saldarini, \textit{Christian}; Luz, \textit{Theology}, 105–106; Sim, \textit{Matthew}, 1–2, 302; Murphy,

\textsuperscript{3} Gundry, \textit{Use}; Davies and Allison, \textit{Matthew}, 58.
(Mk 10:2, 9/Matt 19:3, 11). In this case, Jesus confronts some Pharisees on the topic of divorce. While divorce is an important issue, it is not a central pillar of the Law. By comparison, both Shabbat observance and the Temple ritual are significantly undermined by Matthean alterations of Markan references. Thus, in contrast to the Markan Jesus, who implies but never explicitly admits that his disciples have desecrated Shabbat (Mk 2:25-27), the Matthean Jesus clearly affirms and justifies their violation of Shabbat (Matt 12:5-7). Similarly, in the same debate, the Matthean Jesus declares himself to be of greater importance than the Temple (Matt 12:6). Moreover, in three instances, Matthew reduces the level of specificity in Markan legal references from Tanakh (10:19/Matt 19:18–19; Mk 12:29–30/Matt 22:37; Mk 12:32–33/Matt 22:40).

Even more challenging to the concept that Matthew’s treatment of Markan references reflects a more robust connection to Judaism is the absence of the Shema in the First Gospel. Whether this stems from Matthew’s higher Christology or a reluctance to cite the Jewish creed, it is inconsistent with the notion that Matthew presents a Judaized version of Mark. Furthermore, despite indications that Matthew demonstrated interest in and care for elements of the Law (Matt 5:17-19; 15:17-20; 24:20), when Torah-observance conflicts with Jesus’ authority, the latter supersedes the former.

Third, although there is evidence that Matthew used the MT independently in a number of instances (13:11; 16:21; 19:3, 9; 22:31), most allusions that rely (to some
extent) on the MT originate in Mark. Thus, seventeen partly or fully MT-based Matthean references appear in an identical or very similar form in Mark. Only in one instance does Matthew bring a Markan reference from the LXX closer to the MT (Mk 12:30/Matt 22:37). Similarly, only one Markan allusion that relies on the MT (whether partly or fully) is brought closer to its Hebrew version (Mk 1:6b/Matt 3:4). By contrast, Matthew eliminates three references that are at least partially based on the Hebrew text (Mk 5:3; 11; 6:22-23; 14:58) and brings three others closer to the LXX (Mk 1:10b/Matt 3:17b; Mk 6:34/Matt 9:36; Mk 12:19/Matt 22:24). Therefore, it is quite possible that Matthew did not recognize some of the MT allusions that are present in Mark, or was concerned that his readers would fail to do so. Thus, while Matthew seems to have had a command of Hebrew, my analysis suggests that Mark’s knowledge of this language was comparable to (or perhaps exceeded) Matthew’s. In sum, my research does not support the assertion that the intensification of references in Matthew reflects a stronger connection to Judaism and its Law.

III. This study also indicates that both Mark and Matthew were probably able to engage

---

the MT directly. Words, phrases or verses that could not have been derived from the LXX appear in twenty-four Markan instances and in twenty-two Matthean ones. Moreover, these references are not reflected in major LXX variants. It is possible, to be sure, that these allusions were drawn from unknown Greek translations that are closer to the MT. If that were the case, however, it is reasonable to expect that at least some of these alternative translations would have been reflected in reliable LXX manuscripts or in non-Hexaplaric variants. Given that it is always preferable to draw conclusions from existing rather than theoretical sources, the MT should be preferred to non-extant Greek translations as a source for the non-LXX references.

IV. The results of this study also reveal that most of the Matthean modifications of Markan references are related to Jesus’ identity rather than Law observance. Indeed, in nineteen instances, Matthew intensifies references that focus on Jesus’ identity while thirteen are rendered less prominent. Moreover, as detailed above, in six cases where Tanakh references become less prominent, those Matthean omissions elevate Jesus’ figure. Similarly, ten Matthean enhancements effectively bolster the image of Jesus.

Eight of the Markan allusions that relate to the Law become more prominent in Matthew, and five become less so. Furthermore, in only one instance (Mk 10:2-4, 7/Matt 19:3, 7, 9) does the Matthean modification place stronger emphasis on Law observance. Whereas, in three cases Matthew distances his text from the Law (Mk 2:27/Matt 12:5-7; Mk 12:29–30/Matt 22:37) and, in another three, he makes the reference more generic and
less specific (Mk 10:19/Matt 19:18–19; Mk 12:29–30/Matt 22:37; Mk 12:32–33/Matt 22:40).

Overall, the results of this comparison of Mark and Matthew affirm that the Tanakh played a central role in their narration of Jesus’ life and death, and that it becomes slightly more prominent in Matthew. The primary purpose of this enhanced prominence, however, is not to present a more Jewish version of Mark but, rather, to elevate the figure of Jesus and bring his status very close to God.

**Plans for Future Research**

I consider this comparison and analysis of references to the Tanakh in Mark and Matthew a significant contribution to research on the role of the Tanakh in the New Testament. It is, however, the first phase of what I (and hopefully others) will explore in the future. The next stage would be to broaden the scope of this systematic comparison by incorporating Luke and Acts, thereby making possible a study of the implications for the Synoptic problem of the different evangelists’ use of biblical allusions. Another subject of interest is a comparison of the presence of the Tanakh in the Synoptic gospels and in John’s writings, as a means for assessing John’s degree of dependence on or independence from the Synoptics. Analogously, the Pauline correspondence could be added to this comparison in an effort to assess possible Pauline influence (or the lack thereof) on the gospels. It seems clear, then, that a systematic and comprehensive comparison of Tanakh references in the New Testament offers a promising tool for New Testament research.
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