

**RE-READING THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW:
SCRIPTURE IN THE HANDS OF THE KING'S SCRIBE**

A Thesis Submitted to the University of Manchester
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Faculty of Humanities

2016

KYUNG BAEK

SCHOOL OF ARTS, LANGUAGES AND CULTURES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES AND APPENDIX	6
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	7
ABSTRACT	8
DECLARATION AND COPYRIGHT STATEMENT	9
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	10
CHAPTER 1: MATTHEW’S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT	
I. Introduction	11
II. History of Research.....	12
1. Period I: 1913–1946	13
2. Period II: 1947–1975	16
3. Period III: 1976–1992	23
4. Period IV: 1993–2015	28
5. Conclusion.....	33
III. The Issues and the Thesis	33
1. Significance of the Problem	33
2. Thesis and Overview	36
IV. Conclusion	37
CHAPTER 2: JESUS THE ROYAL MESSIAH AND MATTHEW HIS SCRIBE	
I. Introduction	39
II. Jesus: Royal Messiah and King of the Jews.....	40
1. Jesus the Royal Messiah.....	40
2. Nature of Kingship in Late Second Temple Judaism.....	44
III. Matthew: Jesus’ Scribe	51
1. Matthew the Scribe.....	51
2. Scribes in Late Second Temple Judaism.....	54
3. Nicolaus of Damascus and Flavius Josephus	60
4. Matthew’s Scribal Activity	64
IV. Conclusion	65
CHAPTER 3: MATTHEW REWRITES MARK	
I. Introduction	67
II. Matthew’s Use of Scripture: Rewriting Narrative	67
1. Rewriting Narrative	67
2. Examples and Features of Rewriting Narrative	72
III. Matthew Rewrites Mark	75
1. Rewriting Mark.....	75
2. Rewriting Mark in a Torah Pattern: Narrative-Discourse Structure.....	80
3. Rewriting Mark: Genesis Beginning and Deuteronomy Ending	83
IV. Matthew’s Purpose: Conferring Authority	84
1. Matthew as a Jewish-Christian Authoritative Composition	84

2. Conferring Mosaic Authority to Jesus	85
V. Conclusion	85

CHAPTER 4: MATTHEW REWRITES TORAH

I. Introduction	86
II. Matthew, Torah and the Last Days	87
1. Torah in the Last Days	87
2. Mosaic Discourse	88
III. Matthew's Use of Scripture: Rewriting Torah	90
1. Rewriting Torah	90
2. Rewriting Torah with Wisdom	92
3. Rewriting Torah in the Last Days	93
IV. Jesus' Torah Discourse (5:1–7:29)	95
1. Literary Structure	95
2. The Beatitudes	97
3. Rewriting the Decalogue and the Holiness Code	98
4. Rewriting the Torah with Wisdom	101
V. Jesus' Prophetic Eschatological Discourse (23:1–26:1)	102
1. Literary Structure	102
2. Seat of Moses	103
3. Prophetic Woes: Curses	104
4. Rewriting Torah in the Last Days	105
VI. Matthew's Purpose: Authorizing the Words of the King	106
1. The Torah of the King	106
2. The Coming of the Kingdom of Heaven	108
VII. Conclusion	109

CHAPTER 5: MATTHEW APPLIES TORAH

I. Introduction	110
II. Matthew's Covenant Community	111
1. Twelve Disciples and Ἐκκλησία	111
2. Torah and Righteousness	112
III. Matthew's Use of Scripture: Applying Torah	114
1. Introduction	114
2. Covenant Community and the Rule Texts	114
3. Covenant Renewal	117
IV. Jesus' Mission Discourse (10:1–11:1)	118
1. Missions and the Rule of War	118
2. Jesus' Rule of War	119
3. Jesus' Mission Discourse	124
4. Jesus' Mission Strategy: Two Campaigns	125
V. Jesus' Covenant Community Discourse (18:1–19:1)	126
1. Matthew's Covenant Community	126
2. Hierarchical Organization	127

3. Reproof and Community Discipline	127
4. Heart of the Covenant Community: Forgiveness.....	129
VI. Matthew's Purpose: Rules of the Kingdom of Heaven	130
1. Introduction.....	130
2. Expanding the Kingdom of Heaven.....	131
3. Community Rules of the Kingdom of Heaven	131
VII. Conclusion.....	132

CHAPTER 6: MATTHEW'S USE OF JESUS' PARABLES

I. Introduction	134
II. Wisdom and Parables in Matthew.....	135
1. Introduction.....	135
2. Jesus the Teacher and His Disciples	135
3. Jesus and Wisdom.....	137
4. Jesus and Parables.....	138
5. Conclusion	141
III. Matthew's Use of Scripture:	
Wisdom and the Mystery of the Kingdom of Heaven	141
1. Wisdom and Parables.....	141
2. Solomonic Traditions.....	143
3. Anthological and Allegorical Interpretation	147
4. Conclusion	149
IV. Jesus' Parable Discourse (13:1–58).....	150
1. Introduction.....	150
2. Literary Structure	150
V. Matthew's Purpose:	
Revealing and Hiding the Mystery of the Kingdom of Heaven	152
1. Introduction.....	152
2. Purpose of Parables and Use of Scripture.....	152
3. Conclusion	156
VI. Conclusion	157

CHAPTER 7: MATTHEW'S USE OF FULFILMENT QUOTATIONS

I. Introduction	158
II. Matthew and Divination.....	158
1. Overview	158
2. Signs and Omens.....	160
3. Dream-Visions	162
4. Fulfilment of Prophecy	165
5. Conclusion	165
III. Matthew's Use of Scripture: Divination and Prophecy	166
1. Introduction.....	166
2. Divination to Written Prophecy	168
3. Prophetic Scribes	170

IV. Matthew's Fulfilment Quotations.....	173
1. Introduction.....	173
2. Explicit Quotations	173
3. Matthew's Fulfilment Quotations.....	175
V. Matthew's Purpose: Jesus as Prophetic Fulfilment.....	181
VI. Conclusion	183
CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSION	
I. Matthew's Use of Scripture.....	184
II. Restatement and Resolution of the Problem	186
1. Summary	186
2. Further Research.....	187
BIBLIOGRAPHY	188
APPENDIX 1: MATTHEW AND MARK.....	213

Word Count: 78,348

LIST OF FIGURES AND APPENDIX

FIGURE 1: Matthew's Narrative-Discourse Structure	81
FIGURE 2: Literary Structure of Jesus' Torah Discourse	96
FIGURE 3: Literary Structure of Jesus' Prophetic Eschatological Discourse.....	103
FIGURE 4: Literary Structure of Jesus' Mission Discourse.....	119
FIGURE 5: Literary Structure of Jesus' Covenant Community Discourse	127
FIGURE 6: Literary Structure of Jesus' Parable Discourse	151
FIGURE 7: Categories of Matthew's Explicit Quotations	174
APPENDIX 1: Matthew and Mark	213

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations of ancient texts, journals, reference works, series, and other secondary sources generally conform to those in *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies*, edited by Patrick H. Alexander et al. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1999).

Unless otherwise stated:

- all biblical quotations in English are from *The Holy Bible New Revised Standard Version*. 1989, 1995, 2007 © Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America;
- all Hebrew Bible quotations are from *Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1990;
- all Greek New Testament quotations are from *Novum Testamentum Graeca*, 28th revised edition, Edited by Barbara Aland and others, © 2012 Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart.

ABSTRACT

Matthew's use of the Old Testament had been primarily read from the perspective of explicit fulfilment quotations with an attempt to discover the text-type of Matthew's "Old Testament." In this dissertation, I have attempted to broaden this view by demonstrating that Matthew understood himself to be a scribe in the service of Jesus the *Royal Messiah*, which put at his disposal the scribal skills and practices necessary to handle and use the Jewish scriptures in multiple ways for composing the Gospel. Therefore, by examining Matthew's narrative structure, Jesus' five discourses, and Matthew's fulfilment quotations, I have tried to determine Matthew's scribal practices, as well as his purposes, for using the Jewish scriptures.

First, in examining the whole Gospel, Matthew seems to use the Jewish scriptures to rewrite Mark in a Torah pattern. In doing this, he *blends* together Jewish and Christian scriptures to contextualize and authorize Mark and itself as scripture; thereby, producing an authoritative work for the Jewish-Christian community. Second, Matthew rewrites the Torah with wisdom and eschatological traditions to produce Jesus' Torah Discourse (5–7) and Jesus' Prophetic-Eschatological Discourse (23–25). Matthew, as Jesus' scribe, rewrites the Mosaic Torah, providing legislation for the kingdom of heaven, which will then be used as a standard for Jesus to judge all the nations in the *Last Days*. Third, Matthew applies Jesus' Torah Discourse into rules for the covenant community to practice and perform as it spreads the message of the kingdom of heaven and exists together as the covenant community. Matthew 10, Jesus' Mission Discourse, functions as Jesus' *rule of war* to proclaim, teach and expand the peace of the kingdom of heaven in non-violent resistance. Matthew 18, Jesus' Covenant Community Discourse, sets forth rules for the covenant community by establishing a hierarchal organization, disciplinary practices, and obligations for being a part of the ἐκκλησία. Fourth, Matt 13, Jesus' Parable Discourse, uses parables like riddles to reveal and to hide. By utilizing wisdom traditions and associating Jesus with Solomon, Matthew reveals the *mystery* of the kingdom of heaven to his disciples, who are "scribes trained for the kingdom of heaven," and hides it from the crowds, who do not "hear" and "understand." Fifth, Matthew uses explicit fulfilment quotations as prophetic fulfilment concerning Jesus' identity, message and work as foretold in the Jewish scriptures. By setting the fulfilment quotations as narrative comments and selecting them all from the Hebrew prophets, these quotations can be seen within the trajectory of prophetic and divinatory practices of late Second Temple scribal culture to discern the divine will by "reading" the prophets as one would read the stars (astrology) or an animal's liver (hepatoscopy).

DECLARATION

No portion of the work referred to in this thesis has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other university or any other institute of learning.

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

(1) The author of this thesis (including any appendices and/or schedules to this thesis) owns certain copyright or related rights in it (the “Copyright”) and s/he has given The University of Manchester certain rights to use such Copyright, including for administrative purposes.

(2) Copies of this thesis, either in full or in extracts and whether in hard or electronic copy, may be made only in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (as amended) and regulations issued under it or, where appropriate, in accordance with licensing agreements which the University has from time to time. This page must form part of any such copies made.

(3) The ownership of certain Copyright, patents, designs, trademarks and other intellectual property (the “Intellectual Property”) and any reproductions of copyright works in the thesis, for example graphs and tables (“Reproductions”), which may be described in this thesis, may not be owned by the author and may be owned by third parties. Such Intellectual Property and Reproductions cannot and must not be made available for use without the prior written permission of the owner(s) of the relevant Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions.

(4) Further information on the conditions under which disclosure, publication and commercialization of this thesis, the Copyright and any Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions described in it may take place is available in the University IP Policy (see <http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=487>), in any relevant Thesis restriction declarations deposited in the University Library, The University Library’s regulations (see <http://www.manchester.ac.uk/library/aboutus/regulations>) and in The University’s policy on Presentation of Theses.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project would not have been possible without the support of many individuals and communities. First, I would like to express my sincerest appreciation to Professor George Brooke, my doctoral supervisor, for his skilful supervision and brilliant instruction, as well as his patience and encouragement. I learned, more than he will realize, from his acumen and scholarship, as well as his kindness and hospitality. In the same vein, I want to thank Professor Todd Klutz, my second supervisor, who brought keen insight and direction to this project. Second, I am grateful for all my friends and colleagues from the University of Manchester, Trinity Western University, Pacific Life Bible College, and Living Hope Fellowship, who graciously supported and encouraged me throughout this process. There are too many people to thank by name with so many helping me in various ways. Finally, I am grateful for my family who share in this accomplishment. To my parents, you are my inspiration. To Madeline, Isaiah and Micah, you are beautiful. And to Linda, you are my love.

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.

CHAPTER ONE

MATTHEW'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

I. INTRODUCTION

A characteristic of the Gospel of Matthew is its explicit and implicit uses of the Jewish scriptures or authoritative traditions, which, in the past, have often been referred to as *Matthew's use of the Old Testament*. For a variety of reasons, this anachronistic reference needs readjusting to account for the discoveries and advances in the field of biblical studies. This dissertation entitled *Re-reading the Gospel of Matthew: Scripture in the Hands of the King's Scribe* attempts to update and understand *Matthew's use of the Old Testament* within the socio-historical context of Second Temple Judaism to explain its distinctive features: Matthew's fivefold structure, Jesus' five discourses, and the fulfilment quotations.¹

In this introductory chapter, I will begin with a survey of the history of research on *Matthew's use of the Old Testament* attempting to identify various issues within it. Next, I will elucidate the significance of these problems and propose this thesis: Matthew, considering himself a scribe within the tradition of court scribes of ancient Israel and Second Temple Judaism, wrote his Gospel to authenticate Jesus' kingship and his message concerning the kingdom of heaven, and in the process exhibited a variety of scribal practices of using the Jewish and Christian scriptures.² Therefore, Matthew fulfils his duties as a scribe with all the expertise, techniques, and available texts. In addition, to clarify aspects of this dissertation, I will try to define the meaning of the *scriptures*. Finally, I will give an overview of the remaining chapters as each displays a different aspect of Matthew's scribal activity and use of the Jewish scriptures: Chapter 2, Matthew portrays

¹ I have chosen to use the designation of Jewish scriptures (γραφῆ) rather than the "Hebrew Bible." The Jewish scriptures can be identified as a sacred collection of literature that is regarded as authoritative and revelatory. They can also be substituted by authoritative traditions, but scriptures imply that they are written.

² See Chapter 2. Matthew's self-understanding should be viewed as an etic rather than an emic approach (with the analogy of scribe and king).

Jesus as the *Royal Messiah* and understands himself to be his scribe; Chapter 3, Matthew rewrites the Gospel of Mark; Chapter 4, Matthew rewrites the Torah; Chapter 5, Matthew applies this rewritten Torah; Chapter 6, Matthew veils and reveals the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven in Jesus' parables; and Chapter 7, Matthew identifies Jesus as the long-awaited messiah foretold by the prophets with the use of fulfilment quotations.

II. HISTORY OF RESEARCH

The early Church Fathers began a long-standing and ongoing fascination with *Matthew's use of the Old Testament*.³ For example: Justin Martyr in the *Dialogue with Trypho* referenced Matthew's Old Testament quotations surrounding Jesus' birth; Origen in his commentary attempted to explain Matt 27:9 and its mistaken reference to Jeremiah rather than Zech 11:13; and Jerome in his letters concluded that Matthew preferred the Hebrew rather than the Greek text in citing Matt 2:15, 23, and 12:17:11.⁴ Modern scholarship has not abated in this interest and has produced a long string of publications. However, as we examine these publications, a number of issues start to arise that need to be addressed.

1. Most publications have only examined the explicit fulfilment or formula quotations, and usually for the sole purpose of determining the text-type of the Old Testament being used. However, implicit allusions and uses of the Jewish scriptures are present.
2. Some publications have a tendency to be ahistorical, focusing on their own Christological interests.
3. Some publications have narrowly located Matthew's socio-historical setting either as being didactic, liturgical or homiletic. This rather flat view of late Second Temple Judaism does not incorporate the complex web of Graeco-Roman and Jewish influences surrounding Matthew.
4. Many publications examine only a section of Matthew without attempting to incorporate the entire Gospel.

To outline the history of research of *Matthew's use of the Old Testament*, I have divided this section into four periods with a number of landmark publications and the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Period I (1913–1946): This period began with Robert H. Charles' *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* in 1913, which made accessible a

³ For this chapter, I will refer to the Hebrew Bible as the Old Testament due to this nomenclature found in many of the publications in this history of research; however, throughout the rest of the dissertation, I will refer to the Old Testament as the Hebrew Bible.

⁴ See Graham Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992), 346–37.

number of significant Second Temple compositions for New Testament studies (e.g. *Jubilees*, *Book of Enoch*, and *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*).⁵

Period II (1947–1975): This period began with the first discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls near khirbet Qumran, and, within this timeframe, included all the caves and their contents, as well as the initial publications of the Scrolls.

Period III (1976–1992): This period included three significant publications for New Testament and Gospel studies: Geza Vermes in 1976 with “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on the Study of the New Testament”;⁶ E.P. Sanders in 1977 with *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*;⁷ and Yigael Yadin in 1977 with *מגלת המקדש* or *The Temple Scroll* (English in 1983).⁸

Period IV (1993–2015): This period began with *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judean Desert*, by Emanuel Tov in collaboration with Stephen J. Pfann, in 1993 after the Israeli authorities released all the unpublished Scrolls in 1991.⁹

These divisions are intentional as they introduce significant publications in the field of biblical studies, especially Second Temple Judaism, to be incorporated into Matthean studies. Therefore, with each stage, a greater understanding of Second Temple Judaism and Christian Origins should have informed the discussions surrounding *Matthew’s use of the Old Testament*, but sadly they did not.

1. Period I: 1913–1946

Period I began with R. H. Charles’ *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, and ended before the first discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Surprisingly, it seems that, apart from the Old Testament and the *Cairo Damascus Document* (CD) relatively, little interaction occurred between New Testament studies and Second Temple literature (including Jewish exegetical and interpretative methods) in the area of *Matthew’s use of the Old Testament*. Within this period, three prominent British scholars (Robert H.

⁵ Robert H. Charles, ed., *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1913).

⁶ Geza Vermes, “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on the Study of the New Testament,” *JSJ* 27 (1976): 107–16.

⁷ E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (London: SCM, 1977).

⁸ Yigael Yadin, ed., *מגלת המקדש* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, 1977); and *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, 1983).

⁹ Emanuel Tov, and Stephen J. Pfann, *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 1993).

Lightfoot, G. D. Kilpatrick, and C. H. Dodd) set the agenda for future research; however, a number of issues arose due to their publications.

Robert H. Lightfoot's *History and Interpretation in the Gospels* (1934) bridged the pre-critical and critical eras of Gospel studies by summarizing the history of Gospel research and incorporating German scholarship (i.e. *Formgeschichte*).¹⁰ Two issues seem to arise from his publication: (1) a sharp division between the Old and New Testament,¹¹ and (2) a separation between the Gospels and their Jewish and Greek precursors.¹² Lightfoot simply characterized Matthew as being influenced by the thought and language of the Old Testament without much influence from Second Temple Judaism or its socio-historical context.¹³

G. D. Kilpatrick's pioneering work, *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (1946), investigated the origins and function of Matthew.¹⁴ In examining Matthew's sources, Kilpatrick rightly permitted multiple methodological possibilities due to the uncertainty of pinpointing the sources being used (i.e. Q, M, or others): "Therefore, the author may be accurately copying, conflating, or freely re-writing from his sources."¹⁵ Furthermore, by investigating narrative types that were peculiar to Matthew, Kilpatrick stated that they were often late expansions of Mark and written in his own style of heightened amazement and with apologetic motives.¹⁶ Now concerning Matthew's fulfilment quotations, Kilpatrick identified the LXX as the source, but, on account of its variety, differences between the two should not automatically lead to a Hebrew or Aramaic

¹⁰ Robert H. Lightfoot, *History and Interpretation in the Gospels* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1934).

¹¹ Lightfoot, *History and Interpretation*, 217–18.

¹² Lightfoot (*History and Interpretation*, 218) states: "One after another, during the first century, the categories first of the Jewish and then of the Greek religious world were applied to Jesus, and were all found to be of value; they achieved a permanent place in the interpretation of his person in the records; nor did the church leave any of them precisely where they were before; they were all baptized, as it were, in him, and impregnated with new meaning; but equally they were all found to be partial and inadequate; the church was unable to rest finally and completely in any one of them."

¹³ Lightfoot, *History and Interpretation*, 160.

¹⁴ G.D. Kilpatrick (*The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1946]) concluded that the M text is a written document consisting of discourses by the author. Matthew was a comprehensive book used for liturgy in the church. Matthew was an unknown Christian scribe.

¹⁵ Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 10.

¹⁶ Kilpatrick listed the five narrative types as (1) Jesus' birth narratives; (2) Petrine narratives; (3) Passion and resurrection narratives; (4) miscellaneous narratives; and (5) quotations (37).

original.¹⁷ Therefore, Kilpatrick concluded that Mark provided a skeleton for Matthew with two written sources (Q and M) and many oral traditions before him.¹⁸

In addition, Kilpatrick classified Matthew as a revised Gospel lectionary for the early church used for its worship in reading and exposition by observing Matthew's tendency to abbreviate Mark and contrasting it with Jewish exegetical practices.

Instruction through the reading of Scripture and its exposition played an important part in the synagogue. The range of works that might be read was, especially among Greek-speaking Jews, very wide. Exposition, which followed the two main types of Haggadah and Halakah, tended to become fixed, and either provided a settled context in which the text in its main lines and details was reinterpreted, or else itself became part of the regular reading of the synagogue.¹⁹

C. H. Dodd's *According to the Scriptures* was first delivered at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1950.²⁰ As a historical study of New Testament theology, Dodd identified *kerygma* as the starting point and standard reference for everything in the New Testament.

It appears to have at its core what the New Testament itself calls the *kerygma*, or proclamation of the Gospel. In its most summary form the *kerygma* consists of the announcement of certain historical events in a setting which displays the significance of those events. The events in question are those of the appearance of Jesus in history—His ministry, sufferings and death and His subsequent manifestation of Himself to His followers as risen from the dead and invested with the glory of another world—and the emergence of the Church as a society distinguished by the power and activity of the Holy Spirit, and looking forward to the return of its Lord as Judge and Saviour of the world.²¹

Dodd stated that *kerygma* was expressed through the Old Testament as certain passages were examined and applied to the New Testament situation.²² He concluded that the quotations from the Old Testament were not from *testimonia*, but intelligibly quoted,²³ i.e. New Testament writers, immersed in the Old Testament, interpreted and applied its

¹⁷ Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 56.

¹⁸ Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 55–57.

¹⁹ Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 63.

²⁰ C.H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (London: James Nisbet & Co. Ltd, 1952).

²¹ Dodd, *Scriptures*, 11–12.

²² Dodd (*Scriptures*, 27) states: “The attempt to discover just how the Old Testament was employed to elucidate the *kerygma* in the earliest period accessible to us and in circles which exerted permanent influence on Christian thought, is one which we are bound to make in seeking the substructure of New Testament theology; because, if we can discover it, we shall be on the way to understanding the concept of “fulfillment,” which appears to govern the early Christian interpretation of the Gospel events as proclaimed in *kerygma*.”

²³ Dodd, *Scriptures*, 126–27.

prophecies while trying to remain true to their main intentions.²⁴ Although Dodd has greatly influenced Matthean scholarship, he overlooked Second Temple literature and its methodological uses of the Old Testament.²⁵

In sum, five main issues seem to arise from these influential scholars before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

1. A sharp distinction between the Old and New Testament that exaggerated the uniqueness of Jesus and the Synoptic Gospels, which consequently minimized their socio-historical contexts and their Jewish and Greek precursors.
2. The either-or propositions concerning the use and social setting of Matthew as being instruction, homily, or liturgy.²⁶
3. An overemphasis on Jamnia and the sharp schism between Christianity and Judaism from around 70 to 135 CE.²⁷
4. Statements concerning the fulfilment quotations as encapsulating and illuminating the whole *biblical* narrative rather than being specific proof-texts.
5. Over-theologizing with Christology as the answer to Matthew's methodology.

2. Period II: 1947–1975

Krister Stendahl, shortly after the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947, wrote *The School of St. Matthew and its use of the Old Testament* (1954).²⁸ He concluded that Matthew's *Sitz im Leben* was a school setting by examining Matthew's use of the Old Testament against the Hebrew, Greek, Syriac, Latin, and Aramaic versions. Furthermore, he proposed that the Matthean community grew out of Hellenistic Judaism with an increasing Gentile constituency and the Matthean author was Jewish with formal training in Palestine.²⁹ To substantiate his conclusions, he compared Matthew with CD, 1QpHab, the *Didache*, and other handbooks for catechetical instructions and eschatological teachings,³⁰

²⁴ Dodd, *Scriptures*, 130.

²⁵ Dodd, *Scriptures*, 132–33. For Dodd, the New Testament use of the Old Testament is not a mechanical stringing together of isolated proof-texts and fulfilments, but a selection of contexts that illuminates fundamental aspects of the biblical narrative; and these quoted texts from Christian theology depict the method that was used by the first Christians in formulating it. However, it does seem that fulfilment quotations are isolated and unique to Matthew (at least in his form).

²⁶ Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 78.

²⁷ Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 106.

²⁸ Krister Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament* (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968).

²⁹ Stendahl (*School of Matthew*, xiii) was influenced by Dead Sea Scrolls' research, Frank M. Cross Jr.'s text-types of the Hebrew Bible, and Septuagint studies. In addition, he identified Matt 13:52 as a veiled reference to the author as a scribe.

³⁰ Stendahl, *School of Matthew*, 24.

or where he thought the scribal school seemed to be at work.³¹ “That this brotherhood acted as a school which preserved and expounded the doctrines and rules of its founder is seen already in its Manual of Discipline. The scholarly work of the Sect can be sampled and tested in its commentary on Habakkuk.”³²

In examining Matthew’s formula quotations,³³ Stendahl tried to illuminate the relationship between the sources and their development, and to observe how the form of the quotations helped to portray its historical setting.³⁴ He identified three basic features of these quotations:³⁵

1. Old Testament quotations with parallels in Mark (and Luke) are fundamentally LXX.
2. Old Testament quotations with parallels in Luke (allusions rather than quotations) often show dependence on the LXX.
3. Old Testament quotations that are unique to Matthew have an irregular text-form. They show familiarity with the LXX, knowledge of the Hebrew text, and freedom to make use of readings from various LXX manuscripts, the Targums and the Peshitta.³⁶

Stendahl observed, contrary to classical authors who deliberately quoted freely from memory, that Mark’s and Q’s quotations were reproduced from the LXX even when it deviated from all known texts.³⁷ However, he concluded that Matthew did not have a Hebrew text other than the MT, and his variant readings should be understood as an *ad hoc* interpretation.³⁸

Barnabas Lindars in *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of Old Testament Quotations* (1961)³⁹ researched Christian origins and the earliest formulation of

³¹ Stendahl (*School of Matthew*, 195) proposes that Matthew’s formula quotations are treated in the same way as the 1QpHab quotations and are the product of the Matthean community’s study of the Old Testament and an indication of a school setting.

³² Stendahl, *School of Matthew*, 31.

³³ Stendahl (*School of Matthew*, 42, 46) avoids the complexity of differentiating between quotation and allusion by only investigating explicit quotations.

³⁴ Stendahl (*School of Matthew*, x–xi) concluded that Matthew had a Jewish setting and a double polemic against pharisaic and scribal Judaism and antinomian Hellenism.

³⁵ Stendahl begins with the assumption that Matthew had an advanced form of Jewish exegesis, which was based on having access to both the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures.

³⁶ Stendahl, *School of Matthew*, 151.

³⁷ Stendahl, *School of Matthew*, 158.

³⁸ Stendahl, *School of Matthew*, 166–69. He (216) also states: “There are more simple alternatives than the testimony hypothesis to explain the feature of composite quotations.”

³⁹ Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of Old Testament Quotations* (London: SCM Press; 1961).

Christian doctrine by examining the characteristics of the Old Testament quotations in the New Testament.⁴⁰ He suggested that the use of Old Testament quotations belong primarily to the apologetic element of early preaching: “the events of redemption are the regulative factor, and provide the key to the meaning of scripture.”⁴¹ Therefore, he understood the Old Testament in the New Testament as testimonies of early Christianity.⁴² With the resurrection, Lindars argued that testimonies (newly revealed faith rooted in the ancient biblical revelation) were applied to Jesus’ Passion, as well as his life and teachings, to show his messianic character.⁴³ These *testimonia* then were used to discover the original content of that faith and the process by which it was developed.⁴⁴

W. D. Davies’ *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (1964) attempted to understand the interaction between Christianity and Judaism in the first century by examining the Sermon on the Mount.⁴⁵ He regarded its contents as lacking cohesion, and identified it as a mere patchwork collection of unrelated sayings of diverse origins.⁴⁶ Davies expresses a rather abrupt shift from Judaism to Christianity, which is evident in his language of dispensations (“new” versus “old”) and Jamnia.⁴⁷ He attempted to find the setting of the Sermon on the Mount by examining Gnosticism,⁴⁸ the Dead Sea Sect,⁴⁹ and

⁴⁰ Lindars emphasizes the shift of application (changing situations or circumstances) and modification of text (conscious and deliberate). He suggests three factors to be kept in mind in estimating the modification of a text: (1) deliberate alteration, (2) selection of reading (Ur-text), and (3) memory-quotation.

⁴¹ Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 17.

⁴² These quotations, called “Testimonies,” provide Lindars a term to best describe the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament (*New Testament Apologetic*, 14). See J. Rendel Harris, *Testimonies* (2 vols; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916–20); E. Earle Ellis, *St. Paul’s Use of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957).

⁴³ Lindars (*New Testament Apologetic*, 29, 260, 271) proposed that the resurrection of Jesus is the primary factor in the formation of Christian dogma. He also indicated that Matthew presents his material as a Christian Pentateuch showing Jesus as the true fulfilment of the Jewish Scriptures by means of the *peshet* texts. However, I would suggest that Matthew is not so much a Christian Pentateuch (a rewriting of Jewish history) but a rewriting of Mark within a Torah. See Chapter 3.

⁴⁴ Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 260.

⁴⁵ W.D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964).

⁴⁶ Davies (*Sermon on the Mount*, 8, cf. 1–4) stressed Matthew’s didactic nature as Jesus’ disciples are in a sitting posture.

⁴⁷ This seems to cloud his conclusions and the development of Jewish-Christianity from Second Temple Judaism.

⁴⁸ Davies (*Sermon on the Mount*, 207) concludes that at no point in Matthew is a direct encounter with Gnosticism reflected.

Jamnia.⁵⁰ Again, there was not a rejection of the traditional Jewish Torah, but rather a recognition that it was fulfilled in the words of Jesus.⁵¹

Birger Gerhardsson's *The Testing of God's Son (Matt 4:1–11 & Par): An Analysis of an early Christian Midrash*⁵² (1966) analysed the origin, development and the meaning of Jesus' temptations in the wilderness.⁵³ Identifying this temptation narrative as *haggadic midrash*, he focuses on the scriptural exchange between Satan and Jesus paralleling Deut 6–8 and Israel as the “son of God” in the desert.⁵⁴ “The temptation narrative was not written by some simple soul who constructed his story with a few suitable quotations from an old and valued scroll: on the contrary, we have in it a narrative whose every detail bears the stamp of the late-Jewish (and early Christian) scribal tradition. It is an example of an early Christian midrash.”⁵⁵

Robert H. Gundry's *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel* (1967) re-examined Matthew's Old Testament quotations by including allusive quotations. He concluded that Matthew's formula citations are typical of other Synoptic quotations and adhere to Mark's quotations of the Septuagint, and they are not atomized exegesis.⁵⁶ Commendably, Gundry includes Matthew's allusive quotations and provides a fuller picture regarding Matthew's Old Testament text-form; however there are five issues with his analysis: (1) Gundry's Old Testament text-forms are too rigid without accounting for the pluriformity of the “Biblical” texts found among the Dead Sea Scrolls and representative of Second Temple Judaism. (2) Based on this neat compartmentalization of Greek, Aramaic, and Hebrew (Old Testament text-forms) found within Matthew's

⁴⁹ Davies (*Sermon on the Mount*, 209) concludes that a number influences from Qumran are possible: eschatology, ecclesiology, Christology, and ethics.

⁵⁰ Davies (*Sermon on the Mount*, 315) concludes that it is possible that the Sermon on the Mount was being formed because of it.

⁵¹ Davies (*Sermon on the Mount*, 439) states: “That the Church found it increasingly necessary to make the revelatory, radical, eschatological demands of Jesus the source of regulations is apparent.”

⁵² Birger Gerhardsson, *The Testing of God's Son (Matt 4:1–11 & Par): An Analysis of an early Christian Midrash* (Trans. John Toy; Lund, Sweden: CWK Gleerup, 1966).

⁵³ Gerhardsson based his conclusion on five presuppositions: (1) Torah is significant; (2) fluidity of texts and scripturalization; (3) growth and multiplicity of types of midrash; (4) scribe as an expositor creates midrash from memory primarily from an inherited authoritative text and (5) the problem of the relationship between an individual scribe and the scribal community.

⁵⁴ Gerhardsson (*Testing*, 12) recognized the marks of late Jewish and early Christian scribal tradition.

⁵⁵ Gerhardsson, *Testing*, 11.

⁵⁶ Robert H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel with Special Reference to the Messianic Hope* (Leiden: Brill, 1967), 5.

quotations, he locates Matthew in Palestine without seriously considering Hellenization within Second Temple Judaism. (3) Gundry frequently identifies Matthew's use of the Old Testament as Christian Jewish targumization or Qumran *peshet*⁵⁷ with both lacking clear definition, as they seem to be Gundry's catchall phrases for the method of authorial modification or eschatological fulfilment respectively.⁵⁸ (4) Based on the practice of note-taking and synagogue targumic practices, Gundry seems to weave hypotheses concerning dating, Q and the authorship of Matthew.⁵⁹ (5) Gundry uses Matthew's quotations to situate Jesus messianism in the Old Testament with its unfulfilled prophecies, and uses the Dead Sea Scrolls to confirm his conclusions.⁶⁰

Richard T. France's *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission* (1971)⁶¹ aimed to study the application of the Old Testament in the Synoptic Gospels to the person and mission of Jesus.⁶² Therefore, engaging in the historical Jesus debate, he assumed the reliability of the Gospels, and that Jesus' application of the Old Testament originally developed within his contemporaneous Jewish milieu and formed the pattern for later uses of the Old Testament in early Christianity. France expanded the use of the Old Testament beyond formal quotations by including formula and non-formula quotations, Old Testament teachings and events, verbal allusions, and significant actions that seemed to call attention to Old Testament prophecies.

⁵⁷ Gundry equates early Christian exegesis as targumic because it reflects this "sole" synagogue practice among Palestinian Jews.

⁵⁸ Gundry, *Use of the Old Testament*, 172.

⁵⁹ Concerning Q, Gundry (*Use of the Old Testament*) states: "The suggestion of a common source for all three synoptics because of their common mixed text-form in quotations invites us to think of an Aramaic or Hebrew ur-Mt (181)," and "A single authoritative, apostolic source behind the bulk of synoptic tradition best answers the question (183)."

⁶⁰ For example, Gundry (*Use of the Old Testament*, 224) states: "If 4QFlor. can interpret the Nathanic oracle of the Davidic Messiah, there is no reason why the same interpretation could not have arisen soon after the oracle was given." Rather than identifying 4Q174 as a source for Davidic messianic interpretation within Second Temple Judaism, Gundry transports this fragment back to the pre-exilic era to affirm the possibility of the earliest interpretation of 2 Sam 7:11–16.

⁶¹ R.T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission* (London: Tyndale Press, 1971).

⁶² France (*Jesus and the Old Testament*, 13–14) attempts to answer two questions: "How did Jesus see his mission in the light of the Old Testament Scriptures? What does his choice and use of Old Testament passages reveal of his conception of his own place in the purpose of God, and indeed of his own person?"

France, like his predecessors, began by examining Old Testament quotations as text-forms.⁶³ Furthermore, based on Woollcombe's definition of τύπος as primarily meaning a model or pattern of a person, actions or events, France chose to examine the typological uses of the Old Testament.⁶⁴ He distinguished typology from prediction and allegory,⁶⁵ and thus utilized New Testament typology by examining the consistency and continuity between the Old and New Testaments with its culmination of God's dealings with humanity.⁶⁶ Identifying the lack of interest in history as the problem with allegory, he chose typology because it is based on history, actual historical characters and events: "Typology may be described as 'the theological interpretation of the Old Testament history.'"⁶⁷

Narrowly focusing on Zech 9–14 and Dan 7, France envisaged a suffering messiah (cf. Isa 52:13–53:12), which makes up most of the allusions to Jesus.⁶⁸ He concludes Jesus' predictions are almost all eschatological in their original intent by looking forward to the Day of LORD with his decisive acts of judgment and salvation, which brings an end to the present order and inaugurates a new order of peace and blessing.⁶⁹ France stressed

⁶³ France (*Jesus and the Old Testament*, 37) primarily focuses on the LXX and MT with little or no mention of other versions (i.e. Samaritan Pentateuch, Targums, or Peshitta). He identifies the Semitic character, but denies a Greek origin for them.

⁶⁴ See K. J. Woollcombe, *Essays on Typology* (London: SCM Press, 1957).

⁶⁵ France (*Jesus and the Old Testament*, 40) differentiates between prediction and typology: "A prediction looks forward to, and demands, an event which is to be its fulfilment; typology, however, consists essentially in looking back and discerning previous examples of a pattern now reaching its culmination."

⁶⁶ France (*Jesus and the Old Testament*, 40) states: "It [typology] is essentially the recognition of a correspondence between New and Old Testament events, based on a conviction of the unchanging character of the principles of God's working, and a consequent understanding and description of the New Testament event in terms of the Old Testament model. The idea of fulfillment inherent in New Testament typology derives not from a belief that the events so understood were explicitly predicted, but from the conviction that in the coming and work of Jesus the principles of God's working already imperfectly embodied in the Old Testament, were more perfectly re-embodied, and thus brought to completion."

⁶⁷ France (*Jesus and the Old Testament*, 75) also identifies types of Jesus: (1) individuals (e.g. David, Jonah, Elijah, and Elisha); (2) experiences of Israel (e.g. temptation, resurrection); (3) hope of Israel; and (4) failures of Israel.

⁶⁸ Identifying eschatology in the prophets and messianic expectations of a future hope in the OT, France (*Jesus and the Old Testament*, 149) primarily examines Davidic messianism with Zech 9–14, the servant of the LORD and the messianic figures, and the son of man. He concludes that the dominant popular expectation and hope during the time is that a son of David (messiah) would reign in Jerusalem, subdue all the nations, and exalt Jews to an everlasting earthly kingdom.

⁶⁹ France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 160.

Jesus' uniqueness to his contemporaries and that the New Testament followed along this trajectory with little continuity with Second Temple Judaism and especially Qumran.⁷⁰ France concluded that the Christian church was founded on Jesus' distinctive and revolutionary use of the Old Testament.

The source of the distinctive Christian use of the Old Testament was not the creative thinking of the primitive community, but that of its founder. It was not the early church which inscribed its theology on the blank cheque of its Master's teaching, but Jesus whose teaching and life initiated that theology. The church did not create Jesus, but Jesus created the church.⁷¹

In their commentary, W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann identified Christology as the primary function of Matthew's use of the Old Testament (1971).⁷²

1. Albright and Mann recognized the significance of the DSS by citing 1QpHab and W. H. Brownlee's article on Biblical Interpretation.⁷³
2. They were aware of the fluidity of the Hebrew text and the influence of Hellenism in Jewish Palestine.⁷⁴
3. They differentiated between midrash and *halakah*, and identified Matthew's use of midrash (*pesher*).⁷⁵ Characterized by OT quotations, Matthew's subject was more similar to the *pesher* models of Qumran than the later interpretive method of Paul.⁷⁶
4. They did not consider the OT texts as 'proof texts,' but recognized that the OT quotations are a key to understanding the author's methods and background, and possibly his identity.

Michael Goulder, in *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* (1974),⁷⁷ proposed that Matthew is a *midrashic* expansion of Mark.⁷⁸ Recognizing Matthew's attitude towards the Torah and identifying Matthew's origin within an educated Jewish-Christian system, Goulder identifies Matthew as a Jewish-Christian scribe, who was devoted and enthusiastic about the written and oral Law.⁷⁹ Therefore, as a scribe Matthew was engaged in midrash:

⁷⁰ France concludes that (1) Matthew alters the Old Testament wording far more than Qumran; and (2) Matthew gives more attention to the original intention of the Old Testament than Qumran.

⁷¹ France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 226. See also 225 n. 205.

⁷² W.F. Albright, and C.S. Mann, *Matthew: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AB; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1971).

⁷³ W.H. Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scroll," *BA* 15 (1951): 54–76.

⁷⁴ Albright and Mann, *Matthew*, lx–lxi.

⁷⁵ Albright and Mann, *Matthew*, lxi.

⁷⁶ Albright and Mann, *Matthew*, lxi.

⁷⁷ M.D. Goulder. *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* (London: SPCK, 1974).

⁷⁸ Goulder, *Midrash and Lection*, 3–4.

⁷⁹ Goulder (*Midrash and Lection*, 5) suggests that Matthew was a converted Rabbi.

“Matthew is much more a free reworking of Mark, and much less an edited compendium of traditions.”⁸⁰

Goulder challenged the Q solution to the Synoptic Problem, the hypothesis of Aramaic originals behind the Q and M material, and form-critical theory of Matthew, and suggested that Matthew was a liturgy utilized by the early church. Goulder used Hillel’s list of seven principles of interpretation and identified a number of texts directly from Matthew as midrash and concluded that Q is Matthean midrash.⁸¹

In sum, Period II, even after the discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls, was still plagued by some of the same issues from the previous period: (1) a sharp distinction between the Old and New Testament that disconnected Jesus from Second Temple Judaism and broadened the schism between Christianity and Judaism; (2) a focus on the fulfilment quotations and text-types; (3) a tendency to be ahistorical with authors focused on their own Christological interests; and (4) a narrow examination of only a part of Matthew.⁸²

3. Period III: 1976–1992

Douglas J. Moo, in *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (1983),⁸³ focused on hermeneutics, and the way the Old Testament was used by a Palestinian Jewish sect about the time of Jesus. He investigated the exegetical procedure, relationship with late Second Temple Judaism, and the process through which the Old Testament was taken up by the early church in Jesus’ Passion narratives. He compared late Second Temple Jewish hermeneutical strategies and took a “horizontal” approach by using general aspects of the hermeneutical procedure. He identified and compared various approaches by different

⁸⁰ Goulder (*Midrash and Lection*, 6) gives a list of linguistic features in Matthew.

⁸¹ Goulder (*Midrash and Lection*, 116) examines Matthew’s language and use of Scripture and states: “The First Gospel is written in Greek, but it’s thought is Semitic; indeed at a number of points its thought is Aramaic rather than Hebrew.” By comparing Matthew and Luke’s use of Mark and examining Matthew’s parables, poetry and imagery, Goulder (*Midrash and Lection*, 32, 47) draws the conclusion that they were his own rabbinic compositions and identifies Matthew, more than Luke, as a midrashic expansion of Mark.

⁸² See also W. Rothfuchs, *Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangeliums* (BWANT 88; Stuttgart, 1969); George M. Soares Prabhu, *The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew: An Enquiry into the Tradition History of Matthew 1–2* (Analecta Biblica, 63; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1976); 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: Reinhardt, 1969).

⁸³ Douglas, J. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1983).

communities to illuminate more clearly their similarities and differences.⁸⁴ Moo investigated Matthew from a Jewish literary framework of translation-paraphrase, re-writings of biblical narratives, *testimonia*, commentaries and midrashim, compilations of religious laws (*halakah*), community guides, didactic writings and wisdom literature, liturgical writings, apocalypses, and historical narratives.⁸⁵

In addition, he identified seven of the most prevalent methods of citing the Old Testament: (1) general linguistic influence (unconscious evoking); (2) explicit quotations (introductory formula); (3) implicit quotations (word-for-word parallels to the Old Testament); (4) allusions (anthological style of utilizing scripture without any introduction or disruption); (5) structural style (basic structure build around the scriptural text); (6) conceptual influence (not word but theme or person—concept); and (7) summaries of Old Testament history and teaching (explicitly appealing to Old Testament incidents or teachings by way of illustration or validation).⁸⁶ These categories are not neat or mutually exclusive, but can often overlap and can be combined together with literary genre and certain citation techniques being related.⁸⁷

In examining Jesus' Passion and death, Moo makes three conclusions concerning Matthew's use of the Old Testament. Firstly, Matthew is faithful to Marcan sources with a few exceptions. Secondly, narrative allusions tend to be Septuagintal, but all other types (i.e. citations) display a greater reliance on Semitic text-types.⁸⁸ Thirdly, there is no testimony book of Old Testament quotations in the Passion texts. Furthermore, the fulfilment quotations have the element of a genuine predictive function with the Old Testament foreshadowing the life and teachings of Jesus. "Simply, the early Christians were convinced that the OT spoke of the promised one and that Jesus was that promised one."⁸⁹ Moo concludes the actual history and teachings of Jesus were the guiding factor in the use of the Old Testament.

⁸⁴ Moo (*Gospel Passion Narratives*, 7–8) studies hermeneutics on three levels: (1) hermeneutical axioms are identified by statements which express the identity and use of Scriptures related to a particular community; (2) hermeneutical techniques by which specific texts have been "contemporized" or actualized; and (3) literary framework or genre that Scripture is appropriated and the methods by which it is inserted in the narrative.

⁸⁵ Moo, *Gospel Passion Narratives*, 9–17, 25–28.

⁸⁶ Moo, *Gospel Passion Narratives*, 17–24.

⁸⁷ Moo, *Gospel Passion Narratives*, 24.

⁸⁸ Moo, *Gospel Passion Narratives*, 363.

⁸⁹ Moo, *Gospel Passion Narratives*, 386–87.

Graham Stanton's "Matthew" in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF* (1988) concluded that Matthew's formula quotations were all theological comments by the author.⁹⁰ He proposed that Matthew used the Jewish scriptures to accentuate his distinctive theological concerns; however, he did not have one over-riding concern or theme, which provides the key to his gospel.⁹¹

Concerned with the setting and purpose of Matthew, Stanton proposed that Matthew was a gospel for a new people comprised of Jewish and Gentile Christians defining themselves over against Jewish synagogues:

I am convinced that Matthew wrote following a period of prolonged dispute and hostility with fellow-Jews. He and his opponents are heirs to the same Scriptures and share many religious convictions, but differences run deep. Mutual incomprehension has led to mutual hostility and, eventually a clear parting of the ways; . . . Although many books on early Christianity still state or imply that Judaism gradually withered away following the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, this is a mistaken assumption. The Christian churches to whom Matthew writes are minority groups still living in the shadow of thriving local Jewish communities. For this reason the evangelist encourages group solidarity in the face of perceived hostility from external sources.⁹²

Furthermore, Stanton stated: "The evangelist writes with several strategies in mind. He intends to set out the story and significance of Jesus as a 'foundation document' for his readers: his primary aims are Christological and catechetical."⁹³ Although Matthew's community identity was new, the stress falls on the continuity and similarity with Judaism. Moreover, Stanton proposes that Matthew was not struggling with being libertine or antinomian, but responds to the Jewish taunt that Christians are "lawless."⁹⁴

Stanton's sociological analysis compared Matthew with CD to determine the relationship between Matthew's Christian communities and Judaism.⁹⁵ From a sociological perspective, Stanton drew some parallels between Qumran and Matthew: the threat of persecution from their opponents, a minority at odds with the parent body, an emphasis on

⁹⁰ Graham Stanton, "Matthew," in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF* (eds. D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 205–19; esp. 205. Also included modification of quotations and quotations without introductory formula.

⁹¹ Stanton (*Gospel for a New People*, 3) views the author having broad catechetical and pastoral concerns in setting the story and significance of Jesus in order to assist Christians to come to terms with their identity as communities distinct from Judaism.

⁹² Stanton, *Gospel for a New People*, 2–3.

⁹³ Stanton, *Gospel for a New People*, 2.

⁹⁴ Stanton, *Gospel for a New People*, 6–7.

⁹⁵ Stanton (*Gospel for a New People*, 87) observes the limitations of this approach.

strict moral requirements, and strong internal discipline.⁹⁶ Building on F. García Martínez's ideas of Qumran, a group loyal to the Teacher of Righteousness, as a split within the Essenes movement,⁹⁷ he writes:

On this view, the Damascus Document stems from a renewal or protest movement within Essenism which became a sect with a quite separate identity and tightly drawn boundaries. As often happens in sectarian communities, much of the 'worldview' of the parent body is retained, in spite of the development of the distinctive views which led to the parting of the ways. The new sectarian community has hi-jacked the claim of the parent body to be 'the true way'. The ferocious polemic directed at the parent body is part of the distancing process. In its final form the Damascus Document is a foundation document for the new community: it functioned as legitimation of the separation from Essenism.⁹⁸

Furthermore, Stanton identifies Matthew as a creative interpreter of Jesus' sayings and closely dependent on his sources (Mark, Q and M traditions), but not hesitant to expand them in order to develop his own themes of discipleship, community, Christology, and eschatological concerns.⁹⁹

... Matthew's gospel is both *more than* and *other than* the sum of the individual traditions which have been incorporated. The evangelist has reinterpreted his traditions by reshaping and 'tidying' them, and by setting them in new contexts – often by juxtaposition with originally unrelated traditions. For all of this, the analogy of a 'montage' is appropriate. But this analogy does not do justice to the extent to which the evangelist has himself expanded individual narrative and sayings traditions. Again and again we have seen that Matthew is creative but not innovative: he is committed to the traditions at his disposal, but he endeavours to elucidate them for his own community.¹⁰⁰

Stanton considered that the early church transmitted Jesus' words with great care. He suggested five conclusions regarding Matthew's use of the Old Testament:

1. Quotations and allusions of Old Testament passages are more prominent in Matthew than the other three gospels.
2. Formula quotations are all theological comments.
3. Matthew's origin and purpose has dominated discussion of Matthew's use of the Old Testament.
4. There is a lack of attention concerning the modification of quotations found in his sources.
5. There is a lack of attention concerning the references without the introductory formula.

⁹⁶ Stanton, *Gospel for a New People*, 94.

⁹⁷ F. García Martínez, "Qumran Origins and Early History: a Groningen Hypothesis," *Folia Orientalia* 25 (1988): 113–36.

⁹⁸ Stanton, *Gospel for a New People*, 93.

⁹⁹ Stanton, *Gospel for a New People*, 344.

¹⁰⁰ Stanton, *Gospel for a New People*, 344.

As to the text-type of Matthew's Bible, Stanton concluded that it was the LXX;¹⁰¹ however, the texts of all the formula quotations puzzled him with signs of dependence on both Greek and Hebrew, and perhaps also Aramaic traditions.¹⁰²

Concerning *Matthew's use of the Old Testament*, Ulrich Luz, in his commentary (1989), discussed Matthew's formula quotations and observed an unbalanced distribution of the formula quotations with a concentration in Matthew's prologue.¹⁰³ Due to their location at the end of narrative sections, he proposed their function as a running commentary that should be interpreted in connection with one another.¹⁰⁴ Luz, accounting for the variation in the formula quotations, concluded that Matthew only had the Isaiah scroll and did not have Jeremiah or the minor prophets.¹⁰⁵ I was surprised by this conclusion, which was exacerbated by a lack of discussion with Second Temple Judaism.¹⁰⁶ He situated *Matthew's use of the Old Testament* in early Christianity to the exclusion of Second Temple Judaism. Luz sees Matthew as a conservative interpreter of tradition with the fulfilment quotations as proof-texts.¹⁰⁷ Luz's reasoning for these fulfilment quotations is that after the traumatic break of the Christian community with Second Temple Judaism, the Jewish-Christian Matthew emphasized their claim on the Jewish Scriptures.¹⁰⁸

In sum, although Period III broaden and nuanced its study on Matthew, it still had some of the same basic issues from the previous periods: (1) a sharp distinction between the Old and New Testament; (2) a focus on the fulfilment quotations and text-types; (3) a focus on Christological interests; and (4) a partial examination of Matthew.

¹⁰¹ Stanton (*Gospel for a New People*, 358; cf. 353) states: "Since Matthew usually follows his sources closely, it is no surprise to find that he takes over with little modification many of the Old Testament citations found in his sources, principally Mark. By and large they are Septuagintal, so he retains them in that form. However, in numerous passages Matthew does abbreviate, expand and modify Mark and Q in line with his own stylistic and theological concerns. As we have seen, he treats the OT quotations found in his sources in the same way as he treats the sources themselves. Matthew's primary allegiance is to the textual form of the quotations in his sources rather than to the LXX as such."

¹⁰² Stanton, *Gospel for a New People*, 360.

¹⁰³ Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1–7: A Commentary* (trans. W. C. Linss; Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1989), 156–64.

¹⁰⁴ Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 156–57.

¹⁰⁵ Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 158.

¹⁰⁶ Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 158.

¹⁰⁷ Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 160.

¹⁰⁸ Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 162–63.

4. Period IV: 1993–2015

Donald Hagner, in his commentary on Matthew (1993), saw the formula quotations as Matthew's own creative interpretation of his narrative that the kingdom of heaven was the fulfilment of Old Testament expectations.¹⁰⁹ He identified the quotations as a Jewish practice of *sensus plenior* (i.e. they were not understood within the original context but only in its new context).¹¹⁰ They were Christocentric¹¹¹ from a mixed text-type that interpreted Old Testament texts in a manner similar to the *peshet* hermeneutic practiced at Qumran.¹¹²

Davies and Allison (1997) discussed the formula quotations as a development of the early Christian use of πληρόω to indicate that the Old Testament texts were fulfilled in Jesus.¹¹³ They proposed three conclusions about Matthew's formula quotations: (1) Matthew's quotations were located mostly in the first half; (2) eight of ten quotations were not cited elsewhere in the New Testament; and (3) Matthew's quotations were from the Prophets (and once from the Psalms). In addition, Davies and Allison, contrary to Luz, viewed Matthew having access to many scrolls as from a synagogue library.¹¹⁴

Emerson B. Powery, in *Jesus Reads Scripture: The Function of Jesus' Use of Scripture in the Synoptic Gospels* (2003), concluded that each Synoptic Gospel used scripture differently depending on their own theological and literary agendas.¹¹⁵ With Matthew, he distinguished between Matthew's editorial citations and Jesus' citations with a list of distinctive features:

1. Editorial quotations have the idea of "fulfilment," and Jesus uses a form of the term only once (13:14).
2. Editorial quotations have the Jewish scriptures as the spoken word.

¹⁰⁹ Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 1–13* (WBC; Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1993), lv, cf. liii–lvii.

¹¹⁰ Hagner (*Matthew 1–13*, lvi) states: "This is not arbitrary, frivolous misuse of the texts, as is sometimes claimed, but a reasoned practice that assumes a divinely intended correspondence between God's saving activity at different times in the history of redemption."

¹¹¹ Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, lvi.

¹¹² Hagner (*Matthew 1–13*, lvi) claims that the quotations are derived from the preaching of the early Church and possibly directed against Jewish opponents.

¹¹³ W.D. Davies and D. Allison Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (3 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988, 1991, 1997), 3.574, cf. 3.573–77.

¹¹⁴ Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, 3.576 n. 22.

¹¹⁵ Emerson B. Powery, *Jesus Reads Scripture: The Function of Jesus' Use of Scripture in the Synoptic Gospels* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 23. See also C.D. Stanley, "The Rhetoric of Quotations: An Essay on Method," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* (eds. C.A. Evans and J.A. Sanders; JSNTSup 148: Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 44–58.

3. Two prominent features within Jesus' quotations completely absent from the editorial citations are scripture as "written word" and the "challenging" use (e.g. "Have you not [never] read?").
4. Matthew's portrayal of Jesus' quotations with an antagonistic crowd while Matthew's audience was probably not.¹¹⁶

Moreover, Powery examined both Matthew's and Jesus' citation under five categories:

1. The selection of texts: Most of the citations derive from the Torah (about two-thirds of Jesus' explicitly cited texts) with one-third from the prophets and the psalms accounting for the other one-third (Isaiah is most prominent) and one text from the former prophets (i.e. 1 Sam 21:1–6).
2. Their narrative location and audience: Matthew basically distributes explicit citations in equal proportion throughout the narrative. Jesus' citations appear throughout the narrative before he begins his public mission (Matt 4) to his final meal with his disciples (Matt 26) with neither legal nor prophetic texts bound by any narrative divisions.
3. Jesus' audience varies for the explicit references to sacred texts. The most prominent audience for Jesus' scriptural use are the Pharisees.¹¹⁷
4. Their narrative use: Within the narrative discourse, Jesus uses scriptural citations to defend his actions (and beliefs) and to instruct various groups. Marginally, Jesus uses scripture to correct certain beliefs (see 19:4–5; 22:44) and to predict a coming event (26:31).
5. Their narrative function: Fitzmyer's categories are utilized in Jesus' use of scripture with the most prominent being Jesus' literal use (about 50%), then accommodating (25%), then modernizing the text, and finally on two occasions, Jesus offering an eschatological reading.¹¹⁸

Powery concluded that Matthew generally depicts Jesus as an interpreter of the Torah; however, Jesus primarily quotes the Prophets to the Pharisees.¹¹⁹ In comparison, Matthew's editorial citations were strikingly different: (1) the selection was exclusively the Prophets with Isaiah being half of them and the only one mentioned by name; (2) the location was within the first half of the Gospel except for 21:5 and 27:9–10;¹²⁰ (3) the audience was primarily to the Matthean community as a commentary to Jesus' life and mission; (4) they

¹¹⁶ Powery, *Jesus Reads Scripture*, 13.

¹¹⁷ Also included are other religious leaders, disciples and crowds, buyers and sellers, devil and the young man.

¹¹⁸ Powery, *Jesus Reads Scripture*, 185–86.

¹¹⁹ Powery, *Jesus Reads Scripture*, 188–89.

¹²⁰ Jesus' citations are all throughout the narrative with a steady increase in Jesus' prophetic quotations within the second half.

were used to defend the events Matthew portrays;¹²¹ and (5) the function was accommodation.¹²²

Matthew's citations portray Jesus as the one who instructs numerous groups throughout the Gospel including the disciples and the crowds, while Jesus' citations (primarily associated with his use of the Torah) portray Jesus' proper reinterpretation of the Torah.¹²³ Matthew's narrative has many different and competing groups citing the Jewish scriptures, but Jesus is the primary interpreter of scripture and the final authority in debatable matters.¹²⁴

Maarten J. J. Menken's *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist* (2004) recognized the importance of the Old Testament in the New Testament as it identified the core of early Christianity's theology in its portrayal of Jesus in scriptural terms. He attempted to identify the Old Testament text-type that the New Testament authors employed.¹²⁵ His conservative approach simply adopted the list of quotations from NA 27 with the two exceptions of including Matt 2:23 and excluding Matt 21:9.¹²⁶ By examining the study of the development of the textual forms of the Old Testament,¹²⁷ he stated: "Matthew drew them [fulfilment quotations] from a continuous Greek text whose textual form is best described as a revised LXX."¹²⁸ He suggested that Matthew used a pre-Matthean LXX in his explicit fulfilment quotations from these observations:

- Old Testament quotations derived from Mark:
The changes are scribal changes, but it cannot be assumed that Matthew made use of the LXX in modifying these quotations.¹²⁹
- Old Testament quotations inserted in Markan contexts:
When an Old Testament quotation is inserted into direct speech from Mark, Matthew uses a pre-Matthean LXX (revised) like the fulfilment quotations.¹³⁰

¹²¹ Jesus' use of scripture is primarily to defend his actions and beliefs.

¹²² Powery (*Jesus Reads Scripture*, 187–88) concludes that the citations accommodate and modernize the prophetic texts that are cited with a limited eschatological function.

¹²³ Powery, *Jesus Reads Scripture*, 188–89.

¹²⁴ Powery, *Jesus Reads Scripture*, 248–49, 250. Matthew expresses a deep interest in the Torah and its application.

¹²⁵ Maarten J.J. Menken, *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist* (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), vii.

¹²⁶ Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, 1.

¹²⁷ Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, 8–9.

¹²⁸ Menken (*Matthew's Bible*, 10, 15) generally identifies the fulfilment quotations from a pre-Matthean revision of the LXX from a continuous text.

¹²⁹ Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, 225.

¹³⁰ Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, 238.

- Old Testament quotations from Q:
The changes are scribal changes, but again one cannot assume that Matthew made use of the LXX in modifying these quotations.¹³¹
- Old Testament quotations inserted in Q contexts:
For Matt 12:40 (cf. Jonah 2:1), it is impossible to determine.¹³²
- Old Testament quotations in Matthean *Sondergut*:
It is varied with the *Sondergut* quotations not giving evidence of Matthew using the unrevised LXX, but Matt 11:29 could support his use of a revised LXX.¹³³

From his thorough examination of Matthew's explicit quotations, Menken proposed four conclusions:

1. Matthew integrated the fulfilment quotations and they were not a collection of testimonies.
2. Matthew seemed to have used a textual form of continuous "biblical" text (pre-Matthean), which can be described as a revised LXX.
3. In Matthew's other Old Testament quotations, he makes minor scribal changes but there is no reason to conclude a LXX base for them (i.e. he simply copies Mark and Q). However, when he added material, there does seem to be a pre-Matthean revised LXX.
4. Matthew contained two Old Testament passages, which completely agree with a revised LXX: "The distribution of the editorially inserted quotations suggests that Matthew had a revised LXX text for Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Minor Prophets and the Psalms, and an unrevised LXX text for Deuteronomy."¹³⁴

Menken suggested that revision of the LXX to Hebrew was a widespread phenomenon and confirms the plurality of text forms.¹³⁵ He concluded that Matthew was a conservative scribe: "He carefully selected the amount of text he wished to quote, and omitted, when necessary, words or clauses from this piece of text, but he did not interfere much with its wording."¹³⁶

John Nolland in his commentary (2005) concentrated on Matthew's text-types and his midrashic method of interpreting the Old Testament.¹³⁷ He identified *Matthew's use of*

¹³¹ Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, 251.

¹³² Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, 254.

¹³³ Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, 278.

¹³⁴ Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, 282.

¹³⁵ Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, 282.

¹³⁶ Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, 283.

¹³⁷ John Nolland (*The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* [NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Bletchley: Pasternoster Press, 2005], 21; cf. 33–38) states: "Some interpreters have wanted to draw a connection between the Gospel of Matthew and Jewish midrash. In Jewish midrash biblical stories are sometimes retold with elaborate, edifying embellishments. To some degree Matthew displays an identifiable 'midrashic' manner of retelling the stories. Inasmuch as

the Old Testament as a type of Jewish *midrash* identifying the core narrative as Jesus' ministry rather than biblical narrative.¹³⁸ He recognizes *Matthew's use of the Old Testament* in the ten formula citations, at least sixty quotations, and a large number of allusions.¹³⁹ Nolland's conclusion recognized Matthew as a Jewish interpreter of scripture: not only the Old Testament, but other Jewish traditions as well:

Our survey of OT quotations in Matthew has identified fourteen different approaches to the generation of the wording of the quotations...Though some of Matthew's text forms come to him straight from the Gospel tradition, the overall impression is of a man who freshly scrutinizes, at least on many occasions, the OT texts to which he appeals, and is able to do so in Greek, Hebrew (not always the Hebrew of the preserved MT), and occasionally in Aramaic. When it suits him to do so, he produces translations that reflect influence along more than one track of tradition.¹⁴⁰

Richard T. France in his commentary (2007) argued that the central theme of Matthew's gospel was "fulfilment" with the coming of Jesus as the Messiah: the climax of the history of God's people revealed in the Old Testament.¹⁴¹ However for France, "fulfilment" in Matthew seemed to operate on many levels as it embraced more of the pattern of Old Testament history and language than merely its prophetic predictions, and as it traced lines of correspondence and continuity in God's dealings with his people.¹⁴² France indicated textual freedom concerning text-types, suggesting that Matthew modified the wording of the text in order to explain how it was fulfilled in Jesus.¹⁴³ He also identified the quotations as scribal glosses on the story of Jesus.¹⁴⁴

midrash might involve the presentation of an edifying theological interpretation of Jesus, Matthew could be said to fit the category."

¹³⁸ Nolland, *Gospel of Matthew*, 21.

¹³⁹ Nolland, *Gospel of Matthew*, 29.

¹⁴⁰ Nolland, *Gospel of Matthew*, 33 n. 23; cf. 37.

¹⁴¹ R.T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT; Grand Rapids; Eerdmans, 2007), 10.

¹⁴² France, *Matthew*, 12.

¹⁴³ France (*Matthew*, 13) states: "Such 'texts' owe their presence in Matthew's gospel not to any 'messianic' significance they possessed in their own right but to his imaginative perception of OT 'pre-echoes' of details in the stories of Jesus. They are editorial comments, arising from Matthew's own creative biblical interpretation, on the story he is telling inviting readers to join the author in his eager search for underlying patterns of fulfilment."

¹⁴⁴ France, *Matthew*, 13.

