

STUDIEN ZUM NEUEN TESTAMENT UND SEINER UMWELT (SNTU)

Serie A, Band 6/7

Herausgegeben von DDr. Albert Fuchs
o. Professor an der Theologischen Fakultät Linz

Die « Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt » (Serie A = Aufsätze) erscheinen seit 1976, mit Originalaufsatzen oder bearbeiteten Übersetzungen sonst schwer zugänglicher Artikel.

Inhaltlich werden wissenschaftlich-exegetische Arbeiten bevorzugt, gelegentlich auch historische und philologische Fragen behandelt.

Alle Manuskripte, Korrekturen, Mitteilungen usw., die die Serie betreffen, werden an den Herausgeber, Prof. DDr. Albert Fuchs, Blütenstr. 17, A-4040 Linz, erbeten. Es wird darum ersucht, die Manuskripte in Maschinschrift einseitig beschrieben, spationiert (auch und besonders die Fußnoten) und in druckreifem Zustand einzusenden (eine Zusammenfassung, deren Umfang 10-15 Zeilen nicht übersteigen soll, ist sehr erwünscht).

Abkürzungen, Zitate und Schreibweise (Angabe von Untertitel, Reihe usw.) sollten den bisher erschienenen Bänden entsprechen bzw. sich nach LThK² und IATG richten. Biblische Namen (mit Ausnahmen) nach den Loccumer Richtlinien, Bibelzitate nach der deutschen Einheitsübersetzung. Hebräische Texte werden in Transkription gedruckt.

Anschriften der Mitarbeiter

D. Catchpole, University of Lancaster, Furness College, Bailrigg, Lancaster, LA1 4YG

H. Giesen, Waldstraße 9, Postfach 1127, D-5202 Hennef (Sieg) 1

F. Laub, Hilblestraße 19, D-8000 München 19

C.-P. März, Arndtstraße 2, DDR-508 Erfurt

F. Mußner, Domplatz 8, D-8390 Passau

M. Theobald, Karl-Esser-Straße 1/VI, D-8400 Regensburg

© Prof. DDr. A. Fuchs, Linz 1982. Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

Bestelladresse:

Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt
A-4020 Linz, Harrachstraße 7/Austria

INHALTSVERZEICHNIS

FRANZ MUSSNER	
Der Messias Jesus	5
ALBERT FUCHS	
Entwicklungsgeschichtliche Studie zu Mk 1,29-31 par Mt 8,14-15 par Lk 4,38-39	21
DAVID CATCHPOLE	
The ravens, the lilies and the Q hypothesis. A form-critical perspective on the source-critical problem	77
CLAUS-PETER MÄRZ	
« ... mich habt ihr nicht allezeit ». Zur Traditions- geschichte von Mk 14,3-9 und Parallelen	89
FRANZ MUSSNER	
Die Gemeinde des Lukasprologs	113
MICHAEL THEOBALD	
Das Gottesbild des Paulus nach Röm 3,21-31	131
FRANZ LAUB	
Verkündigung und Gemeindeamt. Die Autorität der ἡγούμενοι Hebr 13,7.17.24	169
HEINZ GIESEN	
Heilszusage angesichts der Bedrängnis. Zu den Makarismen in der Offenbarung des Johannes	191
REZENSIONEN	225

**The ravens, the lilies and the Q hypothesis.
A form-critical perspective on the source-critical problem**

The current rivalry between divergent source-critical hypotheses can only be resolved in favour of that one which copes most satisfactorily with the phenomena in the overwhelming majority of specific cases of variously worded traditions. That means that a series of individual explorations must be undertaken in the setting of both double and triple traditions, and it is with one such instance within the double tradition, that is, Mt 6,25-33/Lk 12,23-31 that this article is concerned. The attempt is to be made to determine whether formal considerations may help to resolve the conflict between the proposals that Mt and Lk are here independent (so H.-T. Wrege),¹ that Mt is the sole creator of a midrash which Lk employed (so M.D. Goulder),² that Mt may well have had earlier tradition at his disposal but his version was used by Lk (so modern defenders of the Griesbach hypothesis), and that Mt and Lk independently used an earlier written source (so adherents of the Q hypothesis). This investigation is intended to focus on formal considerations but not in any sense of thereby narrowing the approach; to the contrary, this is a widening precisely because word-statistics and the appeal to stylistic tendencies would by themselves be too weak, and because it is necessary to insist with all possible firmness that considerations of form and of content should not, because ultimately they can not, be divorced.

