

Miszelle

Alida C. Euler*

Drinking Gall and Vinegar: Psalm 69:22: An Underestimated Intertext in Matt 27:34, 48

<https://doi.org/10.1515/znw-2021-0007>

Abstract: The intertextual play with Psalm 69:22 in Matt 27:34, 48 is an important aspect for adequately understanding Matthew’s crucifixion scene. In Matt 27:34 the Roman soldiers offer Jesus “wine mixed with gall”, which is an allusion to Psalm 69:22a. By acting as the praying-self’s opponents, the Roman soldiers are portrayed as the mockers of Psalm 69:22a. In Matt 27:48, the Jewish authorities offer vinegar to the crucified Jesus, which is a clear allusion to Psalm 69:22b. Therefore, the Jewish authorities are portrayed in parallel to the Roman soldiers. Considering that Matthew refers to Psalm 69:22 not in a selective manner, but in the psalm’s context, the parallel between the Roman soldiers and the Jewish authorities extends to the crucial point in Jewish self-conception of being accused of ἀνομία.

Zusammenfassung: Das intertextuelle Spiel mit Ps 69,22 in Mt 27,34.48 ist ein wichtiger Aspekt für das Verständnis der matthäischen Kreuzigungsszene. In Mt 27,34 bieten die römischen Soldaten in Anspielung auf Ps 69,22a Jesus „Wein mit Galle vermischt“ an. Indem sie sich wie die Gegner des betenden Ichs verhalten, werden die römischen Soldaten als Spötter von Ps 69,22a porträtiert. In Mt 27,48 versuchen die jüdischen Autoritäten, deutlich auf Ps 69,22b anspielend, den gekreuzigten Jesus mit Essig zu tränken. Demzufolge werden die jüdischen Autoritäten parallel zu den römischen Soldaten gezeichnet. Da schließlich Matthäus auf Ps 69,22 nicht selektiv, sondern auf den Vers in dessen Kontext im Psalm verweist, erstreckt sich die Parallele zwischen den römischen Soldaten und den jüdischen Autoritäten bis hin zu dem für jüdisches Selbstverständnis entscheidenden Vorwurf der ἀνομία.

Keywords: Gospel of Matthew, Psalm 69, Intertextuality, Matthew’s Crucifixion Scene, ἀνομία, Jewish Authorities

*Corresponding author: Alida C. Euler, Theologisches Seminar der Universität Heidelberg, Kisselgasse 1, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany; alida.euler@ts.uni-heidelberg.de

1 Introduction: The Psalms Are Significant to Understand the Matthean Crucifixion Scene

Within the Matthean crucifixion scene the two allusions to Psalm 69:22¹ have long been noted within scholarship. In Psalm 69:22 the praying-self moans: “They gave me gall for my food and for my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink.” This verse is, first, intertextually referred to by the Roman soldiers who offer Jesus a mixture of wine and gall on his way to Golgotha (Matt 27:34). And second, it is alluded to by the Jewish authorities’ attempt to give a sponge soaked with vinegar to the already crucified Jesus (Matt 27:48).

These two allusions frame the four well-noted intertextual references to Psalm 22 (Matt 27:35, 39, 43, 46), with the most famous being Jesus’ cry of desolation in Matt 27:46. While the implications of this intertextual play with Psalm 22 have widely been studied, the contribution of Psalm 69:22 for adequately understanding the Matthean crucifixion scene has been under-estimated.²

The purpose of this paper is to show that not only the intertextual play with Psalm 22, but also with Psalm 69, contributes important aspects to the Matthean crucifixion scene, since it possesses major significance for the portrayal of Jesus’ opponents. The conflict between Jesus and the Jewish authorities that is present

1 All indications of passages from Israel’s Scriptures conform the counting of the Hebrew Bible, since today especially within the psalms those are the commonly used designations. However, although the question of ‘Matthew’s Bible’ (or ‘Matthew’s Bibles’, if he knew the texts in Greek and Hebrew) shall not be addressed in this paper, it has to be noted that Matthew was familiar with a Greek version of the two most important psalms of the Matthean passion narrative (Psalm 22 and Psalm 69). Therefore, the primary ‘intertexts’ are rather the Septuagint’s than the Hebrew Bible’s psalms.