5. Conclusion

The history of research concerning Matthew's use of the Old Testament has demonstrated a scholarly fascination with it. Especially with Matthew's explicit fulfilment (formula) quotations, and the search for a text-type.¹⁴⁵

III. THE ISSUES AND THE THESIS

1. Significance of the Problem

New Testament scholarship seems to have had a myopic view on *Matthew's use of the Old Testament*.¹⁴⁶ Although it continues to occupy a prominent place in Matthean scholarship, it too narrowly focuses on Matthew's fulfilment quotations, which in turn fixates on identifying the text-type of the Old Testament. Although this is important, it is much too restricting in regards to Matthew's use of the Jewish scriptures. The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls and research in Second Temple Judaism, when placed alongside the Gospel of Matthew, start to illuminate aspects concerning texts, authoritative traditions, scribes, and uses of scriptures.¹⁴⁷

A number of issues have prompted this re-examination of *Matthew's use of the Old Testament*. First, the term "Old Testament" is somewhat misleading and anachronistic as it raises two issues of textual fluidity and canonicity in Second Temple Judaism and Christian origins. Many of these scholars assumed an "Old Testament," but, due to the Dead Sea Scrolls, Eugene Ulrich suggests textual pluriformity and fluidity in the Jewish scriptures.¹⁴⁸ Second, Second Temple Judaism is often overlooked as only the Old Testament is

¹⁴⁵ See also Jean Miler, *Les citations d'accomplissement dans l'évangile de Matthieu: quant dieu se rend present en toute humanite* (AB 140; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1999); H. Frankemölle, *Matthäus, Kommentar I* (Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1994), 52–76; David Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew. The New Century Bible Commentary* (London: Marshal, Morgan & Scott, 1972); Craig Blomberg, "Matthew," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (eds. G.K. Beale and D.A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007).

¹⁴⁶ To be fair, many were constrained by their time of writing with inadequate information to formulate a fuller portrait of Second Temple period, which is now at our disposal.

¹⁴⁷ The discoveries and publications of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Second Temple scholarly discourse, and publications have greatly enhanced and brought into sharper focus important aspects for this period: its texts, scriptures, scribal practices, textual formation, sectarianism, social dynamics, and Jewish practices.

¹⁴⁸ Similarly, the discussion on text-types is also restrictive in its narrow focus on the Septuagint (LXX) and Masoretic Text (MT) rather than the pluriformity of the Jewish scriptures. See Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (SDSSRL; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 79–120.

examined in relation to the New Testament. The use of the Old Testament is simply flattened to a purely textual level without accounting for the historical complexity of Second Temple Judaism,¹⁴⁹ Christian Origins, Jesus, and the Gospels. Third, there is a tendency to make *Matthew's use of the Old Testament* overly theological with texts losing their socio-historical context.¹⁵⁰ This strong theological bias and motivation to funnel the entire Old Testament through the New Testament without placing Jesus and Christianity within the larger framework of Second Temple Judaism seems ahistorical. Often this tendency exaggerates the “uniqueness” of Jesus and the Gospels, as well as Matthew’s innovative use of the Old Testament, and overstates the division between the Old Testament and New Testament. This abrupt parting of the ways is often portrayed with an emphasis on Jamnia as *the* decisive break between Christianity and Judaism, rather than the possibility of a sectarian matrix of conflict within Judaism.¹⁵¹ Fourth, many examinations of *Matthew's use of the Old Testament* do not examine the Gospel as a whole with its quotations, allusions and echoes of the Jewish scriptures. Many Matthean monographs excellently focus on a certain Jewish textual tradition or a section of Matthew without examining the entire Gospel with its multiple strategies in using Jewish texts and traditions.¹⁵²

Therefore, on the basis of investigating *Matthew's use of the Old Testament* in this chapter, four overarching issues have come to light: (1) textual simplicity,¹⁵³ (2) lack of Second Temple socio-historical understanding, (3) overly theological and ahistorical focus,

¹⁴⁹ Even when Second Temple literature is used, sometimes there are some misconceptions and terminological issues concerning interpretation. For example, all the DSS are sectarian, Qumran interpretation is exclusively *peshet*, simplistic view of Old Testament history and fulfilment, and misunderstanding *midrash* and *middot*.

¹⁵⁰ Specifically, some authors have a lack of a historical approach. For example, Dodd, *Scriptures*, 15 esp. n. 22.

¹⁵¹ Or conflicting Judaisms. This oversimplified perceptive of Second Temple Judaism does not account for the dynamic integration and identity of both Hellenism and Judaism. Therefore, Matthean studies, specifically, seems to oscillate between an emphasis on its Graeco-Roman and Palestinian-Jewish background.

¹⁵² For example, the function of the fulfilment quotations is often simply reduced to being used either for an apologetic, a liturgical, a kerygmatic, or a didactic reason (without being considered mutual or complementary).

¹⁵³ The Dead Sea Scrolls reveal a nuanced complexity concerning the textual history (i.e. pluriformity and fluidity of these texts) of the Jewish scriptures that is missed due to textual simplicity. Ulrich (*Origins of the Bible*, 79–120) discusses the pluriformity of the biblical texts of the DSS by analysing the manuscript evidence and suggests multiple literary editions as a theory of the history of the biblical text.

and (4) partial examinations of Matthew. Many of these issues flatten Second Temple Judaism, as well as the Gospel of Matthew, with its robust authoritative traditions, dynamic textual histories, and diverse scribal practices in using the Jewish scriptures. Therefore, a fuller consideration of the developments in the late Second Temple period can produce a more nuanced and precise understanding of Matthew's use of the Jewish scriptures.¹⁵⁴

- The Second Temple period had both explicit and implicit uses of the Jewish scriptures. Scribes would then amend their compositions to contextualize and correct previous authoritative traditions.¹⁵⁵
- The setting for Second Temple scribal activity was in the temple, palace, or public spheres either for liturgical (prayer texts and psalms), legislative (laws) or instructional (wisdom) purposes.¹⁵⁶
- Second Temple Judaism had varying beliefs and practices with varying centres with sects vying against one another to validate their beliefs and practices. However, they interrelated with each other as they emphasized the Torah, temple, holy days, and Jewish practices.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁴ This will be illustrated in various parts of chapter 3–7.

¹⁵⁵ E.g. explicit examples are CD 1:13–14 cites Deut 5:12; 4QMMT B 77–78 cites Lev 19:19 and Deut 22:19; and implicit examples are *Jub.* 8:10–10:35 with Gen 10:1–11:19, 1QapGen 20:33–22:26 with Gen 13:1–14:24, and *Ant.* 1:222–237 with Gen 22:1–19. Concerning written and oral scriptures see Martin S. Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001); Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 2003); Judith Newman, *Praying by the book: The Scripturalization of Prayer in Second Temple* (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1999); Bilhah Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (trans. J. Chipman; Leiden: Brill, 1994); Julie A. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot* (Leiden: Brill, 2006).

¹⁵⁶ The palace setting and understanding is what Chapter 2 attempts to argue with Matthew's emphasis on Jesus' identity as the *Royal Messiah* and Matthew as his scribe (cf. Matt 1:1; 13:52). See W.V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press, 1989); R. Kalmin, *Sages, Stories, Authors, and Editors in Rabbinic Babylonia* (Atlanta: Scholars press, 1994); idem, *The Sage in Jewish Society of Late Antiquity* (London; New York: Routledge, 1999); W. Kelber, *The Oral and the Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q.* (repr. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1997); J. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987); H. Snyder, *Teachers, Texts and Student: Textual Performance and Patterns of Authority in Greco-Roman Schools* (Yale University Dissertation, 1998).

¹⁵⁷ This can be seen with Matthew's focus on the conflict between Jesus and the religious leaders (especially the Pharisees and their scribes) (cf. Matt 23 as well as 3:7, "You brood of vipers," [Pharisees and Sadducees]; cf. Luke 3:7 [crowds]). See Albert Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (Leiden: Brill, 1997); J.T. Sanders, *Schismatics, Sectarians, Dissidents, Deviants* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1993); M. Smith, *Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament* (New York & London: Columbia University Press, 1971); G. Stemmerger, *Jewish Contemporaries of Jesus: Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1995).

- There were multiple methods by which Second Temple scribes wrote and interpreted Jewish authoritative traditions.¹⁵⁸

When *Matthew's use of the Old Testament* is understood within this socio-historical context, then the Gospel of Matthew starts exhibiting diverse approaches to using the Jewish scriptures.

2. Thesis and Overview

This dissertation will examine Matthew's uses of the Jewish scriptures by focusing on the Gospel's fivefold narrative structure, Jesus' five discourses, and the fulfilment quotations. Each chapter will present and elaborate on a specific function that Matthew, as Jesus' scribe, dutifully accomplishes on his behalf by using the Jewish scriptures.

Chapter 2: Matthew presents Jesus as the *Royal Messiah*, and infers his scribal office and activities with various clues within his narrative. As a scribe, Matthew uses multiple scribal strategies, as well as previously known Jewish and Christian authoritative traditions, to authenticate Jesus' kingship and authorize his message concerning the kingdom of heaven.

Chapter 3: Matthew rewrites narrative (i.e. rewrites the Gospel of Mark within a Torah) by seamlessly blending (collecting, reordering, rewriting and supplementing) material from Mark, Jesus' teachings (Q), and the Torah.

Chapter 4: Matthew rewrites the Torah in Jesus' first and fifth discourses by citing the Decalogue and Holiness Code, and emphasizing a "righteousness that exceeds the scribes and Pharisees" for entering into the kingdom of heaven.¹⁵⁹ In addition, Matthew rewrites the Torah by blending it with eschatology and wisdom in Jesus' prophetic woes as he denounces the scribes and Pharisees and their understanding and practices of Torah, and in foretelling the destruction of the temple and the signs of the *Last Days* (i.e. necessitating the need to be faithful and watchful).

¹⁵⁸ Chapters 3–7 each have a section that illustrates an aspect of the multiple uses of the Jewish scriptures. See C. Schams, *Jewish Scribes in Second-Temple Period* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998); E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004); M. Hirshman, *A Rivalry of Genius: Jewish and Christian Biblical Interpretation* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1996); P. Alexander, "Quid Athenis et Hierosolymis? Rabbinic Midrash and Hermeneutics in the Graeco-Roman World," in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (eds. P. Davies and R. White; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 101–23; Johann Maier, "Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Literature," in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation, vol. 1, From the Beginning to the Middle Ages (Until 1300), part 1, Antiquity* (ed. M. Saebo; Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 108–29.

¹⁵⁹ This includes the practices of almsgiving, prayer and fasting.

Chapter 5: Matthew applies the Jesus' Torah in Jesus' second and fourth discourses as covenant community rules to expand Jesus' reign and message by presenting his mission strategy, and to establish a covenant community by stating the importance of each member, the procedure for community discipline, and the significance of forgiveness.

Chapter 6: Matthew reveals and hides the *mystery* of the kingdom of heaven in Jesus' Parable Discourse. He emphasizes Jesus' use of parables and wisdom traditions to reveal/hide the kingdom of heaven and identities himself as a scribe.

Chapter 7: Matthew uses the Hebrew prophets in his explicit fulfilment quotations to disclose divine revelation and prophecy.

In sum, Matthew uses the Jewish scriptures in multiple ways to re-present Jesus' traditions within Second Temple Judaism. Considering himself as a scribe within the tradition of the court scribes, Matthew writes his Gospel: (1) to authenticate Jesus' kingship and authorize his message by rewriting the Gospel of Mark within a Torah; (2) to present Jesus' royal legislation concerning the kingdom of heaven and to validate Jesus' role as a judge in the *Last Days* by rewriting the Torah; (3) to apply the Jewish scriptures in formulating Jesus' mission strategy and establishing a rule for the covenant community; (4) to unveil/hide the *mysteries* of the kingdom of heaven in Jesus' parables; and (5) to reveal God's divine plan from the Hebrew prophets in Matthew's fulfilment quotations.

IV. CONCLUSION

The history of research concerning *Matthew's use of the Old Testament* has revealed some deficiencies and a number of issues.¹⁶⁰ The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls and subsequent scholarly discussions and publications have greatly enhanced and brought into sharper focus important aspects of Second Temple Judaism and Christian origins: scribal practices, textual formation, authoritative texts and traditions (scriptures), sectarianism, social dynamics, and Jewish practices. Therefore, a fuller consideration of these developments during this period can produce a more nuanced and precise understanding of *Matthew's use of the Old Testament* (i.e. his scribal practices and use of Jewish scriptures).¹⁶¹

¹⁶⁰ This is due perhaps to the constraints of the information at their disposal, and especially incomplete information regarding Second Temple Judaism and its literature.

¹⁶¹ For example, including the Hebrew Bible as a canon-in-the-making with minimal or no distinction between authoritative Jewish texts and interpretations; the significance of the Second Temple literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls for Matthean studies; and the dynamic complex socio-historical matrix of Second Temple Judaism and Christian origins.

Furthermore, to remedy the issues arising from its history of research and include recent research, I propose the thesis that Matthew, considering himself as a scribe to Jesus, wrote his Gospel with multiple uses of the Jewish scriptures to authenticate Jesus' identity as the *Royal Messiah* and his message regarding the kingdom of heaven; thereby, fulfilling his duties as a scribe. First, he rewrote the Gospel of Mark within a Torah. Second, he rewrote the Torah as Jesus' legislation concerning the kingdom of heaven (Matt 5–7) to judge all the nations in the *Last Days* (Matt 23–25). Third, he applied the Jewish scriptures to formulate Jesus' mission strategy for expansion (Matt 10), and to establish Jesus' rules for life within the covenant community (Matt 18). Fourth, he veils and reveals the *mysteries* of the kingdom of heaven in Jesus' parables (Matt 13). Fifth, he reveals the culmination of the Jewish scriptures in the Hebrew prophets in Jesus *the Royal Messiah* with his fulfilment quotations.

CHAPTER TWO

JESUS THE ROYAL MESSIAH AND MATTHEW HIS SCRIBE

I. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, I propose to examine Matthew's presentation of Jesus as the *Royal Messiah*,¹⁶² and the various clues within his narrative as to his self-understanding as Jesus' scribe.¹⁶³ This gives us a metaphor from Matthew's socio-historical context from which Matthew may have understood himself in writing his Gospel.¹⁶⁴ Therefore, concomitant with scribes in Second Temple Judaism, Matthew has multiple writing strategies at his disposal, as well as previously known Jewish and Christian authoritative traditions, to identify and illuminate Jesus' kingship and the kingdom of heaven.

This chapter can be divided into three sections. First, I will attempt to illuminate Matthew's emphasis on Jesus as the *Royal Messiah*. Second, I will try to locate within the Gospel where Matthew's self-understanding as a scribe seems to be inferred. Furthermore, I will examine other contemporaneous scribes to formulate some understanding of scribal duties. Third, I will conclude that the Gospel of Matthew accentuates the office of scribes, alongside Jesus' identity as the *Royal Messiah*, and should be re-read in light of Matthew's scribal expertise and his multiple uses of the Jewish scriptures.

¹⁶² In designating Jesus' identity as the *Royal Messiah*, I have chosen to maintain the significance of Jesus' royalty while differentiating him from other foreign kings (cf. Matt 1:6).

¹⁶³ This chapter, as well as this dissertation, attempts to illustrate Jesus and Matthew as an etic (an analogy of king and scribe) rather than an emic approach.

¹⁶⁴ The authorship and location of Matthew is not critical to this dissertation. However, it is generally thought to be written by a Jewish Christian scribe who wrote it predominately for converts from Judaism in the region of Syria or Galilee. For the sake of simplicity, I will refer to the author as Matthew. See Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 62–65, 73–75; Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, 1.7–58; Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 177–98, especially 178 n. 492 and 179 n. 497; Aaron M. Gale, *Redefining Ancient Borders: The Jewish Scribal Framework of Matthew's Gospel* (New York: T&T Clark, 2005), 87–110; Anthony J. Saldarini, "The Gospel of Matthew and Jewish-Christian Conflict in the Galilee," in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity* (ed. Lee I. Levine; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), 271.

II. JESUS: ROYAL MESSIAH AND KING OF THE JEWS

1. Jesus the Royal Messiah

The Gospel of Matthew asserts that Jesus is the *Royal Messiah* and the *King of the Jews*. Although God is the ultimate king in Matthew, both Jews and Gentiles recognize Jesus' royalty (5:35; cf. 14:9; 18:23).¹⁶⁵ The Jews recognize Jesus' kingship through the royal titles of *Messiah* or *Christ* (ὁ χριστός),¹⁶⁶ *Son of David*,¹⁶⁷ and *Son of God*.¹⁶⁸ Furthermore, the Gentiles unmistakably acknowledge Jesus' kingship with the title the *King of the Jews*, which is the charge that eventually leads to his crucifixion (27:42; cf. 2:2; 27:11, 29, 37).

Jesus' royalty is explicitly highlighted at the beginning and the end of the Gospel, and more implicitly within the Gospel.¹⁶⁹ First, Jesus' identity as the royal messiah is expressed right from the outset: “Βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ,”¹⁷⁰ with his designation as *Christ* and *Son of David*, and his royal genealogy in the line of “King” David (1:1–17; cf. 1:16). Therefore, Jesus, as David's descendant in royal succession, is recognized as the *Royal Messiah* and the *Son of God* (2:11; 3:17; cf. Ps 2:7; Isa 42:1). Moreover, Jesus' birth narrative emphasizes his kingship with the magi, as well as King Herod, searching specifically for the *King of the Jews* (2:1–3; cf. 14:9). Reminiscent of the infanticide of Exod 1 by the king of Egypt,¹⁷¹ King Herod plots against “the child who has been born king of the Jews” and devises a plan to eliminate this threat to his rule under the pretence of paying homage to the new king (cf. Exod 1:15–22).

¹⁶⁵ Matthew asserts God's kingship through Jesus' and John's proclamation of the kingdom of heaven.

¹⁶⁶ Χριστός (Messiah) occurs 16–17 times in Matthew (1:1, 16, 17, 18; 2:4; 11:2; 16:16, 20, 21[?]; 23:10; 24:5, 23; 26:63, 68; 27:17, 22). Although it may be used as a personal name, it still conveys the basic titular idea of an anointed, national deliverer, and is associated with the *King of the Jews* (2:2, 4, 13, 16; 27:11, 17, 22, 29, 37) and the *Son of God* (16:16; 26:63).

¹⁶⁷ See Matt 1:1, 17; 9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 20:30, 31; 21:9, 15; 22:42; cf. 1:20. This title seems to have connotations to royalty and healing.

¹⁶⁸ See Matt 4:3, 6; 8:29; 14:33; 26:63; 27:40, 43, 54.

¹⁶⁹ The beginning of Matthew is mostly his own material (1:1–2:23). In the middle of the Gospel, there is less explicit mention of Jesus as the Royal Messiah and more inference of Matthew's concern for royalty and Jesus' authority.

¹⁷⁰ Literally translated as “[The] book of the origins (or genesis) of Jesus Christ son of David son of Abraham.”

¹⁷¹ Matthew seems to be drawing a parallel here to the call of Moses in an effort to establish Jesus' messianic credentials in line with mosaic authority and royal status (cf. *Moses* 1:20–21, 59–61). The call narrative of the prophet Jeremiah in Jer 1:5–10 serves as a useful analogy for this phenomenon. See also William Holladay, *Jeremiah 1* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1986), 26–31; Walter Beyerlin, ed., *Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1978), 27–30.

However, the magi do not return to King Herod, but leave for their own country. This infuriates him, and leads him to murder all the children in and around Bethlehem who were two years old and under (2:1–19).

Second at the end of Matthew, various events surrounding Jesus' crucifixion and death bring his royal identity to the forefront.

1. Jesus' entry into Jerusalem portrays him as the royal messiah who is celebrated as God defeats Israel's enemies and establishes his rule (21:5; cf. Zech 9:9).¹⁷²
2. Before Pilate the Roman Governor, Jesus affirms his royalty when asked, "Are you the King of the Jews?" (27:11).¹⁷³
3. The Roman soldiers mock Jesus as king by clothing him with a scarlet robe, by placing a crown of thorns on his head and a reed in his right hand, and by kneeling before him and hailing him as the *King of the Jews* (27:27–31).
4. The charge against Jesus that led to his crucifixion was the claim that he was the *King of the Jews* (27:37).
5. During his crucifixion, Jesus was taunted by the Jewish religious elite to come down from the cross, to validate his identity as the *King of Israel* and the *Son of God*, and to save himself (27:42).

Third within the Gospel, a number of instances emphasize Matthew's royal concern. In Matt 10:18, as compared to Luke 12:1, Jesus indicates that his disciples will be dragged before governors and kings (ἡγεμόνας δὲ καὶ βασιλεῖς) rather than rulers and authorities (τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας) as witnesses. Exclusively in Matthew, Jesus speaks to Peter about kings and taxes (17:25), and Matthew's fulfilment quotation identifies Jesus as a king entering into Jerusalem (21:5; cf. 5:35). Moreover, Jesus' kingship seems to be authenticated by his authority to teach, heal, forgive, and confer his authority on his disciples (7:29; 8:9; 9:6, 8; 10:1; 21:23, 27; 28:18),¹⁷⁴ as well as his message concerning the kingdom of heaven: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven has come

¹⁷² Matthew develops the metaphor of Jesus as a shepherd, who will ultimately gather God's scattered people and will judge all the nations as a shepherd king over his court (25:34, 40; cf. 2:6; 9:36; 10:6; 25:32; 26:31). See Clay A. Ham, *The Coming King and the Rejected Shepherd: Matthew's reading of Zechariah's Messianic Hope* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005).

¹⁷³ However, there are two instances of kingship that Matthew seems to miss: (1) Luke equates the Messiah with kingship, but this could be purely explanatory for Luke (Luke 23:2); and (2) Mark has two instances of the king of the Jews rather than Messiah but again this could be due to Matthew's emphasis of Jesus as the Messiah (Mark 15:9, 12; cf. Matt 27:17; 22).

¹⁷⁴ Jesus' teaching is not only in word, but authoritative through acts of power, healing and forgiveness (7:29; 8:9; 9:6–8 cf. 21:23–27). Furthermore, Jesus as the *Royal Messiah* bestows his authority to Peter and his disciples (16:19; cf. 10:1; 28:18).

near” (3:2; 4:17).¹⁷⁵ This key component of Jesus’ message, the kingdom of heaven (or the reign of God), naturally has connotations of kingship (4:17, 23; 5:3, 10, 19–20; 9:35; 10:7). In addition, Matt 11:2–6, the works of the Messiah, ties together the kingdom of heaven with the Messiah by suggesting that Jesus’ mighty acts are signs of the *Royal Messiah* and appearance of the kingdom of heaven. Also Matthew’s parables about the kingdom of heaven portray God and Jesus as king (18:23; 22:2, 7, 11, 13; 25:34, 40; cf. 16:28) and Jesus’ teaching about the kingdom of heaven identifies God as king and Jesus as his son (6:10; 33; 7:21). Therefore, the kingdom of heaven seems to be a sphere to be entered into by those whose practices conform to the standards of divine reign with the *Royal Messiah*.

Jesus’ kingship also seems to be built on prominent kings from Israel’s past: David, Solomon, and Moses.¹⁷⁶ Associated with the house of David, Jesus is identified as the *Son of David* (2:11), the *Son of God* (3:17; cf. Ps 2:7 and Isa 42:1), and the rejected eschatological shepherd of God’s people (2:5b–6). Matthew’s use of Zechariah portrays Jesus as both the Davidic king and the rejected shepherd.¹⁷⁷ Solomon’s wisdom is associated with Jesus as he is identified as greater than Solomon and often speaks in

¹⁷⁵ The kingdom of heaven is located in a number of key locations. For example: Jesus’ testing (4:8); Beatitudes (5:3; 10); Jesus’ Torah Discourse (5:19–20; 6:10; 7:21); inclusion of the centurion and Gentiles (8:11–12); Jesus’ teaching and proclaiming and healing (9:35); parables (18:23; 22:2); entrance into (19:14); and transfer of authority (21:43).

¹⁷⁶ Allison (*New Moses*, 275) comments: “Both Moses and Jesus were many things, and they occupied several common offices. Moses was the paradigmatic prophet-king, the Messiah’s model, a worker of miracles, the giver of Torah, the mediator for Israel, and a suffering servant. And Jesus was similarly a suffering servant, the mediator for Israel, the giver of Torah, a worker of miracles, the Mosaic Messiah, and the eschatological prophet-king. It would be error to isolate any one common function or title and promote it as the *raison d’être* for Matthew’s Moses typology. One should not, for instance, assert that Matthew’s Jesus is Mosaic simply because he is the Messiah, or simply because he is the prophet like Moses, or simply because he gives a new law. The truth is more expansive than that.”

¹⁷⁷ Shepherd occurs four times in Matthew: Davidic king who will shepherd the people of Israel (2:6); Jesus’ description of Israel as sheep without a shepherd (9:36); Jesus who heals and gathers the ‘the lost sheep of the house of Israel’ (10:6); the Son of Man who judges all the nations as a shepherd separating the sheep from the goats (25:32); the flight of disciples as the scattering of sheep (26:31). Furthermore, Jesus enters Jerusalem as a king with this quotation (21:5; 27:1, 29, 37, 42). Matthew develops the metaphor of Jesus as a shepherd, in contrast to the failed Jewish leaders, as the fulfilment of the expectations of a future Davidic king from Bethlehem (25:34, 40).

parables (12:42).¹⁷⁸ Jesus shares many similarities to Moses, who is identified as a king in Philo, as the giver, interpreter, and teacher of the Torah (5–7; cf. 12:5, 41–42).¹⁷⁹

Jack Kingsbury identifies a number of major and minor titles associated with Jesus in Matthew:¹⁸⁰ the major titles are *Christ* (Messiah), *Son of David*, *Son of God*, *Κύριος*, and *Son of Man*, and the minor titles are *Son of Abraham*,¹⁸¹ *Coming One*,¹⁸² *Shepherd*,¹⁸³ *Rabbi-Teacher*,¹⁸⁴ *Servant*,¹⁸⁵ and *Emanuel*.¹⁸⁶ Jesus is explicitly identified as the Messiah,¹⁸⁷ which is combined with Jesus' designation as the *Son of David* (i.e. *Royal*

¹⁷⁸ See Matt 12:42; 13; cf. Prov 8:15–16.

¹⁷⁹ Howard C. Kee (*Knowing the Truth: A Sociological Approach to New Testament Interpretation* [Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1989], 95) states, “above all, Jesus is portrayed in Matthew as a figure of authority, with respect to the interpretation of the law and to the determination of who are worthy to be members of the new community.” Moses was for Judaism the personification of authority. To him was given the Torah, and “Moses says” was interchangeable with “Scripture says” and with “God says.” (CD 5:8; 7:14; 19:26–27; Matt 22:24; Rom 10:19; *Ant.* 7:91).

¹⁸⁰ Although Jack D. Kingsbury (*Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom* [Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1975]) attempts to identify the *Son of God* as the primary function of Jesus, he recognizes the significance of *Christ* (Messiah), and *Son of David*. In addition, his neat categorizations are misleading due to the overlap of these various roles; e.g. Jesus' designation as Messiah may be a conflation of *Son of David*, *Κύριος*, *Son of God*, and *Son of Man*.

¹⁸¹ This designation has connotations for the ideal Israelite for the history of Israel beginning in Abraham and culminating in Jesus (1:17).

¹⁸² Occurs 4 times where it seems to be messianic (3:11–17, 11:3; cf. 21:9).

¹⁸³ Often associated with God himself as the shepherd of his people or the Davidic Messiah (34:23–34; 37:24). Matthew refers to Jesus as an eschatological shepherd (2:6, 15; 25:31–33; 26:31–32; cf. 9:36; 10:6; 15:24).

¹⁸⁴ Although not by his disciples, Jesus is often addressed as teacher (8:19; 9:11; 12:38; 17:24; 19:16; 22:15–16, 23–24, 36; cf. 26:17–19). This is evident with Jesus, who wanders about Galilee teaching (4:23; 9:35; 11:1), ascends the mountain and instructs his disciples and the crowds (5:1–2; 7:28–29), invites those who labour and are heavy-laden to “learn from me” (11:25–30), teaches in the temple with the authority of God (21:23–27), and, after his resurrection, appears to his disciples on a mountain in Galilee inviting them to teach the nations to observe all that “I have commanded you” (28:16–20). In addition, Rabbis authoritatively interpret and teach the Jewish scriptures (23:7–8). Jesus as Messiah also functions as a Rabbi-Teacher who authoritatively interprets the Torah and Jewish scriptures. The teacher stands in apposition to the title “Messiah” in that the Messiah is the one teacher of the disciples (10:24–25; 23:8, 10). Judas Iscariot address Jesus as rabbi two times (26:25, 49) as compared to the other disciples who address Jesus as “Lord” (26:22).

¹⁸⁵ A number of quotations from Isaiah's Servant Songs are adapted (12:18; cf. Isa 42). In addition, the term “servant” is attributed to Jesus, giving him God's authority (4:23–25; 9:27, 35; 12:22–23; 15:20, 29–31; 20:30; cf. 8:16–17; 11:5).

¹⁸⁶ Found in association with Isaiah, the person of Jesus signifies God's presence—God with us (1:23; cf. 14:27, 18:20; 28:20).

¹⁸⁷ Jesus is portrayed and acknowledged as the Messiah by John the Baptist and Simon Peter (1:1, 16–18; 2:4; 11:2; 16:16, 20). Jesus acknowledges himself as the Messiah (16:20; 22:42; 24:5) as

Messiah; 1:1; cf. 1:20; 22:42–45) and the *Son of God* (3:14–15; cf. 4:3, 6; 8:29; 14:33; 16:16; 26:63; 27:40). First, Jesus’ identification as the *Son of David* is connected with his healings (9:27; 15:22; 20:30–31; cf. 12:23) and emphasized as he enters Jerusalem (21:9, 15) and as he is questioned about his authority in the temple (22:42–45).¹⁸⁸ Second, Jesus is identified as the *Son of God* at his baptism (3:14–15; cf. 4:3, 6; 8:29; 14:33; 16:16; 26:63; 27:40), which overlaps with *Messiah* (cf. Matt 26:63). In sum, Jesus is the *Royal Messiah* with an unconventional understanding of kingship. Divinely appointed, his kingship is a mix of humility and power and most apparent at the time of his greatest humiliation (27:29).¹⁸⁹ As the *Royal Messiah*, he displays and teaches with power and authority (10:1; 11:4–5; 23:10; cf. 2:4; 16:16, 20–21, 22:42) and yet dies on a cross (20:26–28; 26:28, 52–53; 27:17, 22, 37, 42).¹⁹⁰

2. Nature of Kingship in Late Second Temple Judaism

Matthew emphasizes Jesus’ royalty, which seems to be a response by Jewish-Christians to their socio-historical context. Therefore, I will attempt to establish the nature of kingship as a feature of Second Temple Judaism from which Matthew could have emerged by examining its tumultuous political landscape and conflicting ideologies on kingship.

A perusal of the landscape in the late Second Temple period seems to indicate high political tension as various authorities and sects vied for control.¹⁹¹ Palestine, surrounded by local kings and competing powers, sat in the midst of political uncertainty.¹⁹² However,

well as a teacher-messiah (23:10; cf. 26:63, 68; 27:17, 22). References to messiah are found in Matt 1:1, 16, 17, 18; 2:4; 11:2; 16:16, 20; 22:42; cf. 23:10; 24:5, 23; 26:63, 68; 27:17, 22.

¹⁸⁸ Jesus’ question and the Pharisees’ answer equates the *Messiah* with the *Son of David* and hints at Jesus’ superiority over King David.

¹⁸⁹ Matthew 8:20; 9:6; 12:8; 19:28; 24:64. Jesus as king will someday sit on a throne to judge all the nations (25:31–46).

¹⁹⁰ Matthew 21:5 cf. Isa 62:11; Zech 9:9.

¹⁹¹ For the social, political, and religious diversity within Second Temple Judaism see Albert I. Baumgarten, *Flourishing of Jewish Sects*; Eyal Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*, (Religion and Society 45; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007); and Martin Goodman, *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998).

¹⁹² The shifting political rule of Palestine (Ptolemies, Seleucids, Hasmoneans, and Romans) added to its political turmoil and internal conflict. See S. Safrai and M. Stern (eds.), *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions* (Vol. 1; second printing; Van Gorcum & Comp. B.V., 1974).

First, with the success of the Maccabean revolt in 167–64 BCE, the Hasmoneans under Jonathan (152 BCE) and Simon (140 BCE) began as a priestly monarchy without using the title of king, probably to distinguish themselves from the very Hellenistic ruler they had resisted and

the nature of their kingship assimilated many aspects of Hellenistic kingship: (1) in their use of mercenaries, (2) in expanding their territory, (3) in engaging with diplomatic intrigue with foreign nations, and (4) in establishing their authority and power.¹⁹³

With the end of the Hasmonean dynasty and the beginning of Roman rule from 40 BCE onward, Herod the Great was appointed as king of Judea by the Roman senate where he and his descendants ruled as client kings. However, the nature of this type of kingship differed from their predecessors with its primary focus on domestic affairs and keeping order, collecting taxes, and the appointment of the high priest.¹⁹⁴

After the death of Herod the Great in 4 BCE, with the uncertainty of kingship and political unrest in Palestine, a number of messianic figures revolted against Roman-Herodian rule and economic exploitation: Judas in Galilee, Simon in Perea, and Athronges in Judea (*J.W.* 2.57–65; 2.117–18; *Ant.* 17.274–84).¹⁹⁵ These political movements gained control of considerable areas for a time, only to be overthrown by the Roman army (*Ant.* 17.278–84).¹⁹⁶

overthrown. They, however, later took the title of king starting with Aristobulus I in 104 BCE, followed by Alexander Jannaeus, Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II (1 Macc 14:47; *Ant.* 13:301). Aristobulus I is even called a *philhellene* by Josephus, and Hyrcanus II saw himself not only as king of Judea but also as the King of the Jews in his intervention with Rome on behalf of Diaspora Jews (*Ant.* 13:318; 14:223–24; cf. also 15:14–15). Because the Hasmoneans claimed and merged together the offices of high priest and king, some Pharisees and other groups opposed and questioned their legitimacy, as they were not from the traditional high priestly family of the Zadokites or from the royal Davidic line (cf. *Ant.* 13:291–95). This seems to explain the separation of priestly and royal figures in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

¹⁹³ The Hasmoneans did this by adopting Greek names, claiming kinship with the Spartans, and naming their dynasty after an early ancestor.

¹⁹⁴ This type of kingship seems to have had no real national identity as a Jewish delegation after Herod's death wished "to be delivered from kingship and such forms of rule," and preferred to be under the Roman governor of Syria (*Ant.* 17:315). Therefore, some Jews rejected human kingship altogether as Josephus explains, "The nation was against them both and asked not to be ruled by a king, saying that it was the custom of their country to obey the priest of God," and that the two claimants "were seeking to change their form of government in order that they might become a nation of slaves (*Ant.* 14:41)." In addition, when Rome instituted direct rule of Judea in 6 CE, Judas the Galilean, founder of the sect Josephus called the Fourth Philosophy, led an armed revolt based on the view that "God alone is their leader and master" (*Ant.* 18:23). There seems to have been wide support for the Fourth Philosophy and with it a revival of the Israelite antimonarchical tradition (*Ant.* 18:9).

¹⁹⁵ Josephus also includes Menahem (*J.W.* 2.433–40).

¹⁹⁶ From lowly social origins, these messianic movements consisted largely of peasant followers. The popularly acclaimed king Simon bar Giora proclaimed liberty for slaves and justice to the poor and wore a white tunic and royal purple mantle as he surrendered to the Romans (*J.W.* 7:21–36; 2:517–22; *Ant.* 17:273–84). Another messianic movement was the Bar Kokhba revolt of 132–35

In connection with the nature of kingship, Israel's royal ideology in the Jewish scriptures focuses on the kingdom of God. In the Hebrew Bible, the kingdom of God often refers to a territory or political organization under monarchical rule, but is ultimately identified as God's sovereign rule over all creation: therefore, Israel's king was God's vicegerent.¹⁹⁷ Basically instituted with the Davidic dynasty, the king represented God's rule and mediated divine blessings to Israel as God's son.¹⁹⁸ Although the monarchy came to an abrupt end with the fall of Judah in 586 BCE, the expectations of an ideal future king persisted into exilic and postexilic times as it was kept alive with Israel's authoritative traditions and often associated with the Davidic Messiah.¹⁹⁹ Furthermore, integrated into Second Temple Judaism and corresponding with Matthew's kingdom of heaven, Dale C. Allison helpfully identifies three aspects of the kingdom of God within this broader perspective:²⁰⁰ (1) it is righteous and virtuous, and often associated with wisdom and the sage-scribe (Matt 5–7; 13);²⁰¹ (2) it is a heavenly realm (26:52–54; cf. Matt 24–25);²⁰² and (3) it is God's eternal eschatological rule implicitly set over Satan's kingdom that fully occurs after a final judgment and Satan's destruction (4:1–11; 12:22–32; 25:31–46).²⁰³

CE, which seemed to have developed from expectations of a messiah and from authoritative traditions of kingship. In sum, these popularly recognized kings with their messianic movements, even though they ruled a limited area for a limited time, were significant and served as a backdrop to Matthew's royal messianic depiction of Jesus.

¹⁹⁷ Cf. Gen. 10:10; Num 32:33. God's Kingship over all the world and all creation (Pss 22:8; 47; 103:9; Dan 4:32; *1 En.* 84:2) but should also include kingdom of YHWH (1 Chr 28:5; 2 Chr 13:8), kingdom of Israel (1 Sam 15:28; 24:20), kingdom of Judah (2 Chr. 11:17; cf. *T. Jud.* 17:3), or the kingdom of this or that ruler (1 Kgs 2:12; 1 Chr 10:14). God is the true king of Israel (Num 23:21; 1 Sam 8:4–9; *Ant.* 6:60).

¹⁹⁸ Cf. 2 Sam 7; 1 Kgs 2:1–4; Pss 2; 72; 89; 110; 132; Isa 9:1–7.

¹⁹⁹ Cf. Deut 17:14–20; Gen 49:8–12; Num 24:17–19; cf. Isa 32:1–8. See Kenneth E. Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism: Its History and Significance for Messianism* (SBLEJL 7; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995).

²⁰⁰ Dale C. Allison, Jr. "Kingdom of God" in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (eds. J.J. Collins and D.C. Harlow: Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 860–61.

²⁰¹ Philo describes a true king as being virtuous (rather than false kings who establish their kingdoms through violence and wars): "the kingdom of the sage comes by the gift of God, and the virtuous individual who receives it brings no harm to anyone, but the acquisition and enjoyment of good things to all his subjects, to whom he is the herald of peace and order" (*Somn.* 2:243–44; cf. *Abr.* 261; *Sacr.* 49; *Migr.* 197; *Prob.* 125–26; also *4 Macc.* 2:23; *T. Jud.* 15:2). See also Matt 6:3–4; Dan 3:33; 2 Macc 1:7; *Pss. Sol.* 17:3; Wis 10:10.

²⁰² Cf. Wis 6:17–20.

²⁰³ Cf. Isa 52:7; Obad 21; Zech 14:9. In the New Testament, it seems that Satan rules the world, but, with Jesus and the coming of the kingdom of heaven, he is bound (Matt 4:8; 12:18, 26; Luke 4:5;

Closely connected with Allison’s concepts of the kingdom of God are messianic expectations.²⁰⁴ Specifically, the Messiah is not a unified concept, but characteristically diverse depending on the type of work that is expected: (1) royal messiah,²⁰⁵ (2) priestly messiah,²⁰⁶ (3) prophetic messiah,²⁰⁷ and (4) heavenly eschatological messiah.²⁰⁸ In response to new social and political circumstances, royal messianism emerged ca. 100 BCE arguing from authoritative texts (pre-exilic Israelite royal ideology and later hopes for the restoration of the Davidic monarchy) to legitimize their views.²⁰⁹ Royal messianism, founded on the traditions of kingship, continued the ancient Israelite royal ideology that kings represent divine rule and mediated divine blessing to their people.²¹⁰

This socio-historical understanding about the nature of kingship can also be seen in a number of Second Temple compositions that Matthew may have known. However, we must first examine Deut 17:14–20 for it may have laid the foundation for the nature of kingship in late Second Temple Judaism and the Gospel of Matthew. It has six regulations²¹¹ that are required for Israel’s ideal king so that he would have the fear of the

John 2:31; 14:30; 16:11; cf. 4Q246; 4Q521; 1QSb 4:25–26; 2 Bar. 73:1; *T. Jud.* 4:4–5; *T. Mos.* 10:1).

²⁰⁴ Although messianic expectations are absent in some Second Temple literature, a number of Jews embraced the hope that God would ultimately intervene to judge, liberate, and rule the world through his eschatological agent—the Messiah. Generally, the Messiah, a divinely ordained position of authority, refers to any eschatological figure serving as an agent to God’s purposes in the world.

²⁰⁵ Cf. 2 Sam 23:1; Ps 2:2. Zechariah 4:14, “two sons of oil,” alludes to dual leadership of priest and king (cf. 1Q21 frg.1; *Jub.* 31:18–20).

²⁰⁶ Cf. Lev 4:3, 5, 16; 16:5; Dan 9:25–26. The priestly messiah is also called the interpreter of the law (CD 7:18; 4QFlor i 11–12). CD 7:18–19 takes the star from Num 24:17 to represent the priestly messiah (cf. 4Q175; 4Q541 frg. 9 col. 1. See also “messiah of Aaron” (CD 7:18–20; 12:23–13:1; 14:19; 19:10–11; 20:1; 1QS 9:10–11; 1QSa 2:11–15).

²⁰⁷ Cf. 1 Kgs 19:16; Isa 61:1. The prophets could collectively be called “anointed ones” (Ps 105:16). This hope for a future ideal prophetic figure (Deut 18:15–18; Mal 4:5–6; cf. 1QS 9:11).

²⁰⁸ For heavenly eschatological messiah, see *Pss. Sol.* 17:32; 1QS 9:10–11; *1 En.* 48:10 (cf. Dan 7:13–14; 12:1; 10:13; 1QM 17:7–8; 11QMelch). In addition, many Jews held no messianic expectations, since expectations are absent in some Second Temple literature (cf. Philo; Josephus).

²⁰⁹ From Israel past, royal messianism anticipates future restoration through an ideal Davidic king characterized as the son of God, who conquers his enemies and rules forever (Mic 5:2–5; Isa 11; cf. Gen 49:10; Num 24:15–19).

²¹⁰ See 2 Sam 7; Isa 8:23–9:6; Pss 2, 45, 89, 110, 132.

²¹¹ (1) The king must be an Israelite and not a foreigner. (2) The king must not acquire many horses or rely on military might. (3) The king must not acquire many wives or rely on political alliances. (4) The king must not acquire great wealth or rely on riches. (5) The king must have a copy of this law written for him in the presence of priests. (6) The king must have and read the law all the days of his life.

Lord, keep the words of the Torah, not exalt himself above any other person in Israel, and his descendants would reign long over Israel.

The first regulation concerning Jesus' nationality as an Israelite can be seen in Jesus' genealogy with his designation as a *son of Abraham* (1:1). The second, third and fourth regulations concerning the accumulations of military might, political alliances, and wealth on the surface seem nonsensical, but, throughout Matthew's narrative, Jesus makes efforts to fulfil these requirements.²¹² Jesus' humble beginnings and flight into Egypt illustrate a certain picture of his kingship, ultimately epitomized in his crucifixion and death, that seems diametrically opposed to Herod's kingship and brutality. The fifth and six regulations are important for Jesus' kingship and they could be viewed in terms of Matthew's role as a scribe, who writes a copy of the Torah for the king.²¹³ This *Torah of the King* would then produce wisdom, obedience to the Torah, and humility in the king, whom God would bless with a long rule (cf. 28:18).

The Temple Scroll rewrites the *Torah of the King* (11QT 56:12–59:21).²¹⁴ It seems to be a response to Hellenistic and Hasmonean kings consisting of military and judicial affairs.²¹⁵ In other Scrolls, the legitimate king, sometimes expected to be of Davidic descent, is described as a royal messiah and an eschatological king, who is righteous, able to conquer Israel's enemies (*Kittim*), and judges the nations.²¹⁶ The royal messiah will be endowed with spiritual power, bear the names of the tribes of Israel on his shield, judge righteously, defeat the ungodly in the eschatological battle, and establish the kingdom of God's people (1QS^b 5:20–29; 4Q285; 1QM 5:1–2; cf. 4QpIsa^a frgs. 2–6 15).

²¹² Without being too rigid, Jesus does not reply on military might (cf. Matt 26:51–56), political alliances (cf. Matt 16:1–4; 21:23–27) or wealth (cf. Matt 6:24–34).

²¹³ This is displayed in Matthew's five blocks of teaching, but especially in Jesus' Torah Discourse (Matt 5–7; cf. 13:51–53).

²¹⁴ 11QT^a is thought to have originated around the last third of the second century BCE and related (antecedent) to the sectarians at Qumran.

²¹⁵ Even though the Hasmoneans claimed and merged together the offices of high priest and king, they faced opposition and questions of legitimacy (cf. *Ant.* 13:291–95).

²¹⁶ Several Dead Sea Scrolls (mostly from the *pesharim*) refer to a Davidic messiah (4Q252 col v 1–4; 4QFlor i 10–13; 4QpIsa^a frgs 8–10 11–24; 4Q285 v 1–6) from the “Branch of David” (Jer 23:5; 33:15) or other interpretations of Gen 49:9–10, 2 Sam 7:11–14, Amos 9:11, and Isa 10:34–11:5.

This royal messiah, often designated as the *Messiah of Israel*, seems to be consistently paired and subordinate to a priestly messiah, the *Messiah of Aaron* (1QS 9:10–11; CD 12:23; 1QSa 2:20). Another designation for the royal messiah or the branch of David is the *Prince of the Congregation*, which seems to be understood as the fulfilment of Balaam's prophecy “a sceptre will rise out of Israel,” who will strike violently the sons of Seth (CD 7:19–20; cf. Num 24:17).

Psalms of Solomon 17 (ca. 50 BCE) also depicts the ideal king as the *son of David*, who is appointed by God as the Messiah and represents God's kingship. He is righteous, compassionate, wise, and powerful. He mediates divine blessing to his people, destroys the unrighteous, and judges the nations.²¹⁷ This king as the *son of David* has a variety of tasks in connection with the LORD, the Israelites, and the nations.²¹⁸ *Psalms of Solomon* 17 depicts a royal messiah based on God's promise to David and his eternal rule (2 Sam 7; Pss 2 and 89; Isa 11).²¹⁹

Josephus can be labelled antimonarchical with his ideal government as a form of priestly aristocracy (*Ag. Ap.* 2.184–89).²²⁰ This is evident in his retelling of the *Law on the King* from Deut 17: 14–20, where he advocates God as the ultimate king and concedes to a controlled form of monarchy under the high priest and senators (*Ant.* 4:223–224).²²¹ In addition, the unconditional character of the Davidic monarchy is absent with the end of the dynasty acknowledged (*Ant.* 10:143).²²²

Both Philo and Ezekiel the Tragedian depict Moses as the ideal king due to his virtue. In the beginning of the first century CE, Philo of Alexandria, reflecting on kingship,

²¹⁷ In contrast to the *Law of the King* in the Temple Scroll, the *Psalms of Solomon* has no priests in view and solely presents the king in terms of a royal Davidic ideology (cf. Isa 11:1–5).

²¹⁸ Concerning the LORD, he will not put his trust in military strength or wealth, but trust in the lord as his king (*Pss. Sol.* 17:32–34). Concerning Israel: he will rule and judge them in wisdom, joy and righteousness, giving glory to the lord; he will gather them together as a great people, allotting land to each tribe; he will be pure from sin, mighty in works and strong in the fear of the lord to shepherd Israel so that none will stumble or be oppressed; he will be mighty in the Holy Spirit and wise by the spirit of understanding; and he will eradicate wickedness so that there is no unrighteousness in his day and all will be holy. Concerning the nations: he will be endowed with strength to shatter unrighteous kings and purge Jerusalem from ungodly nations; he will destroy the pride of the sinners and godless nations by the might of his word; he will be feared and be served by the nations; and all the nations will come from the ends of the earth to see this righteous king, who is anointed and taught by God.

²¹⁹ God will appoint, empower, and instruct this royal messiah to be mighty, wise, compassionate and just. Wholly devoted to God, the Davidic messiah will be a military figure bringing political change—judgment against enemies and deliverance for Israel—and a virtuous figure, who will wisely and righteously rule all Israel, including Jewish exiles, and the nations.

²²⁰ Ultimately, Josephus applies a scriptural text about a world ruler, interpreted by some to refer to a Jewish figure, to Vespasian, the Roman general and future emperor (*J.W.* 6:312–13).

²²¹ Also in *Ant.* 6:36, when Israel seeks a king, Samuel opposes a monarchical government because of “his innate love of justice and his hatred of kings.”

²²² Contrary to Josephus, Justus of Tiberias was promonarchical and served as a scribe to King Agrippa II and wrote a chronicle of the kings of the Jews, beginning with Moses and ending with Agrippa (*Life* 336–341).

begins with the premise that “God is the first and sole king of the universe” (*Post.* 101).²²³ Philo indicates that Moses was the true king because of his goodness, closeness to God, and desire to benefit his subjects (*Mos.* 1.148–62), who embodied the Hellenistic ideal of the king as the “living law.”²²⁴ Similarly Ezekiel the Tragedian, in *Exagoge*, depicts Moses as a universal king (lines 68–89).²²⁵ In a dream, God asks Moses to take God’s crown and sceptre and His place on a great throne on the top of Mt. Sinai. From the throne, Moses can see the whole world, at which point the stars fall at his feet.²²⁶

In sum, Matthew’s portrayal of Jesus is part of the lively discussion on the nature of kingship in Second Temple Judaism. Although Jesus is like other kings, Matthew adapts it with Jesus’ many designations. This may be the reason that only the Gentiles refer to Jesus as the *King of the Jews*, while the Jews use their own designations and titles such as the *Messiah*, the *Son of David*, and the *Son of God*. Therefore, like the Hasmonean kings, Jesus uses his disciples to expand his reign and territory and engages in diplomatic relations with other nations (Matt 10:1–42; 28:16–20); like the Herodians, Jesus focuses on domestic affairs and the ordering of his covenant community (Matt 18); like *Pss. Sol.* 17, Jesus rules and judges in wisdom, joy and righteousness, giving glory to God (Matt 13; 23–25); like

²²³ For the ideal human king, Philo passes over David and Solomon and turns to Adam, Melchizedek, Abraham, and especially Moses.

²²⁴ Although Philo’s model kings are Jewish, his understanding of kingship is thoroughly Hellenistic, accepting moral kingship (*Legatio ad Gaium*).

²²⁵ Written in the late third or early second century BCE, Ezekiel was an author from the Egyptian Diaspora and his view of Moses’ universal kingship may have been a response to notions of universal kingship among the Ptolemies.

²²⁶ Other Second Temple texts present various images, competing ideologies, and their voice to the lively socio-historical discussion on the nature of kingship. The *Letter of Aristeas* (ca. 130 BCE) includes a set of fictional banquet scenes hosted by Ptolemy II, the Egyptian king, who questions seventy-two Jewish sages about the nature and practice of kingship. Echoing Hellenistic concepts of kingship in universalistic terms, the Jewish sages recommend the king recognize God’s sovereignty. Therefore, the kings imitating God’s virtuous rule would govern with justice, patience, benevolence, temperance, and impartiality, while avoiding pride and tyranny. *The Testament of Judah*, drawing from Gen 49:9–10, presents kingship alongside and subordinate to the priesthood from the tribe of Levi as it brings salvation to Israel by destroying their enemies (*T. Jud.* 21:1–6). Offering a positive perspective on foreign kingship, *Sibylline Oracles* 3 (ca. 150 BCE), reminiscent of Cyrus the divinely appointed Persian king (Isa 44:28–45:7), envisions God to appoint a “king from the sun” from the Ptolemaic line, who will bring an end to war, restore God’s people and inaugurate the messianic age (3.191–94). *4 Ezra* 11–12 (ca. 100 CE) refers to a Davidic messiah in an interpretation of a vision about a lion from the forest that passes judgment on an eagle (Roman Empire) who has oppressed the earth: “The lion is the messiah whom the most High has kept until the end of days, who will arise from the seed of David (12:32; cf. Gen 49:9–10).”

Philo and Ezekiel the Tragedian, Jesus is like Moses who gives, interprets and teaches the Torah (Matt 5–7).

III. MATTHEW: JESUS' SCRIBE

1. Matthew the Scribe

In the previous section, I argued that Matthew's depiction of Jesus as the *Royal Messiah* was not his invention but reflected the concerns of several Jewish authors on the nature of kingship. In this section, I want to work out what the implications of such a Christological perspective might be for how any modern interpreter might reconstruct Matthew's self-understanding as a scribe—i.e. working on Jesus' behalf with some of the roles and prerogatives of a scribe. Therefore, I will attempt (1) to establish that Matthew understood himself as a scribe fulfilling his duties on behalf of Jesus, his king; (2) to briefly delve into the socio-historical realities of scribes to delineate their various duties and roles; and (3) to examine two scribes roughly contemporaneous with Matthew—Nicolaus of Damascus and Flavius Josephus—to further illuminate a scribe's role and responsibilities.

Although Matthew's identification as a scribe is not explicitly stated, Matthew's emphasis on scribes, his use of the Jewish scriptures, and some scribal practices hint at this self-understanding. First, the somewhat cryptic identification of Matthew as a scribe in 13:52 is significant: "And he said to them, 'Therefore every scribe (πᾶς γραμματεὺς) who has been trained for the kingdom of heaven is like the master of a household who *throws* out of his treasure what is new and what is old.'" Second, Matthew mentions scribes more than any other Gospel with 22 references—ten from Mark and twelve exclusively to Matthew.²²⁷ Those found only in Matthew are mostly positive or at least neutral unless they are associated with the Pharisees (5:20; 12:38; 15:1; 23:2; 23:13–36; esp. 23:34) or other religious leaders (16:21; 20:18; 21:15; 26:57; 27:41).

Although some of Matthew's views of scribes are negative due to their association with Pharisees and Sadducees, scholars have accentuated Matthew's positive perspective of scribes.²²⁸ For example, "the scribes" in Mark 1:22 is changed to "their scribes" in

²²⁷ Matthew 2:4; 5:20; 7:29; 8:19; 9:3; 12:38; 13:52; 15:1; 16:21; 17:10; 20:18; 21:15; 23:2; 23:13–36; 23:34; 26:57; 27:41.

²²⁸ See Anthony J. Saldarini, *Pharisees, Scribes, and Sadducees in Palestinian Society* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1988); D.E. Orton, *The Understanding Scribe: Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal* (JSNTSup 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988); J.A. Overman, *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1990). Scribes are

Matt 7:29. When scribes are connected with Pharisees, they are portrayed negatively (Matt 23; cf. 22:41–46; Mark 12:35–40). Therefore in Matthew, scribes are not clearly distinguished.²²⁹ They are neutral and only viewed negatively or positively depending on their association with another group (i.e. the Pharisees or Jesus). This becomes evident when comparing Matthew and Mark’s use of scribes.²³⁰ For example, contrary to Mark 11:27 (chief priest, scribes and elders), scribes are not included in those who want to kill Jesus in Matt 21:23 (chief priest and Pharisees).²³¹ This is also evident in Jesus’ trial with his opponents: (1) Matt 26:3 (elders and chief priests) compared to Mark and Luke (scribes and chief priests); (2) Matt 26:47 (chief priests and elders) compared to Mark (chief priest, scribes and elders); and (3) Matt 27:1, 11, 20 (chief priest and elders) compared to Mark (chief priest, elders, scribes and the whole council).²³² In addition, when scribes and Pharisees are viewed negatively, scribes are sometimes omitted in Matthew (9:9–13; cf. Mark 2:13–17). Therefore, in Matthew, scribes seem to be associated with a religious group or leader (i.e. scribes and Pharisees) and negative only in their association with them. Overman concludes that the office of the scribe is developing in Matthew with some possibly being disciples, and there were good and bad scribes.²³³

Matthew refers to scribes as teachers having religious authority, who are concerned with Jesus’ authority and power (7:28–29; 17:10; cf. 9:3) and observe the Torah and the traditions of the elders (15:1–2; 16:21–23; 20:17–19). In Matthew’s woes to the scribes and Pharisees, a number of observations can be made about Matthew’s view of scribes (Matt 23).

associated with Pharisees (5:20, 12:38; 23:2, 13, 15, 23, 25, 27, 29; cf. 15:1) and the Sadducees (3:7; 16:1, 6, 11, 12).

²²⁹ Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 182.

²³⁰ Mark has a negative picture of scribes. Scribes are overly concerned about social contact and matters of the law; e.g., eating with sinners and tax collectors (Mark 2:13–17) and eating bread with unwashed and therefore defiled hands (Mark 7:1–2). They want social recognition and display their religious prestige; e.g., best seats in synagogues and feasts with robes and long prayers (Mark 12:38–40). Mark identifies them as teachers of the people in opposition to Jesus’ teaching (Mark 1:22; 9:11; 12:35), and occupy a position to question the legitimacy of Jesus’ actions, teachings, and source of authority (Mark 11:27–28). Furthermore, the scribes from Jerusalem seem to have greater influence and authority than local scribes from Galilee (Mark 3:22). See Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 150–51.

²³¹ Even in the larger context of Jesus’ teaching in the temple, the opposition consists of chief priests and elders.

²³² However, this is not always the case: e.g., Matt 27:4 (chief priests, scribes and elders) compared to Mark 15:31 (chief priests and scribes) and Luke 23:35 (rulers).

²³³ Overman, *Matthew’s Gospel*, 117.

1. They have authority as teachers in matters of the Mosaic Torah as they interpret the Jewish scriptures (23:2, 7).²³⁴
2. They make detailed and rigorous religious regulations and laws (with power to enact them).
3. They have social status.
4. Although they display a pretense of religious piety with long prayers and clothing, they are to be devoted to God (23:16, 23–24; cf. 15:14).
5. They are zealous in making converts (23:15).²³⁵

Therefore, like these scribes, Matthew functions as a scribe—who has expertise and authority in writing and interpreting the Jewish scriptures. However, unlike these scribes, he observes the Torah and the scriptures.²³⁶ He is a trained scribe, who interprets the fulfilment of the scriptures and prophecies correctly (1:22–23; cf. 2:3–6),²³⁷ and interprets parables and understands Jesus’ message about the kingdom of heaven (13:52; 23:34).²³⁸

In sum, Matthew, like the scribes of the Pharisees, uses Jewish authoritative traditions to affirm his office as a scribe. Matthew is not a mere copyist but rather a top-tiered scribe, a scribe, in service to King Jesus.²³⁹ In this section, I have tried to demonstrate that Matthew could have viewed himself as working like a scribe to fulfil the king’s commands in writing (producing, preserving, transmitting and elaborating) Jewish and Christian authoritative traditions. This seems to be evident in his use of late Second Temple scribal strategies and multiple uses of the Jewish scriptures to authenticate Jesus as the *Royal Messiah*, and to authorize his edicts, laws and rules.²⁴⁰

²³⁴ D.J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Sacra Pagina Series 1; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991), 320. Scribes and Pharisees are portrayed as successors of Moses in their role as interpreters of the Torah and teachers to the people. They are legal authorities associated with their expertise in the Jewish scriptures.

²³⁵ See Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 189 n. 540; Goodman, *Mission and Conversion*; McKnight, *Light*, 107.

²³⁶ Moses’ legend recorded by Josephus has close parallel to these functions of the scribes (*Ant.* 2:205). Furthermore, Egypt’s sacred scribes had considerable skill in predicting the future by announcing to the king the birth of Moses and his role as the new ruler of the Israelites. See Schams *Jewish Scribes*, 193 n. 555.

²³⁷ Orton, *Scribe*, 155–56. Disciples in opposition to the Jewish leadership (cf. Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982], 469–70; Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 193).

²³⁸ In Ben Sira, one area of expertise of a scribe was the interpretation of parables (Sir 38:33–39:3). See Orton, *Scribe*, 142.

²³⁹ See N.S. Fox, *In the Service of the King: Officialdom in Ancient Israel and Judah* (Cincinnati, 2000), 101–107, 271–72; A. Demsky, “Scribe,” in *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 14 (Jerusalem, Keter, 1971), 1041–43.

²⁴⁰ Cf. Matt 16:19; 17:10; 23:2–3, 34.

2. Scribes in Late Second Temple Judaism

Recent research into the person and work of scribes, textual transmission, and the use of Jewish authoritative traditions can add to a greater understanding of Matthew's self-understanding as a scribe.²⁴¹ Therefore, the anachronistic picture of the author of Matthew as a mere copyist sitting at a desk dissolves with a clearer image of Second Temple scribal culture and practices for the production of literary texts.²⁴² In this section, I will attempt to utilize the work of David Carr, Catherine Hezser, Karel van der Toorn and Christine Schams as guides to survey the world of scribes and textual transmission in late Second Temple Judaism and to see how their views may inform our picture of Matthew as a scribe.²⁴³

By incorporating aspects of ancient Jewish literacy and education, all four scholars give a broad portrait of Second Temple Jewish scribal culture including the occupation and practices of scribes, and the production and transmission of texts.²⁴⁴ They confine the writing of literary texts primarily to scribes and associate them either with the palace (i.e. royal officials) or the temple (i.e. priests).²⁴⁵ Furthermore, they provide a broad spectrum of scribal professions with only a tiny minority reaching high levels of scribal activity. They insist on calling Jewish society a "literate society" with writing employed in various social

²⁴¹ The state of the "biblical" text in the Second Temple period and the current scholarly discussions concerning the Hebrew Bible or Old Testament text: F.M. Cross, S. Talmon, E. Tov and E. Ulrich. The use of scripture needs some clarification: (1) the identification of scripture (both explicit and implicit use of scripture); (2) the multiplicity or multi-pronged approach to the use of scripture, including contemporaneous Jewish interpretation (e.g. rewriting, explicit quotations, etc.), the range and diversity of uses in the New Testament, the mediation of scripture (i.e. Matthew's received tradition), and modern Jewish identification of biblical interpretation.

²⁴² R.A. Derrenbacher, Jr., *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem* (BETL 186. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005).

²⁴³ David M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005); Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine* (TSAJ 81; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001); Karel van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007); and Schams, *Jewish Scribes*.

²⁴⁴ Although these scholars focus on scribal activity in Palestine, they have examined texts and scribal practices beyond it by following and chronicling Jewish scribal activity as it became associated with and influenced by Egyptian, Babylonian, Hellenistic and Roman periods. Furthermore, late Second Temple Jewish scribal practices do not seem to be limited to Palestine but seem to be scattered throughout the Diaspora. See Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 274–327; Carr, *Writing on the Tablet*, 3–14, 287–97; Naomi G. Cohen, "The Prophetic Books in Alexandria: The Evidence from Philo Judaeus" in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism* (eds. M.H. Floyd and R.D. Haak; LHB/OTS 427; T&T Clark, 2006), 166–193.

²⁴⁵ See Carr, *Writing on the Tablet*, 8.

contexts as a means of communicating and distributing information as texts were read aloud.²⁴⁶ Therefore, orality (often dependent and affected by written scribal culture) and textuality (often oracular performances) were interrelated as both accomplished the common goal of accurately recalling, communicating and impressing key traditions onto people's minds.²⁴⁷

David M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, provides a description of textual development in ancient Israel by surveying the surrounding cultures of ancient Mesopotamia, Egypt and the Eastern Hellenistic world. Developing a picture of textual production, collection, revision and usage, Carr attempts to outline the process regarding the formation of the Hebrew Bible, the nature of education, and the use of writing as a major cultural-religious medium.²⁴⁸ For Carr, Israelite literature is “intertextual,” not as a process of citing and interpreting separate written texts, but scribes were trained from the outset to write by building on templates provided by earlier texts or authoritative curriculum.²⁴⁹ Therefore scribes added to, recombined, and revised texts. In addition, rather than juggling multiple scrolls or having one scribe dictate, the oral-written model suggests that Israelite scribes most likely would have drawn from their memory of texts in quoting, borrowing from, or significantly revising them. Of course, as in other cultures, Israelite scribes probably visually copied certain texts that they wished to reproduce precisely.²⁵⁰

This model explains the continuation and modification of authoritative traditions; e.g. after the exile, scribes augmented and revised earlier traditions in the wake of the destruction of Jerusalem. Working from memory and addressing current situations, scribes would produce new texts constructed on memorized building blocks of older tradition. At

²⁴⁶ Jews used writing for many different purposes (military, administration, business, property, and family-related matters). Writing helped maintain friendship and patronage relationships, and preserved the memory of deceased ancestors and the Jewish religious heritage. See Hezser, *Jewish Literacy*, 449; 452.

²⁴⁷ See Carr, *Writing on the Tablet*, 9; van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 17.

