THE USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM:
AN ANALYSIS OF FRANCIS WATSON'S 'L/M THEORY' AS A TEST CASE

Woojin Chung

McMaster Divinity College, Hamilton, ON, Canada

Introduction

Analysis of the use of the Old Testament in the Synoptic Gospels helps one examine the proposed theories of the Synoptic Problem. The method of investigating the scriptural quotations and allusions in the Gospels is similar to that of the Synoptic Problem in that it naturally turns one's attention to earlier sources and traditions and their connection with the Gospel texts. Recognizing the importance of this approach, Krister Stendahl asserts, 'For the Synoptics the study of quotations is essential to the understanding of the sources and composition of the gospels'.[1] Mark Goodacre also argues, 'The evangelists' use of the Old Testament is one of many issues that is rarely given the chance to shed light on the Synoptic Problem, in spite of the rich potential for interaction'.[2] Moreover, David New avers that 'an examination of OT citations could *provide a criterion or test to confirm or deny some hypothesis*, but which would not by itself fully prove the hypothesis'.[3] As New contends, analysis of the use of the Old

---

1. Krister Stendahl, *The School of St Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament* (Uppsala: Almquist & Wiksells, 1954), p. 41.

2. Mark S. Goodacre, 'The Evangelists' Use of the Old Testament and the Synoptic Problem', in Paul Foster *et al.* (eds.), *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem, Oxford Conference, April 2008: Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett* (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), pp. 281-98 (281). Although Goodacre's position on the Synoptic Problem is far from my stance, he rightly points out the potential significance of this approach. For his position, see Mark S. Goodacre, *The Case against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002).

3. David S. New, *Old Testament Quotations in the Synoptic Gospels and the Two-Document Hypothesis* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), p. 16 n. 2 (italics

Testament in the New may not fully solve the Synoptic Problem. Nevertheless, it is the main premise of this essay that delving into the Gospel writers' particular uses of Old Testament texts can yield significant insights into examining the reliability of a proposed solution to the Synoptic Problem.

In his book, *Gospel Writing*, Francis Watson offers the suggestion that a process of reception in tracing the canonical history of the four Gospels should be taken more seriously.[4] He asserts, 'No religious, philosophical, or literary text enters the world with the label "canonical" already attached'.[5] In search of the origins of the fourfold Gospel, he extends his research to the second century CE and beyond, and argues for what he calls 'a canonical perspective'—that equally investigating both canonical and extra-canonical voices in the first two centuries can better serve to determine the canonization process of the Jesus tradition.[6] Watson's effort in highlighting the diversity of the reception process to shed light on the emergence of the canonical Gospels as well as on the Synoptic Problem should be appreciated as a fresh attempt to open up a new discussion on New Testament research and early Christianity. However, his assertion on the compositional relations between Matthew and Luke based on what he calls 'the L/M theory' seems problematic.

For example, Watson sees a number of coincidences between the two annunciation stories in the beginning of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke and contends that Luke composed his infancy story of Jesus based on Matthew's. In other words, Watson breaks with the current scholarly consensus that Matthew and Luke wrote their Gospels independently without knowing each other's work, and argues that Luke's infancy story is secondary to Matthew's. In this article, Watson's proposal of the Synoptic Problem will be evaluated through the examination of Matthew and Luke's uses of the Old Testament, and it will be argued that Watson's suggestion is highly unlikely and also undermines the significance of the distinctive exegetical features and strategies of the two infancy narratives. As a result of this study, it will be attested that

added). New confirms the 'two-document hypothesis' by investigating the Old Testament quotations in the Synoptic Gospels.

4.   Francis Watson, *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013).

5.   Watson, *Gospel Writing*, p. 3.

6.   Watson, *Gospel Writing*, p. 6.

analysis of the use of the Old Testament in the Synoptic Gospels is an effective tool to examine the proposed theories of the Synoptic Problem, Watson's 'L/M Theory' in our case.

Methodology and Procedure

In the study of the New Testament writers' use of the Old Testament, defining one's terminology, for example, the 'issue of how one determines when a passage from the Old Testament is used in the New Testament', has been a controversial matter.[7] In his influential book, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, Richard Hays defines intertextuality as the 'imbedding of fragments of an earlier text within a later one' and uses such terms as echoes and allusions.[8] Stanley Porter, on the other hand, argues that these terms are poorly defined in Hays's work, and contends, 'Intertextuality is a term that sometimes seems to biblical scholars (such as Hays) to mean nothing more than echo or paraphrase, but at other times to be nothing less than the invocation of an entire textual universe'.[9]

Recognizing the importance of accurate terminological definitions, therefore, I will utilize the five categories of Porter in his article, 'Further Comments on the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament'.[10] They are, based on the pattern of 'explicit to non-

7. Stanley E. Porter, 'Further Comments on the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament', in Thomas L. Brodie *et al.* (eds.), *The Intertextuality of the Epistles: Explorations of Theory and Practice* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006), pp. 98-110. Porter calls this 'one of the most important and enduring problems in New Testament study'. Porter, 'Further Comments', p. 98.

8. Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), p. 14.

9. Porter, 'Further Comments', p. 99. In his review of Hays's book, Ellis also remarks, 'The seeming confusion of typology with allegory may underlie his lack of interest in the historical framework of Paul's exegesis since he thinks that Paul "reads Scripture primarily as a *narrative* of divine election and promise"'. E. Earle Ellis, review of *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), by Richard B. Hays, in *Theology Today* 47 (1990), pp. 202-203 (italics by Ellis).

10. Porter, 'Further Comments', pp. 98-110. He also argues, 'In order to undertake any such investigation it is imperative that one defines the categories under discussion, and then apply them rigorously' (p. 94). Stanley E. Porter, 'The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology', in Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders (eds.), *Early Christian*

explicit', *formulaic quotation, direct quotation, paraphrase, allusion* and *echo*.[11] A formulaic quotation is the most explicit quotation that we will be primarily dealing with in this study. Porter defines it as a citation with an introductory formula that shares at least three words with its source text. We can also be assured about the writer's specific intention that he 'wishes to label the words that follow as a quotation'.[12]

A direct quotation, on the other hand, is a citation without an introductory formula but contains a minimum of three corresponding words. Porter contends that two words may be a coincidence, but 'three form a minimal unit of determinable syntax and conceptual relation'.[13]

The next category is a paraphrase, a unique invention that bears resemblance to its modern term, and yet a helpful distinguishing marker from allusion. It represents an 'intentional and specific invoking of a definable passage', which is 'typified by the use of words from the same semantic domain, or similar words in differing syntax, as a recognizable passage'.[14]

The fourth category is the most difficult one. Porter defines an allusion as the 'invoking of a person, place or literary work', with or without conscious intentions. This is what differentiates paraphrase from allusion. Whereas the former holds a specific intention of an author, the latter 'may or may not be consciously intentional'.[15] According to Porter, the nature of allusion is 'less concerned with language' and more associated with the invoking of an external person, place or literary work.[16]

The last category, an echo, though the most abstract among the five, 'involves not paraphrase of a specific passage, not allusion to a person, place or literary work, but the invocation by means of thematically related language of some more general notion or concept'.[17] Porter's

---

Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), pp. 79-96.