2 Whereas in most anterior and contemporary commentaries the intertextual references to Psalm 69:22 are noted (e. g. Bernhard Weiss, *Das Matthäus-Evangelium*, 9th ed., KEK 1.1 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898], 486f.; Joachim Gnilka, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, vol. 2, HThKNT 1,2 [Freiburg et al.: Herder, 1988], 472, 475; Matthias Konradt, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, NTD 1 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015], 441, 446), even in longer commentaries like the works of Ulrich Luz (*Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, vol. 4: Mt 26–28, EKKNT 1.4 [Düsseldorf et al.: Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2002] 315f., 344f.) and William Davies and Dale C. Allison (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, vol. 3: Commentary on Matthew XIX–XXVIII, ICC [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997], 612, 626) or in Raymond E. Brown’s elaborate monograph on the different presentations of Jesus’s death (*The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave*, vol. 2, ABRL [New York et al.: Doubleday, 1994], 941) the implications of Ps 69:22 as an intertext are not sufficiently evaluated.

throughout the entire gospel³ reaches a point of culmination in the crucifixion scene not only due to their actual deeds, but also due to their intertextual parallelization with the Roman soldiers up to the harsh accuse of ἀνομία. To demonstrate this hypothesis, I will first point out that Psalm 69:22 is apparent as an intertext in Matt 27:34, 48 for Matthew's first readers. Second, I will explicate the parallelism between the Roman soldiers and the mockers of Psalm 69:22, before I will, third, address the equivalent parallelism between the Jewish authorities and the mockers of the Psalm in Matt 27:48. Fourth, I will conclude that Matthew creates an intertextual parallel between the Roman soldiers and the Jewish authorities up to the accusation of ἀνομία and therefore criticizes the latter in a crucial aspect of their Jewish self-understanding.

On the whole, the Gospel of Matthew can only be properly appreciated if one takes into account the Jewish character of the author and his writing.⁴ It is widely known that Matthew frequently draws on Israel's scriptures in spelling out his version of the Christ-event – with the 'fulfillment citations' only being the tip of the iceberg of numerous further intertextual references to the First Testament.⁵

In particular with regard to his frequent references to the psalms, Matthew can expect his first readers, which are assumed to consist to the bigger part of Christ believers with a Jewish background to notice and correctly place the given intertextual hints, since the Psalms were widely known and used at Matthew's time.⁶ Although due to a lack of sources it is not possible to trace in detail the

3 Cf. e. g. Jack D. Kingsbury, "The Developing Conflict between Jesus and the Jewish Leaders in Matthew's Gospel. A Literary-Critical Study," *CBQ* 49 (1987): 57–73; Marlies Gielen, *Der Konflikt Jesu mit den religiösen und politischen Autoritäten seines Volkes im Spiegel der matthäischen Jesusgeschichte*, BBB 115 (Bodenheim: Philo Verlagsgesellschaft, 1998); Boris Repschinski, *The Controversy Stories in the Gospel of Matthew. Their Redaction, Form and Relevance for the Relationship Between the Matthean Community and Formative Judaism*, FRLANT 189 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000); Matthias Konradt, *Israel, Kirche und die Völker im Matthäusevangelium*, WUNT 215 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 97–181.

4 Cf. e. g. William Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, vol. 1: Introduction and Commentary on Matthew I–VII, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 7–58; Ulrich Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, 5th ed., vol. 1: Mt 1–7, EKKNT 1.1 (Düsseldorf et al.: Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2002) 84–99; Anders Runesson, "Rethinking Early Jewish-Christian Relations: Matthean Community History as Pharisaic Intragroup Conflict," *JBL* 127 (2008): 95–132, here 99–104; Konradt, *Evangelium* (see n. 2), 17–19.

5 Cf. Donald Senior, "The Lure of the Formula Quotations. Re-Assessing Matthew's Use of the Old Testament with the Passion Narrative as Test Case," in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*, ed. Christopher M. Tuckett, BETL 131 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997), 89–115, esp. 108.

