

UHI Thesis - pdf download summary

Matthew's Presentation of The Son of David

Davidic Tradition and Typology in the Gospel of Matthew

Zacharias, Hermann Daniel

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (AWARDED BY OU/ABERDEEN)

Award date:
2015

Awarding institution:
University of Edinburgh

[Link URL to thesis in UHI Research Database](#)

General rights and useage policy

Copyright, IP and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the UHI Research Database are retained by the author, users must recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights. This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement, or without prior permission from the author. Unless otherwise stated, this thesis is provided under the terms of a CC BY re-use license, where use of any part of this thesis must be attributed to the author.

Users may download and print one copy of any thesis from the UHI Research Database for the not-for-profit purpose of private study or research on the condition that:

- 1) The full text is not changed in any way
- 2) If citing, a bibliographic link is made to the metadata record on the the UHI Research Database
- 3) You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- 4) You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the UHI Research Database

Take down policy

If you believe that any data within this document represents a breach of copyright, confidence or data protection please contact us at RO@uhi.ac.uk providing details; we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

MATTHEW'S PRESENTATION OF THE SON OF DAVID:
DAVIDIC TRADITION AND TYPOLOGY IN THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

A thesis presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

at

Highland Theological College and the University of Aberdeen

H. Daniel Zacharias

B. A. Providence College

M. Div. Acadia University

M. A. Acadia University

2015

I, H. Daniel Zacharias, confirm that I composed the thesis, that it has not been accepted in any previous application for a degree, that the work is my own, and that all quotations have been distinguished by quotation marks and the sources of information specifically acknowledged.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'H. Daniel Zacharias' in a cursive style.

H. Daniel Zacharias, January 30, 2015

Abstract

This thesis is a literary-critical analysis of the Gospel of Matthew and its interaction with Davidic tradition and use of Davidic typology. Throughout the narrative, the evangelist makes pervasive use of Davidic tradition from the Old Testament in his portrayal of Jesus. This begins from the first verse and the declaration that Jesus is the Son of David, and culminates in Jesus' usage of Psalm 22's Davidic lament on the cross. The incipit and genealogy predisposes the reader to look for interaction with the Davidic tradition. Matthew's Davidic theme utilizes throughout the narrative formal quotations, allusions, and echoes to the Davidic tradition found particularly in the OT prophets. In addition, Matthew makes use of Davidic typology numerous times, with David as type and Jesus as anti-type. This is done in order to present to the reader a scripturally-grounded redefinition of what it means for Jesus to be the Son of David: not as a violent militant leader, as was expected, but as a physical descendant of David, a healing shepherd, and a humble king. Within the Gospel, Matthew utilizes Davidic typology to show how the Son of David even has similar experiences as his royal predecessor. Even David's own words from the psalms are utilized as testimony to the legitimacy of Jesus as the Davidic Messiah.

Acknowledgements

I want to offer my thanks to a number of people who helped me during this long process towards my PhD. The staff and faculty at Highland Theological College were always available when I needed help. In particular, Jason Maston and Mike Bird were wonderful supervisors during this process. I also want to thank John Nolland, my external supervisor – in writing a dissertation on Matthew, I could not have hoped for a better scholar to offer me comments and critiques. I would like to also thank my mentor, colleague, and friend Craig Evans for his support through this process.

I received a great amount of support and encouragement from the faculty and staff of Acadia Divinity College. I'm honoured to be part of this ministry team. Thank you to the board and President of the college for taking a chance on me, and supporting me on this path.

Finally, my wife and children supported me a lot through this process. There were many evenings and weekends spent without dad at home. Thanks for being supportive and being my cheerleaders through this process.

Soli Deo gloria!

Danny

List of Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible (Commentary)
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AnBib	Analecta biblica
ASNU	Acta seminarii neotestamentici upsaliensis
AThRSup	Anglican Theological Review supplement series
AUSS	<i>Andrews University Seminary Studies</i>
AYBD	Anchor Yale Bible Commentary
BBR	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
BDAG	Arndt, William, Frederick W. Danker, and Walter Bauer. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
<i>BibInt</i>	<i>Biblical Interpretation</i>
<i>BJRL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</i>
<i>BSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
<i>BTB</i>	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZNW	Beihefte zur <i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
col(s).	column(s)
<i>Colloq</i>	<i>Colloquium</i>
<i>CTM</i>	<i>Concordia Theological Monthly</i>
<i>DSD</i>	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>The Expository Times</i>
<i>HALOT</i>	Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, M. E. J. Richardson, and Johann Jakob Stamm. <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . 5 vols. Leiden; New York: E.J. Brill, 1999.
<i>HBT</i>	<i>Horizons in Biblical Theology</i>
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<i>IEJ</i>	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JGRChJ</i>	<i>Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
JSJSup	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period</i> , Supplements
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i> , Supplement Series
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
JSPSup	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i> , Supplement Series
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>

KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
LXX	Septuagint
NA	E. Nestle and K. Aland (eds.), <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i>
NAC	New American Commentary
NCBC	New Century Bible Commentary
NETS	New English Translation of the Septuagint
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
<i>NIDNTT</i>	C. Brown (ed.), <i>New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology</i> (1975–78)
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum, Supplements
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
repr.	reprint(ed)
<i>ResQ</i>	<i>Restoration Quarterly</i>
rev.	revised
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>RHPR</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSP	Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
<i>SR</i>	<i>Studies in Religion/Sciences religieuses</i>
SSEJC	Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
<i>StPatr</i>	<i>Studia patristica</i>
<i>TJT</i>	<i>Toronto Journal of Theology</i>
<i>TJ</i>	<i>Trinity Journal</i>
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
UBS	United Bible Society
<i>VD</i>	<i>Verbum domini</i>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
WW	<i>Word and World</i>
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZWT	<i>Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie</i>

Abbreviations for primary literature follows the *Society of Biblical Literature Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999).

Table of Contents

1. Introduction to the Present Study	1
1.1: Previous Work on Davidic Tradition in Matthew	2
1.1.1: <i>Development of Davidic Tradition</i>	2
1.1.2: <i>Therapeutic Son of David</i>	3
1.1.3: <i>Messianic Shepherd Tradition</i>	5
1.1.4: <i>Matthew's Use of Zechariah</i>	5
1.1.5: <i>Davidic Typology in the Betrayal Narrative</i>	6
1.2: Thesis	7
1.3: Contribution	8
1.4: Methodology	9
1.4.1: <i>Citations, Paraphrases, Allusions, and Echoes</i>	10
1.4.2: <i>Clustered Echoes</i>	13
1.4.3: <i>Typology and Typological Fulfillment</i>	14
1.4.4: <i>Recognizing Typology in Matthew</i>	19
1.4.5: <i>Typological Awareness</i>	21
1.5: Approach	21
1.6: A Sketch of Davidic Messianism at the Turn of the Era	23
1.6.1: <i>Davidic Messianism in the OT</i>	24
1.6.2: <i>Davidic Messianism in Psalms of Solomon 17</i>	25
1.6.3: <i>Davidic Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls</i>	27
1.6.4: <i>Davidic Messianism in the NT</i>	29
1.6.5: <i>Other Messianic Claimants</i>	30
1.6.6: <i>Summary</i>	31
2. Enter the Son of David: Matthew's Incipit and Genealogy	33
2.1: Matthew's Incipit	33
2.1.1: Βίβλος γενέσεως	34
2.1.2: <i>Son of Abraham</i>	36
2.1.3: <i>Son of David</i>	38
2.1.4: <i>Function of the Incipit</i>	38
2.1.5: <i>Summary and Relevance for Thesis</i>	42
2.2: The Significance of David in the Genealogy	43
2.2.1: <i>Royal Descent</i>	43
2.2.2: <i>David "the King"</i>	44
2.2.3: <i>The 3 x 14 Structure</i>	46
2.2.4: <i>Summary and Relevance for Thesis</i>	58
2.3: Conclusion	59
3. Assuming the Throne: Establishing Jesus as the Son of David	61
3.1: Mary and Joseph	62
3.1.1: <i>Mary the Betrothed of Joseph</i>	62

3.1.2: <i>Joseph, Son of David</i>	63
3.1.3: <i>Joseph's Confirmation of Jesus and His Mother</i>	64
3.1.4: <i>Summary and Relevance for Thesis</i>	67
3.2: Matthew's Isaiah Quotation	68
3.2.1: <i>Davidic Character of Isaiah 7:14</i>	69
3.2.2: <i>Matthew's Davidic Motif and Isaiah 7:14</i>	71
3.2.3: <i>Summary and Relevance for Thesis</i>	72
3.3: Born in Bethlehem	73
3.3.1: <i>Matthew's Citation of Micah 5:2</i>	74
3.3.2: <i>Weeping in Ramah</i>	76
3.3.3: <i>Summary and Relevance for Thesis</i>	77
3.4: The Kingship of Herod and The Kingship of Jesus	77
3.4.1: <i>The Three Kings of Matthew 1–2</i>	78
3.4.2: <i>Herod and the Kings in Isaiah 7</i>	78
3.4.3: <i>The Visit and Gifts of the Magi</i>	79
3.4.4: <i>The Divine Care for the Son of David</i>	80
3.4.5: <i>Summary and Relevance for Thesis</i>	81
3.5: The Move to Nazareth	82
3.5.1: <i>Various Explanations for Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται</i>	82
3.5.2: <i>Isaiah 11:1 and the Trend of Messianic Lowliness</i>	84
3.5.3: <i>Summary and Relevance for Thesis</i>	88
3.6: Conclusion	88
4. Jesus as the Healing Son of David	91
4.1: Matthean Passages Displaying the Son of David as Healer	91
4.1.1: <i>Synoptic Tradition Outside of Matthew</i>	92
4.1.2: <i>Matthew 9:27</i>	92
4.1.3: <i>Matthew 12:22–23</i>	95
4.1.4: <i>Matthew 15:22</i>	97
4.1.5: <i>Matthew 20:30–31</i>	98
4.1.6: <i>Matthew 21:14–15</i>	99
4.1.7: <i>Summary and Relevance for Thesis</i>	100
4.2: Explanations for the Therapeutic Son of David in Matthew	101
4.2.1: <i>David as Exorcist</i>	101
4.2.2: <i>Solomon as Exorcist and Healer</i>	102
4.2.3: <i>4Q521 and the Son of David as Healer</i>	108
4.2.4: <i>Ezekiel's Eschatological Shepherd</i>	110
4.2.5: <i>David, the Blind, and the Lame</i>	117
4.3: Conclusion	118
5. The Son of David's Humility and Authority in Matthew	120
5.1: Jesus, David, and the Sabbath	120
5.1.1: <i>Davidic Parallels in Matt 12:1–4</i>	122
5.1.2: <i>The Purpose of the Davidic Parallel</i>	124
5.1.3: <i>The Authority of the Son of David</i>	126

5.1.4: <i>Summary and Relevance for Thesis</i>	127
5.2: The Son of David's Triumphal Entry	128
5.2.1: <i>Davidic Typology and the Triumphal Entry</i>	129
5.2.2: <i>Parallels with 20:29–34</i>	130
5.2.3: <i>Structural and Thematic Parallels with Infancy Narrative</i>	131
5.2.4: <i>Foreshadowing the Jerusalem Narrative</i>	134
5.2.5: <i>Summary and Relevance for Thesis</i>	135
5.3: Zechariah's Humble King in Matthew	136
5.3.1: <i>Davidic Character of Zechariah</i>	136
5.3.2: <i>Messianic Meekness</i>	137
5.3.3: <i>Matthew's Two Donkeys</i>	139
5.3.4: <i>Additional Uses of Zechariah 9–14 in Matthew</i>	142
5.3.5: <i>Summary and Relevance for Thesis</i>	147
5.4: The Reception of the Son of David in Jerusalem	148
5.4.1: <i>The Jerusalem Crowd's Reaction to the Son of David</i>	148
5.4.2: <i>Psalms 118 and David</i>	151
5.4.3: <i>Jerusalem's Response to the Son of David</i>	153
5.4.4: <i>Summary and Relevance for Thesis</i>	156
5.5: The Son of David as David's Lord	157
5.5.1: <i>David's Voice in the Psalms</i>	158
5.5.2: <i>Understanding Jesus' Argument</i>	163
5.5.3: <i>The Implications of Matt 22:41–46 for Matthew's Son of David Christology</i>	165
5.5.4: <i>Matt 22:41–46 in the Trajectory of Matthew's Davidic Theme</i>	170
5.5.5: <i>Summary and Relevance for Thesis</i>	171
5.6: Conclusion	173
6. David's Betrayal and the Betrayal of Jesus	175
6.1: Ahithophel in the Hebrew Bible	176
6.1.1: <i>Ahithophel in 2 Samuel 15–17</i>	176
6.1.2: <i>Ahithophel in the Davidic Psalms</i>	176
6.1.3: <i>Summary and Relevance for Thesis</i>	179
6.2: The Profile of Biblical Betrayers: Judas and Ahithophel	180
6.2.1: <i>Betrayer as Friend</i>	180
6.2.2: <i>Name of the Betrayer</i>	181
6.2.3: <i>Fate of the Betrayers</i>	184
6.2.4: <i>Death of the Betrayers</i>	184
6.2.5: <i>Summary and Relevance for Thesis</i>	187
6.3: The Profile of Biblical Betrayals: Thematic Parallels in the Gospel Narratives	187
6.3.1: <i>Leading up to the Betrayal</i>	187
6.3.2: <i>The Movements of King David/Son of David</i>	188
6.3.3: <i>Distress of Jesus</i>	189
6.3.4: <i>Ahithophel's Advice taken by Judas</i>	190
6.3.5: <i>The Hand of the Betrayer(s)</i>	191

6.3.6: <i>In Fulfillment of the Scriptures</i>	192
6.3.7: <i>Additional Parallels</i>	193
6.3.8: <i>Summary and Relevance for Thesis</i>	194
6.4: Conclusion	194
7. David's Passion in the Psalms and the Passion of the Son of David	196
7.1: Jesus' Quotation of Psalm 22	196
7.1.1: <i>Ancient Readings of Psalm 22</i>	197
7.1.2: <i>Jesus' Cry of Psalm 22</i>	202
7.1.3: <i>Abandonment of the Righteous Sufferer</i>	204
7.1.4: <i>Summary and Relevance for Thesis</i>	204
7.2: Further Typological Connections with Psalm 22	205
7.2.1: <i>Trust in God</i>	205
7.2.2: <i>Inability To Save Himself</i>	206
7.2.3: <i>Mockery</i>	206
7.2.4: <i>Casting of Lots for Clothing</i>	207
7.2.5: <i>Surrounded by Enemies</i>	208
7.2.6: <i>Thirst</i>	209
7.2.7: <i>Piercing</i>	210
7.2.8: <i>Happy Resolution</i>	211
7.2.9: <i>Summary and Relevance for Thesis</i>	213
7.3: Conclusion	213
8. Conclusions	215
8.1: Summary of Study	215
8.2: Contribution	219
8.2.1: <i>Davidic Explanations of Various Passages</i>	220
8.2.2: <i>Understanding Matthew's Wider Davidic Program</i>	220
8.2.3: <i>Understanding of Typology</i>	221
8.3: Suggestions for Further Research	222
8.3.1: <i>The "Son of..." Titles in Matthew</i>	222
8.3.2: <i>Mark, Luke, and John</i>	222
8.3.3: <i>Historical Jesus Research</i>	223
8.3.4: <i>Christology</i>	224
8.3.5: <i>Typology</i>	224
Bibliography	225

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Present Study

The title “Son of David” appears three times in the Gospel of Mark (Mark 10:47–48; 12:35). Two of these occurrences appear also in the parallel passages in the Gospel of Luke (Luke 18:38–39), with an additional use of the title to refer to Jesus in his genealogy (Luke 3:31). Matthew, on the other hand, parallels Mark’s occurrences (Matt 20:30–31, 22:42), and has seven more occurrences of the title (Matt 9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 21:9, 15), with only one of those not referring to Jesus, but rather to Joseph (Matt 1:20). In addition, there are three titles given to Jesus in Matthew’s incipit— Messiah, Son of David, and son of Abraham (Matt 1:1). This establishes the title “Son of David” as a significant theme for the Evangelist, and certainly stands as one of the significant Christological motifs in Matthew’s gospel. The use of this thematic title is indicative of Matthew’s pervasive interaction with the Davidic tradition of the OT.

However, Matthew’s interaction with David’s story in the OT and later Davidic tradition is not confined to the appearance of the title Son of David, as important as those appearances are. There have been numerous individual studies on the title “Son of David” in the Gospel of Matthew, as well as numerous studies seeking to explain why Matthew connects this title to Jesus’ healing activities. To this can be added individual studies on isolated passages which make use of Davidic tradition or typology. So, while it is true that many scholars have made notable contributions to Matthew’s use of Davidic traditions in particular passages, there has been no comprehensive examination of David and Davidic typology in the Gospel of Matthew as a whole. The goal of this study is to fill this gap, by showing how Matthew ex-

tensively interacts with Davidic tradition and utilizes Davidic typology in his presentation of Jesus as the Son of David.

1.1: Previous Work on Davidic Tradition in Matthew

The following sections highlight some of the important studies pertaining to the use of Davidic tradition in the Gospel of Matthew, as well as a number of important studies on the development of the Davidic tradition in early Judaism.

1.1.1: Development of Davidic Tradition

Although not directly related to Matthew, three monographs in particular have surveyed and traced the development of Davidic tradition in the OT and later Jewish writings. Kenneth Pomykala's work on the Davidic dynasty tradition takes a thorough look at the Davidic tradition from the OT and up to its presence in Josephus, the LXX, Qumran, and *Pss. Sol. 17*. Pomykala argues that there was no "continuous, widespread, or dominant expectation for a davidic messiah."¹ While Pomykala is critical of seeing messianism in the OT, he does recognize the Davidic messianic portrait of *Pss. Sol. 17*, as well as its presence, alongside prophetic and priestly messianism, in the Qumran literature. While Pomykala's more critical assessment might not be accepted, it is important to note that even he sees the resurgence of royal messianic hope in the Herodian and Roman period.

More recently, this type of survey of Davidic tradition has also been undertaken by Yuzuru Miura, doing his survey in the context of Davidic tradition in Luke-Acts.² In six chapters, Miura surveys Davidic tradition in the texts leading up to the NT. Miura finds nine

¹Kenneth E. Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism: Its History and Significance for Messianism* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 270.

²Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah In Luke-Acts: the Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (JSNTSup 110; Sheffield, Eng: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995); Yuzuru Miura, *David in Luke-Acts: His Portrayal in the Light of Early Judaism* (WUNT 232; Tübingen: Eisenbrauns, 2007).

themes in his survey of the primary literature: David as sinner, David as ideal king, David as prophet, David as religious authority, David as parallel to Moses and to Solomon, David as Psalmist, David as model for Jews, and David as indicator of the Messiah. Miura finds these themes in Luke-Acts. A number of these themes will also present themselves in Matthew.

1.1.2: Therapeutic Son of David

Dennis C. Duling, Lidija Novakovic, as well as several others have all done important research on Matthew's deliberate connection between Jesus as Son of David and his healing deeds. Dennis Duling's work began with his dissertation work on the Davidic tradition and then focused on Matthew's use of the Son of David in therapeutic contexts.³ Duling argued first that the basis for Mark portraying the Son of David as exorcist stemmed from tradition surrounding Solomon as exorcist. In another article, he then argued that Matthew continued this trend first found in Mark, with Matthew grouping Jesus' healing within the broader scope of his exorcistic activity. Duling's position will be critiqued in Chapter 4.

Novakovic's 2003 monograph also looked into the perceived paradox regarding Matthew and popular Jewish messianic expectation: why does Matthew portray Jesus, the messianic Son of David, as a performer of healings and miracles when the messiah was not expected to be such? When dealing specifically with the healing passages in Matthew, Novakovic critiqued and dismissed Duling's suggestion that the answer is found in Solomonic tradition. The second option she dismisses is the traditions involving the eschatological prophet. Matthew disassociates Jesus' healings from exorcism (evidenced in his redaction of Mark), and the Evangelist is reluctant to display Jesus' miracles as prophetic "signs." No-

³Dennis C. Duling, "Traditions of the Promises to David and His Sons in Early Judaism and Primitive Christianity" (Ph.D. Diss., University of Chicago, 1970); Dennis C. Duling, "Solomon, Exorcism and the Son of David," *HTR* 68 (1975), 235-252; Dennis C. Duling, "The Therapeutic Son of David in Matthew's Gospel: an element in Matthew's christological apologetic," *NTS* 24 (1978), 392-410; Dennis C. Duling, "Matthew's Plurisignificant 'Son of David' in Social Science Perspective: Kinship, Kingship, Magic, and Miracle," *BTB* 22/3 (1992), 99-116.

Novakovic argued that Matthew's portrayal of Jesus as Davidic healer is rooted in a midrashic understanding of Scripture, particularly passages from Isaiah linked to Matt 8:16–17 and 12:15–21. An important part of her argument is Jesus' reply to John the Baptist in Matt 11:2–6 and its connection to passages in Isaiah, and especially its connection to 4Q521. She finds that 4Q521, along with a few other early Jewish texts, associate healings and miracles with a coming messianic age.⁴ While this monograph has much to commend it, Novakovic's relative neglect of Ezekiel 34 and 37's Davidic shepherd tradition is also surprising.⁵ It will be shown in later chapters that Ezekiel 34 and 37 is the primary influence on Matthew's presentation of the Son of David as healer.

Finally, several articles written have argued for Ezekiel 34's messianic shepherd as Matthew's warrant for portraying the Son of David as healer.⁶ Wayne Baxter in particular shows numerous parallels between Ezekiel 34 and Matthew's portrait of the healing Son of David. I have found this argument persuasive, and it will be more fully detailed in Chapter 4.

⁴Novakovic's handling of 4Q521 and its relationship to Matt 11:2–6 is at odds with other researchers, and I think out of step with Matthew's narrative. Although Novakovic interacts with John J. Collins and his work, she neglects work by Craig Evans on the subject: both scholars agree that the messiah is the agent of the blessings described in 4Q521. Matthew, as another example of early Jewish reflection, confirms this. Furthermore, it is obvious from the narrative that the question at hand in Matt 11 is the identity of Jesus, not the "character of the time." Matthew clearly identifies Jesus as the messiah (Matt 11:2), and John the Baptist specifically asks Jesus if he is "the one who is to come" (11:3). This is the question that Jesus answers, and the connection with 4Q521 makes it clear that the answer is affirmative. In short, Novakovic underestimates the importance of 4Q521 for providing an analogy to Matt 11, and to help scholars understand that Jesus was answering John the Baptist in the affirmative. Subsequently, understanding the connection to 4Q521 also aids in the connection between the portrayal of Jesus as prophet-king, since the messianic agent in 4Q521 is of a prophetic character. See Craig A. Evans, "Messianic Hopes And Messianic Figures In Late Antiquity," *JGRChJ* 3 (2006), 13; Craig A. Evans, "Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*, 2 vols. (eds. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam; Boston: Brill, 1999), 585–88; John J. Collins, "The Works of the Messiah," *DSD* 1 (1994), 98–112; John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1995), 117–122.

⁵This has also been noted in a review. See J. R. C. Cousland, review of Lidija Novakovic, *Messiah, The Healer Of The Sick: A Study Of Jesus As The Son Of David In The Gospel Of Matthew* (WUNT 2.170; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003) *RBL* 08/2006.

⁶Francis Martin, "The Image of Shepherd in the Gospel of Saint Matthew," *ScEs* 27/3 (1975), 261–301; John Paul Heil, "Ezekiel 34 and the Narrative Strategy of the Shepherd and Sheep Metaphor in Matthew," *CBQ* 55 (1993), 698–708; Wayne S. Baxter, "Healing and the "Son of David": Matthew's Warrant," *NovT* 48/1 (2006), 36–50.

1.1.3: Messianic Shepherd Tradition

Closely tied to the previous section is the research that has gone into the messianic shepherd tradition and Matthew's use of that motif. Two of the more significant and most recent monographs were written by Joel Willitts and Young Chae.⁷ Willitts surveys the shepherd tradition in the OT, and focuses primarily in the geo-political connotations of that tradition, arguing for their adoption also in the Gospel of Matthew. Chae's monograph also contains an extensive overview of the shepherd motif in the OT and Second Temple Judaism. Moving to Matthew, Chae analyzes the shepherd motif throughout Matthew, and as Baxter noted above, argues for Ezekiel's messianic shepherd as the primary backdrop for Matthew's presentation of a healing Son of David.

1.1.4: Matthew's Use of Zechariah

The importance of Zechariah for Matthew has been well recognized, and is of significance for this thesis because Zechariah contains significant Davidic tradition as well as the Davidic shepherd motif, and of course Matthew makes significant usage of Zechariah in his presentation of Jesus. Numerous studies merit attention on this matter and are interacted with in Chapter 5. Two detailed studies on this are Clay Ham's monograph and Charlene McAfee Moss's dissertation.⁸ McAfee Moss surveys the citations and possible allusions to Zechariah in Matthew, noting ways in which tradition derived from Zechariah may have influenced the gospel sub-structure are also considered. Finally, she explores the extent to which Matthew alludes to themes characteristic of Zechariah. Together, these components illuminate how Matthew's Gospel incorporates its Zechariah material, whether alone or in combination with

⁷Young S. Chae, *Jesus as the Eschatological Davidic Shepherd: Studies in the Old Testament, Second Temple Judaism, and in the Gospel of Matthew* (WUNT 216; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006); Joel Willitts, *Matthew's Messianic Shepherd-King* (BZNW 147; New York: Walter De Gruyter, 2007).

⁸Clay Alan Ham, *The Coming King and the Rejected Shepherd: Matthew's Reading of Zechariah's Messianic Hope* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006); Charlene McAfee Moss, "Zechariah and the Gospel of Matthew: the use of a biblical tradition" (PhD Thesis, Durham University, 2002).

other prophetic traditions. Ham too takes a detailed look at all of Matthew's explicit usages of Zechariah as well as what he considers the eight probable allusions to Zechariah. Ham argues convincingly that Zechariah's theology strongly influences Matthew's theology, and specifically influences the evangelist's presentation of Jesus as both a humble king and a rejected shepherd.

1.1.5: Davidic Typology in the Betrayal Narrative

There have been relatively few studies on the use of Davidic typology in Matthew, but a few deserve mention. Two short comments published in 1974 and 1975 in *The Expository Times* explored the links between Ahithophel and Judas. These articles, published by T. Francis Glasson and L. Paul Trudinger, have had the most impact on Dale Allison, who expands upon them in the ICC commentary on Matthew.⁹ The first article by Glasson looks at all of the Gospels. He concludes that there are striking similarities with Jesus' betrayal and the betrayal of David instigated by Absalom and Ahithophel. The connection most highlighted by Glasson is Jesus' crossing the Kidron to go to the Mount of Olives in John 18:1. This seems to parallel David's crossing of the Kidron to escape from Absalom. Glasson goes on further by drawing the connection between Ps 41:9 and Mark 14:18. This psalm, which is quoted more fully in John 13:18, can likely be connected to Absalom's rebellion and particularly Ahithophel at v. 9: "Even my bosom friend in whom I trusted, who ate of my bread, has lifted the heel against me." If it is possible that Ahithophel foreshadowed Judas, then a connection may further be strengthened by Acts 1:20 using Psalms 69 and 109 to refer to Judas. Ahithophel was also expressly connected with Ps 55:13 in *m. Aboth* 6.3 and *Sanhedrin* 10.2. The final connection

⁹T. Francis Glasson, "Davidic Links With The Betrayal Of Jesus," *ExpTim* 85/4 (1974), 118-19; L. Paul Trudinger, "Davidic Links With The Betrayal Of Jesus: Some Further Observations," *ExpTim* 86/9 (1975), 278-79; W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (3 vols.; ICC. New York: T&T Clark, 1988-1997).

Glasson points out is the frequently noted connection between Judas' suicide (Matt 27:5) and Ahithophel's suicide (2 Sam 17:23).

Trudinger built upon an earlier work by Edward Selwyn. In 1912 Selwyn devoted a chapter of his work *The Oracles of the New Testament* to the betrayal of Jesus and its relation to David's betrayal.¹⁰ While Selwyn tended to harmonize the gospel accounts in his reading, his treatment until the current work was the largest scholarly work connecting Jesus' betrayal with David's betrayal (see Chapter 6). Selwyn finds twenty-one phrase connections between the Gospel accounts and David's betrayal.¹¹ Of these twenty-one, only 7 are possible in my opinion, with a number being outside of Matthew and so not directly relevant to this thesis. Selwyn errs by both harmonizing the Gospel accounts and overstating the connections between these two stories. Having said that, his work is the first such example I have found which laid out the thematic connections and other possible echoes between the two betrayal stories. His work was picked up later by Trudinger,¹² and apart from him Glasson,¹³ Bertil Gärtner¹⁴ and Dale Allison¹⁵ shared similar ideas that the two narratives shared thematic similarities.

1.2: Thesis

The central contention of this thesis is that Matthew through his Gospel intentionally utilized Davidic tradition on a variety of levels, as well as utilized Davidic typology to present Jesus as the Son of David. Matthew's Davidic theme is pervasive, appearing frequently throughout

¹⁰Edward Carus Selwyn, *The Oracles in the New Testament* (New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1912).

¹¹See section 6.3.

¹²Trudinger, "Further Observations," 278.

¹³Glasson, "Davidic Links," 118-19.

¹⁴Bertil E. Gärtner, *Iscaiot* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 37-68.

¹⁵Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 565-66.

the narrative; it utilized quotations, allusions, echoes, first-order typology, second-order typology (§1.4.3), and even David's own testimony from the Psalms. All of this is done not only to present Jesus as the Davidic Messiah, but also to explain from the OT scriptures the full implications of what it means for Jesus to be the Son of David. In doing so, Matthew goes against the popular expectation for a militant royal messiah, instead using the scriptures to present a redefinition of the Son of David.

1.3: Contribution

The academic works reviewed above have contributed in significant ways to scholarship's understanding of the first Gospel. The limitations of previous research were not only some issues of content, but also issues of scope. Some have focused only on particular sections of the Gospel of Matthew, others have focused specifically on the messianic strain of Davidic tradition or the use of the title Son of David. Few studies have asked whether typological allusions to the story of David also exist through the narrative. This thesis will attempt to bring these disparate parts together to show how Matthew's multi-layered approach in his use of Davidic tradition and typology weaved throughout his narrative creates the significant Davidic theme.

This thesis will build upon previous scholarship that has focused on particular phrases or verses, as well as particular episodes in the narrative like the triumphal entry or genealogy, and create a comprehensive picture that will display how Matthew makes use of Davidic tradition and portrays Jesus as the typological Son of David. John Jones has stated previously, "Matthew may underscore this typological motif more consistently than any other typological motif in his gospel."¹⁶ This thesis will seek to show that this is indeed the case. This will aid

¹⁶John Mark Jones, "Subverting the Textuality of Davidic Messianism: Matthew's Presentation of the Genealogy and the Davidic Title," *CBQ* 56/2 (1994), 267.

in scholarly understanding of not only how Matthew composed his Gospel, but also displays his keen interest in utilizing the scriptures to display Jesus as the Davidic messiah, and the full implication of what it means to recognize Jesus as such.

1.4: Methodology

The text of Matthew is rich in its scriptural usage, and is punctuated throughout with biblical phrases and echoes, as well as direct allusions and quotations from Israel's sacred literature.¹⁷ Conscious inner-biblical echoes serve to connect previous texts and ideas to the text at hand, and can reveal to readers the intention of the author. This study is interested in the intricacies of the Gospel of Matthew; how it received, interacted with, and alluded to Jewish scriptures and traditions related to King David as well as later Davidic tradition about the coming Davidic messiah. The title "Son of David," for instance, assumes several subtexts in the Jewish tradition, ultimately aiming to show how Jesus of Nazareth fulfills the expectation in a unique and unparalleled way. In researching the conscious allusion to and direct citation to the author's sacred texts, "we may behold an author's intention, which was to create a series of hermeneutical events in a community of readers, events which together add up to a typological conclusion: this person is like that person because their two stories have so much in common."¹⁸ This study, then, will be a literary-critical probe into the Gospel of Matthew and the textual traditions that come to bear on the evangelist's presentation of Jesus, the Son of David.