Given the character of the rival theories listed above it is appropriate to start with the Matthaean text alone. Two varying analyses of its component parts may immediately be noticed. In the view of R. Bultmann, v. 25 may originally have been an independent logion; vv. 26.28-30 may have been either a further continuation of v. 25 or an independent and subsequently attached section; v. 27 was a secondary insertion; finally, vv. 31-33 were an independent and secondary construction.³ Noteworthy are Bultmann's suggestions that vv. 26.28-30 were originally expressions of popular piety, rather than of secular wisdom, and that they lacked all trace of eschatological motivation, while v. 27 in his view was akin to Old Testament pro-

¹ *H.-T. Wrege*, *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte der Bergpredigt* (WUNT, 9), Tübingen 1968, 116-123.

² *M.D. Goulder*, *Midrash and Lction in Matthew*, London 1974, 302-304.

³ *R. Bultmann*, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, Oxford 1963, 88.

verbs. This analysis left unexplained the remarkable overlap of vv. 25a.31, passed over the problem of the relationship of vv. 26.28-30 to the wisdom tradition (a problem which the distinction between popular piety and secular wisdom tended to obscure), and apparently detected no internal tension within vv. 31-33. Some, but not all, of these problems were observed by S. Schulz⁴ (and, later, H. Merklein)⁵ who saw v. 27 as the sole intrusive element and reasserted the unity of the rest by appealing to the allegedly prophetic character of the λέγω ὑμῖν formula in vv. 25.29, the typical appeal by «Mahnwörter» to human experience which coupled vv. 26.28-30 to v. 25, and the close relationship between the wisdom and prophetic/apocalyptic-traditions which prevented vv. 31-33 from being regarded as a new eschatological attachment and therefore secondary. There remained the question of whether v. 25a could naturally and smoothly introduce both v. 25b and vv. 26.28-33 and also the problem of whether the unity of all the latter complex had been securely established. The continued existence of such difficulties was perhaps signalled by the work of D. Zeller⁶ who, while generally leaning towards Bultmann and away from Schulz, proposed another scheme. In his view there were two underlying and independent traditional units, i.e. v. 25 (minus διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν), and vv. 26.28 (minus καὶ περὶ ἐνδύματος τί μεριμνᾶτε); 29-31.32b; subsequent expansions could be observed in both vv. 27, 28a and, rather significantly, vv. 32a.33, this latter being an importation of eschatological concern under the influence of a Jewish-Christian community. While not noticing two of the important questions left unasked by Bultmann, Zeller did implicitly face the third, namely the problem of whether vv. 31-33 constitute a unity. Since however, the overall solutions to the internal problems of Mt 6,25-33 which were presented by him and the other writers mentioned all contain some difficulties the attempt will be made in what follows to present another proposal. This proposal has initially to concentrate on seams or lines of demarcation between different layers of tradition.

1. V. 25 begins διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν and needs therefore to be a concluding inference from what went before. Yet this it cannot be since (1) the contrast between the service of God and of mammon (v. 24) is no counterpart of the contrast between recognition of the

⁴ S. Schulz, Q. Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten, Zürich 1972, 152-154.

⁵ H. Merklein, Die Gottesherrschaft als Handlungsprinzip (FzB, 34), Würzburg 1978, 177-180.

⁶ D. Zeller, Die weisheitlichen Mahnsprüche bei den Synoptikern (FzB, 17), Würzburg 1977, 86.87.

superiority of $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}\text{-}\sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha$ on the one hand and concern about food and clothing on the other (v. 25); (2) formally v. 25 is not the conclusion of one section but the beginning of another, as is shown by the recurrence of its characteristic terminology in v. 31. So there comes into focus a line of demarcation between traditions at vv. 24/25.