6 Psalms are used as intertexts in both Hebrew and Greek Early Jewish literature. Furthermore, the Book of Psalms is among the most frequently represented texts within the Dead Sea Scrolls (cf. Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* [Leiden et al.: Brill, 1997],

usage of Psalm 22 and Psalm 69 in day-to-day piety at that time, these two psalms must have been especially well-known, because they were used in several intertextual plays within early Jewish literature (e. g. Psalm 22 in Wis 2:18; 1QH^a XIII/ Psalm 69 in Philo, QG 4:147; 1QH^a XII:12).

In the ‘individual lament’ Psalm 69, verse 22 itself belongs to the section Psalm 69:20–22 that addresses the mockery which the praying-self has to suffer. This section is followed by a short ‘psalm of revenge’ (Psalm 69:23–29), that spells out the consequences which the praying-self’s opponents have to face due to their misbehavior. Verse 22 is particularly eye-catching, because it is only here within the Septuagint that the two rarely used terms ὄξος and χολή are used together. Furthermore, apart from in Psalm 69:22 these two terms appear together in Greek literature only in non-Jewish medical texts prior to Matthew’s time. Nowhere are both substances offered together as ‘food’ or in a context of mockery. Moreover, the rarity of the use of ὄξος and χολή together is relevant for Matthew’s understanding of Matt 27:34, 48. ὄξος and χολή cannot be known as a common pair of terms, but must have drawn special attention and therefore have to be understood in the light of Psalm 69:22.

2 Matt 27:34: Matthew Establishes a Parallelism Between the Roman Soldiers and the Mockers of Psalm 69:22

Matthew already found the offering of a drink based on wine during Jesus’ way to Golgotha in his Marcan source, where the Roman soldiers offer wine mixed with myrrh (Mark 15:23). Since myrrh is widely used in ancient medicine, it has to be assumed that, in Mark’s Gospel, this drink is a friendly gesture.⁷ An intertextual link to Psalm 69:22 in this case is implausible, as the two conforming lexemes between Psalm 69:22 and Mark 15:23 (διδόναι, οἶνος) are too common to establish a certain reference.

702; Eva Jain, *Psalmen oder Psalter? Materielle Rekonstruktion und inhaltliche Untersuchung der Psalmenhandschriften aus der Wüste Juda*, STDJ 109 [Leiden et al.: Brill, 2014], 300).

⁷ An expected pain-relieving effect of myrrh is likely due to the situation of an imminent crucifixion, but unfortunately just this effect is not mentioned in contemporary sources from the Graeco-Roman world or Mesopotamia. Cf. Gus W. v. Beek, “Frankincense and Myrrh,” in *The Biblical Archaeologist Reader*, ed. Edward F. Campbell and David N. Freedman, vol. 2 (Garden City [NY]: Doubleday, 1964), 99–126, here 116.

Matthew, however, changes the given mixture to wine and gall (οἶνον μετὰ χολῆς μεμιγμένον) and thereby establishes a clear link to Psalm 69:22. This becomes apparent for three reasons: First, the two lexemes διδόναι and χολή appear together within the Septuagint and the New Testament only in Psalm 69:22 and Matt 27:34. Second, Matthew adjusts the verb form ἐδίδου (Mark 15:23) to the aorist form ἔδωκαν, exactly as it is used in the psalm. Of course, Matthew often changes Mark's verb forms to an aorist, but usually he changes present tense verbs and not, like here, an imperfect form. And third, Matthew completes the actions of Psalm 69:22 by using gall instead of myrrh: the praying-self receives gall *and* vinegar. The latter is offered to Jesus in a clear allusion to the Psalm in Matt 27:48, while the former complements the reference to the psalm by adding gall.

It is not possible to determine exactly what kind of substance χολή was for Matthew and his first readers. It has to be something drinkable – a liquid or some powder, since it can be mixed with wine. As χολή is used within a psalm-reference, its use within the Old Testament and Early Jewish literature is more relevant for ascertaining its identity in Matt 27:34 than the non-Jewish usages, which focus on the organ of the 'gall' or the liquid produced therein. Within the Septuagint, χολή is used 17 times and translates לענה, מררה and ריש/ראש, the latter of which is used in Psalm 69:22. The meaning of ריש/ראש is also difficult to determine, but is consistently connected to 'poison'⁸, leading to the conclusion that the praying-self of the Hebrew Psalm 69:22 receives something poisonous as 'food'.