11. Porter, 'Further Comments', pp. 107-10.

12. Porter, 'Further Comments', p. 108.

13. Porter, 'Further Comments', p. 108.

14. Porter, 'Further Comments', p. 109. Porter here follows the definition of 'paraphrase' by C.H. Holman: 'A restatement of an idea in such a way as to retain the meaning while changing the direction and form.' C. Hugh Holman, *A Handbook to Literature* (New York: Macmillan, 6th edn, 1992), p. 343.

15. Porter, 'Further Comments', p. 109.

16. Porter, 'Further Comments', p. 109.

17. Porter, 'Further Comments', p. 110.

definition of echo is more specific than that of Hays who permits an extensive range of definition of echo, encompassing both 'subliminal' and 'higher-volume' evocations of the earlier text.[18]

The procedure of this investigation will begin from an analysis of the Old Testament quotations that Matthew and Luke share. This comparative analytic process, which will be conducted in a selective manner due to the limited space in this article, will help us determine a particular textual relationship of both the evangelists' uses of Scripture. Once this overall textual relationship is established, Matthew's and Luke's uses of the Old Testament in their infancy narratives will be examined respectively. The possible *Vorlage* of the Old Testament quotations, paraphrases and allusions, along with their peculiar Jewish or Hellenistic stylistic features, will also be investigated.

This programmatic analysis will serve to determine the unique characteristics and features of the Matthean and Lukan infancy narratives within the larger literary context of the evangelists' overall use of Scriptures. In other words, the analysis of the Old Testament quotations that Matthew and Luke share, on the one hand, will show that both Gospels hold a close textual affinity to each other, and the examination of both evangelists' use of the Old Testament in their infancy narratives, on the other hand, will exhibit the fact that they actually do carry a number of obvious differences in their employment of the Old Testament. This observation will lead us to argue for the textual difficulties of the 'L/M theory' proposed by Watson. His contention of the Matthean priority based on the points of similarity between the two infancy narratives lacks textual support due to the particular and complex ways both evangelists use the Old Testament throughout their entire Gospels. Rather, as will be asserted, a more plausible alternative to this source-critical problem is that the Matthean and Lukan infancy narratives were composed independently. Through this procedure, this study will demonstrate that the examination of the evangelists' use of the Old Testament does provide a criterion to test the reliability of the suggested hypothesis of the Synoptic Problem, even though the analysis of their use of the Old Testament by itself may not fully solve the problem.

18. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, p. 24.

The Old Testament Quotations that Matthew and Luke Share[19]

In his Gospel, Matthew contains about fifty explicit Old Testament quotations.[20] The Jewishness of his Gospel is well displayed in the witty comment of Jonathan Pennington who avers that, 'when Matthew is cut, he bleeds Bible'.[21] Luke, on the other hand, has about half as many explicit Old Testament quotations as Matthew. Yet, that the Old Testament plays an important role in his Gospel is evidenced by the comment of Jesus: 'Everything written about me in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms must be fulfilled' (Lk. 24.44).[22] Among those Old Testament quotations, Luke shares about fifteen

---

19. In investigation of the Matthean and Lukan uses of the Old Testament, it would be ideal to examine both the explicit and implicit Old Testament quotations in their Gospels. Yet it is beyond the scope of this article to delve into such an extensive magnitude of research. C.A. Kimball finds four hundred thirty-nine Old Testament allusions in the Gospel of Luke alone. C.A. Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), pp. 206-12. For our purposes, therefore, only the explicit Old Testament quotations will be discussed.

20. Richard Beaton asserts, 'The frequent explicit citations, forty in all, implicit quotations, of which there are twenty-one, and numerous allusory references to the Old Testament are central to his [Matthew's] narrative development'. Richard Beaton, *Isaiah's Christ in Matthew's Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 17. Craig L. Blomberg notes that 'fifty-five references prove close enough in wording for commentators typically to label them "quotations", compared to about sixty-five for the other three canonical Gospels put together'. Craig L. Blomberg, 'Matthew', in G.K. Beale and D.A. Carson (eds.), *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), pp. 1-109 (1). Daniel J. Harrington also argues that the 'community for which Matthew wrote was largely (though not exclusively) Jewish Christian. For such an audience Matthew could use Jewish rhetoric and themes without explanation.' Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991), p. 1. See also M.J.J. Menken, *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist* (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), pp. 1-10.

21. Jonathan T. Pennington, 'Refractions of Daniel in the Gospel of Matthew', in Craig A. Evans and Daniel Zacharias (eds.), *Early Christian Literature and Intertextuality* (London: T. & T. Clark, 2009), I, pp. 65-86 (65).

22. David W. Pao and Eckhard J. Schnabel contend, 'The fact that Luke uses fewer explicit quotations in his Gospel … than Matthew does in his … must not be misread to suggest that Luke was less interested in intertextual links with Israel's Scriptures'. David W. Pao and Eckhard J. Schnabel, 'Luke', in Beale and Carson (eds.), *Commentary on the New Testament*, pp. 251-414 (251).

quotations with Matthew, which amounts to more than half of his entire scriptural quotations.[23] Among these Old Testament quotations that Matthew and Luke share, selective quotations will be analyzed below to determine their particular textual relationship.