As with any large undertaking, it is important to define the terms used and seek to work within a defined methodological approach. The scholarly pursuit of understanding the

¹⁷As one author has said recently: "when Matthew is cut he bleeds Bible. As one saturated in the Jewish Scriptures, Matthew regularly reveals his indebtedness to these writings at all levels – from basic vocabulary to theological themes." Jonathan Pennington, "Refractions of Daniel in the Gospel of Matthew," in *Early Christian Literature And Intertextuality*, 2 vols. (eds. Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias; SSEJC 14; New York: T & T Clark, 2009), 65.

¹⁸Dale C. Allison, *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 7.

New Testament's use of the Old Testament is rich and diverse, with numerous methods and terms used, often in differing ways. The following sections will clarify the terminology and methodology utilized in this study.

1.4.1: Citations, Paraphrases, Allusions, and Echoes

In a series of essays, Stanley Porter sought to interact with, critique, and clarify terminology utilized in the field of biblical studies when discussing the use of the OT in the NT.¹⁹ When turning to the various ways in which the NT authors made use of the OT, Porter defined five categories of OT usage in the NT:²⁰

1. *Formulaic quotation*: Those times when an author explicitly cites a scriptural text with an introductory formula. These instances have a high degree of lexical correspondence within the quotation, with three lexemes in sequence being the minimum acceptable amount suggested.²¹ The morphology and syntax of the scriptures are frequently changed in quotations, making lexeme quantity a more suitable method for identifying a quotation. As with any methodology, there must be a level of flexibility within the system, and sequence would be one such area of flexibility. While exact sequence will make the quotation more sure, word order is not as crucial in the Bibli-

¹⁹Stanley E. Porter, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: a brief comment on method and terminology," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel* (eds. James A. Sanders and Craig A. Evans; JSNTSup 148; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 79–96; Stanley E. Porter, "Further Comments on the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," in *The Intertextuality of the Epistles: explorations of theory and practice* (eds. Thomas L. Brodie, Dennis Ronald MacDonald, and Stanley E. Porter; NTM 16; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006), 98–110; Stanley E. Porter, "Allusions and Echoes," in *As it is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture* (eds. Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 29–40. Porter critiqued in particular, though not exclusively, Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (Yale University Press, 1993).

²⁰These definitions are presented in Porter, "Further Comments," 107–09.

²¹I recognize the complexity inherent even within the suggestion of three sequential lexemes. In terms of sequence, word order is much more flexible in Greek (and Hebrew), and in terms of lexemes one must also deal with the reality of citations at times being on-the-fly translations of the Hebrew/Aramaic text. On the subject of text-forms, see R. T. France, *Jesus and The Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission* (2d ed. Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Press, 1971), 25–37. Despite these cautions, I believe holding to three sequential lexemes helps in maintaining a stable standard in the methodology.

cal languages. However, when sequence is lost, with many words between lexemes, the usage is more aptly categorized as paraphrase.²²

2. *Direct quotation*: This category is identical to formulaic quotations, but without an introductory formula. Within this category, especially when the lexeme count is small, scholars cannot discount the possibility that the author is unconsciously using biblical language or simply mimicking biblical phraseology.
3. *Paraphrase*: Those times when an author cites a scriptural text (with or without an introductory formula) with the minimum lexical correspondence of quotations, but in non-sequential order. Paraphrases will have additional words added in and around the lexemes of the passage cited, though the entirety of the quotation retains the essence of the scripture being paraphrased. All three of the above citation types are often found in conflated citations to numerous biblical passages as well.
4. *Allusion*: The invocation of a person, place, event, or literary work by an author.²³ As Porter admits, allusions may be made unintentionally by an author at times, but it is often difficult to determine when this is the case. Although not highlighted by Porter, Beale notes that allusions are often “judged along a spectrum of being virtually certain, probable, or possible, the latter being essentially equivalent to ‘echoes’.”²⁴ Pinpointing an allusion on this spectrum is not an exact science, but a degree of lexeme correspondence, degrees of lexeme semantic similarities, as well as established recurrence of a text would all factor in to the determination of certainty.

²²One caveat to Porter’s definition is that quotations (formulaic and direct) are not always to a singular scriptural text, but sometimes several are woven together.

²³Porter does not specify “event” as an item of allusion, but OT events are frequently alluded to as well. Porter, “Further Comments,” 109.

²⁴G. K. Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation* (Baker Academic, 2012), 31.

5. *Echo*: Porter, recognizing echo as the most abstract category, defines it as “the invocation by means of thematically related language of some more general notion or concept.”²⁵ Like allusion, echoes can be intentional or unintentional on the part of the author. Echoes are distinct from allusions in that they do not specifically invoke a person, place, event, or literary work. Furthermore, like our own present day communication which may be replete with echoes to modern books, movies, and television shows, echoes in the NT may not always signal anything exegetically significant to the passage beyond similar language, while at other times the echo may be crucial to the understanding. Hays, for example, has shown throughout his book echoes in Paul’s works may have profound effect on the understanding of a text.²⁶

The final two usages of the OT, allusions and echoes, are often the most difficult to identify within a text, and the terms have had a wide range of usage within academic literature. “Echo,” following Hays’ influential work, has at times come to be a catch-all term to refer to paraphrases as well as what is normally seen as allusion. Porter helpfully differentiates these terms so that they can be more responsibly applied within the field. While I recognize that Porter’s scheme may be perceived as rigid, I have found his taxonomy useful, in particular for staying author-centric, by helping to determine when uses of the OT were intended by an NT author and in what ways the scripture was utilized. Porter’s definitions and inherent methodology for recognizing these types of usages of the OT will be utilized in this study. However, as is the case in the study of literature and communication, one cannot be too rigid or too confined by imposed classifications. What needs to be stressed is that Porter’s taxonomy is a method for categorizing and recognizing OT usage, but *the significance of that usage*

²⁵Porter, “Allusions,” 39.

²⁶Hays 1993.

is only established through a careful reading of the text. In other words, direct quotations are not inherently more exegetically significant than an allusion may be.

Foundational to this methodology as well is the belief that the use of the OT is author-centered rather than reader-centered. While it is possible that an author unconsciously alludes to or echoes an OT passage, these uses still originate with the author rather than the reader. When solid allusions or echoes are not recognized by the reader, Hays' criterion of *availability* does come into play—the author may have had access to a text that the reader simply did not—but this does not make the allusion or echo any less present in the text.²⁷ Indeed, this reality holds true for all categories listed save the formulaic quotation. With the formulaic quotation, the significance of the citation (and its original context) may still not be known by a reader, but it is at least clear that the author is indeed making use of another text.

1.4.2: Clustered Echoes

One of Hays' criteria for recognizing echoes, which I would apply to both allusions and echoes under Porter's terminology, is recurrence.²⁸ This criterion looks at whether or not the NT author has made use of an OT passage elsewhere, particularly within the book in question. When an NT author has cited, paraphrased, or clearly alluded to an OT text or story, the likelihood of echoes to the same stories or traditions is more likely. I point out this criterion because the following chapters will show that Matthew is in constant dialogue with Davidic traditions. The recognition of citations and the establishment of solid allusions to a passage, a story, or a cohesive tradition alerts readers to recognize the author's intentions and thus predisposes readers to recognize often more subtle echoes to similar traditions that the author may also be supplying. To say it a different way, if a subtle echo to an OT passage is not ac-

²⁷Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 29-30.

²⁸*Ibid.*, 30.

accompanied within the book by more concrete allusions or citations to that passage or tradition, it is difficult and requires additional support to assert whether the echo is conscious on the part of the author and thus exegetically significant. But, with firm citations and allusions to a passage in place, recognition of echoes to that same tradition is inherently easier to spot and far more likely to be occurring on the conscious part of the author.²⁹ This recognition leads to an important issue in methodology: echoes are most firmly recognized when more certain citations and allusions are first established. It needs also to be noted that subsuming echoes behind citations and allusions does not thereby diminish their exegetical or rhetorical significance when in this “clustered” environment. In certain situations, echoes may in fact bolster the significance of allusions and citations within the text.

1.4.3: Typology and Typological Fulfillment

Matthew’s use of typology is a primary concern in this thesis, with the aforementioned methods of interaction with the OT often serving to conjure up typology for the Gospel’s readers. There have been various attempts to define precisely what scholars mean by typology when describing the NT’s use and interaction with the OT. Partly responsible for the differing conceptions and definitions is the error in past treatments of not differentiating the two types of typology which are found in the New Testament.

The first type of typology, which has its roots within the Old Testament itself, is the way in which present or future persons or events are displayed as anti-types to past historical events or persons (the type).³⁰ For example, Isaiah uses Eden as a type in Isa 11:6–9 as well as the exodus as a type for an envisaged new exodus (43:16–21). David is also used frequently as a typical king who is to come (Isa 11:1, 55:3–4; Jer 23:5; Ezek 34:23–24; Amos 9:11). The

²⁹This does not exclude the possibility of echoing in a text when no citation or allusion is present, but more argumentation and support would be necessary.

³⁰Gerhard von Rad, “Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament,” *Int* 15/2 (April 1, 1961), 175-76.

types in this first-order typology were viewed as historical, and were rooted in the belief that God's people and "his dealings with them is a single continuous process in which a uniform pattern may be discerned."³¹ Examples of historical figures in the OT being a type for an anti-type within the NT are also present; in the case of this study, aspects of the narrative of David's life are drawn upon as types for Jesus, the anti-type.³² Throughout much of church history, Jesus was envisaged as the anti-type (*par excellence*) for Jonah, Solomon, David, the priesthood, and others.³³ This typological reading of OT characters and institutions saw these figures as foreshadowing Christ.

Second-order typology, which is sometimes labeled as *typological fulfillment*, is a slightly more complex type of typology which is frequent in the NT. Typological fulfillment looks to OT prophecies and finds something analogous in the literal meaning and fulfillment of that prophecy. James Hamilton defines typological fulfillment this way:

Typological fulfillment is neither allegory nor *sensus plenior*, and in contrast to predictive fulfillment, it does not necessarily maintain that the prophet is looking into the distant future and prophesying about something outside his own historical context. Rather, typological fulfillment in the life of Jesus refers to the *fullest expression of a significant pattern of events*.³⁴

This second-order typology shares in common with first-order typology the notion of a type and anti-type, but further aspects of typological fulfillment are not always present in first-order typology. The following sub-sections will deal with the various components that factor into a proper understanding of typological fulfillment.

³¹David L. Baker, "Typology and the Christian use of the Old Testament," *SJT* 29/2 (1976), 147. See also E. Earle Ellis, "Biblical Interpretation in the New Testament Church," in *Mikra: text, translation, reading, and interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in ancient Judaism and early Christianity* (eds. Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling; *Mikra*. Netherlands: Assen/Maastricht, 1988), 713; Klyne Snodgrass, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New," in *Interpreting the New Testament: essays on methods and issues* (eds. David Alan Black and David S. Dockery; Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman & Holman, 2001), 215.

³²Another example is Jesus as anti-type to Jeremiah. See Mark F. Whitters, "Jesus In The Footsteps Of Jeremiah," *CBQ* 68/2 (2006), 229-247.

³³France, *Old Testament*, 43-50.

³⁴James M. Hamilton Jr., "'The Virgin Will Conceive': Typological Fulfillment in Matthew 1:18-23," in *Built upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew* (eds. Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 233.

1.4.3.1: Retrospective, Not Prospective

In one of the finest essays on the use of typology in the OT, David Baker puts forth two “natures” of typology: 1) typology is not exegesis and 2) typology is not prophecy.³⁵ Baker rightly asserts that the literal meaning of OT prophecies are found through proper grammatical and historical study. When an OT prophecy was prospective in nature, its fulfillment quite often is found within the OT, by the messiah, or within the framework of the coming eschatological age. Typological fulfillment, however, discerns an analogical relationship with the event, person, or institution which fulfills that OT prophecy. The belief which spurs the search for analogical relationships is the same as that of first-order typology; namely, that God works in uniform patterns in dealing with his people. R. T. France states:

This new meaning is not something inherent in the OT texts themselves, so that any objective exegesis, Jewish or Christian, ought properly to perceive it. Rather, it is a new level of relevance, going beyond what the OT writer and the original readers could have perceived, which is now discovered by retrospective reflection in the light of NT events. Typology depends not so much on exegesis of the original meaning as on a theological hindsight informed by commitment to Christ as the climax of God’s work of salvation. It proceeds from faith rather than from objective literary analysis.³⁶

Through much of the church’s history, the assumption was, as St. Augustine stated, “in Vetere Novum lateat, et in Novo Vetus pateat.”³⁷ Not only were many characters simply foreshadows of Jesus, but scores of prophecies were assumed to be directly fulfilled by Christ.³⁸ While not as extreme as earlier readings, the doctrine of *sensus plenior* has continued this belief that Jesus *more fully fills* past prophecies. Where *sensus plenior* fails is in its belief that, in

³⁵Baker, “Typology,” 149-150.

³⁶R. T. France, “Between the Testaments,” *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible*, 669. Unlike allegory, the typological use of the OT respected the historical circumstances and fulfillment of the scriptures and saw correspondence with them.

³⁷Augustine, *Quaest. Hept.* 2.73. “the New lies hidden in the Old, and in the New the Old is open.” Augustine makes a similar statement elsewhere about grace; *Spir. et litt.* 27 [XV].

³⁸Lampe gives a nice summary of this type of reading in past Church writings. See G. W. H. Lampe, “The Reasonableness of Typology,” in *Essays on Typology* (SBT 22; London: SCM Press, 1957), 9–11.

its original instance, the prophecy was primarily about Jesus, with any recognition of past fulfillments being seen at best as *partial fulfillments* only. Said in another way, the fulfillment of OT prophecies are sometimes painted as “foreshadows” or “prefigurements” of the ultimate fulfillment found in Jesus.³⁹ With a proper understanding of typology, however, the need for this type of understanding of OT prophecy becomes unnecessary. Once the oracles of the OT are read on their own terms,⁴⁰ Baker’s “natures” mentioned above become clear. The NT’s typological use of the OT were not attempts at exegeting the prophecy, and so they do not evince a belief that the prophecies were directly about Jesus. The typological fulfillment highlighted by Matthew does not indicate a belief that the OT prophecies were prospectively pointing to Jesus. Rather, their use of the OT prophecies display a retrospective understanding of the prophecies and a relationship between the past fulfillment of that prophecy with Jesus.⁴¹ Only when we assume *sensus plenior* or a predictive approach to typology must modern readers come to the conclusion that the NT authors do “shocking” exegesis.⁴²

1.4.3.2: Canonical Context and Escalation

The rejection of *sensus plenior* does not completely remove an element of prospectivity or prefigurement within OT prophecies if properly framed in a canonical context. In fact, the typological fulfillment presented in the NT seems to indicate not only an escalation from type to anti-type (which is a typical factor in typology),⁴³ but also that the unfolding eschatological or

³⁹Beale, *Handbook*, 14.

⁴⁰The types in the Old Testament should be not only read on their own terms, but valued for the what they bring to their own context rather than simply pointers to the antitype. See Hoskins for an opposing view, Paul M. Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John* (Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 2006), 23.

⁴¹Baker, “Typology,” 149.

⁴²Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (2d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 124.

⁴³Baker makes the argument that escalation “is simply an aspect of the progression from Old Testament to New Testament and not a necessary characteristic of a type.” Baker, “Typology,” 152.

messianic outlook⁴⁴ of the scriptures point forward to more decisive action and fulfillment by God. D. A. Carson aptly states:

The NT writers insist that the OT can be rightly interpreted only if the entire revelation is kept in perspective as it is historically unfolded (e.g., Gal. 3:6–14). Hermeneutically this is not an innovation. OT writers drew lessons out of earlier salvation history, lessons difficult to [completely] perceive while that history was being lived, but lessons that retrospect would clarify (e.g., Asaph in Ps 78; cf. on Matt 13:35). Matthew does the same in the context of the fulfillment of OT hopes in Jesus Christ. We may therefore legitimately speak of a “fuller meaning” than any one text provides. But the appeal should be made, not to some hidden divine knowledge, but to the pattern of revelation up to that time—a pattern not yet adequately discerned. The new revelation may therefore be truly new, yet at the same time capable of being checked against the old.⁴⁵

This perspective rightly treats the original author’s context and meaning on its own terms, while also recognizing the wider canonical context and the teleological aspect of the OT, which as Beale states may provide “hints or indications that the [OT] passage is typological.”⁴⁶ This prefiguration, rightly understood, can only be recognized retrospectively with Jesus standing already at the climax of salvation history. While it is certainly true that “the human author of an Old Testament writing may not have a full understanding of the typological import of what he is writing,”⁴⁷ this does not therefore necessitate a *sensus plenior* understanding. As laudible as it may be to place primacy on divine authorship, this should not come at the expense of what texts meant to the human author and original audience.⁴⁸ This does not remove a belief in divine authorship, but rather understands that the nature of the divine authorship meant not only that God works in patterns, but that “the important point about correspondence in history is that the text is not used up by a single event.”⁴⁹

⁴⁴Moo states: “An eschatological ‘fullness’ or advance (Steigerung) in the New Testament antitype over against the Old Testament type is also usually considered essential to true typology.” Douglas J. Moo, “The Problem of Sensus Plenior,” in *Hermeneutics, Authority, and Canon* (eds. John D. Woodbridge and D. A. Carson; 1986), 195.

⁴⁵D. A. Carson, “Matthew,” *Expositor's Bible Commentary: Matthew, Mark, Luke*, 8:92-93.

⁴⁶Beale, *Handbook*, 15.

⁴⁷Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment*, 24.

⁴⁸See *Ibid.*, 24.

1.4.4: Recognizing Typology in Matthew⁵⁰

NT Typology has nowhere, to my knowledge, been categorized in its usage, but it is useful as a template for understanding the way Matthew makes use of typology in his narrative to create some categories of typology. The following list categorizes how Matthew employs typology as well as typological fulfillment:

1. *Quotation of prophecy and indication of fulfillment.* Typological fulfillment of OT prophecies are highlighted specifically by Matthew, with the fulfillment also being highlighted. In these cases it is up to the reader to understand in what way “fulfillment” occurs. Using an example with the typological understanding outlined above, Matthew’s quotation of the Immanuel prophecy in 1:23 does not imply direct fulfillment (in the way the Bethlehem prophecy in 2:6 would), but rather displays 1) Matthew understanding the original historical fulfillment of that prophecy; 2) its analogous relationship with the fulfillment manifested in the current situation; 3) recognition of how this current fulfillment displays God’s pattern of working in similar ways; 4) and finally how this fulfillment has in a more ultimate sense been teleologically realized in the current fulfillment.
2. *Simple comparison.* Often a type and anti-type are forthrightly compared by Matthew through citation or allusion. In these instances, Matthew is not inviting the reader to draw a sustained comparison and shows no sign of further correspondence beyond the immediate example. These examples fall under typology of the first order. An example of this is Matt 12:40, where the burial and resurrection of Jesus is compared to Jonah being in the belly of the whale. It is this singular experience of Jonah that is

⁴⁹Snodgrass, “The Use,” 215.

⁵⁰While I am confining this to the Gospel of Matthew, I believe these classifications of typology may cover all typological usage in the NT.

drawn upon (here as well as 16:4). Matthew makes no further comparisons between Jesus and Jonah—indeed further comparison would serve a negative function (i.e. Jonah’s disobedience to God and lack of mercy for the people).

3. *Complex comparison.* In other instances, Matthew alludes to OT material in a typological fashion which invites a more complex comparison between type and anti-type. In these cases there is at least one firm allusion or citation which invites the typological comparison, but further analogous relationship between type and antitype may be more allusive—often in the form of echoes or analogous circumstances. Examples of this are Matthew’s Son of Man material as well as the likely Israel typology invoked in 2:15 and continued in the temptation of ch. 4.
4. *Sustained or repeating comparison.* A sustained typology through the text is a comparison with type and antitype made multiple times, and presented with citations/allusions and echoes. A sustained typology can be both typology of the first and second order, or a mix of the two. An example of this is evident in the classic treatment of Moses typology by Dale Allison,⁵¹ as well as a David typology which this thesis will present.
5. *Global comparison.* Although harder to establish in a definitive sense, a meta comparison may be made by Matthew which overarches his entire narrative, or can be seen within the structure of the entire narrative. These types of global typologies may or may not be reinforced by comparisons like that listed above. A possible example is an Isaac typology, hinted at in the incipit and found in a more global comparison.⁵²

⁵¹Allison, *New Moses*.

⁵²On this see Leroy A. Huizenga, “Matt 1:1: “Son of Abraham” as Christological Category,” *HBT* 30/2 (2008), 103-113; Leroy A. Huizenga, “The Matthean Jesus and the Isaac of the Early Jewish Encyclopedia,” in *Reading the Bible Intertextually* (eds. Richard B. Hays, Stefan Alkier, and Leroy A. Huizenga; Waco, Tex: Baylor, 2009), 63-81.

1.4.5: Typological Awareness

An important element that can help to bolster the arguments for a sustained typology or a global typology is the level to which Matthew may seek to invoke an awareness of typology for the reader. If it can be reasonably shown that Matthew has portrayed in his narrative a typological anti-type more than once in his narrative (particularly early in the text), it stands to reason that the author is predisposing the reader to more acutely recognize allusions and echoes to that type within the unfolding of the narrative. This can be important in particular when attempting to recognize allusions and especially echoes. Through the experience of reading a text, the author may have already *intentionally oriented* his audience through explicit means to both seek and hear subtle and overt parallels to a particular tradition, present in the form of allusions and echoes in order to present a sustained or global typology. This presents a cumulative effect within singular passages and the entire text. For example, LeRoy Huizenga argues that the incipit of Matthew predisposes the reader to a global typology of Isaac as type and Jesus as antitype.⁵³ I will similarly argue that the incipit and early episodes of Matthew intentionally orient the reader to a sustained comparison with David as type and Jesus as antitype.

1.5: Approach

Matthew's interaction with Davidic tradition and use of Davidic typology runs throughout much of his Gospel. As such, I have attempted as best as possible to study the text in narrative order. Because Matthew is a carefully crafted narrative, rich in inner-narrative connections, the study at certain times will break sequence when I felt it necessary. I will also make note here that the final section discussed is the use of Psalm 22 in the passion narrative. In my

⁵³Huizenga, "Matt 1:1," 103-113.

study of Matthew, I have found no use of Davidic tradition and typology in the burial and resurrection sections of the Gospel. I suggest there are several reasons for this. First, there is precious little in the OT on the death and burial of David (cf. 2 Kgs 2:10), so there was nothing in particular to draw upon in the scriptures. The same can likewise be said about resurrection: there are only hints of resurrection in places like Dan 12:2, Ezek 37:12, and Zech 14:4–5, and Matthew made relatively little use of direct quotations and allusions in the resurrection narrative. More importantly, though, is that the NT authors viewed the resurrection as a singularly unique event. Because of the uniqueness of the resurrection, the utilization of typology would in fact have downgraded the evangelist's presentation of this singularly unique event, as typology is rooted in the idea that there are patterns within the history of God's dealing with humanity. The lack of typology in this instance actually serves to highlight the uniqueness of Jesus (see more at §1.4.3).

Chapter 2 will study the Davidic motifs present in Matthew's incipit and genealogy. Matthew introduces Jesus in the very first words with the Davidic title Son of David, and proceeds to present Jesus' genealogical credentials in such a way as to emphasize David. Chapter 3 will explore the Davidic motifs and traditions within the infancy narrative. Within this section of the Gospel, Joseph, the other Son of David, will confirm Jesus as his legitimate son. Matthew then goes on to set Jesus up as the legitimate Davidic king over against Herod. Significant Davidic elements occur in Matthew's formula citations within the infancy narrative as well. Chapter 4 will focus in on how Matthew connects Jesus' acts of healing with the title Son of David. I will argue that Matthew utilizes typology and interacts with the Davidic shepherd tradition of Ezekiel 34 to help his readers understand why the Son of David is a healer.

Chapter 5 will look at three pericopes which seek to establish both the authority and the humility of the Son of David. Matthew does so, once again, by utilizing typology and Davidic tradition from the scriptures to highlight what kind of messiah Jesus is. Within this

chapter, it will also be shown how Matthew makes use of David himself to testify to the supremacy of the Son of David. Chapter 6 will explore the betrayal of Jesus by Judas, and show how the story of Jesus' betrayal was built upon Davidic typology – namely the betrayal of David by Ahithophel. Chapter 7 will present the use of Psalm 22 in the passion narrative. Psalm 22 provides Matthew with a unique opportunity to show how Jesus typologically suffered as David did.

1.6: A Sketch of Davidic Messianism at the Turn of the Era

As mentioned above, several monographs, Miura in particular, made a thorough examination of the development of Davidic tradition, so it is unnecessary to do a thorough survey here.

However, given the continual interaction with Davidic messianic tradition in Matthew, it is important to lay out what exactly I mean when using the designation “Davidic messianism.”⁵⁴

Although messianism is not the primary aim of this thesis, Matthew through his Gospel makes use of much of the same Davidic tradition which fuelled early Jewish messianism. Yet, Matthew through his narrative will make use of Davidic tradition and typology in his presentation of Jesus in such a way that he redefined what it meant for Jesus to be the Son of David. His portrait stood in contrast to some messianic expectation as it is presented in early Jewish literature around that time. Because of the chronological proximity, it is *Psalms of Solomon*

⁵⁴An extensive study of Davidic tradition in early Jewish literature has been undertaken by Miura, *David in Luke-Acts*. Although treated more briefly, Mark Strauss has also devoted a large portion of a monograph to this subject as well, see Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*. The literature on early Jewish messianism is enormous. The following are some of the major monographs or edited collections: Collins, *Scepter and the Star*; William Scott Green, Jonathan Z. Smith, and Jacob Neusner, eds., *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Joseph Klausner, *The Messianic Idea In Israel, From Its Beginning To The Completion Of The Mishnah* (New York: Macmillan, 1955); James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity: The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (Minneapolis, MN.: Augsburg Fortress Publishers, 1992); Hermann Lichtenberger, Gerbern S. Oegema, and James H. Charlesworth, eds., *Qumran-Messianism: studies on the Messianic expectations in the Dead Sea scrolls* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998); Gerbern S. Oegema, *The Anointed and his People: Messianic Expections from the Maccabees to Bar Kochba* (JSPSup 27; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).

17 and the Qumran literature which provide scholars the closest window into messianic hope in the first century. With this messianic matrix in place, Matthew's unique presentation of the Son of David can be better appreciated in the following chapters. It is well recognized that there were varieties of messianism in early Judaism. For the purposes of this sketch, I will confine myself as much as possible to those texts that connect closely to a royal Davidic messianism.

1.6.1: Davidic Messianism in the OT

The root of Davidic messianism is the promise of God to David himself in 2 Sam 7:5–16 (cf. 1 Chron 17:4–14). God promises that David's family line will continue, that God himself will be faithful, that God will have a unique fatherly relationship with his descendants, and that his throne will be eternal. The promise to David also encompassed a promise for a land and peace for Israel. These sentiments are reiterated in one form or another in Pss 89, 132, and 2 Sam 23:1–7. The royal psalms (2, 18, 20, 21, 45, 72, 101, 110, 132, 139, 144) also affirm and expand upon this original promise.⁵⁵ Prior to the exile, hopes for a reunification of Israel under a just monarch were expressed in terms of the Davidic promise in Isa 9:1–7, 11:1–5; Mic 5:1–5, Hos 3:5, Amos 9:11. Isa 11 in particular became an important text which the exilic and post-exilic prophets built upon. Jeremiah 23:5–6 (cf. Jer 33:14–26) declared that God would “raise up for David a righteous branch.” So too God declares his unhappiness with Israel's current leaders (shepherds) and promises to raise up a new “David” to shepherd a united Israel in Ezek 34:23–24 (cf. 37:24–25). With the return from exile came a brief renewal in messianic expectation, centered around Zerubbabel and the rebuilding of the temple (Hag 2:22–23; Zech 3:1–10, 4:6–10, 6:9–14) though this soon faded as Zerubbabel passed from the scene.

⁵⁵Texts prior to Nathan's oracle were also used as legitimation and precursors to God's full blown covenant with David, particularly Gen 49:8–12 and Num 24:17–19.

1.6.2: Davidic Messianism in Psalms of Solomon 17

As one gets closer to the time of Jesus, the Davidic hope was renewed and finds a full expression in *Psalms of Solomon* 17 as well as the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁵⁶ The growing disillusionment with the priestly leadership of Israel brought about in the 1st c. BCE one of the strongest statements of the Jewish hope for a Davidic king.⁵⁷ *Pss. Sol.* 17's original composition was likely in response to Pompey's attack on Jerusalem in 63 BCE. Kenneth Atkinson suspects that the psalm was later read as referring to Herod and amended (with the insertion of 17:7–9) to more accurately reflect the Herodian period.⁵⁸

²¹Look, O LORD, and raise up for them their king, a Son of David, to reign over your servant Israel in the time that you know, O God. ²²Undergird him with the strength to break the unrighteous rulers, to cleanse Jerusalem from the Gentiles who trample her down to destruction; ²³In wisdom and in righteous-

⁵⁶For detailed studies of the Psalms of Solomon, and in particular the messianism found within, see the following: J O'Dell, "The Religious Background of the Psalms of Solomon (Re-evaluated in the Light of the Qumran Texts)," *RevQ* 3 (1961), 241-257; Robert B. Wright, "The Psalms of Solomon, the pharisees, and the Essenes," in *International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies and the SBL Pseudepigrapha Seminar, 1972 proceedings* (ed. Robert A. Kraft; Missoula: SBL, 1972), 136-147; Robert R Hann, "Christos Kyrios in PsSol 17:32: "the Lord's anointed" reconsidered," *NTS* 31 (1985), 620-27; Joseph L Trafton, "The Psalms of Solomon in Recent Research," *JSP* 12 (1994), 3-19; Michael A Knibb, "Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls," *DSD* 2/2 (1995), 165-184; Kenneth Atkinson, "Herod the Great, Sosius, and the Siege of Jerusalem (37 BCE) in Psalm of Solomon 17," *NovT* 38 (1996), 313-322; James H. Charlesworth, "Messianology in the Biblical Pseudepigrapha," in *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. James H. Charlesworth, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Gerbern S. Oegema; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 22-52; Hermann Lichtenberger, "Messianic Expectations and Messianic Figures in the Second Temple Period," in *Qumran-Messianism* (eds. James H. Charlesworth, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Gerbern S. Oegema; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 9-20; Kenneth Atkinson, "On the Herodian Origin of Militant Davidic Messianism at Qumran: New Light from Psalm of Solomon 17," *JBL* 118 (1999), 435-460; Kenneth Atkinson, "On the Use of Scripture in the Development of Militant Davidic Messianism at Qumran: new light from Psalm of Solomon 17," in *Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 106-123; Michael E. Fuller, "The Davidic Messiah in Early Jewish Literature," in *Spirit and the Mind: Essays on Informed Pentecostalism* (eds. Terry L. Cross and Emerson B. Powery; Lanham: University Press of America, 2000), 65-86; Kenneth Atkinson, *An Intertextual Study of the Psalms of Solomon* (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 49; Lewiston, N.Y.: E. Mellen Press, 2001); Johannes Tromp, "The Davidic Messiah in Jewish Eschatology of the First Century BCE," in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (ed. James M. Scott; JSJSup 72; Boston: Brill, 2001), 179-201; Joseph L. Trafton, "The Bible, The Psalms of Solomon, and Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community*, 3 vols. (ed. James H. Charlesworth; The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins 2; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 427-446; Joel Willitts, "Matthew and Psalms of Solomon's messianism: a comparative study of first-century messianology," *BBR* 22/1 (2012), 27-50.

⁵⁷*Pss. Sol.* 18 also contains some Davidic messianism. It is likely that this final composition was a reflection on the previous psalm by the final redactor. However, it does not contain near the level of detail.

⁵⁸See H. Daniel Zacharias, "Raise up to them their King": *Psalms of Solomon 17-18 in the Context of Early Jewish Messianism* (Tübingen: Verlag Dr. Mueller, 2008), 7–12. This amendment was likely at the hand of the redactor who brought these 18 works together.

ness to drive out the sinners from the inheritance, to smash the pride of sinners like a potter's jar; ²⁴to demolish all their resources with an iron rod; to destroy the lawbreaking Gentiles with the word of his mouth; ²⁵to disperse the Gentiles from his presence at his threat; to condemn sinners by their own consciences.

²⁶He will gather a holy people whom he will lead in righteousness; and he will judge the tribes of the people who have been made holy by the LORD his God. ²⁷He will not tolerate unrighteousness to dwell among them again, and no person who knows evil will live with them. For he will know them, because they are all children of their God. ²⁸He will distribute them upon the land according to their tribes. The stranger and the foreigner will no longer live with them. ²⁹He will judge peoples and nations in the wisdom of his righteousness. ³⁰He will have Gentile peoples serving him under his yoke, and he will glorify the LORD publicly in the whole world. He will pronounce Jerusalem clean, consecrating it as it was in the beginning.