This connotation is not necessarily given for the Greek term χολή, as it is not poisonous in Deut 32:32/Odes 2:32; Prov 5:4 and Lam 3:15. Within the Septuagint χολή is combined with πικρία five times (Deut 29:17; 32:32/Odes 2:32; Lam 3:15, 19) and this connotation of something 'bitter' is also present in the rare uses of χολή in Early Jewish literature (Philo, Ebr. 1:222; Somn. 2:191 [both quoting Deut 32:32]; T. Naph. 2:8; T. Sol. 5:13).

Three results are important to understand Matthew's use of χολή in Matt 27:34: First, no other scripture before Matthew's Gospel establishes an intertextual link to Psalm 69:22 by using the term χολή or ריש/ראש. Therefore, the invocation of Psalm 69:22 cannot just be a coincidence due to common language but must have been intended by Matthew. Second, while Balz and Schneider speculate that wine mixed with χολή could function as an anaesthetic beverage⁹, this hypothesis must be dismissed, as this use is not covered by ancient sources. And third, Matthew in his version of Jesus' crucifixion turns the friendly gesture of a

⁸ Cf. William McKane, "Trial by Ordeal and the Cup of Wrath," *VT* 30 (1980): 474–492, here 479.

⁹ Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider, "χολή, ἦς, ἡ cholē Galle," *EDNT* 3:470.

pleasant drink into an act of mocking by offering Jesus a disgusting potion that exploits the meaning of $\chi\omicron\lambda\eta$ as being something bitter, maybe even poisonous, and most importantly due to its intertextual relation to the psalm. However, it is possible to trace Matthew's intentions further.

Secondary literature often refers to bSanh. 43a as evidence for an existing habit of offering a pain-killing drink to a moribund on his way to his execution.¹⁰ In terms of Matthew's Gospel bSanh. 43a is clearly younger¹¹, thus the difficulties of relying on bSanh. 43a for such a habit not only concern the significant differences between the described offering in the Babylonian Talmud and the drinking scenes in Mark's and Matthew's Gospels, but above all the chronological discrepancy between these two sources. Therefore, it is not possible to prove that such a habit existed in Matthew's day by appealing to the Babylonian Talmud.

However, to carve out Matthew's intention it is less important whether Matthew's readers expected such a scene due to an existing custom or due to their possible knowledge of traditions such as those which are portrayed in Mark 15:23. If, however, the intended readers expected a drinking scene like Mark 15:23, Matthew's change of the drink to a detestable wine-gall mix must have drawn the attention of his readers and thereby invited them to give special attention to the scene. Since the exact reading-expectations of Matthew's first readers cannot be completely traced here, it has to be noted that the detestable drink draws attention to itself either only by the prominent psalm-reference or additionally by a disappointed readers' expectance.

With this background information in mind, it is possible to trace Matthew's intention in changing the drink. As the psalm reference is obvious for Matthew's first readers and as the opponents in the psalm are aimed at mocking, not killing the praying-self, the consideration of Davies and Allison that the offered drink is an "invitation to commit suicide"¹² must be rejected. By inserting the psalm reference into the crucifixion scene, Matthew draws attention to the topic of Psalm 69:22 itself. As mentioned above, Psalm 69:22 is part of the psalm's mocking-section (verses 20–22) and therefore the intertextual relation emphasizes the fact of Jesus being mocked. After having already suffered violent verbal and physical mocking (Matt 27:27–31), the mocking in v.34 provides yet another non-verbal mocking before another verbal mocking follows in vv.39–44. In comparison with

¹⁰ E. g. Weiss, *Matthäus-Evangelium* (see n. 2), 487; Gnllka, *Matthäusevangelium* (see n. 2), 2:472; Brown, *Death* (see n. 2), 2:941.

¹¹ E. g. Günter Stemberger, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch*, 9th ed. (München: C. H. Beck, 2011), 215.

¹² Davies and Allison, *Matthew* (see n. 2), 3:613.

Matthew's Marcan model, mocking Jesus features as a more central aspect within the crucifixion and the events leading to it.

To conclude this section, the Roman soldiers are characterized as the mockers of Psalm 69:22. This corresponds structurally with their casting of lots about Jesus' clothes in Matt 27:35, as this action is also a clear allusion to a psalm (Psalm 22:19). On both occasions the Roman soldiers are portrayed as the active opponents of the praying-self in a psalm.