²⁴⁸ Writing makes language permanent as it formalizes, generalizes, and perpetuates features and intentions of language. See Carr, *Writing on the Tablet*, 4, 10.

²⁴⁹ Carr (*Writing on the Tablet*, 159) states: “As in other cultures like Mesopotamia or Egypt, young scribes showed their competence through their ability to accurately recite and copy texts from the authoritative curriculum. Yet fully educated literate specialists in those other cultures also demonstrably added to that curriculum at key points, whether through producing a translation or new edition of major works, or through authoring new works that often echo those works in which the scribal author was trained.”

²⁵⁰ Carr (*Writing on the Tablet*, 161–62) states: “In Israelite history, first and foremost the Babylonian exile, when Israelite scribes probably had no access to reference copies of key traditions on which to base their reproduction or revision of the corpus.”

the same time, not all of them strictly need be from memory. Sometimes scribes may have produced new versions quite close to older texts, while in other cases they radically altered and expanded them: “Overall, it appears that the exile was a time of renewed focus on Israel’s pre-land traditions, the Mosaic Torah, with radical reformulations of those pre-land traditions being done in the oral-written matrices of both royal, nonpriestly scribal circles and priestly groups.”²⁵¹ However, a mark of development is the relative fixing of the basic contours of the Mosaic Torah.²⁵²

Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*, describes various elements concerning Jewish literacy and scribal culture.²⁵³ Hezser provides a general picture of Jewish reading practices as concentric circles with only a small minority able to read literary texts.²⁵⁴ The technical skills of writing were primarily associated with scribes with various levels of scribal writing probably existing with some able to write only letters and documents while others were able to write literary texts.²⁵⁵ Therefore, the more formal and complex the writing, the more specialized the scribe. The most complex and difficult type of writing was literary texts, with accounts, lists and labels on the other end of the spectrum scale. Literary compositions, such as the Gospel of Matthew, were almost always written by professional scribes.²⁵⁶

Karel van der Toorn also indicates the multi-level profession of scribes. Although some scribes were merely copyists, scribes were primarily from the social upper class, elite

²⁵¹ Carr, *Writing on the Tablet*, 168.

²⁵² Carr, *Writing on the Tablet*, 171–172.

²⁵³ See Hezser, *Jewish Literacy*, 110; 188 n. 108. Regarding Jewish literacy in Palestine, Catherine Hezser has proposed a variety of aspects and formulated five conditions for the development of Jewish literacy: (1) education; (2) the cost and distribution of texts; (3) the socio-economic functions of literacy; (4) religion and literacy; and (5) language usage.

²⁵⁴ Hezser (*Jewish Literacy*, 473) has a tiny centre of highly literate people (able to read in various languages), small circle of literates (able to read in a single language), wider circle of semi-literates (able to read only short letters, lists and accounts), broader semi-illiterate group (able to merely identify individual letters, names, and labels), and vast majority of the illiterate population (only able to listen to texts read out loud).

²⁵⁵ See Hezser, *Jewish Literacy*, 474–75. Communication was generally conducted orally and, on the few occasions when a document or letter was needed, one could simply hire a scribe and dictate the text (e.g. marriage, divorce and inheritance documents). Therefore, the availability of scribes was necessary.

²⁵⁶ Hezser, *Jewish Literacy*, 476–77.

professionals who underwent many years of advanced training.²⁵⁷ On the highest levels, scribes were sages with superior knowledge and access to the written traditions, which they often passed down to future generations.²⁵⁸ Israelite scribal culture focused on the production of divine revelation or texts claiming supernatural origins and insight into divine knowledge. Therefore, scribal education provided the training of “new prophets” able to read, write, interpret and speak divine revelation. Scribal education chiefly resided in teacher-student relationships with explanations of texts and elucidation of scripture.²⁵⁹

Furthermore, successive generations of professional scribes recalled, revised and augmented their valued traditions as situations changed. Deuteronomy, as well as the prophets and other writings, attests to this memorization, revision and augmentation as it often offers a new version of older instructions with claims of Torah authority. In addition, various social contexts were conducive to writing and often connected with power and the execution of authority.²⁶⁰ Writing seems to have been used for political, economic, social and religious reasons by the elites to support their claims of authority and as a means of influencing and controlling others:²⁶¹ “Jewish officeholders collaborating with the Romans in the administration of the province, wealthy Jewish landowners and large-scale merchants, and judges of local courts or rabbis.”²⁶²

Christine Schams, *Jewish Scribes in the Second-Temple Period*, examines the evidence for Jewish scribes in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman periods.²⁶³ During the

²⁵⁷ Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 53. Literacy could only be acquired through training: the possession of rudimentary writing skills would not be enough to qualify a person for the professional title of scribe.

²⁵⁸ Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 94–95.

²⁵⁹ Carr, *Writing on the Tablet*, 128, 130.

²⁶⁰ See Hezser, *Jewish Literacy*, 489–91. In the political-administrative sphere: The Roman administrators of the province and their Roman and Jewish subordinates on the local level are likely to have made ample use of writing, both in the form of documents and letters.

²⁶¹ Hezser, *Jewish Literacy*, 493.

²⁶² Hezser, *Jewish Literacy*, 494–95. The usage of texts and writing was not the only bias and expression of these circles’ power, but it certainly supported their authority claims and enhanced their means of controlling and influencing others.

²⁶³ I will focus on the Roman period (63 BCE–second century CE); however, some features of scribal practices from the Persian period should be noted. During the Persian period, Scribes functioned as officials on all levels of administration in both the palace and the temple. Specifically, in Jerusalem, some scribes held high official positions and were designated as sages, who were known for their knowledge and wisdom (Neh 13:13) as Schams (*Jewish Scribes*, 312) states: “Thus the role of scribes from pre-exilic times and the general Near Eastern tradition of influential and educated scribes as royal courts and in the administration of empires continued in a non-monarchic context.”

Roman period, Schams identifies scribes performing a variety of different roles and functions. Some scribes were high officials, who were educated and wise, and therefore continued to represent the Near Eastern notion of scribes as sages.²⁶⁴ However, scribes generally became increasingly established in towns and villages and functioned as officials in the administration of the province.²⁶⁵ In addition, some scribes began to copy sacred writings, which may have given them some influence and authority as experts through their reading and copying.²⁶⁶ Specifically in the Herodian kingdom, scribes functioned as officials and independent professional writers as the value and use of written documents increased.²⁶⁷ Therefore, only some scribes were scholars and wise men, who were educated and trained in sacred writings and designated as sages and experts in the laws and the scriptures.²⁶⁸

In sum, concerning scribal occupation, professional scribes as literate officials were key organizational tools for royal and priestly administrations.²⁶⁹ However, Israel's scribes belonged to a scholarly and professional guild connected with the temple, as a professional class of priests (scribes, scholars and teachers), rather than as individual authors.²⁷⁰ Authors, therefore, were not individuals in a sense, but a role associated with the scribal milieu and social group: authors were scribes who belonged to a certain social category

In addition, scribes in the early postexilic period probably also included the supervision, collection and distribution of tithes and taxes.

²⁶⁴ Scribes were in a wide range of social positions: a village scribe had a low social status (*J.W.* 1:479), and scribes such as Diophantus had a high official position in Herod's court as the king's secretary with influence because of writing skills (*J.W.* 1:529; cf. *Ant.* 16:319). See Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 135.

²⁶⁵ This made it easier to access written documents with the number of independent scribes growing in towns and cities.

²⁶⁶ Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 320–21.

²⁶⁷ Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 321–22. The influence of Hellenistic culture with its interest in writings and use of letters for private and commercial communication increased the number and status of scribes.

²⁶⁸ Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 322. This could be Josephus' references to Aristeus (scribe of the council of Jerusalem) and possibly Diophantus (scribe of King Herod), and others (*J.W.* 5:532; 1:529; *Ant.* 20:208; *J.W.* 6:291; cf. Matt 2:3–4).

²⁶⁹ Almost all writers and readers in the Hebrew Bible are officials of some kind: scribes, kings, priests, and other bureaucrats. See Carr, *Writing on the Tablet*, 116–17; 120. Cf. David and Solomon's officials (2 Sam 8:17; 20:25; 1 Kgs 4:3; 2 Kgs 12:11–16; 1 Chr 18:16; 2 Chr 24:11).

²⁷⁰ Van der Toorn (*Scribal Culture*, 6) states: "There was an intimate link between the scribal profession as it took shape in the Persian era and the application and the interpretation of the written Law (the Torah). Scribes were more than lawyers, however. Their training familiarized them with the works known as the Prophets and with the Writings as well. The Jewish scribes developed into the scholars of the nation and the guardians of its literary heritage."

representing the scribal community.²⁷¹ Moreover, scribes were craftsmen who wrote, edited, copied, publically read and interpreted the Jewish scriptures, which were the result of a series of scribal interventions: expansion, conflation, substitution, continuation and harmonization.²⁷²

Although a number of levels exist within the scribal profession, it seems that the making of the Jewish scriptures was reserved for the highest “scholar scribe” often associated with the temple.²⁷³ These temple scribes arose from Levitical scribes from the Persian era and were scholars of scripture and transmitters of sacred literature.²⁷⁴ These professional scribes were more than writers, but were scholars committed to the transmission, interpretation and teachings they had received from their ancestors.²⁷⁵

Furthermore, concerning scribal practices and text production, scribes wrote under the auspices of either the palace or the temple and were often the spokesmen for the patrons or institutions to which they belonged.²⁷⁶ They were not mere copyists, but involved the formation and the transformation of older tradition in their form, structure and wording: “To properly appreciate the role of the ancient scribes, it is necessary to take leave of the common conception of the scribe as a mere copyist. The traditional distinction between authors, editors, and scribes is misleading because it obfuscates the fact that authorship and editorship were aspects of the scribal profession.”²⁷⁷ Furthermore, scribes incorporated a combination of techniques into their literary production: (1) transcription of oral lore; (2) invention of new texts; (3) compilation of existing lore, either oral or written; (4) expansion

²⁷¹ Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 46–47.

²⁷² Van der Toorn (*Scribal Culture*, 7; cf. 1–8) states: “Both Deuteronomy and Jeremiah exhibit successive layers of scribal intervention. The final compositions reflect the involvement of generations of scribes. While displaying great respect for the text as they had received it, they added their interpretations, framework, and other textual expansions.”

²⁷³ Schams (*Jewish Scribes*, 139; cf. 124–273; esp. 180–99) identifies the common Graeco-Roman notion of a scribe as that of a village scribe, a secretary, a clerk or a government official.

²⁷⁴ Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 90.

²⁷⁵ Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 96, 166–67. Moses is used as model and forerunner of the scribes as a Torah scribe: a prophet, a priest and a lawgiver (gives Torah and communicates God’s Torah). Furthermore, it is well known that the promise concerning a prophet like Moses (Deut 18:18) was not written to be read as a prediction of the coming of one particular prophet, but as a legitimization of those who were sitting on “the seat of Moses” (Matt 23:2).

²⁷⁶ Written text and documents were often commissioned by wealthy and powerful individuals of organizations. High-ranking individuals, such as a king or wealthy citizens, might commission a text.

²⁷⁷ See van de Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 109–10. E.g. David as a sage and scribe (11Q5 27 line 2).

of inherited texts; (5) adaptation of an existing text for a new audience; and (6) integration of individual documents into a more comprehensive composition.²⁷⁸

3. Nicolaus of Damascus and Flavius Josephus²⁷⁹

Near the time of Matthew and Jesus,²⁸⁰ Nicolaus of Damascus²⁸¹ was a scribe of King Herod.²⁸² He was a distinguished historian, orator, philosopher, compiler of tragedies, and producer of works on natural science, the first autobiography and a multivolume *Histories*.²⁸³ Before being a scribe to King Herod, he had connections to Octavius

²⁷⁸ Professional scribes were responsible for the transmission of the written tradition; however, many texts were primarily created to support oral performance. See van de Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 12–15; 115–39.

²⁷⁹ Although only Nicolaus and Josephus are examined here, there were similar views of scribes in the Hellenistic world. Some scribes were secretaries and town clerks (Apollonius of Tyrana; *Philostratus* 1:352, 7; cf. Acts 19:35). They were educated and primarily performed official tasks of administration, finance and taxation, and some legal interpretation. See J. Andrew Overman, *Church and Community in Crisis* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press, 1996), 205.

However, others were more like Nicolaus and Josephus, who produced texts as professional and accomplished writers: Thucydides and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. As Gerald L. Bruns (*Hermeneutics Ancient and Modern* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992], 57) states: “The function of this monumental version is not simply to preserve but, prior to this, to institute—to settle and establish or lay down once for all—just what was said. On this model, at any rate, Thucydides is not only the historian of the Peloponnesian War but its lawgiver and scribe as well: his purpose is not to construct a picture of the war but to establish its twofold nature as a formal narrative of *erga* and *logoi*. (57)” See also Chris Keith, *Jesus’ Literacy: Scribal Culture and the Teacher from Galilee* (LNTS 413. New York: T&T Clark, 2011), 105.

²⁸⁰ I have chosen Josephus and Nicolaus as my two examples for two reasons: (1) their closeness to Matthew in terms of time and similarities; and (2) their close relationship, including their writings, to rulers. In addition, I could not find enough information about other scribes that were connected to kings within this timeframe.

²⁸¹ Josephus mentions Nicolaus in *Antiquities* (1:94, 108, 159), *Jewish War* (1:574, 629, 637; 2:14, 21, 34, 37, 92) and *Against Apion* (2:84). Nicolaus’ books on histories is mentioned in *Ant.* 7:101; 12:127; 14:68, 104. In addition, he is categorized with other writers as τὰς βαρβαρικὰς ἱστορίας ἀναγεγραφότες (writers of barbarian histories), συγγραψάμενοι τὰς ἀρχαιολογίας (writers of antiquities), and ἱστοριογράφος (historiographer or historian) (cf. *Ant.* 16:183, 186).

²⁸² On the life and works of Nicolaus of Damascus, see Wacholder, *Nicolaus of Damascus* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1962); M. Toher, “On the Use of Nicolaus’ Historical Fragments”, *CA* 8.1 (1989): 159–72. See also *Ant.* 14:9–10; 16:183–186, 335–50.

²⁸³ M. Stern, “The Reign of Herod and the Herodian Dynasty,” in *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions* (eds. S. Safrai and M. Stern; CRINT 1/1; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 255.

Augustus by writing his biography and tutoring Anthony and Cleopatra's children.²⁸⁴ As Herod's scribe, Nicolaus of Damascus had a number of duties including being his court historian, ambassador, counsellor and chief advisor.²⁸⁵

As a court scribe, Nicolaus wrote *Histories*, which was devoted to Herod.²⁸⁶ Although Nicolaus' *Histories* exists only in fragments, he wrote extensively and positively about Herod contributing a third of his *Histories* focused on him.²⁸⁷ Josephus comments on Nicolaus' positively biased testimony of Herod often glorifying him.

It is true, that Nicolaus of Damascus says that Antipater was of the stock of the principal Jews who came out of Babylon into Judea; but that assertion of his was to gratify Herod, who was his son, and who, by certain revolutions of fortune, came afterwards to be king of the Jews, whose history we shall give you in its proper place hereafter. However, this Antipater was at first called Antipas, and that was his father's name also; of whom they relate this: that king Alexander and his wife made him general of all Idumea, and that he made a league of friendship with those Arabians, and Gazites, and Ascalonites, that were of his own party, and had, by many and large presents, made them his fast friends (*Ant.* 14.9–10; cf. 16.183–86).

Furthermore, in contrast to other contemporary Greek writings, *Histories* occasionally cited and revered the Jewish scriptures.

Moreover, as a court scribe, Nicolaus spoke on behalf of Herod and his son Archelaus on at least three situations: (1) accompanied Herod to Asia Minor in 14 BCE and defended the privileges of the Jews before Agrippa; (2) went to Rome with a delegation from Herod and appeased Augustus; and (3) pleaded for Archelaus over Antipas before the emperor.²⁸⁸ In the delegation to Rome, Nicolaus successfully reconciled Herod with

²⁸⁴ Wacholder (*Nicolaus of Damascus*, 50) points out that Josephus wrote his *Vita* in the tradition of the Roman *commentarti pro vita sua*, whereas Nicolaus produced with his autobiography “an ethical treatise in the Judaeo-Peripatetic tradition.”

²⁸⁵ Many of Herod's assistants were Greek: Ptolemy (financial administrator); Philostratus (academic and Greek writer); Ptolemy (brother of Nicholas but concerned with finances); and Diophantus (secretary). See Stern, “The Reign of Herod,” 255–56.

²⁸⁶ Nicolaus wrote histories (τῶν ἱστοριῶν) and is a historiographer (ἱστοριογράφος) to King Herod who even Josephus indicates wrote a biased history for Herod rather than for others (*Ant.* 7:101; 16:182, 86). However, his role went beyond that of a historiographer and included being an ambassador to Rome (τὴν ἐντυχίαν ποιησάμενος).

²⁸⁷ Peter Richardson, *Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1999), 13. Nicolaus of Damascus (a historian and scribe) and his brother (a financial expert) were imported by Herod to advise him. Damascus, a typical Greek city, had institutions that provided sophisticated educational opportunities and training for talented youths to move in elite circles of the Roman empire (Richardson, *Herod*, 87).

²⁸⁸ Stern, “The Reign of Herod and the Herodian Dynasty,” 279.

Augustus, undermining the Nabatean delegation by exposing the truth of the circumstances surrounding Herod's invasion of Nabatea (*Ant.* 16:335–50).²⁸⁹

Flavius Josephus²⁹⁰ (Joseph ben Matthias) was also a scribe and a historian²⁹¹ to the Flavian dynasty of Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian, and wrote three major works: *The Jewish War*, *Jewish Antiquities* (with the *Life* as an appendix), and *Against Apion*.²⁹²

Josephus seems to have written as a historian defending the Jews, their beliefs and practices, while taking care not to offend his Roman patrons.²⁹³ Therefore, he seems to have laid the blame of the Jewish wars on a small and unrepresentative group of radicals (*J.W.* 1:9–12).

Josephus does not mention scribes (γραμματεῖς) as an important and influential group in his contemporaneous society, which raises questions as to their status and

²⁸⁹ Richardson, *Herod*, 292. In another example, Herod asked Publius Quintilius Varus (new governor of Syria) and Nicolaus to advise him in the matter of his son, Antipater.

²⁹⁰ Louis Feldman (*Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible* [Leiden: Brill, 1988], 539) summarizes Josephus' writing with these conclusions: (1) he is not a mere copyist or compiler but has consistent historiographical, political, religious and cultural views; and (2) he uses an eclectic collection of texts but favours the LXX. Similarly, Matthew is not a mere copyist or compiler and has a consistent view and presentation of Jesus. However, although he seems to have an eclectic collection of text, he favours the Hebrew rather than the Greek. This is evident with Matthew's quotations from Mark closer to the Greek and his own closer to the Hebrew.

²⁹¹ Josephus identifies himself with a number of people who wrote histories, referred to as ἀναγεγραφότες (those who record or inscribe), or who have written Antiquities (συγγραψάμενοι τὰς ἀρχαιολογίας): Manetho wrote Egyptian history, Berosus collected Chaldean monuments (Mochus and Hestiaeus), Hieronymus the Egyptian who wrote Phoenician history, Hesiod, Hecataeus, Hellanicus, Acusilaus, Ephorus, Mnaseas, and Nicolaus of Damascus (*Ant.* 1:107–108; cf. 1:93–95).

²⁹² Josephus wrote *Jewish Antiquities*, which is a multi-volume work mainly intended for a Greek and Roman audience to defend the Jewish people, culture, heritage and history. See S. Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992), 64–71; and Tommaso Leoni, "The Text of Josephus's Works: An Overview," *JSJ* 40 (2009): 149–184. Harold W. Attridge ("Josephus and His Works," in *Jewish writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (ed. M.E. Stone; CRINT 2.2; Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984], 203) states: "Since the Jewish revolutionaries were wicked and the Roman conquerors were not only brave but blameless in their conquest of the city, then, according to Josephus, the fall of Jerusalem was not an advantageous event, but a necessity dictated by God. This is a theme which permeates the War in various forms."

²⁹³ Although Josephus's reliability as a historian is frequently questioned, knowledge of the history, society and politics of the Second Temple period depends substantially on his writings. See Louis H. Feldman, *Josephus' Rewritten Bible*, 539–570; Pnina Stern, "Life of Josephus: The Autobiography of Flavius Josephus," *JSJ* 41 (2010): 63–93; S. Mason, "Josephus, Daniel, and the Flavian House," in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith* (eds. F. Parente and J. Sievers; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 163–191; Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 252; Bilde, *Josephus*, 123–71; M. Broshi, "The Credibility of Flavius Josephus," *JJS* 33 (1982): 379–84.

functions during his time.²⁹⁴ However, it also seems that he did not consider this Greek term γραμματεὺς an adequate description of various positions and the expertise of Jewish scribes for a non-Jewish readership.²⁹⁵ Josephus, as a scribe and historian,²⁹⁶ drew from many sources to write his compositions: (1) his own Aramaic account (*J.W.* 1:3, 6); (2) his own eyewitness experiences and careful notes (*Ag. Ap.* 1:48–49); (3) the Jewish scriptures; (4) *Jubilees* and *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*; (5) historians such as Nicolaus of Damascus, Cleodemus Malcus, and Artapanus; (6) Roman writings (*Life* 342, 358; *Ag. Ap.* 1:56); and (7) other written sources. In addition, Josephus exhibits literary artistry using A-B-A patterns, repetitions, doublets, changes in narrative voice for effect, and new word forms.²⁹⁷

Specifically in *Antiquities*, an expansive paraphrase that he claims to be a translation of the Jewish scriptures, Josephus presents the story of the Jews (their history, religion, and customs) for a Graeco-Roman audience (*Ant.* 1:17).²⁹⁸ This presentation incorporates a number of speeches by leading figures to invigorate the narrative: Agrippa II (*Ant.* 2:345–407), Josephus (*Ant.* 3:362–82), Ananus the priest (*Ant.* 4:162–92), Jesus (*Ant.* 4:239–69), Simon (*Ant.* 4:272–282), Eleazar (*Ant.* 7:320–36), and Titus (*Ant.* 3:472–84).²⁹⁹

²⁹⁴ Josephus calls the seventy elders who translated the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek *interpreters of the law* rather than scribes (*Ant.* 12:108; cf. 106–109).

²⁹⁵ Josephus seems reluctant to use the term γραμματεὺς. Schams (*Jewish Scribes*, 252–73) states a possibility to this silence. Josephus’ aim to explain Jewish society in a more intelligible way to his Greek non-Jewish audience may have prevented him from using the term γραμματεὺς, because of its standard meaning as a clerk or secretary rather than an expert in the Jewish scriptures. He would have preferred to refer to them in terms of their positions: i.e. teachers, priests, Pharisee, or experts in the Torah. In addition, Josephus’ political biases and residency in Rome may have also contributed to his avoidance of the term γραμματεὺς for some unknown connotation by the Roman Jewish community. Therefore, as Schams (*Jewish Scribes*, 257) states: “To summarize, it may be assumed that scribes had power and influence in society and possessed expertise in the Scriptures but Josephus failed to mention them because of his personal bias, his intentions, and/or the perception of his audience.”

Furthermore, the LXX translates the term γραμματεὺς for ספר and ספרא (scribe), שטר (prince or officer), שפט (judges) and מהקק (rulers of the nation; Sir 10:5). See Orton, *Understanding Scribe*, 52–53.

²⁹⁶ Scribes and historians seem to be compatible terms for Josephus due to the narrow and general Graeco-Roman understanding of γραμματεὺς as a clerk or secretary.

²⁹⁷ Steve Mason, “Josephus,” in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (eds. J.J. Collins, and D.C. Harlow; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 831.

²⁹⁸ Kimberly R. Peeler, “Josephus, Flavius,” in *The New Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible: I–Ma Volume 3* (ed. K.D. Sakenfeld; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2008), 403–404.

²⁹⁹ G. Hata, “Is the Greek Version of Josephus’ Jewish War a Translation or a Rewriting of the First Version?” *JQR* 66 (1975): 102–104.

In addition, Josephus accentuated the fulfilment of prophecy with all things happening according to prophecy.³⁰⁰ Moreover, *Antiquities* has a didactic dimension with moralizing aspects as virtues are exemplified by leading figures.³⁰¹

4. Matthew's Scribal Activity

From this evidence, a portrait of Matthew as a scribe begins to emerge.³⁰²

1. They are not mere copyists but are extensively trained in adding, revising and rewriting Jewish authoritative traditions and the scriptures.
2. They write histories for their king.
3. They use multiple written sources, almost anything at their disposal, but they also use their memory and oral traditions.
4. They use literary artistry by blending narrative and discourses together, and incorporating their own interests into their writing (e.g. Josephus' fulfilment of prophecy and teaching of virtue).
5. They speak on behalf of their king functioning as ambassadors, counsellors and chief advisors (e.g. Nicolaus on behalf of King Herod; *Ant.* 16:335–50).

Similarly, Matthew's scribal duties would require writing on behalf of Jesus, which could be in the form of recording, documenting, authenticating, and authorizing Jesus' identity and teachings, as well as validating his actions.

1. Authenticating Jesus' royal lineage and authority (Jesus' genealogy and seat of Moses; Matt 1–4; 23; 28:16–20);
2. Recording and legislating Torah (Jesus' Torah Discourse; Matt 5–7)
3. Adjudicating royal decrees (Jesus' Prophetic Eschatological Discourse; Matt 23–25);
4. Establishing royal strategies for expansion (Jesus' Mission Discourse; Matt 10; cf. 28:16–20)
5. Announcing royal edicts and policies for community life (Jesus' Covenant Community Discourse; cf. Matt 10 and 18);
6. Displaying Jesus' source of wisdom (Jesus' Parable Discourse; Matt 13);³⁰³ and

³⁰⁰ Attridge (“Josephus and His Works,” 223) states: “Although Josephus’ treatment of biblical prophets is limited, he does note the fulfilment of prophecies by David (8:109–10), Elijah (8:418–20), Isaiah (11:5–6, 13:64, 68) and Jeremiah (10:142, 11:1) and he devotes a considerable part of book 10 to a paraphrase of Daniel. Fulfilment of the prophecies of Daniel (1:322).”

³⁰¹ Attridge, “Josephus and His Works,” 185–232.

³⁰² There seems to be a diverse picture of scribes in late Second Temple Judaism with different individuals of varying backgrounds claiming expertise in the interpretation of the Torah and the Jewish scriptures. This provides a context in which scribes could gain authority and influence in society with regard to their expertise. See Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 325.

³⁰³ This is similar to Solomon's wisdom sayings and parables.

7. Jesus as the fulfilment of the Jewish scriptures (Matthew's fulfilment quotations).

In sum, scribal positions can be viewed as a spectrum with one end being scribal technicians (copyists) and the other end as wisdom teachers (sages). Matthew is not a mere copyist, but rather a sage teacher or top-tiered scribe who is able to use a variety of scribal strategies (cf. 1QS 6:6–8). Matthew presents scribes, as well as himself, as experts in the Torah with some influence in society as guardians and transmitters of the Jewish scriptures.³⁰⁴ Matthew seems to approve of some scribes—those trained for the kingdom of heaven—while denouncing the scribes associated with the Pharisees, because of their opposition to Jesus (23:1–36; cf. 13:52; 23:34). Therefore, Matthew, as a scribe, is able to draw from his “toolbox” of scribal strategies, as well as the Jewish scriptures and authoritative traditions, to write a history of Jesus and his teaching.

IV. CONCLUSION

The Gospel of Matthew depicts Jesus as the *King of the Jews* and the *Royal Messiah*, and Matthew as his scribe. Jesus is a virtuous, wise king, who is identified with many titles and designations: *Christ, Son of David, Son of God, Κύριος, Son of Man, Son of Abraham, Coming One, Shepherd, Rabbi-Teacher, Servant, and Emanuel*. Therefore, one can infer Matthew understood himself as a scribe at the service of King Jesus, fulfilling his duties of recording, documenting, authorizing and authenticating Jesus' identity and words concerning the kingdom of heaven. This is accomplished by Matthew's use of the Jewish scriptures as he interprets, writes, rewrites and textually transmits them on behalf of Jesus. On account of this, the entire Gospel should be re-read in light of Matthew's scribal expertise in using the Jewish scriptures in a variety of ways: to establish Jesus' identity and authority (chap. 3); to compose Jesus' decrees and judgments (chap. 4); to outline Jesus' mission strategy and rules for living in the covenant community (chap. 5); and hiding/revealing the mystery of Jesus' kingdom in parables (chap. 6); to authenticate divine revelation and prophecy of the person of Jesus as the fulfilment of the Jewish scriptures (chap. 7).

³⁰⁴ Matthew portrays γραμματεὺς with some functions usually associated with a סופר or ספרא in Near Eastern notions of scribes. Confusion with regard to role and function of Jewish scribes in the Roman period can also be partly ascribed to the semantic ranges of the terms סופר, ספרא and γραμματεὺς. See Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 323, 325.

This chapter has attempted to situate Matthew's self-understanding within the metaphor of the Second Temple context of kings and scribes.³⁰⁵ By understanding the nature of kings and the role of scribes, we now have a strategy to grasp Matthew's multiple ways of using the Jewish scriptures. Matthew, being quite comfortable with the traditions and practices of court scribes,³⁰⁶ would have at his disposal various scribal practices to accomplish his duties in establishing Jesus' kingship and reign.

³⁰⁵ By using the analogy of scribes and kings for Matthew and Jesus, I have attempted to highlight the etic rather than an emic understanding of Matthew. See note 162. Therefore, Matthew does not need to be a member of a court to be able to think of himself as having characteristics of a scribe in the service of a king.

³⁰⁶ They interpreted and rewrote authoritative traditions for their patrons and their nations.

CHAPTER THREE

MATTHEW REWRITES MARK

I. INTRODUCTION

In chapter 3, I will focus on Matthew's scribal aspect of rewriting narrative to give the general impression that Matthew uses the process of rewriting by weaving Jewish and Christian scriptures together in its narrative-discourse structure. I propose that Matthew rewrites the Gospel of Mark within a Torah pattern from Genesis to Deuteronomy by blending (collecting, reordering, rewriting and supplementing) material from Jesus' teachings (Q) and the Torah into Mark's narrative.³⁰⁷

As a scribe, Matthew would have been acquainted with rewritten texts, and been familiar with the widespread Second Temple scribal practice of rewriting narrative. In this chapter, I will attempt (1) to define rewriting narrative, (2) to identify and describe the characteristics of Matthew's rewriting of Mark, and (3) to ascertain Matthew's purpose for rewriting: to give authority to both Mark and Matthew, to authenticate Jesus' words as Torah, and to place Matthew within the trajectory of Torah and Gospel in his presentation of Jesus as the royal messiah.

II. MATTHEW'S USE OF SCRIPTURE: REWRITING NARRATIVE

1. Rewriting Narrative

Geza Vermes was the first to classify exegetical compositions that reworked large biblical narratives as "Rewritten Bible" (i.e. 1QapGen or the *Pesharim*).³⁰⁸ Many scholars have commented on and continued the discussion on Vermes' "Rewritten Bible." Moshe J. Bernstein has listed the scholarly debate surrounding "Rewritten Bible" in two directions

³⁰⁷ I have defined the Torah beyond just the Pentateuch to include extended teaching and law. See Chapter 4 section III.1 (Rewriting Torah). In addition, when the Pentateuch of the Hebrew Bible is specifically in view I use the term Pentateuch; however, when it extends beyond this then I use the term Torah.

³⁰⁸ See Geza Vermes, *Les Manuscrits du désert de Juda* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1953); *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (2nd ed.; StPB 4; Leiden: Brill, 1973).

that modify its understanding: (1) a classification or genre that needs refining and specificity; or (2) a process that expands into other genres and categories.³⁰⁹ Similarly, Anders Klostergaard Petersen has presented a brief diachronic discussion on “Rewritten Bible” and its identification as a genre or a textual strategy.³¹⁰

We begin again with Geza Vermes (1975) as the originator of this term, who recognizes “Rewritten Bible” as a narrative composition that followed the Hebrew Bible and included a substantial amount of emendations and interpretative expansions (alterations, paraphrases, and comments). He identifies “Rewritten Bible” as a genre: “The literary genre under consideration seeks to incorporate various explanatory devices into the biblical narrative with a view to clarifying, embellishing, completing or updating it.”³¹¹ However, George W. E. Nickelsburg (1984) and Daniel J. Harrington (1986) argue in favour of “Rewritten Bible” as a textual strategy.³¹² Nickelsburg lists a number of compositions from a variety of genres to define it as a textual process: running paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible, often with lengthy expansions (Jubilees, Genesis Apocryphon, Biblical Antiquities); narrative blocks in a non-narrative genre (1 Enoch); narrative roughly shaped by a non-narrative genre (Apocalypse of Moses); and poetic presentations of biblical stories (Philo the Elder, Theodotus, Ezekiel the Tragedian).³¹³ Similarly, Harrington broadens the category of “Rewritten Bible” to include other genres (i.e. 11QT) and those with a smaller “biblical” text base (i.e. *Assumption of Moses*), and, in this way, “Rewritten Bible” is more a process than a classification.³¹⁴ However, Philip Alexander

³⁰⁹ Moshe J. Bernstein, “‘Rewritten Bible’: A Generic Category which has outlived its Usefulness?” *Textus* 22 (2005): 169–96.

³¹⁰ See Anders Klostergaard Petersen, “Textual Fidelity, Elaboration, Supersession or Encroachment? Typological Reflections on the Phenomenon of Rewritten Scripture,” *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Technique? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes* (ed. József Zsengellér; JSJSup 166; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 13–48. He divides his discussion into four phases: (1) from 1961 to mid-eighties; (2) 1984 to mid-nineties; (3) mid-nineties to the millennium; and (4) the millennium to today.

³¹¹ Geza Vermes, “Biblical Interpretation,” in *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975), 49.

³¹² George W. E. Nickelsburg, “The Bible Rewritten and Expanded” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. M.E. Stone; Assen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress, 1984), 89–156; Daniel J. Harrington, “Palestinian Adaptations of Biblical Narratives and Prophecies I; The Bible Rewritten (Narratives),” in *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters* (ed. R.A. Kraft and G.W.E. Nickelsburg; SBLBMI 2; Philadelphia: Fortress; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 239–47

³¹³ Nickelsburg, “The Bible Rewritten and Expanded,” 89–156; esp. 89–90.

³¹⁴ Harrington, “Palestinian Adaptations,” 239–47.

(1988) in “Retelling the Old Testament” agrees with Vermes and argues that “Rewritten Bible” is a genre.

These previous authors set the basis for continued discussions on “Rewritten Bible” by a number of other scholars. By including the Temple Scroll, Dwight D. Swanson (1995) understood “Rewritten Bible” as process.³¹⁵ Devora Dimant (1999) and George J. Brooke (2000) stressed textual strategy of process.³¹⁶ George J. Brooke defines “Rewritten Bible” as “any representation of an authoritative scriptural text that implicitly incorporates interpretive elements, large or small in the retelling itself.”³¹⁷ This broad definition identifies this implicit use of the Jewish scriptures: rewriting closely follows the scriptural base text, and displays an editorial intention that emends or supplements the base text. This includes reworked Pentateuchs, rewritten Pentateuchal narratives, and Pentateuchal laws. Furthermore, Brooke adds those texts that not only deliberately attempt to rewrite the “biblical” narrative, but also use it to facilitate another work of a different kind (e.g. rewritten prophetic texts such as Apocryphon of Jeremiah or pseudo-Ezekiel texts).

Rewritten Bible texts come in almost as many genres as can be found in the biblical books themselves. It is a label that is suitable for more than just narrative retelling of biblical stories. It is a general umbrella term describing the particular kind of intertextual activity that always gives priority to one text over another.³¹⁸

In sum, Brooke expands *rewriting* to include any representation of an authoritative scriptural text or tradition that implicitly incorporates interpretive elements in its retelling.³¹⁹

Alongside this discussion, scholars raised the question of the Bible and canonicity, which eventually led to a terminological change from “Rewritten Bible” to “Rewritten Scripture.” Emanuel Tov (1994) refined “Rewritten Bible” by making a distinction

³¹⁵ Dwight D. Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT* (STDJ 14; Leiden: Brill, 1995), page.

³¹⁶ Devora Dimant, “The Scrolls and the Study of Early Judaism,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings* (eds. R.A. Kugler and E.M. Schuller. SBLEJL 15. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 43–59.

³¹⁷ George J. Brooke, “Rewritten Bible,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 2.777–78.

³¹⁸ Brooke, “Rewritten Bible,” 2.780.

³¹⁹ George J. Brooke, “Genre Theory, Rewritten Bible and Peshet,” *DSD* 17 (2010): 361–86; Harrington, “Palestinian Adaptations,” 239–47.

between *rewriting*, which has limited intervention in the biblical text, and *rephrasing*, which incorporates major changes so that the base biblical text is hardly recognizable.³²⁰ Furthermore, the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls has shed light on the textual history of the Hebrew Bible. Eugene Ulrich (1994) recognized that the Jewish scriptures in the Second Temple period were not fixed in any way, but contained multiple text types with some aligning to our known versions (e.g. MT, SP, and LXX), and others not aligning to any known version: i.e. pluriformity.³²¹ Therefore, at the turn of the century individual texts were not finalized but on their way. On a separate issue, there does not seem to be an agreed canon of the Jewish scriptures at this time, with many different authoritative collections of sacred writings.³²² Even though certain texts, such as the Torah and the Prophets, may have been viewed as authoritative among various Jewish communities, the exact status and number of works, including the Writings, is unclear during this time. Moreover, some works, such as *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch*, were found in multiple copies at Qumran. They may have held some prestige and influence, and, therefore, may have been viewed as authoritative.

This change in terminology from “Rewritten Bible” to “Rewritten Scripture” attempted to address these two issues: (1) multiple editions of texts at Qumran; and (2) the modern concept of the “Bible” being an anachronism for the late Second Temple period.³²³ However, even with this change in designation, the issue of genre and process persisted.³²⁴

³²⁰ Emanuel Tov differentiates between biblical and rewritten biblical texts, with rewriting being limited intervention with the addition of exegetical comments to a biblical text (“Biblical Texts as Reworked in Some Qumran Manuscripts with Special Attention to 4QRP and 4QparaGen-Exod,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* [eds. E. Ulrich and J.C. VanderKam; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994], 111–34).

³²¹ See Eugene Ulrich, “The Bible in the making: The Scriptures at Qumran,” *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Ulrich, and J. C. VanderKam; Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 77–93; idem, “The Text of the Hebrew Scriptures at the Time of Hillel and Jesus,” in *Congress Volume Basel 2001* (ed. A. Lemaire; VTSup 92; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 85–108.

³²² See Emanuel Tov, “The Many Forms of Hebrew Scripture: Reflections in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch,” in *From Qumran to Aleppo* (ed. A. Lange et al.; FRLANT 230; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 11–28; Michael Segal, “The Text of the Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Materia Giudaica* 12 (2007): 5–20.

³²³ However, “Rewritten Scriptures” as a designation, which includes compositions that have a close similarity to the Hebrew Bible, still recognizes the centrality of the Hebrew Bible and excludes authoritative texts that may not be specifically identified with it.

³²⁴ See Sidnie White Crawford, “The ‘Rewritten’ Bible at Qumran: A Look at Three Texts,” *ErIsr* 26 (1999): 1–8. In addition, she identifies “parabiblical texts” as compositions that are connected to

Moshe Bernstein and Michael Segal argue for a more rigid understanding of “rewriting” as it is applied to more and more texts. Bernstein (2005) himself maintains the genre of “rewritten Bible,” but excludes writing lemmatized commentaries and biblical translations (i.e. Palestinian targumim).³²⁵ Michael Segal (2005) identifies characteristics that distinguish rewritten biblical compositions from biblical manuscripts themselves. He sets internal criteria for defining rewritten compositions as a new work (i.e. transformation of the message of an earlier work and not merely a further literary edition of the source) in the same language as the original. However, it is a new literary unit and a new narrative frame with a different narrative voice as it expands, as well as abridges, the original with an editorial layer.³²⁶ These previous scholars identify “Rewritten Bible” or “Rewritten Scripture” to be a genre of a literary composition rather than the scribal process. In addition, Molly Zahn (2012) proposes “rewritten scripture” to be a genre functioning interpretively to update and correct earlier traditions by recasting a substantial portion of those traditions in the context of a new work that locates itself in the same discourse as the scriptural work it rewrites.³²⁷

This short diachronic survey of the history of “Rewritten Bible” illustrates the on-going discussion of its identification as a genre or a process, and the back-and-forth of changing opinions. I give two comments to conclude this discussion. First, although Bernstein critiques Brooke’s definition of rewriting as an “excessively vague all-encompassing term,”³²⁸ it does identify a Second Temple process that seems to be common and not specific to one kind of genre or limited in scope. Therefore, the process of rewriting can occur in narrative texts (Jubilees), legal texts (11QT), or wisdom texts (Ben Sira), with the actual process of rewriting usually conferring authority not only on the

a person, an event or a pericope from the Hebrew Bible without extensively reusing the biblical text. Even with this change of terminology, the issue of genre or process persists. Crawford in *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (2008) examines 4QRP, 11QT, and Jubilees, and holds to rewriting as a genre. Conversely, Daniel Falk (*The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 8; London: T&T Clark, 2007], 17) proposes rewriting to be a process or strategy, dissolving the distinction between the biblical texts and interpretation.

³²⁵ However, Bernstein (“Rewritten Bible,” 175) does incorporate 11QT into the category of “Rewritten Bible,” which reworks legal rather than narrative material from the Pentateuch.

³²⁶ Michael Segal, “Between Bible and Rewritten Bible,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* in SDSSRL (ed. M. Henze; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 10–28.

³²⁷ Molly Zahn, “Genre and Rewritten Scripture: A Reassessment,” *JBL* 131 (2012): 271–88.

³²⁸ Bernstein, “Rewritten Bible,” 187.

source text, but also to the new composition.³²⁹ Second, I end where we began with Geza Vermes. Recently, he indicated that “Rewritten Bible” is both a genre and a textual strategy of process: “The question has been raised whether the ‘Rewritten Bible’ corresponds to a process or a genre? In my view, it verifies both. The person who combined the biblical text with its interpretation was engaged in a process, but when his activity was complete, it resulted in a literary genre.”³³⁰

So how does *rewriting* pertain to Matthew? I suggest that Matthew, seeing himself as a scribe, rewrites the Gospel of Mark by blending and supplementing it within the Torah. Conflating, emending and rearranging Mark, Matthew alternates between his narrative and Jesus’ five discourses.³³¹ In addition, as a process, it helps to understand Matthew in three ways: (1) it can be used to group texts (into discourses and constellations), conferring authority on new compositions; (2) it is an implicit use of scripture (macro-rewriting of narrative), giving the significance to the narrative structure; and (3) it uses various genres as its base text.

2. Examples and Features of Rewriting Narrative

Drawing from earlier Jewish authoritative traditions, scribes rewrite texts to produce new compositions, often forming a literary dependence between the old and new texts.³³² This section will examine familiar rewritings of “biblical” narratives: *Chronicles*, *IQapGen*, *Jubilees*, *Reworked Pentateuch*, *LAB*, and *Jewish Antiquities*.

³²⁹ John E. Harvey, *Retelling the Torah: The Deuteronomistic Historian’s Use of Tetrateuchal Narratives* (JSOTSup 403; London; New York: T&T Clark, 2004); Bruce N. Fisk, “One Good Story Deserves Another: the Hermeneutics of Invoking Secondary Biblical Episodes in The Narratives of Pseudo-Philo and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” in *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity: Studies in Language and Tradition* (ed. C.A. Evans; JSJSup 33; SSEJC 7; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 217–38.

³³⁰ Geza Vermes, “The Genesis of the Concept of ‘Rewritten Bible,’” *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Technique? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes* (ed. József Zsengellér; JSJSup 166; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 8.

³³¹ The Second Temple scribal practice of rewriting can be found in many compositions on a micro- or macro-level with whole documents based on previous authoritative traditions.

³³² Specifically, in this rather wide phenomenon, rewriting can be accomplished by observing: (1) the object of what is being rewritten; (2) the way or the purpose it is rewritten; and (3) the degree or scope of the rewriting.

Chronicles' editorial influence (*tendenz*) shows itself in its theological interests on the Davidic dynasty as it rewrites and re-contextualizes Samuel and Kings.³³³ This royal emphasis is skilfully rewritten: reinterpreting, rearranging and supplementing parts of Samuel and Kings to create a literary composition to suit the author's own times and interests by positively highlighting David and Solomon.³³⁴ More than a mere paraphrase of Samuel and Kings, it fuses together old and new traditions to create a new literary work.

The *Genesis Apocryphon* rewrites parts of Genesis and embellishes the accounts of Noah and Abraham by idealizing these characters and "problem solves" their deficiencies.³³⁵ For example, Noah has a birth narrative (*IQapGen* 2–5) and Abraham's deception concerning Sarah is validated by a dream, which explains and dismisses his deception (*IQapGen* 19:13–19).

Jubilees, a transcript of the revelation made by the Angel of the Presence to Moses during his time on Mount Sinai,³³⁶ rewrites Gen 1 to Exod 12. It shares some similarity to Matthew in four characteristics of its rewriting: (1) legal rulings (cf. Matt 5–7),³³⁷ (2) explaining the difficulties of a scriptural text (4:29–30; 17:15–18; cf. Matt 19:1–12); (3) emphasizing various themes: eschatology (1:7–18, 22–25), idolatry (11:16–17), demons (5:6–11), and Sabbath (50:1–13); and (6) solving perceived ambiguities and gaps in Genesis by altering, expanding or omitting the base text (*Jub* 17:15–18:16; cf. Gen 22:1–2).³³⁸

³³³ See Gary N. Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 12; New York: Doubleday, 2004), 131.

³³⁴ Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9*, 122: "It may well be that the Chronicler, like a number of other authors in the ancient Mediterranean world, employed the literary technique of mimesis or *imitatio*, the conscious reuse of the content, form or style of an older literary work to define and bring recognition to one's own work." See also Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9*, 123, n. 171.

³³⁵ This idealization of biblical characters is also evident in *Jubilees* with Abraham and Jacob becoming model law keepers; in *Jewish Antiquities* with David and Solomon as exemplary kings functioning as healers and champions of virtue; and in *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* these exemplary figures deliver eloquent speeches and moving testaments, rehearsing God's deeds or calling the people to obedience (*LAB* 23; 32; cf. *Jub* 20–22; 25; 26).

³³⁶ Written around the second century BCE.

³³⁷ Legal matters such as purification (3:8, 10, 13), murder (4:5), retaliation (4:32), eating blood (6:11), circumcision (15:25–34), marriage (28:6), incest (33:10–17), and feasts (6:17; 16:29).

³³⁸ This can be seen by the addition of Jesus' birth narrative and some events after Jesus' resurrection which do not seem to be part of the Gospel of Mark.

Reworked Pentateuch rewrites narrative and legal portions of Genesis and Exodus, interwoven with excerpts from Deuteronomy.³³⁹ It interprets scripture by scripture. It often portrays its authoritative tradition as a single, unified story so that interpreting one passage could readily entail citing or alluding to several others (4Q158 frags 7–8 inserts Deut 5:30–31 between citations of Exod 20; 4Q252 connects Gen 49:3–4 and Gen 35:22; *Jub* 4:30 invokes Ps 90:4 as an explanation of Adam and God’s statement “surely die”).

Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum selectively rewrites Genesis to Samuel by emphasizing Israel’s covenant (4:5; 7:4; 8:3; 9:3; 11:5), warning against the dangers of idolatry (6:1–5; 12:1–10; 25:7–13; 44), and stressing the importance of moral leadership (*LAB* 9).³⁴⁰ Similarly to Matthew, it distinctly uses authoritative traditions from far-removed contexts to illuminate and interpret his rewritten narrative (cf. 9:5–6; cf. Matt 15:1–28). In addition, it juxtaposes episodes to meaningfully relate and mutually illuminate one another (e.g. Abraham and Babel; cf. Matt 12:38–42).

Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities* rewrites virtually the whole narrative of the Hebrew Bible (*Ant.* 1–11). It is shaped by Josephus’ own apologetic concerns and patronage to the Flavian dynasty. Although he promises to provide a precise rendering of the Scriptures without additions or omissions, he rewrites Israel’s history embellishing Jewish traditions (*Ant.* 1:17).

These examples of rewriting narratives illuminate Matthew’s use of Jewish scripture by providing a starting point to understand the processes and reasons for Matthew’s rewriting of Mark within a Torah pattern. First, Matthew’s *tendenz* and his own theological interests are exhibited in his rewriting of Mark, Q and Torah. Second, Matthew seems to idealize characters in his narrative as compared to Mark (e.g. Peter and the disciples). Third, certain Matthean elements are set as explanations or *apologia* (e.g. guards at the tomb for Jesus’ resurrection; fulfilment quotation regarding Judas’ betrayal and suicide for the loss of an apostle). Fourth, Matthew integrates narrative and Torah together to solve some of the deficiencies in Mark (e.g. Jesus’ teachings on the kingdom of heaven). Fifth, Matthew represents Jesus as the climax of Israel’s history (cf. *Antiquities*).

³³⁹ Although 4Q364–365 (4QRP^{b,c}) are fragmentary scrolls, they originally may have spanned the entire Pentateuch.

³⁴⁰ *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* was written around 70 CE in Palestine.

III. MATTHEW REWRITES MARK

1. Rewriting Mark

Matthew, who is familiar with scribal practices, rewrites the Gospel of Mark by setting it within a Torah structure (i.e. Jesus' five discourses). First, Matthew rewrites—conflates, rearranges and supplements—Mark with Q, M and the Jewish scriptures (Torah). Second, Matthew's structure, which is built on Mark's narrative frame, alternates between narrative and discourse sections. Third, Matthew is enveloped by the Torah as it contains a Genesis beginning (Matt 1:1–17) and a Deuteronomic ending (Matt 28:16–20). In sum, Matthew is a seamless *blending* of texts and interpretations as he implicitly uses his source texts—Mark, Q and the Jewish scriptures.

In his classification of “Rewritten Bible,” Philip S. Alexander lists several features for rewriting narratives.³⁴¹ If slightly re-adjusted, seven are applicable to Matthew's rewriting of Mark:

1. Matthew generally follows the narrative and chronological sequence of Mark in a framework of the account of events concerning Jesus' life and can be broadly described as a history.
2. Although rewriting often replicates the form of its source, Matthew is an independent composition integrating his sources (Mark, Q, M and the Jewish scriptures), into a coherent retelling of an authoritative tradition.
3. Matthew does not intend to replace or supersede Mark (or the Jewish scriptures).
4. Although rewriting generally incorporates and follows the order of its source, Matthew is highly selective as he alters, omits, abbreviates, and expands Mark.
5. Matthew intends to produce an interpretative reading of Mark (and the Jewish scriptures) offering a fuller, smoother and theologically advanced composition.
6. As rewriting pays close attention to its sources (Mark, Q, M and the Jewish scriptures), Matthew notes obscurities, inconsistencies and narrative lacunae and attempts to solve them implicitly within his composition.
7. Rewriting makes use of “non-biblical” traditions and sources (Mark, Q and M), fusing them to “biblical” material (Jewish scriptures), which form a synthesis of the whole tradition: Matthew seeks to unify Jesus' tradition onto a Torah base. Therefore, it is both exegesis and eisegesis seeking to draw out the sense of Torah and solve its problem, and at the

³⁴¹ Philip S. Alexander, “Retelling the Old Testament,” in *It is Written: Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF* (eds. D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 99–121; esp. 116–118.

same time to read Jesus' material into Torah, thereby validating it and preventing the fragmentation of the tradition.

First, does Matthew generally follow the narrative sequence of Mark concerning the history of Jesus' life? Yes. Quite rigidly, Matthew rewrites Mark by primarily keeping its order and weaving Jesus' teaching (Q and M) and the Jewish scriptures into its narrative framework.³⁴² This seems to authenticate, authorize and contemporize not only Mark's and Jesus' teaching, but Matthew's as well. Matthew follows its source text, Mark, and usually keeps its chronological sequence and narrative structure. This includes almost all of Mark's 661 verses except for 55 verses and uses 8,555 of Mark's 11,078 words.³⁴³ Matthew's literary framework incorporates Mark's narrative (sustained retelling of Jesus' story) within the framework of authoritative Jewish traditions (Torah).³⁴⁴

Second, Matthew is an independent composition that integrates his sources into a coherent retelling of an authoritative tradition. It is a seamless and independent composition that integrates Christian and Jewish authoritative traditions.³⁴⁵ Matthew is a coherent blend of alternating narrative and discourse material (Matt 1–4; 5–7; 8–9; 10; 11–12; 13; 14–17; 18; 19–22; 23–25; 26–28).³⁴⁶

Third, Matthew does not intend to replace or supersede Mark.³⁴⁷ As with many Second Temple Jewish rewritings, Matthew functions as a companion to rather than a

³⁴² Q is either a written or oral source that is shared by both Matthew and Luke. M can be exclusively Matthew's own written or oral source (or a mixture of both) or it can arise from the mind of the author.

³⁴³ W. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1975), 57, n. 32.

³⁴⁴ See Appendix 1 which compares the narrative of Matthew and Mark. One should note the general similarities to the narrative sequence as well as Matthew's changes (e.g. Matt 8–9).

³⁴⁵ Even the material that is unique to Matthew (*Sondergut*) and not included in Mark is blended together into a coherent narrative: Jesus' birth narrative (Matt 1–2); two miracle accounts (9:2–34); trained scribes and parables (13:51–52); temple taxes (17:24–27); death of Judas (27:3–10); earthquake and appearance of dead (27:51–53); Jesus' final commission (28:16–20); Jesus' parables (13:44–50; 21:28–31; 25:1–13, 31–40); and discourse (15:13; 24:10–12, 26). See J. Andrew Doodle, *What was Mark for Matthew? An Examination of Matthew's Relationship and Attitude to his Primary Source* (WUNT 344. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 33.

³⁴⁶ See Figure 1.

³⁴⁷ See Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 102; and Adela Y. Collins, *Mark* (Hermeneia Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2007), 103–25. Around the late second century, Mark begins to appear with Matthew, Luke and John in some manuscripts (P⁴, P⁶⁴ and P⁶⁷). Furthermore, as Doodle (*Mark for Matthew*, 21) states, "However, unlike Q, Mark survived the test of time: a collection of logia could not compete with this attribute of the written gospel, the storyline format lending credibility to the account and ensuring its triumph over the more flexible yet less stable oral traditions.

replacement of the underlying authoritative texts by offering a fuller and smoother composition that coherently interprets and contemporizes its sources for his audience.³⁴⁸ Deuteronomy, Chronicles, and *Jubilees* are examples of rewritten literary works that do not seem to replace their previous sources but re-contextualize them for their contemporary situation.

Fourth, although Mark is consistently followed, Matthew improves on Mark. Matthew is highly selective as he abbreviates, omits, and expands Mark with its additions and revisions often appearing more moral, theological or didactic in nature. Eight examples of these features are found in Matt 8–9.³⁴⁹

1. Matt 8:1–4 (Jesus heals a leper) abbreviates Mark 1:40–45 while omitting Mark 1:23–28.
2. Matt 8:5–13 (Jesus heals centurion’s servant) adds Q material (Luke 7:1–10).
3. Matt 8:14–15 (Jesus heals Peter’s mother-in-law) abbreviates Mark 1:29–31 while reordering Mark 1:29–31 and 32–34, and omitting 1:35–39 (cf. Matt 8:14–17).
4. Matt 8:16–17 (summary of Jesus’ healing) abbreviates Mark 1:32–34 while adding a citation from Isa 53:4.
5. Matt 8:18–22 (Jesus describes followers) adds Q material (Luke 7:57–62).
6. Matt 8:23–27 (Jesus stills storm) abbreviates Mark 4:35–41.
7. Matt 8:28–34 (Jesus heals Gadarene demoniacs) abbreviates Mark 5:1–20.
8. Matt 9:1–8 (Jesus heals paralytic) abbreviates Mark 2:1–12 while departing from Mark’s order.

Specifically, Matthew abbreviates Mark. Mark’s account of the leper’s healing of 97 words becomes 61 words in Matt 8:1–4 (cf. Mark 1:40–45). Mark’s account of the healing of the paralytic with 196 words becomes 126 words in Matt 9:1–8 (cf. Mark 2:1–12).³⁵⁰

Moreover, Matthew omits unnecessary details (e.g. Matt 14:19//Mark 6:39–40; Matt 13:3//Mark 4:3; Matt 8:28–34; 9:18–26//Mark 5:1–43;³⁵¹ Matt 14:1–12//Mark 6:14–29; Matt 17:14–20//Mark 9:14–29).³⁵²

Therefore, regardless of the genre we might ascribe to Mark today. Matthew clearly saw Mark as a ‘life’ of Jesus, or rather, as a ‘death’ of Jesus, *the* historical account of events in the months leading up to the crucifixion.”

³⁴⁸ Contrary to David C. Sim, “Matthew’s Use of Mark: Did Matthew Intend to Supplement or to Replace His Primary Source?” *NTS* 57 (2011): 176–92.

³⁴⁹ See Warren Carter, *Matthew: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist* (revised ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic: 2004), 55.

³⁵⁰ See Carter, *Matthew*, 57.

³⁵¹ Matthew has 271 words and Mark has 699 words.

³⁵² See Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, 1.74 concerning Greek style. Matthew improves Mark’s style with omission of Mark’s frequent uses of “and immediately,” “again,” “many things,” and

Fifth, Matthew intends to produce an interpretative reading of Mark and the Jewish scriptures by offering a fuller, smoother and theologically advanced composition. Matthew's implicit and explicit interpretations of the Jewish scriptures are not a loose connection of traditions, but blended together with narrative additions functioning as implicit scriptural exegesis: filling gaps, solving problems and explaining connections.³⁵³ For example by beginning with Jesus' miracle section with Jesus' healing of a leper (Matt 8:1–4), it has been suggested by Harrington that it confirms that Jesus came to fulfil and not abolish the Law and the Prophets (5:17–48; cf. Lev 14).³⁵⁴ Furthermore, the addition of Isa 53:4 in Matt 8:17 presents Jesus' miracles as carrying out God's purposes as Jesus has been given God's power and authority over diseases, nature, demons and sin (8:1–9:1). Matthew's meticulous readings of Jewish authoritative traditions informs his composition as it interprets, clarifies, and addresses his contemporaries. This is illustrated with the centurion narrative (cf. 8:5–13; esp. 10–12; cf. Luke 7:1–10)³⁵⁵ and with the question, "Do you believe that I am able to do this?" (Matt 9:28) as compared to "What do you want me to do for you?" (Mark 10:51), which stresses Matthew's acceptance of Gentiles (9:36–38; 28:16–20) and emphasis on faith as compared with Jewish traditions (8:4; cf. Lev 14:3–4, 10; 9:13).

Sixth, Matthew notes obscurities, inconsistencies and narrative lacunae and attempts to solve them within his composition. Warren Carter observes a number of omissions by Matthew that may deal with obscurities and inconsistencies in a diminished portrayal of Jesus or the disciples: (1) omission of Jesus' limitations (Matt 13:58//Mark 6:5; Matt 14:25//Mark 6:48); (2) omission of limiting Jesus' knowledge (Matt 9:21–22//Mark 5:30; Matt 16:4//Mark 8:12); and (3) omission of disciples' failings³⁵⁶ (Matt 13:18//Mark 4:13; cf. Matt 13:16–17; Matt 17:9//Mark 9:6; Matt 20:20–21//Mark 10:35–

"that." Matthew reduces redundancies, double negatives, use of compound verbs with same preposition, and unusual vocabulary.

³⁵³ This is evident with Matthew's narrative-discourse structure (implicit) and fulfilment quotations (explicit).

³⁵⁴ See Harrington, *Matthew*, 112–44; H.J. Held, "Matthew as Interpreter of the Miracle Stories," in *Tradition and Interpretation*, 165–299; W.G. Thompson, "Reflections on the Composition of Matt 8:1–9:34," *CBQ* 33 (1971): 365–88; J.D. Kingbury, "Observations on the 'Miracle Chapters' of Matthew 8–9," *CBQ* 40 (1978): 559–73

³⁵⁵ Matthew 8:10–12 is not found in the centurion narrative of Luke but located in Luke 13:28–29.

³⁵⁶ Matthew 8:26 identifies Jesus' disciples as having "little faith" rather than "no faith" (Mark 4:40; cf. Matt 14:31//Mark 6:50–51; Matt 16:8//Mark 8:17).

37).³⁵⁷ Furthermore, Matthew includes large additions to Mark that fill the narrative lacunae of Jesus' life and teachings: (1) Jesus' birth narrative (Matt 1–2); (2) five major sections of Jesus' teaching (Matt 5–7, 10, 13, 18, 23–25; cf. Mark 4 and 13) and (3) Jesus' resurrection appearances and commission (Matt 28).³⁵⁸ Moreover, four terms were added as emphasis by Matthew: *Son of God*, *Jesus*, and *Son of David*.³⁵⁹ Matthew also expands Mark's theme of eschatology, teaching and ecclesiology.³⁶⁰ Matthew 24–25 expands Mark 13 by adding parables with many coming from Q (Matt 24:37–44, 45–51; 25:1–13, 14–30, 31–41). Matthew emphasizes teaching the disciples through Jesus' discourses with a stress on ethical and righteous behavior. Matthew accentuates communal identity by adding terms for Jesus' community of disciples: *church* (16:18; 18:17), *little ones* (10:42; 18:10, 14), and *righteous* (5:45; 10:41; 13:43, 49; 25:37, 46; cf. 9:13//Mark 2:17).³⁶¹

Seventh, Matthew seeks to unify Jesus traditions onto a Jewish scriptural base. Matthew integrates Jewish authoritative traditions and Jesus traditions with a blurring of text and interpretation as it contextualizes these traditions. For example, Matthew, in continuity with the Jewish scriptures, adds a number of scriptural citations throughout his narrative as additions to Mark.³⁶²

- Isa 9:1 added to Jesus' ministry from Capernaum (4:12–17//Mark 1:1–14)
- Isa 53:4 added to Jesus' healing miracles (8:16–17//Mark 1:32–34)
- Hos 6:6 added to Jesus' appeal to God's mercy (9:9–13//Mark 2:13–17)
- Hos 6:6 added to Jesus' appeal to God's mercy again (12:1–8//Mark 2:23–28)
- Isa 42:1–4 added to Jesus' hope to the Gentiles (12:16–21//Mark 3:12)
- Ps 78:2 added to Jesus' teaching in Parables (13:34–35//Mark 4:33–34)

These additions blend together Mark with the Jewish scriptures.

Therefore, Mark as an authoritative base source is implicitly rewritten with Jesus' discourses and the Jewish scriptures (i.e. authoritative traditions) as supplements to

³⁵⁷ See Carter, *Matthew*, 49–51.

³⁵⁸ See Collins, *Mark*, 125, 806. If Mark originally ended with 16:8, there would have been reason to add an ending with Jesus' resurrection appearances.

³⁵⁹ See Carter, *Matthew*, 53–54. For *Son of God*, e.g. Matt 14:33//Mark 6:51–52 and Matt 16:16//Mark 8:29). For *Jesus*, cf. Matt 1:21 with 80 times in Mark and 154 times in Matthew. For *Son of David*, e.g. healings (Matt 9:27; 20:30–31; cf. Matt 12:23//Mark 9:33; Matt 15:22//Mark 7:25–26) and others (Matt 21:9, 15//Mark 11:9, 11).

³⁶⁰ See Carter, *Matthew*, 54. Davies and Allison notes Matthew's language gives evidence of the importance of Christology, eschatology, ethics, ecclesiology and the role of the Hebrew Bible (*Saint Matthew*, 1.79–80; cf. Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 73–74).

³⁶¹ See Carter, *Matthew*, 54 n. 22.

³⁶² See Stanton, *Gospel for a New People*, 328–33; Doodle, *Mark for Matthew*, 43.

Matthew's rewriting. In sum, similar to other Jewish rewritings (Deuteronomy, Jubilees and 11QT), Matthew's rewriting *blends* narrative material from Mark with legal material from Q and M (Jesus' teachings) and with the Jewish scriptures by inserting them as five discourses onto Mark's narrative.

2. Rewriting Mark in a Torah Pattern: Narrative-Discourse Structure

Rewriting, as a late Second Temple emic scribal practice that authenticates and contextualizes past traditions, explains Matthew's literary composition in two ways: its close similarity with the Gospel of Mark, and its alternating narrative and discourse structure.³⁶³ In light of Jesus' significance to both the history of Israel and early Christianity, Matthew understands the need to re-contextualize the Jewish scriptures for his setting; therefore, he rewrites Mark within the Torah.