³¹He will have nations come from the ends of the earth to see his glory, bearing as gifts her scattered children and to see the glory of the LORD with which God has glorified her. ³²He will be a righteous king over them, taught by God, there will be no unrighteousness among them in his reign, because everyone will be holy, and their king will be the Lord Messiah. ³³For he will not depend on cavalry and archers; Nor will he need to finance a war; He will not place his hope on going to war. ³⁴The LORD himself is his king, the hope of the one who hopes in God. He will be merciful to all the Gentiles that fearfully stand before him.⁵⁹

This rich passage constitutes the most extensive portrayal of the hope for a Davidic messiah and is heavily indebted to Isaiah 11.⁶⁰ Space does not permit a full interaction with this passage, but several important points should be noted.⁶¹ *Pss. Sol.* 17 is the first time the messiah is called Son of David (v. 21), and also called Lord Messiah (v. 32) and is repeatedly characterized by righteousness (vv. 23, 26–27, 29, 31–32). He is raised up by God to be king and himself acknowledges God as the true king (v. 21, 34). This messiah enacts geographic and political change (v. 26–28), and also exhibits priestly functions by bringing about spiritual

⁵⁹Translation comes from Robert B. Wright, ed., *The Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (New York: T&T Clark, 2007).

⁶⁰“[N]owhere else in early Jewish literature are the functions of the Messiah so well delineated.” James H. Charlesworth, “From Messianology to Christology: Some Caveats and Perspectives,” in *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (eds. Jacob Neusner, William S. Green, and Ernest Frerichs; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 236.

⁶¹For a more in-depth interaction, see Zacharias, *Raise up*, 15-42.

change (v. 32), pronouncing Jerusalem clean (v. 30), and purging the land of foreigners (v. 28). The messiah's reign is universal in scope, with Gentiles in servitude to him (v. 30), desiring to see his glory (v. 31), being merciful to Gentiles who stand before him (v. 34), and gathering together the remainder of the diaspora. Especially important to note is that the messiah exacts judgment of the rulers, the sinners, and the Gentiles and is portrayed in violent terms: he will break the rulers (v. 22), smash the pride of sinners (v. 23), demolish their resources with an iron rod (v. 24), destroy the Gentiles with the word of his mouth (v. 24). Despite this violent and somewhat supernatural power, the messiah is not militant – he does not lead an army of the faithful in this re-establishment of the promised kingdom (v. 33) and the only weapon is the word of his mouth (v. 24). *Pss. Sol.* 17 paints a clear picture of a violent messiah overthrowing the ruling powers. As the Roman empire took control of Israel, these hopes no doubt continued to stir and likely grew as a foreign power took firm control of the promised land.

1.6.3: Davidic Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls

Similar hopes for a revolutionary messiah are found in the Qumran literature.⁶² The two passages cited below were written at the end of the Hasmonean period and into the Herodian pe-

⁶²It must be kept in mind that the sectarian scrolls from Qumran are not preoccupied with messianism, law observance was the dominant focus. See Craig A. Evans, "Qumran's Messiah: how important is he?" in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 148. Michael Knibb thinks otherwise: "[T]here can be no question but that eschatological and messianic beliefs were of considerable significance in the theological outlook of this group at all stages of its existence." Michael A. Knibb, "Eschatology and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*, 2 vols. (eds. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam; Boston: Brill, 1999), 379. Knibb is correct insofar as it is understood that messianism is a part of, not separate from, the groups eschatological outlook. For further discussion on Qumran messianism besides those cited previously, see Kenneth Atkinson, *I Cried to the Lord: A Study of the Psalms of Solomon's Historical Background and Social Setting* (JSJSup 84; Boston: Brill, 2004), 144-176; Craig A. Evans, *Jesus and His Contemporaries: comparative studies* (AGJU 25; New York: Brill, 1995), 83-154; James VanderKam, "Messianism in the Scrolls," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant* (eds. Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam; Notre Dame: Notre Dame Press, 1994), 211-233; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Qumran Messianism," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (ed. Joseph A. Fitzmyer; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 73-110.

riod, around the same time as the *Pss. Sol.* Although numerous passages could be brought to this discussion, the *War Scroll* well represents Qumran's Davidic messianism.⁶³

4Q161 8, 10.11–24: “[A rod will grow from] Jesse’s stock, a sprout [will bloom] from his [roots;] upon him wi[ll rest] the spirit of [the Lord: a spirit of] wisdom and insight, a spirit of good coun[sel and strength,] a spirit of true know[ledge] [and reverence for the Lord, he will delight in reverence for] the Lord. [He will not judge only] by what [his eyes] see, [he will not decide only by what his ears hear;] but he will rule [the weak by justice, and give decisions] [in integrity to the humble of the land. He will punish the land with the mace of his words, by his lips’ breath alone] [he will slay the wicked. ‘Justice’ will be the sash around] his waist, ‘Tr[uth’ the sash around his hips.”]. [This saying refers to the Branch of] David, who will appear in the las[t days, ...] [...] his enemies; and God will support him with [a spirit of] strength [...] [...] and God will give him] a glorious throne, [a sacred] crown, and elegant garments. [...] He will put a] scepter in his hand, and he will rule over all the G[enti]les, even Magog [and his army ... all] the peoples his sword will control. As for the verse that says, “He will not [judge only by what his eyes see,] he will not decide only by what his ears hear,” this means that [he will be advised by the Zadokite priests,] and as they instruct him, so shall he rule, and at their command [he shall render decisions; and always] one of the prominent priests shall go out with him, in whose hand shall be the garments of [....]”

4Q285 f7.1–6: [... just as it is written in the book of]Isaiah the prophet, “And [the thickets of the forest] shall be cut down [with an ax, and Lebanon with its majestic trees wil]l fall. A shoot shall come out from the stump of Jesse [and a branch shall grow out of his roots.” This is the] Branch of David. Then [all forces of Belial] shall be judged, [and the king of the Kittim shall stand for judgment] and the Leader of the community—the Bra[nch of David]—will have him put to death. [Then all Israel shall come out with timbrel]s and dancers, and the [Chief] Priest shall order [them to cleanse their bodies from the guilty blood of the c]orpse[s of] the Kittim[....]

Several brief observations can be made about Qumran's Davidic messianism. Davidic language of the OT prophets is utilized in this scroll as well as others, with “branch of David,” (4Q174 frag.2, 1.11; 4Q252 5.3–4; 4Q285 f7.2–3) “shoot of David,” (4Q285 f7.2) “booth of David,” (4Q174 frag.2, 1.12) and “root/sprout of Jesse” (4Q161 8, 10.11) all appearing. Like *Pss. Sol.* 17, Isa 11 is a significant text for the author of 4Q161. The *Florilegium* (4Q174) also weaves together Davidic tradition from 2 Sam 7:11–14, Amos 9:11, Jer

⁶³Other important passages are 4Q174 frag.2, 1:10–13; 4Q252 5:1–7; 4Q285 f7:1–6; 1QS^a 2:11–17, 1QS^b; 4Q246; 4Q458; and 4Q541. See my discussion of these sections in *Zacharias, Raise up*, 57–59.

33:15, and Isa 11:1. The particular scrolls above are part of the *War Scroll*.⁶⁴ The *War Scroll* places the Messiah as the leader of the army in the eschatological war: he puts to death the king of the Kittim and there is a resulting celebration. There is also a clear mention of corpses of the Kittim, indicative of a battle. The messiah here is portrayed as a militant army commander, standing over the ranks of the congregation (cf. 1QS^a 2.14) with sword in hand (4Q161 10.21). Like *Pss. Sol.* 17, the character of the messiah is of an upstanding nature. He has a spirit of wisdom and strength, of true knowledge and reverence for the Lord.

The Qumran community, like the author of *Pss. Sol.* 17, expected at some point the fulfillment of God's promise in the raising up of the Davidic messiah who would bring about the geo-political restoration of Israel, and would be at the head of an army with sword in hand. Hints of this type of messianic expectation are also present in the NT.

1.6.4: Davidic Messianism in the NT

Pss. Sol. 17 and the Qumran literature illustrates well some of the core components of at least one strand of messianism prior to Jesus' life. Three examples in the NT can be highlighted which may indicate that this same type of messianic expectation, in particular the more revolutionary and violent components, were still in the air at the time of Jesus.

John 6 recounts the feeding of the 5,000 on the hillside. That passage ends with the reaction of the crowd: "Now when the people saw the sign that he performed, they began to say, 'This one is truly the Prophet who is to come into the world!' Then Jesus, because he knew that they were about to come and seize him in order to make him king, withdrew again up the mountain by himself alone" (6:14–15). John makes it clear that this veritable army of 5,000 men were ready to follow Jesus in revolt: "Apparently in the crowd there were not merely

⁶⁴Collins, *Scepter and the Star*, 59; Evans, "Qumran's Messiah," 144.

quietistic followers but political activists who were not content with confession but were set on revolutionary king-making actions.”⁶⁵

Another place where the geo-political aspect of messianism may present itself is at the ascension in Acts 1. After the death and resurrection of Jesus, the disciples ask him: “Lord, is it at this time you are restoring the kingdom to Israel?” (Acts 1:6). While the disciples at this point in Luke’s two-part story have come to understand the reality of Jesus’ death and resurrection, some commentators have suggested that the expectation of the Day of the Lord (cf. Joel 2:28–32), which included geo-political restoration by the messiah, has not abated.⁶⁶

Finally, the trial and crucifixion shows Jesus as acceding to the title of king, probably the only time that he verbally does so (Mark 14:61, Matt 26:63). Bringing the charges before Pilate, Pilate also asks Jesus if he is the messiah, this time using the title “king.” Again, Jesus answers affirmatively, if passively. This was understood as a royal designation (Matt 27:11; Mark 15:2; Luke 23:2–3; John 18:33, 37). This designation carries through during the torture by the soldiers (Mark 15:17–20 par.) and culminates in the sign, placed above Jesus’ head on the cross, which read “King of the Jews” (Mark 15:26 par.). His trial and death, then, are powerful indicators of how he was perceived by the Roman and Jewish authorities.

1.6.5: Other Messianic Claimants

Further confirmation of the messianic hopes extant in Jesus’ day are illustrated by other messianic claimants, in particular the royal messianic claimants. Josephus tells of Athronges (*Ant.* 17.278), Simon of Perea (*War* 2.57), Judas son of Hezekiah (*Ant.* 17.271–272), and Judas the

⁶⁵Gerald L. Borchert, *John 1–11* (NAC 25A; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1996), 257.

⁶⁶See Chalmer E. Faw, *Acts* (Believers Church Bible Commentary. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1993), 30; Richard N. Longenecker, “Acts,” *Expositor’s Bible Commentary: John and Acts*, 9:256; John B. Polhill, *Acts* (NAC 26; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1995), 83–84. For a critique on this perspective, see Jason Maston, “How Wrong were the Disciples about the Kingdom? Thoughts on Acts 1:6,” *ExpTim* 125/8 (May, 2014), 1–10.

Galilean (*Ant.* 18.4–10; *War* 2.117–118).⁶⁷ All of these men sought a claim to Israel's throne, with all eventually being killed.

The next wave of messianic claimants comes in the years leading up to the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in 70 CE. Josephus tells of Menahem, leader of the *Sicarii* (*War* 2.441–444), prior to the sack of Jerusalem. Leading up to and during the siege of Jerusalem, John of Gischala (*War* 4.389–90) and Simon bar Giora (*War* 4.510, 575; 7.26–31) fought within the walls of Jerusalem for control as well. Despite the crushing defeat of 70 CE, hopes for a revolution led by the messiah still existed. Lukuas of Cyrene, described by Eusebius (*Eccl. Hist.* 4.2.1–5) led a revolt during the reign of Trajan in 115 CE. The final rebellion occurred under the leadership of Simon Bar Kochba, or the “son of the star,” in reference to Num 24:17. The writing on Bar Kochba is somewhat fragmentary,⁶⁸ but it is likely that Rabbi Aqiba hailed Simon as the messiah as well (*y. Ta'an.* 4:5).

1.6.6: Summary

This brief sketch of Davidic messianism serves to show that during the time of Jesus and even into the second century, the hope for a Davidic messiah was still high, and it had taken on a particularly geo-political and violent/militaristic tone.⁶⁹ Traces of this appear in the NT, and hopes for a messiah to overthrow the oppressors culminated in the first Jewish revolt, and ultimately died with Bar Kochba.

⁶⁷Martin Hengel has argued that the final two are the same individual, Martin Hengel, *The Zealots: Investigations Into The Jewish Freedom Movement In The Period From Herod I Until 70 A.D* (Translated by David Smith. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989), 330-387. Craig Evans has suggested that they are different, Evans, *Contemporaries*, 63.

⁶⁸See Dio Cassius *Hist.* 59.13.3; Justin Martyr *Apol.* I 31.5–6; and Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* 4.6.1–4.

⁶⁹I have in this brief sketch refrained from discussion of the Targum tradition due to its uncertain provenance and dating, but relevant passages will be discussed when appropriate. Suffice it to say that, if the Targumic tradition is any indication of messianic thought in Jesus' day, then messianism continued to play a vital role in the worldview of Judaism in Jesus' day.

Understanding the nature of this messianic hope makes Matthew's presentation of the Son of David all the more stark. The present study will show how Matthew presents Jesus and his ministry as a contrast to this popular expectation. No less entrenched in the scriptures, the evangelist will utilize both Davidic tradition and Davidic typology to properly define what it means for Jesus to be the Son of David.

Chapter 2: Enter the Son of David: Matthew's Incipit and Genealogy

The beginning of the Gospel, even from its very first verse, draws upon and interacts with Davidic tradition. This interaction at the outset of the Gospel predisposes the reader to a posture of reading the rest of the narrative in light of its beginning. Jesus is introduced as “Son of David”, his genealogy is one focused on dynastic succession from David, and a focus of the infancy narrative is Jesus’ ties to the line of David. Thus, not only do the early sections of the Gospel display an interest in and interaction with Davidic tradition, but they serve the important role of predisposing the reader to be on alert for other elements of Davidic tradition in later portions of the Gospel.

2.1: Matthew's Incipit

While most Matthean scholars and commentators agree on the importance of Matt 1:1, not all agree on its exact function. Dale Allison clearly and concisely defines the options proposed:¹

1. The incipit introduces the genealogical list only (1:1–17).²
2. In recognition of the fact that γένεσις appears in Matt 1:18 and does not mean “genealogy,” the incipit more appropriately introduces the entirety of the birth of Jesus in chapter 1.³
3. The incipit introduces the entirety of the infancy narrative in chs. 1–2.⁴

¹Dale C. Allison, *Studies in Matthew: Interpretation Past and Present* (Grand Rapids: Baylor University Press, 2006), 158-160.

²W. Barnes Tatum, “‘The Origin of Jesus Messiah’ (Matt 1:1, 18a): Matthew’s Use of the Infancy Traditions,” *JBL* 96/4 (1977), 526.

³Raymond E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah* (ABRL. Rev. and Enl. ed. New York: Doubleday, 1993), 59.

4. The incipit functions as the superscription for the entirety of the extended prologue leading up to Jesus' ministry (1:1–4:16).⁵
5. Taking more seriously the basic meaning of βίβλος and following some ancient commentators (Jerome and Chrysostom), the incipit functions as the title of the entire Gospel.⁶
6. Rather than understanding the previous options to be mutually exclusive, J. C. Fenton has proposed that verse 1 is telescopic— it extends more and more as the story unfolds to encompass the entirety of the Gospel. “First, it can cover *the genealogy* which immediately follows it; then, it can refer to the account of *the birth* of Jesus ... thirdly, it can mean ‘history,’ or ‘life-story’; and finally, it can refer to the whole new creation which begins at the conception of Jesus and will be completed at his second coming.”⁷

A decision on the function of the incipit involves looking carefully at each of the constituent parts of which it is made up in the context of the Gospel, as well as the literary context of Matthew as whole.

2.1.1: Βίβλος γενέσεως

The most basic meaning of βίβλος is simply “book.”⁸ It is the stereotyped translation for the Hebrew word סֵפֶר, which typically refers to a document.⁹ βίβλος is regularly used to refer to

⁴Allen C Willoughby, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (ICC. 3d ed. T and T Clark, 1912), 1.

⁵David R. Bauer, “The Literary and Theological Function of the Genealogy in Matthew’s Gospel,” in *Treasure Old and New: Contributions to Matthean Studies* (eds. David R. Bauer and Mark A. Powell; SBLSymS 1; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 138–39.

⁶Ulrich Luz, *Matthew: A Commentary* (3 vols.; Hermeneia 61A-C; Translated by James E Crouch. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989), 1:69. For a full list of the ancient commentators who carried this opinion, see Allison, *Studies in Matthew*, 159–60 n.7.

⁷John C. Fenton, *The Gospel of St. Matthew* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1964), 36.

⁸Frederick W. Danker et al., “βίβλος,” *BDAG*, 176.

⁹Walter Baumgartner et al., “סֵפֶר,” *HALOT*, 766-67.

any written document, and used to refer specifically to individual writings in the Hebrew Bible (Tob 1:1; 1 Chr 27:24).¹⁰ Given the basic sense of the word βίβλος, commentators like Leon Morris and Ulrich Luz conclude that verse 1 is a heading for the entire book.¹¹

The word γένεσις is also used by Philo to refer to the book of Genesis a generation before the Gospel of Matthew was written,¹² and used as the title to Genesis later by Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 20.1) and Origen (*Orat.* 23.2). Davies and Allison also list Nah 1:1, Tob 1:1, *T. Job.* 1:1, *Apoc. Abr.* title, *2 Esd.* 1:1–3, *Sepher Ha-Razim* preface, and 4Q^aAmram^b 1.1, all of which are introduced with βίβλος, βιβλίον, or סִפְרָא.¹³ Worthy of note also is the fact that five of the seven examples that Davies and Allison cite “begin with a genealogy of the central figure.”¹⁴

Taken together, Βίβλος γενέσεως seems to echo more specific sections of the scriptures, specifically Gen 2:4 and 5:1: “readers of Matthew’s Gospel, who have read or heard the Scriptures read, could scarcely fail to hear the allusion(s) to Genesis.”¹⁵ But what in particular the evangelist seeks to remind readers of should not be limited to Gen 2:4 and 5:1, particularly 5:1 which introduces a genealogical list. As Davies and Allison states:

For those acquainted with the Greek version of Genesis, Βίβλος γενέσεως would likely have brought to mind more than the genealogical table of Adam. It would probably have sent thoughts back to the primeval history in general. This in turn suggests that Matthew might have opened his gospel as he did in order to draw a parallel between one beginning and another beginning, between the creation of the cosmos and Adam and Eve on the one hand and the new creation brought by the Messiah on the other.¹⁶

¹⁰Colin Brown, “βίβλος,” *NIDNTT* 1:243-44.

¹¹Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to Matthew* (Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1992), 18; Luz, *Matthew*, 1:69.

¹²Craig A. Evans, “‘The Book of the Genesis of Jesus Christ’: The Purpose of Matthew in Light of the Incipit,” in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels* (ed. Thomas R. Hatina; LNTS 310; New York: T&T Clark, 2008), 62. Davies and Allison also make note of Genesis being referred to as γένεσις in other sources as well. See Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:151.

¹³*Ibid.*, 1:152.

¹⁴John Nolland, “What Kind of Genesis do we Have in Matt 1.1?” *NTS* 42/3 (1996), 470.

¹⁵Evans, “Book of the Genesis,” 66.

¹⁶Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:150. Davies and Allison also support this contention by noting the connec-

John Nolland take a more cautious approach, noting that the repetition of the word γένεσις in verse 17 to begin the story of Jesus' birth can be seen as a bookend to the genealogy and that the incipit should not be viewed in Fenton's (and Davies and Allison) telescopic manner,¹⁷ but rather as an introduction "only for the immediate section, 1.1–17 (with vv. 18–25 as an explanatory supplement)."¹⁸ Ulrich Luz also cautions against too determinative an association: "It is scarcely possible to interpret the title in the sense of a theology of the new creation through Christ. However, the evangelist probably thus gives his book a biblical background and a biblical-like importance."¹⁹

2.1.2: Son of Abraham

The designation of Jesus as "son of Abraham" in Matt 1:1 has posed a bit of a conundrum for interpreters. Whereas Βίβλος γενέσεως echoes scripture and "Son of David" is an early Jewish messianic title which is echoed later in the Gospel, the same things cannot be said of "son of Abraham." It was not a messianic title, but rather a generic description of any person of Jewish descent, and the title "son of Abraham" is never repeated in the Gospel. Because of this, it has been common for commentators to view this reference as, 1) highlighting Jesus' Israelite ancestry, and 2) as recalling the promise(s) to Abraham in Genesis—possibly anticipating the end of the Gospel when the good news is preached to all nations. The evangelist thus seeks to draw the reader to the foundational promises of God before beginning to unfold

tions with the Spirit at Jesus' baptism, the travel to and from Egypt, etc. It is for this reason that Dale Allison argues for the translation choice of "genesis" for modern English translations. See Allison, *Studies in Matthew*, 161-62.

¹⁷Nolland, "What Kind of Genesis," 463-471.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, 471. Nolland's conclusion will be discussed more in §2.1.4.

¹⁹Luz, *Matthew*, 70.

their fulfillment in Jesus.²⁰ However, Leroy Huizenga has made a good case for an Isaac typology being introduced as a sacrificial christological category for Matthew:

“Son of David” and “son of Abraham” therefore stand at the beginning of the Gospel of Matthew as two titular designations specifying two Christological categories of the greatest import for the Gospel: Messiah (“Son of David”), and Isaac (“son of Abraham”). The latter concerns “Son of God” language in the Gospel: as Isaac was to Abraham his father, so is Jesus to God his Father. This second Christological category would solve the dissonant conundrum of a dying Messiah, as the Messiah never undergoes martyrdom in any of the various contemporary Jewish portrayals. The two categories of Messiah and crucified savior are wrapped up together in one person, Jesus, with the Isaac typology providing the conceptual category of the atoning death of a martyr.²¹

In support of this proposal is Ulrich Luz’s assertion that “son of Abraham” offers readers “a blank slate deliberately inserted by Matthew, to be filled in by his readers in quite different ways. His concern is that they take along in their reading an unanswered question. Not until later will they be able to say in what sense Matthew spoke of Jesus as ‘the Son of Abraham’.”²² While Luz does not specifically mention the genealogy, it seems clear that the most immediate contribution to the “blank slate” is the genealogy. So too Davies and Allison see a possible conflation of the two titles as being specifically messianic, as Jer 33:21–22 and *Targ. Ps.* 89:4 both conflate the promise to Abraham (Gen 17:7) and the promise to David (2 Sam 7:12) together. If Huizenga’s proposal is correct, it would classify as a global typology, though it would certainly not overshadow the dominance of the title Son of David in Matthew.

²⁰Most commentators follow this general understanding. See for example Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew* (2 vols.; WBC 33A-B; Dallas: Word Books, 1993), 9; Morris, *Matthew*, 20; John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: a Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 72; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:158.

²¹Huizenga, “Matt 1:1,” 107.

²²Ulrich Luz, *The Theology Of The Gospel Of Matthew* (Translated by J. Bradford Robinson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 24. Davies and Allison also suggest seeing an Isaac connection in the designation “son of Abraham.” See Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 159.

2.1.3: *Son of David*

With the exception of John Nolland,²³ most commentators see the designation “Son of David” as titular, with reverberations through the rest of the Gospel.²⁴ At the very least, Matthew introduces the title here and makes it explicit through the Gospel that it is titular. The genealogy will answer immediately the question of how Jesus is related to the Davidic line, and various episodes of the Gospel will flesh out how and in what sense Jesus is the true and longed for Davidic heir. The fact that the designation is used seven times to refer to Jesus (Matt 9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 20:30–31; 21:9, 15; 22:42)²⁵ bolsters the argument that the incipit is in some sense introducing the entirety of the text and not simply the genealogy. Furthermore, the designation has a rich textual history which encompassed the hopes of the Jewish people for a new David to lead God’s people. Aware of the forthcoming usage of the title in the Gospel, the evangelist evidently sought to at once remind the reader of the messianic hope and encourage the reader to seek its fulfillment in what followed. Joel Willitts states: “From the standpoint of the primacy effect, Matthew’s Davidic messianism becomes the determinative factor for understanding the complete literary work. In other words, the Messianic tradition centered on David is the matrix of Matthew’s Gospel.”²⁶

2.1.4: *Function of the Incipit*

Since John Nolland has provided the strongest and most cogent argument against viewing 1:1 as a title for the book, arguing for it simply being an introduction to the genealogy, it is necessary to interact with some of his statements to support a more inclusive reading. Nolland con-

²³Nolland, *Matthew*, 72.

²⁴“‘Son of David’ had become, by the first century, a title for the messianic deliverer who would assume the throne of David,” see Hagner, *Matthew*, 9. Donald Juel states that by the time of the NT, Son of David had become “a shorthand substitution for the actual citation of a passage like 2 Sam 7:12–14.” Donald Juel, *Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation Of The Old Testament In Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 143.

²⁵“Son of David” is also applied to Joseph in 1:20, though the use is not titular.

²⁶Willitts, *Shepherd-King*, 2.

siders “Son of David” and “son of Abraham” as referring exclusively to the genealogy, and finds legitimate biblical support in Gen 2:4 and 5:1 for confining Βίβλος γενέσεως to the genealogy. However, there is one crucial difference between Gen 2:4 and 5:1 on the one hand, and Matt 1:1 on the other: the Genesis verses do not stand at the very beginning of a written work the way this and other references do. It is natural *not* to read Gen 2:4 and 5:1 as introductions to books given the place in their narratives, but it is at the very least confusing for the author of Matthew to have begun his work with Βίβλος were he only referring to the genealogy.

Arguing against the idea that Βίβλος γενέσεως is meant to conjure ideas of “new creation,” Nolland states that this type of emphasis would be a “jarring note of discontinuity.”²⁷ This conception of new creation assumes too much of a dichotomy: the new creation was also about continuity and completion—it was what salvation history was moving towards. To state that this is what God and his story is moving towards makes it necessary to connect it to the original promise to Abraham and the messianic hope connected to David. The new creation is at once continuous and discontinuous. Nolland also states:

Matt 1.1 and 17 bracket the genealogy which provides an opening section to Matthew which offers us a genealogical account of the origin of Jesus in which it is suggested that Jesus sums up in himself and brings to a climax that salvation-history which began in the call of Abraham.²⁸

This statement acknowledges the role of the genealogy and incipit—it is both dynastic and messianic, seeking to draw the reader to the past promise to Abraham now coming to fruition in Jesus. In my opinion, it is not too much to also assume that the argued for “introduction” to the genealogy is doing the same thing as the genealogy itself—pointing both backwards to the Jewish scriptures and forwards to the story of Jesus about to unfold in the Gospel.

²⁷Nolland, “What Kind of Genesis,” 467.

²⁸*Ibid.*, 471.

If Matt 1:1 simply began as Βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, with no later repetition, it could be cogently argued that it functions simply as a title for the entire work. Alternatively, if this verse and the genealogy occurred later in the Gospel, like Luke’s genealogy, it would be natural to read these words as only introducing the genealogy—exactly like Gen 5:1. The evangelist, though, compounded this statement by integrating two titles, and repeating the information at the end of the genealogy in 1:17, and using γένεσις once again in 1:18.²⁹ Furthermore, while it may be easy to confine “son of Abraham” to the genealogy, it seems quite certain that “Son of David” is significant for the entirety of the Gospel.³⁰ While for the purposes of this treatment it is not necessary to exhaustively discuss and decide firmly upon the available options, a more inclusive approach seems to make good sense. Readers have, as it were, in verse 1 a rock being dropped into a pond, with noticeable ripples in response continuing throughout the Gospel, with the first ripple (the genealogy) being the largest and most obvious, the recounting of the birth being the next largest ripple (introduced also by γένεσις), and further ripples noticeable in the usage of the title “Son of David” and perhaps even an Isaac typology reverberating as well.

The literary function of the beginnings of narratives, known as the primacy effect,³¹ needs to occupy an important place within this discussion as well. Boris Repschinski states:

Beginnings occupy one of the most prominent positions in a narrative. They provide the readers with an opening into the world of the text that allows them gradually to orient themselves within it. They do so by providing tentative markers of space and time, of themes and topics, and of characters. Yet it is precisely their tentativeness that invites the readers into the story and sharpens readers’ views for the development of these markers within the story. These markers may be confirmed or discredited within the narrative through the repe-

²⁹W. B. Tatum states, “By using γένεσις rather than γέννησις, therefore, the First Evangelist serves notice that his statement before the birth story introduces more than the birth story.” (Tatum, “The Origin,” 526)

³⁰The same may be said of “son of Abraham” if Huizenga’s arguments are accepted. See Huizenga, “Matt 1:1,” 103-113.

³¹The primacy effect is defined as “our tendency to accept as valid the information we are initially given, even when that information is contradicted later in the same message.” Definition from James Phelan and Peter J. Rabinowitz, *A Companion To Narrative Theory* (Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture 33; Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub, 2005), 549.

tion of confirming or contradictory material. Thus, they are essential in giving coherence to a narrative. Furthermore, beginnings have the function of awakening within the reader the necessary predispositions for understanding the text. In more pragmatic terms, this means creating an implied reader who can serve as an identifying figure for potential actual recipients of the text. The beginning of a text seeks to steer this process of identification of an actual complex and multifaceted recipient with the implied reader.³²

Acknowledgement of the primacy effect at work in Matthew's Gospel softens the discussion as to whether 1:1 introduces the entire text or just the genealogy (and birth narrative). Those who argue that the incipit introduces only the genealogy essentially view verse 1 as the genealogy in micro form, with the genealogy further fleshing out how Jesus is the "Son of David" and "son of Abraham." Thus, the Gospel either begins with the genealogy in micro form (verse 1 only) or it begins with the genealogy which emphasizes Jesus' as the "son of Abraham" and "Son of David." From the standpoint of the primacy effect the result is the same:

[T]he First Evangelist has constructed the genealogy as the introduction to the entire gospel and uses it to demonstrate that Jesus' genealogical origin establishes him as the Davidic Messiah ... It thereby announces that Jesus' lineage confers upon him messianic credentials. The genealogy itself, however, does more than show him to be a "Son of David" and a "Son of Abraham." It demonstrates that Jesus, and precisely Jesus among the descendants of David and Abraham, is the Messiah foreordained by God— *the* "Son of David" and *the* "Son of Abraham."³³

The important function of the genealogy as stated by W. B. Tatum can also be stated for the incipit; whether it stands as a title for the book or introduces the genealogy does not change

³²Boris Repschinski, "'For He Will Save His People From Their Sins' (Matthew 1:21): A Christology For Christian Jews," *CBQ* 68/2 (2006), 251-52. Warren Carter also recognizes the importance of the primacy effect for Matthew's Gospel. See Warren Carter, "Matthaeian Christology In Roman Imperial Key: Matthew 1.1," in *Gospel of Matthew in its Roman Imperial Context* (London: T & T Clark, 2005), 151.

³³Tatum, "The Origin," 524, 528.

its function or effect on the reader.³⁴ It is in fact the genealogy which infuses additional significance into the incipit.³⁵

2.1.5: Summary and Relevance for Thesis

Whether or not 1:1 stands as the title for the entire work or just the genealogy, the micro-genealogy³⁶ of 1:1 and the full genealogy's function is one and the same, and from the standpoint of the primacy effect the result for the reader is the same as well. David stands as the second proper name of the Gospel, David will be the most repeated name in the genealogy, interaction with Davidic tradition will continue throughout the Gospel, and Jesus' status as the "Son of David" is introduced at the outset and is reiterated numerous times throughout the narrative. Furthermore, we are immediately introduced to the character of Jesus by way of comparison with Abraham and David:

The very names David and Abraham create character for Jesus, just as the names Babe Ruth and Mickey Mantle evoke character for a baseball player. To say that a baseball player is another Babe Ruth is to suggest that he has extraordinary hitting power. Similarly, to say that Jesus is the child of David is to indicate that he has royal authority.³⁷

As will be shown in the following chapters, there will be points in the narrative where Jesus is explicitly compared with David, times when the stories about David are typologically employed when talking about Jesus, as well as times when the Davidic messianism will be invoked and refined. The incipit itself invites the reader to see these points of connection.