3 Matt 27:48: The Jewish Authorities Are Equivalently Portrayed as the Mockers of Psalm 69:22

The second point of interest in the role of Psalm 69:22 relates to the deliberate misunderstanding of Jesus' cry $\eta\lambda\iota \eta\lambda\iota \lambda\epsilon\mu\alpha \sigma\alpha\beta\alpha\chi\theta\alpha\nu\iota$ (Matt 27:46) as calling Elia for help. Immediately after Jesus utters this cry, one of the 'bystanders' runs to offer him a sponge soaked with vinegar that is attached to a stick (Matt 27:48). Matthew clarifies the Marcan scene by pointing out that the one who offers the drink is a member of those who 'misunderstand' the cry by inserting $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\xi \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\acute{\nu}$.

This second drinking scene is a clear allusion to Psalm 69:22 for two reasons. First, as pointed out above within the Septuagint and the New Testament, the two lexemes $\chi\omicron\lambda\acute{\eta}$ and $\delta\acute{\xi}\omicron\varsigma$ only appear together in Psalm 69:22. Of course, there is a gap of 14 verses between Matt 27:34 and v.48, but as no other biblical scripture besides Matthew's Gospel uses both terms at all, and since at the allusion in v.34 Matthew has already activated Psalm 69:22 as an intertext for the crucifixion scene, the offering of $\delta\acute{\xi}\omicron\varsigma$ as a drink must invoke Psalm 69:22 again. In addition, the second reason is the parallel established between the *situations* of Psalm 69:22 and Matt 27:48, since Jesus suffers mockery like the praying-self in Psalm 69:20f., and the mocking is continued in both texts by offering vinegar as a drink.

In order to adequately understand the second drinking scene, the following question has first to be answered: Who are the 'bystanders' ($\tau\iota\nu\epsilon\varsigma \delta\grave{\epsilon} \tau\omega\acute{\nu} \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota} \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\omicron\tau\omega\acute{\nu}$ [Matt 27:47]) who raise the Elia misunderstanding? Three groups can be considered as plausible candidates: the Roman soldiers, the mocking group of spectators (Matt 27:39f.) and the Jewish authorities. The latter are the most likely option because their deliberate misunderstanding of the cry of desolation (Matt 27:46) is more easily explainable than the misunderstanding of a

Jewish psalm among the non-Jewish soldiers. In addition, the Roman soldiers are ‘sitting’ beneath the cross (καθήμενοι, Matt 27:36), whereas the mockers of v.39f. are described as ‘passing’ (παραπορευόμενοι) and not as ‘standing’ (ἑστηκότων, Matt 27:48).

Based only on the Old Testament or Early Jewish background, it cannot be determined whether the gift of vinegar is in itself, like the gift of χολή, to be considered negative for Matthew’s first readers, since the term is rarely used and there are positive or neutral¹³ and negative¹⁴ appearances. Within Psalm 69:22b, however, the presentation of vinegar as a drink is clearly negative, since it is presented in a synonymic *parallelism membrorum* to χολή in Psalm 69:22a. If the non-Jewish Greek literature is taken into consideration, it becomes apparent that vinegar counts as a simple every-day drink¹⁵ and within the medical literature it is testified to even have positive effects.¹⁶ A use of vinegar as a means of torture cannot be detected within the contemporary literature.¹⁷

Matthew’s first readers will therefore probably have taken the gift of vinegar as in itself a friendly gesture that is turned into a symbol of mockery against Jesus due to the intertextual invocation of Psalm 69:22b and the way the vinegar is offered – namely, with a sponge wrapped around a stick as if it was used as a toiletry.¹⁸ As there is no hint within the Matthean text that Jesus is elevated to a height that cannot be reached without a tool during his crucifixion, the soaked sponge on a stick is a mocking action within itself.