The first Old Testament quotations to examine are Mt. 3.3 and Lk. 3.4-6, in which Isa. 40.3-5 is cited. Matthew quotes only one verse, Isa. 40.3, whereas Luke cites three verses, Isa. 40.3-5. In their citations of Isa. 40.3, Matthew and Luke agree with each other verbatim, basically following the LXX except for the alteration of the phrase τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν (paths of our God) into τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ (his paths) (Mt. 3.3; Lk. 3.4). This is an obvious example of the correspondence between Matthew and Luke against the LXX. They also share the bulk of Old Testament quotations in their temptation narratives. The first quotation in Mt. 4.4 and Lk. 4.4, in response to the devil's test to make bread out of stones, is from Deut. 8.3 and almost follows the LXX verbatim, except for Matthew, who eliminates the dative article τῷ before the participle ἐκπορευομένῳ (coming out of) (Mt. 4.4), and for Luke, who quotes only the first part of the passage.[24] The second quotation on the divine protection from harm in Mt. 4.6 and Lk. 4.10-11 comes from the devil himself who apparently quotes Ps. 91.11-12. Matthew seems to quote from the LXX, omitting the phrase τοῦ διαφυλάξαι σε ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς σου (to guard you in all your ways) (Ps. 90.11 LXX), whereas Luke places the quotation at the last part of the narrative and includes only the utterance τοῦ διαφυλάξαι σε (to guard you) (Lk. 4.10). In the last quotation in Mt. 4.10 and Lk. 4.8, Matthew and Luke exactly correspond to each other by making a dramatic change from the LXX of Deut. 6.13, replacing the verbal form of φοβηθήσῃ (you shall fear) with προσκυνήσεις (you shall worship) and adding the adverb μόνῳ (only) in front of the verbal form of λατρεύσεις (you shall serve) (Lk. 4.8). These examples also attest to the probability that both evangelists were working from the same scriptural traditions.

---

23. They are: Mt. 3.3 and Lk. 3.4-6; Mt. 4.4, 6, 7, 10 and Lk. 4.4, 8, 10-12; Mt. 7.23 and Lk. 13.27; Mt. 11.5 and Lk. 7.22; Mt. 11.10 and Lk. 7.27; Mt. 19.18-19 and Lk. 18.20; Mt. 21.13 and Lk. 19.46; Mt. 21.42 and Lk. 20.17; Mt. 22.32 and Lk. 20.37; Mt. 22.37 and Lk. 10.27a; Mt. 22.39 and Lk. 10.27b; Mt. 22.44 and Lk. 20.43.

24. Luke does not quote the phrase ἀλλ' … ἄνθρωπος in the latter part of Deut. 8.3.

Another example would be the quotations in Mt. 11.5 and Lk. 7.22, where Matthew and Luke also correspond to each other verbatim: τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν (the blind see), χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν (the lame walk), λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται (the lepers get healed), κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν (the deaf hear), νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται (the dead are raised) and πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται (the Gospel is preached to the poor). It is interesting, however, that there is not a single scriptural verse in Isaiah that conforms to these words. The LXX version of Isa. 35.5-6 seems to be the closest text with different wording, that is, ἀνοιχθήσονται ὀφθαλμοὶ τυφλῶν (the eyes of the blind will be opened), ὦτα κωφῶν ἀκούσονται (the ears of the deaf will hear), ἀλεῖται ὡς ἔλαφος ὁ χωλός (the lame will leap like a deer) and τρανὴ ἔσται γλῶσσα μογιλάλων (the tongue of the mute will speak). The LXX of Isa. 61.1 also attests to εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς (to bring the Gospel to the poor) and τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν (the recovery of sight to the blind), and to that in Isa. 26.19, which mentions the raising of the dead.[25] Strictly speaking, this example represents an Old Testament paraphrase as well as suggests the idea that Matthew and Luke shared common scriptural traditions. Moreover, a complex juxtaposed quotation from the texts of Exod. 23.20 and Mal. 3.1 is shared by Matthew and Luke in Mt. 11.10 and Lk. 7.27, in which they agree with each other by adding the phrase ἔμπροσθέν σου (before you) instead of the πρὸ προσώπου μου (before my presence) in Mal. 3.1.[26] Also, in his exposition of parables, according to Matthew, Jesus indicates the purpose of speaking in parables in Mt. 13.13: βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσιν (seeing they do not see) and ἀκούοντες οὐκ ἀκούουσιν οὐδὲ συνίουσιν (hearing they do not hear or understand). Then, using a

25. It is noticeable that some scholars are careless in their examination of the Old Testament *Vorlagen* of this text. For example, Helmer Ringgren argues, '*Luke 7.22 contains brief quotations from, or allusions to, Isa. 61.1 and/or 29.15; 26.19*', and fails even to mention Isa. 35.5-6. Helmer Ringgren, 'Luke's Use of the Old Testament', *HTR* 79 (1986), pp. 227-35 (227) (italics by Ringgren). Also, Pao and Schnabel seem to err by referring to the text of Isa. 35.3-4 rather than that of Isa. 35:5-6. Pao and Schnabel, 'Luke', p. 299. Concerning the lepers being healed, some contend that it is an allusion to the story of Elijah and Elisha (1 Kgs 17.17-24; 2 Kgs 5). See I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1978), p. 292; F. Neirynck, 'Q 6,20b-21; 7,22 and Isaiah 61', in C.M. Tuckett (ed.), *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997), pp. 27-64 (50).

26. Matthew also follows the LXX and includes a subject ἐγώ, 'I' (Mt. 11.10), which conforms to both texts of Exod. 23.20 and Mal. 3.1.

formulaic quotation, Matthew quotes the full text of Isa. 6.9-10 with some variations, declaring the fulfillment of Scripture, ἀναπληροῦται αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία Ἡσαΐου (the prophecy of Isaiah is fulfilled in them), in Mt. 13.14.[27] Although this formula is omitted, Luke likewise quotes from Isa. 6.9, manifesting the purpose of Jesus' parables in Lk. 8.10: βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν (seeing they may not see) and ἀκούοντες μὴ συνιῶσιν (hearing they may not understand). Matthew and Luke again correspond to each other with minor differences.

In spite of the fact that only selective Old Testament quotations have been examined, this analysis provides a sufficient ground to suggest a particular textual relationship between Matthew's and Luke's use of the Old Testament. It appears that, on the basis of the corresponding words and phrases of their Old Testament quotations and paraphrases, Matthew and Luke have either seen each other's Gospel or worked with the same scriptural traditions. Whether Luke has drawn these quotations from Matthew or vice versa, or they have worked independently from common scriptural traditions, cannot be known. Nonetheless, this comparative analysis shows a close textual affinity between them, such that it is safe to contend that they had access to each other's *Vorlage* when they used the Old Testament. However, contrary to these findings, the following analyses will show that the infancy stories of both evangelists display extremely distinct uses of the Old Testament.