2. V. 25a issues a demand to avoid anxiety about $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}\text{-}\sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha$ in respect of food and clothing, and v. 25b supports the demand with an argumentative question: 'Is not the $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$ more than food, and the $\sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha$ than clothing?' Food and clothing here represent absolutely basic necessities of life (cf. Sir 29,21; 39,26 – the term used there is $\zeta\omega\acute{\eta}$), and $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}\text{-}\sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha$ represent the human person as an indivisible whole.⁷ The connection between v. 25a and v. 25b is, however, defective. (1) In the former, concern about food and clothing is an expression of anxiety about the $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}\text{-}\sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha$, whereas in the latter it is an antithetical alternative. (2) As an antithetical alternative, concern for $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}\text{-}\sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha$ becomes the basis of a painfully weak and unconvincing argument, concerning which Zeller commented quite rightly: 'Das erste Argument, Leben und Leib seien mehr wert als Nahrung und Kleidung, scheint zunächst wenig durchschlagend. Man könnte ja erwidern: Gerade weil sie uns so lieb sind, sorgen wir dafür.'⁸ In other words, v. 25b cannot satisfactorily secure v. 25a. When, however, Zeller went on to try and resolve the problem by means of a distinction between means and ends, in the sense that whoever sets out to acquire these means of life makes them an « Endzweck », he took as his starting-point something about which the text is completely silent. In fact, the content of the text as it stands remains at odds not only with the logic of the situation but also with specific examples of those who pursued occupations as means of human support without jeopardising a higher concern e.g. rabbis with the study of Torah⁹ or Paul with the outreach of mission (1 Thess 2.9). (3) The overlap between v. 25a and v. 31 is too strong to be discounted. It extends to common terminology and formal agreement in being followed by an argument (v. 32) and a hint of what should be the higher concern (v. 33). But vv. 32.33 do not overlap at all with v. 25b in the content of their argument, which means that either v. 25b or vv. 32.33 may excite suspicion as a secondary development. Of the two v. 25b is the more vulnerable to suspicion since v. 32 at least picks up the logic of the

⁷ K.H. Rengstorf, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (NTD, 3), Göttingen 1966, 161.

⁸ Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 89.

⁹ H.-J. Degenhardt, *Lukas-Evangelist der Armen*, Stuttgart 1965, 84.

argument from the natural world and the care of God (as does v. 31 with οὖν), thus permitting v. 31 to introduce a concluding summary which matches an introductory demand in v. 25a. But that concluding summary wholly ignores v. 25b and even the ψυχῆ-σῶμα language of v. 25a. The likely inference from these three considerations is therefore that between vv. 25a/25b and between vv. 25b/26 further lines of demarcation come into view. This result could be rendered more precise by the related inference that the ψυχῆ-σῶμα language in v. 25a is a secondary addition, unnecessary within v. 25a and required only to introduce v. 25b.

3. V. 27 deals with man's inability, not to add the massive extra amount of a cubit (=0.52m) to his height, but to add the smallest additional length of time to his life-span.¹⁰ In commenting upon a person's life-span, v. 27 links up with the subordinate and ancillary reference in v. 30 to the grass of the field with its fleetingly brief period of existence (cf. this motif in Ps 37,2; 90.5f; 102,11; 103,15f; Is 40,6), though the point of emphasis varies in that v. 27 envisages a short addition to a life-span of unspecified length, while v. 30 refers to a life-span which is short *in toto*. Now vv. 26.28-30 match one another very neatly in that (1) both deal with examples in the natural world, in which (2) none of the normal human activities are involved, as a basis for which (3) an appeal can be made by way of the *a minore ad maius* principle, to (4) the provision of God for certain human persons, but v. 27 is a distraction and a deviation away from the smooth passage from v. 26 to vv. 28-30. No contribution by v. 27 to its immediate context can be established by drawing from it a warning about the imminent hour of catastrophe,¹¹ since such a warning is most appropriately addressed to those who are not concerned but should be, rather than to those who are concerned but in this context should not be. It would be better to recognize that formally v. 27 is an interruption,¹² just as content-wise its man-centred appeal to the ineffectiveness of anxiety is to be contrasted with the God-centred appeal to the inappropriateness of anxiety in the surrounding material. Once again, therefore, lines of demarcation inside the tradition come into focus, this time between vv. 26/27 and between vv. 27/28-30.

4. V. 31 introduces a section which corresponds remarkably with the content of what precedes. An identical demand is voiced

¹⁰ J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, London 1963, 171.

¹¹ So Jeremias, *Parables*, 171.