Therefore, it can be deduced that the offering of the vinegar is ambivalent in terms of its implications. Giving Jesus something to drink is a friendly gesture, which is turned into a mockery by the intertextual relation and the mode of the gift. Special attention has to be paid to the verb ἐπότιζεν (Matt 27:48): Unlike in Matt 27:34, Matthew does not adapt the verb to the aorist of Psalm 69:22 but keeps the imperfect of his Marcan source. As the scene happens in a hurry (εὐθέως) and is interrupted by the bystanders’ interjection ἄφες, an iterative and repetitive meaning of the imperfect can be ruled out. Therefore, ἐπότιζεν has to be an

13 E. g. Num 4:3; Ruth 2:14; Philo, Aet 113.

14 E. g. Prov 25:20; Psalm 69:22; 1QH^a XII:8.

15 Cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew* (see n. 2), 3:626; Andreas Gutsfeld, “Essig,” *DNP* 4:149.

16 Cf. Hans W. Heidland, “ὄξος,” *ThWNT* 5:288f., here 288.

17 Cf. Heidland, ὄξος (see n. 16), 288. The interpretation of bread dipped in vinegar as part of the suffering of the messiah in the midrash on Ruth 2:14 is too young to be instructive for Matthew’s understanding of ὄξος (cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew* [see n. 2], 3:627).

18 Rainer Nicklas and Joachim Kügler, “Essig auf der ‘Klobürste’ – Der Schwamm am Stock als Zeichen des Spotts. Kulturgeschichtliche Notiz zu Mk 15,36 par. Mt 27,48 (Joh 19,29),” *BN* 117 (2003): 27–32.

imperfect *de conatu*.¹⁹ Thus, Jesus does not receive a refreshing drink, but the attempt is stopped. That fits the Matthean presentation of the Jewish authorities as being purely hostile within the crucifixion scene, because, in mocking Jesus, the *attempt* to give him a drink such as the one in Psalm 69:22 by the mode of a sponge on a stick is enough.

The interrupted offering of vinegar is embedded within the Elia misunderstanding. Considering the far-reaching knowledge of Psalm 22 in Early Judaism, one has to assume that the Jewish authorities *want* to misunderstand Jesus' cry of desolation (Matt 27:46).²⁰ The whole scene therefore amounts to one huge mocking of the crucified Jesus: the Jewish authorities not only mockingly 'misunderstand' Jesus' cry of the opening verse of Psalm 22, but also scoff at him by offering him the vinegar and therefore act like the opponents of Psalm 69:22. This is an analogy to Matt 27:43, since by derisively reasoning "He trusted in God – let him deliver him now, if he will have him!" the Jewish authorities assume the role of the mockers in Psalm 22:9.

4 Implications: Matthew Creates an Intertextual Parallel Between the Roman Soldiers and the Jewish Authorities up to the Accusation of ἀνομία

In Matt 27:34 the Roman soldiers and in Matt 27:48 the Jewish authorities are portrayed as acting like the mockers of Psalm 69:22 by offering Jesus a drink with a mocking intention behind it. By referring on both occasions to exactly the same verse, both groups are intertextually marked as parallel. Of course, both groups act differently within the crucifixion scene: The Roman soldiers physically hurt Jesus by first humiliating and whipping him (Matt 27:27–31) and later by fixing him to the cross (27:35), whereas the Jewish authorities stick to verbal violations (Matt 27:41–43). However, in the intertextual characterization Matthew sees both groups as parallel.

For adequately understanding the meaning of the contribution of Psalm 69:22 to the crucifixion scene, it is relevant to ask whether Matthew points only to v.22

¹⁹ Cf. Luz, *Evangelium nach Matthäus* (see n. 2), 4:330.

²⁰ Contra Markus Öhler, *Elia im Neuen Testament. Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung des alttestamentlichen Propheten im frühen Christentum*, BZNW 88 (Berlin et al.: De Gruyter, 1997), 145f.

specifically or whether he wants the context of that verse to be activated as the intertextual horizon as well. First, in contrast to his Marcan source, Matthew *twice* clearly refers to Psalm 69:22. Second, in both cases the intertextual reference serves to characterize Jesus' opponents. And third, the intertextual reference corresponds in Matt 27:34 and 27:48 within the context of a mockery set up as parallel with the context of Psalm 69:22 itself. Therefore, it has to be assumed that Matthew does not activate v.22 as a stand-alone depiction, but that it also refers to the context of the Psalms' portrayal of the praying-self's opponents.