Matthew's Use of the Old Testament in his Infancy Narrative

Matthew's infancy narrative contains five formulaic quotations, also known as the 'fulfillment quotations',[28] functioning as interpretive

---

27. It is notable that Matthew uses the verb ἀναπληρόω instead of πληρόω. Robert H. Gundry asserts that the former 'is common in the LXX (thirteen times) and elsewhere in Greek literature (Eur., Luc., Plat., Demos., Josephus, papyri) … We cannot assume, therefore, that … [it] was foreign to Mt's vocabulary.' Robert H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel: With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope* (Leiden: Brill, 1967), pp. 116-17.

28. The term 'Reflexionszitate' was first used by H.J. Holtzmann, the designation 'Formula Quotations' was proposed by S. Johnson, and the term 'Fulfillment Quotations' (Erfüllungszitate) was suggested by W. Rothfuchs. Also, for the formulaic quotations as a unique literary invention, see G.D. Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel according to St Matthew* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946), p. 57.

comments on the events that take place.[29] In terms of their *Vorlage*, the non-Septuagintal character of the formulaic quotations is noted by many scholars. Stendahl notes that Matthew was influenced neither by the Greek nor by the Aramaic texts, but was going through a 'targumizing procedure which demands much of the knowledge and outlook of the scribes'.[30] Matthew used this approach in order to adapt the Old Testament texts to their fulfillment in Jesus. This 'citation technique', which bears close resemblance to the exegetical practice of the Qumran community, was a 'result of the school-activity in the church of Matthew'.[31] In response to Stendahl's hypothesis, Robert Gundry asserts that the Matthean quotations and allusions display a 'mixed textual tradition'.[32] The basis of this mixed text-form, representing an association with Greek, Aramaic and Hebrew textual traditions, was Matthew's note taken of the cultural milieu of first-century Palestine, where these three languages were commonly used.[33] Although his assertion seems a bit of an overstatement,[34] Gundry notes,

29. George M. Soares Prabhu asserts that the formulaic quotations have an 'extra-narrative commentary function'. George M. Soares Prabhu, *The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew: An Enquiry into the Tradition History of Mt 1–2* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976), p. 42. David E. Garland also notes that the formulaic quotations 'freeze the action and explain its significance'. David E. Garland, *Reading Matthew: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the First Gospel* (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2001), pp. 28-29.

30. Stendahl, *School of St Matthew*, p. 127. See also his influential work on the geographical notion of the Matthean infancy narrative, Krister Stendahl, 'Quis et Unde: An Analysis of Matthew 1–2', in G.N. Stanton (ed.), *The Interpretation of Matthew* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), pp. 56-66.

31. Stendahl, *School of St Matthew*, pp. 126, 204. While the stylistic features of the Matthean formulaic quotations, for example, the commentary functions, do appear to be similar to the *pesher* interpretation of the Qumran sect, they differ in that, while the latter provides explicit commentaries on the Old Testament, the former does not offer a commentary on the Old Testament. Rather, it is 'commented upon by the Old Testament' with independent stories or discourses of the events of Jesus Christ such as the infancy narrative. See Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, p. 15.

32. Gundry, *Use of the Old Testament*, pp. 147-50.

33. Gundry, *Use of the Old Testament*, pp. 172-85.

34. While providing valuable analyses of textual characters of the Matthean quotations, Gundry's demonstration of the mixed textual tradition sometimes seems arbitrary, and including allusions in his research intensifies the level of vagueness

along with Stendahl, that Matthew was a 'targumist', a free translator of the Old Testament.[35] George Soares Prabhu, moreover, suggests that the source of Matthew's quotations is the proto-Masoretic Hebrew text, freely translated and 'targumized' into Greek by Matthew himself with some influence of the Septuagint in his choice of words.[36]

In contrast to these proposals, Maarten Menken asserts that the non-Septuagintal character of the Matthean formulaic quotations did not come from the Hebrew text or from a 'collection of testimonies or something similar', but from the revised Septuagint from which he made use of the quotations with his editorial contributions.[37] Menken finds no trace of Matthew's own translation in his quotations, and rather argues that Matthew used a pre-Matthean Greek translation of the Old Testament, which manuscript evidence is not known to us.[38] Although Menken rightly presupposes the ancient practice of repeated revisions of the Old Greek text by the Jews in antiquity,[39] his analysis of various quotations is inconclusive and relies heavily on some mysterious Greek textual tradition that we do not have. In fact, the revision process of the Old Greek text is quite complicated, and it is almost impossible to locate a 'standard rendering or revision' of the Hebrew or Greek text, on which Menken frequently establishes his theory.[40] It seems reasonable, therefore, to attribute the non-Septuagintal character of the

in determining the source text of the Old Testament. Prabhu also notes that Gundry is 'perhaps over-stating the case'. Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, p. 39 n. 215.

35. Gundry, *Use of the Old Testament*, p. 172.

36. Soares Prabhu, *The Formula Quotations*, pp. 104-106, 192-293. He argues that Matthew was a Targumist, 'who knew well how to choose between the SEPTUAGINT and the Hebrew text for the version which best suited his argument'. Soares Prabhu, *The Formula Quotations*, p. 73.

37. Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, pp. 203-204, 279.

38. Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, pp. 279-80.

39. See Kristin De Troyer, 'The Septuagint', in Joachim Schaper *et al.* (eds.), *The New Cambridge History of the Bible. Volume 1: From the Beginning to 600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp. 267-88 (267).

40. De Troyer asserts, 'Whereas older generations of New Testament scholars tended to conceive of "the Septuagint" in a very general sense, more recent scholars distinguish between different stages in the development of the Old Greek text towards the "Septuagint" and different uses by different authors'. De Troyer, 'The Septuagint', p. 269. Also, Menken repeatedly uses the phrase 'standard translations or renderings', which he does not define. Among many, see Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, pp. 23-28, 81-82, 112-14, 148-49.

formulaic quotations to Matthew's own peculiarity, until we discover such revised texts of the LXX as Menken has proposed.