¹² J. Schmid, *Matthäus und Lukas* (BSt, 23), Freiburg 1930, 142; *Bultmann*, *History*, 88.103; *Degenhardt*, *Lukas*, 69.

by vv. 25a.31, and the dominant assertion of the care of God, which is exhibited in the provision of food and clothing, in vv. 26.28-30 leads directly into the comparable affirmation of divine awareness, seen now as a function of divine Fatherhood, in v. 32b. This correspondence might permit vv. 31-32 to be regarded as an inessential and secondary development over against what went before, were it not for two considerations which suggest otherwise. (1) It will shortly be argued that v. 33 is a necessary counterpoise to vv. 26.28-30. A direct movement from v. 30 to v. 33 with nothing intervening would read harshly and would itself raise the question of whether something had been omitted. (2) If vv. 31.32 are allowed to intervene, then they clearly fulfil the role of concluding summary in relation to vv. 25a.26.28-30. But those two verses cannot *in toto* perform such a role precisely because lines of demarcation are visible within them. Specifically, v. 32a is an interruption because, firstly, its reference to πάντα τὰ ἔθνη is new and unprovoked by anything that has gone before; secondly, its logic is alien, in that previously there has been no hint of a requirement to preserve a higher standard of behaviour than that of another less than highly regarded category of persons; thirdly, its position is totally wrong in that the time for introducing another argument has passed when one has reached the stage of the concluding summary. In other words, form and content again combine to bring sharply into focus the demarcation lines at vv. 31/32a and vv. 32a/32b.

5. V. 33 has been viewed, according to several analyses of this material, as lacking any original connection with what precedes. It is not difficult, however, to find in v. 33b a double link with v. 32b by way of the common ταῦτα πάντα and the common allusion to God as provider (in that v. 33b employs a 'divine passive'). Both together, of course, link up without difficulty with similar allusions to God as provider of specific needs in vv. 26.30. But are there any comparable links involving v. 33a? Certainly the attempt has been made to find in the λέγω ὑμῶν of the earlier material an eschatological prophetic element,¹³ and that might have matched the eschatological βασιλεία reference in v. 33a, had it not been a support so brittle and so swiftly removed by Zeller's comment: 'Für die Versicherung, das sogar die sprichwörtliche Pracht Salomos der Schönheit der Blumen nachstand, braucht es keine prophetische Hellsicht.'¹⁴ So if any link involving v. 33a is to be discerned it must be discovered by an alternative route. Such a discovery requires

¹³ Schulz, Spruchquelle, 153.

¹⁴ Zeller, Mahnsprüche, 84.

no great effort! The two illustrations of the birds and the lilies in vv. 26.28-30 involve just such an appeal to the natural world as is typical of the wisdom tradition. The illustrations themselves begin to sheer over into the human activity, which is the point of contact with the hearers, in the verbs *σπείρειν* ... *θερίζειν* ... *συνάγειν* (v. 26) *κοπιᾶν* ... *νήθειν* (v. 28). The activities here described are normal, necessary, and typical of the sort of labour which alone will produce the normal and necessary basics of human existence – and yet they are here seen as an expression of that care which the tradition requires the hearers to avoid!¹⁵ If the tradition is not to be written off as ‘das Hohelied des kindlich frommen Optimismus’ (to use J. Schmid’s telling phrase)¹⁶ some explanation has to be found for the collision between it and the wisdom tradition, to which it belongs formally but with whose characteristic praise for the worker and scorching dismissal of the non-worker it clashes so resoundingly.¹⁷ Only one explanation seems ready to hand, namely, that the demand which is clarified and supported by vv. 26.28-30 applies to a situation which is both special in character and short in duration, i.e. it belongs only to that period envisaged by the expectation of an imminent eschatological crisis.¹⁸ Not surprisingly commentators on Mt 6,25-33 have frequently felt the need to allude to its closest parallel in Mt 10,5-16 where the equipment rule sets up a situation identical with that of the demand not to be anxious.¹⁹ And just as the proclamation of the near kingdom is inseparably attached to that rule, so here also we are driven to see in v. 33a the necessary complement for the demand in vv. 25a.31 which is reinforced by the theocentric argumentation in vv. 26.28-30.32b.33b.

6. V. 34 is usually categorized as a wisdom ruling,²⁰ which is the first of a number of links with foregoing material which might be listed. A second is the common exhortation against *μέριμνα* (vv. 25.28.31). A third is in the *οὖν* (v. 34a) which attempts to

¹⁵ *Degenhardt*, Lukas, 81 correctly senses the meaning: «Ihr sollt nicht säen und ernten, ihr braucht keine Kammern und Scheunen, Gott ernährt euch».