³⁴Ulrich Luz makes this same point without using the nomenclature of the "primacy effect". He states, "the readers still could have understood γένεσις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κτλ. as pars pro toto and the incipit of 1:1, which would initially refer to the content of the genealogy, as the title of the entire book. The first readers probably did not need to choose between the two possibilities. Only in the German [and English] translation do I have to do that" (Luz, *Matthew*, 70).

³⁵See §2.2 below.

³⁶Gerard Mussies calls the incipit a "shortened pedigree." Gerard Mussies, "Parallels To Matthew's Version Of The Pedigree Of Jesus," *NovT* 28/1 (1986), 32. This same sentiment is also stated by Nolland as well as Brown, Nolland, *Matthew*, 72; Brown, *Birth Of The Messiah*, 67.

³⁷Jones, "Subverting the Textuality," 265.

2.2: The Significance of David in the Genealogy

The full genealogy from Matt 1:2–17 has been the subject of much research, with focus upon several different topics, including: the named women/gentiles in the genealogy, the differences with Luke’s genealogy, the annotations in the genealogy, and Matthew’s apparently poor math skills.³⁸ These scholarly discussions revolving around the genealogy serve to highlight both the function of the genealogy and also the importance of David and Jesus’ Davidic descent. This descent is important for Matthew to establish as “the genealogical character of Davidic messianism is consistently demonstrated in early biblical and Jewish tradition.”³⁹

2.2.1: Royal Descent

Modern commentators recognize that Matthew did not intend to relate an exhaustive family tree in his genealogy, but rather to trace both Jesus’ descent from the father of the Israelite nation, and more importantly his royal descent from David, thereby placing him in the line of the Jewish monarchy.⁴⁰

It is a universally accepted point that Matthew’s genealogy of Jesus is intended to legitimate his status as Davidic Messiah: it is ‘essentially a dynastic document’. One would suspect, then, that as Matthew accents the bare genealogical outline with material from Israel’s story, the constituent parts of the genealogy work in concert to highlight Jesus’ messianic vocation.⁴¹

That Matthew intended to write an exclusive rather than inclusive genealogy is easily recognizable. First, Matthew’s three grouping of fourteen generations each cover different

³⁸Regarding the inclusion of Gentiles into the genealogy, J. B. Hood states “When Matthew begins to identify Gentiles in the genealogy, therefore, he is not changing topics; he is still referencing Jesus’ messianic vocation as *son of David*, following the charter for Davidic leadership established in Genesis 49.” Jason B. Hood, “Matthew 1:1–17 as a Summary of Israel’s Story: The Messiah, His Brothers, and the Nations” (PhD Diss, Aberdeen University (Highland Theological College), 2009), 223, italics his.

³⁹Miura, *David in Luke-Acts*, 134.

⁴⁰This is not to deny the authenticity of of the genealogy, as some scholars have done. See Ernest L. Abel, “Genealogies of Jesus O XPICTOC,” *NTS* 20/2 (1974), 204. Abel notes how the genealogy summarizes Israel’s history around the monarchy, with the first division summarizing the attainment of the throne, the second its loss, and the third its recovery (p. 205).

⁴¹Hood, “Matthew 1:1–17,” 210–11. Hood quotes from R. T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT. Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 2007), 32.

amounts of time: Abraham to David covers approximately 750 years, David to the exile covers approximately 400 years, and the exile to Jesus covers approximately 600 years. Matthew's source for the genealogy is likely 1 Chron 2:3–16; 3:1–10, and in comparing the list of names it is obvious that Matthew has been selective.

That the genealogy is dynastic rather than biological is immediately obvious in the Gospel, as the following sections work to explain how Jesus, begotten of Mary by the Holy Spirit, is a descendent of Joseph, a "Son of David" (1:20). The genealogy, as the introduction of Jesus into the story of Israel and as the introduction to the Gospel's narrative, highlights David in both subtle and overt ways: 1) the ascription of a title, 2) the structure of the genealogy, and 3) the summation of the genealogy in 1:17 as being 3 x 14 generations.

2.2.2: David "the King"

At various points through the genealogy, Matthew (or his source) added annotations to particular names.⁴² The annotation of particular interest is the ascription of a the title "king" to David. The ascription of the title to David gives confirmation of what has already been stated: this is a royal genealogy. As one reads the genealogy it is important to note that the ascription of "king" could in fact be legitimately applied to all of the names from David to Jechoniah. Giving the title to David helps the reader to understand that all names which follow from David are of royal lineage, and undoubtedly "evokes the whole story of the rise of David to the throne and his subsequent rule."⁴³ As the evangelist reaches the end of the genealogy, Jesus also receives a title, *χριστός*. While some commentators have preferred to view this exclusively as a name,⁴⁴ John Nolland's perspective on the matter is most convincing:

Is Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ here a double name ('Jesus Christ') or is Christ titular? In Matthew's use the two alternatives are not as far apart as this way of putting

⁴²On the annotations, see Hood, "Matthew 1:1–17," 210 ff.

⁴³Nolland, *Matthew*, 79.

⁴⁴Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:12.

the question might suggest. In v. 16 Jesus is ‘called Christ’ because he is deemed to be ‘[the] Christ’, as is clear from the end of v. 17 (cf. 27:17, 22). The phenomenon is similar to the use of places of origin or other descriptive designations in double names: the etymology of the name remains important. Given the total lack of definite articles in v. 1, the lack of an article here should not be taken to exclude a titular use. The chiasm formed by vv. 1 and 17 favours a titular use. In v. 18 Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is a double name, but after vv. 1, 16, 17 the reader knows how to read the double name ‘intelligently’ in relation to the title. The focus in the genealogy on the kings of Judah and ‘king of the Jews’ in 2:2 makes it clear from the outset that ‘Christ’ is being used in connection with some form of royal messianism.⁴⁵

Thus, Jesus the Christ is highlighted not only as the Davidic messiah, but the ascription of titles (among other significant annotations) to the otherwise bare genealogy indicates at the outset a close link between David and Jesus—the following chapters of this thesis will show how this David/Jesus comparison, already present in the genealogy, will manifest itself in both usage of Davidic tradition and utilization of Davidic typology throughout the Gospel.

The word βασιλεύς is used twice as much in Matthew as compared to the other synoptics, and in fact is used most out of any NT book, making it a key word for the Gospel, as it attempts to answer what kind of king Jesus is. It is important to note that the first title ascribed to Jesus by a character is “βασιλεύς of the Jews” by the magi (2:2). As we come to the trial of Jesus, two recurring titles for Jesus are the very same titles encountered in the genealogy: “βασιλεύς of the Jews” (27:11, 29, 37; “king of Israel”, 27:42), and ὁ λεγόμενος χριστός (27:17, 22; same phrase, but in the accusative). The very titles which the author seeks to identify Jesus with in the beginning chapters of the Gospel are the very titles which get him crucified. These titles will be important in the confluence of Matthew’s Davidic motifs later in the Gospel (see chapter 5).

⁴⁵Nolland, *Matthew*, 72.

2.2.3: *The 3 x 14 Structure*

The author makes it clear in 1:17 that Jesus' genealogy follows a pattern of 3 x 14. The problem is that, according to modern reckoning, there are too few names to fit the scheme, even if "Matthew clearly intended, or understood, it [the third grouping] to contain fourteen."⁴⁶ The traditional breakdown of the names are as follows: Abraham to David is 14 generations, Solomon to Jechoniah is 14 generations, and Salathiel to Jesus = 13 generations. There have been various attempts to explain the lack of names:⁴⁷

1. Matthew miscounted, or at the least left the discrepancy from his source.⁴⁸ Davies and Allison adopt this perspective, suggesting that the evangelist rounded up to get the 3 x 14 schema.
2. Without assuming a textual problem (though perhaps for his source), Raymond Brown has suggested that Jehoiakim is present in the count, though not in the list of names. Thus, the second grouping ends with Jechoniah (but really Jehoiakim), and the third grouping begins with Jechoniah.⁴⁹
3. The missing name is the result of textual corruption or scribal error. The most common name thought to have been dropped is Jehoiakim,⁵⁰ though Abner has been suggested as well.⁵¹
4. Brian Nolan has suggested that the Holy Spirit is the missing generation.⁵²

⁴⁶D. E. Nineham, "The Genealogy in St. Matthew's Gospel and Its Significance for the Study of the Gospels," *BJRL* 58 (1975), 428.

⁴⁷For a thorough review of the available options, see Stephen C. Carlson, "Making Matthew's Genealogy Count" (paper presented at the SECSOR regional meeting, 2009), 1-24.

⁴⁸Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:186.

⁴⁹Brown, *Birth Of The Messiah*, 81-84. This position is also adopted by Nolland as well as Hagner. See Nolland, *Matthew*, 86; Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:6.

⁵⁰Later manuscripts evidence this reading, though they are too late to be thought original (mss. M, U, Θ, Σ, Ϝ, and 33).

⁵¹Hugh J. Schonfield, *An Old Hebrew Text of St. Matthew's Gospel* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1927), 23.

⁵²Brian M. Nolan, *The Royal Son of God: the Christology of Matthew 1-2 in the Setting of the Gospel* (OBO 23; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 223.

5. Jane Schaberg has suggested the missing generation is Jesus' real biological father.⁵³
6. Robert Gundry has suggested counting Mary.⁵⁴
7. Krister Stendahl has suggested that "Jesus" be counted as generation 41, and "Christ" as generation 42.⁵⁵ No commentator has since adopted this view. Though not separating "Jesus" from "Christ," Herman Waetjen has also suggested double counting Jesus.⁵⁶
8. Augustine suggested double-counting Jechoniah.⁵⁷
9. John Chrysostom suggested counting the exile itself as one of the generations.⁵⁸
10. Johann Bengel, Hugo Schöllig, and Stephen Carlson have argued that David is counted twice in the genealogy.⁵⁹

While each of the above options have both their strengths and weaknesses, I am inclined to the final two options listed above, as both do (1) the least violence to the text, (2) have no need to assume a textual problem for either this Gospel nor its possible source, and (3) do not assume the author of Matthew made a mistake by either accidental omission or bad arithmetic.

2.2.3.1: Counting the Exile

While no one beyond John Chrysostom has adopted this position, it is easy to understand from the genealogy why this may be the case, albeit an odd one. In Matt 1:17 the author uses

⁵³Jane Schaberg, *The Illegitimacy Of Jesus: A Feminist Theological Interpretation Of The Infancy Narratives* (New York: Crossroad, 1990), 38.

⁵⁴Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution* (2d ed. Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1994), 19.

⁵⁵Krister Stendahl, *Matthew* (Peake's Commentary on the Bible. London: Nelson, 1962), 771.

⁵⁶Herman C. Waetjen, "Genealogy As The Key To The Gospel According To Matthew," *JBL* 95/2 (1976), 210.

⁵⁷*Cons.* 2.4.10.

⁵⁸*Hom. Matt.* 4.1.

⁵⁹Johann Bengel, *Gnomon of the New Testament, Volume 1* (Translated by Andrew R. Fausset. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1858), 94-95; Hugo Schöllig, "Die Zählung der Generationen im matthäischen Stammbaum," *ZNW* 59/3 (1968), 261-68; Carlson, "Genealogy Count," 1-24.

μετοικεσίας Βαβυλῶνος as a dividing point, in the same manner in which he mentions people in the dividing of the three groups of generations. Furthermore, the μετοικεσία Βαβυλῶν is repeated in the same manner as every name in the genealogy—only Abraham, Joseph, and Jesus are not repeated. Finally, the μετοικεσία Βαβυλῶν is being treated just like any other name in 1:2–17. The biggest difficulty with this option is recognized by Carlson: “Chrysostom’s exegesis, however, requires a strained interpretation of γενεά to refer to an event instead of a person.”⁶⁰ Even this is not an insurmountable objection, as all would surely recognize that the exile represents an extended period of time that could be construed as a γενεά. However, it does seem clear that it is individuals that represent a γενεά, so Chrysostom’s suggestion is ultimately unsatisfying.

2.2.3.2: *Counting David Twice*

In my opinion, counting David, and David alone, twice in the genealogy makes the most sense of Matthew’s genealogy without having to posit a missing name, author error, or textual problems. What’s more, this option in fact reads 1:17 in its plainest sense, and uses it as a guide for making sense of the 3 x 14 scheme. Verse 17 states:

Πᾶσαι οὖν αἱ γενεαὶ ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ ἕως Δαυὶδ γενεαὶ δεκατέσσαρες, καὶ ἀπὸ Δαυὶδ ἕως τῆς μετοικεσίας Βαβυλῶνος γενεαὶ δεκατέσσαρες, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς μετοικεσίας Βαβυλῶνος ἕως τοῦ Χριστοῦ γενεαὶ δεκατέσσαρες.

The author specifically states the start and end point of each grouping in a formulaic manner—ἀπὸ ... ἕως— with the second endpoint/third front-point being an event and therefore not counted in the generations. Hugo Schöllig describes the scheme this way: “In Wirklichkeit aber bietet 1.17 die Beschreibung dreier Torbögen auf vier Säulen (Abraham, David, die Verschleppung nach Babylon, der Messias), von welchen die beiden mittleren zugleich an zwei Bögen tragen.”⁶¹ The 3 x 14 scheme can be illustrated in this way:

⁶⁰*Ibid.* 10.

⁶¹Schöllig, “Die Zählung,” 263.

First “fourteen”		Second “fourteen”		Third “fourteen”		
Ἀβραὰμ	Ἰσαάκ Ἰακώβ Ἰούδας Φάρες Ἑσρῶμ Ἀράμ Ἀμιναδάβ Νασσῶν Σαλμών Βόες Ἰωβήδ Ἰεσσαὶ	Δαυὶδ	Σολομῶνα Ῥοβοὰμ Ἀβιά Ἀσάφ Ἰωσαφὰτ Ἰωρὰμ Ὀζίας Ἰωσθάμ Ἀχάζ Ἐζεκίας Μανασσῆς Ἀμώς Ἰωσίας	μετοικεσίας Βαβυλῶνος	Ἰεχονίας Σαλαθιήλ Ζοροβαβέλ Ἀβιοῦδ Ἐλιακίμ Ἀζώρ Σαδῶκ Ἀχίμ Ἐλιούδ Ἐλεάζαρ Ματθᾶν Ἰακώβ Ἰωσήφ	Ἰησοῦς

To be sure, this proposal is not without its issues. First, it is clear that Matthew was not counting true “generations” but names as representative of a generation, but this is no different than any other proposed solution. It also introduces some inconsistency, as the first and second group overlap, while the second and third do not. Yet, scholars should not let modern sensibilities cloud the plain reading of 1:17, however odd it may be. Furthermore, both 1:6 and 1:11–12 seems to indicate, apart from v. 17, that a special point in the genealogy has been

reached with both David and the exile and thus provide support for Schöllig’s reading.⁶² Apart from Jesus, only David receives a title in the genealogy (see §2.2.2 above), and the phrasing of v. 11 and v. 12 indicates a clean break at the exile (ἐπὶ τῆς μετοικεσίας Βαβυλῶνος...Μετὰ δὲ τὴν μετοικεσίαν Βαβυλῶνος). Finally, counting the genealogy in this way allows some other possible motifs to come to the fore:

1. Assuming the list is exactly how Matthew intended it to be makes Jesus the fortieth son of Abraham. The number forty evokes the biblical story, in particular the wilderness wanderings prior to the conquest. Matthew will draw readers to this theme at the introduction to the temptation (Matt 4:2). Proposing a textual problem or missing name as the solution removes this possible motif in the genealogy.
2. Understanding David and the exile as the “pillars” of the genealogy brings into focus themes that will run through the Gospels— Jesus as the legitimate Son of David, and Jesus bringing an end to the exile.⁶³

In regards to the former point, the highlighting of David and the exile are not mutually exclusive, but rather intimately linked, highlighted most obviously in 1:17. It is the Davidic messiah who will bring about an end to the exile: “Although the extent of the ongoing impact of the exile may be debated, underscoring the exile certainly provides a way for Matthew to highlight the need for restoration under the reign of a Davidic Christ-King.”⁶⁴ The structure of the genealogy points forward to important themes for Matthew that hinge upon Jesus being recognized as the Davidic King, and succeeding where both the nation and the monarchy has

⁶²I do not think that it is a stretch of the imagination to believe that readers of the genealogy would have discerned the “structural pillars” of David and the exile in the genealogy if v. 17 had never been written, and likely the 3 x 14 scheme as well.

⁶³This point is not readily disputed by commentators, as v. 17 makes this very clear. The problem is that the other options for understanding Matthew’s odd counting, beyond the two discussed, in fact place the second hinge point on a person, not the exile.

⁶⁴Hood, “Matthew 1:1–17,” 221. For an extended discussion on this theme in general, see Brant Pitre, *Jesus, the Tribulation, and the End of the Exile* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006). For a more focused discussion on this theme in Matthew, see Willitts, *Shepherd-King*.

failed: “The Deportation thus points both to the failure of the nation to fulfill its role as son of Abraham and to the failure of the Davidic kings to fulfill their role as sons of David. Failure in both of these areas points ahead to Jesus, who as the Christ fills up all that was lacking in Israel’s history.”⁶⁵ Furthermore, the title *χριστός* given to Jesus in 1:16 serves as a link to connect back to David, the only other one to receive a title (1:6).⁶⁶ These connections, and the very structure of the genealogy, place important emphasis on David and Jesus as the Davidic messiah: “Placing Christ in the line of Israel’s history, and highlighting David and exile along the way, requires a royal and restorative interpretation for Christ wherever it appears.”⁶⁷ I must concur, then, with Bengel, Schöllig, and Carlson: “Double-counting David, therefore, does the least violence to the text or to the author’s intentions. It does not require any textual conjecture that a generation had been lost or a primitive corruption in the transmission of the text of Matthew.”⁶⁸

2.2.3.3: *Why 14?*

While counting David twice, and names instead of proper generations, seems to be the best option for understanding the 3 x 14 scheme in 1:17, the question still remains as to why 3 x 14 was important for the author in the first place. Before affirming the well-worn explanation of gematria, it is important to dispel some other options that have been given regarding the significance of the numbers.

The most important fact to keep in mind when discussing this matter is that the evangelist specifically highlights 3 x 14, not the number 7.⁶⁹ This is all the more significant given

⁶⁵Bauer, “Literary and Theological Function,” 146.

⁶⁶See §2.2.2 above.

⁶⁷Hood, “Matthew 1:1–17,” 223.

⁶⁸Carlson, “Genealogy Count,” 16.

⁶⁹A point made also by Hood, see Hood, “Matthew 1:1–17,” 231.

the biblical significance of the number 7, as it could invite endless speculation should

Matthew have called attention to 7 rather than 14. R. T. France states:

If there is deliberate symbolism in the choice of fourteen, it is perhaps better perceived in the fact that fourteen is twice seven ... Three fourteens is six sevens, and a sequence of six sevens points to the coming of the seventh seven, the climax of history when the ongoing purpose of God for his people from the time of Abraham reaches its culmination.⁷⁰

Similar arguments are made by Brian Nolan, who argues that the significant numbers are what “looms” behind 3 and 14, namely 7 and 42, from which several connections are drawn especially from apocalyptic literature.⁷¹ It is possible that Matthew meant to invoke all sorts of numerical schemes when mentioning the 3 x 14 scheme, and intelligent readers through the centuries who were steeped in Jewish literature would have likely dwelled on and drew all sorts of connections to the number 3, 14, 7, and 42—not unlike modern scholars!

Yet, despite these interesting connections that can be invoked with the aforementioned numbers, scholars should not lose sight of the specific numeric scheme which the author himself highlights, 3 sets of 14. If the evangelist’s *primary* task was to highlight for his readers a pattern of sevens leading to the “seventh seven” (as France argues) or any other pattern involving seven, he would have phrased 1:17 differently—like highlighting the multiple of 7 as is done in Matt 18:22.⁷² This is all the more obvious given the unique way Matthew chose to count the names/generations—even if the suggestion of counting David twice (§2.2.3.2) is dismissed and another option is chosen, the evangelist “creatively” counted in order to arrive at 3 x 14, so the significance of the number *specifically mentioned* should be sought.⁷³

⁷⁰France, *Matthew*, 31-32.

⁷¹Nolan, *Royal Son Of God*, 59-61. Nolan also highlights gematria as a likely candidate for the symbolism.

⁷²Bauer, “Literary and Theological Function,” 149-50, also prefers 7 as the real number of importance for the genealogy. He points to the use of 7 elsewhere in the Gospel, 12:45, 18:22, and 22:25–28. Again, I must state what is plainly obvious—7 is highlighted in those passages. In 1:17 it is the number 14.

⁷³Reji Mathew states: “Daraus können wir den Schluß ziehen, daß der Evangelist nicht die mathematische Korrektheit der Zählung von 14 Generationen, sondern die theologische Bedeutung der Zahl 14 für die Genealogie Jesu zu betonen beabsichtigt.” Reji Mathew, “Die Genealogie Matthäus 1, 1-17 im Rahmen der Christologie des Matthäusevangeliums” (PhD Diss., Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1997), 98-99.

There is one more caveat to the above discussions which must also be made. While it is obvious that 1:17 introduces a 3 x 14 scheme, the evangelist *does not* in fact highlight the number three at all—it is, rather, inferred.⁷⁴ Again, I have no doubt that the number(s) are used to invoke many things to the reader, but if one is to stick closely to text, it is obvious that it is in fact the number fourteen alone which is specifically highlighted:⁷⁵

Πᾶσαι οὖν αἱ γενεαὶ ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ ἕως Δαυὶδ γενεαὶ δεκατέσσαρες, καὶ ἀπὸ Δαυὶδ ἕως τῆς μετοικεσίας Βαβυλῶνος γενεαὶ δεκατέσσαρες, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς μετοικεσίας Βαβυλῶνος ἕως τοῦ Χριστοῦ γενεαὶ δεκατέσσαρες.
(Matt 1:17)

Once it has been recognized that it is fourteen that has been highlighted by the author—without discounting 3, 7, 42, and all other derivatives which make for rich and possibly deliberate speculations—it is left for the discerning reader to understand its significance.⁷⁶ Despite varied opinions among commentators, I believe the best option remains gematria on the name of David.⁷⁷ Gematria grew to more widespread use after the NT, but there is evidence that it was used in the NT, and even in the Hebrew Bible (see below). Gematria assigns a numerical value to each letter, in this case Hebrew letters. David's Hebrew name דָּוִד comes to 14 (4+6+4).⁷⁸

⁷⁴It is easy to recognize why a tripartite structure is in the genealogy, as the evangelist makes frequent use of a threefold structure. For some detailed discussion on the triads in Matthew, see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:63-:72.

⁷⁵A fact also highlighted by Bengel, *Gnomon*, 95.

⁷⁶The most interesting and persuasive view for the possible significance of 42 is made by LeRoy Huizenga, who argues that 42 points to the *Akedah*, thus highlighting an Isaac typology, and thereby heightening the importance of Jesus as “son of Abraham.” See Huizenga, “Matt 1:1,” esp. 106-07.

⁷⁷For a listing of scholars for and against, see Marshall D. Johnson, *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies: with special reference to the setting of the genealogies of Jesus* (2d ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 192-93; Nolan, *Royal Son Of God*, 60 n.1. To these lists can be added the recent commentary by Craig Evans: Craig A. Evans, *Matthew* (NCBC. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

⁷⁸The majority of the MT spells David's name without the *matres lectiones* (about 72% of the time), though the longer spelling is used about 28% of the time (mostly in Chronicles) and seems to have become more common during Jesus' time if we assume Qumran evidence as normative—though the *plene* writing of David's name is also present at Qumran (on this see Frank Moore Cross, “The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text,” *IEJ* 16/2 (1966), 89-90). As for the likely sources of the genealogy, 1 Chr 2:15 and Ruth 4:22 both use the *matres lectiones* writing.

2.2.3.3.1: External Support for Gematria

Several items for external support can be brought forth to support the gematria explanation. It is common to dismiss this option because it is based upon gematria of a Hebrew word in a Greek text, thus it would require “quite a sophisticated awareness of Hebrew numerology.”⁷⁹ Whether or not “sophisticated” is the right adjective to apply in this case, the objection is legitimate but ultimately unfounded. First, only a few verses later in Matthew the angel says to Joseph: “you will call his name Jesus, for he will save his people from their sins” (1:21). This verse obviously plays upon the Hebrew meaning of **ישוע**, a variation of **ישועה**, which means “salvation, help.”⁸⁰ On some occasions Matthew provides a translation for a Hebrew/Aramaic term (1:23, 27:33, 46),⁸¹ but in other places in the Gospel he will not (“mammon” in 6:24; “Gehenna” in 5:22, 29, 30; 10:28, 18:9, 23:15, 33). Thus Matthew expects familiarity with Hebrew from his readers, or at the very least is not opposed to making inexplicit use of Hebrew in his Greek composition.

Second, the New Testament does in fact employ Greek-to-Hebrew gematria (transliterating a Greek word to Hebrew) in Revelation 13:18. Most Revelation scholars agree that the number 666 employs gematria on a transliterated version into Hebrew of Nero Caesar.⁸² Objection has been made that Rev 13:18 is more explicit in alerting the reader to “an explicit link drawn between the letters and their numerical value.”⁸³ This is certainly an overstatement: the author has made it far from clear that gematria is the key to understanding the number 666, it is rather inferred by later readers. Later rabbinic practice of gematria use the word **גימטריה**

⁷⁹France, *Matthew*, 31.

⁸⁰Baumgartner, *HALOT*, 446.

⁸¹Bauer, “Literary and Theological Function,” 151, suggests that in these cases there is a theological reason for offering the translations.

⁸²David E. Aune, *Revelation* (3 vols.; WBC 52A-C; Nashville: Nelson Reference, 1997), 1:770. For an extended discussion on gematria see pp 771–72 of the same title. Gematria on Nero’s name also makes sense of the alternative number of the beast, 616. See G. K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation: a Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 719.

⁸³France, *Matthew*, 31.

explicitly, but we do not have an equivalent to this word (roughly translated “calculation”) in Rev 13:18.⁸⁴ Gideon Bohak has also argued that in Rev 21:17 the measurement of 144 cubits is tied to the word ἄγγελος, which transliterated to Hebrew as אנגלס, would be numerically equivalent to 144.⁸⁵ Bohak also displays the same Greek-Hebrew gematria in *3 Baruch*, for the Greek word snake (δράκων/דרקון) in 4.7 and deluge (κατακλισμός/קתקליסמס) in 4.10. *3 Baruch* is dated anywhere between the first and third century CE, providing a perhaps contemporary example of the same phenomenon happening in Jewish circles before gematria came into more popular use among the rabbis. Finally, though it is not certain what the number symbolizes, several scholars have argued that gematria also lies behind 153 in John 21:11. Three scholars, apparently independent of each other, discerned that the Hebrew phrase “children of God/בני האלהים” lay behind the number 153, as the phrase adds up to 153.⁸⁶ Yet another suggestion has been highlighted by Bruce Grigsby (highlighting the work of J. A. Emerton and Peter Ackroyd) suggesting that 153 is derived from gematria on the Hebrew names of two fishing villages named in Ezekiel 47, En-Gedi and En-Eglaim.⁸⁷

Given that we have one firm example of gematria (Rev 13:18) and possibly two more, it is certainly feasible that a similar thing is occurring in Matt 1:17, and in my opinion provides enough evidence to adequately counter the argument that a Greek author wouldn’t employ symbolism based on Hebrew—nor does one need to posit an original composition in Hebrew.⁸⁸

⁸⁴To my knowledge the earliest example comes from the Tannaic period, and became widely used later. See *Avot*. 3.18.

⁸⁵Gideon Bohak, “Greek-Hebrew Gematrias in 3 Baruch and in Revelation,” *JSP* 4/7 (1990), 121.

⁸⁶Joseph A. Romeo, “Gematria and John 21:11, the Children of God,” *JBL* 97/2 (1978), 263-64. I take Romeo at his word on the matter of independent investigation, as he states as much in n.1, and I have been unable to retrieve the other two articles: D. R. Ahrendts, *ZWT* 41 (1898), 129-148; H. Kruse, “Magni Pisces Centum Quinquaginta Tres,” *VD* 38 (1960), 129-148.

⁸⁷Bruce Grigsby, “Gematria and John 21:11 - another look at Ezekiel 47:10,” *ExpTim* 95/6 (1984), 177-78; John A. Emerton, “Gematria in John 21:11,” *JTS* 11/2 (1960), 335-36; Peter R. Ackroyd, “The 153 Fishes In John XXI. 11— A Further Note,” *JTS* X/1 (1959), 89.

⁸⁸Lidija Novakovic wrongfully dismisses gematria for this very reason. See Lidija Novakovic, *Messiah, The*

Second, while scholars have been able to find significant symbolic references to seven and even forty-two, symbolic reference to fourteen is lacking. Brian Nolan has attempted to draw connection with the *War Scroll* 3.13–14 and 4.15, which discusses a banner with different names and phrases written upon it.⁸⁹ Nolan says it has fourteen names written on it, which is technically true (3.13–14), but the number fourteen is not specifically mentioned in the text. Secondly, a banner fourteen cubits long is mentioned in 4.15, but there is no inherent significance to this, as the *War Scroll* in column 4 is discussing numerous banners: the first is fourteen cubits long, the next is thirteen cubits long, the next is twelve cubits long, etc., thus fourteen here hardly holds any significance. Nolan also notes that in 5Q15 (*5QNew Jerusalem*), fourteen is a frequently used measurement for the New Jerusalem and its buildings, which is used either as the doubling of seven, or to represent the twelve tribes plus Aaron and Israel (or the high priest and messiah). Finally, Nolan also makes mention of different patterns of dividing history in *2 Baruch* 53–74 and *Exodus Rabbah* 15:26.⁹⁰ However, these epoch schemes are noted not because of an emphasis on the number fourteen, but rather forty-two (6x7)—and *2 Baruch* emphasizes twelve (+2), not fourteen (53.6, 11; 69.1).⁹¹ This lack of symbolic significance for the number fourteen in early Jewish literature should lead to alternative explanations for its significance.

Finally, Jack Sasson has shown that the genealogy in Gen 46:8–27 and 29:31–30:24 were constructed with seven and its multiples in mind. More than that, though, is the attention given to Gad (גַּד) whose numerical equivalent is seven. He is placed in seventh position, with

Healer Of The Sick: A Study Of Jesus As The Son Of David In The Gospel Of Matthew (WUNT 2.170; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 40-41.

⁸⁹Nolan, *Royal Son Of God*, 60.

⁹⁰*Ibid.*, 60-61. For a scholar who favors *2 Baruch* as the background for the 3 x 14 scheme, see Waetjen, “Genealogy As The Key,” 210-15.

⁹¹Novakovic also favors *2 Bar.* as the background for fourteen, as well as the ten week apocalypse of *1 En.* 93, despite the fact that fourteen as a number is nowhere specifically highlighted in these texts. See Novakovic, *Healer Of The Sick*, 41.

the only one to have seven sons.⁹² This convention provides precedent in the biblical text of a genealogy being partially shaped because of gematria of one member's name, without the gematria being explicitly mentioned.

2.2.3.3.2: Internal Support for Gematria

Some of the internal support for gematria has already been introduced in this chapter, and has been summarized succinctly by Davies and Allison:

We suspect *gematria* because David's name has the value fourteen and because in Mt 1.2–16 there are 3 x 14 generations. but there is an additional observation to be made. David's name is fourteenth on the list. This is telling. In a genealogy of 3 x 14 generations, the one name with three consonants and a value of fourteen is also placed in the fourteenth spot. When one adds that this name is mentioned immediately before the genealogy (1.1) and twice at its conclusion (1.17), and that it is honoured by the title, king, coincidence becomes effectively ruled out. The name, David, is the key to the pattern of Matthew's genealogy.⁹³

To this statement we can also add the aforementioned argument (§2.2.3.2) that David alone is counted twice in the genealogy, thereby emphasizing David in the structure. Furthermore, the recognition that David is counted twice means Matthew was intent on a creative solution to count the genealogy, specifically to highlight the number fourteen.⁹⁴ It may well be then that the evangelist, building upon the fourteen scheme because he recognized David as the fourteenth from Abraham in his sources,⁹⁵ sought to complete the pattern to play on the numeric value of David's name—something that would serve not only as a memory aid, but would emphasize Jesus as a Davidide.⁹⁶ In order to leave some sort of clue in the text that gematria

⁹²Jack M. Sasson, "A Genealogical "Convention" in Biblical Chronography?" *ZAW* 90/2 (1978), 181.