Matthew *rewrites Mark within a Torah* seems to be evident in (1) its literary structure of alternating narrative and discourse sections, and (2) its *inclusio* or literary envelope of a Genesis beginning and a Deuteronomic ending. First, Matthew's narrative structure or literary framework plays an important role in his rewriting, but it has been a topic of scholarly debate with five general proposals.

1. Matthew has no narrative structure.³⁶⁴
2. Matthew's narrative structure is based on geography,³⁶⁵ time,³⁶⁶ or theme;³⁶⁷
3. Matthew's narrative structure can be divided by the clause “ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς” (from that time Jesus began),³⁶⁸
4. Matthew's narrative structure has a fivefold discourse pattern with the end marker “καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς” (now when Jesus had finished);³⁶⁹ or
5. Matthew's narrative has a chiastic structure.³⁷⁰

³⁶³ Chronicles, *Antiquities* and 11QT all seem to have structural keys.

³⁶⁴ Gundry, *Matthew*; Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*; Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction* (3rd ed.; Downer's Grove: IVP, 1970); Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*; Craig S. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).

³⁶⁵ W.C. Allen and L.W. Grensted, *Introduction to the Books of the New Testament* (3rd ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1912).

³⁶⁶ Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992).

³⁶⁷ David Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NCBC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972).

³⁶⁸ Kingsbury (*Matthew*) divides Matthew's narrative with two turning points indicated by the repeated clause, “From that time Jesus began” in 4:17, and 16:21.

³⁶⁹ B.W. Bacon (“The Five Books of Matthew against the Jews,” *The Expositor* 15 [1918]: 56–66) first recognized a fivefold discourse pattern with the end marker, “When Jesus finished” in 7:28, 11:1, 13:53, 19:1, and 26:1. See also T.J. Keegan (“Introductory Formulae for Matthean discourses,” *CBQ* 44 [1982]: 415–30), who identifies the beginnings of these discourses.

However, these do not need to be exclusive, but can be combined to illustrate Matthew’s rewriting: a fivefold discourse structure in a chiasmic pattern focused on the theme of king (royal messiah) and kingdom (kingdom of heaven).³⁷¹

Figure 1: Matthew’s Narrative-Discourse Structure

Narrative Prologue (1:1–4:25):

Title and Introduction: Genesis Beginning (1:1–17)

The Coming of the King (1:18–4:25)

Discourse 1: Jesus’ Torah Discourse (5:1–7:29; cf. 4:25–5:2)³⁷²

Narrative 1: Work of the King (8:1–9:34)

Discourse 2: Jesus’ Mission Discourse (10:1–11:1; cf. 9:36–37)

Narrative 2: Work of the King (11:2–12:49)

Discourse 3: Jesus’ Parables Discourse (13:1–53; cf. 13:1–3)

Narrative 3: Work of the King (13:54–17:27)

Discourse 4: Jesus’ Covenant Community Discourse (18:1–19:1; cf. 18:1, 3)

Narrative 4: Work of the King (19:2–22:46)

Discourse 5: Jesus’ Prophetic Eschatological Discourse (23:1–26:1; cf. 24:3)

Narrative 5: Work of the King (26:2–27:66)

Narrative Epilogue (28:1–20):

The Going of the King (28:1–15)

Conclusion and Commission: Deuteronomy Ending (28:16–20)

This combination highlights Matthew’s narrative structure and literary distinctions. He employs various rhetorical features to frame the entire Gospel as well as its parts.³⁷³

Matthew 1:1–17 and 28:16–20 seems to act as an introduction and conclusion³⁷⁴ with royal language and edicts of authority at the beginning and end suggesting an emphasis on king

³⁷⁰ See P.E. Ellis, *Matthew: His Mind and His Message* (Collegeville: Liturgical, 1974); H. B. Green (“The Structure of St. Matthew’s Gospel,” In *Studia Evangelica IV: Papers Presented to the Third International Congress on New Testament Studies. Part I: The New Testament Scriptures* [ed. F.L. Cross; TU, 102; Berlin: Akademie, 1968], 47–59) has the chiasmic centre at Matthew 11.

³⁷¹ See D. Bauer, *The Structure of Matthew’s Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (JSNTSup 31; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1988), 21–55. I have changed Bauer’s categories (geographical-chronological, topical, and conceptual structures).

³⁷² See Keegan, “Introductory Formulae,” 415–30.

³⁷³ Luz and Davies and Allison note the frequent use of *inclusios* in Matthew: 4:23 with 9:35; 5:2 with 20; 5:3 with 5:10; 7:16 with 7:20; 8–9 with 24:42 and 25:13; and 23:15 with 23:33. See Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 7; Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, 1.92.

³⁷⁴ Matthew is bracketed by Ἐμμανουήλ (God with us) in 1:23 and “I am with you always” in 28:20. See David D. Kupp, *Matthew’s Emmanuel: Divine Presence and God’s People in the First Gospel* (SNTS Monograph Series 90. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 7; Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, 1.92; 3.683.

and kingdom.³⁷⁵ Moreover, the symmetry, number of words, and thematic similarities between Jesus' five discourses suggest a chiasmic pattern. Therefore, Matthew has a distinct narrative-discourse structure in rewriting Jesus traditions in a Torah manner with its fivefold structure.³⁷⁶

Matthew, seeing himself as a scribe, rewrites Mark's narrative with a fivefold design for his macro-structure with the repetitive marker, "Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς."

1. "Now when Jesus had finished saying these things, the crowds were astounded at his teaching, for he taught them as one having authority, and not as their scribes" (7:28–29). Afterwards, Jesus' authority is displayed in healing and miracles (8:1–9:38).
2. "Now when Jesus had finished instructing his twelve disciples, he went on from there to teach and proclaim his message in their cities" (11:1). Afterwards, Jesus aligns his actions to John the Baptist and previous prophets with his identification as God's servant incorporating his disciples into God's family and people (11:2–12:50).
3. "Now when Jesus had finished these parables, he left that place" (13:53). Afterwards, Jesus is rejected at Nazareth and John the Baptist dies, which marks the beginning of more and more revelations of Jesus' suffering and death (his purpose), and Jesus' transfiguration (his identity) (13:54–17:27).
4. "Now when Jesus had finished saying these things, he left Galilee and went to the region of Judea beyond the Jordan. Large crowds followed him, and he cured them there" (19:1–2). Afterwards, Jesus teaches about divorce, triumphantly enters Jerusalem, and disputes his authority and identity with the Jewish leaders in the Temple (19:3–22:46).
5. "Now when Jesus had finished saying all these things, he said to his disciples, 'You know that after two days the Passover is coming, and the Son of Man will be handed over to be crucified'" (26:1–2). Afterwards, Jesus is betrayed, anointed for his death, tried, crucified, buried and resurrected (26:3–27:66).

Not only does this repetition indicate Matthew's literary design with an alternating narrative discourse structure, but it also gives the reader a hint of the themes of the coming narrative.

³⁷⁵ See O. Michel, "The Conclusion of Matthew's Gospel (1950)," in *The Interpretation of Matthew* (ed. G. N. Stanton; 2nd ed.; Edinburg: T&T Clark, 1995), 39–51.

³⁷⁶ Bauer (*Structure of Matthew's Gospel*, 142) correctly accesses the fivefold pattern: "We contend that Matthew draws attention to the five great discourses, but that he also incorporates these discourses into the flow of the narrative. The function of these five discourses within the narrative framework is to point to Jesus' activity of instructing his community, with special reference to the post-Easter existence of the church."

3. Rewriting Mark: Genesis Beginning and Deuteronomy Ending

In organizing material, Matthew not only rewrites Christian and Jewish scriptures in a fivefold Torah structure, but also has a Genesis beginning and a Deuteronomic ending.³⁷⁷

First, a number of indicators point to Matthew's Genesis beginning. (1) Matthew begins with the book of Genesis (βίβλος γενέσεως) as its incipit. (2) Βίβλος γενέσεως is found in Gen 2:4 and 5:1 LXX, which is translated from תולדות אלה, as it introduces the *toledot* formulas throughout Genesis. (3) Matthew, with Jesus' identification as "son of Abraham" and his genealogy immediately following, seems to be suggesting a type of beginning or origins, especially as Abraham is the forefather to the nation of Israel. (4) In Jesus' genealogy, Matthew deliberately recollects and emphasizes three key phrases of Israelite history: beginning with Abraham, running through David and the Babylonian exile, and culminating in Jesus (1:17; cf. 1:2–17; Gen 12:2–3).

Second, three aspects within Matthew suggest a Deuteronomic ending. Jesus' discourses are reminiscent of Moses' speeches in Deuteronomy. Jesus' final speech to his disciples authorizing and commissioning them on a mountain before his departure may be specifically recounting Moses' farewell speech in Deuteronomy. In addition, explicit blessings and curses are found in both Deuteronomy and Matthew.

Third, Matt 1:1–17 and 28:16–20 seems to form a narrative envelope for the entire Gospel as it draws attention to Abraham and God's promise of blessing to the families of the earth (cf. Gen 12:2–3). This Abrahamic role of being a blessing to the nations of the earth can be found with Jesus' designation as "son of Abraham" (1:1), the inclusion of Gentile women in Jesus' genealogy (1:5–6), and Jesus' commission to make disciples of πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (28:18b).

In conclusion, the Jewish scriptures are significant for Matthew, which is evident from its many quotations and allusions from the Torah. Mosaic traditions are prominent in Jesus' birth narrative, temptations, his instruction on mountains, and the giving of the Torah (Matt 2:16–18; 4:1–11; 5:1; 5:21–30).

³⁷⁷ This notion of a Genesis beginning and Deuteronomy ending should not limit the definition of Torah (see Chapter 4 section III.1). This is another aspect of emphasizing Matthew's rewriting of Torah with the Pentateuch in mind but not limited to it.

IV. MATTHEW'S PURPOSE: CONFERRING AUTHORITY

1. Matthew as a Jewish-Christian Authoritative Composition

Matthew rewrites Jesus traditions (Mark, Q and M) within a Torah (fivefold narrative framework) by recollecting the Torah of Moses, as well as Mosaic authority. This in turn gives legitimacy and authority to Matthew as Mosaic status is conferred from differing traditions and texts.³⁷⁸ This textualization process imparts authority from the Torah, as well as Mark, to the Gospel of Matthew.

Matthew, like other Second Temple rewriting compositions, functions in four ways:

1. Problem solving: rewriting is a response to perceived ambiguities and gaps in authoritative writings and solves them by altering, expanding or omitting the base text.
2. Exploiting juxtapositions: Underlying rewritings was the assumption that adjacent episodes were meaningfully related and thus mutually illuminating.
3. Interpreting scripture by scripture: Rewritings often portray scripture as a single, unified story, so that interpreting one passage could readily entail citing or alluding to several others.
4. Idealizing biblical characters: Patriarchs and kings become model law keepers, leaders, healers, and champions of virtue, delivering eloquent speeches and moving testaments, rehearsing God's deeds or calling the people to obedience with their sins and flaws passed over or explained away.

Rewriting is a process that re-interprets, re-writes and re-applies ancient authoritative traditions for the present generation. It often re-historicizes Israel's past traditions and contemporizes ancient texts by blending together text and tradition with contemporary interpretation and application.³⁷⁹ In a way, as Matthew rewrites Mark within the Torah, Christian and Mosaic authority are imparted onto this new composition. Therefore, Matthew's rewriting seems to be blending both Christian (Mark, Q and M) and Jewish scriptures (Torah) into his narrative. This procures authority and gives some validity not only to Matthew, but also to previous Jesus traditions (i.e. Mark, Q and M).

³⁷⁸ See George J. Brooke, "Hypertextuality and the 'Parabiblical' Dead Sea Scrolls," in *In the Second Degree. Paratextual Literature in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Culture and Its Reflection in Medieval Literature* (eds. P.S. Alexander, A. Lange, and R.J. Pillinger; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 43–64. Authority is conferred to the rewriting and to what is being rewritten.

³⁷⁹ By re-historicizing, the past is brought into the present or the present is incorporated in continuity with the past and provides a linear trajectory from past to present.

2. Conferring Mosaic Authority to Jesus

In addition, Matthew confers Mosaic authority onto his portrayal of Jesus. Matthew, as a scribe, deliberately rewrites Mark with Torah in a fivefold structure by inserting Jesus' five discourses into the narrative and by having a Genesis beginning and a Deuteronomic ending. Matthew's intentional blending gives Mosaic authority to Jesus.

Similarly, Jesus is portrayed like Moses as a Torah giver and teacher, and identified as a prophet when he comes into Jerusalem by the crowds, "This is the prophet Jesus, from Nazareth in Galilee (21:9; cf. Deut 18:15)." In addition, Jesus's birth narrative with Herod seeking Jesus' death and the slaughter of children echoes Pharaoh's killing of all the Israelite male infants (2:16–18). Also, just as on Mount Sinai, Moses gave and taught the Torah, Jesus teaches on a mountain giving them a new Torah (Matt 5–7). Therefore, Matthew uses Moses for his particular portrait of Jesus as lawgiver with Mosaic authority.

V. CONCLUSION

Matthew can be seen as a narrative rewriting of Mark in a Torah pattern (fivefold structure) within a Torah (Genesis and Deuteronomy) as Jewish and Jesus traditions are *blended* together. Furthermore, Matthew rewrites Mark to re-contextualize and authorize his Gospel, as well as Mark, to a Jewish context. Supplementing Mark with earlier Jesus tradition (Q and M) in a Torah pattern was not meant to replace them (Mark and Q), but to produce a new authoritative work. Matthew's distinctive literary features such as the genealogical material, theological emphasis of Jesus as the *Son of David*, or implicit Pentateuchal allusions illustrates his admiration for a variety of older authoritative traditions as he reuses them.

In sum, rewriting, a scribal practice of authenticating and contextualizing past traditions, best explains Matthew's composition: literary similarities with Mark, Matthew's fivefold structure, and Jesus' five discourses. The process of rewriting ensures Matthew's relevance and growing authoritative status.³⁸⁰ Therefore, Matthew rewrites Mark in a Torah pattern to authorize Jesus as the *Royal Messiah* and Mosaic king in continuity with Israel's past and established in Jewish scriptures.

³⁸⁰ George J. Brooke "Between Authority and Canon: The Significance of Reworking the Bible for Understanding the Canonical Process," in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran: Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced studies Research Group on Qumran, 15–17 January, 2002* (eds. E.G. Chazon, D. Dimant, and R.A. Clements; STDJ 53; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 85–104.

CHAPTER FOUR

MATTHEW REWRITES TORAH

I. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the aspect of Matthew's scribal activity that I will focus on is rewriting Torah: specifically, Jesus' Torah Discourse (Matt 5–7) and Jesus' Prophetic Eschatological Discourse (Matt 23–25).³⁸¹ In Jesus' Torah Discourse, Matthew rewrites the Torah by citing particular parts of the Decalogue and Holiness Code, and emphasizing a “righteousness that exceeds the scribes and Pharisees” that intensifies the practices of almsgiving, prayer and fasting as qualifications for entrance into the kingdom of heaven. In Jesus' Prophetic Eschatological Discourse, Matthew is concerned with the *Last Days* and rewrites the Torah with the prophets to denounce the scribes and Pharisees and their understanding of Torah in his prophetic woes. In addition, Jesus foretells the destruction of the temple and the signs of the *Last Days* in his parables. Matthew rewrites the Torah in various ways involving various strategies in relation to the Torah itself (summaries, citations, omissions, allusions, radicalisations) with some interpretative extensions using the prophets and wisdom traditions for the purpose of being righteous, faithful and watchful.

Matthew, as a scribe, rewrites the Torah using the prophets and wisdom traditions to provide legislation for the kingdom of heaven and for Jesus to rightly judge not only Israel but also all the nations in the *Last Days*. Matthew 5–7 depicts Jesus as a Torah giver and interpreter within a Mosaic discourse by rewriting Torah with wisdom to illustrate the character and practice of righteousness and holiness. In addition, Jesus' denouncement of the scribes and Pharisees identifies him as an eschatological and royal judge arbitrating those who are and are not citizens of the kingdom of heaven.

³⁸¹ Matthew 5–7 is usually referred to as the Sermon on the Mount; however, Matt 23–25 is also a discourse on the Mount of Olives. Therefore, together they can be Sermon on the Mount Part 1 and Part 2.

In this chapter, (1) I will introduce Matthew and Torah in the *Last Days* as part of a Mosaic discourse in Second Temple Judaism. (2) I will examine rewriting Torah as Matthew’s use of scripture by defining and identifying some of its features as it blends with wisdom traditions, the prophets and eschatology. (3) I will examine Matt 5–7 (comprised of principles [i.e. beatitudes], key authoritative texts [i.e. Decalogue and Holiness Code], practices [i.e. righteousness], and wisdom [i.e. two ways]) as it reveals the qualifications for entering into the kingdom of heaven. (4) I will examine Matt 23–25 as Matthew rewrites the Torah using the prophets and wisdom traditions: the seat of Moses, the prophetic woes, signs, and parables concerning the kingdom of heaven and *the Last Days*. (5) I will comment on Matthew’s purpose for these two discourses to authorize, authenticate, mediate and fulfil the Torah in Jesus.³⁸² In sum, these two discourses present Jesus as the king of the kingdom of heaven, who provides the Torah (legislative laws, decrees and penalties), and the king (Torah Giver, Torah Interpreter and Righteous Judge), who then rightfully and rightly adjudicates the nations in the *Last Days* as the prophets foretold.

II. MATTHEW, TORAH AND THE LAST DAYS

1. Torah in the Last Days

The Gospel of Matthew rewrites the Torah in the *Last Days* in a number of ways. As the most Jewish of the Gospels, it is replete with explicit quotations and implicit allusions to the Torah, with its narrative structured around Jesus’ five discourses (cf. 4:4, 7, 10).

Matthew saw himself in the on-going process rewriting Torah by emphasizing Moses and the giving of the Torah at Mount Sinai (Matt 5–7; cf. Exod 19).³⁸³ He uses mountains as chain-links or catchwords associating Jesus with Moses and the Sinai event in giving the Torah and forming a nation.³⁸⁴ In addition, reminiscent of the ten plagues and the exodus from Egypt, Jesus performs ten miracles, one being a herd of swine drowning in water,

³⁸² See Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 1–40; Brooke, “Hypertextuality,” 57–62.

³⁸³ The general milieu of the times with its socio-historical factors may have contributed to Matthew’s composition. The destruction of the Temple in 70 CE, and the increase in textualization and the promulgation of Torah (e.g. *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*). The Torah with the destruction of the temple may have gained added significance. This was not only for Jews, but Christian Jews as well as they shared the same heritage. In addition, the corruption of the temple may have placed added weight on the Torah written by scribes in the Second Temple period (CD 5:6–7; 1QS 8:1–10; *Pss. Sol.* 2:2–4; 8:11–13; *1 En* 12–16; 89:72–90:29; 93:8–10 and 91:11–13).

³⁸⁴ Matthew 4:8; 5:1; 8:1; 17:1, 9, 20; 21:21; 24:16; 28:16 are occurrences of mountains that seem to echo various aspects of Mount Sinai and the Exodus.

after his Torah Discourse (8:2–9:34).³⁸⁵ Jesus discusses Moses’ significance and authority with “the seat of Moses” (23:2–3). Moreover, Matthew understood himself as living in the *Last Days* seeing scriptural texts and prophecies fulfilled in the events of Jesus with blessings and curses coming to their generation.³⁸⁶ In continuity with the prophets and their message about the *Last Days*, Jesus signals that the time is at hand in his teaching and ministry (3:2; 4:17; cf. 11:7–15). In sum, Jesus’ Torah Discourse and Prophetic Eschatological Discourse are rewritings of Torah to instruct and warn about the coming judgment of the *Last Days*.

2. Mosaic Discourse

Matthew’s use of Torah and many Mosaic elements led to the conclusion that he participated in Mosaic Discourse as Hindy Najman defines it:

The idea of a discourse tied to a founder provides, I want to suggest, a helpful way to think about the developing conceptions of the mosaic Law and figure of Moses. On this understanding of a discourse tied to a founder, to rework an earlier text is to update, interpret and develop the content of that text in a way that one claims to be an authentic expression for the law already accepted as authoritatively Mosaic. Thus, what we might call a “new” law—perhaps even what we might regard as a significant “amendment” of older law—is characterized as the Law of Moses, this is not to imply that it is found within the actual words of an historical individual called Moses. It is rather to say that the implementation of the law in question would enable Israel to return to the authentic associated with the prophetic status of Moses.³⁸⁷

³⁸⁵ Between Matthew’s first and second discourses, there are ten miracles: (1) Jesus cleanses a leper (8:1–4); (2) Jesus heals a centurion’s servant (8:5–13); (3) Jesus heals Peter’s mother-in-law and others (8:14–17); (4) Jesus calms wind and sea (8:23–27); (5) Jesus heals the Gadarene demoniacs (8:28–34); (6) Jesus heals a paralytic (9:2–8); (7) Jesus heals a woman suffering from haemorrhaging (9:20–22); (8) Jesus raises girl from dead (9:18–19; 23–26); (9) Jesus heals two blind men (9:27–31); and (10) Jesus heals a demoniac who was mute (9:32–34).

In addition, between this string of ten miracles there seems to be three interludes concerning discipleship: (1) a scribe approaching Jesus to be his follower (8:18–22); (2) Jesus calling Matthew and the question of disciples’ lack of fasting (9:9–17); and (3) great harvest and few laborers (9:35–38).

³⁸⁶ For viewing Matthew as apologetic see Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*. For occurrences of Jesus quoting or alluding to prophetic texts of the Hebrew Bible see Dale C. Allison Jr., *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History* (reprint; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 79–82.

³⁸⁷ Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 13.

Mosaic Discourse, more than intertextuality, is defined by the twin relationship of a text to the chain of its predecessors as the textual dimension and to a common theme as the thematic dimension.³⁸⁸ Najman lists four required features in Mosaic Discourse.³⁸⁹

1. The new text claims for itself the authority that already attaches to previous traditions by reworking and expanding them through interpretation.
2. The new text ascribes to itself the status of Torah. It may portray itself as having either a heavenly or an earthly origin, but in any event as an authentic expression of the Torah of Moses.
3. The new text is said to be a re-presentation of the revelation of Sinai. There is repeated emphasis on gaining access to revelation through a re-creation of the Sinai experience. This strategy emphasizes the presentness of the Sinai event, even in the face of destruction and exile.
4. The new text is said to be associated with, or produced by, the founding figure, Moses. This claim serves to authorize the new interpretations as divine revelation or dictation and as prophecy or inspired interpretation. The new text can then be seen as an extension of earlier ancestral discourse.

In this light: first, Matthew does rework and expand older Mosaic traditions through rewriting and interpretation with a claim to Mosaic authority (23:1–12). This is evident on both a macro-level with Matthew’s use of Mark and the Jewish scriptures (e.g. Jesus’ discourses and Matthew’s fulfilment quotations), and on a micro-level with Jesus’ reworking of some of the Ten Commandments and Torah (Matt 5:21–48).³⁹⁰

Second, Matthew 5–7, as well as the whole of Matthew, can be seen as Torah with its fivefold discourse structure and Jesus’ divine authority and instruction in continuity with Moses’ authority and Torah. This seems evident with similarity between Jesus’ birth and Moses’ birth (Matt 2:16; cf. Exod 1:15–16) in Jesus’ statement of purpose not to abolish the law and the prophets but to fulfil them (Matt 5:17–20). Therefore, in Matt 5–7, it should not be misunderstood as contradicting previous authoritative traditions (Torah and Prophets), but in continuity with them ascribing it as Jesus’ Torah Discourse—an authentic expression of the Torah of Moses.

Third, Matthew is a re-presentation of Sinai with Torah revelation. This is somewhat evident with significant events in Jesus’ life that occur on mountains, and

³⁸⁸ Jan Assmann, *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997).

³⁸⁹ Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 16. If any of the four features are missing, then it must be compensated appropriately.

³⁹⁰ It is not necessary for each of the five discourses to cite explicitly from the Torah, because I am arguing that Matthew implicitly uses various aspects associated with the Torah within his whole narrative while only being explicit in Matt 5–7.

especially his interpretation and teaching of the Torah and the Prophets (5:1; 8:1; 24:3; 26:30); Jesus' temptation (4:8); Jesus' walking on water (14:23); Jesus' healings (15:29); Jesus' transfiguration (17:1, 9); and Jesus' commission to his disciples (28:16).

Fourth, Jesus as the *Messiah* identifies himself as a teacher like Moses who is recognized as having authoritative revelation and inspired interpretation, and who occupies the seat of Moses but in opposition to the scribes and Pharisees (23:1–12; 28:18; cf. 7:29; 9:8; 21:23–27). Therefore, Matthew mentions Moses a number of times in connection with Jesus: Jesus heals a leper and commands him to show himself to the priest and offer the gift that Moses commanded (8:4); Jesus' transfiguration has two figures Moses and Elijah (17:3–4); Jesus discussion concerning divorce (19:7–8); Sadducees question regarding the resurrection (22:24); and the beginning of Jesus' woes against the scribes and Pharisees (23:2). Interestingly, on the issue of divorce, Jesus and the Pharisees argue on the Torah by citing different Mosaic traditions: Jesus quotes Gen 2:24 and the Pharisees quote Deut 24:1–4 (cf. Matt 19:1–10). Jesus ends the discussion by interpreting Moses' intention and concession regarding divorce (19:8–9).

In conclusion, Matthew seems to be involved in Mosaic discourse with Jesus' five discourses emphasizing Jesus' authority to give, interpret and teach the Torah.

III. MATTHEW'S USE OF SCRIPTURE: REWRITING TORAH

1. Rewriting Torah

The Anchor Bible Dictionary defines the Torah as the Pentateuch—the first five books of the Hebrew Bible.³⁹¹ This definition of Torah, however, is too narrow and should refer to more than just the Pentateuch, as Brooke states: “The Torah can be conceptualized as more than the Pentateuch in a strict sense. From the evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls, especially that from the eleven caves at or near Qumran, it is now widely acknowledged that Torah is something more than the five books of Moses in a pre- or proto-Masoretic form.”³⁹² First, Brooke establishes that the Pentateuch existed in several and various forms in the first century BCE and probably later, but it is only found from the first century CE and later that

³⁹¹ Richard Elliott Friedman, “Torah (Pentateuch),” *ABD* 6.605–22. There is no entry for Torah.

³⁹² See George J. Brooke. “Torah, Rewritten Torah and the Letter of Jude,” in *The Torah in the New Testament: Papers Delivered at the Manchester-Lausanne Seminar of June 2008* (eds. Michael Tait and Peter Oakes; LNTS 401; T&T Clark), 189, 180–93. This is especially true for Matthew who seems to be working from Hebrew, Aramaic, and possibly Syriac sources.

texts exist either identical or almost like the MT.³⁹³ Second, compositions like the Enoch corpus and texts like 4Q127 derive their authority from earlier forms of the Pentateuch and also give authority to that which they rework by showing that it is still in need of application.

For some of those at Qumran, I believe, all of these compositions, and possibly others such as the Testament of Moses, could merit the designation Torah and could be used as authorities in debates and discussions, sometimes being quoted or alluded to. If we suppose that the writings associated with Enoch are similarly best understood as parabiblical in some way, even as extensions to the Torah of Moses, then the corpus of Torah compositions becomes excitedly variegated.³⁹⁴

Johan Maier also does not restrict the Torah to the legal contents of the Pentateuch or like texts but, by compiling numerous definitions from various Jewish groups in the Persian and Hellenistic periods, re-defines Torah as: “not a uniform unit but rather a conglomerate of different social, political, and religious tendencies, more or less organized as groups, all of them with their own concept of ‘Torah’ and authority, presupposing, of course, a common basis.”³⁹⁵ Therefore, the Torah, for most Jews from the fifth century BCE to about the first century CE, had many textual forms with a common authoritative base.³⁹⁶ For example, the word תורה can be found in many of the Dead Sea Scrolls with the broader understanding of a general idea of instruction or law often involving ethics (cf. CD 15:2, 9, 12; 1QS 5:8; 8:22).³⁹⁷

Therefore, if it is possible to envisage the Torah for a member of the Qumran group or its wider movement had a broader referent than the Pentateuch alone in a strict sense, then it is conceivable that describing Matthew’s use of Torah as only referencing the Pentateuch or Hebrew Bible does not do justice to the status of the traditions that the author has at his disposal. Matthew’s rewriting Torah is then a use of the Jewish scriptures and authoritative traditions common in Second Temple Judaism performed under the authority of Moses (*Jub.* 23–31; *T. Mos.* 9–10; cf. 11QT).

³⁹³ Copies of Pentateuchal books closer to the Samaritan Pentateuch are 4QpaleoExod^m and 4Q365.

³⁹⁴ Brooke, “Torah, Rewritten Torah,” 191.

³⁹⁵ Brooke, “Torah, Rewritten Torah,” 189.

³⁹⁶ Torah can be both a reference to the canonical Pentateuch or have a wider meaning as discussed here. In Matthew, both understandings of Torah are present (5:17–18). The combination of the Law and Prophets (ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται) seems to be a reference to the Jewish scriptures (5:17; 7:12; 11:13), but the law in 5:18 seems to encompass more (cf. 12:5; 23:23).

³⁹⁷ Marcus Tso (*Ethics in the Qumran Community: An Interdisciplinary Investigation* [WUNT 2.292; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010], 6–7) identifies four contributing factors to ethics: (1) the use of scriptural traditions; (2) sense of identity; (3) response to political and cultural contexts; and (4) eschatology.

Furthermore, the Qumran community believed they represented the embodiment of biblical Israel and therefore possessed the true meaning of the revelation at Sinai and all subsequent revelations to Moses.³⁹⁸ One way that the community bridged this gap was to envision its legislative activity as the most recent stage in the progressive revelation of law (1QS 5:7–13).

The community believed that Moses received an initial one-time revelation of the Torah on Sinai. The interpretation of the Torah and the formulation of post-biblical law were disclosed to successive generations through a series of later revelations. The community viewed itself as the current beneficiary of this revelation. Its leaders, most notably the Teacher of Righteousness, were regarded as inspired individuals who interpreted the Torah and formulated law based on their status as recipients of legislative revelation. The Qumran rule books represent the record of the legislative activity of these inspired individuals during nightly study sessions. For the Qumran community, revelation serves as the source of all law. The members regarded Moses as both a lawgiver and a prophet and considered his lawgiving role to be directly related to his prophetic status as God's intermediary. Indeed, the vast majority of Jews in the Second Temple period shared this view of Moses.³⁹⁹

Moreover, the Torah must be placed within its cultural context with its hermeneutical, narrative and dialogical strategies taken into account, as Steven D. Fraade indicates:

Rather, I wish to argue, such legal systems need to be viewed as organic expressions of their respective *polities*: as mythic architectures of time and space, as mappings of power distribution and identity differentiation both within a culture and between it and others. Legal systems are no more *functional* systems of order and control than they are *fictive* systems of meaning and imagination. They need to be compared and contrasted along both lines.⁴⁰⁰

Similarly, Matthew seems to connect Moses, Sinai and Torah with Jesus, his discourses and the Gospel in his rewriting Torah as a legislative activity now as the most recent stage in the progressive revelation of Torah (cf. 5:17–19).

2. Rewriting Torah with Wisdom

Although the foundational nature of the Torah was established by the time of Matthew, the Torah could be supplemented and was often rewritten to adapt for the present generation:

“The important thing to notice about all these different ways of dealing with the ‘legal

³⁹⁸ Alex P. Jassen, “The Presentation of the Ancient Prophets as Lawgivers at Qumran,” *JBL* 127 (2008): 307 n. 1, 307–37.

³⁹⁹ Jassen, “Ancient Prophets,” 307–308.

⁴⁰⁰ Steven D. Fraade, “The ‘Torah of the King’ (Deut 17:14–20) in the Temple Scroll and Early Rabbinic Law,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. James R. Davila; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 26, 25–60.

question' is that in no case are we presented with an abrogation of the old Torah or the promulgation of a new, superior, eschatological, still less messianic substitute for it. All we have, all that is claimed, is interpretation and, from time to time, maybe, expansion of the existing Torah."⁴⁰¹ Therefore, when the Torah was not a sufficient guide for ordinary life, Torah was rewritten and blended with wisdom traditions (Bar 4; Sir 24; cf. Wis 18).

She [Wisdom] is the book of the commandments of God, and the law that endures forever. All who hold her fast will live, and those who forsake her will die (Bar 4:1).

All this [Wisdom] is the book of the covenant of the Most High God, the law which Moses commanded us as an inheritance of the congregations of Jacob (Sir 24:23).

Matthew 5–7, rewriting Torah, contains aspects of wisdom traditions (blessings, two ways and parables) to bring Torah into the present and into Matthew's context. The Beatitudes (5:3–11), the two gates and two ways (7:13–14), the two trees (7:17–20) and the parable of the wise and foolish builders (7:24–27) are examples of aspects of wisdom which end Jesus' Torah Discourse.

3. Rewriting Torah in the Last Days

Furthermore, Matthew rewrites the Torah with the prophets and wisdom traditions for the *Last Days* in Jesus' prophetic woes, eschatological signs, and parables of judgment. The Torah and the Prophets (ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται) occur three times in Matthew (7:12; 11:13; 22:40).⁴⁰² Their perpetuity is emphasized with not a letter or stroke will pass away, which refers to the actual text rather than the contents of the text in a general way.⁴⁰³ This forbids the removal of any element that is already present in the text, but does not prohibit the addition of new ones; therefore, any addition assumes authoritative status.⁴⁰⁴ Therefore,

⁴⁰¹ Michael Tait, "The End of the Law: The Messianic Torah in the Pseudepigrapha," in *The Torah in the New Testament* (ed. Michael Tait, and Peter Oakes; LNTS 401; London: T&T Clark, 2009), 200, 196–207.

⁴⁰² This could refer to the Hebrew Bible as a whole, but Luke 24:44 has the "law of Moses, the prophets and psalms" indicating groupings rather than a canon. However, Walter Gutbrod ("νόμος," in *TDNT* [ed. Gerhard Kittel; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76], 4.1051) defines νόμος on its own as referring to the Torah and ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται refers to the Hebrew Bible.

⁴⁰³ See Siam Bhayro, "Matthew 5:17–18 in the Light of Qumran Scribal Practice," in *Paratext and Megatext as Channels of Jewish and Christian Traditions: The Textual Markers of Contextualization* (eds. A.A. den Hollander, U.B. Schmid and W.F. Smelik; Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series 6; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 42–45.

⁴⁰⁴ The scribal practice of compiling authoritative texts included supplementing texts; for example, Baruch composed a second collection of Jeremiah's oracles, producing a new copy of Jeremiah's message because the original was destroyed (Jer 36:28, 32; cf. Eccl 12:9–12).

although it may seem that Jesus' Torah Discourse merely adds to the Torah, "you have heard that it was said...but I say to you," it is Torah and used to qualify inclusion or exclusion into the kingdom of heaven (Matt 5–7; 24–25).

The Torah with the prophets, including its eschatological signs and parables of judgment, is also found in the Dead Sea Scrolls as the prophets participated in the progressive revelation of Torah as Alex Jassen lists.⁴⁰⁵

1. 1QS begins with an exhortation to members of the community to do what is good and right as God commanded through Moses and through all his servants the prophets (1QS 1:2–3). The language of doing what is good and right is from Deuteronomy and often refers to observing the Torah (6:18; 12:28; 13:19; cf. 11Q19 59:16–17; 4QMMT C31).
2. 1QS 8:15–16 introduces the prophets and their role of illuminating the performance of the Torah and providing instructions on how to properly observe it. The prophets, in sectarian writings, appear with great regularity as the mediators of divine law (1QS 8:15–16). Moses and the classical prophets are the first two stages in the revelation of law to Israel. The passage begins by introducing the Torah of Moses.
3. CD 5:21–6:1 and 4Q166 2:1–6 identify the prophets as the mediators of God's commandments.
4. 4Q390 2 i 4–5 and 4Q375 lines 1–4, non-sectarian documents, have the prophets mediating God's commandments.⁴⁰⁶
5. 4Q380–381, non-canonical Psalms, specifically 4Q381 69:4, illustrate the prophetic role of instruction and teaching.

Therefore, the community's legislative program—system of lawgiving—was a continuation of the prophetic word from the ancient prophets. The prophets, assuming the role of the spirit of God, rewrite the Torah.⁴⁰⁷ Prophetic instruction, grounded in the interpretation of the Torah itself, complements Moses' initial formation of the Torah

⁴⁰⁵ Jassen ("Ancient Prophets," 310) states: "Qumran documents the ancient prophet's juridical responsibilities within the framework of the community's model for the formation and development of postbiblical law. Prophets in the Hebrew Bible rarely appear as lawgivers. In contrast, the Qumran texts routinely represent the ancient prophets as mediators of divinely revealed law, sometimes in cooperation with Moses and sometimes independent of Moses."

⁴⁰⁶ See Devorah Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990* (eds. D. Dimant and L.H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23–58.

⁴⁰⁷ See John R. Levison, *The Spirit in First-Century Judaism* (AGJU 29; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

(4Q381; cf. Neh 8:8; 13; 9:20).⁴⁰⁸ Therefore, as Eileen Schuller indicates, the prophets are Torah instructors (למך) with the root למך (to teach) being a common Deuteronomic term associated with Moses (Deut 4:1, 5, 14, 5:28, 6:1).⁴⁰⁹ Through revelatory experiences, the prophets continue the task of prophetic lawgiving begun with Moses at Sinai, making the Torah intelligible and applicable in the present setting.

Similarly, in Matthew, Jesus instructs and interprets the Torah. Even though God ultimately gives and teaches the Torah, the *Royal Messiah* has a close relationship with it (Matt 5:17–19; Isa 2:3 cf. 30:20–21).⁴¹⁰ Therefore, messianic figures and claimants copied the Torah of Moses (*J.W.* 2:258–60; *Ant.* 20:97–99). This is not a new Torah, but emphasizes the interpretation, internalization and contextualization of the Mosaic Torah with Matthew’s rewriting of some parts of the Decalogue and the Holiness Code (Exod 20:13–15 [Matt 5:21–37]; Lev 19:12; 24:20; 19:18, 26 [Matt 5:38–48; 7:12]; cf. Deut 6:6).⁴¹¹ In addition, the Torah is not just to legislate, but also to judge (Matt 11:13; cf. Luke 16:16).⁴¹²

IV. JESUS’ TORAH DISCOURSE (5:1–7:29)

1. Literary Structure

Matthew rewrites the Torah in Jesus’ first discourse by citing the Torah (i.e. parts of the Decalogue and the Holiness Code), emphasizing a “righteousness that exceeds the scribes and Pharisees” through the intensification of Torah practices and giving qualifications for entering into the kingdom of heaven.⁴¹³ Jesus’ Torah Discourse begins and ends by affirming Jesus’ authority with the posture of sitting as he teaches, and the crowd’s

⁴⁰⁸ In 4Q390 line 5–6, God declares that he will speak with the returnees and send them commandments (line 6; cf. Deut 5:28). God entrusts Moses, the first lawgiver, with the responsibility of transmitting divine law to Israel.

⁴⁰⁹ See Eileen Schuller, *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts Part I* (eds. Esther Eshel et al.; DJD XI; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 151. In *HALOT* 1.531, למך refers to formal instruction in wisdom or in a skill, except for in Deuteronomy.

⁴¹⁰ The messiah also employs it with his mouth to destroy his enemies (Isa 11; cf. *4 Ezra* 13:10; *Pss Sol* 17:36; *1 En* 51:3).

⁴¹¹ The Torah is written on the hearts of God’s people (Jer 31:33; Ezek 36:27).

⁴¹² See Alistair I. Wilson. *When Will These Things Happen? A Study of Jesus as Judge in Matthew 21–25* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2004).

⁴¹³ Jesus’ Torah Discourse interprets the commandments on murder (5:21; Exod 20:13; Deut 5:17) and adultery (5:27; Exod 20:14; Deut 5:18), and actions concerning the taking of oaths (5:33; Lev 19:12; cf. Num 30:2), retaliation (5:38; Lev 24:20; cf. Exod 21:24), loving neighbours (5:43; Lev 19:18) and holiness (5:48; Lev 19:2).

astonishment regarding his authority (5:1–2; 7:28–29).⁴¹⁴ Jesus interprets the Torah with Mosaic authority as opposed to the authority of the scribes and Pharisees: the teachers and experts of the Torah (cf. 23:2). Furthermore, in the temple, a range of religious leaders (chief priests, elders, Pharisees, Herodians, and Sadducees) question and confront Jesus’ authority, but he leaves them confounded about his identity and authority (21:23–46). Therefore, Jesus’ Torah Discourse is an authoritative interpretation of the Torah of Moses.

Matthew rewrites Torah as he rewrites parts of the Decalogue and the Holiness Code by citing from Exodus and Deuteronomy as well as Leviticus. Hans Dieter Betz identifies four parts to Matt 5–7: (1) ten beatitudes mark the introduction with an *inclusio* in 5:3–10 and 12 with the first eight beatitudes in the third person plural and the last two in the second person plural; (2) a ring composition of “the Torah and the Prophets” as principles (5:17 and 7:12) with the interpretation of the Torah (5:17–48), cultic rituals (6:1–18) and daily life (6:19–7:12); (3) eschatological warnings (7:13–23); and (4) hearing and doing (7:24–29).⁴¹⁵ However, Matt 5–7 can also be read as a variegated literary composition of rewriting Torah: legislation, ethics and worship. This illustrates the gradual expansion of the Torah into legal, moral and cultic precepts.

Figure 2: Literary Structure of Jesus’ Torah Discourse (5:1–7:29)

- I. Introduction (5:1–2)
- II. Rewriting the Torah (5:3–7:27)
 - 1. Beatitudes and Being Salt and Light (5:3–16)
 - 2. Fulfilling the Torah and the Prophets (5:17–20)
 - 3. Rewriting the Torah: Legislation, Ethics and Worship (5:21–6:34)
 - a. The Decalogue: Murder and Adultery (5:21–30)
 - b. The Holiness Code: Oaths, Retaliation and Love for Enemies (5:38–48)
 - c. Alms Giving, Prayer and Fasting (6:1–18)
 - d. Allegiance to King and Kingdom (6:19–34)
 - 4. Rewriting the Torah with Wisdom (7:1–27)
 - a. Judgment and Discernment (7:1–11)
 - b. The Golden Rule (7:12)
 - c. Two Gates, Two Roads and Two Trees (7:13–23)
 - d. Wise and Foolish Builders (7:24–27)
- III. Conclusion (7:28–29)

⁴¹⁴ In Matthew, “scribes,” are negative when they are associated with groups like the Pharisees, chief priests and elders (23:1–36) and positive when they are associated with Jesus (i.e. the disciples; 8:19, 21; 13:52).

⁴¹⁵ Hans Dieter Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain (Matthew 5:3–7:27 and Luke 6:20–49)* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2008), 50–58.

In this literary structure of Matthew, I have designated Jesus' Torah Discourse as a rewriting of Torah: (1) the Beatitudes, (2) fulfilment of the Torah and the Prophets, (3) teaching on parts of the Decalogue and Holiness Code which includes ethics and worship, and (4) the way of wisdom. This discourse begins with a series of blessings pertaining to the character of the kingdom of heaven. It then states Jesus' purpose of fulfilling the Torah and the Prophets, which is preceded by Jesus' radicalization of the Decalogue (i.e. Commandments 6, 7 and possibly 8 pertaining to life, family and reputation) and the Holiness Code (i.e. oaths, retaliation, love of neighbours and enemies) as well as the greater righteousness of almsgiving, prayer and fasting.⁴¹⁶ Lastly, Matthew rewrites Torah with wisdom in Jesus' exhortations about judging, searching for his kingdom and living by the golden rule. Furthermore, Jesus acknowledges two ways (i.e. the way of wisdom and the way of folly) and identifies those who choose the narrow gate, travel the narrow road, bear good fruit, and build on the foundation of Jesus' teaching as those who enter into the kingdom of heaven and the way of wisdom (cf. Prov 9:1–18).

2. The Beatitudes

The beatitudes introduce Jesus' Torah Discourse with the first eight beatitudes in the third person plural with an *inclusio* between verses 3 and 10 (ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν), and the last beatitude in the second person plural. In comparing the beatitudes with Jewish authoritative traditions, they have four characteristics: (1) they function in ritual; (2) they are declarative statements; (3) they are eschatologically orientated as well as in the present; and (4) they are connected with ethics.⁴¹⁷ In addition, the beatitudes are associated with joy, fulfilment and responsibility, and with ethical injunctions—involving both inward motives and outward conduct—to gain entrance into the kingdom of heaven (5:2b–16; cf. 7:13–27).

Furthermore, Jesus does not abolish the Torah and the Prophets but fulfils them, which sets the foundation for understanding the Torah and righteousness (5:17–20). This corrects his critics and affirms the legal binding authority of the Mosaic Torah (7:21; 10:34). Jesus therefore recognizes the Torah as having legal authority and implements that authority as a source for righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) to bear on kingdom ethics. Therefore,

⁴¹⁶ This greater righteousness is not practiced for public recognition, but seeks and lives out the kingdom of heaven by identifying, serving and trusting in God alone (cf. 6:23).

⁴¹⁷ *Joseph and Aseneth* 16:7–8; *Sir* 48; *Tob* 12:6; *2 En.* 42:6–14; 4Q525 has 8 or 10 beatitudes in a 3x3 or 2x4 +1 construction.

righteousness as a human action can be obtained as a result of obedience to the will of God as revealed in the Torah and reinterpreted by Jesus.⁴¹⁸ Matthew 5:20, concerned with entering into the kingdom of heaven, emphasizes a “better righteousness” that exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees (5:21–7:27). Jesus did not come to abolish (καταλύω) or “put an end” to the Torah but to fulfil (πληρώω) the legal, ceremonial and moral law.

3. Rewriting the Decalogue and the Holiness Code

Matthew rewrites parts of the Decalogue and the Holiness Code as six different scenarios beginning with, “you have heard that it was said (5:21, 27, 31, 33, 38, 43),” and summarized by the golden rule providing six answers to some social issues of Matthew’s day.⁴¹⁹ Three answers rewrite the Decalogue with murder, adultery and stealing (i.e. divorce and oaths),⁴²⁰ and three rewrite the Holiness Code concerning oaths, retribution, and love of neighbour (5:21–48).⁴²¹ For the Decalogue, this same order is found in Matthew’s list of vices—murder, adultery, fornication, theft, bearing false witness, blasphemy (15:19 cf. Mark 7:21–22)—and commandments: murder, adultery, stealing, bearing false witness, honouring your father and mother, and loving one’s neighbour as oneself (19:19; cf. Mark 10:19).⁴²²

Matthew radicalizes the Decalogue by forbidding what might lead to its violation and what was allowed because of people’s hardness of heart (cf. 19.8).⁴²³ By being directly written by God, the Decalogue could be viewed as the foundation of the Torah: the constitution of Israel that sets the ground rules for God’s people (cf. Deut 5:22).⁴²⁴ The

⁴¹⁸ Opponents include the scribes and the Pharisees (Matt 23:2–4). See also Qumran: the seekers of smooth things (4QpNah 1.2, 7; 2.2, 4; 3.3, 6–7; 1QH 2.15, 32 and CD 1.18).

⁴¹⁹ The Decalogue can be found in Exod 20:2–17 and Deut 5:6–30, and reiterated in Exod 34:11–26 within the context of the rest of the Mosaic Torah (Exod 20:18–23:33; cf. Exod 34:1–35; 1Q2). The prophets also reference, reiterate and adapt the Decalogue (Hos 4:2; 12:10; 13:4 Jer 7:9; cf. Job 24:14–15, Pss 50:7; 81:10–11). The Holiness code is found in Lev 17–26 with Ezekiel adapting it (eg. Ezek 22:10–11).

⁴²⁰ Exodus 20:13, 14, 16; Deut 5:17, 18, 20; cf. Deut 24:1–4.

⁴²¹ Retribution (eye for eye and tooth for tooth) is found in Exod 21:24, Lev 24:20, and Deut 19:21. Divorce is found in Deut 24:1–4. Love of neighbour is found in Lev 19:18.

⁴²² The three nets of Belial list fornication, wealth and defiling the sanctuary, which is similar to adultery, murder and idolatry (cf. CD 4:12–19). In the second example, the Decalogue is joined with the Holiness Code with Lev 19:18.

⁴²³ David Baker, “The Finger of God and the forming of a nation: the origin and purpose of the Decalogue,” *TynBul* 56 (2005): 1–24

⁴²⁴ See Patrick D. Miller, “The Place of the Decalogue in the Old Testament and Its Law,” *Int* 43 (1989): 229–42.

Decalogue as Torah is a summary of points for maintaining Israel's covenant relationship with God.⁴²⁵ It states the basis of Israel's covenantal relationship with God and lists primary obligations for maintaining that relationship, including responsibilities toward both God and humanity. It is about law and the basic moral and ethical principles that are central to Israel's identity and history.⁴²⁶ The Torah is an ethical policy with detailed laws in the Book of the Covenant, Holiness Code and Deuteronomic Laws, which explains how these policies and principles are to be put into practice. The Decalogue as Torah was instrumental in forming the nation of Israel and providing the basis for the ethics of God's people.

Matthew follows the order of the commandments from the Hebrew (murder, adultery, stealing) rather than the Greek (adultery, stealing, murder).⁴²⁷ Matthew and Mark have the order as murder, adultery and stealing while Luke, Paul and Philo have adultery, murder and stealing (cf. Rom 13:9). This suggests that, even though the Decalogue is foundational for forming the rest of the Torah, it is fluid in terms of its order. Three of the commandments are "from ancient times" or "to the men of old" and refer to the Decalogue (5:21, 27, 33).⁴²⁸ These three commandments (6, 7, 8) are concerned with people rather than God with Lev 19:18, "loving one's neighbour," as the climax of Matthew's rewriting the Torah. The commandment against murder is linked with anger and hatred (Sir 22:24; cf. Did 3:2). The commandment against adultery is concerned with respectful conduct of men and women (cf. 11QT 57:17–19; CD 4:21–5:2).

Matthew seems to advocate a radical stance on the Torah: having to keep it in every detail, including people's feelings, thoughts and motivations, as well as their actions. He summarizes the entire law in the double command to love God and neighbour, and puts

⁴²⁵ Jesus often uses the introductory formulas of "you have heard" (5:21, 27, 33, 38, 43), "it is said" (5:31, 33) and "it is written" (4:6, 7, 10) before quoting the Torah. The references to the law are often introduced by the formula "Moses commanded" (8:4; 19:7; cf. 22:24; 23:2) with Moses representing (speaking for) the Torah. Jesus also quotes from the Jewish scripture with "Have you not read" (12:3, 5; 19:4, 22:31).

⁴²⁶ G.E. Mendenhall makes a distinction in Ancient Near Eastern law between policy and technique ("Ancient Oriental and Biblical Law," *BA* 17 [1954]: 26, 26–46).

⁴²⁷ The Decalogue order follows the MT (murder, adultery and stealing) in Exod 20:13–15LXX (Manuscript A, F), Josephus, Matt 15:19, 19:18, Mark 10:19, Didache 2:1–3 (cf. Hos 4:2), while order is adultery, murder and stealing in Mark 7:21, Luke 18:20, Rom 13:9, Jas 2:11, Philo (*Dec.* 12; *Spec.* 3.2), and Nash Papyrus. See Richard A. Freund. "The Decalogue in Early Judaism and Christianity," in *The Function of Scripture in Early Jewish and Christian Tradition* (eds. C.A. Evans and J.A. Sanders; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988), 60–100.

⁴²⁸ Matthew 5:31, 38, 43 do not contain this phrase.

mercy above cultic observances (9:13; 12:7).⁴²⁹ Therefore, the Mosaic Torah must be governed by love and mercy (5:38; cf. Deut 19:21).

This point of view explains the antitheses with their quotations from Deuteronomy: the Old Testament laws remain valid, but Jesus interprets them in the light of the governing principle of love or mercy. Acting fully in accordance with this governing principle means that ‘your righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees’ (5:20) and that one is ‘perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect’ (5:48; cf. 19:21).⁴³⁰

In two controversies with the Pharisees, Jesus legitimates his own behaviour by radicalizing the Torah and quoting Hos 6:6. He characterizes “justice, mercy and faith” as the weightier matters of the Torah; however, he still maintains the practice of the whole Torah in all its minutiae (23:23).⁴³¹ Therefore, Jesus gives examples of this surpassing righteousness that gives entry into the kingdom of heaven including the interior motivations of actions with Jesus’ rewriting of the Decalogue, and the external practices regarding piety with Jesus’ rewriting of the Holiness Code.

Jesus’ Torah Discourse is summarized by the golden rule, the commands to love God and love neighbour (7:12; 22:40; cf. Deut 6:5; Lev 19:18). Matthew 5:48, “You will be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly Father is perfect,”⁴³² rewrites Lev 19:18, “You will be holy, for I the LORD your God am holy.” This verse summarizes Matthew’s rewriting of the Decalogue and the Holiness code and introduces the righteous practices of almsgiving, prayer and fasting (6:1–18). In rewriting the Holiness Code, Matthew establishes a standard for entering into the kingdom of heaven that exceeds the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees. Again Jesus seems to radicalize, as well as universalize, the Holiness code in speaking simply (i.e. “yes be yes and no be no”), no retaliation (“turning the other cheek”), and including loving enemies and neighbours (5:33–48; cf. Lev 19:12; 24:20; 19:18).

Furthermore, arising from Matthew’s rewriting of the Torah are various righteous and pious acts: giving to the poor, prayer, and fasting (6:1–18). Jesus directs these practices against the hypocrites (i.e. scribes and the Pharisees) who do them for public recognition

⁴²⁹ Strict adherence in Matt 23:2–3 and 24:20 but more liberal in 19:19 and 22:34–40 (cf. Deut 6:5). See Maarten J.J. Menken, “Deuteronomy in Matthew’s Gospel,” in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament* (eds. S. Moyise and M. Menken; LNTS 358; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 42–62.

⁴³⁰ Menken, “Deuteronomy in Matthew’s Gospel,” 52.

⁴³¹ Both references to Hos 6:6 are missing in the Mark and Luke parallels. See Matt 9:13; Mark 2:17; Luke 5:32; and Matt 12:7; Mark 2:26; Luke 6:4.

⁴³² I have translated ἕσσεσθε literally as a second plural future indicative.

rather than God’s favour.⁴³³ Jesus urges his disciples to do them in secret for God to witness, as the kingdom of heaven demands complete allegiance to God alone. Furthermore, the disciples are to work for and to trust in God by storing up “heavenly” treasures and not worrying about their basic necessities. They are not to judge but to search for God’s will in every matter. This leads to Jesus’ emphasis on “righteousness” and the kingdom of heaven. First, mere compliance with the written stipulations of the Torah is considered inadequate to enter into the kingdom of heaven. Second, Jesus interprets the Torah with authority and not only through tradition alone. Third, both internal motivations and external performance are vitally important to enter into the kingdom of heaven. Fourth, the scribes and Pharisees have an inferior form of “righteousness.”

4. Rewriting the Torah with Wisdom

Matthew rewrites Torah with wisdom:⁴³⁴ beatitudes (5:3–12), instructions in aspects of daily life (6:19–7:12), and parables⁴³⁵ of warning for a “better righteousness” (7:13–27).⁴³⁶ These elements of wisdom, including hearing and doing, either lead to inclusion in or exclusion from the kingdom of heaven. They reinforce God’s standards of righteousness, which can only be upheld by following Jesus’ Torah Discourse. His instructions to his disciples concerning the way of wisdom will qualify them to enter into kingdom of heaven and eternal life rather than being separated for eternal destruction.

Furthermore, Jesus’ Torah Discourse is bracketed by wisdom: the beatitudes and the way of wisdom. The beatitudes (μακάριος) express God’s favour and reward. They are not only implicit imperatives, but are also identity markers for those who are in the

⁴³³ The scribes and the Pharisees are often identified as hypocrites (15:7; 22:18; 23:23, 25, 27, 29; 24:41).

⁴³⁴ Ben Sira is a rewriting of Torah with Wisdom. See E. Earle Ellis, “The Old Testament Canon in the Early Church,” in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. M. Jan Mulder; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 653–90, esp. 687–688.

⁴³⁵ *Meshalim* can be translated as parables (e.g. Num 23:7, 18; Deut 28:37 LXX). However, it has a broad definition that includes figurative language, metaphor, simile, parable, parabolic story, illustrative story, and allegory. In the Gospel, parables can be understood as *meshalim* with short, carefully formulated texts from everyday speech in mind (i.e. maxims, proverbs, riddles, brief narratives, illustrations, parables, and allegories). See B. Gerhardsson, “Illuminating the Kingdom: Narrative Meshalim in the Synoptic Gospels,” in *Jesus and the Oral Gospel* (ed. H. Wansbrough; JSNTSup 64; JSOT; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 266–304.

⁴³⁶ These six sections deal with six social issues determined by the *Golden Rule* (7:12).

kingdom of heaven.⁴³⁷ These nine beatitudes indicate an eschatological reversal with a transformation of the present situation (cf. 11:2–6). They exhort behaviour in accordance to God’s justice (cf. Isa 61; Ps 37). They reveal the way of wisdom that observes the Torah (Pss 1:1–2; 33:12; 119:1–2; 144:15) with the several choices between life or death: (1) two gates and two roads, (2) two trees and two fruits, and (3) two builders with one being wise and another being foolish. Therefore, Jesus’ Torah Discourse with the way of wisdom leads to life, while the way of folly leads to death and destruction (Prov 8; cf. Matt 7:13, 19).

Before examining Jesus’ Prophetic Eschatological Discourse, a number of features connect it with Jesus’ Torah Discourse. First, the same group of people—the crowds and the disciples—are found at the beginning of the two discourses (5:1; 23:1; cf. 13:36; 14:15, 19, 22; 15:32–33; 36). Second, the setting of a mountain acts as an *inclusio* bracketing both discourses (5:1; 8:1; 24:16; 26:30).⁴³⁸ Third, the combination of blessings and curses links the two discourses with Matt 5–7 beginning with blessings and 23–25 starting with woes.⁴³⁹ Fourth, wisdom material with metaphors of two ways, parables of warning and judgment join both discourses. Fifth, both discourses are larger blocks of Jesus’ teaching and roughly the same size.

V. JESUS’ PROPHETIC ESCHATOLOGICAL DISCOURSE (23:1–26:2)

1. Literary Structure

In Jesus’ Prophetic Eschatological Discourse, Matthew rewrites the Torah with the prophets in the *Last Day* (אחרית הימים). This discourse begins with prophetic woes connecting it back to the blessings of Jesus’ Torah Discourse. These prophetic woes are curses directed to the scribes and Pharisees who have broken the Torah and its practices (23:1–36). In addition, Jesus’ Prophetic Eschatological Discourse foretells the destruction of the temple and the signs of the *Last Days* (23:37–24:31). It also ends with eschatological parables of judgment that warn and encourage a person to be faithful and watchful (24:32–25:46).

⁴³⁷ Beatitudes can be a form of royal teaching (e.g. Ps 1; Proverbs; Philo’s *Moses*).

⁴³⁸ Jesus’ transfiguration also has a mountain as an *inclusio* (17:1, 9).

⁴³⁹ Luke 6:20–26 has blessings and curses together.

Figure 3: Literary Structure of the Jesus' Prophetic Eschatological Discourse (23:1–26:2)

- I. Jesus' Prophetic Woes (23:1–24:2)
 1. Jesus denounces the Scribes and Pharisees (23:1–12)
 2. Jesus' Oracles against the Scribes and Pharisees (23:13–36)
 3. Jesus' Lament and Prophecy over Jerusalem (23:37–39)
 4. Jesus' Prophecy of the Destruction of the Temple (24:1–2)
- II. Jesus' Eschatological Discourse (24:3–25:46)
 1. Questions about the *Last Days*: When and What Signs? (24:3)
 2. Prophecy of False Messiahs and Persecution (24:4–14)
 3. Prophecy of Destruction and Instruction to Flee (24:15–28)
 4. Prophecy of the Coming of the Son of Man (24:29–31)
 5. Warnings and Parables of Preparation (24:32–25:46)
 - a. The Fig Tree: Warning to be Watchful (24:32–44)
 - b. The Faithful and Unfaithful Servant (24:45–51)
 - c. Parable of the Ten Bridesmaid (25:1–13)
 - d. Parable of the Talents (25:14–30)
 - e. Parable of the Sheep and the Goats (25:31–46)
- III. Conclusion (26:1–2)

2. Seat of Moses

The Seat of Moses (τῆς Μωϋσέως καθέδρας) refers to Mosaic authority and divine revelation (23:2–3). Like the scribes and the Pharisees who sit on Moses' seat, Jesus also has authority to interpret and teach the Torah.⁴⁴⁰ Matthew depicts Jesus as the royal messiah and the true interpreter of the Torah in opposition to Satan, the chief priests, the Sadducees, and the scribes and Pharisees (cf. 2:6; 4:6; 19:7; 22:24). Powell states that the Messiah, just like Moses, is a teacher and interpreter of Torah with the keys of the kingdom of heaven, who can bind and loose or interpret the words of Moses (cf. 16:18–20; 18:19; 23:10).

He is also able to bind and to loose laws in ways that bring out their true intent. An example of binding a commandment would be his declaration that the law prohibiting adultery applies even to lustful thoughts (5:27–28). An example of loosing a commandment would be his decision that the law forbidding work on the Sabbath does not apply to picking grain to satisfy one's hunger (12:1–7).⁴⁴¹

Moreover, this is passed down to Matthew and the disciples (and ultimately the ἐκκλησία), who are also able to interpret and teach the Torah (13:52; cf. 17:10–11; 23:2, 34). "It is

⁴⁴⁰ Jesus' triumphal entry into Jerusalem and subsequent events depict and accentuate his kingship. After cleansing the temple and cursing the fig tree, Jesus enters the temple and teaches. All the religious leaders of the day—chief priest and elders, Pharisees, Herodians, and Sadducees—in turn question Jesus' authority, but are all ultimately dismissed (21:23–22:46).

⁴⁴¹ Mark A. Powell, "Do and Keep What Moses Says (Matthew 23:2–7)," *JBL* 114 (1995): 434, 419–35.

possible that Matthew as a Jewish-Christian author thoroughly familiar with the HB and with Jewish traditions of its interpretation considered himself to be a scribe.”⁴⁴² Therefore, Jesus’ commission to Peter in terms of binding and loosing, essentially a scribal function referring to the declaration of legal decisions of removing and imposing religious bans, is passed down (16:19).⁴⁴³ Moreover, Jesus’ commission to his disciples to make disciples, “teaching them to obey everything that I have commanded you,” can also be viewed as a handing down of this authority of binding and loosing (28:18–20; cf. 23:34).

3. Prophetic Woes: Curses

Matthew’s woes to the scribes and Pharisees are reminiscent of Israel’s ancient prophets uttering curses as warnings and proclamations of judgment upon Israel for breaking God’s covenant (Isa 3:8–12; Jer 13:27; Hos 7:11–16). After Jesus’ authority is questioned and rejected by the Jewish religious leaders, Jesus denounces the scribes and Pharisees by condemning them for their actions and speaking oracles against them (23:1–36), and foretelling the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple (23:37–24:2).

Jesus’ seven prophetic woes against the scribes and the Pharisees condemn their actions as teachers and interpreters of the Torah (23:2). They make the Torah a heavy burden and prefer to be honoured rather than honouring God and helping people.

1. Woe for they lock people out of the kingdom of heaven.
2. Woe for they convert people and make them children of hell.
3. Woe for they swear and give oaths to deceive.
4. Woe for they disregard matters of Torah such as justice, mercy and faith.
5. Woe for they are clean in outside appearance but neglect their inner being.
6. Woe for they are whitewashed tombs full of hypocrisy and lawlessness.
7. Woe for they reject and murder God’s messengers.

The problem with the scribes and Pharisees is that they do not demonstrate a true understanding of Torah through word and deed.⁴⁴⁴ In contrast, Jesus’ prophetic woes and understanding of the Torah place him in line with Israel’s prophets. Furthermore, just as they are persecuted and killed, he will share a similar fate in his rejection, crucifixion and death (cf. 23:34–35).

⁴⁴² See O. Lamar Cope. *Matthew. A Scribe trained for the Kingdom of Heaven* (CBQMS 5; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1976), 10.

⁴⁴³ M.J. Suggs, *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew’s Gospel* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970), 120–21.

⁴⁴⁴ Powell, “Do and Keep What Moses Says,” 432.