Furthermore, most formulaic quotations in the Matthean infancy narrative do show some textual affinities with the Hebrew Scriptures. In the juxtaposed quotation of Mic. 5.2 with 2 Sam. 5.2 in Mt. 2.6, Matthew translates the Hebrew text, that is, the proto-Masoretic Text (proto-MT), and uses the phrase ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα (among the *rulers* of Judah) in the place of בְּאַלְפֵי יְהוּדָה (among the *tribes* of Judah), whereas the LXX chooses another rendering of the Hebrew word אֶלֶף and translates it as ἐν χιλιάσιν Ἰουδα (among the *thousands* of Judah) (Mic. 5.1 LXX).[41] Concerning the quotation from Hos. 11.1 in Mt. 2.15, Matthew also translates from the MT without any notable variation. The unmistakable differences between Matthew and the LXX are: (1) the use of the verbs, μετακαλέω (to summon) and καλέω (to call); (2) the objects of the verbs, τὰ τέκνα (the children) and τὸν υἱόν (the son); and (3) the modifiers of the objects, αὐτοῦ (his) and μου (my). In the case of the quotation from Jer. 31.15 in Mt. 2.18, Matthew has a similar choice of words with the LXX, and yet he is following the proto-MT rather than the LXX, because he translates לְהִנָּחֵם (to be comforted) as παρακληθῆναι, whereas the LXX omits it.[42] Accordingly, except for the first formulaic quotation of Isa. 7.14 in Mt. 1.23, which closely follows the LXX with a minor variation of the verb καλέω (to call) in different person, and the last quotation of Mt. 2.23 without any extant Hebrew or Greek *Vorlage*, the formulaic quotations in the Matthean infancy story

41. W.D. Davies and D.C. Allison also contend that the 'MT has *'alpê* ("thousands", "clans"; cf. LXX, χιλιάσιν); but the Hebrew consonants could be pointed to give *'allûpê* = "princes". This explains Matthew's reading. He is working with the Hebrew.' W.D. Davies and D.C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (3 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988–1997), I, p. 243. Also, the so-called 'Kaige text', that is, a preserved recension of the Old Greek text in Codex Vaticanus, attests to the word χιλιάσιν in Mic. 5.1. See Emanuel Tov, Robert A. Kraft and P.J. Parsons (eds.), *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever: 8ḤevXIIgr* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), p. 41.

42. Soares Prabhu notes that this 'suggests that we have here a targumic translation from the Hebrew, with perhaps some reminiscence of the LXX'. Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, p. 253.

follow the Hebrew text.[43] It seems, therefore, fair to say that Matthew had access to both the proto-MT and LXX and made his own translations *ad hoc* from those scriptural texts. It also seems that, for his infancy narrative, Matthew translated the Hebrew text into Greek with some influence of the LXX in his choice of words. Although the term 'targumizing', that is, Matthew's free eclectic translation technique, is a poor one, the scholars mentioned above were certainly right in their assessment that Matthew was indeed a translator of scriptural texts.[44]

Another unique feature of Matthew's use of the Old Testament is his use of formulaic quotations in keeping with the overall tone and atmosphere of his infancy narrative. It is notable how Matthew's infant Jesus is persecuted and threatened by the people attempting to take his life from the start. John Meier even states that 'the [Matthean] infancy narrative becomes a proleptic passion narrative',[45] and it not only answers the question, 'who is Jesus and where is he coming from?' but it also gives an explanation of the inquiry, 'where is he going?'[46] The persecution starts from the moment Herod found out about the existence of the newborn king by the magi from the East. In the narrative plot of Matthew 2, Herod attempts to kill the infant Jesus, while the angel of the Lord attempts to save the child through guiding the Magi and Joseph in their dreams (vv. 12-13, 19-20). When Herod sees his evil plan thwarted, the most tragic event happens, and Matthew

43. Beaton also affirms, 'Perhaps the most conspicuous element of the formula quotations is their distinctive Hebraic text-form, and it is this "Hebrew character" that first set the quotations apart as a group'. Beaton, *Isaiah's Christ*, p. 22.

44. Along with the scholars mentioned above, see also Gerhard Barth, 'Matthew's Understanding of the Law', in G. Bornkamm *et al.*, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew* (London: SCM Press, 1963), pp. 58-164 (125-28); Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II, pp. 323-24; Garland, *Reading Matthew*, pp. 138-39; D.A. Hagner, *Matthew 1–13* (Dallas: Word Books, 1993), pp. 337-39; R.S. McConnell, *Law and Prophecy in Matthew's Gospel: The Authority and Use of the Old Testament in the Gospel of St Matthew* (Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt, 1969), p. 134; W. Rothfuchs, *Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangeliums* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1969), p. 89. Some, however, are not convinced by this view. See Beaton, *Isaiah's Christ*, p. 29. Also, some adhere to more diverse textual traditions whose position, however, does not change the possibility of Matthew's rendering of the Old Testament. See Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), pp. 114-16.

45. John P. Meier, *The Vision of Matthew: Christ, Church, and Morality in the First Gospel* (repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2004), p. 53.

46. Meier, *Vision of Matthew*, pp. 52-57.

as a narrator quotes Jer. 31.15 in Mt. 2.18 to interpret this event of the massacre of the Hebrew male infants.[47] Matthew appeals to Jeremiah's visionary image of Rachel's mourning for her descendants at the prospect of exile, which could also represent the wailing Israelite women, whose sons were about to be deported to Babylon, and relates it to the bitter weeping of the Jewish mothers in and near Bethlehem for the loss of their children. Furthermore, this event alludes to the person of Moses in the Old Testament.[48] The massacre of the Hebrew male infants and the miraculous deliverance of the baby Jesus invoke the birth narrative of Moses in the book of Exodus.[49]

If we accept Watson's proposal to extend our research of the canonization process to the second century CE and beyond,[50] there are even more allusions of this sort that we can find among the extra-canonical voices in the first two centuries. For example, the angel's appearance before Joseph after Mary's pregnancy, prophesying the future redemption through the son, may allude to the story of Moses recounted in Josephus's *Antiquities*. Josephus records that God spoke of the future liberation of his people through the son of Amram, the noble father of Moses, when he was praying in fear of his wife's pregnancy at

---

47. For works on this quotation, see Walter Brueggemann, 'Texts that Linger, Words that Explode', *TTod* 54 (1997), pp. 180-99; Michael Knowles, *Jeremiah in Matthew's Gospel: The Rejected Prophet Motif in Matthaean Redaction* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993); Frederick A. Niedner, 'Rachel's Lament', *Word & World* 22 (2002), pp. 406-14.