⁹³Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:165, italics theirs. John Nolland also finds Davies and Allison's arguments persuasive (Nolland, *Matthew*, 86-87). Davies and Allison also make mention of a Rabbi Bechai who is of the opinion that David was fourteenth in Chronicles because of David's name (Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:165 n.20). Davies and Allison base this on Bengel, *Gnomon*, 98. While the editor of Bengel notes that there were two Rabbi's of this name (c. 1100 CE and c. 1290 CE), Bengel does not make specific reference to a writing of Bechai, nor have I been able to locate Bechai's writings.

⁹⁴Curiously, Herman Waetjen argues that because the genealogy doesn't have the perfect 3 x 14 scheme, gematria must not be a factor! See Waetjen, "Genealogy As The Key," 210.

⁹⁵On this see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:164.

was in use, the construction of the genealogy and 1:17 makes it sufficiently clear that David is a hinge point in the construction and in fact should be counted twice. Given the precedence in the genealogies of Genesis mentioned above, as well as the discussion of other possible uses of gematria in the New Testament, Matthew left readers with more clues than most other authors to point to his use of gematria.⁹⁷

2.2.4: Summary and Relevance for Thesis

Moving from the “micro-genealogy” of Matthew’s incipit in 1:1 to the genealogy proper in 1:2–17, readers are introduced to a heavy emphasis on David, ultimately with the aim to establish Jesus as the rightful Davidic messiah. Besides Jesus, David alone receives a title within the genealogy, the 3 x 14 structure is arranged so as to count David twice, and the best explanation for the emphasis on the number 14 is the employment of a Greek-to-Hebrew gematria on David’s name—without discounting all of the other symbolic connections that readers would derive from 3, 7, and 42.

Once again, the primacy effect needs to be emphasized. Matthew has established within the first 17 verses a number of David-related items which will reverberate throughout his Gospel. The title Son of David will be drawn and expanded upon, Jesus as the legitimate Davidic heir will be presented through the text, and finally readers ought to expect, and are perhaps invited to, see in the unfolding narrative subtle and overt allusions to David and his story, exactly like the genealogy which highlights David in both obvious and subtle ways. From the very beginning, Matthew’s Gospel highlights David as a key person for the text, and in its

⁹⁶David Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew* (New Century Bible commentary. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1981), 74.

⁹⁷There is some possible evidence that 14 was associated with David in the MT as well. Patrick W. Skehan has argued that the book of Proverbs was composed in such a way as to display on its scroll the design of “wisdom’s house” (Prov 9:1). Part of Skehan’s argument is that the book of Proverbs is composed of 930 lines, and the number 930 is used because the proper names in Prov 1:1 (שלמה דוד, ישראל) adds up to 930 (David=14, Solomon=375, Israel=541). This admittedly scant evidence possibly shows that David’s name was by the 5th century BCE already associated with 14 by way of gematria. See Patrick William Skehan, “Wisdom’s House,” *CBQ* 29/3 (1967), 179.

quest to present Jesus as the Davidic Messiah, the genealogy incorporates subtle elements to draw increased focus upon David.

2.3: Conclusion

In an attempt to articulate a wide-ranging influence of David tradition and David typology on Matthew, a *crux interpretum* would be whether the beginning of the text displays the aforementioned characteristics. Matthew's incipit and the genealogy of Jesus displays at the outset a deep interest in David and establishing Jesus into the Davidic line: "Matthew assigns this Messiah a Davidic title which functions both inside and outside the genealogy to assist the development of the gospel's narrative ideology."⁹⁸ The genealogy is heavily interested in David in both overt and subtle ways, and disposes the reader from the outset to read the narrative with David and Davidic tradition in mind. The primacy effect, mentioned previously, makes Davidic messianism the determining factor for understanding the evangelist's presentation of Jesus.⁹⁹ The "matrix" which readers are now predisposed to is meant to assist the reader to see both the overt and subtle ways in which the narrative is colored with Davidic themes, much like the genealogy itself, which gives an annotation to David, uses David as a hinge point, counts him twice, and builds the 3 x 14 schema to play upon the Hebrew spelling of his name (gematria). The following chapters will explore these items throughout the narrative in more depth. The closing verse of the genealogy, like the genealogy itself, encapsulates the Gospel:

Matt. 1:17 is this gospel in miniature. It may be so termed because this verse, which mentions the call of Abraham (signifying God's establishment of the covenant binding God to Israel), the accession of David (the "glory days" of Israel), the Babylonian exile (fall from grace), and the birth of the Messiah (Israel's redemption from exile), contains in capsulized form the *Heilsgeschichte* ordained by God. Thus, the genealogy, whose atmosphere is conditioned by the

⁹⁸Jones, "Subverting the Textuality," 256-57.

⁹⁹Willitts, *Shepherd-King*, 2.

positive movement of God on behalf of humanity, presents Jesus as the very “God with us” (1:23) who is redeeming Jewish history.¹⁰⁰

¹⁰⁰Jones, “Subverting the Textuality,” 264.

Chapter 3: Assuming the Throne: Establishing Jesus as the Son of David

The evangelist has made it clear through the incipit and genealogy that Joseph is in the family line of King David. In the verses immediately following the genealogy, Matthew makes it equally clear that Jesus was born to Mary ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου (1:18), not by union with Joseph. The evangelist highlights this disjunction even further by using different verbs to describe the birth of Jesus: whereas the reader has been bombarded in the genealogy with γεννάω, Matthew uses γένεσις (1:1) in 1:18, and then later the verb τίκτω (1:25) is used to describe Mary giving birth. Matthew thus makes it clear that Jesus' birth is *not* like the other births in the genealogy and makes it equally clear that Joseph was not Jesus' biological father.

Through the birth narrative (1:18–2:23) the evangelist will show that, just as Jesus came to be born in a unique way, Jesus is in the line of David in a unique way. This chapter will explore how Matthew weaves Jesus into the dynastic genealogy and how the remainder of the infancy narrative seeks to portray Jesus with Davidic echoes and motifs, particularly in the utilization of second-order typology in Matthew's formula quotations.¹

¹It should be noted that the focus on Davidic motifs in no way detracts from the Moses typology well recognized by scholars. See Allison, *New Moses*; Roger D. Aus, *Matthew 1–2 and the Virginal Conception: In Light of Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaic Traditions on the Birth of Israel's First Redeemer, Moses* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2004); Wayne S. Baxter, "Mosaic Imagery in the Gospel of Matthew," *TJ* 20/1 (1999), 69-83. Davies and Allison argue for two layers in the development of the infancy narrative, the first layer built upon a Mosaic typology, with a stage two expansion focusing on Davidic Christology. See Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:190-95.

3.1: Mary and Joseph

Mary and Joseph are the primary characters of the Matthew's infancy narrative, and in the presentation of Jesus' lineage, the evangelist will highlight both characters to establish Jesus within the line of David. Both will be discussed in turn.

3.1.1: *Mary the Betrothed of Joseph*

While scholars have generally focused on Joseph when discussing Jesus' lineage, there is evidence in the text and in Jewish tradition that may indicate Mary's importance in this discussion as well. The Mishnah indicates that the betrothal process was as binding as marriage in that it required a divorce to break (*m. Git.* 6:2; *m. Ketub.* 1:2; *m. Yebam.* 2:6). In the case of death during the betrothal year (*m. Ketub.* 5:2; *m. Ned.* 10:5) the partner left was still considered a widow (*m. Ketub.* 1:2; *m. Yebam.* 4:10; 6:4). Infidelity during this period was considered adultery and punished as such (Deut 22:23–24). This understanding is highlighted by Matthew: Mary is not only described as already having been betrothed to Joseph,² but Joseph is also explicitly called Mary's husband (ἀνὴρ) in verse 19.³ In patriarchal terms, Mary already belongs to Joseph as his wife, with the final confirmation of their union later to come.

This fact has been under-appreciated by Matthew commentators: Mary was already legally Joseph's wife and so, in being legally bound to the line of David, her offspring would also be in that family.⁴ This is confirmed by the ending of the genealogy: Ἰακώβ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰωσήφ τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας, ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς (Matt 1:16). While this

²The aorist participle for μνηστεύω is used to describe a preceding action.

³Samuel Lachs has objected to this, noting that “during the betrothal period, conjugal relations were prohibited, the man did not have the responsibility for her support, he was not liable for her funeral expenses should she die during this time, nor could he, in the event of her death, inherit from her.” Samuel T. Lachs, “Studies in the Semitic background to the gospel of Matthew,” *JQR* 67/4 (1977), 195-96. Unfortunately, Lachs's sources for these assertions are from the Babylonian Talmud (*b. Ket.* 53b and 47b are cited) and should not necessarily be read as reflecting upon 1st century Palestine, whereas the Mishnah brings us much closer to the time of Jesus.

⁴This is also argued by C. L. Rogers, “The Davidic Covenant in the Gospels,” *BSac* 150 (1993), 460. One exception to this proposal is a commentary on Luke, Hans Klein, *Das Lukasevangelium* (KEK. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 96.

is well recognized as an odd ending to a genealogy (which Matthew will go on to explain), it does indicate that Mary was in the family line by betrothal already and Matthew has already given examples of Davidide-by-marriage women in his genealogy. At conception Jesus is already in the family of David, but it will be up to Joseph whether or not the baby and his mother remain part of the family.⁵

3.1.2: Joseph, Son of David

The Davidic motif of the birth narrative is first cast upon Joseph, who is called “Son of David” by the angel (v. 20). This immediately draws the reader back to the incipit and also seeks to reinforce Joseph’s pivotal role in affirming Jesus as a legitimate heir to David.⁶ Because Joseph is addressed as Son of David, the only time someone other than Jesus is addressed as such in Matthew, his actions as a representative of the Davidic kingly line are paramount. And so it is that he is both required to complete his marriage to Mary and to name Jesus.

As previously mentioned, Joseph is described as Mary’s husband in verse 19, a superfluous mention. He was already described as being betrothed to Mary and as Mary’s husband at the end of the genealogy in verse 16. Commentators have recognized the change from the active to the passive voice of γεννάω. But verse 16 should not be exaggerated so as to be read as a conundrum of how Jesus remains in the Davidic line. Joseph is specifically named as the husband (ἀνὴρ) of Mary. The birth narrative (1:18–25) serves to explain verse 16.

⁵Markus Bockmuehl has argued recently for Mary’s own Davidic descent, something highlighted in the church fathers. His discussion is based primarily on Luke. See Markus Bockmuehl, “The Son of David and his Mother,” *JTS* 62/2 (2011), 476-493. Matthew does not reveal any awareness of this, but if it was assumed by early readers then it places Jesus even more squarely into the Davidic line.

⁶There is little dispute that a Davidic line was still in existence at the time of Jesus. A Davidic line is mentioned by Eusebius, when several emperors attempted to kill any potential claimants (*Eccl. Hist.* 3.12; 3.19–20; 3.32.5–6), as well as in the Mishnah (*m. Ta’an.* 4:5; *t. Ta’an* 3.5).

What is not curious is how Jesus is considered to be in the family of David—it is clear from the genealogy that his mother already was and so he was as well.

The angel’s address to Joseph as “Son of David” remind us what is at stake in the decision Joseph has just reached: the loss of Jesus’ royal pedigree if he is not officially recognized as Joseph’s son. So, despite his previous decision, he is called to take two decisive actions, first to accept Mary as his wife rather than repudiating her and secondly to give her son a name, which will confirm his legal recognition of Jesus as his own son and hence also as a “Son of David.”⁷

3.1.3: Joseph’s Confirmation of Jesus and His Mother

The entirety of the birth narrative in Matthew presents Jesus and Mary as passive characters, and Joseph as the main actor. It is Joseph alone who can choose to sever Mary’s and her son’s connection with the Davidic line: “It is Joseph who does what needs to be done. This circumstance is partly to be explained by a Christological interest: by his actions, Joseph, the Davidide, proves that he has made Jesus his own.”⁸ As the “Son of David,” Joseph is told to complete his marriage with Mary and name Jesus because these two actions confirm that Jesus is in the royal line.

3.1.3.1: Marriage to Mary

The angel’s first command to Joseph is μή φοβηθῆς παραλαβεῖν Μαρίαν τὴν γυναῖκά σου (1:20), with the subjunctive of φοβέω used as a negative command.⁹ This is the third confirmation of their legal marital status: Joseph has twice been described as Mary’s husband, and now Mary is described as Joseph’s wife (cf. 1:24): “‘your wife’ complements ‘her husband’ in v 19 ... and renews the emphasis of Jesus’ belonging to a Davidic family.”¹⁰ The “taking” (παραλαμβάνω) of Mary describes step two in Jewish marriages of this period,

⁷France, *Matthew*, 53.

⁸Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 208.

⁹Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 469.

¹⁰Gundry, *Matthew*, 23.

when the wife would move into the husband's home.¹¹ Numerous English translations and commentators make the mistake of adding "as" to the translation, "to take Mary *as* your wife." Mary is already legally his wife according to Matthew. It is in Joseph's purview to divorce Mary, but the command is to continue in the marital relationship, with the taking of Mary into his home being stage two in their marriage. After the dream and the editorial insertion of the formula quotation, Joseph does "take his wife" (1:24). With this act, Mary and her son are solidly in the family line of David through the completion of their marriage: "Joseph's taking his wife—i.e., taking her home in wedlock—echoes v 20 and assures Jesus' place in the Davidic line."¹²

3.1.3.2: Naming of Jesus

It is left now for Joseph, the "Son of David," to affirm Mary's son as his own. The angel commands¹³ Joseph to name the child Jesus (1:21): "The genuine point is that the angel encourages Joseph, the Son of David, to make this child a Davidic child."¹⁴ While it is commonplace to label this act as adoption, Yigal Levin has argued that adoption was unknown in Jewish law but known in Roman law.¹⁵ Levin notes two frequent Jewish sources cited by commentators for adoption: "If a man says 'This is my son,' he may be believed" (*B. Bat.* 8.6); and "Whoever brings up an orphan in his home is considered by Scripture as though the child had been born to him" (*b. Sanh.* 19b). Levin points out that both of these "are cases of adoption within

¹¹BDAG lists a number of times the word is used in reference to bringing a wife into a home (Song 8:2; Matt 1:20, 24; *Hdt.* 4, 155; Lucian, *Toxar.* 24; Jos., *Ant.* 1, 302; 17, 9; *Prot. Jas.* 9:1, 3; 13:1; 15:2; 16:1, 3). See Frederick W. Danker et al., "παραλαμβάνω," *BDAG*, 767-68.

¹²Gundry, *Matthew*, 25.

¹³The verb καλέω here is a future indicative. Given the context, it is likely being used as an imperatival future. This use, while uncommon, is done elsewhere in Matthew (6:5, 19:18, 20:27, 22:37). See Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 569.

¹⁴Krister Stendahl, "Quis Et Unde: An Analysis Of Matthew 1-2," in *Interpretation of Matthew* (ed. Graham Stanton; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), 61.

¹⁵Yigal Levin, "Jesus, 'Son of God' and 'Son of David': The 'Adoption' of Jesus into the Davidic Line," *JSNT* 28/4 (2006), 415-442.

the existing family ... there is nothing in Jewish law, in either the Hebrew Bible or in later Halakhah, which can be seen as the model by which Jesus, Son of God, could have been considered the legal, but not genetic, heir to the Davidic throne.”¹⁶

While it is true that examples of adoption in Jewish circles are not widespread, there is at least one non-biblical example in an Aramaic papyrus from Elephantine referring to the manumission via adoption of a Jewish slave by a Jewish man (416 BCE).¹⁷ Levin has pointed out that most of the adoptions which happen in the Hebrew scriptures are by women (Moses by Pharaoh’s daughter, Ruth’s child by Naomi, and Esther by Mordecai). This is true, and given the Moses typology that is also being weaved by the evangelist, the adoption that should be especially highlighted is Moses who is found by Pharaoh’s daughter and later “he became her son” (Exod 2:10). Levin’s criticism concerning commentators use of *B. Bat.* 8.6 and *b. Sanh.* 19b may also be overstated if any of the above arguments hold merit. Mary was within Joseph’s family by marriage already, and so, while the circumstances were unusual, Joseph was “adopting” within his family.

Whether the evangelist was appealing to Roman or Jewish custom, it is certain that in Matthew’s narrative Jesus is portrayed as Joseph’s son. Research into whether or not this would be a recognizable custom to Jewish readers does not detract from the fact that it is portrayed this way in the Gospel, whether it is labeled adoption or, perhaps more accurately, ingrafting. If the birth narrative does not provide enough proof, Matt 13:55 (an alteration of Mark 6:3) surely seals the case. Matthew calls Jesus ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός, an affirmation not only of him being Joseph’s legal heir but probably an indication that he had learned and taken over the family trade after Joseph’s death just like a firstborn son was expected to.¹⁸

¹⁶*Ibid.*, 423, 425. See also 424 n.30.

¹⁷The “Aramaic Adoption Contract” (accession 47.218.96a-b) can be viewed on the Brooklyn Museum’s website: www.brooklynmuseum.org/opencollection/objects/3489

¹⁸France notes that Matthew is careful never to call Joseph Jesus’ father. See France, *Matthew*, 47. Most commentators assume this given that Joseph is not listed in 13:55–56 and parallel passages. See *Ibid.*, 549.

3.1.4: Summary and Relevance for Thesis

After beginning the Gospel with such strong Davidic overtones, the birth narrative seeks to place Jesus squarely within the family line of David, albeit in an untraditional way. Mary is by marriage already part of David's family line, and Joseph the "Son of David" confirms this family connection by completing his marriage with Mary and naming the baby Jesus. Because of his marriage, and thus authority over Mary, he assumes the mantle of fatherhood and caregiver by naming Jesus.¹⁹ It was not quite enough that Jesus was in the family of David through Mary, as Jewish (and Roman) culture was patrilineal.²⁰ But Joseph's confirmation of marriage with Mary and his naming of Jesus confirms Jesus as being a legitimate Son of David: "the messiah would not have come as 'Son of David' to his people had not righteous Joseph, the 'Son of David', done everything exactly as the angel of the Lord had commanded him."²¹ Matthew further solidifies this adoption later on in 13:55 when he is called the "carpenter's son" in Nazareth—a change the evangelist made of Mark's parallel statement "the carpenter, the son of Mary" (Mark 6:3).²²

The focus on Jesus' family and how he fit into the Davidic line continues Matthew's focus on legitimating Jesus as a rightful Son of David. Not only is this important for presenting Jesus as the Messiah, but it sets the foundation for Matthew's continued interaction with Davidic tradition in the Gospel. Further, it prepares the reader to understand Jesus' teaching and actions as the outworking of his status as the Son of David.

¹⁹If early readers were acutely aware of the Davidic overtones, it is possible that the story of David and Mephibosheth may have come to mind. The story, found in 2 Sam 9:9–13, states that Mephibosheth ate at David's table. Josephus more explicitly states that Mephibosheth had "the same care that a son could claim taken of him" (*Ant.* 7.5.5).

²⁰Levin, "Adoption," 422 n.19; Novakovic, *Healer Of The Sick*, 45: "Jesus' identity as the son of David is established only in his relationship to Joseph and not to his mother Mary."

²¹Rudolf Pesch, "'He will be called a Nazorean': Messianic Exegesis In Matthew 1-2," in *Gospels And The Scriptures Of Israel* (eds. Craig A. Evans and William Richard Stegner; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 149.

²²Andrew T. Lincoln, "Contested Paternity and Contested Readings: Jesus' Conception in Matthew 1.18-25," *JSNT* 34/3 (2012), 216.

3.2: Matthew's Isaiah Quotation

Matthew's formula quotations occupy an important part of the infancy narrative, and a number of them carry strong Davidic themes that contribute to the evangelist's Davidic theme. The first of these is the Immanuel prophecy of Isaiah 7. John Collins, following Rudolph Kilian and Hans Wildberger, has stated that more has been written about Matthew's use of Isa 7:14 than any other biblical verse.²³ The interpretation of this passage runs the gamut, with some believing this is a simple case of "prophecy historicized" created by the evangelist or early church, to the conviction of Raymond Brown that Matthew added this formula quotation to traditional material.²⁴ Matthew's respect for the original meaning and context of Isa 7:14 (and other OT passages) also ranges between belief that the evangelist cared little for the original meaning, to arguments that Matthew sought to draw the entire context of the passage into focus.²⁵ Related to this is how readers should understand Matthew's use of scripture and in what sense readers ought to understand "fulfillment"—literal or typological.²⁶ Much of the "fulfillment" discussion circles around the word *παρθένης* and its Hebrew equivalent *עַלְמָה*.

²³John J. Collins, "The Sign of Immanuel," in *Prophecy and Prophets in Ancient Israel* (ed. John Day; New York: T & T Clark, 2010), 225; Rudolph Kilian, *Die Verheißung Immanuels. Jes. 7,14* (SBS 35; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1968); Hans Wildberger, *Isaiah 1-12* (Continental Commentary. Translated by Thomas H. Trapp. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1991).

²⁴Brown, *Birth Of The Messiah*, 149: "At most, reflection on Isa 7:14 coloured the expression of an already existing Christian belief in the virginal conception of Jesus." Most evangelical commentators have more or less come to the same conclusion. Worthy of note is that Matthew's fulfillment quotations seem to come primarily at the redactional level, thus showing the evangelist's own theology and purpose. As Stanton states, "it is difficult to envisage just how these passages might have been used by earlier Christians. It seems likely that Matthew himself was the first to see their relevance in a Christian setting." See Graham N. Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People: studies in Matthew* (London: T & T Clark, 1992), 360.

²⁵On this see these excellent essays: Warren Carter, "Evoking Isaiah: Matthean Soteriology and an Intertextual Reading of Isaiah 7–9 and Matthew 1:23 and 4:15–16," *JBL* 119 (2000), 503-520; Rikk E. Watts, "Immanuel: Virgin Birth Proof Text or Programmatic Warning of Things to Come (Isa 7:14 in Matt 1:23)?" in *From Prophecy to Testament: The Function of the Old Testament in the New* (ed. Craig A. Evans; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004), 92-113.

²⁶David Turner states the three options as 1) predictive, 2) multiple fulfillment, and 3) typological fulfillment. Turner, I think rightly, finds flaws in the predictive options and chooses typological as the paradigm of understanding. See David L Turner, *Matthew* (ECNT. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008), 70-73.

If typological fulfillment is the proper way to understand Matthew, then in the words of James Hamilton: “the nuance of the Hebrew word *‘almah*, so much discussed, is *irrelevant*. Taking Matthew’s citation of Isaiah 7:14 as an instance of typological fulfillment, we see that there is historical correspondence and escalation, regardless of whether the Hebrew word refers strictly or primarily to a virgin.”²⁷

What is sometimes obscured by many of these discussions is the Davidic character of this first formula quotation—understandably so given the issue of the virginal conception. This thesis has already established the importance of Davidic motifs in the incipit and genealogy, and this section with its important formula quotation continues the trend.

3.2.1: Davidic Character of Isaiah 7:14

It is in the midst of military threat that God offers a sign to Ahaz to convince them not to fear Rezin of Syria and Pekah of Israel, and encouraging them not to appeal to Tiglath-pileser III of Assyria for help.²⁸ The sign is addressed directly to the House of David (Isa 7:13). “The passage turns on a threat to the throne and to the ‘Son of David’ who occupies it. The prophecy ‘It will not happen’ announces that the threat is empty and that the throne will remain secure.”²⁹ In other words, “The child graciously ensures that the Davidic line will continue.”³⁰

Modern scholars rightly recognize the flaws in reading this as a messianic prophecy. It is messianic only in the very broadest sense of the term—it speaks of the next king who by default is a Davidide and anointed by God to lead. It was a specific sign for Ahaz, fulfilled in Ahaz’s time. “In this sense, at least, the passage is ‘messianic.’ It is related to the fulfillment of God’s promises to David and his dynasty.”³¹ Dennis Duling notes that the original Davidic

²⁷Hamilton Jr., “Virgin Will Conceive,” 242.

²⁸John T. Willis, “The Meaning of Isaiah 7:14 and its Application in Matthew 1:23,” *ResQ* 21/1 (1978), 1.

²⁹John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 1-33* (WBC 24; revised ed. Waco, Tex.: Thomas Nelson, 2005), 139.

³⁰Carter, “Evoking Isaiah,” 510. The same point is also made by Duling, “Promises to David,” 113.

³¹Watts, *Isaiah 1-33*, 140.

covenant of 2 Sam 7:16 is central to the promise of Immanuel (cf. Isa 7:13, 17), and contains linguistic connections in Isa 7:7 and 7:9.³²

3.2.1.1: *Identity of Immanuel*

While it is true that Isaiah's two other children are "sign children" (Shear-jashub, Isa 7:3; Maher-shalal-hash-baz, 8:1, 3), it has been commonly argued that Immanuel is Ahaz's son.³³

Rabbinic literature specifically identified Hezekiah.³⁴ As John Watts points out, "The most likely woman to have been present with the king would have been the queen,"³⁵ which makes a son of Ahaz the most likely candidate. This also makes the most sense of the context of the prophecy, as it is addressed to the house of David and is thus a "sign of hope for the continuity of the Davidic line."³⁶

3.2.1.2: *The Name Immanuel*

While the identity of the child is likely the heir to Ahaz, it is important to note that the focus and importance of the prophecy has to do more with the name of the child, Immanuel.³⁷ This is evidenced by the fact that the mother is not specifically named, and the birth of the child is not later mentioned in Isaiah, but the name is (Isa 8:8, 10). The name Immanuel (עִמָּנוּאֵל) means "God with us." On the name Immanuel, Collins states:

The name Immanuel also brings to mind the promise to David. In 2 Sam. 7.9, the Lord tells David that he has been with him wherever he went. In Ps. 89.22 (ET 21) he says of David 'my hand shall always remain with him', and three verses later 'my faithfulness and steadfast love shall be with him'. The Zion theology expressed in Ps. 46.8 (ET 7) professes that 'the Lord of hosts is with

³²Duling, "Promises to David," 110-11.

³³John Collins points out that neither of the other two sons carry any association with the Davidic promise. Collins, "Sign," 231.

³⁴Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, Vol. 1 (4 vols.; 2d ed. Munich: Beck, 1956), 75.

³⁵Watts, *Isaiah 1-33*, 139.

³⁶Collins, "Sign," 239.

³⁷Gary Smith, *Isaiah 1-39* (NAC 15A; Nashville: B & H Publishing Group, 2007), 213: "his name is the significant part of this sign."

us, the God of Jacob is our refuge'. According to Mic. 3.11, the rulers of Judah say, 'Surely the Lord is with us!' In 1 Kgs 11.38 the prophet Ahijah tells Jeroboam that if he walks in the way of the Lord, 'keeping my statutes and my commandments as my servant David did, I will be with you, and I will build you an enduring house, as I built for David'.³⁸

The name of the child carries the promise as much as the child himself. The name Immanuel seeks to assure Ahaz that God has not forgotten his promises to his people and has not abandoned his plan for the line of David.

3.2.2: Matthew's Davidic Motif and Isaiah 7:14

Despite popular reading of this passage of Matthew, it has been convincingly argued that Matthew's aim is not to establish a Son of God theology.³⁹ In light of the verses that have led up to this point, the focus of Matthew continues to be on grafting Jesus into the Davidic line, and thus Davidic concerns and motifs continue. The evangelist brings into convergence the angel's declaration to Joseph, the "Son of David" (Matt 1:20), and the Isaianic declaration to the "House of David" (Isa 7:13). Just as the sign for Ahaz assured the continuance of the Davidic dynasty, so too the child of Mary assures Matthew's readers of the continuance of the line of David, and God's faithfulness to his promises regarding David's line.

As in Isaiah's context, the name Immanuel is also the most important part of the prophecy for Matthew. This is made clear both by the explanatory note, ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνεύμενον μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός (Matt 1:23), and by the fact that Joseph names the child Jesus rather than Immanuel—indicating the name's function in drawing to the reader's mind the promises associated with the Isaianic sign.⁴⁰ The sign and the promise, tied as it is to the Davidic promise, is a thematic statement concerning both salvation and judgment.⁴¹

³⁸Collins, "Sign," 230.

³⁹John Nolland, "No Son-of-God Christology in Matthew 1.18-25," *JSNT* 62 (1996), 3–12.

⁴⁰Victor J. Eldridge, "Typology - The Key To Understanding Matthew's Formula Quotations," *Colloq* 15/1 (1982), 44. Eldridge also notes that Matthew's translation of the name from the Hebrew "is not so much for the sake of his Gentile readers but a way of underlining the significance of the name as indicating God's saving action in both Old and New Testament contexts."

As expressed by Hamilton, typological fulfillment involves both correspondence and escalation.⁴² As shown above, the full context of the sign in Isaiah is important for the evangelist. The specifics of the sign are also in view, as they both correspond to, and are escalated by, the fulfillment in the birth of Jesus.

<i>Isa 7:14</i>	<i>correspondence and escalation</i>
a young [unnamed] woman (עַלְמָה)	a virgin (παρθένος) named Mary
The [unnamed] child (probably Hezekiah)	The child Jesus born ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου
Ahaz, a Son of David, who does not ask for a sign as commanded	The righteous Joseph, a Son of David, who does what he is told
The child's name as the sign of God's presence	God's presence in the person of Jesus, who will "save his people from their sins" (Matt 1:21)

3.2.3: Summary and Relevance for Thesis

The infancy narrative and Matthew's first fulfillment quotation continues the trend of Davidic motifs and typology. As W. Barnes Tatum states: "That the 'Messiah' (1: 18a) would be 'Immanuel' (1:23a) by the creative power of the Holy Spirit and 'Son of David' (1:20) by adoption was God's plan all along. The circumstances surrounding Jesus' genealogical origin were in fulfillment of OT prophecy."⁴³ Jesus' birth into the Davidic family fulfills to a greater degree the same type of Davidic promise given to Ahaz in Isa 7:14. Despite the popular reading of this section as introducing divine sonship, the focus is still primarily on grafting Jesus into the line of David. In so doing, the evangelist draws upon the Isaiah prophecy not only because of its typological correspondence to Mary's virginal conception, but also because it expresses Jesus as a typological fulfillment of the Isaianic promise of God that the House of David will

⁴¹Watts, "Immanuel," 92–113.

⁴²Hamilton Jr., "Virgin Will Conceive," 228–47.

⁴³Tatum, "The Origin," 531.

continue, and its continuance will mean salvation for those who believe, and judgment for those who do not.

This important formula quotation reveals two important elements of Matthew's Davidic theme that will continue through his narrative. The first is that Matthew will turn, time and again, to Davidic tradition within the scriptures as he begins to explain what it means for Jesus to be the Son of David. The second important element is the second-order typology which Matthew utilizes in his quotation of Isa 7:14. Matthew at various points in his narrative will harness this unique typological fulfillment in relation to Jesus and his connection to Davidic tradition in the prophetic tradition of the scriptures.

3.3: Born in Bethlehem

The next formula quotation that displays important Davidic motifs is the quotation of Micah 5:2. Chapter 2 of Matthew exhibits both geographic and royal interests which both continue Davidic motifs.⁴⁴ The primary place of interest is Bethlehem as the place of Jesus' birth. Although David did not rule from Bethlehem, it was intricately tied to David because it is presumably the place of his birth ("the son of an Ephrathite of Bethlehem in Judah, named Jesse," 1 Sam 17:12) and because it was the place of his anointing by Samuel (1 Sam 16:13). Matthew's narrative portrays the chief priests and scribes of the people understanding that the messiah will be born in Bethlehem (Matt 2:4–5; cf. John 7:42).⁴⁵ This episode confirms the royal lineage and specific linkage to David. The repetition of γεννάω in 2:1 serves to remind the readers of the genealogy.⁴⁶

⁴⁴The focus on geography, including the four formula quotations in ch. 2, are summarized in R. T. France, "The Formula-Quotations of Matthew 2 and the Problem of Communication," *NTS* 27 (1981), 237-240; France, *Matthew*, 41-42.

⁴⁵Besides this information in the Gospels, there are only late Rabbinic witnesses to this belief. See *y. Ber.* 2.4.5a; *La. Rab.* on 1.16.

⁴⁶David R. Bauer, "The Kingship of Jesus in the Matthean Infancy Narrative: A Literary Analysis," *CBQ*

3.3.1: Matthew's Citation of Micah 5:2

The quotation of Micah 5:2 is more properly understood as an amalgamated quotation, since 2 Sam 5:2 is also seamlessly woven into the quotation. This addition highlights the Davidic motifs that the evangelist continues to focus on.