4. Rewriting Torah in the Last Days

Jesus' Prophetic Eschatological Discourse, concerned with the *Last Days*, has been interpreted in three major directions: (1) as a prophesy of Jerusalem's fall that was fulfilled in 70 CE; (2) as a prophesy concerning the eschatological future; or (3) as a depiction of the post-Easter messianic woes culminating in the *parousia*.⁴⁴⁵ Warren Carter chooses number 3 and argues that the imagery of the gathering eagles depicts a scene of the Roman army being destroyed in the final eschatological battle as Jesus returns to judge the Roman imperial order and establish the kingdom of heaven (24:28).⁴⁴⁶ This perspective stresses Jesus' kingship and his kingdom that wars against other powers and authorities.⁴⁴⁷

Matthew rewrites the Torah with the prophets by contextualizing and discussing the *Last Days* with its warnings and judgment scenes in the form of signs⁴⁴⁸ and parables (Matt 24–25). Jesus answers the disciples' questions of when and what signs will accompany the end with a number of quotations from the Hebrew Prophets: Isa 19:2 (cf. 24:7); Dan 9:27, 11:31, 12:11 (cf. 24:15); Dan 12:1, Joel 2:2 (cf. 24:21); Isa 13:10, Ezek 32:7, Joel 2:10 (cf. 24:29); Dan 7:13 (24:30); and Isa 27:13, Zech 9:14 (cf. 24:30). In addition, Jesus gives some signs that accompany the *Last Days*: many false prophets and false messiahs; persecution; the desolating sacrilege in the temple; and the coming of the Son of Man.⁴⁴⁹

In addition, the *Last Days* has an element of surprise and the necessity for watchfulness.⁴⁵⁰ Jesus frequently warns his disciples to be prepared, because of the unrevealed aspect of its occurrence (24:36–37). Therefore, five parables arise from this unknown time and conclude Jesus' Prophetic Eschatological Discourse:⁴⁵¹ (1) the householder and the thief (24:42–44); (2) the faithful and unfaithful slave (24:45–51);⁴⁵² (3) the ten virgins (25:1–13); (4) the talents (25:14–30); and (5) the sheep and the goats (25:31–46). All of these parables have the common themes of faithfulness and recognition, which then become the qualifications for entering into the kingdom of heaven or being rejected: with the faithful and unfaithful slave, “on a day when he does not expect him and

⁴⁴⁵ Warren Carter, “Are There Imperial Texts in the Class? Intertextual Eagles and Matthean Eschatology as “Lights Out” Time for Imperial Rome (Matthew 24:27–31),” *JBL* 122 (2003): 467–87.

⁴⁴⁶ Carter, “Imperial Texts,” 468 n. 9. Carter finds imperial symbolism in Matt 24:27–31.

⁴⁴⁷ See discussion in Chapter 5 about Matt 10 and Jesus' Mission Discourse.

⁴⁴⁸ See Karl H. Rengstorf, “σημείον,” in *TDNT* 7.223–25.

⁴⁴⁹ Matthew 24:30 has a reference to the Son of Man (cf. Zech 12:12, 14; Dan 7:13–14; Rev 1:7).

⁴⁵⁰ Except for the sign of Jonah (cf. Matt 12:39–40; 16:4; cf. Luke 11:29–30)

⁴⁵¹ It can be argued that all five are parables, but they seem to be a general type of *meshalim*.

⁴⁵² This is reminiscent of the wise and foolish builder (7:24–27).

at an hour that he does not know” (24:50); the ten virgins, “I do not know you” (25:11; cf. 7:23); and the talents, “thrown out into the outer darkness where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth (25:14, 28–30).” The last parable is a scene of judgment for all the nations with Jesus sitting as a royal judge on his throne and dividing people by their faithfulness, indicated by their actions to the “least of these” (25:31–46). Again, this parable, as well as the others, is about faithfulness and Jesus’ recognition and acceptance as people are separated with some getting eternal punishment and others receiving eternal life (25:46).

VI. MATTHEW’S PURPOSE: AUTHORIZING THE WORDS OF THE KING

1. The Torah of the King

Using George Brooke’s critique of Najman’s Mosaic Discourse under the categories of authority, authenticity, immediacy and continuity gives insight to Matthew’s purpose in rewriting Torah in the *Last Days*.⁴⁵³

1. Authority is conferred from the older tradition and it can also be given to what is being rewritten. Rewriting is a bestowal of authority on both what is old and new with rewritten compositions not designed to replace what is being rewritten.
2. Authenticity seems concerned with integrity and truth-claims for each successive generation to be learnt. An authentic voice in the Mosaic discourse is contextual or limited to a particular setting in which it is produced and to which it speaks.
3. Immediacy is even shorter as it functions to make Sinai present in the here and now. It quickly outdates rewritten texts.
4. Continuity recognizes its opened-ended role with the Mosaic Torah as the rewriting process goes on from generation to generation in a variety of forms.

First, authority is mutually conferred from both older and newer traditions. Matthew’s rewriting of Torah that includes both Jesus’ and Moses’ words gives authority to this entire process. Second, Matthew’s rewriting Torah gives authenticity to Jesus’ claims for another generation by contextualizing Torah. Third, rewriting Torah gives immediacy in that the giving of the Torah and the making of God’s people are again paralleled in Matthew with Jesus’ giving of the Torah and forming a people. Fourth, rewriting Torah produces a continuity that recognizes the open-ended role of the Mosaic Torah as interpreted by Jesus, as well as the disciples and now the ἐκκλησία; in other words, it is not closed but can be bound and loosed in every generation.

⁴⁵³ Brooke, “Hypertextuality,” 50–53.

Concerning Jesus and the Mosaic Law, it is generally said that Jesus opposed either some of its aspects or ways of observing it.⁴⁵⁴ However, it must be emphasized that in Matthew, the Torah is to be perfectly performed even as new demands are rewritten into it (5:17–22). E. P. Sanders argues that Jesus did not reject Jewish legalism that emphasized external conformity to the Torah in favour of piety concerned with the fulfilling of the Torah through obedience.⁴⁵⁵ The Mosaic Torah is not to be set aside, but needs to be radically rewritten as it continues to be a standard for right motivation and behaviour. Matthew affirms both the validity of the Torah and righteousness.⁴⁵⁶ Therefore, Matthew reframes Jesus and Mosaic Torah: (1) Jesus is pro-Torah as it is perfect, wise and eschatological; (2) anti-Torah statements refer to Jewish legalism of the scribes and Pharisees, which is often only an external shell for public recognition; and (3) Jesus did not reduce Torah but emphasized its complete obedience as a demand from God.⁴⁵⁷

Therefore, the Torah should be rewritten and embodied in particular cultures and new circumstances with new approaches and applications. Philo identified particular laws to more general principles (*Abr.* 3), the Ten Commandments became headings for special laws (*Dec.* 19, 154; *Spec.* 1.1; 3.7), and the Torah was intended to foster the virtues of courage and humanity (*Virt.* 22, 51; *Spec.* 2:104, 107). Neither Philo nor Josephus distinguished between more and less important commandments that should and should not be observed. They all contributed to a way of life. However, in certain times, specific commandments became more important than others. Similarly, Matthew rewrote Torah for his audience and their present situation. He, as well as Philo and Josephus, was open to rewriting the Torah, but not to any abrogation of existing laws (*Mos.* 2:15–16).⁴⁵⁸

⁴⁵⁴ See E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 1–29; idem, *Jesus and Judaism* (London: SCM Press, 1985), 1–58.

⁴⁵⁵ E.P. Sanders. “When Is a Law a Law? The Case of Jesus and Paul,” in *Religion and Law: Biblical-Judaic and Islamic Perspectives* (eds. E.B. Firmage, B.G. Weiss, and J.W. Welch; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 142, 139–58.

⁴⁵⁶ Sanders. “When Is a Law a Law?” 147. See also Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 256–60. Jesus enters into debate concerning divorce (19:3–12; 5:32; cf. CD 4:19–5:1; 13:17). Jesus prohibits what Moses permits, but does not permit what Moses prohibits. The Mosaic Torah regulates what must and must not be done if there is a divorce, but there is no law prohibiting divorce. However, Jesus demands perfection and goes beyond the Torah for his followers to be more righteous than the Pharisees to inherit the kingdom (5:17–20, 48). Their righteousness (obedience to the Torah) is like, and more than, that of the Pharisees (6:16–18).

⁴⁵⁷ Sanders, “When Is a Law a Law?” 141.

⁴⁵⁸ For Philo, the glory of the Mosaic Torah is that it has remained unchanged (*Mos.* 2.14).

In the *Last Days*, Jesus warns and judges the nations based on his Torah discourse.⁴⁵⁹ Jesus' Torah Discourse does not undermine the Mosaic Torah but accentuates its weightier matters of justice and mercy and faith (23:23; cf. 5:17–19; Luke 16:17; Rom 3:31; 7:12).⁴⁶⁰ Shaping the Torah for the *Last Days* means going beyond the letter of the Torah.⁴⁶¹ It was not enough to refrain from murder or adultery, but the attitudes behind them must be considered as well (5:21–6, 27–30).

2. The Coming of the Kingdom of Heaven

Although Jesus is not explicitly described as a prophet, this designation appears three times by some people who view his ministry as prophetic (16:14; 21:11; 21:46).⁴⁶² This identification of prophetic activity is significant in that although it is not emphasized it is recognized; i.e. Jesus' Prophetic Eschatological Discourse. In addition, Matthew draws from both prophetic and apocalyptic traditions with the language of coming (*parousia*) and the end of the age (10:23; 16:27–28; 26:64; 13:39, 40, 49; 24:3; 28:20).⁴⁶³ Matthew seems to use the apocalyptic scheme of dividing time into parts with a decisive act of God (Jesus' crucifixion, death and resurrection) separating history into two ages (12:32; cf. 13:39, 40, 49; 28:20).⁴⁶⁴ The apocalyptic symbols of the earth splitting, the tombs opening and the saints resurrecting appear at Jesus' death (27:51–53). Jesus' climatic appearance at the close of the age is often referred to as *that Day*, which refers to the *Day of the LORD*, with the precise time of the arrival of the *parousia* unknown (24:19–50; 25:13). On *that Day* future judgment is accentuated with two events: the devastation of Jerusalem and the

⁴⁵⁹ Eschatological expectations do not necessarily prevent people from drafting concrete legislation. See *Jub.* 23 and 50 as it contains eschatological hope.

⁴⁶⁰ The foundational and perpetual nature of the Torah is evident in Philo and Josephus: (1) Philo identifies Moses as the quintessential prophet and interpreter (*Dec.* 175; *Spec.* 2.189); (2) Josephus accentuates the significance of the Torah (*Ant.* 3:89–92, 101; 13:94, 222–23);⁴⁶⁰ and (3) Josephus identifies Deuteronomy, as mediated by Moses, as a written constitution indicating how one should act in all circumstances (*Ant.* 4:196–301).

⁴⁶¹ Josephus decided to fight on the Sabbath if attacked in the Maccabean period (*Ant.* 12:277).

⁴⁶² Ben Witherington III (*Jesus the Seer* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2000]) does not view Jesus as a prophet.

⁴⁶³ *Parousia* and the end of the age are closely linked with a single definite article (cf. 24:3, 27, 37, 39). See J. Plevnik. *Paul and the Parousia: An Exegetical and Theological Investigation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997).

⁴⁶⁴ Five *meshalim* are placed together to reinforce one another concerning Jesus' return: (1) householder and the thief (24:42–44); (2) faithful and unfaithful servant (24:45–51); (3) ten virgins (25:1–13); (4) talents (25:14–30); and (5) the sheep and the goats (25:31–46).

temple, and Jesus' own return in glory and judgment: the coming of the kingdom of heaven with Jesus as king and judge.

For Israel, with God as the ultimate King, the Torah was revealed and established through Moses, the quintessential Lawgiver and interpreter. Similarly, in Matthew, Jesus is identified with Moses as the lawgiver and the true interpreter of Torah in opposition to the scribes and the Pharisees who sit on the seat of Moses (23:2). Not only does Matthew rewrite the Mosaic Torah in Jesus' Torah Discourse and Prophetic Eschatological Discourses, but as a scribe he blends it with wisdom and the prophets to establish a constitution for the kingdom of heaven with legal, ethical and cultic precepts as qualifications to enter into the kingdom of heaven so that, in the *Last Days*, Jesus as royal judge will justly judge all the nations.

VII. CONCLUSION

Matthew, as Jesus' scribe, rewrites the Torah in the *Last Days*, blending it with the prophets and wisdom traditions. Matthew rewrites the Mosaic Torah in Jesus' Torah Discourse, thereby providing legal, ethical and cultic qualifications for entering the kingdom of heaven (Matt 5–7). Matthew depicts Jesus within a Mosaic framework and rewrites Torah with principles (i.e. beatitudes), key authoritative texts (i.e. the Decalogue), and ethical practices or regulations (i.e. Holiness Code and righteousness). This is used as the basis for Jesus' Prophetic Eschatological Discourse as Jesus, the royal judge, adjudicates the fate of Israel and all the nations in the *Last Days* (Matt 23–25). With Jesus' denouncement of the scribes and Pharisees, Matthew identifies him as an eschatological and royal judge arbitrating on behalf of the citizens of his kingdom. Jesus' signs and parables concerning the *Last Days* function as a warning and encouragement to be faithful and watchful.

In sum, Matthew's portrayal of Jesus as the *Royal Messiah* includes the duties of a Torah teacher and judge. This is disclosed in Jesus' Torah and Prophetic Eschatological Discourses as Matthew, his scribe, rewrites Torah by explicitly and implicitly using the Jewish scriptures to present royal laws, decrees, regulations and penalties concerning the kingdom of heaven.

CHAPTER FIVE

MATTHEW APPLIES TORAH

I. INTRODUCTION

In Chapter 4, I argued that Matthew rewrites the Torah by using the Jewish scriptures to establish Jesus' Torah Discourse. In this chapter, I take the step from rewriting Torah to applying Torah as Jesus formulates rules for mission and community: Jesus' Mission Discourse (Matt 10) and Jesus' Covenant Community Discourse (Matt 18). Matthew, acting as Jesus' advisor and legal arbitrator, formulates *rules* for God's people to establish community life (i.e. living as the ἐκκλησία under Jesus' reign) and expand the kingdom of heaven (i.e. engaging in mission activity). Like the *Rule Texts* (1QS, 1QSa, 1QM), Jesus' *rules* become normative for the twelve disciples and ἐκκλησία to provide mission strategy, community boundaries and ritual practices. In this chapter, the aspect of Matthew's scribal activity that I will concentrate on is his application of Torah in Jesus' Mission Discourse and Jesus' Covenant Community Discourse.

Jesus' Mission Discourse is Jesus' strategy for expanding the kingdom of heaven. Jesus reconstitutes Israel by emphasizing the twelve disciples and their mission to "the lost sheep of Israel." Matthew 10, in conjunction with 28:16–20, systematically sets in motion a mission strategy (i.e. *rule of war*) to infiltrate all the nations (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη). It applies Jesus' Torah Discourse to expand Jesus' rule as peacemakers through words (teaching and proclamation) and actions (suffering, persecution and possibly death). Jesus' Covenant Community Discourse emphasizes the rule of the covenant community (ἐκκλησία). Matthew 18:1–14 articulates the hierarchy of the covenant community, cataloguing its penalties and values. Matthew 18:15–35 sets the rule of discipline for members and the importance of forgiveness. It also applies Jesus' Torah Discourse with the Jewish scriptures in parabolic form to exhort covenant faithfulness and forgiveness as the basis of the covenant community.

In Jesus' Mission Discourse, Matthew, as a scribe, is concerned with Jesus' mission strategy to expand his reign peacefully. In Jesus' Covenant Community Discourse,

Matthew puts forward the community's hierarchy, self-discipline, and central aspect of forgiveness to establish peace within Jesus' covenant people. Together these two discourses illustrate Matthew's method of applying Jesus' Torah Discourse by first concentrating on the growth of the covenant community and, second, by focusing on its stabilization. Matthew uses paraenesis (παραίνεσις) with the image of the *sword-in-the-mouth* to reconstitute the lost sheep of Israel and expand to all the nations.⁴⁶⁵ Matthew uses community rules to establish a peaceful kingdom by emphasizing forgiveness as the heart and absolute necessity of the covenant community.

In this chapter, I will attempt to delineate the performative function of these two discourses, and outline the method of applying Torah by examining the War Scroll, the Rule of the Community and the Rule of the Congregation. In light of this, I will examine Matt 10 and 18 to ascertain Matthew's purposes (i.e. Jesus' mission and Jesus' rules for the community).

II. MATTHEW'S COVENANT COMMUNITY

1. Twelve Disciples and Ἐκκλησία

First, I will try to establish that the Gospel of Matthew seems to be addressed to a community of Jewish Christians that are in conflict with other Jewish groups.⁴⁶⁶ Matthew's polemic is primarily directed to the leaders of a dominant group—i.e. the scribes and the Pharisees—as a way of distinguishing his community from its Jewish parent (cf. Matt 23).⁴⁶⁷ He views his audience as a covenant community by implicitly and explicitly identifying them as a newly constituted Israel: (1) numerous references to ἀδελφός with an emphasis on covenant, forgiveness and familial bonds; (2) Jesus' genealogy and its reference to Abraham and Israel; and (3) the twelve disciples in beginning the formation of the ἐκκλησία.

One, Matthew frequently refers to ἀδελφός as the covenant community in reproving and forgiving one another (18:15, 21, 35), as Jesus' family in doing the will of God (12:46–

⁴⁶⁵ The *sword-in-the-mouth* is a term which I have created to incorporate Matthew's use of sword in Matt 10:34, which is contrary to his use in Matt 26:51–54 and unique to Matthew (cf. Luke 12:51). See section IV.2 in this chapter.

⁴⁶⁶ Stanton (*Gospel for a New People*, 146–68) presents the Matthean community as a minority group in sharp disagreement with its parent group (i.e. scribes and Pharisees; cf. Matt 23). See J. Andrew Overman, *Matthew's Gospel*, 101; Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian Jewish Community*, 54.

⁴⁶⁷ This could account for the intolerance of internal dissent (7:13–27; 13:36–43).

50), and as equals in serving Jesus (23:8; 25:40).⁴⁶⁸ Two, Jesus is identified as the son of Abraham and his genealogy begins with Abraham, the forefather of the nation of Israel (1:1–2). In addition, there seems to be an emphasis on Israel as a nation with “Judah and *his brothers*” at its beginning, and “Jechoniah and *his brothers*” at its exile (1:2, 11). Three, Matthew emphasizes the twelve disciples (δώδεκα μαθητής). Not only do they continue Jesus’ purposes in establishing the kingdom of heaven (10:1; 11:1; cf. 10:5; 20:17), but they also will rule with him to judge Israel (19:28). Moreover, Matthew is the only Gospel that mentions ἐκκλησία (16:18; 18:17[2x]). Jesus tells Peter, “on this rock I will build my church (ἐκκλησία), and the gates of Hades will not prevail against it” (16:18). Matthew also gives instructions to the ἐκκλησία regarding the process of reproofing a member (18:15–20).

2. Torah and Righteousness

Second, this covenant community is to be righteous by obeying Jesus’ Torah Discourse, which is full of ethical exhortations. Matthew, as Jesus’ scribe, discloses Jesus’ true interpretation of Torah, which is to be applied as ethical injunctions for a “greater righteousness” to be performed by the Matthean community. This application of Torah urges Jesus’ disciples and followers to be obedient and loyal to their king’s legislation by being upright and performing the whole Torah.

Righteousness (ῥῆς or δικαιοσύνη), proper behaviour, is essential for the Matthean community as well as other Second Temple Jewish groups such as the sectarian movement reflected in the rule texts. The word group ῥῆς was frequently related to legal edicts originating in the royal and judicial courts that defined Jewish life during the Graeco-Roman period with Torah.⁴⁶⁹ CD 1:1 addresses all who recognize righteousness and consider the works of God.⁴⁷⁰ The Teacher of Righteousness, a lawgiver, is responsible for

⁴⁶⁸ See Matt 5:22–24, 47; 12:46–50; 18:15, 21, 35; 23:8; cf. 1:2, 11.

⁴⁶⁹ CD 4:17–18 lists three nets of Belial to ensnare Israel: fornication, wealth and defilement of the temple. The discussion on fornication is followed by polygamy or divorce, which is then followed by a citation from Lev 18:18 and Gen 1:27 (CD 4:20–21; cf. 5:2). The author seems to have reinterpreted Deuteronomy to include the prohibition of polygamy and divorce (cf. 11QT 56:18 and 57:17–18). See John Kampen, “‘Righteousness’ in Matthew and the Legal Texts from Qumran,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995; Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten* (ed. M.J. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 461–87, esp. 461.

⁴⁷⁰ They are the adherents to the new covenant in the land of Damascus (CD 6:19; 8:21; 19:34; 20:12).

the articulation, instruction and development of the sectarian way of life: i.e. righteousness (1QS 5:2, 9; CD 3:21–4:4). Therefore, righteousness describes a sectarian identity and way of life (i.e. their behaviour).⁴⁷¹ This is significant for Matthew in belonging to a particular *chosen* group or movement that claims the *way of righteousness*.⁴⁷²

Benno Przybylski identifies δικαιοσύνη as being used in a polemical role appearing in contexts where Jesus is in debate with other Jewish groups.⁴⁷³ Matthew 5:10–11 advocates a particular way of life within the Jewish community (*true righteousness*), which is not accepted by the majority (i.e. scribes and Pharisees).

The righteousness of the followers of Jesus cannot exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees unless they understand it in the particular manner developed by the author of this Gospel and attributed to Jesus, the founder of the movement. Just as the authors of some of the Qumran documents employed the term קָדָשׁ to designate a sectarian way of life developed for the adherents of that group, so the Gospel writer used δικαιοσύνη to denote the particular understanding of the Jewish way of life advocated for the followers of Jesus. For this writer “your righteousness” could only exceed “that of the scribes and Pharisees” if you followed this particular interpretation of how to live the Jewish life.⁴⁷⁴

In the beatitudes, this righteousness is qualitative in regards to the Torah (5:6, 10, 20; cf. 6:33; Sir 24:19–21).⁴⁷⁵ Furthermore, Jesus’ followers are persecuted for the sake of righteousness. Matthew 7 calls for solidarity and loyalty to this righteous way of life, which is summarized by Jesus’ exhortation in 6:33: “But strive first for the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things will be given to you as well.” Matthew’s way of a righteous life is articulated, developed and defended in Jesus’ Torah Discourse, especially with its radicalizing of the Decalogue, which is framed by statements concerning righteousness and the kingdom of heaven (5:20, 45; cf. 6:1, 33).

The term δίκαιος designates the followers of Jesus within the Jewish community and δικαιοσύνη describes their way of life. God sends rain on the righteous (δίκαιος) and the unrighteous (5:45). The scribes and Pharisees are accused of appearing outwardly to be δίκαιος, but are full of hypocrisy and lawlessness inside (23:28; cf. 5:20; 23:9). Almsgiving, prayer and fasting are all acts of righteousness and Matthew’s life of

⁴⁷¹ Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 312.

⁴⁷² Similarly, in *1 Enoch*, the righteous are constituted as the eschatological remnant (6–11).

⁴⁷³ See Benno Przybylski, *Righteousness in Matthew and His World of Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 77–115.

⁴⁷⁴ Kampen, “‘Righteousness’ in Matthew,” 484.

⁴⁷⁵ See George J. Brooke, “The Wisdom of Matthew’s Beatitudes (4QBeat and Mt. 5:3–12),” *Scripture Bulletin* 19.2 (1989): 35–41.

righteousness includes these practices (6:1, 33).⁴⁷⁶ These examples seem to indicate the identity of the Matthean community as a righteous community. Therefore, they were to be righteous Jews who practiced a righteous way of life based on their understanding and application of the Torah (i.e. Jesus' Torah Discourse).

III. MATTHEW'S USE OF SCRIPTURE: APPLYING THE TORAH

1. Introduction

Writing exhortations for the purpose of applying and performing the Torah is a Second Temple scribal activity.⁴⁷⁷ Therefore, Jesus' Torah Discourse has force with its ethical instructions and admonitions. As Torah, it is a constitution, which sets the basic moral and ethical principles or ground rules for God's people to deal with issues that are central to its identity and history. The Mosaic Torah is an executive summary of points in maintaining Israel's covenant relationship with God. Jesus' Torah Discourse is now applied as ethical policies and practices to be performed in maintaining a covenantal relationship with God. Matthew applies Jesus' Torah Discourse to Jesus' Mission Discourse as a *rule of war*⁴⁷⁸ and Jesus' Covenant Community Discourse as *rules of the covenant community*.

2. Covenant Community and the Rule Texts

סדר typically means rule or order or a set of rules (cf. 1QS 5:1; 6:8; 1QSa 1:1; 1QM 9:10).⁴⁷⁹ Its main purpose is to supply the members of the sectarian movement with a detailed set of regulations.⁴⁸⁰ 1QS and CD portray the actual life and organization of their

⁴⁷⁶ "Beware of practicing your righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) before others in order to be seen by them; for then you have no reward from your Father in heaven."

⁴⁷⁷ Stuart Hall, "Introduction: Who Needs 'Identity'?" in *Questions of Cultural Identity* (ed. S. Hall and P. du Gay; London: Sage, 1996), 4; Stephen Worchel et al., eds., *Social Identity: International Perspectives* (London: Sage, 1998).

⁴⁷⁸ These metaphors help to understand Matt 18 as compared to 1QM.

⁴⁷⁹ It can also connote a military unit (1QM 4:11; 5:4; 6:10, 13; 13:1). See D. Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (ed. M.E. Stone; CRINT 2.2; Assen: Van Gorcum and Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 483–550.

⁴⁸⁰ See Sarianna Metso "Constitutional Rules at Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (eds. P.W. Flint, J.C. VanderKam, and A.E. Alvarez; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999), 1.186–210. She categorizes the Qumran rule texts into two groups: (1) constitutional texts (basic principles of community life); and (2) *halakhic* texts (various aspects of religious life).

communities (1QS 8:1–16; 9:3–10:8; CD 1–8, 19–20).⁴⁸¹ 1QSa describes a future eschatological banquet.⁴⁸² 1QM, also a rule text, describes the final eschatological war between the forces of light and the forces of darkness.

The Serekh texts are a mixed composition containing rules, theological expositions, and liturgical, hymnal and calendrical material.⁴⁸³ At the core of the Rule Texts are regulations: the process of generating legal traditions by communal study of the Torah; the community's sessions for decision making; and the authority of legal traditions.⁴⁸⁴ 1QS, an authoritative and composite collection, contains rules and exhortations with theological exposition, liturgy and psalms. It describes an annual covenant renewal ceremony in which the sectarian community by rank have blessings recited over them and the "lot of Belial" have curses recited over them (1QS 2:2–18; cf. 1:16–3:12). Thoroughly saturated with Jewish scriptures, it describes the religious beliefs, organizational and general rules, principles, and practices of community life: e.g. study of Torah, ethical obligations, separation from outsiders, penalties, calendars, and common property.⁴⁸⁵ The authority of the community was linked with the issue of the covenant as it believed itself to be the keeper of the covenant, existing to "establish the covenant according to the eternal statutes" and to bring new members "into the covenant of love those who willingly offer themselves to observe the statutes of God" (cf. 1QS 8:10; 1:7). Joining the community was identified with entering covenant with a covenant ceremony (1QS 1:16–2:18).⁴⁸⁶ Those outside the

⁴⁸¹ CD has admonitions (1–8 and 19–20) and laws (9–16) with the legal sections having laws of conduct (9:1–10:10a), rites to be observed in the community (10:10b–12:18), community organization (12:19–14:19), penal code (14:20–22), and regulations for entry into the covenant (15:1–16:16). See Joseph M. Baumgarten and Daniel Schwartz, "Damascus Document (CD)," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translation, Volume 2, Damascus Document, War Scroll and Related Documents* (eds. J.H. Charlesworth et al.; PTS DSSP 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 2.4–57.

⁴⁸² 1QSa seems to have same theological basis as 1QS. See Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of the Congregation* (SBLMS 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).

⁴⁸³ Sarianna Metso, *The Serekh Texts* (LSTS 62; Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 9; London: T&T Clark, 2007).

⁴⁸⁴ Metso (*Serekh Texts*, 67) analyses other Rule Texts (4Q265, 4Q477, 4Q275, 4Q279) and asserts that the community treated the laws of the Torah and community regulations as equally authoritative.

⁴⁸⁵ Three quotations in 1QS 5:13b–16a; 6:16b–19a; 8:12b–16a. They are like proof texts.

⁴⁸⁶ It consisted of four parts: (1) the priest and Levites bless God; (2) the priest recounts God's righteous acts towards Israel and the Levites recount the sins of the children of Israel; (3) the priest blesses the men of God's lot and the Levites curse the men of Belial's lot; and (4) together the

community were to be considered in the realm of darkness and were strictly separated as “sons of darkness” and “men of injustice” (1QS 1:10; 5:2; 8:13).

1QSa, a rule about the eschatological banquet in the *Last Days*,⁴⁸⁷ depicts the assembly seated in hierarchical order before the high priest and the royal messiah (1:1).⁴⁸⁸ It pledges to observe the laws of the priests, the sons of Zadok.⁴⁸⁹ Lawrence Schiffman considers 1QSa to be a messianic mirror of the community as it attempts to create and actualize messianic conditions and regulations for its life before the beginning of the eschatological era.⁴⁹⁰

1QM, a rule describing the final eschatological war, depicts the preparation and various phases of the battle between the sons of light and the sons of darkness (remnant of Israel and their enemies), which brings about the end to wickedness. It includes instructions to prepare for war and to direct troops, as well as a collection of prayers and hymns, and a description of military engagements after some encouraging speeches to establish the kingship of God and Israel forever.⁴⁹¹ In using various texts from the Jewish scriptures, 1QM describes and applies the proper procedures in this decisive event.⁴⁹²

priest and Levites curse those who might have entered into the covenant insincerely. See Metzko, *Serekh Texts*, 24–25.

⁴⁸⁷ A. Steudel, “אחרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran,” *RevQ* 16 (1993–94): 225–46. Steudel discussed the term אחרית הימים and argued that at Qumran the term, while having an eschatological aspect, signified the era in which the community was presently living. 1QS is not about a future but refers to the period of the time that had already begun.

⁴⁸⁸ 1QSa and 1QSB are both appendixes to 1QS and about life in the messianic age following eschatological restoration. 1QSB is a series of blessings on different groups and individuals in ascending hierarchical status, each introduced with the formula: “Words of blessing for the Maskil, to bless.” The perspective of 1QSB is eschatological as is 1QSa, and it focuses on the tasks of the *maskil* connecting the work with the final column of 1QS. Philip S. Alexander (“The Redaction History of Serekh Ha-Yahad: A Proposal,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 437–56, esp. 441–42) links 1QS 10–11 hymns with the *maskil*.

⁴⁸⁹ The structure is as follows: (1) outlining the stages of life of the members of the community (1:6–19); (2) listing those who are disqualified from service in the community (1:19–22); (3) indicating Sons of Levi as the leaders of the community (1:22–25a); (4) inviting the congregation of the entire assembly in the presence of the priestly and royal messiahs (1:25–2:10), and (5) providing a description of the eschatological banquet (2:11–22).

⁴⁹⁰ See Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 68–71.

⁴⁹¹ 4Q285 and 11Q14 describe the final victory over the *Kittim*. 1Q491c M^{a/c} (frag 11 col 1 and frag 12) reports the speaker exalted among divine beings and eventually sitting on a throne for the judgment (cf. 1QH^a 26:6–17; 4Q427 H^a frag 7; 4Q431 H^e frag 1 = 4Q471b).

⁴⁹² Explicit quotations: (1) 10:1–2 from Deut 7:21–22; (2) 10:6–8 from Num 10:9; (3) 11:6–7, 11–12 from Num 24:17–19 and Isa 31:8. Similarly, 1–2 Maccabees have military organization and practices with the use of trumpets, banners and slogans.

3. Covenant Renewal

The sectarian movement reflected in the Rule Texts identified themselves as the community of the renewed covenant.⁴⁹³ This renewed community followed the original stipulations by Israel in Exod 19:8–24:7 (cf. Exod 34:1–35:3).

The covenant between God and Israel became a mutual one of the suzerain vassal type no earlier than the Sinai covenant. While preserving the element of choice, the Sinai covenant stipulated its continuity by a pledge exacted of the chosen one, Israel, to observe a code of laws (Exod 19:8; 24:7). The Sinai covenant even included sanctions, based on the principle of retribution, contingent upon the observance of the laws (Exod 20:5).⁴⁹⁴

Deuteronomy as whole symbolized the renewal of the covenant with a new generation after the Exodus.

Covenant renewal, in continuity with the first covenant made by God and earlier generations, stressed new stipulations that were adapted to new situations.⁴⁹⁵ God restored the broken covenant through reiterating and strengthening the stipulations of the previous covenant (Exod 34). Deuteronomy and *Jubilees* presented new formulations of the Sinai covenant as though they were the original revelation of Moses at Sinai, as they both seek to harmonize the scriptures and to actualize the covenant in its new historical situations. The concept of covenant renewal, based on revealed interpretations of the Mosaic Torah, was applied to the new eschatological covenant, readdressing its violations (*Jub.* 1:10, 15–29).⁴⁹⁶ The prophetic traditions have similar concepts of a renewed covenant in the aftermath of national apostasy. Not only did they reinforce the previous covenant, but they also stressed divine intervention that enabled God's people to be obedient (Jer 31:31–34; Ezek 11:19–20 and 36:26–27). This gave hope for an eternal covenant, which emphasized its perpetuity, and gave an eternal existence for Israel as God's holy people (Dan 7:27; cf. *Jub.* 1:21–24).⁴⁹⁷

In addition, covenant renewal was re-enacted with a ceremony—the solemn agreement between two or more parties.⁴⁹⁸ As a public ceremony for all generations, it

⁴⁹³ For example, the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* redefines the terms of membership in the covenant people with the spirit of truth appointed by God only for the predestined sons of light (1QS 3–4).

⁴⁹⁴ Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 87.

⁴⁹⁵ Religious and social reforms are presented as covenant renewal (e.g. 2 Chr 5:14–15; Neh 9–10; cf. CD 20:12).

⁴⁹⁶ Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 89.

⁴⁹⁷ See also Jer 31:32; Ezek 36:26; cf. Deut 4:29; 30:2, 6.

⁴⁹⁸ Covenant renewal began with the renewal of the Sinai covenant with the Deuteronomic covenant and Moses in the wilderness of Moab (Deut 27). It was later renewed by Joshua at Shechem (Josh

became a fixed ritual in Deuteronomy to be executed during the festival of Tabernacles, which renewed the covenant between God and Israel (cf. Deut 31:10–13).⁴⁹⁹ This eschatological renewed covenant became the basis for the sectarian movement’s identity, legal code and practices as it defined their relationship with God (CD 2:14–4:12; 6:19; 20:11–12).⁵⁰⁰ The sectarian movement reflected in the Rule Texts was steadfast to God’s covenant and Torah (CD 3:12–16; cf. Lev 18:5) with its instruction and hidden interpretation revealed to them (CD 6:17b–19; 1QS 5:8–12; cf. CD 15:5–10; 1QHa 14:17). They, just like Israel as God’s chosen people, depended on the correct interpretation of Mosaic Torah. As the renewed covenant, the Torah was applied and performed to observe these laws according to their correct interpretation.⁵⁰¹ This is based on a continuous relationship between God and Israel, and outlines the socio-religious life of the movement (CD 6:19; 8:21; 19:34; 1QpHab 2:3–4).⁵⁰²

IV. JESUS’ MISSION DISCOURSE (10:1–11:1)

1. Mission and the Rule of War

Jesus’ Mission Discourse (10:1–11:1) for his twelve disciples and Jesus’ Covenant Community Discourse (18:1–19:2) stipulating rules and regulating life in the ἐκκλησία are related, as they focus on the aspects of expansion and organization in the covenant community. Jesus’ Mission Discourse is similar to 1QM and can be seen as a *rule of war* for his twelve disciples. Matthew, as Jesus’ scribe, uses Jesus’ Torah Discourse and applies it to formulate his rules for expansion: (1) to teach and proclaim the good news (10:7); (2) to perform miracles relying on Jesus’ authority (10:1, 8); (3) to trust God by taking no supplies (10:9–10); (4) to spread peace from town to town (10:11–15); (5) to endure persecution (10:16–24); (6) to take up the sword (cf. 10:34–37);⁵⁰³ and (7) to acknowledge and welcome Jesus (10:32–33, 40–42). In addition, Matt 10, along with 28:18–20, seems

8:30–35; 24:14–40), then Samuel (1 Sam 12), and then Josiah (2 Kgs 23:1–3; cf. 2 Chr 34:30–33). These were necessary after the breaking of a covenant to motivate hope for eschatological renewal of the covenant.

⁴⁹⁹ See Deut 4:29–31; 30:1–10; cf. Lev 26:39–460; Jer 31:30–36; 32:36–41; Ezek 36:24–28; 37:21–28).

⁵⁰⁰ The sectarian movement reflected in the Rule Texts were heirs of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who kept the covenant throughout all the generations of Israel, and were members of the eternal covenant (CD 3:2–4).

⁵⁰¹ During the days of Nehemiah this activity was considered covenant renewal (Neh 8–10).

⁵⁰² Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 86.

⁵⁰³ See the next section (2. Jesus’ Rule of War).

to reveal Jesus' two-stage mission strategy: first, to the lost sheep of Israel, and second, to all the nations. From Jesus' compassion on the crowds who are like sheep without a shepherd, Jesus sees the harvest of people that would benefit from his reign, and sends out his twelve disciples with his message, his authority, his instructions, and his warnings of persecution (9:35–38; 10:1–42).

Figure 4: Literary Structure of Jesus' Mission Discourse (10:1–11:1)

- I. Jesus Summons and Gives Authority to his Twelve Disciples (10:1–4)
- II. Jesus Applies his Torah Discourse: Rules of Engagement (10:5–42)
 - 1. Who to Engage? Only to the Lost Sheep of the House of Israel (10:5–6)
 - 2. How to Engage? What to Do? (10:7–15)
 - a. Proclaim the Good News (10:7)
 - b. Perform Miracles (10:8)
 - c. Take no Supplies (10:9–10)
 - d. Follow Procedures: Spread Peace or Leave Abandoned (10:11–15)
 - 3. How to Engage? What will Happen? (10:16–42)⁵⁰⁴
 - a. Persecutions and Interrogation (10:16–25)
 - b. Allegiance: Fear God (10:26–31)
 - c. Being Acknowledged (10:32–33)
 - a¹. Not Peace but a Sword (10:34–36)
 - b¹. Allegiance: Follow Jesus (10:37–39)
 - c¹. Being Rewarded (10:40–42)
- III. Conclusion (11:1)

2. Jesus' Rule of War

Matthew identifies Jesus' royalty and his message about the kingdom of heaven—God's sovereignty over every empire and authority. This identification of Jesus as the *Royal Messiah* and the *King of the Jews* within the social matrix of the Graeco-Roman world and Second Temple Judaism and under the subjugation of the Roman Empire would have incited thoughts of sedition.⁵⁰⁵ From this perspective, Jesus' Mission Discourse can be viewed as a *a rule of war* (10:34).

Threats of violence were simply a part of Mediterranean life in antiquity; therefore, it is not surprising that the Gospel of Matthew contains stories, language and images of violence.

⁵⁰⁴ There seems to be parallel construction in this section, which I have indicated with a and a¹, and indentations.

⁵⁰⁵ See Chapter 2.

- Stories of violence include King Herod's order and implementation of infanticide (2:16–18), John the Baptist's execution (14:1–12), Judas' suicide (27:3–10), and Jesus' crucifixion and death (27:32–50).
- Violence language includes sword (μάχαιρα),⁵⁰⁶ violence (βιάζεται) and killing (ἀποκτείνω),⁵⁰⁷ and tribulation (θλίψις).⁵⁰⁸
- Violent images are found in the parables of the wheat and weeds (13:46–43), unmerciful servant (18:23–35), tenants (21:33–46), and banquet (22:1–14).⁵⁰⁹

Specifically in Jesus' parables of the two sons and the tenants and the banquet (21:33–22:10), John Kloppenborg observes that God is portrayed as the agent of astonishing cruelty with excessive images of violence; e.g. torture and burning.⁵¹⁰ Matthew's parables, compared to Mark and Q, are less realistic as they intensify the level of divine violence towards Jesus' opponents and unrighteous insiders.⁵¹¹ Applied to hostile outsiders, God acts in vengeful violence, putting them to a *miserable death* (κακῶς ἀπολέσει) as they repeatedly reject and kill God's prophets and ultimately his son (21:33–46; cf. Mark 12:9). Similarly, unrestrained divine violence is set loose to destroy and burn troops in the parable of the banquet.⁵¹² Furthermore, judgment and violence, including pain and humiliation, are directed at insiders who do not meet Jesus' ethical standards. For example, they are bound hand and foot and “thrown out into outer darkness where there will be the weeping and gnashing of teeth,” or “cut into pieces” (22:13; 24:41).⁵¹³

⁵⁰⁶ See Matt 10:34; 26:49, 51, 52(3x).

⁵⁰⁷ See Matt 11:12; cf. 21:38; 23:34–35.

⁵⁰⁸ θλίψις is found three times in the Olivet Discourse as a sign of the end of the age (24:9, 21, 29).

⁵⁰⁹ Barbara Reid (“Violent Endings in Matthew's Parables and Christian Nonviolence,” *CBQ* 66 [2004]: 237–55) gives three options for the tension between Jesus' discourses and violent parables: (1) they combine strands of conflicting traditions; (2) parables of violence are meant to illustrate lower and higher forms of morality; and (3) these violent images should not be associated with God. Reid's solution to resolve the tension is by distinguishing between Jesus' nonviolent present mandate and God's violent eschatological judgment (243, 250–52).

⁵¹⁰ John Kloppenborg, “The Representation of Violence in Synoptic Parables,” in *Mark and Matthew I*. (ed. E. Becker and A. Runesson; WUNT 271; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 346.

⁵¹¹ For example, see 21:33–46; 22:1–10; cf. Mark 12:9. Furthermore, Kloppenborg (“Representation of Violence,” 330, 343) recognizes Matthew's parables are less about viticulture and more about God's dealings with Israel.

⁵¹² The parables of the tenants and the banquet are concerned with God's demand for righteousness and aimed at the chief priests and elders with an escalating sequence of violence from unbelief (21:32) to the killing of the son (21:39) to the abuse and killing of God's slaves who are presumably the members of the Jesus movement (22:6).

⁵¹³ Cf. Matt 8:12; 13:42, 50; 24:51; 25:30.

These images of violence in Jesus' parables seem incongruous with Jesus' Torah Discourse: teaching peace, forgiveness and reconciliation, and his prohibition against anger and vengeance (Matt 5). However, Warren Carter helps contextualize Matthew's mixture of violence and peace within the context of religious conflict, Roman power and Greek culture.⁵¹⁴ Matthew was competing against the synagogue for the authoritative interpretation of religious traditions and the formation of community practices, so he attempted to guide Jesus' followers to live in the midst of religious conflict, imperial pressures and cultural adaptation. In this multi-faceted context, first-century Christianity appears to be negotiating between Jewish traditions and leadership on one hand, and Roman power and Greek culture on the other hand, by prohibiting direct violence while advocating active resistance.⁵¹⁵ From this perspective, horizontal conflict and violence between Jewish groups is evident in Matthew in the example of King Herod and the Jewish leaders, who align themselves with Rome and against King Jesus, who advocates for peace and the kingdom of heaven.⁵¹⁶

Therefore, although recognizing violence and conflict as part of its social fabric, Matthew dramatically accentuates righteousness and mercy over injustice, especially in Jesus' Torah Discourse.⁵¹⁷ In Jesus' beatitudes, peacemakers—those who were faithful and non-violent in the face of opposition and persecution—are rewarded and recognized as God's children (5:9–11, 39–42, 48; cf. Ps 34:14).⁵¹⁸ Furthermore, the political sense of peacemakers connects it to the court milieu of Jesus and his proclamation about the kingdom of heaven. As Betz concludes: “To the extent, therefore, that peacemaking is a

⁵¹⁴ Warren Carter, “Matthew: Empire, Synagogues, and Horizontal Violence,” in *Mark and Matthew I* (eds. Becker and Runesson, WUNT 271; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 287.

⁵¹⁵ Carter (“Matthew: Empire, Synagogues,” 306): “At stake in this negotiation is the shaping of appropriate social identity, practices, and societal visions in the midst of Roman power, necessitating degrees of accommodation, mimicry, participation, survival, and protection of distinctive identity and practices.”

⁵¹⁶ See Matt 2:2; 27:11, 29, 37, 42.

⁵¹⁷ Within Matthew's social-historical context, there is a longing for peace and stability. This is also expressed in apocalyptic visions of a future, blissful era of peace and prosperity after God destroys his enemies. Peace is a well-established virtue, and is closely associated with righteousness and justice. See Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 139 n. 369; 140.

⁵¹⁸ Persecution seems to be the by-product of being a peacemaker (5:10–11; cf. 10:16–33; 22:6; 23:29–39; 24:9–14; 1QpHab 22:4–8; CD 1:20). Therefore, the peacemaker and the persecution of the righteous seem to be the present reality of being part of God's kingdom on earth.

function of righteousness and the kingdom of God, the work of the disciples as peacemaking agents of God has indeed political implications.”⁵¹⁹

The answer to Matthew’s incongruity between images of violence and torture, and Jesus’ teachings of peace and forgiveness emerges with Jesus’ two usages of the sword.⁵²⁰

Do not think that I have come to bring peace to the earth; I have not come to bring peace, but a sword. For I have come to set a man against his father, and a daughter against her mother, and a daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; and one’s foes will be members of one’s own household (10:34–36).

Suddenly, one of those with Jesus put his hand on his sword, drew it, and struck the slave of the high priest, cutting off his ear. Then Jesus said to him, “Put your sword back into its place; for all who take the sword will perish by the sword. Do you think that I cannot appeal to my Father, and he will at once send me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then would the scriptures be fulfilled, which say it must happen in this way?” (26:51–54).

First, contrary to Luke’s use of the word διαμερισμός (division), Matthew uses the word μάχαιρα (sword): “Do you think that I have come to bring peace to the earth? No, I tell you, but rather division!” (Luke 12:51). This obvious difference of the word “sword” in Matthew carries with it connotations of violence and the “armed hand” as Matthew Black affirms:

Moreover, one does not get rid entirely of the difficulty of Matthew’s harsh term ‘sword’ by describing it as purely figurative, for while ‘division’ may imply ‘conflict’ but not necessarily ‘violence’, the ‘sword’ has all its associations with violent conflict and with the use of the armed hand.⁵²¹

Second, in tension with bringing the *sword* in Matt 10, is Jesus’ description of his kingship as being a nonviolent and peaceful revolution without the use of a sword (26:51–54; cf. 5:9–12, 38–48; 6:14–15). In addition, Matthew seems to have a special emphasis on the “mouth” (στόμα) in his own material (13:35; 21:16), and with additions to both Q (Matt 4:4; cf. Luke 4:4) and Mark (Matt 15:11; cf. Mark 7:14; Matt 15:17; cf. Mark 7:18).

⁵¹⁹ Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 138. In addition, Betz identifies four concepts connected to peacemakers that strengthen Matthew’s emphasis on Jesus’ kingship and political involvement: (1) the language of peacemaker is often used in court language; (2) the act of peace-making is related to righteousness; (3) the principal peacemaker is God (cf. 5:44–45, 48; 6:12, 14–15; 7:10–11); and (4) the concept of Jesus’ disciples as peacemakers has political implications (5:21–48).

⁵²⁰ See E. Plümacher, “μάχαιρα, ης, ή,” *EDNT* 2.397–98. The Hebrew word for sword (חרב) is translated with both μάχαιρα (short sword or dagger) and ρομφαία (long sword) in the LXX. Also moving from the LXX, they are used interchangeably in the New Testament (cf. Rev 6:4 and 19:21). These two swords in the Hellenistic age are not clearly differentiated.

⁵²¹ Matthew Black, “‘Not peace but a sword’: Matt 10:34ff; Luke 12:51ff,” in *Jesus and the Politics of His Day* (ed. E. Bammel and C.F.D. Moule; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 289.

Matt 4:4 “But he answered, “It is written, ‘One does not live by bread alone, but by every word that comes from the mouth of God (διὰ στόματος θεοῦ).””

Luke 4:4 “Jesus answered him, “It is written, ‘One does not live by bread alone.””

Matt 15:11 “...it is not what goes into the mouth (εἰς τὸ στόμα) that defiles a person, but it is what comes out of the mouth (ἐκ τοῦ στόματος) that defiles.”

Mark 7:14 “...there is nothing outside a person that by going in can defile, but the things that come out are what defile.”

Therefore, although Jesus renounces the use of violence, he seems to advocate the taking up *sword-in-the-mouth* through proclaiming, teaching and spreading his message.

Jesus’ use of the sword and prohibition against the use of the sword (10:34–36; 26:51–54) seems to be reconciled by the distinction between and the metaphor of the *sword-in-the-mouth* and the *sword-in-the-hand*.⁵²² Expansion and violence is normally accomplished with the *sword-in-the-hand*, but Jesus uses and advocates for the *sword-in-the-mouth*. Similarly, in the Hebrew Bible, Second Temple Jewish literature and the New Testament, the *sword-in-the-mouth* is a weapon of salvation, judgment and conquest.⁵²³ It saves the destitute from powerful oppressors (Job 5:15) and is placed in the mouth of God’s servant (Isa 49:2; cf. 4Q436 1a+b i 7).⁵²⁴ The king’s words can be gentle or used like a sword in judgment (cf. *Ahiqar* 7:18). Furthermore, it is used to judge the intentions of the heart (Eph 5:10–17; Heb 4:12) and given to Jesus to conquer all his enemies (cf. Rev 1:16; 2:16; 19:15, 21).⁵²⁵

Jesus does not advocate for passive resistance, but an active nonviolent insurrection against religious, political, and spiritual powers and authorities.⁵²⁶ Jesus warns his followers that his revolution does not emulate evil by responding to violence with violence; i.e. the *sword-in-the-hand*. In contrast, his assault with the *sword-in-the-mouth* opposes evil, proclaims the kingdom of heaven, and asserts human dignity and freedom.⁵²⁷ Therefore, violent force is disavowed in favour of peaceful revolution (cf. Isa 42:1–3).

⁵²² Although this term is not specifically found in Matthew, Jesus’ teaching and emphasis on mouth as well as his use of “sword” can be aptly encapsulated by this term.

⁵²³ In more of an apocalyptic sense, the sword of judgment becomes the word of God in texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls (1QH 6:29; 1QM 19:11; cf. Isa 49:2; Wis 18:15; Rev 1:16; 19:15, 21).

⁵²⁴ It is important to note that, syntactically speaking, the “mouth” is an actual replacement for the “sword.”

⁵²⁵ See Alex Jassen, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and Violence: Sectarian Formation and Eschatological Imagination,” *BibInt* 17 (2009): 12–44.

⁵²⁶ Walter Wink, “Beyond Just War and Pacifism,” *RevExp* 89 (1992): 197.

⁵²⁷ Richard A. Horsley, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987), 318–26.

In sum, Matthew uses the image of the sword as an instrument for Jesus' mission with the mixed language of ruthless violence in his parables and non-retaliatory peace in his teachings. Although the uses of the sword in Matt 26:51–54 and 10:34–36 seem to be contradictory, they should be understood as two ways of engaging in kingdom expansion, either with the *sword-in-the-hand* or the *sword-in-the-mouth*. Therefore, Jesus, as God's chosen messiah, expands the kingdom of heaven by taking up the *sword* in his speech: proclamation and teaching.

3. Jesus' Mission Discourse

Jesus' mission can also be seen as he engages in expansion by resisting violence and promoting an empire of peacemakers who would extend love and forgiveness even to their enemies (5:9, 38–48; 6:14–15). Similar to 1QM, Jesus' Mission Discourse can be seen as a *rule of war* for his twelve disciples as they go throughout Israel.⁵²⁸ Therefore, in Matt 10, Jesus' Torah Discourse is applied to formulate his *rules of war*: to proclaim the good news (10:7); to perform miracles (cure the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out demons) relying on Jesus' authority (10:8); to trust God by taking no supplies (10:9–10); to spread peace from town to town (10:11–14); to endure persecution (10:16–25); and to acknowledge Jesus as king (10:34–42).

Matthew, as a scribe, writes Jesus' Mission Discourse.⁵²⁹ Eight observations seem to help identify Matt 10 as Jesus' *rule of war* for his disciples.

⁵²⁸ Within a context that featured a foreign military presence in Palestine, Matthew does not withdraw from the topic of war, but reflects some knowledge of war in Jesus' teachings (cf. 5:41; 22:7). Furthermore, Jesus is born within the politics of war. His birth is a conflict between kings that arises within Israel as the magi inquire about the location and birth of the *King of the Jews* (2:2). King Herod, spurred on by jealousy and power, engages in domestic war by murdering all the children in and around Bethlehem who were two years old and under (2:16).

⁵²⁹ See Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 130–32. In Josephus, a function of scribes was with the military as royal officials. During King Saul's military campaign against the Philistines, there is the addition of scribes reporting the soldiers' sins against God's law to him. Josephus identifies these scribes as officers in Saul's army (*Ant.* 6:120). Concerning King David's census of the people, Josephus writes that Joab takes the chiefs of the tribes and scribes with him in order to take the census of Israel (*Ant.* 5:318–20). Schams (*Jewish Scribes*, 132) suggests two reasons for the addition of scribes: (1) Josephus' writing expertise knew that the skill of scribes was essential to take the census; and (2) in association with Joab they were thought as military officials (cf. *Ant.* 6:120; 2 Chr 26:11). Schams (*Jewish Scribes*, 130–33) suggests that Josephus most probably knew of scribes who functioned as army officials in the Roman army.

1. The twelve disciples are specifically listed and thrice identified as being given authority and instruction by Jesus, which recalls the nation of Israel in the wilderness and conquest of Canaan (10:1–5; 11:1; cf. Num 1–2; 26; Jos 13–21).
2. The situation is dire as Jesus sends them throughout Palestine like sheep in the midst of wolves, avoiding Gentiles and Samaritan towns, proclaiming the good news that “the kingdom of heaven has come near.” There is danger in Jesus’ mission strategy of expanding his kingdom even within Israel.
3. The disciples are given authority and power to cure the sick, raise the dead, cleanse lepers and cast out demons. This authority and these activities suggest signs of the coming messiah and God’s kingdom, and the final eschatological war (10:8; cf. 11:2–6).
4. The disciples judge each town they enter by either giving or not giving their peace. This ultimately leads to the town’s salvation or destruction on the *Day of Judgment* (10:13–15).
5. The disciples, because of their allegiance to Jesus, will face trials and persecution before Jewish and Gentile councils and synagogues, and before governors and kings (10:24–25). However, they are to trust God as he speaks through them.
6. The disciples are to publicly proclaim what Jesus has taught them by using the *sword-in-the-mouth* without fear, knowing that their king is the *Son of God*.
7. The purpose of Jesus’ mission strategy is not to bring peace but a “sword” as he engages every power and authority in order to bring them all under God’s sovereign rule (10:34–39).
8. All those who are loyal and acknowledge Jesus’ identity will be rewarded (10:32–33, 40–42).

In sum, it seems that persecution and death are likely consequences for following Jesus and taking up the *sword-in-the-mouth* in proclaiming and establishing the kingdom of heaven, and following his *rules of war*. This violent response by those who are threatened by Jesus and his message is what has already occurred in the past with others proclaiming God’s message (11:12). Therefore, Jesus’ fate—his persecution, crucifixion and death—brought about by a hostile world also awaits his disciples (10:24–25, 34–37; cf. Micah 7:6).

4. Jesus’ Mission Strategy: Two Campaigns

Jesus’ mission strategy to expand the kingdom of heaven is revealed in both Jesus’ second discourse (10:1–11:1) and his final instructions to his disciples (28:16–20). Although he renounces the use of violence, Jesus’ message and teachings are to be implemented in this strategy: first, to the lost sheep of Israel, and second, to all the nations. Jesus’ final instruction to his disciples, after his resurrection as they are gathered together and given authority, is to expand his rule throughout all the nations by making disciples, baptizing

and teaching them to give their obedience and fidelity to Jesus. What began exclusively for “the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (Jesus’ first campaign) is now expanded to all the nations of the world (Jesus’ second campaign). So again, Jesus commands his disciples to expand into all the nations: prohibiting violence and promoting peaceful resistance through proclamation and teaching to advance the kingdom of heaven.

In sum, the disciples are to follow their king and his strategy of first going throughout Israel and then to all the nations to bring peaceful revolution, and to establish his kingdom against all other political-religious-spiritual powers and authorities (10:1–42; 28:16–20). However, Jesus’ *rule of war* to take up the *sword-in-the-mouth* in the face of opposition trusting God to establish his kingdom throughout the nations comes at the cost of persecution and possibly death as the disciples follow their king.

V. JESUS’ COVENANT COMMUNITY DISCOURSE (18:1–19:1)

1. Matthew’s Covenant Community

Matthew applies Jesus’ Torah Discourse to produce Jesus’ Covenant Community Discourse. It contains *rules* for the covenant community: organizational hierarchy, warnings concerning new and vulnerable members, reproof of community members, and forgiveness as the heart of the covenant community.⁵³⁰ First, Jesus’ Covenant Community Discourse begins with the question of the hierarchal organization within the community by placing “greatness” on humility and using the example of a child for entrance into the kingdom of heaven. Second, Jesus’ second discourse seems to contain stipulations concerning the treatment of fellow members within the covenant community. It gives strong precautions and consequences of members making “little ones” stumble (18:6–9; cf. 5:29).⁵³¹ This is accentuated with the parable of the lost sheep, which esteems the value of each member of the covenant community. Third, Jesus gives instructions and steps regarding reproofing a fellow member. Fourth, Jesus places unlimited forgiveness (“seventy-seven times”) as the heart of the covenant community by locating it as part of God’s character that should be reflected in the covenant community (cf. parable of the unforgiving servant; 18:15–22).

⁵³⁰ See Figure 5.

⁵³¹ “Little ones” are members in the community (cf. 10:42; 18:6, 10, 14). The precautions are the same as found in Matt 5:29 in the context of Jesus’ views about adultery.

Figure 5: Literary Structure of Jesus' Covenant Community Discourse (18:1–19:1)

- I. Hierarchy in Jesus' Covenant Community: Greatness in the kingdom of heaven (18:1–5)
 1. The Question about Greatness (18:1)
 2. The Answer to Greatness: Humility (18:2–5)
- II. Treatment of Members in the Covenant Community (18:6–35)
 1. Placing Stumbling Blocks before Members (18:6–9)
 - a. Warning (18:6–7)
 - b. Precautions and Importance (18:8–9)
 - c. Parable of the Lost Sheep (18:10–14)
 2. Reproof and Forgiveness between Members (18:15–35)
 - a. Reproving Members (18:15–19)
 - b. Forgiveness as the Heart of the Community (18:21–35)
 - c. Parable of the Unforgiving Servant (18:23–35)
- IV. Conclusion (19:1)

2. Hierarchical Organization

Jesus' Covenant Community Discourse begins with the disciples' question: "Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" (18:1). Jesus' simple answer is that humility as a child dictates who is greatest in the kingdom of heaven (18:4). Furthermore, Jesus highlights the significance of each member of the covenant community with strict orders not to cause them to stumble (18:6–7). Status and power are important features in Graeco-Roman society and Second Temple Judaism; however, Matthew places greater importance on each and every member and cautions them to behave in a manner that does not cause other members to stumble.

3. Reproof and Community Discipline

Jesus discusses community discipline and reproof using the exegetical tradition of Lev 19:15–18, with some similarities with the sectarian movement reflected in the rule texts (18:15–20; cf. 1QS 5:24–6:1; CD 9:2–8).⁵³² The community aspect of appealing to

⁵³² There are two major views: (1) those who maintain some sort of dependence between the Qumran text and Matthew, and (2) those who see both texts as parallel and independent developments. See Florentino García Martínez, "Brotherly Rebuke in Qumran and Mt 18:15–17," in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices* (eds. F. Garcia Martínez, and J. Trebelle Barrera; Lieden: Brill, 1995), 221–232; John Kampen, "The Significance of the Scrolls for the Study of the Book of Matthew," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (eds. L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J.C. VanderKam; Jerusalem; Old City Press, 2000), 157–69. CD 6:11–7:6 uses Lev 19:18 with the initial phrase in CD 6:20 with the authoritative general principle undergirding the practices which follow (cf. Lev 19:15–18). While Leviticus addresses impartiality in legal decisions, the sectarian text appears to emphasize support for all the members of the community

the assembly as the final authority is evident for both the sectarian movement reflected in the Rule Texts and in Matthew (CD 9:4; 1QS 6:1; Matt 18:17).⁵³³ However, there is a difference in procedure: (1) the sectarian movement has the rebuke first and then the sentence by the assembly; and (2) Matthew has rebuke in private, then before witnesses, and finally before the assembly (18:15; cf. Deut 19:15). Therefore, in comparing Matthew and the sectarian movement of the Rule Texts, and especially in light of private rebuke, motivations and results, F. García Martínez states: “The differences, on the other hand, seem sufficiently striking and important to suggest that the law of rebuke at Qumran could not have acted as a model or antecedent and even less as the origin of the law of rebuke of Matthew.”⁵³⁴ However, he also says that the law of rebuke at Qumran can be used for understanding Matt 18:15–17 in that: “Its very existence proves that the practice of a juridical procedure of rebuke of faults committed by the members of a group is not something unusual within the pluralistic Judaism of the first century.”⁵³⁵ This seems to suggest that a shared tradition of Lev 19:15–18 is possible with two independent and parallel developments.

Another aspect in Jesus’ Covenant Community Discourse is binding and loosing as to what is and what is not permitted; i.e. equating human judgment and divine will (18:18–19; cf. 16:19). “Two or three in my name” represents community authority as Jesus’ presence and authority is found in the assembly and not with a single leader (cf. 16:19).⁵³⁶ By citing Deuteronomy, Matthew gives a general application to a rule that originally applied only to witnesses for the prosecution in a criminal procedure (CD 9:22–23; John 8:17; 2 Cor 13:1; 1 Tim 5:19).⁵³⁷

The ultimate goal for this entire process of reproof in Matthew is reconciliation. This step-by-step procedure is given to emphasize and necessitate forgiveness (18:15–

with CD 6:21–7:1. CD 9:2–8 quotes Lev 19:18 with regard to taking vengeance or bearing a grudge and CD 9:8–16 is a section on oaths.

⁵³³ See CD 9:16–10:3.

⁵³⁴ García Martínez, “Brotherly Rebuke,” 230–31.

⁵³⁵ García Martínez, “Brotherly Rebuke,” 232.

⁵³⁶ There are two references to ἐκκλησία (assembly) in Jesus’ instructions regarding community discipline (Matt 18:17).

⁵³⁷ Five successive times an “if” clause is followed by a main clause with only Matt 18:16 breaking the structure, as the main clause is expanded by the final clause with the quotation from Deuteronomy. In dealing with offences, every matter may be settled on the statement of two or three witness (18:15–18; cf. Deut 19:15 LXX).

22).⁵³⁸ Therefore, in light of God’s mercy to the covenant community, the parable of the unforgiving servant serves as a warning for those who are unwilling to forgive others (18:23–35).⁵³⁹

4. Heart of the Covenant Community: Forgiveness

As already stated, the core character of the covenant community is forgiveness. There is an emphasis on the lost and the need for their restoration in the parable of the lost sheep.⁵⁴⁰ In Matthew, God is the shepherd seeking those who are wandering away (9:36; 15:24; cf. Luke 15:4–7).⁵⁴¹ Contrary to Luke 15:3–4 where the sheep are being lost, Matthew’s lost sheep are erring members going astray (πλανάω; cf. 18:10–14). In Jesus’ Covenant Community Discourse, the lost sheep are members who have wandered away, and it is the responsibility of the covenant community to forgive, show mercy and restore them.⁵⁴² Matthew 18 provides instructions to the covenant community to deal with erring members: they are to be forgiven (18:22). Jesus climactically ends his discourse with the parable of the unforgiving servant to demonstrate God’s mercy and forgiveness that should be exemplified in his covenant community (18:15–22).

In sum, Matthew 18:1–19:1 contains the rules of the Matthean community.⁵⁴³ After the hierarchy of the covenant community, Jesus’ fourth discourse contains two sets of admonitions each followed by a parable. First, Jesus warns the covenant community against putting a “stumbling block” before the least of the members (18:1–10; cf. 10:40; 15:29–30; 23:12), which is preceded by the parable of the lost sheep as it emphasizes the value of each member (18:12–14; cf. Luke 15:3–7). Second, Jesus gives steps to reprove and forgive community members (18:15–22; cf. 16:19; Luke 17:1–4), which concludes with the parable of the unforgiving servant as it focuses on the central importance of forgiveness and mercy within the covenant community (18:15–22).