48. For allusion to Moses, see Dale C. Allison, *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), pp. 140-65; Raymond E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke* (New York: Doubleday, 1993), pp. 110-19; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, I, pp. 11-36; Michael Goldberg, *Jews and Christians, Getting our Stories Straight: The Exodus and the Passion-Resurrection* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1991), pp. 144-49; Harrington, *Matthew*, pp. 46-50; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1–7: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), pp. 76, 104; John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), p. 37. For a more extended list, see Roger D. Aus, *Matthew 1–2 and the Virginal Conception: In Light of Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaic Traditions on the Birth of Israel's First Redeemer, Moses* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2004), p. 1 n. 1.

49. See Exod. 1.6–2.10 and Mt. 2.13-18.

50. Watson maintains, 'A canonical perspective on early Christian gospels would begin by discarding the end-of-first-century terminus, a concept that systematically distorts the object of enquiry'. Watson, *Gospel Writing*, p. 6.

the time Pharaoh decreed death for all Hebrew male infants.[51] Josephus also reports that Pharaoh's decision regarding the massacre was motivated by the Egyptian scribes' prediction of Israel's future savior.[52] Also, the *Jerusalem Targum* on Exod. 1.15 attests that it was Jannes and Jambres who foretold the birth of Moses to Pharaoh.[53] As examined above, it seems obvious that Matthew translated his unique formulaic quotations mainly from the Semitic tradition and creatively used them to interpret the events of the infancy narrative of Jesus. A possible allusion to the story of persecuted Moses can be detected along with the gloomy atmosphere in the overall tone of the narrative plot.[54] It was Matthew's own designing scheme to reveal the divine redemption of the infant Jesus against the backdrop of the evil plan of Herod.

Luke's Use of the Old Testament in his Infancy Narrative

Contrary to the infancy narrative of Matthew, Luke's infancy account is structured around the birth narratives of both John the Baptist and Jesus with three hymns traditionally known as the 'Magnificat' spoken by Mary, the 'Benedictus' by Zechariah and the 'Nunc Dimittis' by Simeon.[55] Luke does not make use of the formulaic quotation in his infancy story, except for the one regarding Moses' law about the purification of the firstborn male (Lk. 2.23-24), and yet these three canticles show heavy saturation with the Old Testament in the forms of direct quotations, paraphrases and allusions. In terms of the *Vorlage* of these hymns, Stephen Farris examines the evidence of Semitisms and contends that the hymns were first written in Hebrew and then

51. Josephus, *Ant*. 2.210-216.

52. Josephus, *Ant*. 2.205-209.

53. For all other extra-canonical traditions of Moses on Mt. 1–2, see Allison, *New Moses*, pp. 144-65; Luz, *Matthew*, p. 104.

54. Saying that the overall mood of the Matthean infancy narrative is gloomy does not mean that there is not a single moment of joy throughout the narrative. There certainly exist some moments of celebration, such as the magi's visit to the infant Jesus in Bethlehem (Mt. 2.9-12), although the prevailing tone of the narrative is definitely somber.

55. For the importance of these hymns in the Lukan infancy narrative, see Daniel Gerber, 'D'une identité à l'autre: Le *Magnificat*, le *Benedictus*, le *Gloria* et le *Nunc dimittis* dans le rôle de passeurs', in Claire Clivaz *et al.* (eds.), *Infancy Gospels: Stories and Identities* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), pp. 374-89.

translated into Greek by the early Jewish-Christian community.[56] While providing valuable insights into the possible Semitic sources, however, Farris's suggestion is unconvincing. First, he employs the methodology of Raymond Martin's seventeen criteria, but his method of discerning the process of free translation techniques of the LXX is questionable.[57] Secondly, concerning the tense-form shift in the Magnificat, Farris asserts, 'It may be an ingressive aorist or reflect the Hebrew imperfect + waw consecutive'.[58] However, Porter contends, 'It has long been known that tense alternation is not only a phenomenon of Hebrew poetry but of Greek as well (e.g. E. Med. 272, 707, 791), including [H]ellenistic poetry'.[59] Thirdly, Farris's grammatical analysis is also problematic in that he describes the aorist verbs in Mary's praise of God as 'eschatological' (Lk. 1.51-53). He claims, 'In fact, so decisive is the event that one can speak as if the age to come had already arrived, in the aorist'.[60] This exegetical fallacy is again noted by Porter who notes that 'it is highly unlikely pragmatically that a writer would use a single [a]orist with all of these implicatures'.[61]

Counter to Farris's argument, the source behind the text of the Lukan canticles also displays strong affinities with the LXX. In the Magnificat, for example, there appears the evidence of Septuagintalisms. In Lk. 1.48, first of all, Mary praises God, saying, ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δούλης αὐτοῦ (he has looked at the humble state of his servant). This is a direct quotation with four words corresponding with the LXX version of 1 Sam. 1.11 (1 Kgdms 1.11): ἐπιβλέπων ἐπιβλέψῃς ἐπὶ τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δούλης σου (you will indeed look at the humble state of your servant). However, while the LXX shows a clear dependence on the MT, literally translating the emphatic use of the infinitive absolute in Hebrew, רָאֹה תִרְאֶה (you will indeed look at) as ἐπιβλέπων ἐπιβλέψῃς (you will indeed look at), meaning 'surely or

---

56. Stephen Farris, *The Hymns of Luke's Infancy Narratives: Their Origin, Meaning and Significance* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985), p. 62.

57. Farris, *Hymns*, pp. 50-66. See also Raymond A. Martin, *Syntactical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek Documents* (Cambridge, MA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1974).

58. Farris, *Hymns*, pp. 117.

59. Stanley E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament: With Reference to Tense and Mood* (SBG, 1; New York: Peter Lang, 1989), pp. 131-32.