3.3.1.1: Judea

Micah 5:2 is a salvation oracle in the midst of crisis. Jerusalem is in a panic over its invasion and the incapacity of its ruler. In the midst of the chaos comes the promise of a Davidic ruler. In Micah, the portion excluded from Matthew's quotation "whose origin is from of old, from ancient days," is likely a reference to the ideal kingdom of David's reign—Amos 9:11 speaks of David's time in the same manner.⁴⁷

It is well recognized that Matthew has altered Mic 5:2, changing "Bethlehem Ephrathah" to "Bethlehem, land of Judah," as well as changing "small among the clans of Judah" to "by no means least among the rulers of Judah." Regarding the change to "Judah,"

Davies and Allison state:

‘Ephrathah’... Would likely have meant little to Matthew's audience. ‘Judah’, by way of contrast, is full of meaning. It emphasizes the connection between Jesus and the patriarch Judah... so important because the Davidic Messiah was expected to come from the tribe of Judah (Rev 5.5; cf. Gen 49.9–10 LXX; the targums on Gen 49.9–10; *T. Jud.* 21.2; 24.5; Heb 7.14; *b. Sanh.* 98b).⁴⁸

The geographic reference to Judea occurs three times in this section, which rules out the idea that Matthew simply wanted to distinguish between Bethlehem in Judah and the Bethlehem seven miles NW of Nazareth. "The tripling of the reference emphasizes the royal status of Jesus; he came from the tribe and territory that produced the Davidic King."⁴⁹

57/2 (1995), 313.

⁴⁷Ralph L. Smith, *Micah–Malachi* (WBC 32; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1984), 44. Raymond Brown also notes the similarity in birth terminology between Matthew and Micah, Brown, *Birth Of The Messiah*, 184.

⁴⁸Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 242.

⁴⁹Gundry, *Matthew*, 26. France makes the same point as well, France, "Formula-Quotations," 242, as does

3.3.1.2: *The Addition of 2 Sam 5:2*

As Robert Gundry has pointed out, “shepherding” likely provided the bridge between Mic 5:2 and 2 Sam 5:2, since Mic 5:4 speaks of the ruler from Bethlehem as a shepherd.⁵⁰ This provides confirmation that Matthew was reading with the wider context of his OT quotations in mind. The addition, then, of 2 Sam 5:2 is all the more intriguing since the idea of the continuance of the Davidic line and the future ruler as shepherd was already present in the Micah oracle.⁵¹ Why didn’t Matthew simply continue on with the quotation? The addition of 2 Sam 5:2 by the evangelist was a remarkably subtle and powerful continuation of the Davidic motif. Left on its own, the citation of Mic 5:2 could easily be understood as prediction fulfilled in a conventional sense. The addition of 2 Sam 5:2 serves to include an element of typological fulfillment: “Insofar as David’s rule serves as a type of the messianic rule it may be described as typological. However Matthew’s basic purpose is to show that Jesus was qualified to fulfil Old Testament hopes as the one who was born in Bethlehem.”⁵² David receives a word from YHWH in 2 Sam 5:2: “It is you who shall be shepherd of my people Israel, you who shall be ruler over Israel.” Craig Evans points out that the messianic connection is heightened in the targum rendition of 2 Sam 5:2, which draws further connections with the shepherding role of

Nolland, *Matthew*, 114.

⁵⁰Gundry, *Matthew*, 92. It should be noted that recently David Instone-Brewer has argued for a unifying theme for Matt 2’s formula quotations in the Balaam–Laban stories. In doing so, he ignores the addition of 2 Sam 5:2, attributing the rest of Matthew’s quotation to his reworking of the rest of the Micah material, since 2 Sam 5:2 does not fit the Balaam-Laban paradigm. See David Instone-Brewer, “Balaam-Laban as the Key to the Old Testament Quotations in Matthew 2,” in *Built upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew* (eds. Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 207-227.

⁵¹Soares Prabhu argues that the formula quotation of Mic 5:2 was part of the traditional material used by the evangelist, with the evangelist adding the 2 Sam 5:2 portion. See George M. Soares Prabhu, *The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew: an enquiry into the tradition history of Mt 1-2* (AnBib 63; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976), 261-293. “Shepherd” was a familiar image for kings in the ANE and even in Greco-Roman literature. Ezekiel 34 and Zechariah 9–11 in particular are rich in shepherd imagery.

⁵²Eldridge, “Typology,” 45.

the messiah in the OT.⁵³ This charge to David by YHWH in 2 Sam 5:2 is now a vocational statement for Jesus the Christ in Matt 2:6.

3.3.2: Weeping in Ramah

After being deceived by the magi, the evangelist recounts Herod's ruthless murder of innocent children. Matthew continues his geographic emphasis at this point by stating that the killing zone was ἐν Βηθλέεμ καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ὁρίοις αὐτῆς (2:16). At this point readers encounter another one of Matthew's formula quotations from Jer 31:15. Within this quotation, the evangelist introduces another geographic location, Ramah.⁵⁴ Krister Stendahl argues that for Matthew's formula quotations, "geographical names constitute what is really important to him." While Stendahl may be overstating things, this quotation may indeed be used to bring "the birth of Jesus, the Galilean, tighter to the Davidic Bethlehem."⁵⁵ It is also worth noting that David finds refuge in Ramah and later flees to Nob in 1 Sam 19:18 and 20:1. This means that this formula quotation also continues the Davidic emphasis which the evangelist is creating in the infancy narrative.

3.3.3: Summary and Relevance for Thesis

Matthew continues to connect Jesus with David and Davidic tradition as he moves to the "geographical portion" of the infancy narrative. In this instance, the birthplace of the Messiah, foretold by Micah, is brought to the foreground. This is significant because it is David's hometown as well as the place of his anointing; David's first appearance in the scriptures is his anointing in Bethlehem (1 Sam 16:4, 13). This is also reinforced by the reference to

⁵³Evans, *Matthew*, 55. The targum translation given by Evans is "from you shall come forth before Me the Messiah, to exercise dominion over Israel."

⁵⁴Stendahl, "Quis Et Unde," 58. Stendahl further states that Matthew's apologetic serves to explain how Jesus was from Nazareth, with Luke's apologetic being the opposite.

⁵⁵Lars Hartman, "Scriptural exegesis in the Gospel of St Matthew and the problem of communication," in *Évangile selon Matthieu: rédaction et théologie* (ed. M. Didier; BETL 29; Gembloux: Duculot, 1972), 141.

Ramah. But Matthew goes further, by subtly adding to his quotation of Micah 5:2 with 2 Sam 5:2, thereby heightening its Davidic character. Jesus not only fulfills the prophecy of Micah, but symbolically assumes the role of shepherd that once applied to David.

Like the previous section, this formula quotation illustrates Matthew's utilization of Davidic tradition in the OT prophets. This time, it is first-order typology that is utilized. This is the first instance of geography being used to draw a connection with the story of David and the story of Jesus. Later in his narrative, Matthew will utilize a Davidic geography once again (§5.2.1) as he continues to utilize typology in his Davidic theme.

3.4: The Kingship of Herod and The Kingship of Jesus

Matthew's geographical emphasis (discussed in §3.3 and following this in §3.5) and its supporting formula quotations serve an important theme through Matthew 2, namely contrasting Jesus with Herod. Up to this point in the narrative Matthew has shown how Jesus is the Son of David and now Matthew will firmly place Jesus upon the throne of David by immediately upon his birth contrasting him with the self-professed "King of the Jews" Herod. Herod is a half-Jew, a usurper appointed by the occupying power, and therefore an illegitimate king. Jesus as the legitimate king who is appointed by God will be emphasized by Matthew.

3.4.1: The Three Kings of Matthew 1–2

Contrary to the popular perception of the Magi as three kings, Matthew has three particular kings in mind in his infancy narrative. Matthew's use of the word "king" brings the contrast of Herod and Jesus into clear focus, while at the same time emphasizing the Davidic motif. The first person to be called king in the Gospel is David in the genealogy (1:6). The next time someone is called a king it is Herod (2:1) and, though it is repetitious, Matthew continues to address him as king (2:3, 9). Herod is contrasted in 2:2 with the one who has been born king

of the Jews (ὁ τεχθεὶς βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων). The use of the passive participle of τίκτω not only brings to mind the unique circumstances of Jesus' birth (used in contrast to the genealogy's γεννάω), but also emphasizes the instantaneous nature of Jesus' kingship—he has been born into the position by an act of God. The title βασιλεύς, then, is used very deliberately to establish Jesus as the Davidic king.⁵⁶

The focus on genealogy in this section also plays a part in the issue of kingship. Once the Magi have worshipped the child, Herod no longer receives the title king (2:12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 22). Brian Nolan states: “The omission of the title suggests that the kingship has returned to lowly Bethlehem at 2:11. The indubitable irony surrounding the act of homage in 2:2, 8, 11 favours the detection of significance in the absence of ‘king’ as the action progresses.”⁵⁷

3.4.2: Herod and the Kings in Isaiah 7

Given Matthew's familiarity with his scriptures and the context of his quotations, it is likely that he intends to compare Herod with the wicked Kings of Isa 7. James Patrick states:

The contrast is made in Isa. 7:1–16 between the true Davidic heir and the enemy kings who would try to supplant him, even supposedly Israelite kings such as Pekah son of Remaliah. Matthew therefore includes further traditions that describe how the wicked Jewish kings Herod and Archelaus similarly sought to destroy the Davidic heir (2:1–23). A sign ‘as high as the heights’ (Isa. 7:11) is paralleled in the star which directs the magi to the child Jesus.⁵⁸

Along similar lines, Rikk Watts points out several conceptual parallels with Herod and the Ahaz account:

1. The fear of the faithless king in Isa 7:2 and Matt 2:3.
2. The faithless king feigns piety in Isa 7:12 and Matt 2:8.

⁵⁶David Bauer offers some excellent exegesis of this passage and how Herod and the Jewish leaders and their reaction to Jesus is in some sense programmatic through the Gospel. See Bauer, “Kingship of Jesus,” 306-323.

⁵⁷Nolan, *Royal Son Of God*, 39.

⁵⁸James E. Patrick, “Matthew's Peshet Gospel Structured Around Ten Messianic Citations of Isaiah,” *JTS* 61/1 (2010), 63-64.

3. Both kings (Ahaz and Herod) are unjust and oppressive.

Watts further states:

Ironically, here it eventually becomes a kind of Nebuchadnezzar, driving Israel's deliverer into exile—this I believe is partly the point of Matthew's allusions to Jer 31:5... Both Kings responded to their fear by attempting to secure their realms through reliance on their own devious wisdom. And both will ultimately fail. In addition, in Isaiah's narrative Ahaz has only just been invited to "ask a sign from the LORD your God; let it be deep as Sheol or highest heaven" (Isa 7:11 NRSV). Without wanting to make too much of this, I find it interesting that sign as high as the heaven is precisely what the Magi, Herod, and all Jerusalem are given.⁵⁹

It seems clear that Matthew continues to draw on the promises for the Davidic messiah used in the formula quotations. The messianic narrative, as it were, is being played out in the life of the baby Jesus. In addition to a wicked usurper king, this messianic narrative included something like the star.

It is likely that Matthew and his audience understood the star as an angel or celestial being.⁶⁰ But the rising of a star at the birth of a king or ruler was also commonplace in the ancient world, and lies within the context of Isa 7:14.⁶¹ Additionally, Num 24:17 was a popular messianic text that Matthew possibly intended to draw to the readers mind as well.⁶²

3.4.3: The Visit and Gifts of the Magi

While readers should not discount the Gentile elements of the genealogy as well as the Magi as in some sense thematic and culminating in the great commission (Matt 28:19–20), the visit from the Magi should primarily be seen in light of the prominent Davidic motif encountered thus far. Once again, Matthew shows intimate awareness of the context of his formula quota-

⁵⁹Watts, "Immanuel," 108–09. Watts slightly mis-states the evidence on his last point: it is only the magi who see the star, the rest are only told about it.

⁶⁰Allison, *Studies in Matthew*, 17-41; Evans, *Matthew*, 52-53.

⁶¹See Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel Of Matthew: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009), 101-02; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:233-34.

⁶²For a summary of the messianic understanding of Num 24:17 see Evans, *Matthew*, 52; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:234.

tions. In this case the context of Mic 5:2, placed in the midst of the story of the Magi, helps to make sense of the visit of the Magi. Nolland states: “The universally-to-be-recognised significance of the messiah, which Matthew is marking with his Magi account, is well paralleled in ‘he will be great to the ends of the earth’ in Mi. 5:4.”⁶³

Both the visit and the gifts of the Magi fit broadly into the Davidic royal motif as well. The visit and gifts confirm the kingship of the new Son of David, and bring to mind the story of the Queen of Sheba (1Kgs 10:1–10).⁶⁴ Her gifts for Solomon are echoed in later passages related to messianic expectation as well (Ps 72:10–11, 15; Isa 60:5–6).⁶⁵ These OT texts, like Matthew’s story, represent gifts brought to a king. The connection with Isa 60:5–6 is particularly interesting because of its portrayal of gifts offered by gentiles in the eschatological sanctuary. One other important parallel missed by many commentators is to *Ps. Sol.* 17.31: “He will have nations come from the ends of the earth to see his glory, bearing as gifts her scattered children and to see the glory of the LORD with which God has glorified her.” This section of *Ps. Sol.* 17 portrays the nations coming to Jerusalem to see the messiah, bearing the scattered children of Israel as their gifts.⁶⁶

3.4.4: The Divine Care for the Son of David

The story of Jesus’ escape and return to Egypt along with its formula quotations, are rightly understood as part of Matthew’s Moses typology and Israel typology. But it is possible, given Matthew’s skill at weaving multiple motifs together, that the episode of going back and forth from Egypt may also bear some significance, albeit small, for Davidic typology. Bauer states:

⁶³Nolland, *Matthew*, 115.

⁶⁴Interestingly enough, the third targum on Esther relates a story of the Queen of Sheba seeing a dazzling star on her way to Solomon. See J. Edgar Bruns, “Magi Episode in Matthew 2,” *CBQ* 23/1 (1961), 53.

⁶⁵David Bauer also points out that gifts (δῶρα) and gold (χρυσός) appear later in Matthew’s Gospel as things associated with the worship of God (Matt 5:23–24; 8:4; 15:5; 23:16–19). Bauer, “Kingship of Jesus,” 321.

⁶⁶Zacharias, *Raise up*, 31.

Every OT passage in which divine sonship is connected with Davidic kingship speaks of God as the protector or the deliverer of the Davidic king and his royal successors; see 2 Sam 7:14; Psalms 2; 89. The connection between divine sonship and divine deliverance explains in part the odd placement of v 15 within Matthew 2. One would expect this fulfillment quotation to appear not here, upon the child's entry into Egypt, but after v 22, when the child actually leaves Egypt; but Matthew has linked this quotation to the escape from Bethlehem in order to indicate that deliverance from the threat of death at the hands of Herod.⁶⁷

If this is indeed a plausible context for understanding this early section, then it explains why the fulfillment quotation of being delivered from Egypt finds its place here when the primary focus is on Jesus as king. Although there are no specific verbal parallels, it should also be noted that David spent time in Egypt while fleeing Saul (1 Sam 27:8).

3.4.5: Summary and Relevance for Thesis

Within this section of the infancy narrative, Matthew portrays Jesus as the legitimate Davidic king, in contrast to Herod the king. The geography and in particular the context of Isaiah 7 serves as the matrix through which readers understand the contrast with Herod the king. The visit and gifts of the Magi confirm it is Jesus, not Herod, who is the legitimate king.

This episode in the infancy very much confirms Matthew's awareness of and use of the wider context of the quotations used. In so doing, Matthew draws upon the messianic narrative from the Davidic texts quoted and demonstrates "a multi-layered study of the fulfillment of scriptural models in the coming of Jesus, with royal, messianic motifs at the heart of those models."⁶⁸ While in no way downplaying the Moses and Israel typology in Matthew, Davidic typology is more prevalent in Matthew's portrayal of Jesus. In this section of the infancy narrative, Matthew seeks to solidify Jesus' kingship further, by showing how the actions of others (the Magi) recognize Jesus as the rightful king over against the wicked Herod.

⁶⁷Bauer, "Kingship of Jesus," 313 n.23.

⁶⁸Nolland, *Matthew*, 64.

3.5: The Move to Nazareth

Inasmuch as the quotation of Isa 7:14 and the formula quotations in general have received an enormous amount of attention by scholars, the close of the infancy narrative with ὅπως πληρωθῆ τὸ ρηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται (Matt 2:23) has caused numerous speculations as to what Matthew is referencing in the OT. As with the other formula quotations discussed in this chapter, this quotation draws upon Davidic tradition.

3.5.1: Various Explanations for Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται

Various opinions have been given for Matt 2:23:⁶⁹

1. A connection to the verb נָצַר in Exod 34:6 ff., Ps 31:24; Isa 42:6; 49:6.⁷⁰
2. The watchmen (נֹצְרִים) shouting about Israel's salvation in Jer 31:6.⁷¹
3. The use of נָזִיר in Lam 4:7 has been suggested, since it the only time the root is used without the substantival meaning "Nazarite." Tertullian (*Against Marcion* 7) draws a connection to Christians for this verse. H. Smith contends that the basic meaning was to assert Jesus' holiness.⁷²
4. The designation of Nazorean for Jesus comes from a pre-Christian sect called the Νασσαραῖοι, identified by Epiphanius (*Heresies*, 29.6). This sect has been equated with the Mandaeans. Those who have argued for this also seek to draw a connection of the Nasarenes/Mandaeans with John the Baptizer, which explains why Matt 2:23

⁶⁹All of the following options are discussed in Robert H. Gundry, *The Use Of The Old Testament In St. Matthew's Gospel: With Special Reference To The Messianic Hope* (NovTSup 18; Leiden: Brill, 1967), 98–103.

⁷⁰Suggested by Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), 195.

⁷¹Eugenio Zolli, "Nazarenus Vocabitur," *ZNW* 49/1 (1958), 135.

⁷²Harold Smith, "Notes and Studies: Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται," *JTS* 28 (1926), 60.

closes the infancy narrative and leads directly to John. Supporting this as well is Acts 24:5 where Paul is called “a leader of the sect of the Nazarenes.”⁷³

5. One of the most popular options has been connecting the quotation with Judg 13:5, 7; 16:17; concerning Samson as a Nazirite. The strength of this option is the LXX translation of נְזִיר is ναζιραῖον, which is very close to Matthew’s Ναζωραῖος. To support this view, George M. Soares Prabhu points to Mark 1:24 and its phrase “Holy one of God” as evidence of association with the Samson story, where the phrase occurs along with the variant form Ναζαρηνός.⁷⁴
6. Barnabas Lindars suggested the Evangelist did not know the OT source, thus the vague “διὰ τῶν προφητῶν.”⁷⁵ Similarly Chrysostom thought it was from a lost apocryphon (*Hom. on Matt. 9.6*)
7. Raymond Brown proposed that Matt 2:23 is drawing to mind both Isa 4:3 and Judg 16:17.⁷⁶
8. Numerous commentators have suggested that the branch (נֶצֶר) of Isa 11:1 is the specific reference for the wordplay Nazorean (See discussion below).

Numerous clarifications can be made that can quickly dismiss many of the above options. First, readers should expect the reference to have some sort of connection to messianism, to Matthew’s context, or to Nazareth. When it does not, there is reason to be suspect. Second, Although it is intriguing to think that perhaps John the Baptizer was a Mandaean/ Nazarene, and thus Jesus his disciple was also, there is simply no evidence within the Gospels to affirm this.⁷⁷ Third, an answer that confines itself to a single prophet should be suspect, as

⁷³Discussed by Gundry, *Use Of The Old Testament*, 100.

⁷⁴Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 200.

⁷⁵Lindars, *Apologetic*, 196.

⁷⁶Brown, *Birth Of The Messiah*, 211-12.

⁷⁷It should also be noted that this argument makes no connection to the OT prophets, which Matthew does.

Matthew uniquely introduces this quotation as τὸ ρηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν. If only Judges was in mind, Matthew would have likely conformed to his normal formula.⁷⁸ Fourth, while the connection to Judges passages is convenient in that the LXX of these passages provide the closest correspondence (ναζιραῖος) with Matthew’s Ναζωραῖος, it is curious that the vocalization has been changed for no discernible reason. Fifth, drawing connections to Samson would be curious. As France states, “his [Samson’s] notoriously amoral lifestyle is not an attractive option... and the supposed echo would backfire rather badly when the reader reaches 11:18–19... Jesus was no nazirite, and it does not seem that anyone ‘called’ him that.”⁷⁹ It is at the very least difficult to imagine that the evangelist introduced a well-understood term and concept when the rest of the Gospel makes no more such connections to Jesus as a Nazirite.

Keeping these things in mind, the options that have the strongest case are the final two. In the following section, I will defend Isa 11:1, as well as trends of Messianic lowliness, as the primary referent for Matt 2:23, and counter arguments against this view.

3.5.2: Isaiah 11:1 and the Trend of Messianic Lowliness

Scholars of every stripe admit that there is no neat and tidy answer to Matthew’s quotation in 2:23. Every option has weaknesses and in this case it seems the argument with the most cumulative weight should be given priority.

3.5.2.1: נָזִיר as the origin for Ναζωραῖος

It needs to be recognized at the outset that this is not a direct quotation and if Isa 11:1 is in fact the text in mind, then it is plain that Matthew is making a play on the Hebrew word נָזִיר. In this regard, Isa 11:1 as the origin suffers from the same pitfall as all of the other options—

⁷⁸I am unaware of any instances when former prophets are cited with this type of formula, both as “prophet” and it being “fulfilled.”

⁷⁹France, *Matthew*, 93. So too Gundry, *Use Of The Old Testament*, 100.

there is no one to one correspondence. The common objection to this argument lies with its Hebrew origin. Soares Prabhu assumes that Matthew's readership was only familiar with Greek.⁸⁰ However, Matthew assumes at least some familiarity with Hebrew given his use of Jesus in 1:22 without the explanatory clause that Immanuel has in the very next verse.⁸¹ The argument has also been made above that the emphasis on fourteen in the genealogy (§2.2.3) would indicate some familiarity with Hebrew. As Nolland states: "This does not at all imply that general readers knew Hebrew, but it does imply reader access to explanation from at least some in the community who might be in a position to illuminate the opacity by referring to the Hebrew Scriptures."⁸²

An argument based on phonological awkwardness is also lacking. As Brown states, "biblical derivations and etymologies are rarely accurate by scientific criteria. They are often the product of analogy rather than of phonology."⁸³ It also needs to be remembered that none of the available options offer a one to one correspondence.⁸⁴

3.5.2.2: Isaiah 11:1 and "Lowly" Messianism

It is clear that Isa 11:1 was read messianically. The targum of Isaiah reads, "a king shall come from the sons of Jesse, and the Messiah from the sons of his sons." 4Q161 Frags. 8–10, col. III, also reads Isa 10–11 messianically.⁸⁵ Brown makes the objection that נְצִיר only occurs four times in the OT, with Isa 11:1 being the only messianic text.⁸⁶ However, this confuses the issue: scholars should not automatically assume that Matthew must have in mind every instance of נְצִיר. What is more important to note, however, is that Isa 11:1 stands alongside other mes-

⁸⁰Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 204.

⁸¹The same point is made by Watts, "Immanuel," 105.

⁸²Nolland, *Matthew*, 131.

⁸³Brown, *Birth Of The Messiah*, 209.

⁸⁴Brown mistakenly downplays Isa 11:1 because of the transliteration of צ to a ζ—the Hebrew letter is צ. See *Ibid.*, 212.

⁸⁵*b. Sanh.* 43a also shows early Christians reading Isa 11:1 messianically.

⁸⁶*Ibid.*, 212.

sianic texts that refer to a shoot, plant, or branch (Isa 53:2; Jer 23:5, 33:15; Zech 3:8, 6:12; Rom 15:12) which is identified as the Davidic messiah.⁸⁷ Given the variety of vocabulary used, but nonetheless all similar and all used in a very similar way, it only makes sense that the evangelist would choose that which corresponds to his point. Strack and Billerbeck highlight rabbinic interpretation of Isa 11:1 and related scriptures, showing the lowliness and obscurity of the “branch.”⁸⁸ This motif of the branch’s lowliness also appears in the Dead Sea Scrolls (*Hodayot* 6.15, 7.19; 8.6, 8, 10; 4QpIsa^a).

The similarities of the branch/root/shoot/plant passages may explain Matthew’s citation διὰ τῶν προφητῶν rather than a specific prophet as elsewhere.⁸⁹ It is not only the messianic connection, but also the motif of lowliness which draws these passages together. If this section of Matthew serves an apologetic interest, namely legitimizing the messiah from Nazareth,⁹⁰ then it makes sense for Matthew to draw upon a well-known messianic tradition—as opposed to a Nazirite tradition. France, although not fond of the link to Isa 11:1, states: “the most promising approach paradoxically takes its cue from the very nonexistence of Nazareth in the OT...the words ‘He shall be called a Nazorean’ represent the prophetic expectation that the Messiah would appear from nowhere and would as a result meet with incomprehension and rejection.”⁹¹

3.5.2.3: Nazareth and David

As stated previously, a major weakness of a number of arguments is the lack of connection with Nazareth itself. Soares Prabhu states: “Ναζωραῖος for Matthew, then, is always equiva-

⁸⁷ McAfee Moss, “Zechariah Tradition,” 47-48.

⁸⁸ Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, 93-96.

⁸⁹ Instone-Brewer, “Balaam-Laban,” 225: “These other prophecies might explain why Matthew generalized the source as ‘the prophets’ rather than just Isaiah, and his readers would have little difficulty identifying the Isaiah prophecy because it was an important messianic focus in early Jewish traditions.”

⁹⁰ John 1:46 may be evidence of this.

⁹¹ France, *Matthew*, 94-95.

lent to his ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ.⁹² Only Isa 11:1 and the lowly branch theme has a line of connection with Nazareth. Whereas it is clear in the text of Matthew and Micah that the messiah was to be born in Bethlehem, nothing is specifically stated about Nazareth. Africanus, preserved in Eusebius, connects Nazareth with the Davidic family: “Eusebius connects the villages of Nazareth and Cochaba to those who were able to trace the Davidic descent (*Hist. eccl.* 1.7.14), which might indicate that families of the line of David had used words like ‘branch’.”⁹³

3.5.2.4: *Matthew’s Davidic Motif and the Use of Isaiah*

If the arguments of this chapter and the previous chapter are convincing, then readers are left with the fact that there are strong Davidic motifs and typologies in play within the early portions of Matthew. The same cannot be said for a Nazirite motif, nor have any scholars even attempted to argue for understanding this formula quotation in terms of Matthew’s Mosaic or Israel typologies. Furthermore, Matthew has already made use of Isa 7:14, and as Brown states: “The strongest positive indication lies in the fact that the branch which will blossom from the root of Jesse (Isa 11:1) is the child Immanuel whose forthcoming birth had been announced in Isa 7:14.”⁹⁴ Matthew has already shown his affinity for Isaiah,⁹⁵ and will continue to do so in his Gospel (3:3, 4:15–16, 8:17, 12:18–21, 13:14–15, 15:8–9, 21:5, 21:13 plus numerous allusions and parallels). Furthermore, if this is the correct reading, the use of this elusive quotation continues the trend of typological fulfillment:

⁹²Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 201. The word Ναζωραῖος occurs also in Matt 26:71 as well as Matt 26:69 in Codex Ephraemi. Although this 5th century codex is obviously a corruption, it indicates how Ναζωραῖος is meant as a geographical locator.

⁹³Hamilton Jr., “Virgin Will Conceive,” 245.

⁹⁴Brown, *Birth Of The Messiah*, 212. See also p. 211 which points out both Justin and Jerome connecting Isa 11:1 with Jesus. Brown also states: “Médebielle, ‘Quoniam,’ 323, makes the interesting point that between Isa 7:14 and 11:1 there is much reference to devastation and injustice, even as between Matt 1:23 and 2:23 there is the description of Herod’s persecution of Jesus” (212).

⁹⁵On the use of Isaiah in general, and Matthew’s awareness and use of Isaiah’s themes as a whole, see Watts, “Immanuel,” 92–113.

The “fulfillment” is, again, pointing to the broader hope for the Davidic “branch,” and the move to Nazareth corresponds to this hope reflected in the naming of the village. When Jesus moved to Nazareth, the hope for the Davidic branch reflected in the naming of the village comes home. If this is correct, Matthew is claiming that Jesus is the fulfillment of the prophecies of a “branch man.”⁹⁶

3.5.3: Summary and Relevance for Thesis

Given the difficulty of Matt 2:23, Isa 11:1 and other similar messianic “branch” scriptures makes the most sense of the quotation in context.⁹⁷ Given this likelihood, it serves to show once again that Matthew went to Davidic tradition in the prophets to continue with his Davidic theme. Jesus not only was born in David’s home-town of Bethlehem, but his home in Nazareth, a city linked with the Davidic family, also shows his connection to the Davidic family and legitimizes Jesus as the Son of David. The lowly Nazareth matches well the lowly status of the Branch from Isa 11:1 and other messianic scriptures.

3.6: Conclusion

While it is popular to view Matthew’s infancy narrative as establishing divine sonship, this section is not primarily about son-of-God Christology, but links to the Davidic line and the establishment of Jesus as the one born as the legitimate Davidic king.⁹⁸ Through the infancy narrative and particularly with some of the much-discussed formula quotations, Matthew reveals his awareness of the wider context of the prophetic books that he quotes.⁹⁹ At the same

⁹⁶Hamilton Jr., “Virgin Will Conceive,” 246.

⁹⁷Raymond Brown’s words are wise here, and I have echoed the same attitude when discussing the genealogy’s 3 x 14 scheme: “some of the theories are proposed with exclusivity: one derivation is brilliantly defended, but with the contention or implication that other derivations are wrong. However, the biblical attitude is often a ‘both . . . and,’ rather than an ‘either . . . or,’ and we should recognize that Christians may have been attracted by the wealth of possible allusions in a term applied to Jesus,” Brown, *Birth Of The Messiah*, 209. Davies and Allison concur with this type of “maximalist” outlook, though they see the connection to Isa 11:1 as a secondary allusion, the primary one being to the Nazirite and Isa 4:3. See Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 276-79.

⁹⁸On this see Nolland, “Son-of-God Christology,” 3–12.

⁹⁹Regarding the formula quotations, Senior states: “The evangelist’s application of the Old Testament to Je-

time, his idea of fulfillment of these texts is best understood as typological, with the focus on how Jesus as the legitimate Son of David fulfills the messianic narrative found in the OT prophets.

Warren Carter states:

An audience elaborates the gaps or indeterminacy of the text to build a consistent understanding not by supplying whatever it likes but by utilizing the tradition it shares with the author. The common traditions provided the audience with a frame of reference, the ‘perceptual grid,’ for its interpretive work. Precisely this phenomenon is evident through the Gospels opening genealogy (Matt 1:1–17). The list of names (Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, etc.) requires the audiences collaborative work by evoking its knowledge of much more extensive and common traditions.¹⁰⁰

This, I would suggest, is how readers today can best understand how the original audience read Matthew. Through the genealogy and infancy narrative, Matthew has numerous times drawn to mind David and the Davidic hope present in the prophets. He acclimatizes his readers to Davidic motifs, thereby helping them draw connections to stories of David and the scriptures concerning the promise for a new David.

It has already been stated but deserves repeating: no one OT model structures the passage, “but the Davidic motif is the most prominent.”¹⁰¹ The Moses typology and Israel typology are certainly present in these early chapters of Matthew and will continue through the narrative. But it is undeniable that the Davidic motif has dominated the first two chapters of Matthew. As has been stated previously, the primacy effect¹⁰² is a powerful tool of any author, and Matthew has chosen to strongly color his introductory sections with Davidic motifs and

sus is obviously not confined to ten or twelve verses of the gospel. Even if one concentrates on direct quotations and evident allusions, Matthew's use of the Old Testament is a substantial feature of his gospel. The formula quotations, in fact, make explicit a theological perspective that emerges in several ways throughout the gospel.” 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), 103–04.

¹⁰⁰Carter, “Evoking Isaiah,” 506.

¹⁰¹Nolan, *Royal Son Of God*, 38.

¹⁰²See page 59.

overtones, and thus draws his readers to actively look for further Davidic motifs through the narrative.