⁵³⁸ Anger and reproof are treated as opposites (cf. Sir 20:2).

⁵³⁹ The righteous should be reprovved immediately and then forgiven (4Q417 2 I 1–8).

⁵⁴⁰ In the Hebrew Bible, the shepherd imagery is common with sheep wandering and perishing (Ezek 34:10–16; 18:12; cf. Pss 100:3; 119:176). Furthermore, the king is often allegorized as a shepherd. Nolland (*Gospel of Matthew*, 743) lists common themes as having sheep on mountains, seeking sheep, and losing sheep (perishing or wandering or being led astray).

⁵⁴¹ The sheep is lost (ἀπόλλυμι) in Luke 15:4 while the sheep has wandered away (πλανάω) in Matt 18:12–13 (occurs 3 times).

⁵⁴² This emphasis on forgiveness is also found in the Lord’s Prayer (6:12, 14–15).

⁵⁴³ Ἐὰν γένηται starts this pivotal point.

VI. MATTHEW'S PURPOSE: RULES OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN

1. Introduction

Matthew's purpose for Jesus' Mission Discourse and Jesus' Covenant Community Discourse is to present *rules* for expanding and living in covenant community. These discourses act in tandem: Matt 10 is concerned with community strategies for purpose and growth and Matt 18 is concerned with community life and discipline to deal with internal disputes.⁵⁴⁴

As Jesus' Torah is interpreted and applied by a community, it then becomes practice.⁵⁴⁵ An example of a practical ruling with varying results depends on one's use of the Jewish scriptures is Jesus' discussion on divorce (19:1–9). A conflict seems to exist between two laws from the Torah: (1) the Mosaic regulation that permits a man to divorce his wife (Deut 24:1–3), and (2) the divine regulation in creation as the husband and wife become one flesh (Gen 2:23–24). Matthew inverts Mark's order⁵⁴⁶ with Jesus' reference to the divine commandment in Genesis first and the Pharisees citation of Deuteronomy second.⁵⁴⁷ In Matthew, the result is as Menken states: "The effect of this change of sequence is that the Genesis regulation of the indissolubility of marriage is clearly presented as the rule, and the Deuteronomy regulation on divorce as the exception, caused by human weakness."⁵⁴⁸ The law concerning divorce then is a concession rather than a commandment with adultery as the only exception to the rule that divorce is forbidden

⁵⁴⁴ Matthew 10 and 18 give a sense of inclusion and exclusion depending on behaviour concerning the covenant community and the kingdom of heaven.

⁵⁴⁵ The Torah in Second Temple Judaism is wider than individual bits of legislation and instruction. See F.G. Downing, "Legislation as Social Engineering in the New Testament World," in *The Torah in the New Testament Papers Delivered at Manchester-Lausanne Seminar of June 2008* (ed. M. Tait and P. Oakes; LNTS 410; London: T&T Clark, 2009), 218–27, esp. 219–20.

⁵⁴⁶ In Mark, it is first the Pharisees who point out Deuteronomy and second Jesus answers with Moses' concession allowing divorce.

⁵⁴⁷ Matthew adds Deut 24:1 to Gen 2:24 "except for fornication," which has similarities with CD 4:19–5:1 quoting from Gen 1:27. CD inferred that polygamy is prohibited (Gen 7:9) and it seems like divorce is legitimate in the Jewish scriptures and in CD 13:17; 4Q266 9 iii 1–5; Temple Scroll 54:4; 4QInstruction 2 iii 20–21–iv 10. However, in Matthew, the status of marriage: "a man leaves his father and mother and clings to his wife and they become one flesh," heightens the sense of marriage (cf. Gen 2:24).

⁵⁴⁸ Menken, "Deuteronomy in Matthew's Gospel," 56, 42–62. See also Menahem Kister, "Divorce, Reproof, and Other Sayings in the Synoptic Gospels: Jesus Traditions in the Context of 'Qumranic' and other Texts," in *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and early Christianity: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew Center for the Study of Christianity* (ed. Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwarz; STDJ 84; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 195–229.

(19:9; cf. 5:32).⁵⁴⁹ Therefore, although Matthew's Jesus insists on observing and keeping the details of the Torah (e.g. tithing, even of mint, dill and cumin), its application and practice need to begin with loving one's neighbour (i.e. justice, mercy and good faith; 5:43–48; 23:23; cf. CD 9:5; Sir 19:13–17; Lev 19:7).⁵⁵⁰

2. Expanding the Kingdom of Heaven

Matthew, as Jesus' scribe, writes Jesus' Mission Discourse as a *rule of war* to expand the kingdom of heaven. As king, Jesus summons (προσκαλεσάμενος) his followers and gives them authority to go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel to spread the peace of God by proclaiming and teaching that "the kingdom of heaven is at hand." The twelve disciples are given specific order as to where to go, what supplies to carry, and what procedures to follow. They are also warned of the dangers and reassured that their mission is a divine mission (10:17–18). In this way, Jesus states, "I did not come to bring peace, but a sword." With this language, Jesus sends the twelve disciples, recollecting Israel's march in the desert towards the promised land, to advance the kingdom of heaven with the promise of a king's reward (10:40–42; cf. Num 2:1–34).

3. Community Rules of the Kingdom of Heaven

Jesus' Covenant Community Discourse legislates life within the covenant community by applying Jesus' Torah Discourse. Its purpose is to regulate interpersonal relations and to settle conflicts within the community by using a three-stage procedure: private reproof, reproof before witnesses, and bringing the matter to the assembly.⁵⁵¹ The word ἐκκλησία, usually translated assembly or church, identifies the Matthean community (16:18; 18:17). Peter's declaration of Jesus' identity, "You are the Messiah, the Son of the living God" (16:16), becomes the foundation for the ἐκκλησία, as it is given the keys of the kingdom and the authority to bind and loose (cf. Deut 9:10 LXX).⁵⁵²

⁵⁴⁹ See David Instone-Brewer, *Divorce and Remarriage in the Bible: The Social and Literary Context* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002); Kister, "Divorce, Reproof, and Other Sayings," 200.

⁵⁵⁰ See J.J. Collins ("The Works of the Messiah," DSD 1 [1994]: 98–112) for the common element of poverty and the institution of the twelve. See James L. Kugel (*In Potiphar's House: The Interpretative Life of Biblical Texts* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990], 219) as *T. Gad* 6:3–4 interprets Lev 19:17–18.

⁵⁵¹ Cf. 1QS 5:24–6:1; CD 9:2–8.

⁵⁵² The keys of the kingdom of heaven are a divinely-appointed trust usually for the high priest that gave him access to the temple (2 *Bar.* 10:18; 1 *En.* 12–16; *T. Levi* 2–6). In addition, although the authority of binding and loosing is first given to Peter, it is also identified with the church assembly

The term of “binding and loosing” is used for communal legislation to provide authoritative legislation regarding issues pertaining to life within community and give authority for including, excluding and reinstating people in and out of their community (18:18; cf. 16:18–20).⁵⁵³ This authority of binding and loosing texts provides authoritative interpretations of the Torah to safeguard the covenant community and prohibit entry to violators.

The significance of this line of argumentation for the meaning of the binding and loosing texts in Matthew is then clear. Priests in the temple had the authority both to provide the authoritative interpretations of the purity laws which would safeguard that institution’s sanctity and to enforce those laws by prohibiting entry to violators. In Matthew 16 and 18, Peter and the early Christian community are given the authority to legislate the life-style of the early followers of Jesus.⁵⁵⁴

Peter and the early Christian community are given the authority to legislate the life-style of the early followers of Jesus.⁵⁵⁵

However, this authority concerning the life of the assembly emphasizes reconciliation and forgiveness as the heart of the covenant community (cf. parable of the lost sheep and unfaithful servant). A caring, familial relationship shapes Matt 18 to provide instructions for the new covenant community in dealing with dissension and erring members within the community. Therefore, it contains the practices of covenant community: organization, reproof and forgiveness (cf. Gen 4:24; Lev 19:17; Deut 19:15).

VII. CONCLUSION

Matthew 10 and 18, similar to the *Rule Texts*, apply Jesus’ Torah as practices for the covenant community. They contain the purpose for the ἐκκλησία to expand and stabilize the covenant community by giving rules and strategies for growth and rules for daily life. Matthew applies Jesus’ Torah to the twelve disciples and ἐκκλησία to facilitate kingdom

(18:18). The idea of binding and loosing is scribal legislation: “Truly I tell, whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven” (18:18; cf. 16:18–20). See G.W.E. Nickelburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee,” *JBL* 100 (1981): 575–600, esp. 594.

⁵⁵³ See Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, 2.635–41.

⁵⁵⁴ Kampen, “Significance of the Scrolls for the Study of the Book of Matthew,” 166.

⁵⁵⁵ This is also found in covenant renewal ceremonies. Matthew contains hints of certain aspects of covenant renewal ceremonies with the Lord’s Prayer (6:9–13) and Lord’s Supper (26:26–28). The Lord’s Prayer has repetition and seems to have been adopted into the liturgy of the early church (cf. Luke 11:2–4). The Lord’s Supper, a recognized ritual meal, occurs in the Gospels (Mark 14:22–24; Luke 22:17–20) and 1 Cor 11:23–26 with the blood representing the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins (26:28).

expansion, community boundaries and ritual practices. These rules take the Jewish and Christian scriptures and apply them.

Matthew's purpose for using Jewish and Christian authoritative traditions is to establish these rules. I have attempted to identify the purpose of applying Torah by examining the Rule Texts (1QS, 1QSa and 1QM) as an application of Torah. Matthew 10, Jesus' Mission Discourse, functions as Jesus' *rule of war* to expand the kingdom of heaven and Matt 18, Jesus' Covenant Community Discourse, formulates aspects for living within the covenant community by establishing its boundaries and rules.

CHAPTER SIX

MATTHEW'S USE OF JESUS' PARABLES

I. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the aspect of Matthew as a scribe that I will focus on is Jesus' use of parables. A number of key points emerge from Matthew's emphasis on Jesus' parables in Matt 13 as well as throughout the Gospel. First, parables are like riddles that have a hidden aspect requiring wisdom. Matthew's use of parables reveals his allegorical and anthological scribal activity and an implicit use of Jewish scriptures. Second, Matthew identifies Jesus as a sage king—who reveals mysteries and interprets parables—by adopting and superseding Solomonic traditions. Also depicted as a wisdom teacher, Jesus necessitates an understanding and obedience to the Torah by blending it together with wisdom.⁵⁵⁶ Third, Matthew narrowly concentrates all his parables, including his rewriting of Mark's parables, to focus on the kingdom of heaven. Subsequently, his purpose for using parables is to reveal the *mystery* (μυστήριον) of the kingdom of heaven to his disciples (*scribes trained in the kingdom of heaven*), and to hide its secrets from those who do not “hear” and “understand.” This is accomplished with binary wisdom images to differentiate insiders and outsiders concerning the kingdom of heaven (i.e. two ways, two trees and two gates).

These characteristics of Matthew's presentation are all interrelated in a complex manner as Matthew uses and reuses aspects of the role of parables in the scriptures, particularly as associated with Solomon, and yet also pays attention to contemporary Jewish wisdom instruction. As for his use of parables and scripture, it is the case that some parables do reflect on scripture such as the parable of the vineyard (Isa 5), but for the most part what I am arguing is that, just as some key figures in the Hebrew Bible use parables, such as Nathan or especially Solomon, so Matthew is intent to use and expand Mark's use of Jesus' parables as scriptural wisdom tropes. Matthew 13 at its core is wisdom teaching and its interconnected themes resonate throughout the rest of the Gospel and arise from

⁵⁵⁶ Matthew 6 and 7 focus on hidden revelation: earthly wisdom from below and heavenly signs from above.

other Second Temple Jewish wisdom instruction. For example, the overlap between parable and riddle is important in connection with μυστήριον in Matthew and רז in some wisdom texts.

II. WISDOM AND PARABLES IN MATTHEW

1. Introduction

Although not in the category of classical wisdom literature, Matthew contains wisdom material according to J. L. Crenshaw's description:⁵⁵⁷

Formally wisdom consists of proverbial sentence or instruction, debate, intellectual reflection; thematically wisdom comprises self-evident intuitions about mastering life for human betterment, groping after life's secrets with regard to innocent suffering, grappling with finitude, and quest for truth concealing in the created order and manifested in Dame Wisdom. When a marriage between form and content exists, there is wisdom literature. Lacking such oneness, a given text participates in biblical wisdom to a greater or lesser extent.⁵⁵⁸

The Gospel of Matthew is saturated with wisdom themes and material (e.g. Jesus frequently uses parables). Matthew portrays Jesus as a wisdom teacher, emphasizing his didactic role and instruction. Matthew seems to personify Jesus as Lady Wisdom, or in the very least to identify him with Solomon, who is renowned for his wisdom (12:42).

2. Jesus the Teacher and His Disciples

Matthew emphasizes Jesus as a wisdom teacher and his disciples as wisdom pupils.⁵⁵⁹ This is evident as Matthew places Jesus' role as teacher in the first position and ahead of preaching and healing (4:23, 9:35; 11:1).⁵⁶⁰ Furthermore, Jesus' teaching is given in various sapiential forms: aphorism, riddles, beatitudes and parables. Jesus uses the word wise (φρόνιμος) in a number of contexts to illustrate and emphasize what he is doing (cf. 11:25)⁵⁶¹

⁵⁵⁷ Proverbs, Qoheleth, Job, Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon are typically recognized as wisdom literature; however, J.J. Collins (*Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997], 1) gives a broader definition of wisdom: "Like most traditional scholarly categories, however, 'wisdom' is not identified by a systematic literary analysis, but is an impressionistic, intuitive grouping of books that seem to have something in common."

⁵⁵⁸ J.L. Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction* (Atlanta; John Knox Press, 1981), 19.

⁵⁵⁹ As well as an interpreter of Torah (chap. 4) and parables (chap. 6).

⁵⁶⁰ Cf. Mark 1:39, which does not have teaching.

⁵⁶¹ The word wise is found in (1) the parable of the wise and foolish builder (7:24); (2) sending out the twelve disciples to the lost sheep of Israel (10:16); (3) negatively what is hidden to the wise and intelligent, and revealed to infants (11:25); (4) the parable of the faithful and wise slave (his master

This relationship between Jesus and his disciples (teacher and students) can be viewed as that between a sage-king and his scribes.⁵⁶² Just like the Pharisees and scribes, Jesus and his disciples seem to be rivals who as authoritative teachers influence the crowds. The possessive pronoun “their” before scribes (7:29) suggests scribes are associated with some group rather than being a separate entity. Therefore, the disciples, as scribes, are conduits and interpreters for Jesus, the wisdom-teacher (23:8–10; cf. 10:16–24; 28:16–20).⁵⁶³ Furthermore, compared to Luke 11:49, Matt 23:34 designates the disciples as prophets, sages and scribes (προφήτας καὶ σοφοὺς καὶ γραμματεῖς) rather than just apostles (ἀποστόλους), giving them more specified roles. In the same way then, Matthew can be identified as a scribe to Jesus.

In addition, Jesus’ disciples, trained scribes, are given authority to carefully and continually study, transmit, interpret and keep the Jewish scriptures.⁵⁶⁴

“Have you understood all this?” They answered, “Yes.” And he said to them, “Therefore every scribe who has been trained for the kingdom of heaven is like the master of a household who brings out of his treasure what is new and what is old (ὅστις ἐκβάλλει ἐκ τοῦ θησαυροῦ αὐτοῦ καινὰ καὶ παλαιά)” (13:51–52).

I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven (τὰς κλεῖδας τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν), and whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven (καὶ ὃ ἐὰν δήσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ ὃ ἐὰν λύσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται λελυμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (16:19; cf. 18:18–20).⁵⁶⁵

Contrary to Mark where the disciples are painted in such a negative light, the disciples are to teach and carry out Jesus’ commands and teachings as he will no longer be with them (16:17–19; 28:16–20; cf. 17:17). However, they are not to be called rabbi or teacher, but ἀδελφοί as they only have one teacher—the Messiah (23:8–10). In addition, not only does Jesus teach and demand from his disciples the ways of wisdom (righteous behaviour as a natural by-product of his instruction), but he also invites outsiders to be wise disciples and

put him in charge of his household) (24:45); and (5) four times in the parable of the foolish and wise maidens (25:2, 4, 8, 9).

⁵⁶² Although the disciples address Jesus as master (8:21, 25; 14:28; 16:22), the Jewish leaders recognize and address Jesus as rabbi and teacher (8:19; 12:38; 19:16; 22:16, 24, 36). In addition, Jesus identifies himself as teacher (26:17–19).

⁵⁶³ Jesus is increasingly portrayed as a teacher at odds with Jewish authorities. It should be noted that there is a parallel between the Pharisees and scribes and Jesus and his disciples as his scribes.

⁵⁶⁴ R. Alan Culpeper, *The Johannine School: An Evaluation of the Johannine-School Hypothesis Based on an Investigation of the Nature of Ancient Schools* (SBLDS 26; Atlanta: SBL, 1974), 253–55.

⁵⁶⁵ Although this passage is singular and directed to Peter, Matt 18:18–20 seems to expand this authority to the covenant community.

teachers (e.g. Jesus' final commission of his re-gathered disciples; 28:18–20; cf. 7:15–20; 12:46–50; 18:19; 21:43).

3. Jesus and Wisdom

Jesus as the Son of Man is likened to Lady Wisdom. Jesus, speaking of himself as the Son of Man, came eating and drinking and was falsely perceived as a glutton and drunkard. He substantiates his identity and actions by saying, “Yet wisdom (σοφός) is vindicated by her deeds” (11:19), which is often used to affirm the notion that Jesus is Wisdom personified⁵⁶⁶ by drawing parallels between Matt 11:28–30 and Sir 24 (Wisdom calling out) and 51 (sage's speech containing the themes of call, yoke and rest).⁵⁶⁷ In praise of the Law of Moses, Wisdom is identified and depicted as an exalted figure proceeding from the mouth of God and serving Him.⁵⁶⁸

Draw near to me, you who are untaught, and lodge in my school. Why do you say you are lacking in these things, and why are your souls thirsty? I opened my mouth and said, “Get these things for yourselves without money. Put your neck under the yoke, and let your souls receive instruction; it is to be found nearby. See with your eyes that I have laboured little, yet found for myself great rest (Sir 51:23–27).”

Simon Gathercole suggests that Jesus is portrayed as Wisdom incarnate in Matthew's Gospel.⁵⁶⁹ In addition, Celia Deutsch has proposed a Wisdom Christology—Jesus as Wisdom incarnate and also the sage or teacher of wisdom—from Sir 6:18–37 and 51:13–30

⁵⁶⁶ Matthew 11:18–19//Luke 7:33–35 with “deeds” in Matt and “children” in Luke (cf. 11:2, 25–27). See also Matt 11:28 with parallels in Sir 51:23–27 and 4Q421 1a ii–b 10 with Wisdom being present at creation (cf. Wis; Bar 3:9–4:4; 4Q184–185). Also Sir 29:10–11//Matt 6:19–20; Sir 51:23–26//Matt 11:28–30.

⁵⁶⁷ See Celia Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke: Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11.25–30* (JSNTSupp 18; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987). Simon J. Gathercole (*The Pre-existent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark, and Luke* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006]) draws parallels between wisdom in Sir 24 and 51: (1) calling to the uninitiated to come to her to learn; (2) opening their mouths; and (3) learning and acquired from wisdom.

⁵⁶⁸ Wisdom is the one from whom kings are to rule and make just decrees (Prov 8:15–16). Furthermore, Wisdom teaches her children and sitting at the city gates teaches those who will come to her (Sir 4:24; Wis 6:14).

⁵⁶⁹ Gathercole (*Pre-existent Son*, 193) states: “Some of the main features of her (Lady Wisdom) identity and functions are as follows: she (a) has a unique relation to God himself and remains unknown and mysterious to human beings, (b) is a future who, on God's behalf, comes to the human realm from heaven and (c) appeals to humanity to turn to her and God, often by sending prophets. However, find (d) she is a figure of impenetrable mystery, in the course of her visitation of the human realm, she (e) is rejected by the great majority, and, having experienced this general rejection, (f) returns to God in heaven.”

lies behind this section in Matthew.⁵⁷⁰ The Son of Man as hidden and revealed Wisdom is given the Spirit of wisdom, understanding and might (the source of the secrets of wisdom and apocalyptic judgment).⁵⁷¹

Various images in Matthew do bring Jesus and Wisdom together;⁵⁷² however, Matthew's primary Christological emphasis is that Jesus is a sage-king, who hides and reveals wisdom as a teacher and interpreter of parables, and who is rejected as the true representative of God.⁵⁷³ Graham Stanton confirms this: "In short, it is not at all clear that Matthew identifies Jesus as Sophia. The use of some Wisdom themes in 11:28–30 is not being disputed, but they do not seem to be the key to the passage as it now stands in Matthew's Gospel."⁵⁷⁴ Therefore, although Matthew is dependent on wisdom traditions, the Christological focus should shift the modern scholarly attention to Solomonic traditions.⁵⁷⁵

4. Jesus and Parables

Parables are a form of Jewish wisdom literature. In Matthew, Jesus uses parables or parabolic riddles (παραβολαῖς or משלים).

He seeks out the wisdom of all the ancients, and is concerned with prophecies, he preserves the saying of the famous and penetrates the subtleties of parables, he seeks out the hidden meanings of proverbs and is at home with obscurity of parables (Sir 39:1–3).⁵⁷⁶

⁵⁷⁰ Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke*, 130–39.

⁵⁷¹ E.g. of parallel is the withdrawal of wisdom. Wisdom goes forth from the heavens to take her dwelling among humanity, but, finding no home she returns to the heavens, compared to iniquity that finds a home (*1 En.* 42:1–3). In the same way, the citizens of Chorazin and Bethsaida give a place for evil and reject Jesus.

⁵⁷² See Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 321; Gundry, *Matthew*, 220.

⁵⁷³ John Kampen, "Wisdom in Matthew and New Qumran Evidence," in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Oslo 1998* (eds. D.K. Falk, F. García Martínez, E.M. Schuller; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 238.

⁵⁷⁴ Graham N. Stanton, "Salvation Proclaimed X: Matthew 11:28–30: Comfortable Words?" *ExpT* 94 (1982): 6 (3–9).

⁵⁷⁵ The problem is the overt connections made between Matt 11, and Sir 24 and 51. In comparing Josephus' portrayal of Solomon (*Ant.* 8:45–47), Jesus is like Solomon in (1) his wisdom (13:54; cf. 11:19); (2) use of parables and similitudes (5:1–16; 6:9–13, 25–34; 7:24–27; 8:20; 13:1–53; 21:18–22); and (3) his healings (9:27; 20:30–31) and exorcisms (12:23; 15:22; cf. 12:15–45). For more on Solomon traditions see section III.2.

⁵⁷⁶ Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon have the sage assuming some of the functions of a prophet.

Παραβολή has a broad meaning and occurs 17 times in Matthew with 12 in chapter 13—the largest parable collection.⁵⁷⁷ As a literary feature,⁵⁷⁸ Matthew uses two kinds of parables: (1) narrative parables that include comparisons with story, and (2) similitude (“is like” or “is as if”) with analogies being made.⁵⁷⁹ Parables are brief and symmetrical stories that elicit thought, and usually having two levels of meaning with a mirror correspondence between the story level and reality. Although they are not always realistic, they are formed from everyday life with usually an element of shock at the end, which often causes a reversal of one’s understanding. Parables usually include the following elements: (1) narrated occasion, (2) introductory formula, (3) the *mashal* proper, (4) the application, and (5) a scriptural quotation.⁵⁸⁰

Matthew’s parables often have an introductory formula in the form of a question, “to what will we compare?” or a statement, “it is like.” They usually include an interpretation, but some have no conclusion or end with a question (21:31).⁵⁸¹ In addition, they have a comparative function: “as, like” (ὡς or ὅσπερ in 25:14); “to be like, compare” (ὁμοιόω) or “like, similar” (ὅμοιος in 13:24); or more frequently “the kingdom of heaven is like” (ὁμοία ἐστίν).

In comparison to other parables or *meshalim*, Hultgren notes six characteristic differences in Matthew: (1) used as direct address, (2) focuses on Jesus and not just on part of a larger argument, (3) not used for argumentation like ancient philosophers or rabbis, (4)

⁵⁷⁷ Matthew 13:3, 10, 13, 18, 24, 31, 34[2x], 35, 36, 53. In the Gospels, παραβολή can include: proverb (Luke 4:23), riddle (Mark 3:23), comparison (Matt 13:33), contrast (Luke 18:1–8), simple story (Luke 13:6–9) and complex story (Luke 13:6–9). Drury (*The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory* [Crossroad Publishing Company, 1989], 70–72) found as many as 61 parables. In the LXX, למש is translated 28 out of 39 times by παραβολή.

⁵⁷⁸ Often research into parables is divided between historical and literary criticism. Historical criticism usually concentrates on the historical Jesus while literary approaches focus on the final form and context within the Gospels.

⁵⁷⁹ Parables in Matthew are usually similitudes, metaphors, example narratives and allegory. Similitudes are extended, explicit comparisons using “like” or “as” to relate a typical event in life in the present tense (e.g. parable of the leaven; 13:31–32). Metaphors have an implied comparison referring to an event(s) to express a moral truth (e.g. parable of the banquet; 22:1–14). Allegories are a series of related metaphors (e.g. parable of the sower; 13:1–9).

⁵⁸⁰ See David Stern, *Parables in Midrash: Narrative and Exegesis in Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991), 9; Harvey K. McArthur and Robert M. Johnston, *They Also Taught in Parables: Rabbinic Parables from the First Centuries of the Christian Era* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990), 9; Amos N. Wilder, *Jesus’ Parables and the War of Myths: Essays on Imagination in the Scriptures* (ed. James Breech; Philadelphia: Fortress; London: SPCK, 1982).

⁵⁸¹ Ἐπιμύθιον attributed to the main character (18:32–33; 20:13–15; 25:12, 26–28).

focuses on God in an intimate and familiar manner rather than as a theoretical discussion, (5) focuses sometimes on a surprise in the end, and (6) focuses on combining wisdom and eschatology.⁵⁸² In addition, Garland characterizes *meshalim* in Matthew's eschatological discourse with these narrative themes: sudden arrival of something or someone that creates a crisis appears in all five parables; a key figure is delayed in three of the parables; exhortation to watch of the unknown time of arrival sets the tone for the first four parables; division of the characters into two separate categories,⁵⁸³ and the last three parables contain a judgment scene with the faithful (and ready) receiving a joyous reward and the unfaithful (and unready) being banished and/or ruthlessly punished.⁵⁸⁴

Although these parables are concerned with the *Last Days*, they have a paraenetic function about being ready (cf. Matt 24:3). Therefore, honouring Jesus as king is accomplished through taking care of fellow servants, taking part in the wedding banquet, and stewarding his property. The basis for the separation and judgment of *insiders* and *outsiders* is not, basically, their humanitarian actions but rather their attitude towards Jesus, their king, as it is expressed in their behaviour.⁵⁸⁵ These parables in Matt 24–25 entwine aspects of sapiential and apocalyptic traditions to reveal eschatological realities using figurative imagery (cf. *I En* 37–71).

The parables in Matt 13 teach about the kingdom of heaven, not to reveal eschatological realities but to elucidate, exhort and invite others into the kingdom of heaven.⁵⁸⁶ These parables are for those “who have ears to hear”⁵⁸⁷ with the image of a great harvest and potential expansion as the backdrop of the parables (13:23; cf. 12:30).⁵⁸⁸ This invitation to right understanding and right behaviour is revealed to Jesus' disciples and hidden to crowds (6:30; 8:26; 14:31; 16:8; 17:20). In sum, Matthew invites his readers to the way of the wise by accepting Jesus the king and the kingdom of heaven. However, the

⁵⁸² Arland J. Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 8–11.

⁵⁸³ E.g. the wise, faithful and good versus the wicked, foolish and hesitant.

⁵⁸⁴ David E. Garland, *Reading Matthew: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (Macon, Georgia: Smyth&Helwys Publishing, Inc., 2001), 244–45.

⁵⁸⁵ Grant Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 176.

⁵⁸⁶ See K.R. Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 24–31, 191–253.

⁵⁸⁷ Psalm 49:4; Prov 1:5–6; Ezek 17:2; Hab 2:6; Sir 39:2–3; *I En* 68:1

⁵⁸⁸ The eschatological period is inaugurated by the revealing of wisdom to the elect (See *I Enoch*; 4QInstruction specifically).

question that arises is this: “Will the crowds accept or reject Jesus’ message and teaching?” It seems that they do not accept Jesus; therefore, his speaking in parables is the reason for their rejection (e.g. blind, deaf and without understanding; Matt 11–12).⁵⁸⁹ However, the disciples’ knowledge is not yet complete, as they need further instructions about the yeast of the Pharisees and Sadducees (16:5–12). Jesus is the key to either hidden or revealed wisdom (i.e. parables)⁵⁹⁰ as the interpreter who unlocks the mystery of their meaning.⁵⁹¹

5. Conclusion

In sum, it has been illustrated that Matthew, as a scribe trained for the kingdom of heaven, is concerned to associate Jesus with wisdom and parables and portray him as a sage-king. Therefore, Matthew identifies Jesus as a wisdom teacher and as being greater than Solomon. Accordingly, Jesus masterfully uses parables to reveal and hide the realities of the kingdom of heaven.

III. MATTHEW’S USE OF SCRIPTURE: WISDOM AND THE MYSTERY OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN

1. Wisdom and Parables

Wisdom compositions characteristically contain instruction,⁵⁹² sequences of admonitions,⁵⁹³ and *meshalim* (משלים).⁵⁹⁴ They are often pedagogical and eudaemonistic with exhortations that urge the acquisition of wisdom and knowledge (Sir 6:32–37; 4Q298 3–4 ii 3–6). Proverbs 8 and Sir 24 are two typical wisdom discourses, which contain some

⁵⁸⁹ See Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, 1.10–11; Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 77–78. As a word to the wise and a polemic to the broader Jewish community, Matthew was written by a Jewish Christian for a majority Jewish-Christian audience (21:43; cf. 23:37–38; 27:25). Matthew attempts to legitimate Christianity and itself within Judaism with Jesus’ message and teaching as true wisdom and the true interpretation of Torah.

⁵⁹⁰ Chapter 6 is parables, but chapter 4 is Torah and chapter 7 is dreams and prophecy.

⁵⁹¹ E.g. Jesus is rejected in his hometown of Nazareth because they cannot understand where he received this wisdom and power (13:54).

⁵⁹² Sirach 24:33–34; 4Q298 1–2 i 1; 1QS 3:13; 4Q418 81 17, 221 203; 4Q525 14 ii 16–18.

⁵⁹³ 4Q416 2 ii 14–21; Sir 8:1–9.

⁵⁹⁴ Proverbs, Job, Ecclesiastes, Wisdom of Solomon and Ben Sira, as well as wisdom texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls, contain *meshalim*. The Dead Sea Scrolls indicate more diversity within Second Temple sapiential compositions: 4QInstruction has eschatological aspects and cosmological themes; 4QMysteries (1Q27, 4Q299–300) uses *raz*; 4Q300 3 2–3//1Q27 1 I 2–3 “in order that they would know (the difference) between g[ood and evil, and between falsehood and truth, and that they might understand the mysteries of transgression...] all their wisdom.”; 4Q420/421; 4Q525 has walks in the law of the Most High with wisdom equated with Torah (cf. Sir 24).

characteristics of wisdom. First, wisdom compositions are instructive⁵⁹⁵ and usually associated with Torah.⁵⁹⁶ Ben Sira⁵⁹⁷ identifies himself as a wise scribe by studying the Torah, seeking out ancient wisdom, finding the hidden meaning of proverbs, and being comfortable with the obscurity of parables (39:1–3).⁵⁹⁸ A prominent aspect of early Jewish wisdom is Torah piety with wisdom only acquired through Torah observance (Sir 1:26).⁵⁹⁹ Second, wisdom compositions weave wisdom with apocalyptic traditions. Contrary to Ben Sira and attaining wisdom through Torah (Sir 3:21–24), 4Q417 suggests *raz nihyeh* as the chief element of wisdom (4Q417 1 i 6–7, 10–12). In addition, 4QInstruction is a wisdom text with an apocalyptic worldview, and 4QMysteries emphasizes eschatological judgment associated with the *raz nihyeh* (cf. 1Q27 1 i 3–4). Third, wisdom literature often features a father-son relationship. The knowledge of the father is only revealed through the son: Jesus as God’s son reveals the father (Matt 11:27–28).⁶⁰⁰ Fourth, wisdom texts contain sequences of admonitions (4Q416 2 ii 14–21; Sir 8:1–9). Two key ideas concerning wisdom and parables are warning and admonition, and either/or decision making, which is often in the image of two ways.⁶⁰¹

Moreover, wisdom teachers devote themselves to the examination and presentation of *mashal* (משל)—skilfully formed from everyday speech.⁶⁰² The Hebrew Bible and early

⁵⁹⁵ Sirach 24:33–34 and 4Q298 1–2 i 1 have instructions written by teachers for students; 4Q525 14 ii 16–18 have people training to become teachers; 1QS 3:13; 4Q418 81 17, 221 203 has instruction.

⁵⁹⁶ Baruch 3:9–4:4 and Pss 1 and 119 combine wisdom and Torah, while 4Q185 1–2 iii 9 and 4Q525 2 ii + 3 3–4 affirm the Torah as an authoritative source of revelation.

⁵⁹⁷ Sirach is an early 2nd century BCE composition which merges covenant and sapiential traditions.

⁵⁹⁸ See also the Wisdom of Solomon.

⁵⁹⁹ Ben Sira lived in Jerusalem and had a school (Sir 50:27; cf. 34:12–13) and was known as the last of the wise men (sages) of Israel and the first of the professional scribes (Sir 38:24). Sirach contains moral, cultic and ethical maxims, folk proverbs, psalms of praise and lament, theological and philosophical reflections, homiletic exhortations, and pointed observations about life and customs of the day. It served to strengthen the faith and confidence of Jews, not necessarily to condemn Hellenism, but to demonstrate to Jews and Gentiles that true wisdom is found primarily in Jerusalem and not Athens, i.e. in the authoritative literature of Israel rather than Hellenistic writings. See Alexander A. Di Lella, “Conservative and Progressive Theology: Sirach and Wisdom,” *CBQ* 28 (1966): 140–42.

⁶⁰⁰ The father-son relationship is most common in Matthew among the Synoptic Gospels: Matt (42), Mark (5), and Luke (15). See Ben Witherington III, *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1994), 339.

⁶⁰¹ See 4Q302 and 4Q473.

⁶⁰² The fundamental meaning implies likeness. In the LXX, משל is often translated παραβολή. See B. Gerhardsson, “Illuminating the Kingdom: Narrative Meshalim in the Synoptic Gospels,” in *Jesus*

Jewish literature have משל or παραβολή.⁶⁰³ Although they have a broad range of genres (sayings, similitudes, fables or proverbs, riddles, parables, parabolic and illustrative stories, and allegory), they can be comprehensibly understood as a comparison.⁶⁰⁴ Therefore, παραβολή can be understood in terms of a developed comparison setting side-by-side two things from different fields so that the similarity of the unknown may be elucidated from the known.⁶⁰⁵ Arising from everyday experience, Matthew uses παραβολή in four different ways: (1) a similitude (13:33; 17:20); (2) an allegory (13:24–30, 36–43; 22:2–14); (3) an example parable (18:23–35); and (4) a narrative parable used as an analogy (21:28; 25:1–30).⁶⁰⁶ They are allegories (extended metaphor in narrative form) and analogies used in an illustrative way. Often used in argumentation, parables embellish to prove a point, clarify a point, or vividly show a point to its hearers.

2. Solomonic Traditions

In Second Temple Jewish literature, there are both negative and positive portraits of Solomon: Solomon defiled David’s family line (Sir 47:20) and as his reputation for wisdom grew, his greatness overshadowed negative aspects of his reign (cf. Wisdom of Solomon). Benjamin Wright III characterizes Solomon in STJ literature:⁶⁰⁷

1. Solomon as the one who built the first temple (*Ant.* 8:61–123).
2. Solomon’s reputation for wisdom (*Ant.* 8:42–49). Solomon wrote proverbs (משל), songs (שיר) and parables (היורה), which also extends his name to compositions: Proverbs, Qoheleth, Song of Songs, Wisdom of Solomon, and Psalms of Solomon.
3. Solomon the magician and exorcist. The source of Solomon’s role as exorcist is found in 1 Kgs 4:29–34 and provides the basis for the development of

and the Oral Gospel Tradition (ed. H. Wansborough; JSNTSup 64; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 266–309.

⁶⁰³ Parables in the Hebrew Bible: 2 Sam 12:1–10; 14:5–20; 1 Kgs 20:35–40; Isa 5:1–7; Ezek 17:2–10; 19:2–9, 10–14. In addition, a number of different Jewish writings contain משלים: e.g. story of Ahiqar; 1QapGen 19:14–21; 4Q552; 4QH 15:20–22; 1 En 37–71; Jub 37:20–23; 4 Macc 1:28–30; Jos Asen 12:8; T. Naph 2:2–4; 4 Ezra 4:13–21, 28–43; 7:49–61; L.A.B. 37:1–5; 2 Bar 36–40.

⁶⁰⁴ Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom*, 21. See Friedrich Hauch, “παραβολή,” *TDNT* 5.747–51.

⁶⁰⁵ See Friedrich Hauch, “παραβολή,” *TDNT* 5.745–46.

⁶⁰⁶ Also used as a metaphor or figurative sayings (Mark 7:14–17) and a proverb (Luke 4:23).

⁶⁰⁷ Benjamin G. Wright III, “Solomon in Chronicles and Ben Sira: A Study in Contrasts,” in *Rewriting Biblical History: Essays on Chronicles and Ben Sira in Honour of Pancratius C. Beentjes* (eds. J. Corley and H. van Grol; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 139–58.

Solomon's magical ability and control over demons (cf. Wis 7:15–22; *Ant.* 8:42–49).⁶⁰⁸

4. Solomon's flaws, especially his liaisons with foreign women who lured him away from worship of God (cf. 1 Kings; Sirach; *Ant.* 8:190–198, 209–211).⁶⁰⁹

Solomon is mentioned by name three times in Matthew, who seems to be associating Jesus with Solomon in terms of certain aspects: kingship, wisdom and exorcisms.⁶¹⁰ Matthew's primary depiction of Jesus is that of a royal messiah with an emphasis on teaching and interpreting wisdom.⁶¹¹ The model sage-king is Solomon; however, Jesus is greater than Solomon.⁶¹² For example, in the context of the scribes and Pharisees asking Jesus for a sign, Jesus replies that the Queen of the South will rise in judgment against "an evil and adulterous generation" because she came from the ends of the earth to listen to Solomon's wisdom, but someone greater than Solomon is here (12:42).⁶¹³ Therefore, Matthew seems to emphasize Solomon by placing him at the end of the pericope and only mentioning Nineveh once (12:38–42; cf. Luke 11:29–32). In addition, Jesus was teaching in his hometown and they were astounded and asked, "Where did this man get this wisdom and these deeds of power?" (13:54).

Jesus and Solomon are wise kings and both can be identified as *Son of David*,⁶¹⁴ healers, and exorcists (15:22).⁶¹⁵

⁶⁰⁸ Dennis Duling, "Solomon, Exorcism, and the Son of David," *HTR* 68 (1975), 237. Solomon's wisdom surpassed that of the East and Egypt together and could speak of trees, animals, birds, reptiles, and fish (1 Kgs 4:33).

⁶⁰⁹ However, Josephus and *Testament of Solomon* emphasize his heroic stature due to his virtue.

⁶¹⁰ References to Solomon are found in Matt 1:6; 6:29; 12:42(2x); cf. Luke 11:31; 12:27; Acts 7:47. In addition, Matthew seems to connect Jesus and Solomon with their identification as the Son of David in healings (9:27; 20:30–31) and exorcisms (12:23; 15:22).

⁶¹¹ The title "Son of David" stresses royalty (9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 20:30–31; 21:9, 15; 22:42, 45). In Matt 2, Jesus' supernatural birth narrative points to him as a great king; signs from the heavens announcing his coming; visitation by seers with gifts; and a power struggle with another king. In addition, Jesus' baptism is a public declaration in Matthew as compared to Mark's private event (3:3–17). And echoing the duty of kings, it is Jesus' divine anointing and appointment from God to "fulfil all righteousness" (cf. Wis 1:1). See Witherington, *Jesus the Sage*, 354.

⁶¹² Wisdom of Solomon exhorts kings to seek wisdom and righteousness.

⁶¹³ Response of Gentiles: people of Nineveh (Jonah 3) and Queen of Sheba (1 Kgs 10:1–3; 2 Chr 9:1–2). See Larry Perkins, "Greater than Solomon" (Matt 12:42)," *TrinJ* 19 (1998) 207–18.

⁶¹⁴ See M. J. Suggs, *Wisdom, Christology and Law in Matthew's Gospel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970). Although "Son of David" may refer to Solomon only at times, Jesus' identification with Solomonic (healings and exorcisms) and Wisdom traditions should at least bring to mind Solomon (9:27–32; 15:21–28; 20:29–34).

⁶¹⁵ See Duling, "Solomon, Exorcism, and the Son of David," 235–52; L.R. Fisher, "Can This be the Son of David?" in *Jesus and the Historian* (FS E.C. Colwell; ed. F.T. Trotter; Philadelphia:

Could Jesus be claiming in fact that he is “greater than Solomon” precisely because he cast out evil spirits without any need for special incantations or herbal remedies, but merely by the authority of his own word? Is the “wisdom” which Jesus brings, the eschatological authority and power of God himself, engaged in direct contest with the forces of Satan? The context of Matt 12:38–42 certainly would support such a conclusion.⁶¹⁶

Both Jesus and Solomon are wise kings and have power over demons. There are references that connect Jesus and Solomon as wise kings in the contexts of healings and exorcisms with Jesus’ identification as the Son of David (9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 20:30–31). In a discussion concerning Jesus’ power over demons and his healing, all the crowds are amazed and pose the question: “Can this be the Son of David?” (12:23). Furthermore, immediately after Jesus claimed to be greater than Solomon, there is a discussion on the return of unclean spirits with Matthew. This associates Jesus with Solomon as a wise king who have power over unclean spirits (12:43–45).

The background to this connection between Jesus and Solomon as wise kings and as Sons of David is Solomon’s knowledge and wisdom, which is associated with magic and exorcisms: power over nature and demons.⁶¹⁷ By enhancing Solomon’s abilities and virtue, Josephus emphasizes Solomon’s magical wisdom (*Ant.* 8:42–49).⁶¹⁸ Josephus portrays Solomon in four ways: (1) wisdom exceeded everyone (cf. Matt 11:19; 13:54); (2) composed books of odes, songs, parables and similitudes (cf. Matt 5:1–16; 6:9–13; 7:24–27); (3) spoke in parables about every sort of tree, animal and living creatures knowing their descriptions and natures (cf. Matt 6:25–34; 8:20; 13:1–53; 21:18–22); and (4) enabled by God to learn the skill of exorcism, which included composing incantations so that demons could never return, and which was taught to others (cf. Matt 12:15–45).⁶¹⁹ In addition, Solomon was an expert in human science and philosophy, with a special knowledge concerning the violent force of spirits: he understood nature including the power of roots, and astrology, which gave him control over spiritual forces and evil spirits

Westminster Press, 1968): 82–97; C.C. McCown, “The Christian Tradition as to the Magical Wisdom of Solomon,” *JPOS* 2 (1922): 1–24.

⁶¹⁶ Perkins, “Greater than Solomon,” 213.

⁶¹⁷ Wisdom enables Solomon to exercise extraordinary control over the demonic realm. Furthermore, magical traditions were found in Palestine (*J.W.* 2:134–36; *Ant.* 8:42–49).

⁶¹⁸ Josephus seems to depend on 1 Kgs 4:29–34 LXX.

⁶¹⁹ Beginning with 1 Kgs 5:9–14 LXX, especially 5:13 (cf. 1 Kgs 4:29–34; 3 Kgdms 4:12; *Ant.* 8:45–47).

(Wis 7:15–22).⁶²⁰ The *Testament of Solomon* explicitly expresses Solomon’s effective control over demons.⁶²¹ Furthermore, the evidence for Solomon’s magical tradition is also known among the Dead Sea Scrolls (11QPsAp),⁶²² and in magical papyri, Solomon is frequently referred to as a powerful authority of incantations.⁶²³

Although Solomon is a wisdom king par excellence,⁶²⁴ wisdom did not prevent him from failure and the pitfalls against the laws of the king (cf. Deut 17:14–20).⁶²⁵ The ideal king (i.e. Jesus) combines wisdom with Torah to render justice throughout his realm.⁶²⁶ living according to the laws of the king, wisely in the fear of the Lord, and bringing justice to the people (cf. Deut 17:14–20; Pss 18:21; 132:12; Prov 1:7; 8:14–16; 9:10; cf. Matt 18; 23). Messianic prophecies combined these three elements, so that in the new age the ideal king is the bearer of divine law, and the one who uses wisdom to execute justice and law throughout the nation (Isa 9:6; 11:1–5; Jer 21:5; 33:15; cf. Matt 5–7).⁶²⁷

Similarly, Solomon is portrayed in negative rather than positive terms in Matthew.⁶²⁸ Matthew 6:29 contrasts Jesus and Solomon with “but I say to you” (attention

⁶²⁰ See Pablo A. Torijano, *Solomon, the Esoteric King: From King to Magus, Development of a Tradition* (JSJSupp 73; Leiden: Brill, 2002), esp. chap 4. In Solomon’s prayer, the tradition expands to “knowledge of the powers of the spirits” from Josephus’ knowledge of the natural world (Wis 7:15–22).

⁶²¹ See D.C. Duling, “Testament of Solomon,” *OTP* (1988), 1.935–87. Early 3rd century CE but early sources possibly 1st century. Testament of Solomon is a testament about Solomon’s construction of temple that includes complex demonology and other astrological, magical and angel traditions; i.e. magical control of demons. Solomon, however, forfeits the spirit of God because he sacrifices to the god Moloch (*T. Sol* 26:2–5; cf. 1 Kgs 11:7).

⁶²² Solomon is followed in the next line by the word used in Deut 32:17 and Ps 106:37 to refer to demons.

⁶²³ See A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient Past* (London, 1927; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978).

⁶²⁴ See Martha Himmelfarb, “The Wisdom of the Scribe, the Wisdom of the Priest, and the Wisdom of the King according to Ben Sira,” in *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. R.A. Argall, B.A. Bow and R.A. Werline; Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000), 94–97, esp. 95. The Praise of the Ancestors also emphasizes a royal priesthood (*Sir* 47:15–17).

⁶²⁵ Ben Sira views Solomon as an embodiment of a flawed institution: “For his [David] sake, there arose after him an understanding son who dwelt securely (MS B).”

⁶²⁶ Cf. 1 Sam 12:3–4; 2 Sam 8:15; 23:3–4; Ps 72:1–4. See Keith W. Whitelam, *The Just King: Monarchical Judicial Authority in Ancient Israel* (JSOTSupp 12; Sheffield: Sheffield, 1979), 33.

⁶²⁷ Furthermore, *Pss Sol.* 17:33 discusses the Messiah: “Will not put his trust in horse and rider and bow nor will he increase for himself gold and silver for war and in many people he will not increase hope for the day of battle.”

⁶²⁸ See Warren Carter, “‘Solomon in all his glory’: intertextuality and Matthew 6.29,” *JSNT* 65 (1997): 3–25.

to something overlooked) and the nature of Solomon's activity "in all his glory" (his extraordinary wealth, power and prestige of which his clothing is an indication), who abandoned God's purposes.⁶²⁹ Therefore, although both Solomon and Jesus are wise kings and identified as a *Son of David*, Jesus is greater than Solomon as the true *Son of David* and in wisdom and Torah (12:42).

In sum, the ideal king is to walk in God's ways by keeping his statutes and commandments so that he can govern: wisdom and judicial discernment are contingent on obedience to Torah (1 Kgs 3:9, 14). Although both Solomon and Jesus are identified as *Son of David*, Jesus is superior to Solomon and even David (22:41–46).⁶³⁰ Reminiscent of 2 Sam 7:12, Jesus, like Solomon, establishes the kingdom, builds the temple and is intimate with God his father (cf. Matt 3:17; 12:40; 15:32; 17:5; 26:61; 27:40, 63).⁶³¹ Jesus is greater than Solomon as the *Son of David* and a sage-king.

3. Anthological and Allegorical Interpretation

In connection with wisdom and parables, Matthew's method of scribal practice is both anthological and allegorical interpretation. Based on previous authoritative texts or messages, anthological interpretation implicitly uses them to develop and transpose them for contemporary needs. Usually a pastiche of allusions, they can be used in a number of ways: liturgical collections, exegetical anthologies, or copies made for personal reading.⁶³² Parable collections could also be designated as an anthology (i.e. Matt 13). The term παραβολή can occasionally be used of proverbs ("pithy saying") or aphorisms (ἀφορισμός).⁶³³ They are personal insights attributed to particular individuals to give them

⁶²⁹ Cf. Satan's temptation to Jesus with "the glory of them" (4:8; cf. 5:16; 6:2). See B. J. Malina, "Wealth and Property in the New Testament and its World," *Int* 41 (1987), 354–67.

⁶³⁰ Jesus is identified as the son of David (11 times in Matt, 4 in Mark and 4 in Luke).

⁶³¹ Deutsch ("Wisdom in Matthew," 45) states: "In Sir. 24:8–12 Wisdom-Torah came to dwell in the Temple [or Tabernacle]. Here in Matthew 23:37–39 we are told Wisdom will leave the Temple because Wisdom has been rejected."

⁶³² Similarly, CD 20:17–20 is a pastiche of allusions (Exod 20:6; Deut 7:9; Isa 56:1; 59:20; Mal 3:16, 18).

⁶³³ See B.B. Scott, *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1989), 8–19. *Meshalim* includes parables, allegories, enigmatic oracles, and proverbs. Similitudes tend to blend with figurative sayings many of which have the character of popular proverbs. Aphorisms are concise attributed sayings or actions that give insights about life (cf. Mark 7:17; Luke 4:23; 5:36; 6:39; 14:7). See J.D. Crossan, *In Fragments: The Aphorisms of Jesus* (San Francisco: Harper&Row, 1983); idem, *Sayings Parallels: A Workbook for the Jesus Tradition* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986).

authority.⁶³⁴ Aphorisms feature a number of characteristics: (1) attributed to individuals; (2) subject to expansion and contraction; (3) appear in various contexts; (4) basic function is didactic;⁶³⁵ (5) sequential aphorisms attributed to specific authors to guarantee their reliability and authority;⁶³⁶ and (6) maxims with narrative frameworks.

Matthew contains seven types and forms of aphorisms: (1) *makarisms* or beatitudes (5:3–13); (2) whoever or one who says sayings (ὅς ἄν or ὅστις ἄν; 12:50; 16:24–26; 18:6);⁶³⁷ (3) conditional sayings (ἐὰν . . . ἐάν; 12:25); (4) synonymous couplets (7:16–17; 10:24–25, 26–27, 41; 12:30); (5) antithetical and paradoxical aphorisms (19:30; 20:16);⁶³⁸ (6) wisdom admonitions (5:25–26, 44–45; 7:1–2, 7–8, 13–14; 10:28);⁶³⁹ and (7) aphoristic sentences (8:20; 10:24, 26; 16:21, 25; 19:23–24; 20:16; 23:12; 24:37–39).⁶⁴⁰

In ancient societies, aphorisms, such as parables, typically functioned to articulate and preserve traditional values and norms by expressing conservative truths refracted through particular situations; i.e. divine rule and justice is the core of proverbial wisdom.⁶⁴¹ In addition, the use of Jewish scriptures in these poetic compositions is mostly implicit.

Scriptural base texts act as sources for the phraseology of the new composition, which in its final form can often read as if it is a kind of allusive anthology of memorable scriptural phrases. With regard to poetic interpretation, one important matter needs explicit mention, and that concerns the extent to which it is possible to be sure that the poet was consciously alluding to particular biblical phrases and their contexts, or whether the writing of poetry in the late Second Temple period was largely a matter of playing games with one's memory, only some of which one's audience might ever appreciate.⁶⁴²

This use of scriptures is less clear as a poet uses, reuses and exegetically renews a particular base text. They use catchwords from the alluded text. The blessings are a

⁶³⁴ See J.D. Williams, *Those Who Ponder Proverbs: Aphoristic Thinking and Biblical Literature* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1981), 78–80; Crossan, *In Fragments*, 18–25.

⁶³⁵ A feature that is implicit in sentences and questions, and explicit in admonitions.

⁶³⁶ Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 292–94.

⁶³⁷ Crossan, *In Fragments*, 67–75. Cf. Exod 21:12; 35:2; Lev 15:10, 19; Num 31:19; Prov 9:4, 16; 12:1; 20:1; Sir 3:3–6, 16, 26, 31; 4:12, 13, 15.

⁶³⁸ L.G. Perdue, “The Wisdom Sayings of Jesus,” *Forum* 2.3 (1986): 3–35, esp. 9–10.

⁶³⁹ This focuses on exhortation and consists of a clause typically followed by a supportive clause (Matt 5:25–26, 44–45; 6:19–21, 25; 7:1–2, 7–8; 13–14). See J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke* (AB 28, 28A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981–85), 956.

⁶⁴⁰ These are generally declarative statements in the indicative mood that encapsulates general insights (8:20; 10:24, 26, 41; 12:35; 16:21, 25; 18:20; 19:23–24, 30; 24:27–28). See M. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection*, 78.

⁶⁴¹ Williams, *Those Who Ponder Proverbs*, 17, 36, 40.

⁶⁴² Brooke, “Biblical Interpretation at Qumran,” 309–10.

thoroughly suitable collection of phrases and sentences from a range of prophetic and poetic passages woven together to make a new whole that has the cumulative force of all the allusions together (cf. 1QH^a 12:22–23; Isa 52:13–53:12).⁶⁴³

Allegorical interpretation (ἀλληγορία),⁶⁴⁴ a figurative way of interpreting texts, falls under the umbrella of anthological interpretation and overlaps with typology and *midrash*. It is often a rhetorical strategy that uses brief comments framed in figurative and metaphorical language to say something different than what one means. It usually generalizes a text so that it has universal application. For example, CD 3:16 and 6:3–10 allegorizes the *Song of the Well* in Num 21:18 in reference to seek meaning in the Torah (cf. *Sobr.* 2.271).⁶⁴⁵ Similarly, allegorical interpretation is found with Paul in Gal 4:24 with the story of Hagar and Sarah, who are interpreted figuratively to represent two differing seeds.⁶⁴⁶

Some of Jesus' parables are allegories—extended or continued metaphors—to be interpreted with meaning assigned to details narrated in the parables.⁶⁴⁷ Most notably is the parable of the sower, the weeds among the wheat, and the net with allegorical interpretations given to each of them by Jesus (Matt 13).⁶⁴⁸

4. Conclusion

I have attempted to lay the foundation for Jesus' Parable Discourse by outlining and determining Matthew's anthological and allegorical scribal activity in presenting Jesus as a sage-king. As the wise king who is greater than Solomon, Jesus uses parables to hide and reveal truths concerning the kingdom of heaven from everyday experiences. Matthew, as a scribe, presents Jesus as a sage-king who reveals and hides the *mysteries* of the kingdom of heaven by speaking in parables.

⁶⁴³ Brooke, "Biblical Interpretation at Qumran," 311.

⁶⁴⁴ Literally "other speaking" or speaking otherwise than one seems to say.

⁶⁴⁵ In addition, CD 1:16 and Philo in *Spec.* 4.149–50 allegorize Deut 19:14.

⁶⁴⁶ Similarly, in 1 Cor 5:6 (little yeast); 1 Cor 9:9–10 (ox); 1 Cor. 10:1–5 (spiritual rock; cf. Num 21:17); and Gal 5:9 (practice of circumcision).

⁶⁴⁷ *Mashal* (משל) can be both allegory and parable as they were not sharply differentiated. See Raymond E. Brown, "Parable and Allegory Reconsidered," in *New Testament Essays* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1965), 324. This is contrary to Adolf Jülicher (*Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* [2 vols; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2nd ed. 1899–1910] 1.61, 74) who discredited allegorical interpretation by claiming parables contain only one point.

⁶⁴⁸ Interpreters of parables find it difficult to avoid allegorical interpretation due to its polyvalent character.

IV. JESUS' PARABLE DISCOURSE (13:1–58)

1. Introduction

Jesus is a sage-king who uses parables as sapiential stories about the kingdom of heaven to hide and reveal.⁶⁴⁹ Matthew 13 contains parables, often presented in groups of three, to reinforce Jesus' identity as the wise king, who reveals present and eschatological truths concerning the kingdom of heaven. Different from the other discourses, Jesus' Parable Discourse has numerous interruptions with changes in audience oscillating between the crowds and the disciples (13:1, 10, 34, 36).

In the context of Israel's growing rejection of Jesus and questions regarding his identity by John the Baptist, Jesus cryptically answers by describing his present activity by paraphrasing Isa 61:1 (11:2–6; cf. 11:2–13:58). When asked for a sign by the scribes and Pharisees, Jesus again only cryptically offers them the sign of the prophet Jonah and condemns them due to their inability to recognize him as someone greater than Jonah and Solomon (12:38–42). In addition, healings and exorcisms are central to this section, with Jesus' power over demons and Beelzebul paralleled with the parable of the thief and the strong man (12:22–32).⁶⁵⁰

2. Literary Structure

Matthew 11:2–13:53 can be taken as a structural unit: beginning with the disciples of John the Baptist's inquiry to Jesus, "Are you the one who is to come, or are we to wait for another (11:3)?" and ending with Jesus' Parable Discourse.⁶⁵¹ By beginning with Jesus' sitting posture in speaking to the crowds, his authority as he teaches about the kingdom of heaven in parables (παραβολαῖς) is emphasized (13:1–2).

⁶⁴⁹ Three references to σοφία in Matthew (11:19; 12:42; 13:54).

⁶⁵⁰ Also included are the sign of Jonah (12:38–42) and a discussion regarding the return of unclean spirits (12:43–45). Jesus' divine power sweeps away the effect of evil but if people do not respond then the evil one will return with greater and more devastating effect.

⁶⁵¹ This includes: (1) woes to unrepentant cities of Chorazin and Bethsaida (11:20–24); (2) Jesus' gratitude to God his father (25–30); (3) plucking grain and lawfulness on the Sabbath (12:18); (4) Jesus heals man with a withered hand and lawfulness on the Sabbath (12:9–14); (5) Jesus as God's chosen servant from Isaiah (12:15–21); (6) Jesus accused of being Beelzebul, and a tree and its fruit (12:22–37); (7) scribes and Pharisees ask for a sign, and return of an unclean spirit (12:38–45); (8) true family of Jesus (12:46–50); and (9) the third discourse (13:1–53).

Figure 6: Literary Structure of Jesus' Parable Discourse (13:1–53)

- I. Introduction: Jesus use of Parables (13:1–3a)
 - a. Parable of the Sower (13:3b–9)
 - b. Explanation of Jesus' use of Parables (13:10–17)
 - c. Explanation of Parable of the Sower (13:18–23)
 - a¹. Three Parables: Parable of the Weeds, Mustard Seed and Leaven (13:24–33)
 - b¹. Explanation of Jesus' use of Parables (13:34–35)
 - c¹. Explanation of Parable of the Weeds (13:36–43)
 - a². Three Parables: Parable of the Treasure, Pearl and Net (13:45–50)
 - b². Jesus' teaches about Scribes (13:51–52)
 - c². MISSING
- II. Conclusion: “When Jesus finished these parables...” (13:53)

Jesus' Parable Discourse structure seems to highlight four features: (1) parables are grouped into threes;⁶⁵² (2) both Jesus and Matthew give an explanation of Jesus' use of parables by citing Isa 6:9–10 and Ps 78:2 (13:14–15, 35); (3) Jesus in c and c¹ gives explanations to the parable of the sower and weeds but with c² no explanation is needed for Jesus' disciples because they, as scribes, have been trained for the kingdom of heaven; and (4) all the parables are about the kingdom of heaven with people's various responses to it and the results of either accepting or rejecting it: the disciples understand and accept while the crowds do not understand and reject it.

⁶⁵² See Wesley G. Olmstead, *Matthew's Trilogy of Parables: The Nation, the Nations and the Reader in Matthew 21:28–22:14* (SNTS 127; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Jöran Friberg, “Numbers and Counting,” (ABD; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 4.1140–46; Gerhard Delling, “τρεῖς, τρίς, τρίτος,” *TDNT* 8.216–225; S. Mowinckel, *Real and Apparent Tricola in Hebrew Psalm Poetry* (Avhandling 2; Oslo: 1957). Matthew deliberately uses numbers (1:1–17; 10:41; 11:7–9). He seems to group Jesus' parables into threes. Threes are not only in parables, but also in stories with three gifts (2:11), three servants (25:14–30), three steps of discipline (18:15–17), and threefold prayer in Gethsemane (26:44). The number three is a cultic feature of Israel's law and calendar: three annual festivals (Exod 23), periods of three days (Gen 30:36), sacrificial animals are to be three years old (Gen 15:9), and three months (Exod 2:2). Specifically, in wisdom literature, there is a propensity for threes (Sir 25:1ff): either as it expanded from twos (Sir 23:16; 26:28; 50:25), develops into fours (Sir 26:5; Prov 30:18, 21, 29), and used in sequences: 2, 3, and 4 (Prov 30:15). In the Scrolls, there are three nets of Belial (fornication, wealth and desecration of the sanctuary; CD 4:14–18; 6:10–11), and three ranks of priest, elders and people (1QS 6:8f). In addition, threefold utterances of a saying emphasize its validity in a prophetic word (Isa 6:11), and three is a number of completeness (Isa 24:17).

V. MATTHEW'S PURPOSE:
REVEALING AND HIDING THE MYSTERY OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN

1. Introduction

Jesus, in line with wisdom tradition, uses parables⁶⁵³ as illustrative stories or mini-dramas with usually two levels of meaning. Parables begin with an introductory formula, followed by a presentation of characters and setting, and end with a crisis developing and resolving.⁶⁵⁴ Typically, parables, by making their points by means of comparison or analogy (metaphor), use an everyday situation often with an unusual action that draws attention to a particular point.⁶⁵⁵

Matthew presents Jesus' parables in clusters accentuating his authority as the sage-king (cf. 7:28–29; 13:54). Jesus' characteristic mode of teaching is therefore indirect and metaphorical as he expounds the kingdom of heaven. Matthew 13 specifically provides insight into God's rule as parables are grouped together. The parable of the sower indicates that the kingdom involves the presentation of a message and the necessity of a response that leads to productive living. Also, several parables are designed to answer questions from Jesus' hearers about his claims that the kingdom is present. For example: (1) the parable of the mustard seed and leaven (How can the kingdom be present if the results seem so small?); and (2) the parable of the wheat and the weeds (How can the kingdom have come if evil is still present?). The kingdom is present and growing even in the midst of evil, and judgment will take place in the future.

2. Purpose of Parables and Use of Scripture

Both Jesus and Matthew explicitly state the purpose of parables by quoting from Isaiah and Psalms: Jesus quotes Isa 6:9–10 (cf. 13:14–15)⁶⁵⁶ and Matthew quotes Ps 72:2 (cf. 13:35).⁶⁵⁷ Isaiah 6:9–10⁶⁵⁸ seems to be directed to the crowds, as well as the scribes and the

⁶⁵³ Parable(s) occurs twelve times in Matt 13 with five other occurrences (13:3, 10, 13, 18, 24, 31, 33, 34(2x), 35, 36, 53; 15:15; 21:33, 45; 22:1; 24:32).

⁶⁵⁴ B.H. Young, *Jesus and His Jewish Parables* (New York: Paulist, 1989).

⁶⁵⁵ J.W. Sider, "Rediscovering the Parables: The Logic of the Jeremias Tradition," *JBL* 102 (1983): 61–83.

⁶⁵⁶ Isaiah 6:9–10 is also quoted in John 12:40 and Acts 28:26–27.

⁶⁵⁷ Psalm 72 is a review of Israel's history.