60. Farris, *Hymns*, pp. 115-16.

61. Porter also asserts, 'Farris rather attempts to use the Aorist to bolster his theological conceptions'. Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, p. 132.

indeed',[62] Luke does not follow this pattern and uses the verb ἐπέβλεψεν once. This reveals the fact that either Luke consciously rejected the Hebraic use of the verb, or he was working solely with the LXX. Also, the latter part of Lk. 1.48 also displays a form of Old Testament paraphrase, μακαριοῦσίν με πᾶσαι αἱ γενεαί (all generations will call me blessed), with two corresponding words and one word of similar connotation from Leah's words after giving birth to Asher in the LXX version of Gen. 30.13, μακαρίζουσίν με αἱ γυναῖκες (the women call me blessed). Another paraphrase can be found in Lk. 1.50, in which Mary says, καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ εἰς γενεὰς καὶ γενεὰς τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτόν (and his mercy is for those who fear him from generation to generation). In this sentence, Luke paraphrases the text of Ps. 103.17 (Ps. 102.17 LXX), τὸ δὲ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐπὶ τοὺς φοβουμένους αὐτόν (and the mercy of the Lord is on those who fear him from everlasting to everlasting). The Greek noun ἔλεος and the participial form of φοβέω, as well as the phrases εἰς γενεὰς καὶ γενεὰς and ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος, which belong to the same semantic domain, establish an Old Testament paraphrase. In their analyses of semantic domains,[63] J.P. Louw and E.A. Nida suggest four definitions of the Greek word γενεά.[64] Among them is 'age', which represents 'an indefinite period of time, but in close relationship to human existence and in some contexts, a period of time about the length of a generation—"age, epoch"', and which fits the context of Lk. 1.50.[65] This definition lies within the semantic domain of 'time' and the subdomain of 'indefinite units of time', which also includes the definition of the Greek word αἰών as in Ps. 103.17, 'a unit of time as a particular stage or period of history—"age, era"'.[66] Furthermore, Lk. 1.53, πεινῶντας ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶν (he has filled the hungry with good

---

62. For an explanation of the infinitive absolute, see Ronald J. Williams, *Williams' Hebrew Syntax* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), p. 85.

63. Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida (eds.), *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains* (2 vols.; New York: United Bible Societies, 1989).

64. They are: 'a same generation; b people of same kind; c descendants; d age'. Louw and Nida, *Lexicon*, II, p. 50.

65. Louw and Nida, *Lexicon*, I, p. 648.

66. Louw and Nida, *Lexicon*, I, p. 648. Although different in form, Louw and Nida also categorize αἰών with εἰς in front, for example, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας (Lk. 1.33), as 'unlimited duration of time, with particular focus upon the future—"always, forever, forever and ever, eternally"'. Louw and Nida, *Lexicon*, I, p. 641.

things), marks another direct quotation with three equivalent words from the text of Ps. 107.9 (Ps. 106.9 LXX), ψυχὴν πεινῶσαν ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶν (he fills the hungry soul with good things), and Lk. 1.54, ἀντελάβετο Ἰσραὴλ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ, μνησθῆναι ἐλέους (he has helped his servant Israel in remembrance of his mercy), is a paraphrase from the text of Ps. 98.3 (Ps. 97.3 LXX), ἐμνήσθη τοῦ ἐλέους αὐτοῦ τῷ Ιακωβ καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας αὐτοῦ τῷ οἴκῳ Ισραηλ (he has remembered his mercy to Jacob and his truth to the house of Israel). Joseph Fitzmyer discovers eleven words and phrases that show conspicuous dependence on the LXX in the Magnificat alone.[67] Porter also contends that the grammatical features in the Magnificat represent Luke's stylistic imitation of the LXX.[68] François Bovon maintains, 'The language [of the Lukan infancy narrative] imitates that of the Septuagint … Whereas the legends in Matthew are of Semitic origin, here they are Jewish traditions in Greek.'[69] Likewise, Chang-Wook Jung examines the Lukan infancy story and argues that Luke used a 'written Greek source or sources' for his infancy account, and the source or sources were 'composed in imitation of the Septuagint'.[70] It seems obvious, therefore, that Luke's infancy narrative reveals Septuagintalisms in its use of the Old Testament.

Also, contra Matthew, the general tone of Luke's infancy account is joyful and celebratory. The annunciation of the archangel Gabriel attests to the good news, with which many will rejoice and be glad (Lk. 1.14, 19, 26), and Mary's praise of God for his act of salvation and her conversation with Elizabeth (Lk. 1.39-55), the visit of the shepherds and Simeon's hymn are all filled with joyful and celebratory tone (Lk. 2.8-33). In this regard, Joel Green notes, 'The story of Jesus' birth and childhood is a celebration of God's love for Israel and, indeed, for all humanity'.[71] In this overall mood of jubilation,[72] Luke seems to

---

67. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke* (2 vols.; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981), I, pp. 356-57.

68. Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, p. 133.

69. François Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), p. 30.

70. Chang-Wook Jung, *The Original Language of the Lukan Infancy Narrative* (London: T. & T. Clark, 2004), p. 215.

71. Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), p. 47.

72. While the overall tone of the narrative is jubilant, Simeon's prediction of the opponents' hostility against Jesus marks the somber atmosphere (Lk. 2.34-35).

incorporate more than one allusion in his infancy narrative. The allusion to the story of Abraham and his barren wife, Sarah, for example, can be found in the story of John the Baptist's aged parents,[73] Hannah's praise of God for his exaltation of the humble in the song of Mary,[74] the appearance of the angel Gabriel before Daniel in the annunciation to Zechariah and Mary,[75] the prophet Nathan's dynastic oracle in Gabriel's prophecy about Jesus[76] and the language of Malachi concerning Elijah and the great and awesome Day of Yahweh in the prophecy about the infant John the Baptist.[77] For this reason, Luke Timothy Johnson characterizes Luke as a 'Hellenistic author' for his fondness of the literary technique called 'archaizing'.[78] Johnson notes, 'So skillful is he that the reader is plunged into the world of Ruth, the Judges, and Samuel. Imaginatively, then, the reader begins in the biblical world of Temple and Torah, and instinctively feels, "this is part of *our* story".'[79] Johnson also finds in Luke's composition the Hellenistic style of history writing centered on the use of speech as in Thucydides's report on the Peloponnesian War.[80] Building on this idea, Robert Simons also proposes that the prominence of LXX words and themes in the Magnificat is an example of the rhetorical practice of 'speech in character', employing *imitatio*.[81] In fact, it is notable that most of the Old Testament quotations in the Gospel of Luke are found in the direct speeches of different individuals.[82] Christopher Stanley

73. See Gen. 17.17; 18.11 and Lk. 1.7. Takamitsu Muraoka also finds a close linguistic and thematic affinity between Lk. 1.58 and Gen. 21.6, which establishes an allusion between two aged Israelite women, Elizabeth and Sarah. See Takamitsu Muraoka, 'Luke and the Septuagint', *NovT* 54 (2012), pp. 13-15.

74. See 1 Sam. 2.1-10 and Lk. 1.46-55.

75. See Dan. 8.16; 9.21 and Lk. 1.19, 26. Concerning the ties with the book of Daniel, see L. Rodger, 'The Infancy Stories of Matthew and Luke: An Examination of the Child as a Theological Metaphor', *HBT* 19 (1997), pp. 58-81 (71).