Chapter 4: Jesus as the Healing Son of David

As the previous chapters have shown, Matthew solidly roots Jesus into the line of David and establishes him as the legitimate dynastic heir in the early chapters of his Gospel. Once readers come to the ministry of Jesus after the infancy narrative, the prominence of the Davidic motif appears in the evangelist's use of the "Son of David" at the closing of the miracle-laden chapters 8–9. It is here that Jesus is once again entreated as the Son of David by two blind men. In the context of miracle accounts, this title is used more than any other christological title in Matthew.¹

In five passages,² Jesus is hailed as the Son of David for healing or a Davidic motif is present. These passages, in particular the connection of the title Son of David with Jesus' healing ministry, have sparked much literature and numerous theories as to the origin of the connection. It is at this point that Matthew will help the reader to understand what it means for Jesus to be the Son of David: not as a conquering king, but as a healing shepherd.

4.1: Matthean Passages Displaying the Son of David as Healer

The following section will briefly summarize each of the passages in question before evaluating the three major solutions offered by scholars, and will conclude by arguing for Ezekiel's Davidic shepherd imagery as being the most likely solution.

¹Son of God is used once (8:29), as is Son of Man (9:6). Lord is used three times (8:2, 8:6, 17:15) and no title is used in five of the healing accounts (8:14–15, 9:18, 23–26, 9:19–22, 9:32–34, 12:9–14).

²Matt 9:27, 12:22–23, 15:22, 20:30–31, 21:14–15. These will be discussed below.

4.1.1: *Synoptic Tradition Outside of Matthew*

Before looking at Matthew's passages, it is important to recognize that the other Gospels use the title "Son of David" in contexts of healing as well. Matthew's first miracle story that employs the Son of David title (Matt 9:27–31) stems from Mark, where Mark relates the story of the healing of blind Bartimaeus (Mark 10:46–52).³ Richard France points out that Mark has not prepared his readers for the use of the title (unlike Matthew) and "for Jewish people it would be functionally equivalent to Χριστός."⁴ While both Mark and Luke begin the initial petition with "Jesus, Son of David," the subsequent petition by the blind Bartimaeus addresses Jesus only as "Son of David," which confirms its titular use in both Luke and Mark.⁵

Regarding the use of this title in Mark and Luke, Davies and Allison state:

This raises the possibility that 'David's son' at one time functioned not as a messianic title but to clarify Jesus' ability to heal...Its acceptance would help explain Matthew's tendency to use υἱὸς/υἱὲ Δαυίδ in therapeutic contexts...With the exception of Mk 12:35–7 par., in Mark and Luke Jesus is called David's υἱός only when a healing is in view; and throughout the synoptics υἱὲ Δαυίδ appears only in healing stories.⁶

It is important to recognize that the only use of the title Son of David in the other synoptic Gospels occurs in the context of a miracle story, and the use of the title in the context of healing is prevalent in Matthew. This may indicate that at the turn of the era the Son of David was understood in some sense to be a healer and Matthew expounded this idea further.

4.1.2: *Matthew 9:27*

ἠκολούθησαν [αὐτῶ] δύο τυφλοὶ κράζοντες καὶ λέγοντες· Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, υἱὸς Δαυίδ.

³Mark's story is also used by Luke in his narrative (18:35–43).

⁴R. T. France, *The Gospel Of Mark: a commentary on the Greek text* (NIGTC. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002), 423.

⁵Luke omits Bartimaeus' name in 18:35.

⁶Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:136.

Unlike Mark and Luke, Matthew has laid a solid foundation for Jesus being addressed as Son of David already. The early chapters of the Gospel have shown in detail how Jesus is presented as the legitimate Davidic king. After the infancy narrative, the interaction with Davidic material quieted down, and now at 9:27–31 Matthew is prepared to show the ways in which Jesus’ own ministry authenticates the Davidic claim. Matt 9:27–31 introduces the first instance of Jesus being addressed as the Son of David in Jesus’ public ministry. The address comes from two blind men who call out for mercy. After following Jesus into a house and declaring their faith in Jesus’ ability to heal, they are healed.

Commentators have noted that this miracle story likely plays upon the Jewish ideal of two credible witnesses (Deut 17:6) to confirm the truthfulness of a matter.⁷ In this case, the two credible witnesses give confirmation to Jesus as a legitimate Son of David and his ability to heal. James Gibbs notes that, apart from Peter’s confession in Caesarea Philippi (Matt 16:16), Jesus is never acclaimed by the titles Son of God or Son of David by less than two individuals. Gibbs point is valid, though he misses Matt 15:22 as another example of a single individual (8:29, 9:27, 12:23, 14:33, 20:30–31, 21:9, 15).⁸

Gundry thinks it likely that Matthew has recommissioned Mark’s story of the healing of blind Bartimaeus (Mark 10:46–52) for both this miracle story as well as the one found in Matt 20:29–34.⁹ The similarities of these passages are easy to see: Two blind men (δύο τυφλοὶ) involved: 9:27 / 20:30; Both men cry out (κράζω) and say (λέγω): 9:27 / 20:30, 31; In both stories they cry is Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, υἱὸς Δαβίδ: 9:27 / 20:30, 31. The second pericope adds κύριε to the cry in v. 31; and Jesus touches their eyes and they are healed: 9:29 / 20:34.

⁷Craig L. Blomberg, *Matthew* (NAC 22; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1992), 162; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:80, 2:134; Nolland, *Matthew*, 375.

⁸James M. Gibbs, “Purpose and Pattern in Matthew’s Use of the Title ‘Son Of David,’” *NTS* 10 (1964), 457.

⁹Gundry, *Matthew*, 176.

While these parallels are obvious, there are also some differences between the pericopes that ought to be noted:

1. In 9:27–31, the blind men are following Jesus rather than sitting on the side of the road (20:30).
2. The second pericope specifies the location as outside of Jericho (20:29), whereas in 9:27 he is traveling in Galilee.
3. The interaction in 9:27–30 takes place exclusively between Jesus and the blind men, whereas the second story is a public event, with the crowd being involved in trying to rebuke the blind men (20:31).
4. The blind men call out for mercy twice in the second story (20:29, 31).
5. The dialogue between Jesus and the blind men are different. In the first pericope, Jesus asks “‘Do you believe that I am able to do this?’ They said to him, ‘Yes, Lord.’ Then he touched their eyes, saying, ‘According to your faith let it be done for you.’” (9:28–29). But in the second pericope, Jesus says, “‘What do you want me to do for you?’ They said to him, ‘Lord, that our eyes be opened!’”
6. Jesus warns them not to tell anybody in 9:30, whereas the two blind men in 20:34 begin following Jesus immediately.

The above differences have caused other commentators to be more cautious in their assessment;¹⁰ France argues that the amount of distinctive material that is not parallel with Mark and Luke lends favor to seeing this as independent tradition.¹¹ If indeed it is the case that this is a “first edition”¹² of Matthew’s version of the Bartimaeus story, it may further bolster the idea of dual witnesses in Matthew. In this case, we have a very similar story, both

¹⁰Nolland, *Matthew*, 399-400; Evans, *Matthew*, 208.

¹¹France, *Matthew*, 365.

¹²Gundry, *Matthew*, 176.

with dual witnesses, attesting to Jesus healing the blind. An important point in both of these miracles is that Jesus is entreated as the Son of David. Readers have, in effect, a dual affirmation (story) of a dual affirmation (individuals). Regardless of whether this is seen as a distinctive story (France's position) or an edition (Gundry's position), the dual witness is clearly important to Matthew, as it is specifically mentioned in 18:16–17.¹³ Matthew also clarifies the accusations at the trial of Jesus to show that the indictment came upon the basis of two witnesses, whereas Mark simply states that “some” gave false testimony (Matt 26:60–61/Mark 14:57–58).

This story is a carefully placed miracle story that concludes, along with the healing of the demoniac (9:32–34), a cycle of miracle stories through Matthew 8–9. Luz states: “for him [the Evangelist] chapters 8 and 9 tell who the Son of David is.”¹⁴ The placement of this cry near the end of this block may indicate that the cry for Jesus as Son of David may encapsulate all of the healing activity through chapters 8 and 9. Given that the Davidic sonship of Jesus has already been thoroughly established at the beginning of the Gospel, this resonance, retrojected as it were to reflect onto the previous miracle stories, makes good sense: “as we approach the end of this carefully composed section...the messianic character of the whole is placed into a distinctively Davidic garb.”¹⁵

4.1.3: *Matthew 12:22–23*

Τότε προσηνέχθη αὐτῷ δαιμονιζόμενος τυφλὸς καὶ κωφός, καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτόν, ὥστε τὸν κωφὸν λαλεῖν καὶ βλέπειν. 23 καὶ ἐξίσταντο πάντες οἱ ὄχλοι καὶ ἔλεγον,

Μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Δαυίδ;

¹³Deut 17:6 (cf. Num 35:30) is clearly in view here. See William R. G. Loader, “Son of David, Blindness, Possession, and Duality in Matthew,” *CBQ* 44 (1982), 582.

¹⁴Luz, *Matthew*, 2:48.

¹⁵Donald J. Versepunt, “The Davidic Messiah and Matthew’s Jewish Christianity,” *SBLSP* 34 (1995), 111. Versepunt also notes that shepherd imagery follows closely after this final miracle story, which hearkens back to Ezek 34 and Jer 23.

The story of a demon-possessed mute man is shared with Luke (11:14) from their common source (Q), but Matthew adds that this man was also blind. This addition is likely significant because Matthew expects the readers to understand this miracle in concert with the miracles in both 9:27–31 and 20:29–34. Furthermore, Matthew states, rather oddly, that “he healed him,” whereas Luke contains the more natural expression that Jesus expelled the mute demon (Luke 11:14). This is not the only time where Matthew changes his source to emphasize healing as opposed to exorcism (see §4.2.2.1 below).

It is the ὄχλος who speaks in this section, with their questioning recognition of Jesus as Son of David.¹⁶ An important passage that can potentially shed light on the crowds’ response is Matt 11:2–6. The exchange between John the Baptist (via his disciples) and Jesus in 11:2–6 states that Jesus’ healing activities are understood as “the works of the messiah.”¹⁷ In that exchange, John the Baptist is invited to recognize Jesus as the messiah because of his ministry of healing. In Matthew 12:23, the crowd is now perhaps beginning to recognize Jesus as messiah because of his capacity to heal as the Son of David. France states: “They [the crowd] are beginning to draw the conclusion which Jesus had expected John the Baptist to draw from his miracles (11:2–6).”¹⁸ As Burger notes, this is placed in contrast to the Jewish response: “Die Pharisäer reagieren ablehnend, während die Menge Jesu Wunder als messianische Zeichen versteht und ihn selbst als den Davidsson erkennt.”¹⁹

The exclamation of the crowds brings to the fore the entire question surrounding the Son of David and the act of healing. Whether or not scholars want to see the crowds cry as

¹⁶For further discussion on the ὄχλος in Matthew, see §5.4.1. Suffice it to say that the voice of the crowd is a matter of some significance and has potential for further fruitful research.

¹⁷This section will be discussed further. See §4.2.3.

¹⁸France, *Matthew*, 477.

¹⁹Christoph Burger, *Jesus als Davidsson: Eine traditions-geschichtliche Untersuchung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970), 79.

positive or negative (μήτι being the word in dispute), the evangelist makes it clear that the act of healing is to be related in some sense to Jesus as the Son of David. As Chae asks: “how was it that the entire crowd could relate the healing Jesus to ὁ υἱὸς Δαυίδ?”²⁰ This question will be further discussed in §4.2 below.

4.1.4: *Matthew 15:22*

καὶ ἰδοὺ γυνὴ Χαναναία ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρίων ἐκείνων ἐξεληθοῦσα ἔκραζεν λέγουσα·
ἐλέησόν με, κύριε υἱὸς Δαυίδ

Matthew carefully constructs this story to display not only that Jesus heals from a distance, but that Jesus also does not enter into a Gentile home (ἐξεληθοῦσα).²¹ The woman’s appeal is unique from other appeals in miracle stories in that two titles are used, κύριος as well as υἱὸς Δαυίδ. These titles serve to heighten the oddity of the story with a Canaanite, a traditional enemy of Israel, having keen spiritual insight by recognizing the Davidic Messiah. Hers is the correct response to Jesus as messiah, a confession that the “lost sheep of the house of Israel” are not readily seeing. This passage serves a particularly important role in that “these verses bind together the title ‘Son of David’ and the formula ‘the lost sheep of the house of Israel’.”²²

Matthew further redacts Mark by having the woman actually speak to Jesus and includes the content of her entreaty. The resonance with Matt 9:27 is unmistakable. In both instances the plea is ἐλέησόν με [ἡμᾶς], κύριε υἱὸς Δαυίδ. The addition of κύριε and the necessary change to the pronoun are the only differences. Matthew intends for his readers to hear

²⁰Chae, *Eschatological Davidic Shepherd*, 310.

²¹While Mark 7:26 calls her a Συροφονικήσσα, Matthew changes it to Χαναναία. France indicates that this was not an ethnic term by this time, see France, *Matthew*, 592. Matthew, in contrast, used traditional biblical vocabulary to heighten the drama of the story. This also explains the addition of Σιδῶνος. See Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:546.

²²Martin, “Image of Shepherd,” 282.

these entreaties in concert with one another, and emphasizes the connection between Jesus' healing activities and his role as Son of David.

4.1.5: *Matthew 20:30–31*

ἔκραξαν λέγοντες· ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, [κύριε,] υἱὸς Δαβὶδ.

Matthew retells Mark 10:46–51 somewhat more closely than his possible “first edition” use in chapter 9. What is distinctively Matthean, and likely a creation of the evangelist, is again a doubling of the witnesses.²³ Within this miracle story Matthew has for the third time the entreaty ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, [κύριε,] υἱὸς Δαβὶδ. Some textual witnesses insert κύριε, though it is unlikely that it was part of the original text.²⁴ What is interesting is that this insertion indicates scribal awareness of the connection with 15:22. The later scribal insertion reflects Matthew's intention: that these three entreaties are to be read in concert with one another.

William Loader has noted that this second healing of two blind men occurs at the end of Jesus' active ministry and is the last healing miracle prior to entering Jerusalem.²⁵ Nolland, too, sees in this a bracketing effect:

It is likely that some kind of bracketing effect is intended: 9:27–31 summed up in itself the healing ministry of chaps. 8–9 (see at 9:27), and 20:30–34 is the last pre-Jerusalem healing. Given the thread of Son of David references between (discussed at 9:27), Matthew perhaps intends to emphasise that Jesus' healing ministry has been an exercise of his role as the messianic Son of David and has been recognised as such by, among others, the physically blind but spiritually insightful.²⁶

²³See §4.1.2.

²⁴Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A companion volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament* (New York, N.Y.: United Bible Societies, 1971), 44. It was labeled by the UBS board as C, making it unlikely to be part of the original.

²⁵Loader, “Son of David,” 576. As will be shown in Chapter 5, the entrance to Jerusalem continues the interaction with Davidic material.

²⁶Nolland, *Matthew*, 828.

In both of these strategically placed sections, Matthew has emphasized Son of David to highlight not only an appropriate title for Jesus, but also to emphasize Jesus' healing deeds in his capacity as Son of David.

4.1.6: *Matthew 21:14–15*

Καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ τυφλοὶ καὶ χωλοὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτούς. ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τὰ θαυμάσια ἃ ἐποίησεν καὶ τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς κρᾶζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καὶ λέγοντας, Ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαβὶδ, ἠγανάκτησαν

An important point mentioned in several commentaries is the likely connection between Matt 21:14 and 2 Sam 5:6–8:

⁶And the king and his men went to Jerusalem against the Jebusites, the inhabitants of the land, who said to David, “You will not come in here, but the blind and the lame will ward you off”—thinking, “David cannot come in here.”
⁷Nevertheless, David took the stronghold of Zion, that is, the city of David.
⁸And David said on that day, “Whoever would strike the Jebusites, let him get up the water shaft to attack ‘the lame and the blind,’ who are hated by David’s soul.” Therefore it is said, “The blind and the lame shall not come into the house.” (ESV)

This is a significant point in the narrative of David’s life, as he is now the king over united Israel, and he fulfills the thus-far neglected command of YHWH to rid the land of the Jebusites (Exod 23:23–24; Deut 7:1–2, 20:17). The taunt from the Jebusites results in David’s own retaliatory insult of the blind and the lame not entering into “the house.” While this was a play on the Jebusites taunt, it does in fact cohere with aspects of the levitical code, as those with defects could not be part of the priesthood (Lev 21:16–24). Certain texts at Qumran support this position even in the eschatological age, where the lame and the blind cannot take part in the final war (1QM 7.4; CD 15.15–17) and cannot attend the messianic feast (1QS^a 2.3–7). *m. Hag.* 1:1 also later states that the blind and the lame are not obligated to go to the temple for the festivals.

Matt 21:14 makes allusion to this section of 2 Samuel and follows it immediately with the children crying out “Hosanna to the Son of David.” This pericope is a story unique to Matthew and is significant in the narrative for several reasons. The first thing to note is that this is the only synoptic reference to Jesus’ public healing ministry within Jerusalem.²⁷ The second point of significance is that this is the last time that Jesus heals anyone in Matthew’s narrative. Finally, this is also the last time when Jesus is called υἱός Δαυίδ in the narrative. All the more important, then, is the recognition that Matthew alludes to a significant story about king David and also makes use of the title Son of David once again in the context of healing.

4.1.7: Summary and Relevance for Thesis

Through the use and reworking of Mark, possibly presenting an otherwise unattested miracle story, and including a unique pericope of Jesus’ last miracle of healing (in Jerusalem), Matthew carefully displays Jesus being entreated or recognized as the Son of David in the context of healing. In addition to this connection between healing and the Son of David sobriquet, the evangelist reworks his Marcan source to present a dual witness to the healing of the blind men, and therefore a dual recognition of Jesus as Son of David. Finally, Jesus seems to be explicitly contrasted with a story from David’s life, as Matthew presents Jesus healing the blind and the lame in the Temple, in an act that is both unattested in the other synoptics and is the final miracle performed by Jesus in Matthew’s narrative. These passages, strategically placed as they are to emphasize Jesus’ healing capacity as Son of David, highlight Matthew’s emphasis on the title and the strong connection between Jesus’ status as Son of David and the capacity to heal.

²⁷France rightly notes that the emergency repair in Luke 22:51 should not be considered an exception, as it is both a private healing, and it is unrequested. France, *Matthew*, 788.

4.2: Explanations for the Therapeutic Son of David in Matthew

Having considered briefly Matthew's key texts for this discussion, the question arises as to why Matthew drew such a strong connection to the activity of healing and the recognition of Jesus as Son of David. Verseput states: "by means of his unique arrangement of the material, Matthew has carefully endowed the healing ministry of Jesus with an explicit rationale: the Davidic deliverer alleviates the suffering of the afflicted as evidence of God's offer of mercy to his forsaken and dejected people."²⁸ While this statement is certainly true, it raises the question of *how* this would legitimate Jesus as the Davidic deliverer if a political or military messiah was expected.²⁹ Matthew likely has a scriptural basis for this connection. The following section will survey the various explanations that have been put forth by scholars as to why the title Son of David is linked with Jesus' healing activities.

4.2.1: David as Exorcist

The first thing to note in this discussion is that there is evidence in both Josephus and the Qumran literature that David himself was regarded as an exorcist in certain circles. 11QPs^a 27.2–10 states:

Now David the son of Jesse was wise and shone like the light of the sun, a scribe and man of discernment, blameless in all his ways before God and humankind. The LORD gave him a brilliant and discerning spirit, so that he wrote: psalms, three thousand six hundred; songs to sing before the altar accompanying the daily perpetual burnt offering for all the days of the year, three hundred and sixty-four; for the Sabbath offerings, fifty-two songs; and for the new moon offerings, all the festival days, and the Day of Atonement, thirty songs. The total of all the songs that he composed was four hundred and fortysix, not including four songs for charming the demon-possessed with music. The sum total of everything, psalms and songs, was four thousand and fifty.³⁰

²⁸Verseput, "Davidic Messiah," 113.

²⁹See §1.6.

³⁰Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1997–98), 2:1179.

The key section in view here is the line which indicates songs written by David for charming the demon-possessed. This tradition most likely reflects the biblical story found in 1 Samuel:

Saul said to his servants, “Provide for me a man who can play well and bring him to me.”¹⁸ One of the young men answered, “Behold, I have seen a son of Jesse the Bethlehemite, who is skillful in playing, a man of valor, a man of war, prudent in speech, and a man of good presence, and the LORD is with him.”¹⁹ Therefore Saul sent messengers to Jesse and said, “Send me David your son, who is with the sheep.”²⁰ And Jesse took a donkey laden with bread and a skin of wine and a young goat and sent them by David his son to Saul.²¹ And David came to Saul and entered his service. And Saul loved him greatly, and he became his armor-bearer.²² And Saul sent to Jesse, saying, “Let David remain in my service, for he has found favor in my sight.”²³ And whenever the harmful spirit from God was upon Saul, David took the lyre and played it with his hand. So Saul was refreshed and was well, and the harmful spirit departed from him. (1 Sam 16:17–23)

Josephus also reflects this biblical tradition in *Ant.* 6.166–169, stating that David “was the only physician against the trouble he (Saul) had from the demons” (168).³¹ Through reflection on this biblical tradition, Josephus and the author of 11Q5 (Ps^a) viewed David as an exorcist, and attributed to him also the gift of prophecy. This tradition is not pervasive in the literature, and so likely does not provide a direct link to Matthew’s tradition. But it nonetheless shows that later Jewish tradition regarding David included discussion about him as an exorcist and prophet.

4.2.2: Solomon as Exorcist and Healer

A popular option for explaining the link between the title Son of David and Jesus’ healing ministry in Matthew is to focus on Solomon and his reputation as an exorcist in early Jewish and post-Christian literature.³² Dennis Duling traces the trajectory of thinking on Solomon

³¹Very similar to Josephus is *L. A. B.* 60, which is composed around the same time as Josephus.

³²Duling, “Solomon,” 235–252; James H. Charlesworth, “The Son of David: Solomon and Jesus (Mark 10.47),” in *The New Testament and Hellenistic Judaism* (eds. Peder Borgen and Giversen Søren; Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 1995), 72–87; Bruce Chilton, “Jesus ben David: Reflections On The Davidssohnfrage,” *JSNT* 4/14 (1982), 88–112; Loren R. Fisher, “Can This Be The Son Of David?” in *Jesus And The Historian: Written In Honor Of Ernest Cadman Colwell* (Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1968), 82–97; H. B. Green, “Solomon

from a wise man to exorcist that has been followed by numerous other scholars.³³ The tradition began with the declaration in the scriptures of Solomon having unsurpassed knowledge and his prowess as a writer (1 Kgs 5:9–14). The books of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes are also attributed to him, where he is introduced as the Son of David (Prov 1:1, Eccl 1:1). The tradition from 1 Kings was interpreted first in the LXX, with the number of “songs” doubling.

Wisdom of Solomon 7:17–22 describes a book in which Solomon displays wisdom in astrology, powers of certain roots, and powers of spirits.

Although fragmentary, 11QPsAp^a also mentions Solomon in connection with demons.

The most definitive example finally comes from Josephus:

Now the sagacity and wisdom which God had bestowed upon Solomon was so great, that he exceeded the ancients, insomuch that he was no way inferior to the Egyptians, who are said to have been beyond all men in understanding; nay, indeed, it is evident that their sagacity was very much inferior to that of the king's [sagacity]...God also enabled him to learn that skill which expels demons, which is a science useful and sanative to men. He composed such incantations also by which distempers are alleviated. And he left behind him the manner of using exorcisms, by which they drive away demons, so that they never return, and this method of cure is of great force unto this day; for I have seen a certain man of my own country whose name was Eleazar, releasing people that were demoniacal in the presence of Vespasian, and his sons, and his captains, and the whole multitude of his soldiers. The manner of the cure was this: He put a ring that had a root of one of those sorts mentioned by Solomon to the nostrils of the demoniac, after which he drew out the demon through his nostrils; and when the man fell down immediately, he abjured him to return into him no more, making still mention of Solomon, and reciting the incantations which he composed. And when Eleazar would persuade and demonstrate to the spectators that he had such a power, he set a little way off a cup or basin full of water, and commanded the demon, as he went out of the man, to overturn it, and thereby to let the spectators know that he had left the man; and when this was done, the skill and wisdom of Solomon was shown very manifestly; for which reason it is, that all men may know the vastness of Solomon's abilities. (*Ant.* 8:42–49)

the Son of David in Matthaean Typology,” in *Studia Evangelica* (ed. Elizabeth A. Livingston; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1982), 227–230; Richard Van Egmond, “The Messianic ‘Son of David’ in Matthew,” *JGRChJ* 3 (2006), 41–71.

³³Duling, “Solomon,” esp. 248.

The above examples are prior to or during the time of the New Testament, and the trajectory of Solomon as exorcist continued. The *Testament of Solomon* in particular not only addressed Solomon as “Son of David,” but discussed Solomon as an exorcist—though this is a late composition.³⁴ In the magical papyri the ‘seal of Solomon,’ used in exorcisms, is also documented. In later Jewish writings (*Targ. Sheni to Esther*), Solomon rules over all evil spirits, and his seal ring is mentioned in the Talmud (*b. Git.* 68a) and on incantation bowls.³⁵

4.2.2.1: Objections to the Solomon Hypothesis

While aspects of a Solomonic typology may be at work in Matthew (12:42), there are several factors that should caution against this position as the explanation for a therapeutic Son of David. First, it was already noted that David was also connected with exorcism in later traditions. Duling, in his cautious arguments for a Solomonic reading, attempted to fold these Davidic traditions into the Solomon trajectory he outlined. But there is no solid reason for doing this. In 11QPs^a is a fragment of Psalm 91 discussing the compositions of David and contains reference to both Solomon and David.³⁶ Sanders states that these compositions reflect “beliefs concerning David around the time of Christ.”³⁷ Although fragmentary, van der Ploeg believes their apparent purpose was exorcism.³⁸ Duling notes that this assertion is reinforced by Rabbinic literature, which associated Psalm 91 with evil spirits and those stricken.³⁹

³⁴Duling believes there is dependence on the NT, while Klaus Berger believes that *T. Sol.* preserves significant pre-Christian material. See Klaus Berger, “Die königlichen Messias-traditionen des Neuen Testaments,” *NTS* 20 (1974), 1–44.

³⁵According to Novakovic, “At least 18 magical incantation bowls contain the phrase “King Solomon, Son of David” and twelve to thirteen mentions his seal-ring” Novakovic, *Healer Of The Sick*, 102.

³⁶James Sanders dated to between 30–50 CE. James A. Sanders, ed., *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPs^a) (DJD 4)*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez *et al.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), 6. See §4.2.1 for a quotation of the section in question.

³⁷*Ibid.*, 134.

³⁸J. P. M. van der Ploeg, “Un petit rouleau de psaumes apocryphes (11Q PsAp^a),” in *Tradition und Glaube: das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt. Festgabe für Karl Georg Kuhn zum 65. Geburtstag* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 128-139. Duling supports this reading as well.

³⁹*y. Sabb.* 6:8, *b. Shebu.* 15, *y. Erub.* 10:26. See Duling, “Solomon,” 239.

L. A. B. 60 recounts David playing his lyre for Saul for the purpose of rebuking the demon that torments him.⁴⁰ The end of the section states: “But let the new womb from which I was born rebuke you, from which after a time one born from my loins will rule over you.”⁴¹ Daniel Harrington notes that this is a likely reference to Solomon given the lack of messianism elsewhere in the work.⁴² Even if this is the case, it should hardly overshadow the portrait of David in this section.⁴³

In addition, much, though not all, of the suggestion bases itself on a range of late materials. The *Testament of Solomon*, as mentioned above, clearly has some Christian material in it (ch. 10 and ch. 15 especially).⁴⁴ While there may be early tradition, it is hard to sift the text, as its final composition as a testament was from a Christian hand.⁴⁵ Additionally, Duling admits that all addresses to Solomon as “Son of David” in *T. Sol.* are dependent on the NT.⁴⁶ It is important to note at this point that *T. Sol.* is the only literature in Duling’s trajectory that addresses Solomon as Son of David.⁴⁷ Later still are the Aramaic incantation bowls, which are dated to about 600 CE.⁴⁸ Although cautious in his suggestion, Loren Fisher put forth the idea that the incantation bowls may provide some background for understanding passages like Matt 12:22–24.⁴⁹ While intriguing, it seems like such late material cannot really provide scholars with information on the therapeutic Son of David as found in Matthew.

⁴⁰L. A. B. is dated between 1 c. BCE - 1 c. CE.

⁴¹Daniel J. Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols. (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), 373.

⁴²*Ibid.*

⁴³See Duling, “Solomon,” 240-41.

⁴⁴Duling argues that the testament is related orally to the NT. See Dennis C. Duling, “Testament of Solomon,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols. (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), 1:955.

⁴⁵*Ibid.*, 941. Duling generally follows the dating of C. C. McGown and M. R. James.

⁴⁶Duling, “Solomon,” 249.

⁴⁷Noted also by Chae, Chae, *Eschatological Davidic Shepherd*, 289.

⁴⁸Duling, “Solomon,” 240.

⁴⁹Fisher, “Son of David,” 82–97.

Finally, while Duling has rightly pointed out an important trajectory for Solomon as exorcist, the exorcistic activities of Jesus are in fact downplayed in Matthew.⁵⁰ If this Solomon trajectory did indeed influence Matthew to connect the title Son of David with Jesus' ministry, it would seem natural to emphasize exorcism. Yet Matthew's use of Mark reveals the opposite. The lack of "Solomonic-style magical manipulation"⁵¹ is absent from Matthew, something recognized by Duling himself. Instead, Matthew's use of Mark shows the de-emphasis on exorcism. For example, Matt 15:30 summarizes Mark's somewhat magical story of the healing of the deaf mute with saliva (7:31–37) – which amounts to an omission. Further, Matthew redacts the story of the demon-possessed paralytic in Mark 9:17–18. While Mark specifically mentions the "spirit that makes him mute" and "throws him into the fire," Matthew removes these references to the spirit. The request of the man for the disciples to expel the spirit is changed to a request to "heal him" (Mark 9:18/Matt 17:16). Finally, Matthew removes the entire scene and dialogue about the torment the boy endures due to the spirit (Mark 9:20–24) and closes the episode with a simple summary of Jesus rebuking the demon (Matt 17:18), without Mark's detail of the physical manifestation of the spirit leaving the boy (Mark 9:25–27).

Matthew further emphasizes healing through his narrative in the following ways:

1. In two places, Matthew changes Mark's accounts of Jesus teaching to Jesus healing. Paffenroth notes that the first instance (Mark 6:34/Matt 14:14) seems appropriate given the compassion (σπλαγχνίζομαι) Jesus felt, but the change made to Mark 10:1 (Matt 19:2) is more awkward, as a controversy story follows immediately after, and teaching would seem to be the more appropriate lead-in to the controversy.⁵²

⁵⁰Chae notes "Jesus heals the sick with no need for magical manipulations such as incantations." Chae, *Eschatological Davidic Shepherd*, 290.

⁵¹Dennis C. Duling, "Matthew's Plurisignificant 'Son of David' in Social Science Perspective: Kinship, Kingship, Magic, and Miracle," *BTB* 22/3 (1992), 112

⁵²Kim Paffenroth, "Jesus as Anointed and Healing Son of David in the Gospel of Matthew," *Bib* 80 (1999),

2. After the cleansing of the temple, both Mark and Luke have Jesus teaching (Mark 11:18/Luke 19:47; Luke states this directly). Matthew, on the other hand, does not follow this significant event with teaching, but the blind and the lame coming to Jesus in the temple for healing (Matt 21:14). This is followed immediately by the shouts of the children saying “Hosanna to the Son of David” (Matt 21:14–15).
3. In several summary statements of Jesus’ (and the disciples’) ministry, Matthew both creates summaries and redacts Mark to highlight the ministry of healing by either supplementing or changing Mark (Mark 1:39/Matt 4:23; Matt 9:35; Mark 6:7/Matt 10:1).
4. Matthew uses the verb θεραπεύω more than any other Gospel (Mark 5 times; Matt 16 times; Luke 14 times; John once).

It seems sufficiently clear from Matthew’s use of Mark that Jesus’ acts of healing are greatly emphasized, while exorcism is diminished. If the Solomon trajectory put forth by Duling was the context under which Matthew highlighted Jesus’ capacity to heal as the Son of David, an emphasis on exorcism would be expected. Given that Matthew’s tendency is to remove and diminish Jesus’ work of exorcism, the Solomonic typology as background for understanding a therapeutic Son of David in Matthew is ultimately unsatisfying.