¹⁶ *J. Schmid*, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (RNT, 1), Regensburg 1965, 141.

¹⁷ See Prov 6,6-8; 10,26; 12,24.27; 13,4; 15,19; 18,9; 19,15.24; 20,4; 22,13; 24,20-27; 26,13-16; Sir 2,12; 7,15. In Prov 10,3 it is the righteous whom the Lord does not let go hungry, and in 10,4.5 it is made clear that such righteousness involves diligence and is exemplified in harvesting.

¹⁸ *P. Hoffmann*, *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle* (NtA, 8), Münster 1972, 41.

¹⁹ The prohibited *πήρα* is not the beggar’s bag but rather the container for food: Jdth 10,5; 13,10. The prohibited *ὑποδήματα* are basic items of clothing: Deut 25,9.10; Amos 2,6; Sir 46,19. See *Hoffmann*, *Studien*, 324.

²⁰ *Bultmann*, *History*, 73.77.

take up from v. 33. A fourth is the common word *αῦριον* (vv. 30.34). But all these links together prove incapable of establishing an inherent connection between this saying and the rest. The atmosphere of v. 34 lacks the confidence of a trust in God which can dispel care: instead it is wholly secular and, in T.W. Manson's accurate words, 'breathes the pessimism which commonly goes with oriental fatalism. The attempt to square it with Jesus' faith in the fatherly providence of God may be regarded as wasted labour.'²¹ Further, the connection attempted by means of *οὖν* is neither supported by content, nor assisted by the *γάρ* (v. 34b) which itself suggests that v. 34a is a basic statement of principle, independent in itself. Next, *αῦριον* is no more than a verbal association. Finally, and most critically, the tradition which reached its conclusion and climax in v. 33 needed no supplement,²² least of all one which reduced the discussion of anxiety to so inferior a level. Between v. 33 and v. 34, therefore, another line of division becomes plain.

We are now in a position to draw certain source-critical conclusions from our form-critical exploration. Beneath the surface of Mt 6, 25-33 can be detected a well-rounded and coherent tradition consisting of vv. 25a (minus *διὰ τοῦτο ... τῆ ψυχῆ ὑμῶν ... τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν*).26.28-30.31.32b.33. As it stands it has been badly connected to neighbouring material at either end, and it has been damaged by insertions in the wording of v. 25a as well as vv. 25b.27.32a. In consequence and at a stroke we can remove two of the four rival source-critical theories we began by reviewing. First, the existence of strata within the material as well as bad connections at either end rules out a unified Matthaean midrash. Second, the agreement between Mt and Lk in having comparable interruptions at comparable junctures rules out (short of heavy investment in coincidence) the independence of the two versions. The field is therefore reduced to two runners, ridden respectively by advocates of Matthaean priority and of Q. Which is the likelier winner?

* * *

A necessary condition of Matthaean priority would be the greater primitiveness of the Matthaean version at every point of difference from the Lukan version. Now certainly one can compile a list of such examples of greater Matthaean primitiveness. 1. The Lukan *οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ταμιεῖον οὐδὲ ἀποθήκη* (12:24) with its two corresponding nouns has a superficial correspondence with the immediately

²¹ T.W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, London 1971, 173.

²² Schmid, *Matthäus*, 143.