76. See 2 Sam. 7.9-16 and Lk. 1.32-33.

77. See Mal. 2.6; 3.1, 23-24 and Lk. 1.16-17, 76.

78. Johnson argues, 'In apologetic literature, the claim to antiquity is enhanced by language derived from ancient scriptures'. Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991), p. 12.

79. Johnson, *Luke*, pp. 34-35 (italics by Johnson).

80. Johnson, *Luke*, p. 43.

81. Robert Simons, 'The Magnificat: Cento, Psalm or Imitatio?', *TynBul* 60 (2009), pp. 25-46.

82. See Lk. 4.4, 8, 10-12, 18-19; 7.27; 10.27; 18.20; 19.46; 20.17, 28, 37, 42-43; 22.37. Pao and Schnabel assert, 'In contrast to the *Reflexionszitate* in Matthew,

notes that in Greco-Roman culture, 'the most common means of experiencing a "text" was in the form of an oral recitation or performance', such as that of the Homeric epics.[83] An orator would freely render or cite the original text and even add some interpretive comments, because making a deep impression was the primary goal.[84] It is possible that this kind of oral recitation of the artfully composed canticles might have been practiced in Luke's Gentile community.[85]

Conclusion

As examined above, the Matthean and Lukan infancy narratives are markedly different. In their uses of the Old Testament *Vorlagen*, Matthew's formulaic quotations display Semitisms, while Luke's direct quotations and paraphrases in his canticles exhibit Septuagintalisms. Also, their uses of the Old Testament with respect to the overall tone and characteristics of their infancy narratives differ. While Matthew creates a gloomy atmosphere by alluding to the persecuted Moses and to Rachel's mourning, Luke evokes a celebratory and joyful mood by alluding to the praises of Hannah and the Psalmists and the delighted words of Leah and Sarah. In terms of stylistic features, it is notable that the Matthean formulaic quotations usually function as a narration to clarify the significance of the narratival events, while the Lukan Old Testament quotations and paraphrases are frequently placed in the speeches of the characters to contribute to the narratival developments. Besides these differences, Watson also notes several others, such as the annunciations pronounced to Joseph in Matthew and to Mary in Luke, Bethlehem as an actual home or ancestral home and the visit of the

in Luke's Gospel all except the first three quotations … are found in the narration of direct speech—that of Jesus … of the devil … of a scribe … and of the Sadducees'. Pao and Schnabel, 'Luke', p. 251 (italics by Pao and Schnabel).

83. Christopher D. Stanley, 'The Social Environment of "Free" Biblical Quotations in the New Testament', in Evans and Sanders (eds.), *Early Christian Interpretation*, pp. 18-27 (21).

84. Stanley, 'Social Environment', p. 21.

85. For other Hellenistic backgrounds, Joseph B. Tyson also maintains that the Lukan birth story together with Lk. 1.1-4 functions in a way similar to the prologue of Greek dramas, such as the plays of Euripides, by generating expectations about characters and arranging the phenomenon of parallelism with later scenes in the narrative. Joseph B. Tyson, 'The Birth Narratives and the Beginning of Luke's Gospel', *Semeia* 52 (1990), pp. 101-18 (116).

Magi from the East in Matthew and shepherds nearby in Luke.[86]
Raymond Brown also recognizes these differences.[87]

Based on these disparate or even somewhat contrary details in both
evangelists' infancy accounts, the reader would assume the same
pattern in their Old Testament usages throughout the rest of the
Gospels. As examined earlier, however, this is not the case. The
analysis of the Old Testament quotations that Matthew and Luke share
reveals that they in fact hold a very close textual affinity with each
other. On the basis of the standard account of the Synoptic Problem—
the Two-Source Hypothesis—they are derived either from the Q source
or from the Gospel of Mark. But, based on Watson's 'L/M theory',
Luke drew those Old Testament quotations from Matthew. If that is
true, we have to question why Luke wrote an infancy narrative that
seems so discrepant and contradictory to that of Matthew despite his
knowledge of the Matthean Old Testament quotations and allusions.
Watson suggests that Luke wanted to build something creative on his
own and asserts, 'Luke's text makes excellent sense as a creative
response to Matthew's'.[88] Yet, it does not make sense that an
evangelist, focused on recording a historiography, would write such a
different and contradictory infancy narrative.

Furthermore, Watson claims that 'the two evangelists' dependence
on a common annunciation tradition is unlikely, given the lack of
evidence for a pre-Matthean infancy narrative'.[89] However, it does not
seem difficult to find pre-Matthean infancy traditions. Along with the
ancient sources examined above, there are even more evidences of
infancy stories, such as the apocalyptic infancy narrative in Rev. 12.5-6,
and those of apocryphal writings, such as the *Protoevangelium of
James* and the Infancy Gospel of Thomas.[90] It is clear that Watson's

---

86. Watson, *Gospel Writing*, p. 132.
87. Brown, *Birth of the Messiah*, pp. 35-37.
88. Watson, *Gospel Writing*, p. 135.
89. Watson, *Gospel Writing*, p. 135.
90. For discussion on the oldest traditions of the birth narrative of Jesus before
the end of the first century, see Enrico Norelli, 'Les plus anciennes traditions sur la
naissance de Jésus et leur rapport avec les testimonia', in Claire Clivaz *et al.* (eds.),
Infancy Gospels, pp. 47-66. Also, for more discussions on the apocryphal infancy
Gospels, see the ten articles in the same volume (pp. 401-640); and Oscar
Cullmann, 'Infancy Gospels', in Wilhelm Schneemelcher and R. McL. Wilson
(eds.), *New Testament Apocrypha* (2 vols.; London: Lutterworth Press, 1991), I, pp.
414-69.

proposal of the Synoptic Problem based on his analysis of both the evangelists' infancy stories goes against his overall scheme of the canonization process, called 'a canonical perspective'.[91] It seems more reasonable, instead, to conclude that the Matthean and Lukan infancy narratives were composed independently, and thus the contention of Watson that the Gospel of Matthew was the only known source for Luke's composition of his infancy account does not stand on a solid foundation. Moreover, this study shows that analysis of the use of the Old Testament in the Synoptic Gospels is an effective tool for examining and testing the reliability of proposed hypotheses of the Synoptic Problem.

91. Watson, *Gospel Writing*, p. 6.