Furthermore, there is a close correspondence between the two texts concerning the accusation of the mocking parties of lawlessness (ἀνομία). That becomes apparent if one compares the characterization of the opponents within the mocking section (Psalm 69:20–22) and the subsequent 'psalm of vengeance' (Psalm 69:23–29), which is specifically aimed at the opponents, to the characterization of Jesus' opponents within the Gospel of Matthew. In both texts the term ἀνομία is prominent (Psalm 69:28; Matt 7:23; 13:41; 23:28; 24:12).

Of course, with 80 appearances within the psalms, ἀνομία is no uncommon object of accusation. Also the double occurrence within Psalm 69 is not strikingly frequent in comparison with four occurrences within Psalms 34; 58; 93. But ἀνομία is prominent in Psalm 69, because it only occurs three times twice within one psalm-verse (Psalm 32:5; 69:28; 107:17). Further, within the 'psalm of revenge' (Psalm 69:23–29), ἀνομία and ὀργή (Psalm 69:25) alone appear twice, so the ἀνομία is eye-catching within the section.

Within the four gospels only Matthew uses the term ἀνομία. Although the term ἀνομία within the Septuagint is not restricted to the Torah²¹, Matthew narrows it to this limitation. The first appearance in Matt 7:23 explains ἀνομία as being the reason for Jesus' rejection of those who do not serve to carry out God's will. Severe crimes do not necessarily have to be in mind here, but lawlessness is also at hand, if one does not stick to Jesus' understanding of the Torah. This also becomes apparent by the link that is established in Matt 24:12 between the increasing of ἀνομία to the cooling down of love. Love, however, according to Matt 22:40, is the sum of the Torah.²² In Matt 23:28, within his discourse against the Scribes and Pharisees, Matthew has Jesus accuse them of appearing righteous from the outside, but inwardly being full of hypocrisy (ὑπόκρισις) and lawlessness (ἀνομία).

²¹ Walter Gutbrod, "νόμος κτλ," *ThWNT* 4:1016–1084, here 1078.

²² The presented concept of ἀνομία within the Gospel of Matthew follows closely the elaborations of Konradt, *Evangelium* (see n. 2), 128.

Although Matthew takes over the reference to Psalm 69 from his Marcan source, he emphasizes this intertext by using it twice. As the term *ἀνομία*, which is eye-catching in the context of Psalm 69:22, is relevant for Matthew's way of explaining a way of life that conforms closely with the Torah, it has to be assumed that the *ἀνομία* within the 'psalm of revenge' is in Matthew's mind when he is shaping his version of the crucifixion scene. Or to put it the other way around: it is very unlikely that he inserts the term *ἀνομία* into his Gospel, intensifies the use of Psalm 69:22, but at the same time misses the eye-catching use of the term in the nearer context of the alluded verse.

Matthew sees both groups equally in a way that is critical for Jewish self-understanding by comparing the Roman soldiers and the Jewish authorities within the crucifixion scene with the behavior of the praying-self's opponents of Psalm 69. This in turn is linked with the concept of *ἀνομία*. The underlying accusation is that the Roman soldiers, who are non-Jews and therefore naturally do not live according to the Torah, and the Jewish authorities, who by their self-understanding especially live in compliance with the Torah, *both* fail in terms of their disrespect for the law.

With regard to Matthew's community, one can conclude that the stronger intertextual background of Jesus being mocked leads the Matthean readers, in terms of textual pragmatism, to feel encouraged and self-assured of the correctness of their beliefs. On the one hand, Jesus himself suffered severe mockery, which happens according to the scripture and therefore neither Jesus' being mocked nor a Christ-believer suffering mockery is a reason to doubt one's own Christian beliefs. And on the other hand, the mockery is a 'lawless' deed. Even if it is performed by the Jewish authorities who, through their self-understanding, stand firm to the Mosaic law, their behavior is like the Roman soldiers who stand opposed to God's will expressed in the Torah, and both therefore will eventually have to pay the appropriate consequences.

Without paying attention to the intertextual play with Psalm 69, this harsh assessment of the Jewish authorities would have been missed, and therefore this facet of the conflict between Jesus and the Jewish authorities, that lies decisively at the heart of Matthew's Gospel, could not be taken into account.

Article Note: This paper was presented to the Matthew Section at the SBL Annual Meeting 2019 in San Diego and has been revised for publication.