preceding statement using two coordinating verbs σπείρειν + θερίζειν. Since, however, ταμειῶν stands for a barn (see Deut 28,8; Psalm 143,13; Prov 3,10) its combination with ἀποθήκη appears tautologous while the σπείρειν + θερίζειν combination does not. Moreover, this whole phrase in Lk 12,24 lays stress on the fact of possession and is therefore alien to the underlying stress on activity. Activity, seen through from start to finish in Matthew's σπείρειν + θερίζειν + συναγειν εἰς ἀποθήκας is preserved from the original core of the tradition by Mt but secondarily marred by Lk. 2. Following the interruption in v. 27 the Matthaean transition καὶ περὶ ἐνδύματος τί μεριμνᾶτε; is more likely to be the basis of Luke's εἰ οὖν οὐδὲ ἐλάχιστον δύνασθε, τί περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν μεριμνᾶτε; than vice versa. Word-statistics could point to MtR for ἔνδυμα (Mt 7/Mk O/Lk 1, and nowhere else in the NT) especially in view of analogous cases at 3,4; 7,15; 22,11.12; 28,3, but in this particular case ἔνδυμα (v. 28) links up with ἐνδύσησθε (v. 25 = Luke 12,22). The Lukan version, on the other hand, makes a far more concerted attempt to integrate the πῆχυς-ἡλικία saying into the surrounding tradition. The clarification of πῆχυς by means of ἐλάχιστος, the verbal linkage via δύναται-δύνασθε, the extra employment of the *a minore ad maius* argument — all these represent an awareness of a problem, a more considered attempt at solving it and a blurring of the clear line of demarcation between traditions — in short, a secondary development. 3. Mt's μὴ οὖν μεριμνήσητε (v. 31) is very probably more primitive than Lk's counterpart καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ ζητεῖτε. The latter version integrates 12,29 more firmly with 12,30.31 in that ὑμεῖς becomes one half of an antithesis with πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τοῦ κόσμου (12,30) and ζητεῖτε links up with ἐπιζητοῦσιν (12,30a) and ζητεῖτε (12,31). This has the twofold effect of both damaging the symmetry between the concluding demand and its initial counterpart (12,22) and also partially (but only partially, since the friction between 12,30a and 12,30b persists and the genuine correspondence between 12,30b and 12,24.28 persists as well) smoothing away the roughness caused by the secondary interruption in 12,30a. On grounds of form and content, therefore, we can envisage a development from the Matthaean to the Lukan version but not vice versa. Here then are just three examples from what could easily be a more extended list of examples of greater Matthaean primitiveness. And if this list stood by itself we would have no way of choosing between the two remaining source-critical options. But it does not stand by itself. It has rather to be complemented by another list.

Again, it must be stressed, we take Mt alone as the base for the discussion. In doing so we become aware of a series of form/content

problems internal to Mt 6,25-33. These problems show themselves to be acute when we take into account the form/content of the pre-Matthaeian tradition which was — indeed, must always have been — characterized by symmetry (v. 25a/v. 31; v. 26/vv. 28-30; vv. 26b. 30/v. 33b) and balance (vv. 25a.26.28-31.32b/v. 33). Crucial to the argument is the fact that the symmetry and the balance, while remaining clearly visible, do so in spite of having been disturbed and, to a small though still perceptible extent, obscured.

1. Within the symmetry of vv. 26/28-30, several disturbances can be detected. Firstly, a very specific example τὰ κρίνα τοῦ ἀγροῦ (v. 28) became the basis for a broad generic ὁ χόρτος τοῦ ἀγροῦ in the clinching *a minore ad maius* question (v. 30), but the symmetrical section (v. 26) had begun with a broad generic example τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ and in its corresponding and clinching question used the simple word αὐτῶν. Secondly, the person who clothes the flowers was simply ὁ θεός (v. 30) but in the symmetrical section that person had been more amply described as ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος. How should the asymmetries within the symmetry be evaluated? An injudicious hankering after cast-iron canons of criticism which can be applied in all circumstances might produce the answer that asymmetry is always more primitive than symmetry and therefore that in Mt 6,26.28-30 the asymmetries must in some sense be primary. But that would be to neglect the inseparability of form and content and, in this instance, the consideration that it is of the essence of this tradition that it shall originally have been symmetrical. Therefore a different approach to the asymmetries is required. Firstly, then, we would expect a specific example to lie behind τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ which would then be evaluated as a redactional generalization shifted from its proper place in the final clinching question, where in turn it had been replaced by the colourless αὐτῶν. Given the evidence for such a tendency the words τοῦ ἀγροῦ, which are wholly unnecessary as definition of τὰ κρίνα also fall under suspicion. Secondly, the term ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος introduces into the discussion of the birds a quite unnecessary and complicating idea which the corresponding ὁ θεός (v. 30) does not; while this reference to God as the Father of those addressed prepares for the similar reference in v. 32 it in so doing robs the latter of a measure of climatic forcefulness. Consequently, one would suppose that the one who provides for birds and flowers would be named God, and the one who provides for certain human persons would be named Father.²³

²³ Contra *Wrege*, *Bergpredigt*, 118, who disputes the possibility of choosing between the two descriptions of God.