⁶⁵⁸ Matthew's question is simply about teaching and not ambiguous as it is in Mark. Therefore Matthew's purpose is to conceal and Mark's purpose is to reveal. Jesus seems to speak in parables to divide those who are able to know the secrets of the kingdom and those who do not. Although the parable of the sower is based on Mark, it is modified. Disciples ask a question: "Why do you

Pharisees, and emphasizes the hiddenness of Jesus' message and identity, as they do not understand or perceive what is happening.⁶⁵⁹ Psalm 72:2 seems to validate Jesus' use of parables as a mode of revelation of what was "hidden from the foundation of the world."⁶⁶⁰

In addition, parables seem to have five other purposes. First, as aphorisms, they are inherently pluri-significant and polyvalent.⁶⁶¹ They are pliable and their interpretation is determined by its context.⁶⁶²

The meaning of parables and their metaphorical possibilities are not inherent properties of the parables as freestanding works of art but rather depend upon the narratives in which they are embedded or upon the nonliterary contexts into which we attempt to place them. Jesus' parables were not intended primarily as teaching in themselves, but as instruments to be used in teaching.⁶⁶³

While they cannot mean just anything, they can continue to provoke interpretations that are not quite identical. That means that different and multiple meanings of the same parable can exist. This is somewhat evident when the same parable can have different meanings due to the context and minor changes (i.e. parable of the talents and pounds).

Second, parables are not simply information about the kingdom, but are part of the means of bringing it to birth. One is not removed from the parable but as part of the primary activity itself invites people in the new reality that is being created, and warns them of terrible consequences if the invitation is refused.⁶⁶⁴ Jesus' parables are not only instructive but can also be polemically addressing social or political injustices, as William Herzog states:

“speak to them in parables?” Jesus' answer differs (“to you has been given to know the secrets of the kingdom of heaven” and “for this reason I speak to them in parables”) because ὄτι in Matthew rather than ἵνα in Mark. Matthew 13:35 states the fulfilment of Ps 78:2.

⁶⁵⁹ Matthew has Jesus quote Isa 6:9–10 as a description of those who do not see or understand; i.e. the crowds are incapable of comprehending, because their hearts have become dull, their ears hard of hearing and their eyes closed. Isaiah's words of judgment in his days are now for those who do not accept Jesus' message and teaching. However, the disciples do understand Jesus and his message (13:11, 23, 51).

⁶⁶⁰ Parables are revelatory, but not all hear, see and understand them.

⁶⁶¹ Mary A. Tolbert, *Perspectives on the Parables: An Approach to Multiple Interpretations* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 35.

⁶⁶² See Jacobus Liebenberg, *The Language of the Kingdom and Jesus: Parable, Aphorism, and Metaphor in the Sayings Material Common to the Synoptic Tradition and the Gospel of Thomas* (BZNW 102; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000). E.g. Matt 13 and the Gospel of Thomas construe the same parables in different ways (cf. parable of talents and pounds; Matt 25:14–30; Luke 19:11–27).

⁶⁶³ Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, 117–18.

⁶⁶⁴ N.T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1996), 176.

Jesus used parables to present situations familiar to the rural poor, to encode the systems of oppression that controlled their lives and held them in bondage.... The parable, then, was not primarily a vehicle to communicate theology or ethics but a codification designed to stimulate social analysis and to expose the contradictions between the actual situation of its hearers and the Torah of God's justice.⁶⁶⁵

The primary focus of the parables is the coming of the kingdom of heaven and the resulting discipleship that is required, especially acts of mercy (18:33). With the inauguration of the presence of the kingdom of heaven, Jesus uses the image of plundering the house of a strong man. To enter and plunder the house, one must first bind the strong man. Clearly, Jesus viewed one of his purposes as binding Satan and plundering his house (12:29).

Third, concerning the *Last Days*, Matthew's parables of judgment point to separation between those who are obedient, faithful, prepared and merciful, and to those who are not. The first group enters the kingdom and the other suffers punishment and destruction. The parable of the wedding affirms that all is ready and people should come now, but it also points to those who refuse to respond to Jesus' message (22:1–14). These future-orientated parables are not intended to satisfy curiosity but to alter people's present living. By focusing on judgment and the master's return, the purpose of these parables is to encourage faithfulness, wisdom and preparation (24:45–51; 25:1–13; 25:14–30).

Fourth, parables are also performance: they are not merely words of invitation, but also make the offer.⁶⁶⁶ Parables are not merely illustrations of Jesus' admonition, but are themselves admonitions: provocative in that they do not just contain interesting and suggestive facts, but also exhortation and warning. They are to be engaged and lived out. Parables demand interpretation—they point to something else. They hold up one reality to serve as a mirror to another (i.e. kingdom of heaven). Jesus told parables to confront people with the character of God's kingdom and to invite them to participate in it and to live in accordance with it.

Compared to Mark 4:10–12, which is the exact opposite of Matthew, Jesus gives the secret of the kingdom only to his disciples. Jesus reveals in Matt 13:13—not ἵνα (in order that) but ὅτι (because). Hardness of heart and lack of receptivity in Isa 6:9–10 is mirrored in Jesus' ministry. Parables hide in order to reveal. Even though some would respond with hardness of heart and lack of hearing, Jesus taught in parables to elicit hearing and obedient response.

⁶⁶⁵ William R. Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech: Jesus as Pedagogue of the Oppressed* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994), 27–28.

⁶⁶⁶ B.F. Meyer, *The Aims of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1979), 162.

Fifth, parables emphasize the disciples as scribes and their ability to reveal the *mystery* of the kingdom of heaven. In the structure of Matt 13, following the symmetrical parallelism of this discourse, one would expect some explanation from Jesus, but there is instead a discussion concerning scribes.

“Have you understood all this?” They answered, “Yes.” And he said to them, “Therefore every scribe who has been trained for the kingdom of heaven is like the master of a household who *throws out* of his treasure what is new and what is old” (Matt 13:51–52).

This formalized arrangement, typical of wisdom material, indicates the purpose of Jesus’ use of parables: for his disciples’ training and benefit to know and reveal Jesus’ message concerning the kingdom of heaven.

Most commentators translate ἐκβάλλω as “bring out,” but it is commonly translated as “cast away” or “throw out.” This change in meaning shifts Jesus and the disciples’ action as throwing out all that is new and old (cf. 13:44–46). All of the disciples’ treasures are to be thrown out due to Jesus and his message, and their scribal training for the kingdom of heaven.⁶⁶⁷

In a good Matthaean pattern, the kingdom transforms from being the treasure, to the quest for the treasure, and then on to the lifestyle of the disciples. That lifestyle is then challenged in what follows, with a discussion of Jesus’ lack of honour within his own community (13:53–58) and the death of the Baptist (14:1–12). Within such talk of the lifestyle of the disciple in terms of self-deprivation, dishonour, and sacrifice, the normal interpretation of this passage as a reference to a prosperous householder having the luxury to select ‘new and old’ from amongst his stores seems out of place. Instead, the startling image of the householder emptying his treasury fits well into this revolutionary context where values are turned upside-down and where people who come to listen to Jesus often leave more confused than when they came (Mt. 13:53–58).⁶⁶⁸

Lena Lybaek understands Matt 13:52 with old and new as a combination of Jewish scriptures and Jesus’ tradition with Jesus’ fulfilment of scripture either to surpass or stand in continuity.⁶⁶⁹ However, everything they knew of the Jewish scriptures, past and present interpretations, are to be thrown out.

⁶⁶⁷ Peter Phillips, “Casting out the Treasure: A New Reading of Matthew 13.52,” *JSNT* 31.1 (2008): 3–24.

⁶⁶⁸ Phillips, “Casting out the Treasure,” 21.

⁶⁶⁹ Lena Lybaek, *New and Old in Matthew 11–13: Normativity in the Development of Three Theological Themes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), 247–48.

Sixth, in examining Matthew's parables, John S. Kloppenborg concludes that Matthew is not concerned with the original.⁶⁷⁰

Matthew's redaction, then, both makes the interlocutors a more prominent and internal part to the unit by heightening the elements of dialogue and, because the dialogue is more prominent, heightens the element of public shaming. Twice the opponents are out-manoeuvred by Jesus in public debate, being forced into a position where they are first compared unfavourably to sinners and prostitutes and then with murderous tenants and ignorant builders.⁶⁷¹

In addition, Kloppenborg suggests that Matthew's parables have three main interests.⁶⁷² (1) There is confrontation with the ruling elite associated with the temple (or Pharisees as interpreters of the Torah). (2) The parable of the tenants is used as an apologetic and allegory of salvation history, providing an explanation for the destruction of Jerusalem. With the dispatching of troops to destroy these murderers and burn their city, Matt 22:7 (rewriting Mark 12:9) provides an aetiology of the Temple's destruction featuring the Deuteronomistic trope of God sending the prophets, who are persistently rejected and even killed (21:35, 36, 39; 22:6) and the elite not delivering the harvest of the kingdom (21:34, 41, 43; cf. 22:11–13). (3) Parables are didactic or hortatory with the harvest (good works or righteousness) being something that is owed to God. This is a call to righteousness.

3. Conclusion

The primary purpose of Matthew's scribal emphasis on Jesus' use of parables is to hide and reveal the *mystery* of the kingdom of heaven and to place Jesus within the sphere of wisdom traditions. Therefore: (1) Parables and riddles require wisdom (allegorical and anthological interpretation), which is only possible through Jesus as he reveals and interprets the mystery of the kingdom of heaven. (2) Matthew structures chapter 13 (anthological clustering) by expounding on the kingdom of heaven to explain his purpose of speaking in parables (cf. Isa 6:9–11; Ps 72:2) and to reveal his self-understanding as a

⁶⁷⁰ John S. Kloppenborg (*The Tenants in the Vineyard: Ideology, Economics, and Agrarian Conflict in Jewish Palestine* [Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2006], 180, 88, 97) highlights Matthew's literary art (based in Mark): improved connectives, condensation, elimination of parataxis and enhanced dialogue.

⁶⁷¹ Kloppenborg, *Tenants*, 176.

⁶⁷² Kloppenborg, *Tenants*, 198.

scribe, which gives him authority to interpret them.⁶⁷³ (3) Matthew portrays Jesus as a sage-king by using Solomonic traditions.⁶⁷⁴

VI. CONCLUSION

Matthew as a scribe uses parables. Parables, like riddles, have a hidden aspect to them that requires interpretation. Matthew's use of parables reveals allegorical and anthological interpretation as it utilizes wisdom traditions (e.g. two ways metaphor, Solomon). Corresponding to Solomon, Jesus is a sage-king and an interpreter of parables, but "greater than" Solomon because of his obedience to Torah so that wisdom is not only understood but also obeyed. Matthew significantly expands Mark's parables to reveal the *mysterion* of the kingdom of heaven (*raz* in some wisdom texts) to his disciples: "scribes trained in the kingdom of heaven," and to hide it from those who do not "hear" and "understand."

Looking forward to chapter 7, it seems that parables and prophecies, as well as dreams, are different vehicles or types of communication for something that is hidden and unknown, and requires interpretation and revelation. For parables, common metaphors are used to communicate its message, which requires a sage to interpret, while for prophecy and dreams, divine revelation is used to communicate its message, which requires a diviner or seer to interpret; however, both are concerned with the kingdom of heaven. In a way, one reveals from the bottom (common human existence) and the other from the top (divine impartations) with both requiring an interpreter.

⁶⁷³ See Douglas S. McComiskey, "Exile and the Purpose of Jesus' parables (Mark 4:10–12; Mat 13:10–17; Luke 8:9–10)" *JETS* 51.1 (2008): 59–85.

⁶⁷⁴ Jesus' kingship is found in the parables of Matt 24–25.

CHAPTER SEVEN

MATTHEW'S USE OF FULFILMENT QUOTATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the aspect of Matthew as a scribe that I will focus on is the explicit fulfilment and formula quotations scattered throughout the Gospel.⁶⁷⁵ Along a similar line of thought as the *mystery* of the kingdom of heaven in chapter 6, Matthew uses these quotations to interpret and disclose divine revelation, as well as to contemporize the Hebrew prophets.

Three key ideas emerge from Matthew's explicit citations from the prophets throughout the Gospel. First, Matthew seems to be familiar with Hellenistic Near Eastern divination practices and utilizes, as well as adapts, some of their techniques in his use of dream-visions, signs (omens), and explicit fulfilment quotations. Second, Matthew, as a scribe like Joseph, Daniel and Enoch, has the ability to acquire divine revelation by reading dreams and interpreting the scriptures. Third, Matthew's use of fulfilment quotations outside the narrative can be understood as functioning like *peshet*, in that it actualizes and contemporizes the Jewish scriptures of the prophets in the person of Jesus for the early church community.

II. MATTHEW AND DIVINATION

1. Overview

This section gives an overview of Matthew's familiarity with Hellenistic Near Eastern divination practices, which he seems to adapt and employ. Matthew weaves various features of divination as divine revelation throughout the Gospel: signs and omens reveal God's power and authority in Jesus; dream-visions reveal God's approval and protection of Jesus; and the fulfilment (πληρώω) of prophecy or oracles reveal God's divine plan in Jesus, his royal messiah, and the kingdom of heaven.

⁶⁷⁵ In differentiating between fulfilment and formula quotations, see section 7.4.

Before delving into these three aspects of divine revelation, it should be noted that Matthew's knowledge of divinatory practices is strengthened by including μάγοι from the east, heavenly messengers, and blessings and curses. The μάγοι from the east seem to be astrologers who have divined the skies. They have interpreted the appearance of a star as a sign from heaven for the birth of the *King of the Jews*, which they have followed to the palace of King Herod. They inquire of this new king's exact location to which the chief priest and scribes of the people quote the prophet Micah (2:5; cf. Micah 5:2). This juxtaposition of astrology with an explicit citation from the prophet Micah within the narrative emphasizes the "divine" hand and the significance of Jesus' birth as the king. Also, Matthew seems to justify the actions of the μάγοι as astrologers and diviners with no ethical evaluation or prohibition in their paying homage to Jesus and with God's warning not to return to Herod through a dream (2:12).⁶⁷⁶

In addition, a number of sightings of heavenly messengers emphasizes divine revelation and aid: the angel of the Lord appears to Joseph in a dream (1:20, 24; 2:13, 19); angels attend Jesus after he is tested in the wilderness (4:11); Jesus mentions angels in a number of eschatological situations (13:41, 41, 49; 16:27; 24:31; 25:31, 41) and as protecting the little ones (18:10); Jesus, while being arrested acknowledges his ability to call on twelve legions of angels (26:53); the angel of the Lord descends from heaven and rolls back the stone of Jesus' tomb (28:2); and an angel speaks to the women at the empty tomb (28:5). Matthew also has several instances of the Satan (devil) and demons woven throughout the narrative.⁶⁷⁷

Furthermore, another form of divination or magic arising from the royal court or temple is blessings and curses, as Ann Jeffers acknowledges:

After the establishment of the Jerusalem cultus, the powers of blessing and cursing were centred in the person of the king, the priesthood of the royal court and the cult prophets. It was in the cultic sphere that the basic understanding of blessing was developed. Yahweh was understood to be the source of all blessings; blessings were given in his name.⁶⁷⁸

⁶⁷⁶ Furthermore, although Mic 5:2 does not mention the Messiah, it combines Jesus' birth with the anticipation of God's reign.

⁶⁷⁷ Cf. 4:1–11; 7:22; 8:16, 31; 9:33–34; 10:8; 11:18; 12:24, 27–28; 15:22; 17:18.

⁶⁷⁸ Ann Jeffers, *Magic and Divination in Ancient Palestine and Syria* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 249.

Therefore, blessings and curses somewhat blur the sharp distinction between the religious and magical world with the origin of its power being either divine or human.⁶⁷⁹ The origins of the magical practice of the incantations of blessings and curses can be seen in their formulations with its rhythmic organization, and antithetical parallelism, and repletion to strengthen the force of the utterance.⁶⁸⁰ In the Northwest Semitic world, blessings and curses were a fixed part of the cultus and had a prominent place in everyday life.⁶⁸¹ Matthew, as well as the Hebrew prophets, has a rhythmic set of “blessing” and “woe” formulas directed not only to the scribes and Pharisees but also to certain cities (5:1–12; 23:13–36; 11:20–24; cf. Isa 29:1; Jer 13:27; Nah 3:1; Zeph 3:1). Moreover, in his instructions on prayer, Jesus criticizes the Gentiles’ incantations in heaping up empty phrases with many words to be heard by the gods (6:7). Although seen negatively, this manipulative or coercive strategy can be seen as a divinatory practice as it attempts to secure divine favour by influencing the course of nature and compelling spiritual forces to act.⁶⁸²

In addition to these aspects, I will briefly examine signs and omens, dream-visions, and the fulfilment of oracles and prophecy, which seem to place Matthew comfortably in the realm of divination and magic.

2. Signs and Omens

Matthew has 13 occurrences of signs and omens (σημεῖον and τέρας or תּוֹאָ) with nine instances found in connection with two separate requests for a sign from Jesus. The first request comes from the scribes and Pharisees when they said to him, “‘Teacher, we wish to see a sign (σημεῖον) from you.’ But he answered them, ‘An evil and adulterous generation asks for a sign, but no sign will be given to it except the sign of the prophet Jonah (τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωάνᾳ τοῦ προφήτου)’” (12:38–39). The second request comes from the Pharisees and Sadducees:

The Pharisees and Sadducees came, and to test Jesus they asked him to show them a sign from heaven. He answered them, “When it is evening, you say, ‘It will be

⁶⁷⁹ It seems that the difference between the magical and religious worlds is that the words (blessings and curses) are placed in the control of practitioners to accomplish their purposes for magic and in effect control the deity.

⁶⁸⁰ Herbert C. Brichto, *The Problem of “Curse” in the Hebrew Bible* (JBLMS 13; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1963) 5.

⁶⁸¹ Jeffers, *Magic and Divination*, 244.

⁶⁸² H.S. Versnel, “Magic,” in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (3rd ed.; eds. S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 909.

fair weather, for the sky is red.’ And in the morning, ‘It will be stormy today, for the sky is red and threatening.’ You know how to interpret the appearance of the sky, but you cannot interpret the signs of the times (τὸ μὲν πρόσωπον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ γινώσκετε διακρίνειν, τὰ δὲ σημεῖα τῶν καιρῶν οὐ δύνασθε). An evil and adulterous generation asks for a sign, but no sign will be given to it except the sign of Jonah (τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ).” Then he left them and went away (16:1–4).

In rewriting the narratives from Q (Luke 11:16; 12:54–56; 11:29) and Mark 8:11–13, Matthew emphasizes signs. Rather than just the crowds in Luke 12:54 or just the Pharisees in Mark 8:11, Matthew targets all the religious authorities as they question Jesus’ authority (21:23). Matthew indicts the religious leaders as an evil and adulterous generation, because, even though they are able to interpret the appearance of the heavens (i.e. predict future weather), they cannot interpret the signs of the times.

In both instances, Jesus denies their requests, except for the sign of Jonah. This sign seems to be an explicit typological allusion to Jesus’ death and resurrection:

For just as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the sea monster, so for three days and three nights the Son of Man will be in the heart of the earth. The people of Nineveh will rise up at the judgment with this generation and condemn it, because they repented at the proclamation of Jonah, and see, something greater than Jonah is here! (12:40–41).

This pronouncement of judgment condemns the present generation’s leadership.

At stake in this pericope between Jesus and the religious leaders is the interpretation of signs, as well as the interpretation of the Jewish scriptures—specifically the Hebrew prophets (i.e. fulfilment quotations). Scott B. Noegel highlights omens and signs within the interpretive process of ancient diviners, and identifies words and texts as power by recognizing the cosmological foundations that inform the production of divinatory and prophetic (mantic) texts.⁶⁸³ These words and scripts, therefore, provide a contextual framework that permits the reader to see the interpretive process as ritual acts of performative power that legitimates and promotes the cosmological and ideological systems of the interpreter.

The exegesis of divine signs is often treated as if it were a purely hermeneutical act. However, recognizing the cosmological dimension of the spoken and written word naturally forces us to reconsider the ontological and ritual dimensions of the interpretive process. Indeed, I believe it is more accurate to think of the exegesis of divine signs as a ritual act, in some cases, as one chain in a link of ritual acts. In

⁶⁸³ Scott B. Noegel, “‘Sign, Sign, Everywhere a Sign’: Script, Power, and Interpretation in the Ancient Near East” in *Divination and the Interpretation of Signs in the Ancient World* (ed. Amar Annus; Oriental Institute Seminars 6; Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2010).

Mesopotamia, for example, exegesis could be preceded by extispicy or other ritual means for provoking omens and followed by *namburbû* rituals when something went wrong or the omen portended ill (Maul 1994). Therefore, the exegesis of divine signs is cosmologically significant and constitutes a performative act of power.⁶⁸⁴

Therefore, the process of the interpretation of signs is an act of power and writing (scribalism), which plays in shaping Ancient Near Eastern concepts of the divine.

Until one deciphers them, omens represent unbridled forms of divine power. While their meanings and consequences are unknown they remain liminal and potentially dangerous. The act of interpreting a sign seeks to limit that power by restricting the parameters of a sign's interpretation. A divine sign cannot now mean *anything*, but only *one* thing. Seen in this way, the act of interpretation—like the act of naming—constitutes a performative act of power; hence the importance of well-trained professionals and the secrecy in the transmission of texts of ritual power.⁶⁸⁵

The sign of Jonah is an act of power and a future omen in the narrative, as well as a past sign for the Matthean community. What is required for the religious leaders is to read and interpret the sign of Jonah properly as Jesus' death and resurrection. Therefore, Matthew's use of signs and omens places divine power and authority in Jesus with his ability to correctly read and interpret them.⁶⁸⁶

3. Dream-Visions

Matthew uses dream-visions as positive forms of divine revelation and communication (1:20–21; 2:12–13, 19–20, 22; 3:16–17; 17:1–9; 27:19; 28:2–7).⁶⁸⁷ I suggest that, by examining the six dreams and two visions (Jesus' baptism and transfiguration), they inform

⁶⁸⁴ Noegel, "Sign, Sign," 146–47.

⁶⁸⁵ Noegel, "Sign, Sign," 147

⁶⁸⁶ This is further highlighted by three instances of signs found in the eschatological discourse: (1) disciples ask about when and what will be the sign of Jesus coming and the end of the age (24:3); (2) Jesus warns his disciples against false messiahs who will produce signs (σημεῖα) and omens (τέρατα) to lead people astray (24:24); and (3) Jesus attests that the sign of "the *Son of Man* coming on the clouds of heaven" with power and glory will appear and then the whole earth will see it (24:30).

⁶⁸⁷ One could also include the post-resurrection appearances of Jesus (Matt 28:9–10, 16–20). Dreams and visions are two fluid concepts with many Greek words to describe dreams and vision: *apokalypsis*, *enypnion*, *epiphaneia*, *onar*, *oneiros*, *optasia*, *horama*, *horasis*, *opsis*, *phantasia*, *phantasma*, and *phasma*. Dreams and visions were considered messages from the divine while sleeping or awake with no sharp distinction between them with the same term describing both sleep and awake dream-visions. See John S. Hanson, "Dreams and Visions in the Graeco-Roman World and Early Christianity," (*ANRW* II/23.2; 1980), 1395–1427, esp. 1407–1408.

us of their significance and message within Matthew.⁶⁸⁸ Only Matthew actually contains the word ὄναρ (dream) in the New Testament. Acts 2:17 uses the ἐνὸπνιον and Jude 8 uses ἐνυπνιάζομαι derived from the natural process of sleep rather than ὄναρ.⁶⁸⁹ This again seems to intimate Matthew's ease with divinatory practices.

Dream-visions occur at key locations within the narrative. Five occur around Jesus' birth:

1. About to divorce Mary quietly, Joseph has a dream where an angel of the Lord appears to him and says, "Joseph, son of David, do not be afraid to take Mary as your wife, for the child conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit" (1:20).
2. The magicians are warned in a dream after seeing Jesus not to return to King Herod but to leave by another road (2:12).
3. Joseph has another dream where the angel of the Lord appears to him and says, "Get up, take the child and his mother, and flee to Egypt, and remain there until I tell you; for Herod is about to search for the child, to destroy him" (2:13).
4. When Herod dies, an angel of the Lord suddenly appears to Joseph in a dream in Egypt and says, "Get up, take the child and his mother, and go to the land of Israel, for those who were seeking the child's life are dead" (2:19–20).
5. Because Joseph was afraid to go to Judea because he heard that Archelaus was ruling there in place of his father Herod, he was warned in a dream so he went to the district of Galilee (2:22).

This cluster of dreams to Joseph and the magicians indicates the supernatural and divine elements surrounding Jesus' birth. This divine step-by-step movement is intended so that no harm comes to Jesus. Furthermore, at the crucial time of Jesus' trial before Pilate, his wife sends him a warning which she received in a dream: "Have nothing to do with that innocent man, for today I have suffered a great deal because of a dream about him (27:19)."

⁶⁸⁸ There are a number of types of dreams and visions: (1) message where a divine figure appears and relates a clear message; (2) auditory message in which a divine voice speaks with a clear message although no bodily form is visible; (3) symbolic message in which the divine message is coded in symbols needing interpretation by an authoritative interpreter; (4) waking revelation given to a sleeping dreamer and continues when the dreamer awakes; (5) visionary journey where the soul of a dreamer or visionary tours unreachable realms; and (6) apparitions of heavenly beings (Dan 10:4–12:13; 2 Bar. 6:4–7:1). See A. Leo Oppenheim, *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East With a Translation of an Assyrian Dream-Book* (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series, Vol. 46, No. 3; 1956), 186–206; Frances Flanner-Daily, *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests: Jewish Dreams in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras* (JSJSup 90; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 119, 170–200.

⁶⁸⁹ Albrecht Oepke, "ὄναρ," in *TDNT* 5.220–38.

The addition of Pilate's wife's dream highlights Matthew's special interest in the passion narrative of Jesus' innocence.⁶⁹⁰

Although he reorders and abbreviates Mark's material, Matthew generally follows his main source fairly closely. In his account of the Roman trial, however, Matthew has been much freer with Mark's account than usual. He has inserted the story of Judas' suicide between the account of the Sanhedrin's leading Jesus away and his standing before Pilate (27.3–10). He has also added the story of Pilate's wife's dream (27.19), Pilate washing his hands (27.24) and the cry of the Jewish crowd (27.25).⁶⁹¹

The responsibility of Jesus' death has shifted away from Judas and Pilate and onto all the people, including the chief priest and elders (27:25; Deut 19:19; Lev 20:9).⁶⁹² Pilate's wife's dream as divine communication emphasizes Jesus' innocence and prompts Pilate to attempt to release Jesus. However, due to the crowd's riotous response, he washes his hands of Jesus' innocent blood, believing in his wife's dream as divine revelation.

These dream-visions function as divine interruptions in the narrative, offering insights into the present situation and evoking a broader sense of God's work within Israel's history, often explicated by the Jewish scripture (cf. 1:22–23; 2:15, 17, 23). Therefore, both dream-visions and the Hebrew prophets function in tandem to emphasize and interpret divine actions within human experience and history. Moreover, not to miss Matthew's point but to emphasize its significance, there is sometimes a doubling of dream-visions and scriptural quotations.⁶⁹³

The name Joseph is significantly tied to dreams in Matthew, which seems to echo Joseph the dream interpreter in Genesis (1:20; 2:12–13, 19). In Matthew, the angel of the Lord only speaks directly to Joseph in directing his actions to marry Mary and flee from danger. The magicians and Pilate's wife do not seem to have direct dialogue but only recount their dream warnings. Joseph's direct communication from the angel of the Lord seems to emphasize the significance of Jesus' birth and the dangers of his identity as the king of the Jews.

Another form of dream-vision is Jesus' baptism and transfiguration: an experience that lacks any apparent visual element but can be strictly an auditory dream-vision (4:13–

⁶⁹⁰ Helen K. Bond, *Pontius Pilate in History and Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 124–29.

⁶⁹¹ Bond, *Pontius Pilate*, 123.

⁶⁹² Bond, *Pontius Pilate*, 125 n. 22.

⁶⁹³ Alfred Wikenhauser, "Doppelträume," *Biblica* 29 (1948): 100–11. For some more recent comments on this motif, see Flannery-Dailey, *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests*, 145. Examples of the Doppelträume in the Hebrew scriptures include Gen 37:5–9; 40:9–19; and 41:1–8.

17; 17:1–13; cf. Acts 9:10; 18:9). Jesus' baptism and transfiguration, as dream-visions, have the voice from heaven or a bright cloud with only Matthew using ὄραμα (vision) to describe the transfiguration, which is missing in Mark and Luke (17:9).

4. Fulfilment of Prophecy

Matthew the scribe emphasizes πληρόω (fulfilment) of prophecy (i.e. oracles) to signal the significance of Jesus' coming as king (cf. 10:41). Matthew explicitly presents Jesus' life, death and resurrection as being a fulfilment of the Jewish scriptures with explicit fulfilment quotations from the Hebrew prophets. These ten (or eleven) explicit fulfilment quotations, outside the narrative, act as a backbone to Jesus' life and ministry with one (or two) within the narrative supporting them.⁶⁹⁴ These explicit quotations, outside the narrative, seem to act as a running commentary to verify Jesus' identity and life as king within the narrative: all to signify Jesus as divine fulfilment of the Jewish scriptures. Moreover, Matthew frames the narrative of Jesus' ministry (words and actions) as foretold and as a fulfilment of the Jewish scriptures, at the beginning with his first discourse and at the end with his arrest (5:17–18; 26:52–56).⁶⁹⁵

5. Conclusion

Although there does seem to be a general anti-divinatory sentiment in the New Testament, Matthew utilizes various aspects of divination, as a late Second Temple scribe, to reveal and interpret the divine will in Jesus' identity and actions.⁶⁹⁶ Further evidence of divination is found with (1) Matthew's use of astrologers (magicians) from the east as interpreters of the heavens, (2) appearance of heavenly messengers and demonic forces, (3) blessings and curses as words of power, (4) signs and omens to authenticate Jesus' heavenly authority,

⁶⁹⁴ See IV. Matthew's Fulfilment Quotations.

⁶⁹⁵ Jesus also fulfils all righteousness in his baptism: "Let it be so now; for it is proper for us in this way to fulfil all righteousness" (3:15).

⁶⁹⁶ There does seem to be an anti-divinatory sentiment in Acts 16:16–18. The slave girl possessed by a spirit of divination (πνεῦμα πύθωνα) seems to be in reference to Apollo, the "Pythian" Greek god associated with the giving of oracles at the shrine of Delphi. Plutarch (*The Failure of Oracles*, 9.414e) calls such people "ventriloquists" (ἐγγαστρίμυθοι) with utterances that were not beyond their conscious control. The LXX has the same Greek word used of those who have a familiar spirit like the witch of Endor (1 Sam 28:7). In addition, μαντευομένη (oracles) in the LXX has strong negative connotation as it relates to false prophets (Deut 18:10; 1 Sam 28:8; 2 Kgs 17:17; Jer 34:9; Ezek 12:24). See *BDAG*, μαντεύομαι either has the meaning to practice divination, prophesy, divine, give an oracle of a soothsayer, possessed by a ventriloquistic spirit, or to consult a diviner or oracle (Jos 13:22; 1 Sam 6:2; Jer 36:8; Mic 3:7; Zech 10:2; Ac 16:16).

(5) dream-visions (ὄναρ and ὄραμα) to signify the importance of Jesus' identity, and (6) fulfilment of prophetic-oracles from the Jewish scriptures to reveal God's divine plan in Jesus. These divinatory features illuminate Matthew's self-understanding as a scribe, and sets his use of the Jewish scriptures within the context of late Second Temple scribal practices arising from Near Eastern divination practices: omens (Matthew's use of signs), dream-visions (Matthew's use of prophecy), and hepatoscopy (Matthew's use of explicit fulfilment quotations).

The remainder of this chapter will focus on these divinatory practices as the context of Matthew's method for using explicit fulfilment quotations. As a scribe, Matthew's purpose is to reveal the divine will by actualizing and contemporizing the Jewish scriptures (i.e. Hebrew prophets) in Jesus as the anticipated *Royal Messiah* who brings about the kingdom of heaven.

III. MATTHEW'S USE OF SCRIPTURE: DIVINATION AND PROPHECY

1. Introduction

The socio-historical context of late Second Temple scribal culture can account for Matthew's explicit fulfilment quotations. Arising from various divinatory practices of Hellenistic Near Eastern divination, late Second Temple scribal culture shares the same conceptual world of divine revelation. Although the language of prophecy rather than oracles, and signs rather than omens, is preferred in the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament, divination and magic, in the wider context of Hellenistic Near Eastern society, understood the universe to be symbolic and inundated with signs in nature. The divine will often corresponded to signs found in the human sphere, so diviners sought to interpret these signs and the magicians attempted to manipulate them.⁶⁹⁷

More than mechanical manipulation, the divinatory system, which was common to ancient eastern Mediterranean cultures, often articulated societal and institutional understandings and values.⁶⁹⁸ The purpose of divination as a system of knowledge and

⁶⁹⁷ Diviners, magicians and oracular practitioners were prevalent in society. See Jeffers, *Magic and Divination*, 251.

A large number of tablets that deal with divination and omens demonstrate their importance in Mesopotamia. See Wilson, *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980).

⁶⁹⁸ Writing in Mesopotamia and Egypt was only learned after long study. School for teaching scribes or training priests may have had specialized skills in divination. See Martti Nissinen, "Prophecy and Omen Divination: Two sides of the same coin," in *Divination and Interpretation of*

beliefs served to maintain the symbolic universe in a society; i.e. the conviction that things occurring on earth are not coincidental but managed by superhuman agents and reflecting decisions made in the world of gods or spirits. Divination assumed that the natural and supernatural spheres of reality were interlocked and necessitated an interpretation of the gods' involvement in human history and affairs. By observing everyday events (i.e. omens), it attempted to foretell the future through the interpretation of signs and was commonly practiced by the observing and interpreting of heavenly, tectonic or meteorological signs, the entrails of sacrificed animals, the flight or behaviour of birds, the casting of dice, the wearing of amulets, exorcisms and oracles.

Scribes created technical writings, "handbooks," as they collected, elaborated in detail, and systematized types of omens and processes of divination.⁶⁹⁹ Specialists existed in the areas of extispicy (including hepatoscopy), astrology and dreams as they read and interpreted the entrails of sacrificial animals, stars or dream-visions.⁷⁰⁰ One place for these specialists was the royal court, especially as the king wanted to know the will of the gods.⁷⁰¹

Especially in the royal context, divination was the medium through which the king was kept informed of his location within the divinely sanctioned order of the divine favors and obligations and the origin and legitimacy of his rule; this is what Beate Pongratz-Leisten aptly calls *Herrschaftswissen*.⁷⁰²

Through divination, the king is revealed "the secrets of the gods" with the prophets and other diviners functioning as intermediaries and channels of communication of divine knowledge. This was necessary for the king and nation to live in safety and to receive divine advice in times of crisis and uncertainty.

For ancient Israel and Second Temple Judaism, the fine line between divination that is prohibited and instances of God's intervention and revelation are somewhat a matter of

Signs (ed. Amar Annus; Oriental Institute Seminars 6; Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2010), 341.

⁶⁹⁹ See H.W.F. Saggs (*The Greatness that was Babylon* [New York: Mentor, 1962], 307) for the classification of different divinatory techniques.

⁷⁰⁰ Among the specialists, the preferred methods of divination were extispicy (the examination of the entrails of sacrificial animals) and hepatoscopy (the reading of animal livers). These early omens were part of a scholarly tradition that followed a standard pattern and employed a great deal of technical terminology. Omens based on celestial phenomena are attested as early as the Old Babylonian period, and by the beginning of the first millennium thousands of these omens had been assembled in the "canonical" series *Enuma Anu Enlil*. See Jeffers, *Magic and Divination*, 93–55.

⁷⁰¹ See A.L. Oppenheim, *Interpretation of Dreams in Ancient Near East*, 179–354.

⁷⁰² Nissinen, "Prophecy and Omen Divination," 345.

perspective.⁷⁰³ Although it seems like they have a negative attitude towards divination,⁷⁰⁴ some of their practices are perfectly acceptable as God regularly spoke through them (e.g. urim and thummim, ephod, dreams, and prophetic oracles).⁷⁰⁵ In addition, the Joseph narrative is a clear example of someone who practiced divination (Gen 44:5).⁷⁰⁶ Therefore, the fine distinction between divination that is prohibited and accepted is quite blurred with an increasing acceptance in some Second Temple texts.

2. Divination to Written Prophecy

Prophecy is communication and intermediation: “Prophecy is seen as a process of divine human communication, in which the prophet is the mediator between the divine and human worlds, transmitting divine messages to human recipients.”⁷⁰⁷ The development of written prophecy presupposes a community that adopts, repeats, interprets and reinterprets prophetic messages for its own purposes, therefore preserving its atomistic function. Scribes became increasingly important with the change from oral to written prophecy. This development corresponded with the aims and needs of Jewish communities that required

⁷⁰³ Examples may include: Abraham’s servant who uses prayer to divine God’s will and favour (Gen 24:10–14); Joshua crossing the Jordan and destroying the walls of Jericho (Josh 3–4; 6); the test for the conviction of a woman suspected of adultery (Num 5:11–31); and other prophets like Moses, Aaron, Elijah and Elisha, who did miraculous deeds.

⁷⁰⁴ See 1 Sam 28:6; Deut 18:9–14; Num 23:23; and Ezek 13. Josephus states the use of *pharmaka* (use of poison, potions and magical activities) is forbidden by the Jewish Torah (*Ant.* 4:279), but he also gives a positive description of a Jewish exorcist (*Ant.* 8:45–49). 1 Enoch provides a detailed list of all forbidden magical and divinatory technologies that were taught by the fallen angels to the daughters of men (7:1; 8:3).

⁷⁰⁵ Somewhat overlooked is that Joseph also practiced divination in the form of lecanomancy (observing the pattern of oil on water), which is not condemned in Gen 44:5, 15.

⁷⁰⁶ E.g. Joseph’s cup and the interpretation of dreams. Continued after Josiah’s reforms with private cults outside the official temple and priesthood existing and even thriving (Isa 65:1–7). Part of this cult attempted to gain revelations by means of necromancy (spending the night in tombs). Exodus 7–8 describes a sort of divine battle between the God of Israel and the Pharaoh of Egypt with Moses and Aaron against the Egyptian sorcerers and magicians (7:8–13). Deuteronomy 18:14–22 provides a prophet as a substitute for the soothsayers and diviner. Numbers 22–24 contains Balaam’s story of inquiring into the divine will, which seems to overlap divination, dreams and prophecy.

⁷⁰⁷ Martii Nissinen, “How Prophecy Became Literature,” *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 19 (2005): 154–55 (153–72).

skills to preserve, produce and transmit written documents (i.e. scribal culture consisting of scribes, priests and government officials).⁷⁰⁸

Ancient Near Eastern prophecy, like the Jewish scriptures, is preserved in written sources as literature, and includes oracle reports and collections, letters, inscription, literary works, cultic texts and word lists.⁷⁰⁹ Many envision the development of written prophecy beginning with the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple.⁷¹⁰ This stimulus produced the literary genre of prophecy as it grew out of the need to overcome the socio-religious crises caused by the destruction and the rebuilding of Jerusalem.⁷¹¹

In some ways, no sharp distinction exists between prophecy and divination. Prophecy as sub-set of divination. Although they are not entirely the same, Martii Nissinen argues that prophecy and omen divination share the same symbolic universe (i.e. conceptual, intellectual and ideological world) as they represent different ways of attaining the same goal of divine knowledge via divine communication.⁷¹² The human intermediary, the diviner or the prophet, is part of a chain of divine-human communication that transmits divine knowledge from their mouth, which can come in the form of astrology as they read the heavens, dream-visions as they read dreams, extispicy (or more specifically hepatoscopy) as they read the entrails or livers of sacrificed animals, and prophetic oracles.⁷¹³

In some ways, many conceptual aspects of divination including prophecy continued into late Second Temple literature. Mesopotamian astrology and divination in the Dead Sea

⁷⁰⁸ See Nissinen, “How Prophecy Became Literature,” 153–54; and Ehud Ben Zvi, “Introduction,” in *Writings and Speech in Israelite and Ancient Near Eastern Prophecy* (Society of Biblical Literature: Symposium Series 10; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 1–29.

⁷⁰⁹ See Martti Nissinen with contributions by C. L. Seow and R. K. Ritner, *Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East* (SBLWAW 12; Atlanta/Leiden, 2003); Ehud Ben Zvi, “The Prophetic Book: A Key Form of Prophetic Literature” in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century* (eds. M. A. Sweeney and E. Ben Zvi; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003).

⁷¹⁰ Nissinen, “How Prophecy,” 156.

⁷¹¹ Nissinen, “How Prophecy,” 157.

⁷¹² See Nissinen, “Prophecy and Omen Divination,” 342. Prophecy, in the Hebrew Bible, is the privileged way of God’s communication with humans, while other forms of divination are generally condemned (Lev 20:6; Deut 18:9–14; Isa 8:19); however, it is not censured altogether with dreams and with urim and thummim (Exod 28:30; Lev 8:8).

⁷¹³ See Seth Richardson, “On Seeing and Believing: Liver Divination and the Era of Warring States (II),” in *Divination and Interpretation of Signs* (ed. Amar Annus; Oriental Institute Seminars 6; Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago), 225–66.

Scrolls with brontologion (4Q318) and physiognomy (4Q186; 4Q561),⁷¹⁴ Noah's writings of anti-demonic remedies in a special book (Jub 10:10–14), and exorcist texts embedded in literary works (Noah's prayer in Jub 10:3–6; David's exorcism of Saul with a hymn in *LAB* 60; 4Q510–11; 11Q11; 4Q560; and the expulsion of Asmodeus in the book of Tobit) are all examples of putting these divinatory practices into writing.⁷¹⁵

Prophetic interpretation is rooted in divine revelation and legitimation—God himself granting divine insight—for a particular understanding of an authoritative text. David E. Aune lists four common aspects of prophetic interpretation or charismatic exegesis: it is commentary; it is inspired; it has an eschatological orientation; and it is a prevalent type of prophecy during the Second Temple period.⁷¹⁶ The *Pesharim* of the Dead Sea Scrolls, as well as Matthew's fulfilment quotations, also seem to share characteristics of prophetic interpretation: divinely inspired revelation with sacred texts and commentary separated from the text (narrative) and considered eschatological prophecy as the interpreter (or scribe) believes that they are living in the *Last Days*. Matthew blends narrative and discourse with outside commentary by inserting explicit fulfilment quotations from the Hebrew prophets; i.e. like the *Pesharim* (1:22; 2:15, 17, 23; 4:14; 8:17; 12:17; 13:35; 21:4; 27:9). As a scribe, Matthew, with the fulfilment of the Hebrew prophets, interprets and mediates them into the story of Jesus, giving it both divine authority and revelation, and revealing their true meaning.

3. Prophetic Scribes

Along the trajectory of Joseph, Daniel and Enoch, Matthew, as royal prophetic scribe, reveals and interprets the divine will through dreams and fulfilment quotations of the Hebrew prophets. Joseph's narrative is dominated by dreams and refers to him as a *master of dreams* (Gen 37:19). He not only dreamed them for himself but also interpreted them for the chief cupbearer and chief baker while in prison, and ultimately for Pharaoh to gain his prominent position in Egypt (Gen 40–41). Daniel is known as a wise man (חכים) and is

⁷¹⁴ Where one judges from each member's appearance how many shares of light and darkness they possess.

⁷¹⁵ The importance of exorcism is illustrated with it being the best-attested Jewish magical practice. This verbal activity was transmitted in written forms especially in hymns and adjurations to be recited over the demon-afflicted person or to ward off a perceived demonic attack. See papyri from Egyptian and Jewish exorcism embedded in PGM 4:3007–86.

⁷¹⁶ David E. Aune, *Apocalypticism, Prophecy, and Magic in Early Christianity* (reprint; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 280.

included with other diviners (magicians, enchanters, sorcerers and Chaldeans) in the royal court of King Nebuchadnezzar in Babylon (Dan 2:13; 12:3; cf. 2:2).⁷¹⁷ He is given divine wisdom to interpret dreams and visions and known as a *revealer of mysteries* (גלגא רזיג).⁷¹⁸

To you, O king, as you lay in bed, came thoughts of what would be hereafter, and the revealer of mysteries (גלגא רזיג) disclosed to you what is to be. But as for me, this mystery has not been revealed to me because of any wisdom that I have more than any other living being, but in order that the interpretation (פגשר) may be known to the king and that you may understand the thoughts of your mind (Dan 2:29–30).

These verses link the *revealer of mysteries* (גלגא רזיג) with dreams and interpretation (פגשר).⁷¹⁹ The mystery, most often given through dreams, needs to be interpreted (Dan 2:19, 28–30, 47). In addition, Daniel later becomes regarded as a prophet (cf. Matt 24:15; *Ant.* 10.11.7).

Like Daniel, Enoch interprets and communicates between heaven and earth through divine revelation and *mysteries*.⁷²⁰ He, as a scribe, sees and interprets dream-visions and speaks in parables (1 Enoch 1:1–3; 12:1–4; 13:4).⁷²¹ Vanderkam suggests that Enoch was modeled on the mythological figure of Enmeduranki, founder of the guild of diviners and omen interpreters.⁷²² Enmeduranki is said to have been shown “how to observe oil on water, a mystery of Anu, [Enlil and Ea], they gave him the table of the gods, the liver, a secret of heaven and [underworld].”⁷²³ These Babylonian diviners have their counterpart in

⁷¹⁷ Daniel is wise by being loyal to God and faithfully keeping the Jewish Torah, all the while being versed in every branch of literature and knowledge of the Babylonians (Dan 1:4). The משיכיליג is a sort of label for the wise Jew who remains faithful in the time of persecution during the Maccabean revolt and the designation of the leader-instructor in the Qumran community (Dan 11:33, 35; 12:3; cf. 1QS 3:13).

⁷¹⁸ This mantic wisdom links the techniques and terminology of dream interpretation, *peshar*, and the explanations of the meanings by angels in Jewish apocalyptic literature.

⁷¹⁹ Common terms רז and פגשר are similarly used in Daniel and the *Pesharim* as a method of prophetic interpretation (divinatory practice): both the object (dream or text) and the interpretation must be known (Dan 2:17–45).

⁷²⁰ S. Niditch, “The Visionary” in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism* (eds. J.J. Collins and G.W. Nickelsburg; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980), 153–79.

⁷²¹ Enoch is an expert in astrology who is given divine wisdom and revelation (*1 En.* 72:1; 93:2). And like Ben Sira, another scribe, travels to distant lands and like Matthew emphasizes parables (18:14; 22; 27; 32; cf. Sir 28:4).

⁷²² J. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1984), 23–51.

⁷²³ W.G. Lambert, “Enmeduranki and Related Matters,” *JCS* 21 (1967): 132. Scribes speculated on the movements of the stars, regarded dreams as revelation, and believed that the course of history and eschatology was inscribed on the tablets of heaven. See J.J. Collins, *Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (JSJSupp 54; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 342.

Second Temple scribes such as Daniel and Enoch.⁷²⁴ Although they reject most methods of divination and omens, they are interested in divine revelation and interpretation and have a high regard for dream-visions and *mysteries* by showing an interest in the stars and the heavenly tablets, and often ascending to heaven. In sum, these prophetic scribes (Joseph, Daniel and Enoch) are divine interpreters who bring together writing, the interpretation of dream-visions, and the interpretation of sacred texts. Similarly, Matthew can be seen among this group with his prophetic and eschatological interpretations.⁷²⁵

Furthermore, Josephus, a contemporary of Matthew, is a scribe, who considers himself a prophet (seer). He combines dreams and prophecies contained in the sacred books of the Hebrew prophets (*J.W.* 3:352).⁷²⁶ For him, the Hebrew prophets dealt with divine revelation:

No other religious specialist has such an abundance of material in the OT as the prophet. Prophets and their alleged pronouncements were clearly important to the OT tradents ... The individuals recognized as prophets in the text show a wide diversity of activity and characteristics. The one feature common to all the prophets is speaking in the name of god, usually Yhwh, and claiming to pass on a revelation from that god.⁷²⁷

Through the prophets, God revealed to Josephus the future catastrophes of the Jews and the events of the Roman emperors. While he was in prophetic ecstasy, the prophecy of the sacred books came to his mind as well as terrifying images of his dreams. He, just like Matthew, acknowledged the revelatory value of dreams and the importance of sacred written prophecies.⁷²⁸ Josephus and other wise men of his time were occupied with prophetic oracles from the past sacred texts, which they believed had direct bearing on their present situation. In sum, claiming to be a seer, a receiver of dreams and a diviner of the

⁷²⁴ However, VanderKam (*Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*, 62) notes the dissimilarity between the literature of divination and the apocalypses.

⁷²⁵ Collins (*Seers, Sybils and Sages*, 347, n. 25) describes 1 Enoch and Daniel as “mantic wisdom.”

⁷²⁶ See J.L. Blenkinsopp, “Prophecy and Priesthood in Josephus,” *JJS* 25 (1974): 239–62; L.H. Feldman, “Prophets and Prophecy in Josephus,” *JTS* 41 (1990): 386–422.

⁷²⁷ Lester L. Grabbe, *Priest, Prophets, Diviners, Sages: A Socio-historical Study of Religious Specialists in Ancient Israel* (Valley Forge, Penn: Trinity Press International, 1995), 99. Similarly, Greek prophets meaning “interpreter of the divine will, predictor of the future.”

⁷²⁸ Prophecy was highly valued throughout the Roman Empire during the first century CE (*J.W.* 6:300–309). Also, in discussing the Zealots, Josephus acknowledges the ambiguity of sacred texts and the deception of wisemen (τῶν σοφῶν) who missed the meaning of an oracle of a future ruler to mean the emperor Vespasian with the result of destruction of Jerusalem (*J.W.* 6:312–13). See Martin Hengel, *Zealots: Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period from Herod I until 70 A.D.* (reprint; T&T Clark, 1989), 233–45.

meaning of obscure utterances, Josephus prophesied that Vespasian would be emperor and was willing to surrender to the Romans and still live as God's witness (*J.W.* 3.351–354, 3.399–408).⁷²⁹

IV. MATTHEW'S FULFILMENT QUOTATIONS

1. Introduction

Matthew uses explicit fulfilment quotations from the Hebrew prophets. Ten (eleven) are fulfilment quotations that coincide with Matthew's emphasis on fulfilment (πληρώω) in presenting Jesus as fulfilling "all righteousness" (3:15), "the law and the prophets" (5:17–18), and "the scriptures" (26:54). This series of fulfilment quotations outside of the narrative acts as a backbone and running commentary of Jesus' life.

In this section, I will examine Matthew's use of explicit quotations from the Jewish scriptures by first categorizing and differentiating the various kinds of quotations. Second, I will elaborate on five observations that can be made regarding Matthew's use of the fulfilment quotations. (1) They are narrative comments from the author that are scattered throughout the Gospel with a high concentration around Jesus' birth. (2) They quote only the Hebrew prophets with Jeremiah and Isaiah specifically named. (3) They are interpreted to contemporize the prophetic text and function like *peshet*.⁷³⁰ (4) They are concerned with messianic and eschatological fulfilment. (5) They are supported by Matthew's other quotations from the Jewish scriptures.

2. Explicit Quotations

Before examining Matthew's fulfilment quotations, we need to distinguish between various explicit quotations under three categories: (1) narrative comments from the author or direct speech from characters within the narrative (e.g. Matt 13:35 and 13:14–15 respectively), (2) quotations with a formula (including the word "fulfilment") or without a formula, and (3) the speaker of the quotation. This is important for grouping and to establish the function of each particular quotation. I suggest the first and foremost category of explicit quotations is its location either as direct speech within the narrative or as narrative comments from the narrator. Therefore, Matthew has ten (or eleven) explicit fulfilment quotations beginning

⁷²⁹ Philo also speaks of having been seized from time to time by the divine (*Migr.* 35) and possessed with divine frenzy even as prophets are inspired (*Her.* 69–70).

⁷³⁰ However, they are not *peshet* in form.

with something like ἵνα πληρωθῆ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος (1:22; 2:15, 17, 23; 4:14; 8:17; 12:17; 13:35; 21:4; 27:9).

Figure 7: Categories of Matthew's Explicit Quotations

Comments by Narrator:

Fulfilment Quotations:

- (1) Matt 1:22–23 quotes Isa 7:14;
- (2) Matt 2:15b quotes Hos 11:1;
- (3) Matt 2:17–18 quotes Jer 31:15 (names Jer);
- (4) Matt 2:23 quotes Isa 11:1; cf. Judg 13:5;
- (5) Matt 4:13–16 quotes Isa 8:23–9:1 (names Isa);
- (6) Matt 8:17 quotes Isa 53:4 (prophet Isaia);
- (7) Matt 12:17–21 quotes Isa 42:1–4 (names Isaiah);
- (8) Matt 13:34–35 quotes Ps 78:2;
- (9) Matt 21:4–5 quotes Isa 62:11; Zech 9:9;
- (10) Matt 27:9–10 quotes Zech 11:[12–]13; Jer 18:1–2; 32:6–9 (names Jer);⁷³¹

Formula Quotation:

- (11) Matt 3:3 quotes Isa 40:3 (names Isa)⁷³²

Direct Speech by Jesus:

- To devil: (f)⁷³³ Matt 4:4, 7, 10 from Deut 8:3; 6:16; Deut 6:13; 1 Chr 21:1;
- To disciples: Matt 7:23 from Ps 6:9;
- To disciples: Matt 10:35 from Micah 7:6;
- To John the Baptist: Matt 11:5 from Isa 61:1; 35:4–6;
- To John the Baptist: (f) Matt 11:10 from Mal 3:1; Exod 23:20;
- To John the Baptist: Matt 11:23 from Isa 14:11, 13, 15;
- To Pharisees: Matt 15:4a from Exod 20:12; Deut 5:16;
- To Pharisees: (f) Matt 15:8–9 from Isa 29:13;
- To Pharisees: Matt 19:4–5 from Gen 1:27; 2:24
- To Rich Young Ruler: Matt 19:18–19 from Exod 20:12–16; Deut 5:16–20;
- To Temple: (f) Matt 21:13 from Isa 56:7; Jer 7:11;
- To chief priests: (f) Matt 21:16 from Ps 8:2
- To chief priests: (f) Matt 21:42 from Ps 118:22–23
- To Sadducees: (f) Matt 22:32 from Exod 3:6
- To lawyer: Matt 22:37 from Deut 6:4–5; 2 Kgs 23:25
- To lawyer: Matt 22:39 from Lev 19:18
- To Pharisees: Matt 22:44 from Ps 110:1 [Ps 8:7]
- To crowds and disciples: Matt 23:34–36 from 2 Chr 24:21
- To Jerusalem: Matt 23:39 from Ps 118:26
- To disciples: Matt 24:7 from Isa 19:2

⁷³¹ Cf. Matt 26:15.

⁷³² Cf. Mark 1:3; Luke 3:4; John 1:23. This quotation could be added to the fulfilment list as a narrative comment by Matthew, but it lacks the word πληρώω. In addition, unlike the other fulfilment quotations, it is found in the other Gospels.

⁷³³ (f) represents a quotation that is prefaced by a formula.

To disciples: Matt 24:29 from Isa 13:10; Ezek 32:7; Joel 2:10

To disciples: Matt 24:38 from Gen 7:7

To disciples: (f) Matt 26:31 from Zech 13:7

To high priest: Matt 26:64 from Ps 110:1; Dan 7:13

On the cross: Matt 27:46 from Ps 22:2

Direct Speech by Others:

Chief Priests and scribes to King Herod: Matt 2:6 from Micah 5:2

Devil to Jesus: Matt 4:6 from Ps 91:11–12

Crowd to Jesus: Matt 21:9 from Ps 118:25–26

Sadducees to Jesus: (f) Matt 22:24 from Gen 38:8; Deut 25:5

All the fulfilment quotations are written by the author as narrative comments. The remaining quotations are direct speech by characters within Matthew's narrative with various elements associated or not associated with them (i.e. fulfilment, introductory formula and different speaker). For example, King Herod called all the chief priests and scribes of the people together and asked them to locate the birthplace of the Messiah. They quote Micah 5:2 with the formula, "for so it has been written by the prophet" (2:5). This example uses fulfilment language: Jesus explained his reason for using parables by quoting Isa 6:9–10, "to fulfil what had been spoken through the prophet" (13:13–15). There are also four explicit quotations in Jesus' testing in the wilderness that begin with the formula, "It is written" (γέγραπται): three are from Jesus and one is from the devil (4:4, 6, 7, 10). Furthermore, this battle for power and authority uses explicit quotations with "it is written" from the Jewish scriptures (i.e. divination and exorcisms; cf. 12:22–32). Lastly, embedded into its narrative and without any formula, Matthew has two quotations from the exact same text of Hosea the prophet, signalling its significance (9:13; 12:7; cf. Hos 6:6).⁷³⁴

3. Matthew's Fulfilment Quotations

Matthew uses quotations differently than Jesus or anyone else.⁷³⁵ Each fulfilment quotation is a narrative comment by the author and can be viewed as prophetic revelation concerning Jesus. As a central theme of Matthew, fulfilment can be understood typologically (cf. 2:1-

⁷³⁴ First, after calling Matthew to follow him, Jesus is eating with tax collectors and sinners, and he answers the Pharisees' accusations against the company he is keeping by quoting Hos 6:6 (9:13). Second, he again quotes Hos 6:6 and answers the Pharisees' charges against his disciples as they are picking grain and eating it on the Sabbath (12:7). Both these charges are really directed to Jesus and his observance of Torah.

⁷³⁵ Jesus quotes from the Torah, as well as from the prophets: e.g. the devil tests Jesus in the wilderness in a sort-of scriptural duel (4:4–10; cf. 12:28–29).

12; 4:1-11; 12:3-6, 40-42).⁷³⁶ “‘Fulfillment’ for Matthew seems to operate at many levels, embracing much more of the pattern of OT history and language than merely its prophetic prediction. It is a matter of tracing lines of correspondence and continuity in God’s dealings with his people, discerned in the incidental details of the biblical text as well as in its grand design.”⁷³⁷ Therefore, Matthew’s fulfilment quotations are argumentative in that they take Hebrew prophetic texts and locate them within Matthew with Jesus as their focal point.

Before examining each of Matthew’s fulfilment quotations, we begin with some observations. There are eleven occurrences from the Hebrew prophets (1:22; 2:15, 17, 23; 3:3; 4:14; 8:17; 12:17; 13:35; 21:4; 27:9).⁷³⁸ Matthew 3:3 is an instance without the word “fulfilment” but it can still be grouped with them. They have similar introductions with slight variations: “τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος: ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν” (1:22–23). Matthew’s fulfilment quotations are all quotations from the prophets with Jeremiah and Isaiah specifically named (2:17; 4:13; 8:17; 12:17; 27:9). They are scattered throughout the Gospel with a high concentration around Jesus’ birth.

First, Matthew 1:23 (cf. Isa 7:14; 8:8–10 LXX) seems to be directly from Isaiah 7:14 LXX with one change: καλέσουσιν (they will call)⁷³⁹ instead of καλέσεις (you will call).⁷⁴⁰ During the announcement by an angel to Joseph about Jesus’ birth and purpose to save people of their sins, Matthew quotes Isa 7:14 LXX. This is Isaiah’s prophecy to Ahaz in the eighth century BCE about an event in the near future—the time of the destruction of Judah and Judah’s enemies by the Assyrian invasion, which is connected with the son being called Emmanuel (Isa 7:15–17). This sign is fulfilled in Jesus’ birth and identification as “God is with us.”

Second, Matt 2:15b is closer to the Hebrew text of Hos 11:1 rather than the Greek text. This quotation is a pre-announcement of Jesus’ return from Egypt and finding a home (2:19–21). Hosea 11:1–2 is a reflection of Israel’s exodus out of Egypt and wilderness wanderings as a rebellious child. Jesus, like Israel, is called God’s son out of Egypt. They

⁷³⁶ See R.T. France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1989), 166–205. France (*Matthew*, 11) states, “It is thus for Matthew not only the explicitly predictive portions of the OT that can be seen to be “fulfilled” in Jesus, but also its historical characters, its narratives, and its cultic patterns, even the law itself (5:17; 11:13).”

⁷³⁷ France, *Matthew*, 12.

⁷³⁸ I have listed 11 occurrences where the direct quotation is from the narrator and comments on the narrative. France (*Matthew*, 11) has Matt 2:5 rather than 3:3.

⁷³⁹ Third person plural future active indicative.

⁷⁴⁰ Second person singular future active indicative.

are closely connected together with this language of sonship as well as their desert experiences (e.g. temptations; Matt 4:1–11; cf. 3:17).

Third, Matt 2:18 (cf. Jer 31:15) is difficult to interpret with Matthew’s use of Jeremiah. It agrees with the LXX but puts children rather than sons.⁷⁴¹ Jeremiah 31 reflects on the trauma of the Babylonian exile with a view to hope and restoration rather than grief as Rachel is called to stop weeping and mourning because the exiles will return. Jeremiah and Matthew focus on hope beyond the disaster linking Israel’s traumatic contexts together (i.e. Egypt, Babylon and Herod; cf. Babylonian deportation; 1:11–12).

Fourth, it is uncertain whether Matt 2:23b is from Isa 11:1,⁷⁴² Judg 13:5,⁷⁴³ or a general idea (cf. 26:56).⁷⁴⁴ Matthew 2:23b is different from other quotations with the prophets in plural rather than in the singular and missing “saying” (λέγοντος) in the introductory formula. This connection between Jesus with Ναζωραῖος could represent a prophetic expectation of a messiah that is misunderstood and rejected (cf. Zech 9–14; Pss 22; 69; Isa 52:13–53:12).⁷⁴⁵

Fifth, Matt 3:3 (cf. Isa 40:3 LXX) introduces John the Baptist as the subject of Jewish scriptural fulfilment (cf. Mark 1:3).⁷⁴⁶ In following Mark, Matthew resembles Isa 40:3 LXX with “his” (αὐτοῦ) rather than “of our God” (τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν).⁷⁴⁷ Furthermore, this passage does not have the verb to fulfil, which seems to be reserved exclusively for Jesus in these fulfilment quotations.

Sixth, Matt 4:15–16 (cf. Isa 8:23–9:1) explains Jesus’ move to Capernaum (i.e. geographical setting).⁷⁴⁸ The immediate context of Isaiah is the devastation of the Assyrian invasion but afterwards there will be restoration (cf. Isa 58:8–10). Furthermore, the designation of “Galilee of the nations” indicates the region’s openness to surrounding

⁷⁴¹ M. Knowles (*Jeremiah*, 45–52) gives a number of interpretive possibilities.

⁷⁴² If ναζωραῖος from Hebrew נצר. See Stendahl, *School*, 103–4; 198–99 or Gundry, *Use of the Old Testament*, 103–104.

⁷⁴³ If ναζωραῖος from Greek ναζειν (Nazarite) from Judg 13:5, 7. See Davies and Allison, *Saint Matthew*, 1:276; Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 1:149; Menken, *Matthew’s Bible*, 170–72. However, Matthew 11:18–19 identifies Jesus as a glutton and wine drinker.

⁷⁴⁴ It also refers to prophets as a general group rather than as a specific quotation.

⁷⁴⁵ See France, *Matthew*, 94–95. The only other occurrence of ναζωραῖος in Matthew seems to be a derogatory designation (cf. 26:71).

⁷⁴⁶ Cf. Mark 1:2–3, however Matt 3:3 separates Isa 40:3 from Mal 3:1 (cf. Matt 11:10).

⁷⁴⁷ The LXX is different from the Hebrew with the location of “a voice of one crying out” being in the wilderness “rather than “in the wilderness prepare the way of the LORD” (Isaiah 40:3).

⁷⁴⁸ This citation is closer to the Hebrew, but it does not fully correspond to either the Greek or the Hebrew. See Menken, *Matthew’s Bible*, 15–16.

Gentile populations with the image of darkness to light indicating the transformation of hopelessness to salvation.

Seventh, Matt 8:17b quotes Isa 53:4 as a summary comment on Jesus' ministry from the fourth "servant song" (Isa 52:13–53:12). Matthew connects this song with Jesus' exorcisms and healings as the servant's suffering benefits people (cf. 1 Pet 2:24).⁷⁴⁹

Eighth, Matt 12:18–21, the longest fulfilment quotation, quotes Isa 42:1–4 as it summarizes Jesus' ministry.⁷⁵⁰ This quotation identifies Jesus as God's chosen servant in contrast with the Pharisees (12:1–14). As God's servant, Jesus selflessly extends the gospel to the Gentiles as part of God's declared purpose of salvation.