The striking reality which emerges from this discussion is that on the basis of Mt alone we would reconstruct an earlier version of the tradition which, it turns out, matches exactly what we read in Lk. A specific example of the birds is there, i.e. the ravens. This citation of the case of the ravens brings the tradition alongside Job 38,41 and Psalm 147,9 but is not thereby shown to be secondary; rather, its replacement by the generic τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, itself a Biblicism (cf. Gen 1,26),²⁴ is understandable in the light of the raven's status as unclean (Lev 11,15; Deut 14,14).²⁵ Finally, we must note that references to the divine provider take precisely the required forms ὁ θεός ... ὁ θεός ... ὁ πατήρ.

2. Within v. 33 two secondary defects can be detected. Firstly, emphasis is laid on what should be sought πρῶτον. Secondly, the search is to concentrate on both kingdom and righteousness of God. Now the presence of πρῶτον indicates priority rather than exclusiveness of concern.²⁶ In context that means that, provided it is kept at a subordinate level, concern about food and clothing remains permissible. Yet vv. 25a.26.28-31.32b said precisely the opposite, and the whole argument was dedicated to the assertion of an exclusive claim. πρῶτον articulates a concern to blunt the sharp edge of eschatological radicalism under the influence of the pressures of non-eschatological everyday life, and as such it must be classed as secondary. That eschatological radicalism is itself encapsulated in the reference to the kingdom. The kingdom should, however, stand by itself since the term 'righteousness' broadens the reference beyond the eschatological²⁷ and is, moreover, most unlikely to have been omitted by Lk. The latter is happy to represent the plan of God implemented by John and then Jesus as a manifestation of divine righteousness which the adherents acknowledged (Lk 7,29.30) just as Mt does (3,15;21,32). It would be odd if Lk were to subtract it, natural if Mt were to add it (see also 5,20; 6,1 which controlled the whole nearby section vv. 1-18), and superfluous if the pre-Matthaeian tradition were to include it. In respect of v. 33, therefore, it emerges that on the basis of Mt alone we are under pressure to reconstruct an earlier version which again matches exactly what we read in Luke.

The list of examples of more primitive Matthaean wording has

²⁴ E. Klostermann, *Das Matthäusevangelium* (HNT, 4), Tübingen 1927, 63.

²⁵ W. Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (THK NT, 3), Berlin 1961, 260.

²⁶ Degenhardt, *Lukas*, 85: « Das Bemühen um anderes ist nicht ausgeschlossen ».

²⁷ On its significance in Mt, cf. G. Bornkamm, *End Expectation and Church in Matthew*, in: G. Bornkamm-G. Barth-H.-J. Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, London 1963, 24-32.

been balanced by another list of examples of more primitive Lukan wording. It is just conceivable that the second list might consist of cases of Lukan recovery, rather than preservation, of earlier tradition, but that is highly improbable since the first list shows Lk moving away from and (to a degree) spoiling the tradition's closeness to its original form and content. Just conceivable but highly improbable must therefore be the neo-Griesbachian explanation of the data here. The much more probable inference from the combination of the two lists, following on the evidence of a direct literary relationship, is that provided by the only alternative, the Q hypothesis.

* * *

As a concluding postscript to the source-critical discussion it is fitting to draw out the overall tradition-historical implications. By way of the individual studies of the wording of Mt 6,25-33/Lk 12, 22-31 we can reconstruct the underlying Q version which itself contained the internal dislocations discussed above. Consequently, when the dislocating material is removed there remains a pre-Q version which was coherent, complete and delicately balanced. It consisted of the basic demand not to be anxious, the two examples of the ravens and the lilies exhibiting the care of God and applying it by a *minore ad maius* logic to the persons being addressed, the reiterated demand with its summarizing reference to the Father's knowledge of human need, and finally the counterbalancing demand for concern for the kingdom with the final assurance attached. In setting concern for the kingdom over against that fundamental concern for food and clothing which is the mainspring of human work, the material showed itself to be related (but not straightforwardly) to the wisdom tradition and also to belong exclusively to the same setting of urgent and short-term eschatological expectation of God's kingship as determined the mission of the disciples. Subsequent transmission of this material showed a repeated tendency to blunt its edge and to accommodate to less urgent considerations its intense and intolerable radicalism. But before the moves began which took these sayings from pre-Q to Q and then on to Mt and Lk the authentic voice of Jesus was almost certainly to be heard, and indeed to be heard rather more clearly than his later interventionist followers allowed.