Ninth, in quoting Ps 78:2, Matt 13:34–35 expresses the psalmist's agenda and confirms Jesus' quotation of Isa 6:10 LXX (cf. 13:14). Asaph, the psalmist and prophet, makes a prophetic utterance and reveals things unknown (i.e. "secrets of the kingdom of heaven;" cf. 1 Chr 25:2; 2 Chr 29:30). In Matt 13, parables are patterns of revelation that serve to reveal hidden truths; however, the explanation is withheld from the crowds and only given to the disciples. Therefore, the parables are elusive and challenging to the crowds leaving them in a dilemma.⁷⁵¹ Jesus utters God's hidden truth as enigmatic parables, which fulfils the Jewish scriptures.⁷⁵²

Tenth, Matt 21:4–5 (cf. Isa 62:11; Zech 9:9) illustrates Matthew's scribal interpretation.⁷⁵³ It is located between the command and its implementation, which shows that the execution of Jesus' command and the fulfilment of the prophet's word coincide (cf. 1:20–25).⁷⁵⁴ Matthew 21:5 is not like the Hebrew or Greek; however, it does begin by corresponding to Isa 62:11 LXX and then Zech 9:9, which contains a message of salvation

⁷⁴⁹ This connection with Jesus' healing ministry rather than his Passion is also in 12:17–21 (cf. Isa 42:1–4).

⁷⁵⁰ It is closer to the Hebrew of Isaiah.

⁷⁵¹ The Hebrew uses *mashal* and *hida* (riddle) for parable.

⁷⁵² Matthew 13:13 is reminiscent of Solomon who spoke 3000 proverbs (παραβολή in 1 Kgs 4:32 LXX).

⁷⁵³ The first part (εἶπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιών·) is from Isaiah 62:11 LXX. The second part (ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται σοι πραῦς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ) seems to be from Zech 9:9 LXX and the third part (ὄνον καὶ ἐπὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου) seems to be from the Hebrew (or revised LXX) of Zech 9:9. See Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, 111–114.

⁷⁵⁴ Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, 107.

addressed to Jerusalem.⁷⁵⁵ The king is meek and rides a donkey signifying a kingdom of peace rather than coercion.⁷⁵⁶

Eleventh, Matt 27:9–10 is attributed to Jeremiah but a reworked prophecy of Zech 11:12–13 with a connection to Jer 19:1–13 (cf. Jer 18:1–2; 32:6–9).⁷⁵⁷ The text of this fulfilment equation differs from both the Hebrew and Greek texts with verse 9 closer to Zechariah. It is not a simple quotation but seems to be a mosaic of scriptural motifs: (1) thirty silver pieces (Zech 11:12–13); (2) potter (Jer 19:1–13); (3) potter’s house (Jer 18:1–2); and/or (4) field (Jer 32:6–9). With this in mind, Menken’s helpful line-by-line analysis of this passage identifies Matthew’s scribal activity.⁷⁵⁸

Line 1 (καὶ ἔλαβον τὰ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια): Matt 27:9b can be a translation of the Hebrew of Zech 11:13d.

Line 2 (τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ τετιμημένου ὃν ἐτιμήσαντο ἀπὸ υἰῶν Ἰσραήλ): Matt 27:9c is a rendering of the Hebrew of Zech 11:13c.

Line 3 (καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτὰ εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν τοῦ κεραμέως): Matt 27:10a is similar to the final line of the Hebrew of Zech 11:13e with some words deriving from Jer 32:6–15.⁷⁵⁹

Line 4 (καθὰ συνέταξέν μοι κύριος): Matt 27:10b cannot be traced to Zech 11:12–13, but Zechariah could have inspired its content.⁷⁶⁰

However, an adjustment could be made with καὶ ἔλαβον τὰ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια being from Zech 11:13d LXX with some minor changes: from singular to plural verb forms and ἀργύρια for ἀργυροῦς.⁷⁶¹

Matthew seems to reuse words from Zechariah and Jeremiah and adjusts them for his context while keeping some of the original context. Zechariah 11:4–14 depicts a symbolic act where God instructs the prophet to act as a shepherd. Initially, the prophet

⁷⁵⁵ Zech 9:9–10 is a messianic oracle and the first of many quotations from Zech 9–14 (France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 188–89); Matt 21:5 (Zech 9:9–10); Matt 26:31 (Zech 13:7); and Matt 27:9–10 (Zech 11:12–13).

⁷⁵⁶ There is an omission of the words “righteous and victorious (saving) is he” that does not seem to fit Matthew’s interest during his entry into Jerusalem.

⁷⁵⁷ Matthew only attributes fulfilment quotations with the names Isaiah and Jeremiah (2:17; 3:3; 4:14; 8:17; 12:17; 13:14; 15:17; 27:9) while fulfilment quotations from the minor prophets are left anonymous (2:5, 15; 11:10; 21:4; 26:31).

⁷⁵⁸ Menken, *Matthew’s Bible*, 184–92.

⁷⁵⁹ There are many similarities between Jer 32:6–15 and Zech 11:11–13 making them analogous. See Menken, *Matthew’s Bible*, 188–89.

⁷⁶⁰ This could also be a formula that is often command by Moses (e.g. Exod 9:12).

⁷⁶¹ Knowles, *Jeremiah*, 54–55.

does but afterwards he quits and requests his wages for his service (30 shekels of silver).⁷⁶² The concept of a shepherd king who is despised and whose coming will lead to his rejection and death is important for this fulfilment quotation (cf. Zech 9:9–10; 12:10–14; 13:7; 11:4–14),⁷⁶³ but there also seems to be allusion to Jer 19:1–13 with judgment against those who shed innocent blood.⁷⁶⁴

Five general observations can be made about Matthew's fulfilment quotations that give us a sense of Matthew's purpose for using them. (1) All of them seem to be narrative comments that function as Matthew's scribal validations concerning Jesus' life as a fulfilment of the Jewish scriptures. (2) The wording of the fulfilment quotations are altered to indicate the precise sense in which Matthew meant the verse to be understood or applied.⁷⁶⁵ (3) Matthew's fulfilment quotations seem to be concerned with messianic and eschatological fulfilment using typological parallelism between Jesus and Israel (cf. Mic 5:2; Isa 9:1–2; 42:1–4; 53:4; Zech 9:9): a child of promise, being delivered from Herod's slaughter, coming out of Egypt, passing through the water, entering the wilderness for testing, calling out the twelve sons of Israel, giving the Torah from the mount, performing ten miracles, sending out the twelve to conquer the land, and being transfigured before his disciples.⁷⁶⁶ (4) Matthew's fulfilment quotations surrounding Jesus' birth are associated with dreams, similar to the Patriarchal traditions recounting Joseph's narrative from Genesis and the midwives and infanticide of Egypt from Exodus (Matt 1–4). (5) Matthew's fulfilment quotations are supported by Matthew's other quotations from the Jewish

⁷⁶² This amount is the value of a slave (Exod 21:32) or a woman (Lev 27:4).

⁷⁶³ France, *Matthew*, 1045.

⁷⁶⁴ Knowles (*Jeremiah*, 70–71) connects this fulfilment quotation with Jer 19:1–13 with six observations: (1) not field but potter that is the verbal link to Zech 11:13; (2) burial places (cf. Matt 27:7); (3) contains names connoting bloodshed (e.g. valley of slaughter and field of blood); (4) prophetic action involves chief priests and elders of the people; (5) judgment is pronounced in both instances against the shedding of innocent blood; and (6) judgment that anticipates the destruction of Jerusalem.

In addition, the introductory formula of Matt 27:9 is identical to 2:17 with similar a verb tense of aorist passive indicative (ἐπληρώθη) rather than the customary aorist passive subjunctive (πληρωθῆ). Both these fulfilment quotations are in the context of disastrous circumstances: slaughter of innocent children and suicide of Judas following his betrayal of an innocent (Knowles, *Jeremiah*, 53).

⁷⁶⁵ See Christopher D. Stanley, "Social Environment of "Free" Biblical Quotations in the New Testament," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel* (eds. C.A. Evans and J.A. Sanders; JSNTSupp Series 148; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 18–27.

⁷⁶⁶ See Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999) 125. This could also be between Jesus and Moses at the beginning.

scriptures (11:10; 13:14–15; 15:7–9; 21:42). In Jesus’ Parables Discourse, there are two quotations that provide the reason behind Jesus’ use of parables with one outside the narrative as a commentary (13:35; cf. Ps 78:2) and one within the narrative from Jesus (13:13–15; cf. Isa 6:9–10). This doubling also occurs within the narrative as Jesus quotes Hos 6:6 twice.

V. MATTHEW’S PURPOSE: JESUS AS PROPHETIC FULFILMENT

Matthew’s fulfilment quotations authenticate Jesus as the long-anticipated royal messiah and the *King of the Jews*, inaugurating God’s reign (i.e. kingdom of heaven), which was foretold by the Hebrew prophets. Matthew, as a scribe, knowledgeable in divinatory and prophetic scribal practices, uses them through his explicit fulfilment quotations all from the prophets.

First, just like divination which is triggered by uncertainty, Matthew’s fulfilment quotations arise in tumultuous circumstances. They stabilize and explicitly give answers beyond the range of ordinary human understanding what is needed in difficult times through prophecy and oracle: “Divination tends to be future-oriented, not necessarily in the sense of foretelling future events, but as a method of tackling the anxiety about the insecurity of life and coping with the risk brought about by human ignorance.”⁷⁶⁷

Second, prophetic interpretation requires precise divine revelation. In the Second Temple period, there was a concern for divine enlightenment. The *Pesharim* implies the idea that the base-text means something other than what it says; they present atomistic interpretation with little regard for the original literary or historical context, but assume that the words of the prophets are mysteries that refer to the eschatological time so that the Teacher of Righteousness and not Habakkuk holds the meaning (cf. 1QpHab 7:1–2).⁷⁶⁸ The outer appearance of the text, like that of an omen, is obvious to anyone, but its actual meaning is not evident before it is properly interpreted. The meaning can be discerned with the help of certain rules, rituals and techniques available to those few who have learned them, but it is ultimately a matter of divine revelation.⁷⁶⁹ The Hebrew prophets have been

⁷⁶⁷ Nissinen, “Prophecy and Omen Divination,” 341. Two different methods: (1) inductive methods that involve systematization of signs and omens by observing physical objects (extispicy, astrology, bird divination); and (2) non-inductive ones such as dream-visions and prophecy (cf. Plato, *Phaedrus*, 244a–245a).

⁷⁶⁸ See O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1960), 36–59.

⁷⁶⁹ See Nissinen, “Prophecy and Omen Divination,” 341–47.

read but an expert scribe is needed to decipher and interpret their meaning for the present. In addition, the *peshet* application would supersede, but not invalidate, the meaning of the original prophet. Like an omen, not valid at one historical moment only but to be interpreted in any given situation by those who were considered capable of revealing the divine will to their communities, the *Pesharim* are then understood as an indispensable update (if not necessarily a replacement) of the information given to the prophet of the past. Therefore, by the Teacher of Righteousness or Jesus through his scribe Matthew, the *mysteries* of the prophets have been revealed and interpreted for their generation.

Third, fulfilment quotations function like dream-visions or prophecy, which are regarded as having divine origin. They are regarded as enigmatic revelatory communications and need to be interpreted (i.e. clarified, updated and actualized) and juxtaposed with a text. Moreover, this divine interpretation of the sacred text reinforces and legitimizes a particular view of the present and future. Therefore, in continuity with the Jewish scriptures,⁷⁷⁰ Matthew, along with early Christianity, interpreted and attempted to demonstrate Jesus as the royal messiah from the Hebrew prophets as a hidden revelation (mystery and secret) that is disclosed through the prophetic writings (Rom 16:25–27):

Now to God who is able to strengthen you according to my gospel and the proclamation of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery that was kept secret for long ages but is now disclosed (κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου), and through the prophetic writings (φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν διὰ τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν) is made known to all the Gentiles, according to the command of the eternal God, to bring about the obedience of faith—to the only wise God, through Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory forever! Amen.

This prophetic interpretation is rooted in divine revelation and legitimation—God himself granting divine insight—for a particular understanding of the Hebrew prophets.

Before concluding this section on Matthew’s purpose and Jesus as the prophetic fulfilment of the Hebrew prophets, we must examine Deut 18:9–22. Deuteronomy 18:9–14 forbids Israel to imitate the surrounding nations in their divination practices, but rather they are to listen to God’s prophet who will be like Moses and be given God’s words (Deut 18:15–22). The command is that no person should be found that performs these detestable divinatory practices of the nations.⁷⁷¹ This extensive list enforces the notion that divine

⁷⁷⁰ In continuity with Judaism, Christianity believed that they were God’s people: recipients of special revelation, wisdom and insight from God (1 Cor 1:18–31, 2:6–16; Eph 1:9).

⁷⁷¹ There are eight prohibitions: (1) One who makes a son or daughter pass through fire; (2) one who practices divination; (3) a soothsayer; (4) an augur; (5) a sorcerer; (6) one who casts spells; (7) one who consults ghosts or spirits; and (8) one who seeks oracles from the dead.

revelation is strictly from God through the prophets, which is what Matthew is doing when he is quoting the prophets. Although the prophets are read like a liver in its mechanics (i.e. hepatoscopy), these fulfilment quotations are alternatively grounded in God's divine revelation through the Hebrew prophets. Therefore, divine revelation is centred on and mediated through the Hebrew prophets (as in Deut 18) although the mechanism of interpretation arises out of Matthew's scribal expertise and familiarity of reading the Jewish scriptures like livers.⁷⁷²

In sum, the *Pesharim* exclusively concentrate on the Hebrew prophets and function to bring them into the present. This requires an interpreter who is able to discern the divine will to read them. Similar to hepatoscopy, Matthew, as well as the *Pesharim*, may in similar fashion be reading the Hebrew prophets as one would read a liver to divine God's will and purpose. Therefore, the prophetic text is brought into the present and actualized in Jesus' life and Matthew's Gospel.

VI. CONCLUSION

This chapter focused on Matthew's use of fulfilment quotations as a method of prophetic interpretation. Arising from divinatory practices (hepatoscopy), these fulfilment quotations function like the *Pesharim* in providing the combination of sacred text and contemporary (actualized) interpretation in Jesus' identity and message for the early church community. Matthew, understanding himself to be a scribe, seems to use divinatory practices within late Second Temple scribal culture to utilize and adapt its various features in using the Jewish scriptures: dreams-visions, signs and fulfilment quotations.

In sum, I have attempted to highlight Matthew's unique feature, explicit fulfilment quotations, and how he uses them. As prophecy, he uses them like the divinatory practice of hepatoscopy, which may be reflected in the *Pesharim*, to interpret the Hebrew prophets. Therefore, Matthew uses the Hebrew prophets to state that Jesus is the fulfilment of their messianic and eschatological hopes.

⁷⁷² See Nissinen, "Prophecy and Divination," 343–45. He argues that although the Hebrew prophets did not practice divination they were familiar with them and some techniques were adopted.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

I. MATTHEW'S USE OF SCRIPTURE

Up until now, *Matthew's use of the Old Testament* had been primarily read from the narrow perspective of its explicit fulfilment quotations and text-types. I have attempted to broaden this view and situate it within the socio-historical context of kings and scribes in late Second Temple Judaism metaphorically. In examining the Gospel of Matthew as a whole, I have tried to demonstrate this etic (analogy) understanding rather than an emic approach of how Matthew understood himself to be a scribe in the service of Jesus the *Royal Messiah*. Due to this self-understanding, he writes with the expertise of a trained scribe, bringing all of his scribal skills and practices in handling the Jewish scriptures for his composition of Matthew in order to authorize Jesus' royal identity and message to his Jewish-Christian audience. Therefore, each chapter attempts to demonstrate some aspect of Matthew's work as a scribe.

In Chapter 3, Matthew uses the Jewish scriptures by rewriting Mark in a Torah pattern. In doing so, he *blends* together Christian (Jesus tradition) and Jewish (Torah tradition) scriptures in writing his Gospel to not only contextualize and contemporize Mark (i.e. correct and explain difficulties), but also to give authority to Mark and itself within the Jewish sphere of Torah and scripture. Rewriting Mark with earlier Jesus tradition (Q) in a Torah pattern was not meant to replace Mark or Q, but to produce a new authoritative work for the Jewish-Christian community. Matthew's distinctive literary features, such as the genealogical material, theological emphasis of Jesus as the *Son of David* or implicit Pentateuchal allusions, illustrates his admiration for a variety of older authoritative traditions as he reuses them. Rewriting narrative, a scribal practice and an emic category of authenticating and contextualizing past traditions, best explains Matthew's composition: literary similarities with Mark and Jesus' discourses within a Torah pattern. This process of rewriting ensures Matthew's relevance and growing authoritative status not only of its Gospel but also of Jesus and his message (i.e. truth, reliability and relevance).

In Chapter 4, Matthew rewrites the Torah to give Jesus' legislation of entering and living in the kingdom of heaven. Matthew weaves aspects of wisdom and eschatology to warn and urge righteousness, which seems to be the key to entering his kingdom (5–7; 23–25). Matthew portrays Jesus as the Torah giver, Torah interpreter and Torah judge. Matthew, as Jesus' scribe, rewrites the Mosaic Torah, providing legislation for citizenship in the kingdom of heaven (5–7), which will then be used as a standard for Jesus the king to judge all the nations in the *Last Days* (23–25; cf. 25:31–46). Jesus rewrites Torah by stating principles, key authoritative texts and practices that reveal the qualifications for entering into and remaining in the kingdom of heaven. This rewriting of Torah for the *Last Days* is an indictment on the scribes and Pharisees, and gives signs and warnings in parabolic form to be faithful and watchful (23–25). Matthew identifies Jesus as the eschatological and royal judge arbitrating for those who are citizens of his kingdom.

In Chapter 5, Matthew exhorts the Jewish-Christian community to apply Jesus' Torah Discourse into practice as it spreads the message of the kingdom of heaven and lives together as the covenant community. Matthew 10 functions as Jesus' *rule of war* to declare the peace of the kingdom of heaven. Matthew 18 sets forth *rules of the community* for living as the covenant community by establishing boundaries, practices and obligations to be part of Jesus' community. These *rules* are an application of Jesus' Torah Discourse. Therefore, Matthew applies Jesus' Torah Discourse to establish a mission strategy for expanding the kingdom of heaven and instituting the rule of the covenant community for God's people.

In Chapter 6, Matthew reveals his self-understanding as a scribe. He uses parables like riddles with a hidden aspect that requires interpretation. His use of parables reveals an implicit use of the Jewish scriptures as he utilizes wisdom traditions by associating Jesus with Solomon (sage-king). Matthew expands Mark's parables to reveal the *mystery* of the kingdom of heaven to his disciples, "scribes trained in the kingdom of heaven," as well as hide it from the crowds who do not "hear" and "understand."

In Chapter 7, Matthew uses explicit fulfilment quotations from the Hebrew prophets as prophetic commentary to Jesus' identity, message and work. Matthew's use of fulfilment quotations is unique in the New Testament as comments from the narrator and from the Hebrew prophets. Arising from divinatory practices, these quotations contemporize the prophets and find their fulfilment in Jesus. Matthew, understanding himself as a scribe, therefore would be familiar with prophetic and divinatory practices within late Second

Temple scribal culture and utilizes them to “read” the prophets as one would read an animal liver to discern God’s divine will.

II. RESTATEMENT AND RESOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM

1. Summary

This thesis has attempted to provide a strategy for examining *Matthew’s use of the Old Testament* by portraying Matthew within the scribe-king relationship of the late Second Temple period to understand his scribal activity and comprehend the scope of his use of the Jewish scriptures. I will now review the issues of the history of research of *Matthew’s use of the Old Testament*, restate my thesis, and provide various avenues of further research.

These are the basic issues that arose from the history of research of *Matthew’s use of the Old Testament*, which I have tried to address within this dissertation:

1. Too sharp a distinction between the Old and New Testaments.
2. Too great an emphasis on the uniqueness of Jesus and the Synoptic Gospels at the cost of excluding Jewish and Greek precursors and its socio-historical context.
3. An either-or proposition concerning the use and social-context of Matthew (instruction, homily, or liturgy).
4. Overemphasis on Jamnia and the sharp schism between Christianity and Judaism in 70–135 CE.
5. Diverse range of statements about the text of the fulfilment quotations and its function (i.e. not being proof-texts but illuminating the fundamental aspects of the biblical narrative).
6. Over-theologizing Matthew with simple Christology as the answer to Matthew’s methodology.
7. The anachronistic view of the Old Testament canon in Second Temple Judaism and Christian origins.
8. The sharp distinction between text and interpretation and the role of the scribe.

By identifying Matthew’s etic self-understanding as a scribe and examining the Gospel, these issues have been addressed as he uses multiple Second Temple scribal writing strategies to present Jesus as the *Royal Messiah* and his message of the kingdom of heaven.

In this dissertation, I have proposed that Matthew’s etic self-understanding as a scribe facilitated his presentation of Jesus as the *King of the Jews* and the *Royal Messiah*. The socio-historical context of scribes, in continuity with Second Temple Judaism, gives us a way of re-reading the Gospel of Matthew. Therefore, Matthew would have had multiple scribal strategies and texts (Jewish and Christian scriptures) at hand to write his Gospel as a hermeneutical polyphony.

2. Further Research

Due to the nature and limitations of this project, almost every chapter could be expanded for further research to achieve greater detail and further examples of scribal activity. In addition, a more general consideration of the various uses of the Jewish scriptures could be applied to other parts of the New Testament, especially the rest of the Gospels, to get a sense of the entire scope of late Second Temple scribal activity that is utilized by different New Testament writers.

For Chapter 2, further research could be accomplished in understanding Jewish scribal activity as it pertains to the formation and transmission of scriptural compositions for New Testament studies. For Chapter 3, more specific details concerning aspects of rewriting narrative could be enlightening to other fields in Second Temple studies; for example, comparing Matthew's rewriting techniques with *Jubilees*. For Chapter 4, rewriting the Torah and the various degrees to which it is accomplished and practiced could be informative for New Testament studies and Christian origins, especially in relationship with the Torah. For Chapter 5 and from a sociological perspective, the non-violent aspects of Jesus' message in the Gospel of Matthew, as well as other Jewish groups, would make an interesting study as to its origins, purposes and outcomes for peaceful communities surrounded by war. For Chapter 6, Solomonic traditions and wisdom still seem to be an area that needs further research in connection with New Testament writings. For Chapter 7, I would like to continue working through the uses of the Jewish scriptures, including fulfilment quotations, allusions and echoes, in a more systematic way throughout the entire New Testament to differentiate various uses and scribal practices, as well as what is being used, to what extent and for what reason.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. TEXTS, TRANSLATIONS AND REFERENCES

- Aland, K., B. Aland, E. Nestle, J. Karavidopoulos, and C.M. Martini, eds. *Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece* 28. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.
- Balz, H. and Schneider, G., eds. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991–93.
- Botterweck, G. Johannes, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. 14 vols. Translated by John T. Willis, David E. Green, and Douglas W. Stott. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Charles, Robert H., ed. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983–85.
- Colson, Francis H., and George H. Whitaker, trans. *Philo*. 10 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929–53.
- Elliger, K. and W. Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997.
- Freedman, David Noel, ed. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- García Martínez, F., and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: New York: Brill, 1997.
- Hornblower, S., and A. Spawforth, eds. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Horsley, G. H. R., ed. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*. vols. 1–5. North Ryde: Macquarie University, Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, 1981–89.
- Jastrow, Marcus. *Dictionary of the Targumim, Talmud Bavli, Talmud Yerushalmi and Midrashic Literature*. New York: Pardes, 1950; Judaica Treasury, 1971.

- Josephus*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926–65.
- Kittel, Gerhard, ed. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964–76.
- Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated by M. E. J. Richardson. Revised ed. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott with Henry Stuart Jones, eds. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with rev. supplement. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Llewelyn, S. R., ed., *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*. Vols. 6–8. North Ryde: Macquarie University, Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, 1992–98.
- Metzger, B. M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament*. 3rd ed. London; New York; Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1994.
- Neusner, Jacob, and Avery-Peck, Alan J., eds. *Encyclopedia of Midrash: Biblical Interpretation in Formative Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Pietersma, A. and B. G. Wright, eds. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: And the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under that Title*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Robinson, James M., Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg, eds. *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis Including the Gospel of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German and French Translations of Q and Thomas*. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
- Roth, Cecil et al., eds. *Encyclopedia Judaica*. 16 vols. Jerusalem: Encyclopedia Judaica; New York: Macmillan, 1972.
- Schürer, E. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 b.c.–a.d. 135)*. Revised edn. G. Vermes et al., 4 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973, 1979, 1986.
- Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Göttingensis editum*. 20 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931–99.
- Strack, Hermann L., and Paul Billerbeck. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament: Aus Talmud und Midrasch*. 6 vols. Munich: Beck, 1922–61.

- Tov, Emanuel, and Stephen J. Pfann. *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judean Desert*. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- Yadin, Yigael, ed. *מגילת המקדש*. 3 vols. Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, 1977.
- _____, ed. *The Temple Scroll*. 3 vols. Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, 1983.
- William, A., F. W. Danker, and W. Bauer. eds. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Wise, Michael, Martin Abegg, Jr., and Edward Cook, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996.

II. SECONDARY SOURCES

- Albright, W. F., and C. S. Mann. *Matthew: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Anchor Bible. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1971.
- Alexander, Philip S. "Retelling the Old Testament." Pages 99–118 in *It is Written: Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*. Edited by D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- _____. "Quid Athenis et Hierosolymis? Rabbinic Midrash and Hermeneutics in the Graeco-Roman World." Pages 101–23 in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History*. Edited by P. Davies and R. White. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- _____. "The Redaction History of Serekh Ha-Yahad: A Proposal." *Revue de Qumran* 17 (1996): 437–56.
- Allen, W. C., and L. W. Grensted. *Introduction to the Books of the New Testament*. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1912.
- Allison Jr., Dale C. *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History*. Reprint. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.
- _____. "Kingdom of God." Pages 860–61 in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by J.J. Collins and D.C. Harlow. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

- Assmann, Jan. *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Attridge, Harold W. "Josephus and His Works." Pages 185–232 in *Jewish writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Edited by M.E. Stone. Comendia Rerum Judaicarum ad Novem Testamentum. Section 2. Volume 2. Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Aune, David E. *Apocalypticism, Prophecy, and Magic in Early Christianity*. Reprint. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.
- Bacon, B. W. "The Five Books of Matthew against the Jews." *The Expositor* 15 (1918): 56–66.
- Baker, David. "The Finger of God and the forming of a nation: the origin and purpose of the Decalogue." *Tyndale Bulletin* 56 (2005): 1–24
- Bauer, D. *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. JSNTSup 31. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1988.
- Baumgarten, Albert. *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation*. JSJSup 55. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M., and Daniel Schwartz. "Damascus Document (CD)." Pages 4–57 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translation, Volume 2, Damascus Document, War Scroll and Related Documents*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth, J.B.F. Miller, and Lidija Novakovic. PTSDSSP 2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995.
- Beale, G. K., and D. A. Carson, eds. *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Ben Zvi, Ehud. "Introduction." Pages 1–29 in *Writings and Speech in Israelite and Ancient Near Eastern Prophecy*. Edited by E. Ben Zvi and M.H. Floyd. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 10. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.
- _____. "The Prophetic Book: A Key Form of Prophetic Literature." Pages 276–97 in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*. Edited by M.A. Sweeney and E. Ben Zvi. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. "'Rewritten Bible': A Generic Category which has outlived its Usefulness?" *Textus* 22 (2005): 169–96.

- Betz, Hans Dieter. *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain (Matthew 5:3–7:27 and Luke 6:20–49)*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2008.
- Betz, O. *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1960.
- Beyerlin, Walter, ed. *Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Old Testament Library; London: SCM Press, 1978.
- Bhayro, Siam. “Matthew 5:17–18 in the Light of Qumran Scribal Practice.” Pages 37–48 in *Paratext and Megatext as Channels of Jewish and Christian Traditions: The Textual Markers of Contextualization*. Edited by A.A. den Hollander, U.B. Schmid and W.F. Smelik. Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series 6. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Black, Matthew. “‘Not peace but a sword’: Matt 10:34ff; Luke 12:51ff.” Pages 287–94 in *Jesus and the Politics of His Day*. Edited by E. Bammel and C.F.D. Moule. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Brichto, Herbert C. *The Problem of “Curse” in the Hebrew Bible*. Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 13. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1963.
- Blenkinsopp, J.L. “Prophecy and Priesthood in Josephus.” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 25 (1974): 239–62;
- Blomberg, Craig. “Matthew.” Pages 1–109 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G.K. Beale and D.A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Bond, Helen K. *Pontius Pilate in history and interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Brooke, George J. “The Wisdom of Matthew’s Beatitudes (4QBeat and Mt. 5:3012).” *Scripture Bulletin* 19.2 (1989): 35–41.
- _____. “Rewritten Bible.” Pages 777–78 in vol. 2 of *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- _____. “Between Authority and Canon: The Significance of Reworking the Bible for Understanding the Canonical Process.” Pages 85–104 in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran: Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced studies Research Group on*

- Qumran, 15–17 January, 2002*. Edited by E.G. Chazon, D. Dimant, and R.A. Clements. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 53. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- _____. “Biblical Interpretation at Qumran.” Pages 287–319 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Vol. 1, Scripture and the Scrolls*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- _____. “Torah, Rewritten Torah and the Letter of Jude,” Pages 180–193 in *The Torah in the New Testament: Papers Delivered at the Manchester-Lausanne Seminar of June 2008*. Edited by Michael Tait and Peter Oakes. *Library of New Testament Studies* 401. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- _____. “Genre Theory, Rewritten Bible and Peshet.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 17 (2010): 361–86.
- _____. “Hypertextuality and the ‘Parabiblical’ Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 57–62 in *In the Second Degree: Paratextual Literature in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Culture and Its Reflections in Medieval Literature*. Edited by P.S. Alexander, A. Lange, and R.J. Pillinger. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- _____. “Memory, Cultural memory and Rewriting Scripture,” Pages 119–136 in *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Technique? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes*. Edited by József Zsengellér. *JSJSup* 166. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Broshi, M. “The Credibility of Flavius Josephus.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 33 (1982): 379–84.
- Brown, Raymond E. “Parable and Allegory Reconsidered.” *Novum Testamentum* 5 (1962), 36–45.
- Brownlee, W.H. “Biblical Interpretation among the Scribes of the Dead Sea Scroll.” *Biblical Archaeologist* 15 (1951): 54–76.
- Bruns, Gerald L. *Hermeneutics Ancient and Modern*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Carr, David M. *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Carter, Warren. “‘Solomon in all his glory’: intertextuality and Matthew 6.29.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 65 (1997): 3–25.

- _____. “Are There Imperial Texts in the Class? Intertextual Eagles and Matthean Eschatology as “Lights Out” Time for Imperial Rome (Matthew 24:27–31).” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122 (2003): 467–87.
- _____. *Matthew: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist*. Revised ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004.
- _____. “Matthew: Empire, Synagogues, and Horizontal Violence.” Pages 285–308 in *Mark and Matthew I*. Edited by E. Becker and A. Runesson. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 271. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Cohen, Naomi G. “The Prophetic Books in Alexandria: The Evidence from Philo Judaeus.” Pages 166–93 in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by M. H. Floyd and R. D. Haak. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 427. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Collins, Adela Y. *Mark*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2007.
- Collins, John J. “The Works of the Messiah,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1 (1994): 98–112.
- _____. *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.
- _____. Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism. JSJSupp 54; Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Cope, O. Lamar. *Matthew. A Scribe trained for the Kingdom of Heaven*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 5; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1976.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. “The ‘Rewritten’ Bible at Qumran: A Look at Three Texts,” *Eretz-Israel* 26 (1999): 1–8.
- _____. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Crenshaw, James L. *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction*. Atlanta; John Knox Press, 1981.
- Crossan, J. D. *In Fragments: The Aphorisms of Jesus*. San Francisco: Harper&Row, 1983.
- _____. *Sayings Parallels: A Workbook for the Jesus Tradition*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- Culpeper, R. Alan. *The Johannine School: An Evaluation of the Johannine-School Hypothesis Based on an Investigation of the Nature of Ancient Schools*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 26. Atlanta: SBL, 1974.

- Davies, W. D. *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.
- Davies, W. D., and Dale C. Allison Jr. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988, 1991, 1997.
- Deissmann, A. *Light from the Ancient Past*. London: 1927. Reprint. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978.
- Demsky, A. "Scribe." Pages 1041–43 in *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 14. Jerusalem, Keter, 1971.
- Derrenbacker Jr., R. A. *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 186. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005.
- Deutsch, Celia. *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke: Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11.25–30*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 18. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.
- Di Lella, Alexander A. "Conservative and Progressive Theology: Sirach and Wisdom." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 28 (1966): 139–54.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Qumran Sectarian Literature." Pages 483–550 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Edited by M.E. Stone. Comendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novem Testamentum 2.2. Assen: Van Gorcum and Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- _____. "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance" Pages 23–58 in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990*. Edited by D. Dimant and L.H. Schiffman. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 16. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- _____. "The Scrolls and the Study of Early Judaism." Pages 43–59 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings*. Edited by R.A. Kugler and E.M. Schuller. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 15. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999.
- Dodd, C. H. *According to the Scriptures*. London: James Nisbet & Co. Ltd, 1952.

- Doodle, J. Andrew. *What was Mark for Matthew? An Examination of Matthew's Relationship and Attitude to his Primary Source*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 344. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Downing, F. G. "Legislation as Social Engineering in the New Testament World." Pages 218–27 in *The Torah in the New Testament Papers Delivered at Manchester-Lausanne Seminar of June 2008*. Edited by M. Tait and P. Oakes. Library of New Testament Studies 410. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Drury, John. *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory*. New York: Crossroad, 1985.
- Duling, Dennis C. "Solomon, Exorcism, and the Son of David." *Harvard Theological Review* 68 (1975): 235–52.
- _____. "Testament of Solomon." Pages 935–87 in vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1988.
- Ellis, E. Earle. *St. Paul's Use of the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.
- _____. "The Old Testament Canon in the Early Church." Pages 653–90 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by M. Jan Mulder. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988).
- Ellis, P. E. *Matthew: His Mind and His Message*. Collegeville: Liturgical, 1974.
- Falk, Daniel. *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 8. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Feldman, Louis H. *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- _____. "Prophets and Prophecy in Josephus." *Journal of Theological Studies* 41 (1990): 386–422.
- Fishbane, M. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.
- Fisher, L. R. "Can This be the Son of David?" Pages 82–97 in *Jesus and the Historian*. Edited by F.T. Trotter. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968.
- Fisk, Bruce N. "One Good Story Deserves Another: the Hermeneutics of Invoking Secondary Biblical Episodes in The Narratives of Pseudo-Philo and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." Pages 217–38 in *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity: Studies in Language and Tradition*. Edited by C.A.

- Evans. *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 33. Studes in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 7*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Flannery-Dailey, Frances. *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests: Jewish Dreams in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras*. *Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements 90*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. *The Gospel according to Luke*. Anchor Bible 28, 28A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981–85.
- Fox, N. S. *In the Service of the King: Officialdom in Ancient Israel and Judah*. *Monographs of the Hebrew Union College 23*. Cincinnati, 2000.
- Fraade, Steven D. “The ‘Torah of the King’ (Deut 17:14–20) in the Temple Scroll and Early Rabbinic Law.” Pages 25–60 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by James R. Davila. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- France, R. T. *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission*. London: Tyndale Press, 1971.
- _____. *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1989.
- _____. *The Gospel of Matthew*. *New International Commentary of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Freund, Richard A. “The Decalogue in Early Judaism and Christianity.” Pages 60–100 in *The Function of Scripture in Early Jewish and Christian Tradition*. Edited by C.A. Evans and J.A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988.
- Friberg, Jöran. “Numbers and Counting.” Pages 1140–46 in vol. 4 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Friedman, Richard Elliott. “Torah (Pentateuch).” Pages 605–22 in vol. 6 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D.N. Freedman. New York, Doubleday, 1992.
- Gale, Aaron M. *Redefining Ancient Borders: The Jewish Scribal Framework of Matthew’s Gospel*. New York: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Gamble, Harry Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

- García Martínez, Florentino. "Qumran Origins and Early History: a Groningen Hypothesis." *Folia Orientalia* 25 (1988): 113–36.
- _____. "Brotherly Rebuke in Qumran and Mt 18:15–17." Pages 221–32 in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices*. Edited by F. Garcia Martinez, and J. Treballe Barrera. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- _____. "Rethinking the Bible—Sixty years of Dead Sea Scrolls. Pages 19–36 in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by M. Popović. Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods: Supplement Series 141. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Garland, David E. *Reading Matthew: A Literary and Theological Commentary*. Macon, Ga.: Smyth&Helwys, 2001.
- Gathercole, Simon J. *The Pre-existent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark, and Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Gerhardsson, Birger. *The Testing of God's Son (Matt 4:1–11 & Par): An Analysis of an early Christian Midrash*. Translated by J. Toy. Lund, Sweden: CWK Gleerup, 1966.
- _____. "Illuminating the Kingdom: Narrative Meshalim in the Synoptic Gospels." Pages 266–304 in *Jesus and the Oral Gospel*. Edited by H. Wansbrough. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 64. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Glasson, T. F. "The Ensign of the Son of Man (Matt. XXIV.30)." *Journal of Theological Studies* 15 (1964): 299–300;
- Goodman, Martin. *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- Goulder, M. D. *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*. London: SPCK, 1974.
- Grabbe, Lester L. *Priest, Prophets, Diviners, Sages: A Socio-historical Study of Religious Specialists in Ancient Israel*. Valley Forge, Penn: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- Green, H. B. "The Structure of St. Matthew's Gospel." Pages 47–59 in *In Studia Evangelica IV: Papers Presented to the Third International Congress on New Testament Studies. Part I: The New Testament Scriptures*. Edited by F.L. Cross. Texte und Untersuchungen 102. Berlin: Akademie, 1968.
- Gundry, Robert H. *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel with Special Reference to the Messianic Hope*. Leiden: Brill, 1967.

- _____. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Guthrie, Donald. *New Testament Introduction*. 3rd ed. Downer's Grove: IVP, 1970.
- Hall, Stuart. "Introduction: Who Needs 'Identity'?" Pages 1–17 in *Questions of Cultural Identity*. Edited by S. Hall and P. du Gay. London: Sage, 1996.
- Hagner, Donald A. *Matthew 1–13*. Word Biblical Commentary 33a. Dallas: Word Books, 1993.
- Ham, Clay Alan. *The Coming King and the Rejected Shepherd: Matthew's reading of Zechariah's Messianic Hope*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005.
- Hanson, John S. "Dreams and Visions in the Graeco-Roman World and Early Christianity." Pages 1395–27 in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt II: Principat 23.2*. Edited by Wolfgang Haase. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1980.
- Hare, D. R. A., and D. J. Harrington. "Make Disciples of all the Gentiles" (Mt 28:19)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 37 (1975): 359–69.
- Harrington, Daniel J. "Palestinian Adaptations of Biblical Narratives and Prophecies I; The Bible Rewritten (Narratives)." Pages 239–47 in *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by R.A. Kraft and G.W.E. Nickelsburg. Society of Biblical Literature The Bible and Its Modern Interpreters 2. Philadelphia: Fortress; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Harris, W. V. *Ancient Literacy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.
- Harvey, John E. *Retelling Torah: The Deuteronomistic Historian's Use of Tetrateuchal Narratives*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 403. London; New York: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Hata, G. "Is the Greek Version of Josephus' Jewish War a Translation or a Rewriting of the First Version?" *Jewish Quarterly Review* 66 (1975): 89–108.
- Hengel, Martin. *Zealots: Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period from Herod I until 70 A.D.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989.
- Herzog, William R. *Parables as Subversive Speech: Jesus as Pedagogue of the Oppressed*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994.
- Hezser, Catherine. *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 81. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.

- Higgins, A. J. B. "The Sign of the Son of Man (Matt. XXIV.30)." *New Testament Studies* 9 (1962–63): 380–82.
- Hill, David. *The Gospel of Matthew*. New Century Bible Commentary. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1972.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. "The Wisdom of the Scribe, the Wisdom of the Priest, and the Wisdom of the King according to Ben Sira." Pages 89–999 in *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by R.A. Argall, B.A. Bow, and R.A. Werline. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000.
- Hirshman, M. *A Rivalry of Genius: Jewish and Christian Biblical Interpretation*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1996.
- Holladay, William. *Jeremiah 1*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1986.
- Horsley, Richard A. *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987.
- Hughes, Julie A. *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Hultgren, Arland J. *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Instone-Brewer, David. *Divorce and Remarriage in the Bible: The Social and Literary Context*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Jaffee, Martin S. *Torah in the Mouth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Jassen, Alex P. "The Presentation of the Ancient Prophets as Lawgivers at Qumran." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127 (2008): 307–37.
- _____. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Violence: Sectarian Formation and Eschatological Imagination." *Biblical Interpretation* 17 (2009): 12–44.
- Jeffers, Ann. *Magic and Divination in Ancient Palestine and Syria*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Jülicher, Adof. *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*. 2 vols. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck. 2nd ed. 1899–10.
- Kalmin, R. *Sages, Stories, Authors, and Editors in Rabbinic Babylonian*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- _____. *The Sage in Jewish Society of Late Antiquity*. London; New York: Routledge, 1999.

- Kampen, John. “‘Righteousness’ in Matthew and the Legal Texts from Qumran.” Pages 461–87 in *Legal texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995; Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*. Edited by M.J. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- _____. “Aspects of Wisdom in Gospel of Matthew in light of the New Qumran Evidence.” Pages 227–39 in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Oslo 1998: Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet*. Edited by D.K. Falk, F. García Martínez, E.M. Schuller. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- _____. “The Significance of the Scrolls for the Study of the Book of Matthew.” Pages 157–69 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: fifty years after their discovery: proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J.C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Old City Press, 2000.
- Kee, Howard C. *Knowing the Truth: A Sociological Approach to New Testament Interpretation*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1989.
- Keegan, T. J. “Introductory Formulae for Matthean discourses.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44 (1982): 415–30.
- Keener, Craig S. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Keith, Chris. *Jesus’ Literacy: Scribal Culture and the Teacher from Galilee*. Library of New Testament Studies 413. New York: T&T Clark, 2011.
- Kelber, W. *The Oral and the Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q*. Reprinted by Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1997.
- Kilpatrick, G. D. *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1946.
- Kingsbury, Jack D. *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1975.
- Kister, Menahem. “Divorce, Reproof, and Other Sayings in the Synoptic Gospels: Jesus Traditions in the Context of ‘Qumranic’ and other Texts.” Pages 195–229 in *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and early Christianity: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew Center for the Study of*

- Christianity*. Edited by Ruth a. Clements and Daniel R. Schwarz. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 84; Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Kloppenborg, John S. *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- _____. *The Tenants in the Vineyard: Ideology, Economics, and Agrarian Conflict in Jewish Palestine*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2006.
- _____. "The Representation of Violence in Synoptic Parables." Pages 323–51 in *Mark and Matthew I*. Edited by E. Becker and A. Runesson. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 271. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Knoppers, Gary N. *1 Chronicles 1–9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 12. New York: Doubleday, 2004.
- Kugel, James L. *In Potiphar's House: The Interpretative Life of Biblical Texts*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Kümmel, W. *Introduction to the New Testament*. London: SCM, 1975.
- Kupp, David D. *Matthew's Emmanuel: Divine Presence and God's People in the First Gospel*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 90. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Lambert, W. G. "Enmeduranki and Related Matters." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 21 (1967): 126–38.
- Leoni, Tommaso. "The Text of Josephus's Works: An Overview," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 40 (2009): 149–184.
- Levine, Amy-Jill. "To All the Gentiles": A Jewish Perspective on the Great Commission." *Review and Expositor* 103 (2006): 139–58.
- Levison, John R. *The Spirit in First-Century Judaism*. *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 29. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Liebenberg, Jacobus. *The Language of the Kingdom and Jesus: Parable, Aphorism, and Metaphor in the Sayings Material Common to the Synoptic Tradition and the Gospel of Thomas*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 102. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000.
- Lightfoot, Robert H. *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1934.

- Lindars, Barnabas. *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of Old Testament Quotations*. London: SCM Press; 1961.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 1–7: A Commentary*. Translated by W.C. Linss. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1989.
- _____. *Matthew 1–7*. Hermeneia. Reprint ed. Translated by J. Crouch. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2007.
- Lybaek, Lena. *New and Old in Matthew 11–13: Normativity in the Development of Three Theological Themes*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002.
- Macaskill, Grant. *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Malina, B. J. “Wealth and Property in the New Testament and its World.” *Interpretation* 41 (1987): 354–67.
- Maier, Johann. “Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Literature.” Pages 108–29 in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation, vol. 1, From the Beginning to the Middle Ages (Until 1300), part 1, Antiquity*. Edited by M. Saebo. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
- Mason, Steve. *Josephus and the New Testament*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992.
- _____. “Josephus, Daniel, and the Flavian House.” Pages 163–91 in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith*. Edited by F. Parente and J. Sievers. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- _____. “Josephus.” Pages 828–32 in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by J.J. Collins and D.C. Harlow. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- McArthur, Harvey K., and Robert M. Johnston. *They Also Taught in Parables: Rabbinic Parables from the First Centuries of the Christian Era*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990.
- McComiskey, Douglas S. “Exile and the Purpose of Jesus’ parables (Mark 4:10-12; Mat 13:10–17; Luke 8:9–10).” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 51.1 (2008): 59–85.

- McCown, C. C. "The Christian Tradition as to the Magical Wisdom of Solomon." *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society* 2 (1922): 1–24.
- Meier, John. "Nations or Gentiles in Matthew 28:19?" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 39 (1977): 94–102.
- Mendenhall, G. E. "Ancient Oriental and Biblical Law." *Biblical Archaeologist* 17 (1954): 26–46.
- Menken, Maarten J. J. *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist*. Leuven: Peeters, 2004.
- _____. "Deuteronomy in Matthew's Gospel." Pages 42–62 in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament*. Edited by S. Moyise and M. Menken. Library of New Testament Studies 358. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Metso, Sarianna. "Constitutional Rules at Qumran." Pages 186–210 in vol.1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by P.W. Flint, J.C. VanderKam, and A.E. Alvarez. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1998–99.
- _____. *The Serekh Texts*. LSTS 62; Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 9; London: T&T Clark. 2007.
- Meyer, B. F. *The Aims of Jesus*. London: SCM, 1979.
- Michel, O. "The Conclusion of Matthew's Gospel (1950)." Pages 39–51 in *The Interpretation of Matthew*. Edited by G.N. Stanton. 2nd ed. Edinburg: T&T Clark, 1995.
- Miller, Patrick D. "The Place of the Decalogue in the Old Testament and Its Law." *Interpretation* 43 (1989): 229–42.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*. Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1983.
- Morris, Leon. *The Gospel According to Matthew*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Mowinckel, S. *Real and Apparent Tricola in Hebrew Psalm Poetry*. Avhandling 2; Oslo: 1957.
- Najman, Hindy. *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods: Supplement Series* 77. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

- Newman, Judith. *Praying by the book: The Scripturalization of Prayer in Second Temple*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1999.
- Newsom, C. A. "Torah, Knowledge, and Symbolic Power: Strategies of Discourse in Second Temple Judaism." Pages 23–75 in *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 52. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100 (1981): 575–600.
- _____. "The Bible Rewritten and Expanded." Pages 89–156 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by M.E. Stone. Comendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novem Testamentum 2.2. Assen: Van Gorcum and Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Niditch, S. "The Visionary." Pages 153–79 in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by J.J. Collins and G.W. Nickelsburg. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980.
- Nissinen, Martti, C. L. Seow, and R. K. Ritner. *Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East*. Society of Biblical Literature Writings from the Ancient World 12. Atlanta/Leiden: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- _____. "How Prophecy Became Literature." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 19 (2005): 153–72.
- _____. "Prophecy and Omen Divination: Two sides of the same coin." Pages 341–51 in *Divination and Interpretation of Signs*. Edited by Amar Annus. Oriental Institute Seminars 6. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2010.
- Nitzan, Bilhah. *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*. Trans. by J. Chipman. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Noegel, Scott B. "'Sign, Sign, Everywhere a Sign': Script, Power, and Interpretation in the Ancient Near East." Pages 146–62 in *Divination and the Interpretation of Signs in the Ancient World*. Edited by Amar Annus. Oriental Institute Seminars 6. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2010.
- Nolland, John. *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Bletchley: Pasternoster Press, 2005.

- Olmstead, Wesley G. *Matthew's Trilogy of Parables: The Nation, the Nations and the Reader in Matthew 21:28–22:14*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 127. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Oppenheim, A. Leo. *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East With a Translation of an Assyrian Dream-Book*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series, 46.3. Philadelphia, PA: American Philological Society, 1956.
- Orton, D. E. *The Understanding Scribe*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 25. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.
- Overman, J. Andrew. *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1990.
- _____. *Church and Community in Crisis*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press, 1996.
- Peeler, Kimberly R. "Josephus, Flavius." Pages 403–404 in vol. 3 of *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by K.D. Sakenfeld. 5 vols. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2006–2009.
- Perdue, L. G. "The Wisdom Sayings of Jesus." *Forum* 2.3 (1986): 3–35.
- Perkins, Larry. "Greater than Solomon" (Matt 12:42)." *Trinity Journal* 19 (1998): 207–18.
- Petersen, Anders Klostergaard. "Textual Fidelity, Elaboration, Supersession or Encroachment? Typological Reflections on the Phenomenon of Rewritten Scripture," Pages 13–48 in *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Technique? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes*. Edited by József Zsengellér. JSJSup 166. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Phillips, Peter. "Casting out the Treasure: A New Reading of Matthew 13.52," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 31.1 (2008): 3–24.
- Plevnik, J. *Paul and the Parousia: An Exegetical and Theological Investigation*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997.
- Pomykala, Kenneth E. *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism: Its History and Significance for Messianism*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature 7. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Powell, Mark A. "Do and Keep What Moses Says (Matthew 23:2–7)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 114 (1995): 419–35.

- Powery, Emerson B. *Jesus Reads Scripture: The Function of Jesus' Use of Scripture in the Synoptic Gospels*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Przybylski, Benno. *Righteousness in Matthew and His World of Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Regev, Eyal. *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Religion and Society 45. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.
- Reid, Barbara. "Violent Endings in Matthew's Parables and Christian Nonviolence." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 66 (2004): 237–55.
- Richardson, Peter. *Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1999.
- Richardson, Seth. "On Seeing and Believing: Liver Divination and the Era of Warring States (II)." Pages 225–66 in *Divination and Interpretation of Signs*. Edited by Amar Annus. Oriental Institute Seminars 6. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2010.
- Saggs, H. W. F. *The Greatness that was Babylon*. New York: Mentor, 1962.
- Saldarini, Anthony J. *Pharisees, Scribes, and Sadducees in Palestinian Society*. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1988.
- _____. "The Gospel of Matthew and Jewish-Christian Conflict in the Galilee." Pages 26–27 in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity*. Edited by L.I. Levine. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- _____. "Scribes" Pages 1012–116 in vol. 5 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D.N. Freedman. New York, Doubleday, 1992.
- _____. *Matthew's Christian Jewish Community*. Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism. Chicago, CA: Chicago University Press, 1994.
- Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. London: SCM, 1977.
- _____. *Jesus and Judaism*. London: SCM Press, 1985.
- _____. "When Is a Law a Law? The Case of Jesus and Paul." Pages 139–58 in *Religion and Law: Biblical-Judaic and Islamic Perspectives*. Edited by E.B. Firmage, B.G. Weiss, and J.W. Welch. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

- Sander, J. T. *Schismatics, Sectarians, Dissidents, Deviants*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1993.
- Schams, Christine. *Jewish Scribes in the Second-Temple Period*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of the Congregation*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- _____. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Rabbinic Halakhah." Pages 3–24 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001*. Edited by J.R. Davila. Studies on the Text of the Desert of Judah 46. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Schuller, Eileen. "Non-Canonical Psalms." Pages 75–172 in *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part I*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XI. Edited by E. Eshel, J. Eshel, C. Newsom, B. Nitzan, E. Schuller, and A. Yardeni. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- Scott, B. B. *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1989.
- Scott, James M. *Paul and the Nations*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 84. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1995.
- Segal, Michael. "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible." Pages 10–28 in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Edited by M. Henze. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- _____. "The Text of the Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Materia Giudaica* 12 (2007): 5–20.
- Senior, Donald. "Between Two World: Gentiles and Jewish Christians in Matthew's Gospel." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 61 (1999): 1–23.
- Sider, J. W. "Rediscovering the Parables: The Logic of the Jeremias Tradition." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102 (1983): 61–83.
- Sim, David C. "The Gospel of Matthew and the Gentiles." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 57 (1995): 19–48.
- _____. "Matthew's Use of Mark: Did Matthew Intend to Supplement or to Replace His Primary Source?" *New Testament Studies* 57 (2011): 176–92.

- Smith, M. *Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament*. New York & London: Columbia University Press, 1971.
- Snodgrass, K. R. *Stories with Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Snyder, H. *Teachers, Texts and Student: Textual Performance and Patterns of Authority in Greco-Roman Schools*. Yale University Dissertation, 1998.
- Stanley, Christopher D. "The Rhetoric of Quotations: An Essay on Method." Pages 44–58 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by C.A. Evans and J.A. Sanders. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- _____. "Social Environment of "Free" Biblical Quotations in the New Testament." Pages 18–27 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by C.A. Evans and J.A. Sanders. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Stanton, Graham N. "Salvation Proclaimed X: Matthew 11:28–30: Comfortable Words?" *Expository Times* 94 (1982): 3–9.
- _____. "Matthew." Pages 205–19 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*. Edited by D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- _____. *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992.
- Stemberger, G. *Jewish Contemporaries of Jesus: Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1995.
- Stendahl, Krister. *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968.
- Stern, David. *Parables in Midrash: Narrative and Exegesis in Rabbinic Literature*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- Stern, M. "The Reign of Herod and the Herodian Dynasty." Pages 216–307 in *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. Edited by S. Safrai and M. Stern. Comendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novem Testamentum 1.1. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.

- Stern, Pnina “Life of Josephus: The Autobiography of Flavius Josephus.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 41 (2010): 63–93.
- Steudel, A. “אחרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran.” *Revue de Qumran* 16 (1993–94): 225–46.
- Suggs, M. J. *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew’s Gospel*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.
- Swanson, Dwight D. *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 14. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Tait, Michael. “The End of the Law: The Messianic Torah in the Pseudepigrapha.” Pages 196–207 in *The Torah in the New Testament*. Edited by Michael Tait and Peter Oakes. Library of New Testament Studies 401. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Toher, M. “One the Use of Nicolaus’ Historical Fragments.” *Convivium assisiense* 8.1 (1989): 159–72.
- Tolbert, Mary A. *Perspectives on the Parables: An Approach to Multiple Interpretations*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Torijano, Pablo A. *Solomon, the Esoteric King: From King to Magus, Development of a Tradition*. Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods: Supplement Series 73. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Tov, Emanuel. “Biblical Texts as Reworked in Some Qumran Manuscripts with Special Attention to 4QRP and 4QparaGen-Exod.” Pages 111–34 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by E. Ulrich and J.C. VanderKam. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.
- _____. *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- _____. “The Many Forms of Hebrew Scripture: Reflections in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch.” Pages 11–28 in *From Qumran to Aleppo*. Edited by A. Lange, M. Weigold, and J. Zsengellér. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 230. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.
- Tso, Marcus. *Ethics in the Qumran Community: An Interdisciplinary Investigation*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2.292. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

- Ulrich, Eugene. "The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures at Qumran." Pages 77–93 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by E. Ulrich, and J. C. VanderKam. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.
- _____. "The Text of the Hebrew Scriptures at the Time of Hillel and Jesus." Pages 85–108 in *Congress Volume Basel 2001*. Edited by A. Lemaire. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 92. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Van der Toorn, Karel. *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- VanderKam, James C. *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 16. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1984.
- Vermes, Geza. *Les Manuscrits du désert de Juda*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1953.
- _____. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*. 2nd ed. Studia post-biblica 4. Leiden: Brill, 1973.
- _____. "Interpretation, History of: At Qumran and in the Targums." Pages 438–443 in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume*. Edited by K. Crim. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1976.
- _____. "The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on the Study of the New Testament." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 27 (1976): 107–16.
- _____. "The Genesis of the Concept of 'Rewritten Bible.'" Pages 3–9 in *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Technique? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes*. Edited by József Zsengellér. Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods: Supplement Series 166; Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Versnel, H. S. "Magic." Page 909 in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 3rd ed. Edited by S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Wacholder, B. Z. *Nicolaus of Damascus*. Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1962.
- Whitelam, Keith W. *The Just King: Monarchical Judicial Authority in Ancient Israel*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 12. Sheffield: Sheffield, 1979.
- Wikenhauser, Alfred. "Doppelträume." *Biblica* 29 (1948): 100–11.

- Wilder, Amos N. *Jesus' Parables and the War of Myths: Essays on Imagination in the Scriptures* Edited by James Breech. Philadelphia: Fortress; London: SPCK, 1982.
- Williams, J. D. *Those Who Ponder Proverbs: Aphoristic Thinking and Biblical Literature*. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1981.
- Wilson, Alistair I. *When Will These Things Happen? A Study of Jesus as Judge in Matthew 21–25*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2004.
- Wilson, Robert R. *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.
- Wink, Walter. "Beyond Just War and Pacifism." *Review and Expositor* 89 (1992): 102–21.
- Witherington III, Ben. *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1994.
- _____. *Jesus the Seer: The Progress of Prophecy*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2000.
- Wright, N. T. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1996.
- Wright III, Benjamin G. "Solomon in Chronicles and Ben Sira: A Study in Contrasts." Pages 139–58 in *Rewriting Biblical History: Essays on Chronicles and Ben Sira in Honour of Pancratius C. Beentjes*. Edited by J. Corley and H. van Grol. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.
- Woollcombe, K. J. *Essays on Typology*. London: SCM Press, 1957.
- Worchel, Stephen, J. Francisco Morales, D. Páez, and Jean-Claude Champs, eds. *Social Identity: International Perspectives*. London: Sage, 1998.
- Young, B. H. *Jesus and His Jewish Parables*. New York: Paulist, 1989.
- Zahn, Molly. "Genre and Rewritten Scripture: A Reassessment." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 131 (2012): 271–88.

APPENDIX 1: MATTHEW AND MARK

MATTHEW	MARK
Title (1:1)	1:1
Jesus' Genealogy (1:2–17)	
Jesus' Birth Announcement (1:18–25)	
Jesus' Birth, Magi and Egypt (2:1–15)	
King Herod's Massacre and Return to Nazareth (2:16–23)	
John the Baptist and Jesus' Baptism (3:1–17)	1:2–11
Jesus' Temptation (4:1–11)	1:12–13
Jesus in Galilee (4:12–17)	1:14–15; 6:17
Peter, Andrew, John and James (4:18–22)	1:16–20
Teaching in Galilee (4:23–25)	1:35–39
Jesus' Torah Discourse (5:1–7:29)	3:13; 9:50; 4:21; 11:25; 9:43–48; 10:2–12; 11:25; 4:21–23; 4:24–25; 11:24; 13:22; 9:38–40; 1:21–22; 11:18
Leper (8:1–4)	1:40–45
Centurion and Banquet (8:5–13)	
Peter's Mother and Casting Out Evil Spirits (8:14–17)	1:29–34
Son of Man: Foxes have Holes (8:18–22)	
Storm on the Sea (8:23–27)	4:35–41
Healing Demoniacs and Jesus asked to leave (8:28–34)	5:1–20
Paralytic (9:1–8)	2:1–12
Call of Matthew (9:9)	2:14
Eating with Tax Collectors (9:10–13)	2:15–17
Pharisee's Fasting (9:14–17)	2:18–22
Ruler's Daughter and Hemorrhaging Woman (9:18–26)	5:21–43
Two Blind Men (9:27–3)	10:46–52
Deaf and Mute Demoniac (9:32–34; cf. 12:22–24)	3:22
The Harvest (9:35–38)	1:39; 6:6b, 34
Jesus' Mission Discourse (10:1–11:1)	3:13–19; 6:7–13; 13:9–13; 3:22; 4:21–23; 8:34–35; 9:37; 9:41
John's Question from Prison (11:2–6)	
Jesus speaking about John (11:7–15)	1:2; cf. 9:13; 4:23
Woe to Cities and Come to Me (11:20–30)	
Disciples Eating Grain (12:1–8)	2:23–28
Healing on the Sabbath (12:9–14)	3:1–6
Jesus Withdraws (12:15–21)	3:7–12
Casting out Demons (12:22–37)	3:20–22
Sign (12:38–42)	8:11–13
Unclean Spirit (12:43–45)	
Mother and Brothers (12:46–50)	3:31–35

Jesus' Parable Discourse (13:1–48)	4:1–34; 6:1–6
Herod the Tetrarch (14:1–12)	6:14–29
Jesus Withdraws (14:13–14)	6:30–34
Feeding 5000 Men (14:15–21)	6:35–44
Jesus is Alone and Walks on Water (14:22–33)	6:45–52
Healing Sick (14:34–36)	6:53–56
Disciples Eating (15:1–9)	7:1–13
Teaching on Defilement (15:10–20)	7:14–23
Canaanite Woman (15:21–28)	7:24–30
Jesus on Mountain (15:29–31)	7:31–37
Feeding 4000 (15:32–39)	8:1–10
Sign (16:1–4)	8:11–13
Pharisees and Sadducees (16:5–12)	8:14–21
Jesus' Identity (16:13–20)	8:27–30
Suffering Son of Man (16:21–23)	8:31–33
Taking up the Cross (16:24–28)	8:34–9:1
Transfiguration (17:1–8; cf. 3:16–17)	9:2–8
Elijah Coming First (17:9–13)	9:9–13
Healing a Boy (17:14)	9:14–27
Disciples' Failure (17:19–20)	9:28–29
Suffering Son of Man (17:22–23)	9:30–32
Paying Taxes (17:24–27)	
Jesus' Covenant Community Discourse (18:1–19:2)	9:33–37
Divorce (19:3–9)	10:2–9
Marriage (19:10–12)	
Healing Children (19:13–15)	10:13–16
Rich Young Man (19:16–22)	10:17–22
Eye of the Needle (19:23–30)	10:23–31
Labourers (20:1–16)	10:31
Crucified Son of Man (20:17–19)	10:32–34
Request for James and John (20:20–23)	10:35–40
Disciples are Indignant (20:24–28)	10:41–45
Two Blind Men (20:29–34)	10:46–52
Two Disciples Sent for Colt (21:1–6)	11:1–10
Triumphal entry (21:7–9)	11:11
Prophet (21:10–11)	
Cleansing the Temple (21:12–13)	11:15–19
Children's Praises (21:14–17)	
Fig Tree (21:18–22)	11:12–14
Questioned in the Temple (21:23–37)	11:27–33
Two Sons (21:28–32)	
Householder Vineyard (21:33–46)	12:1–12
Marriage Feast (22:1–14)	
Pharisees (22:15–22)	12:13–17

Sadducees (22:23–33)	12:18–27
Pharisee and Commandment (22:34–40)	12:28–34
Who do you Christ (22:41–46)	12:35–37
Jesus' Prophetic Eschatological Discourse (23:1–25:2)	12:38–40; 13:1–37; 4:24–25; 14:1–2
Plot to Kill Jesus (26:3–5)	11:18; 12:12
Jesus is Anointed (26:6–13)	14:3–9
Judas (26:14–16)	14:10–11
Preparations for Passover (26:17–19)	14:12–16
Betrayal Foretold (26:20–25)	14:17–21
Last Supper (26:26–29)	14:22–25
Praying at the Mount of Olives (26:30–35)	14:26–31
Jesus' Prayer (26:36–46)	14:32–42
Jesus is Arrested (26:47–56)	14:43–52
Jesus before Caiaphas (26:57–58)	14:53–54
Jesus' Trial (26:59–68; 24:30)	14:55–65
Peter's Denial (26:69–75)	14:66–72
Verdict (27:1–2)	15:1
Judas' Death (27:3–10)	
Jesus before Pilate (27:11–14)	15:2–5
Barabbas is Released (27:15–26)	
Soldiers Mock Jesus (27:27–31)	15:16–20
Simon of Cyrene (27:32)	15:21
Jesus' Crucifixion (27:33–44)	15:22–32
Jesus' Death (27:45–56)	15:33–41
Jesus Burial (27:57–61)	15:42–47
Guards at the Tomb (27:62–66)	
Two Women (28:1–8)	16:1–8
Meets Jesus (28:9–10)	
Guards are Bribed (28:11–15)	
Jesus' Commission (28:16–20)	