4.2.2.2: Summary and Relevance for Thesis

While the Solomon hypothesis likely provides the context for Mark’s gospel and the focus on exorcisms,⁵³ it is more difficult to assert this as the context for Matthew’s therapeutic Son of David. While it is true that there was large overlap between evil spirits and sickness in the ancient mindset, they were not totally synonymous—every one of Jesus’ healings were not *de facto* considered exorcisms.⁵⁴ The focus on David, with little emphasis on Solomon (cf. Matt

549-550. See also Duling, “Therapeutic Son of David,” 394 ff.

⁵³See Charlesworth, “Son of David,” 72–87.

12:42), should drive scholars to look at Davidic tradition for clues to understanding this Son of David as healer encountered in Matthew, rather than Solomonic material. It is plausible that a Solomonic typology was in the matrix of understanding Jesus and his healing ministry, but it seems unlikely that it was the driving force behind this tradition.⁵⁵

4.2.3: 4Q521 and the Son of David as Healer

Lidija Novakovic has argued for reading the servant songs of Isaiah (particularly Isa 42:1–4 and Isa 53:4) as providing the scriptural basis for connecting the title Son of David with Jesus’ healing ministry.⁵⁶ The attraction of this proposal lies primarily in John the Baptist’s question to Jesus, and Jesus’ own response in Matt 11:3–6. In that exchange, the deeds of the messiah are clearly drawn from the Isaianic passages. Furthermore, some of this Isaiah material is also present in 4Q521, which holds significant parallels with Matt 11:3–6, so much so that the parallels have led John Collins to state: “this can hardly be coincidental. It is quite possible that the author of the Sayings source knew 4Q521; at the least he drew on a common tradition.”⁵⁷ The parallels can be tabulated as follows:

Matt 11:2–6 (Luke 7:18–23)	4Q521	OT parallels
he cured many of diseases (Lk 7:21)	heal the wounded	
blind receive sight	make blind see	blind receive sight (Ps 146:8, Isa 35:5)
lame walk		lame walk (Isa 35:6)
lepers are cleansed		
deaf hear		deaf hear (Isa 35:5)
dead are raised up	revive the dead	their dead bodies will rise (Isa 26:19)

⁵⁴Bruce Chilton makes this connection of exorcism equals healing. See Chilton, “Jesus ben David,” 88–112. Chilton also over-emphasizes the definite article in the use of the title Son of David.

⁵⁵It must also be noted that the Solomonic hypothesis would itself fall into the scope of Davidic tradition.

⁵⁶Novakovic, *Healer Of The Sick*, 124–84 in particular.

⁵⁷Collins, “The Works,” 107.

poor have good news preached to them	the afflicted have good news sent to them	poor have good news preached to them (Isa 61:1)
	setting prisoners free	setting prisoners free (Ps 146:7)
	lifting those who are bowed down	lifting those who are bowed down (Ps 146:8) ⁵⁸

While the table shows the impressive correlation between 4Q521 and Matt 11:2–6, it is lacking in its connections with other portions of Matthew’s narrative, in particular the miracle stories when the Son of David title is used. The strength of Novakovic’s argument is that Matthew specifically cites Isa 53:4 and Isa 42:1–4, though only Matthew’s citation of Isa 53:4 in Matt 8:16–17 specifically mentions healing. However, her argument is weakened by the fact that none of the OT parallels of 4Q521 invoke the name of David at all; they are only connected in the broadest sense to David in that some were popular messianic texts.

Furthermore, an important oversight of Novakovic’s monograph is Ezekiel 34 (discussed below). While she does recognize its influence upon Matthew, the perceived influence is confined for the most part to the shepherding motif.⁵⁹ Yet, the aspect of healing is clearly present in Ezek 34:4, as this was one of the things Israel’s shepherds (the ruling class) were not doing for the flock, and which God himself, and his appointed under-shepherd, would do. Ezekiel 34 also stands out in that it specifically names David, which makes it a more likely candidate as a scriptural basis for the therapeutic Son of David.

While Novakovic’s arguments are important, Isaiah’s servant songs are insufficient for providing the scriptural basis for connecting the title Son of David with Jesus’ ministry of healing. At this point, though, it is important to note that the Hebrew scriptures, especially those read messianically, were often read in concert and in light of one another. As Baxter

⁵⁸Table from H. Daniel Zacharias, “4Q521,” *Encyclopedia of the Historical Jesus*, 138.

⁵⁹Novakovic, *Healer Of The Sick*, 131, 188-89.

states, “to view the [Isaianic] servant and Davidic shepherd motifs as mutually exclusive would be reductionistic.”⁶⁰ Novakovic herself recognizes this, noting how in Ezekiel 34 there is a convergence of images (shepherd, servant, David).⁶¹ In Novakovic’s understanding, then, Ezekiel continues the trajectory of the hope of Davidic restoration, and incorporates into itself some of the servant passages of Isaiah.⁶²

4.2.4: Ezekiel’s Eschatological Shepherd

This section will argue for Ezekiel 34’s Davidic shepherd as the primary backdrop for this motif in Matthew. Young S. Chae deals with Matthew’s extensive interaction with the shepherd motif, and argues for Ezekiel’s eschatological shepherd (Ezekiel 34) as the impetus for Matthew’s therapeutic Son of David.⁶³ In the same year (without interaction with Chae), a well-articulated essay by Wayne Baxter argued similarly for Ezekiel 34 providing the matrix under which the title Son of David was linked with Jesus’ healing activity in Matthew.⁶⁴ Prior to both of these authors, both John Heil and Francis Martin argued that “Ezekiel 34 in particular contains the entire semantic field needed for the implied reader to appreciate fully the Matthean shepherd metaphor.”⁶⁵

4.2.4.1: Ezekiel’s Messianic Shepherd

Ezekiel’s messianic shepherd as introduced in Ezek 34:23–24 is important in that it mentions David specifically. Ezekiel’s oracle in chapter 34 lays out the process of restoration by portraying YHWH first and foremost as the divine shepherd of his flock. The early portion of this oracle explains YHWH’s resolution of the problems within his flock, moves to YHWH’s ac-

⁶⁰Baxter, “Matthew’s Warrant,” 49.

⁶¹Novakovic, *Healer Of The Sick*, 131.

⁶²*Ibid.*, 132.

⁶³Chae, *Eschatological Davidic Shepherd*.

⁶⁴Baxter, “Matthew’s Warrant,” 36-50.

⁶⁵Heil, “Narrative Strategy,” 699. See also Martin, “Image of Shepherd,” 261-301.

tions for the flock, and culminates with YHWH's own appointment of David as a shepherd for YHWH's flock and covenant of peace.⁶⁶ This divinely appointed under-shepherd is one shepherd (as opposed to plural shepherds in Jer 23:4) and represents a re-unification of the Kingdom of Israel.

Ezekiel's naming of the under-shepherd as David, without qualification, is similar to both Hos 3:5 and Jer 30:8–10. Elsewhere, though, discussion of this future Davidic ruler is less direct: Jer 23:5 speaks of raising up for David a righteous branch; Amos 9:11 talks about restoring the fallen hut of David; Isa 9:6–7 speaks of a child on David's throne; Isa 11:1 refers to a root from the stump of Jesse. As Daniel Block notes, there is no hint of "some kind of David *redivivus*."⁶⁷ Ezekiel, as well Jeremiah and Hosea, envision the restoration of the nation and thus the dynasty promised to David in 2 Sam 7:8–16.

It is also important to note that the Ezekiel 34 oracle begins with condemnation towards the shepherds of Israel (i.e. Israel's ruling class). Ezek 34:2–4 states:

Ah, shepherds of Israel who have been feeding yourselves! Should not shepherds feed the sheep? You eat the fat, you clothe yourselves with the wool, you slaughter the fat ones, but you do not feed the sheep. The weak you have not strengthened, *the sick you have not healed*, the injured you have not bound up, the strayed you have not brought back, the lost you have not sought, and with force and harshness you have ruled them.

The oracle then moves on to show how YHWH himself gathers the flock back. The obvious contrast is made between Israel's wicked shepherds on the one hand and YHWH and David on the other: they will perform the duties of the shepherd for the flock of Israel because the wicked shepherds did not. The concentration of shepherding imagery is what makes Ezekiel 34's portrait unique amongst the prophets previously mentioned: the actions which

⁶⁶This follows the installation practice set out in the Old Testament for offices within Israel (Deut 17:14–20, 18:15; Jgs 2:16; 1 Sam 2:35; 1 Kgs 14:14, Jer 23:4; Zech 11:16).

⁶⁷Daniel I. Block, "Bringing Back David: Ezekiel's Messianic Hope," in *The Lord's Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts* (eds. P. E. Satterthwaite, Richard E. Hess, and Gordon J. Wenham; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995), 174.

the shepherds of Israel have not done, and so the Davidic shepherd is appointed to do, are specific – with the most noticeable feature being the mention of healing the sick.

The second block of text is Ezek 37:22–25, which continues with the same themes of restoration under one united and appointed king. Throughout these passages, David is called “my servant” by YHWH (34:23 and 37:25), shepherd [רעה] (34:23 and 37:24), as well as prince [נשיא] and king [מלך] (34:24 and 37:24, 25). Through these two passages, Israel is called a flock (34:22) and portrayed consistently as God’s flock (34:24 and 37:24).

It is only in Ezekiel’s portrait that we have a concentration of ideas and metaphors which find their fruition in Matthew’s healing Son of David. There is the appointed David, the healing of the sick, and the strong shepherd motif which includes in it the shepherd’s care for Israel as the flock.

4.2.4.2: Ezekiel 34 in Matthew

There are numerous types of parallels between Ezekiel 34 and Matthew’s Gospel, which have been highlighted in particular by Baxter. The first type of parallel consists of verbal allusions. First, Matt 9:36 states that Jesus had compassion on the crowds because they were like “sheep without a shepherd.” A similar type of phrase occurs in Num 27:17, 2 Chr 18:16, and Jdt 11:19. Baxter and most commentators argue that Ezek 34:5 is the most likely allusion, given its messianic connotation and the highlighting of Jesus as Son of David in Matthew.⁶⁸ Second, Matt 25:32 describes the Son of Man separating the people like a shepherd separating the sheep. This parallels Ezek 34:16–17.⁶⁹ Third, In Matthew’s fourth discourse (ch. 18) Jesus teaches his disciples about the kingdom with the parable of the lost sheep (18:10–14). The parable and Ezekiel 34 shares several lemmas in common: ζῆτέω (LXX Ezek 34:16 / Matt

⁶⁸Baxter, “Matthew’s Warrant,” 44; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:147; Blomberg, *Matthew*, 166; Evans, *Matthew*, 212; France, *Matthew*, 372.

⁶⁹Heil, “Narrative Strategy,” 705.

18:12), πλανάω (LXX Ezek 34:4 / Matt 18:12), and ἀπόλλυμι (LXX Ezek 34:4 / Matt 18:14). Heil has argued that this parable's shepherd metaphor is drawn from Ezekiel 34.⁷⁰

The next type of parallel is the similarity of shepherding imagery. Ezekiel 34's shepherd would heal the sick, care for the poor, feed the hungry, and bring the flock out of bondage. All of this activity is performed by Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew: he feeds his flock (15:29–38), frees the people from demonic bondage through exorcism, and associates with the outcast.⁷¹ To this can be added supporting shepherding imagery in Matthew; Jesus speaks implicitly of himself as a shepherd in Matt 10:16 when he states to his followers that “I am sending you out like sheep in the midst of wolves.” He further speaks of himself in the role of shepherd in the parable of the lost sheep: “If a certain man has a hundred sheep, and one of them wanders away, will he not leave the ninety-nine on the hills and go and look for the one that wandered away?” (Matt 18:12). Finally, as Jesus extends the shepherding imagery to his disciples and sends them out to the lost sheep (Matt 10:16), their adversaries are portrayed as wolves. Similarly, Israel's shepherds are portrayed as plundering the flock in Ezek 34:1–10, such that the flock becomes “scattered without a shepherd, and they were as food for all the animals of the field when they were scattered” (v. 5).⁷²

In addition to the parallels above, there are supporting contextual parallels noted by Baxter. As already shown in §3.3 above, Matthew has woven important Davidic motifs into the birth narrative. One of these was the conflated citation of Mic 5:2 and 2 Sam 5:2. This “anticipates the shepherding dimension of Jesus' ministry as it will be unfolded in the narra-

⁷⁰*Ibid.*, 704.

⁷¹Ezek 34 likely stands behind the Parable of the Lost Sheep in Matthew as well.

⁷²Additional shepherding imagery, likely stemming from Zechariah, occurs within Matthew as well. Anticipating his betrayal, Jesus quotes Zech 13:7, “I will strike the shepherd and the sheep of the flock will be scattered” (Matt 26:31). This passage will be discussed in more detail in §5.3.4. Craig Evans also notes that the Aramaic paraphrase makes more explicit the royal element of Zech 13:7, with “my shepherd” becoming “the king and ruler” (*Tg. Zech.* 13:7). See Craig A. Evans, “Jesus and Zechariah's Messianic Hope,” in *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus* (eds. Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans; 1999), 385.

tive.”⁷³ Second, the shepherds denounced in Ezekiel 34 have neglected the flock. This is paralleled with the depiction of the religious leaders in Matthew who neglect the sick (9:10–13), lack compassion (12:7, 10), and exploit the people (23:4, 14). Unsurprisingly, God promised to oust the wicked shepherds, which also finds parallel in Matthew (21:33–45). Because of their failure, Jesus sends out his own disciples to care for the “lost sheep” of Israel (10:1–6). Third, the desperate circumstances of Israel, due to the wicked shepherds, is shared in Ezekiel and Matthew, as well as Zechariah 10. In Ezekiel, the people have suffered in the exile, while in Matthew they are like sheep without a shepherd (9:36) and in need of rescue from Satan (12:24–29, 43–45).⁷⁴ Finally, the character and action of YHWH is so intertwined with his shepherd David, that the under-shepherd’s actions are spoken of as if they were the actions of YHWH (Ezek 34:15, 23).⁷⁵ Likewise, Matthew throughout the Gospel portrays the unique relationship between Jesus and God, with Jesus performing deeds that normally only God would do (Matt 9:6, 24:30–31, 25:31–32).

4.2.4.3: Matthew’s Shepherding Imagery in the Context of Healing

All of Matthew’s passages indicating the shepherd motif have been highlighted in the above sections, but it is important to note that in two of those pericopes, the shepherding motif is likely connected to pericopes portraying the Son of David as healer. The first such instance is Matt 9:36. Matthew sets the context of Jesus’ compassion for the crowds (who are “like sheep without a shepherd”) by stating that “Jesus was going around all the towns and the villages, teaching in their synagogues and proclaiming the good news of the kingdom and healing every disease and every sickness” (9:35). This section is Matthew’s summary of the miracle stories in chapters 8 and 9, and adds substantially to Mark’s shortened summary in 6:6b. This

⁷³Baxter, “Matthew’s Warrant,” 38. This same point is made by Heil, “Narrative Strategy,” 700.

⁷⁴McAfee Moss, “Zechariah Tradition,” 51-75; Martin, “Image of Shepherd,” 275.

⁷⁵4Q521 speaks of the messiah in the same way.

summary, then, is meant to shine a light on the previous chapters and Jesus' reason for healing—because the Israelites are like sheep without a shepherd. It also paves the way for sending the disciples out to the lost sheep.⁷⁶ The first entreaty to Jesus as Son of David in chapter 9 also seems to carry the sense of shepherding, as the crowds are amazed that “nothing like this was ever seen in Israel” (9:34), followed immediately by Jesus having compassion on these same crowds because they were “like sheep without a shepherd.” This seems also to point back as a sort of summary to the miracle stories leading up to that point: “Jesus has been shepherding, then, by teaching, preaching, and healing, in contrast to the Jewish leaders, who have failed to shepherd God's people Israel.”⁷⁷

It is important at this point to note that Ezekiel 34 does not stand alone in the OT in its usage of shepherding imagery to describe the role of the Davidic messiah. Nolland has argued that Zech 10:2 is the likely allusion behind Matt 9:36. Even this admission does not detract, though, from the importance of Ezekiel 34, as Zechariah 10–11 belongs to a cluster of OT passages that utilize the shepherding metaphor when discussing the future Davidic king: “It is likely that Matthew is picking up this First Testament thread, rather than focusing in a narrow way on any one of these texts.”⁷⁸ However, while not discounting how these passages were read together, it cannot go unnoticed that Ezekiel's Davidic shepherd is the only passage which contains the hope for a new David who is a *healing* shepherd.

The second point of contact is the healing of the Canaanite woman in 15:21–25. After he is entreated as the Son of David for healing, Jesus declares that he was sent only to “the

⁷⁶Evans, *Matthew*, 211; Heil, “Narrative Strategy,” 701-02.

⁷⁷*Ibid.*, 701.

⁷⁸John Nolland, “The King as Shepherd: the Role of Deutero-Zechariah in Matthew,” in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels* (ed. Thomas R. Hatina; LNTS 310; New York: T&T Clark, 2008), 134–35. Nolland in fact argues that Zech 10:2 is specifically in the mind of the evangelist here. The role of Zechariah 9–14 will also be utilized heavily by Matthew (see Chapter 5). This interaction with Zechariah's shepherding motif continues in Matt 15:30–31. Matthew's further usage of Zechariah's Davidic tradition will be discussed in the following chapter. Suffice it to say that the evangelist's interaction with the Davidic shepherd tradition in Ezek 34 and Zech 10–11 will greatly expand at the triumphal entry and its quotation of Zech 9:9.

lost sheep of the house of Israel” (Matt 15:24). Jesus seems to state this because he “now applies to himself the same restriction which he imposed on his disciples in 10:5–6, using the same metaphor of the lost sheep.”⁷⁹ If the argument for Ezekiel 34’s influence in Matthew is correct, then it is entirely reasonable to have Ezekiel 34 in view here too. Jesus’ statement not only identifies Israel as the flock, but implicitly associates himself as shepherd for the flock. Furthermore, Jesus states that “he was sent.” This coheres well with Ezekiel 34’s portrayal of the under-shepherd who is appointed by YHWH over Israel. Jesus, Son of David, is the eschatological shepherd David to which Ezekiel spoke: “for Matthew, Jesus’ ministry of healing belongs to his duty as a shepherd of his people. The basis for this inference is provided by Ezek 34:4, where the task of searching the lost...appears alongside the task of strengthening the weak and healing the sick.”⁸⁰

4.2.4.4: *Summary and Relevance for Thesis*

It seems sufficiently clear that Ezekiel 34 is made use of throughout Matthew and the arguments of Wayne Baxter that Ezekiel 34 provides Matthew’s warrant for connecting the title Son of David with healing are correct: “By teaching, preaching, and healing as God’s Davidic shepherd, Jesus begins to fulfill God’s promise in Ezek 34:30 that he would be “with them,” with the people of Israel who are his sheep.”⁸¹ While an expected Davidic ruler is found in other passages, and the shepherd metaphor is found elsewhere, there is no other passage that combines these aspects with the idea of healing. This concentration of ideas and motifs makes Ezekiel’s Davidic shepherd the most likely source for Matthew’s scriptural warrant. This shows the importance that the evangelist continues to place on David and Davidic tradition when portraying Jesus and in this instance his ministry of healing.⁸² Matthew continues to

⁷⁹France, *Matthew*, 593.

⁸⁰Novakovic, *Healer Of The Sick*, 132.

⁸¹Heil, “Narrative Strategy,” 701.

turn to the scriptures of Israel to show his audience that Jesus' life and ministry fulfill the Davidic promise. His portrayal of Jesus' actions and their scriptural support continue to define what it means for Jesus to be the Son of David.

4.2.5: David, the Blind, and the Lame

The allusion to David's story in Matt 21:14 (discussed in §4.1.6) reveals once again how the evangelist continues to draw connections with the story of David as well as later traditions about David when portraying Jesus. In this instance, the connection is one of contrast. John Fenton states that Matthew contrasts "the first David, who killed the blind and the lame, and forbade them to enter the temple, with the second David, to whom the blind and the lame come in the temple, and by whom they are healed."⁸³ Matt 21:14 gives evidence to Matthew's Davidic theme, in this case utilizing typology, to support his therapeutic portrait of the Son of David.

Craig Evans has also pointed out how the Targumic tradition of 2 Sam 5:8 and other passages may serve to reinforce the implicit messianism in the texts. The existing Aramaic paraphrase translates 'blind' and 'lame' with 'sinners' and 'guilty.' This translation readily portrays the social status of those born with defects (cf. John 9:2). At 21:14 Matthew not only alluded to 2 Samuel, but also showed how Jesus reversed or corrected David's proclamation. The restorative connotations of Mic 4:6–8 are also made explicitly messianic in the Targum, with God bringing back the exiles (i.e. the lame) and restoring the kingdom. Evans states:

Bringing the lame to the Temple and healing them may have been meant to symbolize Israel's eschatological restoration—which is a concomitant of Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom. It may represent a reversal (or completion) of the interpretive tradition surrounding 2 Sam. 5.8. The tendency elsewhere to

⁸²Chae states, "The compassion of YHWH for his scattered flock is one of the profound motivations for Israel's hope of restoration. We are to see Jesus' healing the blind men as part of the whole restoration process." Chae, *Eschatological Davidic Shepherd*, 306.

⁸³John C. Fenton, *Gospel of St. Matthew* (Pelican Gospel Commentary, rev. ed. SCM Press, 1977), 334. This idea of contrast between Jesus and David will be further explored later in Matt 22:43–45.

interpret the lame as ‘exiles’ coheres with this orientation. Jesus’ ministry to the lame and blind signaled Israel’s restoration and the regathering of her exiles.⁸⁴

Matt 21:14 not only builds upon Matthew’s portrayal of the therapeutic Son of David, but also alludes to a story in the life of David in 2 Sam 5:8. It is also possible that the Aramaic paraphrase presented in the targums reflects a messianic, or at least eschatological reading, which may have further served to draw connection to Davidic tradition. This passage shows once again that the evangelist is seeking to draw connections not only with Davidic tradition, but also the story of David as found in the scriptures. In this example the evangelist once again utilizes typology in his presentation of Jesus.

4.3: Conclusion

Matthew’s unique connection between Jesus’ capacity to heal and the title Son of David has spawned numerous explanations, including a number of recent monographs and articles. Examining Matthew’s passages in question as well as the various proposals, I believe the best explanation is the proposal put forth most recently by Baxter and Chae: Ezekiel 34’s Davidic shepherd provides the scriptural basis for linking the title Son of David with the act of healing. Verseput states, “Matthew has carefully endowed the healing ministry of Jesus with an explicit rationale: the Davidic deliverer alleviates the suffering of the afflicted as evidence of God’s offer of mercy to his forsaken and dejected people.”⁸⁵

Furthermore, in his final recorded miracle, the reference to Jesus’ healing alludes to a story of David in 2 Samuel:

⁸⁴Craig A. Evans, “A Note on Targum 2 Samuel 5:8 and Jesus’ Ministry to the “Maimed, Halt, and Blind,”” *JSP* 15 (1997), 82.

⁸⁵Verseput, “Davidic Messiah,” 113.

The Son of David as healer is contrasted, not compared, with his father David: David was a powerful warrior who killed the figuratively blind and lame and excluded them from his “house”; his son Jesus is a powerful healer who cures the literally blind and lame within his “house,” the temple.⁸⁶

The importance of David and Davidic tradition has been evidenced in the early chapters of the Gospel, and as readers move on to the narrative, it is perhaps unsurprising that the healing ministry of Jesus is also shaped and formed by Davidic motifs and typology. Matthew continues his Davidic them with an eye to the life of David and other Davidic tradition in scripture to root the actions of the Son of David in the OT scriptures.

⁸⁶Paffenroth, “Jesus as Anointed,” 553.

Chapter 5: The Son of David's Humility and Authority in Matthew

The previous chapters have shown the importance of Davidic motifs and Davidic typology in Matthew's portrayal of Jesus' lineage, birth, and ministry of healing. Matthew's introduction to Jesus has set the stage for understanding Jesus as the Son of David and Jesus' ministry of healing is shaped by the Davidic shepherd motif in Ezekiel 34. His ministry of healing begins to describe for the reader how the evangelist understands from the scriptures Jesus' capacity as the Son of David. This chapter will discuss three pericopes in Matthew which will expand upon Matthew's portrayal, again from the scriptures: the Sabbath controversy of Matt 12:1–8, the triumphal entry of Matt 21:6–17, and the discussion of Psalm 110 in Matt 22:41–46. All of these passages portray in one way or another conflict with the religious leaders, with the triumphal entry being one of the most important hinge points of Matthew's narrative. The triumphal entry is also significant in its extensive interaction with the Davidic tradition found in Zechariah. In all of these passages Davidic typology or motifs are present and serve to reinforce the authority of Jesus as the rightful Davidic messiah and help readers to further understand Matthew's perspective on what it means for Jesus to be the Son of David.

5.1: Jesus, David, and the Sabbath

Matthew 12 includes several conflict stories, pitting Jesus against the religious leaders. Matt 12:1–8 is the first of two stories revolving around the issue of Sabbath observance (12:9–12). Throughout his narrative, the evangelist has chosen strategic points to emphasize the Davidic portrait of Jesus. This pericope stands as another important emphasis point, as “it is the first

instance of direct Pharisaic opposition recorded in Matthew,”¹ making the use of Davidic typology at this point all the more significant given Matthew’s Davidic theme. Other sections of the four Gospels show that Sabbath was a regular point of contention between Jesus and the religious leaders (Mark 2:23–28, 3:1–6; Luke 12:10–17, 14:1–6; John 5:1–18, 9:1–41).

As Jesus and his disciples are walking in a field, his disciples are plucking heads of grain and eating them. Deut 23:25 allows for the plucking of grain from a field that is not one’s own (cf. Lev 19:9–10; 23:22; Deut 24:19–22; Ruth 2). It seems that the Pharisees are assuming the “work” of reaping by the disciples on the Sabbath. They could also be accused of not storing up food for the Sabbath the day before (cf. CD 10.20–21). A strict reading of Exod 34:21 would likely forbid reaping, and it seems that Jesus’ opponents view the disciples actions in this way (cf. *m. Šabb.* 7:2; CD 10:14–11:18).² Although the Mishnah should not always be read back into the first century, John Hicks suggests that something like the 39 categories of work activity forbidden on the Sabbath were probably understood in the time of Jesus.³ These categories are listed in *m.Šabb.* 7:2 and discussed at length in the Mishnah tractates *Šabbat* and *‘Erubin*. The reality that Sabbath observance was discussed amongst the Jewish leaders of Jesus’ day is bolstered by texts which precede the Mishnah: The Damascus Document from Qumran contains stringent rules on what acts can and cannot be done on the Sabbath (CD 10.14–11.18). Earlier still is the Rewritten Bible text of *Jubilees* 50.6–13 (ca. 150 BCE), which expands upon God’s Sabbath command with additional parameters and harsher consequences.

This brief sampling of Jewish teaching on the Sabbath supplies important context for understanding this pericope and Jesus’ understanding of Sabbath observance in both word and

¹John Mark Hicks, “The Sabbath Controversy in Matthew: an exegesis of Matthew 12:1-14,” *ResQ* 27/2 (1984), 80.

²Gundry, *Matthew*, 222.

³Hicks, “Sabbath Controversy,” 81.

deed. Jesus is held responsible for his disciples' behavior and in support of their action on the Sabbath Jesus mounts an argument using a historical example (1 Sam 21:1–6), a legal teaching (Num 28:9–10), and a principle from Hosea 6:6. This section will deal primarily with the first portion of the argument using the story of David. Using both Mark's material as well as material of his own, Matthew draws into the conversation a story of David in order to parallel Jesus with David and thus bolster Jesus' authority in the matter.

5.1.1: Davidic Parallels in Matt 12:1-4

The passage in question contains a direct and intentional parallel with David. Using the methodological terms assigned in the opening chapter, this passage is typology of the first order: the type (David in 1 Sam 21) is compared with Jesus as anti-type not in terms of fulfillment, but a parallel situation.⁴

Matthew's interest in the typological comparison between Jesus and David are illuminated in comparing Matthew and his source material in Mark:

⁴Margaret Daly-Denton, "David In The Gospels," *WW* 23/4 (2003), 423.

Mark 2:23–26	Matt 12:1–4
<p>Καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν παραπορεύεσθαι διὰ τῶν σπορίμων,</p> <p>καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο ὁδὸν ποιεῖν τίλλοντες τοὺς στάχους.</p> <p>καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἔλεγον αὐτῷ, Ἴδε τί ποιοῦσιν τοῖς σάββασιν ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν;</p> <p>καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε τί ἐποίησεν Δαυὶδ ὅτε χρεῖαν ἔσχεν καὶ ἐπεινάσεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ,</p> <p>πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἀβιαθάρ ἀρχιερέως</p> <p>καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγεν,</p> <p>οὓς οὐκ ἔξεστιν φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ τοὺς ἱερεῖς, καὶ ἔδωκεν καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ οὖσιν;</p>	<p>Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἐπορεύθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς σάββασιν διὰ τῶν σπορίμων·</p> <p>οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπεινάσαν καὶ ἤρξαντο τίλλειν στάχους καὶ ἐσθίειν.</p> <p>οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἰδόντες εἶπαν αὐτῷ, Ἴδου οἱ μαθηταὶ σου ποιοῦσιν ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν ποιεῖν ἐν σαββάτῳ.</p> <p>ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε τί ἐποίησεν Δαυὶδ ὅτε ἐπεινάσεν καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ,</p> <p>πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ</p> <p>καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγον,</p> <p>ὃ οὐκ ἔξον ἦν αὐτῷ φαγεῖν οὐδὲ τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν μόνοις;</p>

The following differences can be observed in the above passages:

1. The use of δέ over Mark's καί may serve to heighten the tension of the story.
2. Matthew inserts that the disciples were hungry (ἐπεινάσαν). This allows for the repetition of the verb πεινάω in reference to both the disciples and David and his companions in 12:3.
3. Mark's question from the Pharisees becomes a direct accusation by the removal of the interrogative τί.
4. The accusation is more squarely directed at Jesus (οἱ μαθηταὶ σου).

5. Matthew removes the (erroneous) mention of Abiathar. While this fixes Mark's error, it also serves to keep David as the only named character mentioned by name in the recounting of the story.
6. Matthew changes Mark's ἔφαγεν to ἔφαγον to correspond with his additional focus on the disciples elsewhere. This again draws the comparison between Jesus and his disciples and David and his men.

The changes and additions noted above reinforce Matthew's intention to portray Jesus as the anti-type to David. The reference to eating in particular has been noted by scholars as reinforcing the parallel between the two.⁵ Gundry also notes the de-emphasis on David's hunger as well as the change to "they ate," which serves to reinforce the parallel between David's men and Jesus' disciples.⁶ Matthew's subtle additions and changes reveals his continual interest in a Davidic typology.

5.1.2: The Purpose of the Davidic Parallel

While the typological parallel is clear in Matthew, the question remains as to why it is invoked and what its significance is. Davies and Allison provide a list of eight options:⁷

⁵Gundry, *Matthew*, 221-22; Hicks, "Sabbath Controversy," 81-82.

⁶Gundry, *Matthew*, 222. Although stemming from later Jewish material, Davies and Allison list as a possible parallel tradition preserved in the Babylonian Talmud as well as later midrash on 1 Samuel believed that it was indeed the Sabbath when David took the bread. (*b. Menah.* 95b; *Yalqut* on 1 Sam 21:5). While admittedly this is late material, Josephus' account in *Ant.* 6:242-24 omits any reference to David's hunger, which may indicate the desire to mask or reform David's actions. These examples, along with the plain fact that Jesus brought up this episode when discussing the Sabbath issue, may indicate that this story played into the discourse regarding Sabbath. Davies and Allison state, "Jesus might have been appealing to a text whose implications were known to be controversial," (Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:308). Contra this position is Dan Cohn-Sherbok, "An Analysis of Jesus' arguments concerning the plucking of grain on the Sabbath," *JSNT* 2 (1979), 36; as well as Harrington who states, "That precedent was irrelevant to the Sabbath" (Daniel J. Harrington, "Sabbath Tensions: Matthew 12:1-14 and other New Testament Texts," in *Sabbath in Jewish and Christian traditions* (New York: Crossroad, 1991), 52). Scott Spencer also argues that the allusion to David left something to be desired: F. Scott Spencer, "Scripture, hermeneutics, and Matthew's Jesus," *Int* 64/4 (2010), 372.

⁷Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:310-11.

1. The Pharisees were being reminded of the higher good of human need (in this case hunger), which takes precedence over law.
2. Jesus and his disciples were spiritually saving lives, and the rabbis permitted breaching the Sabbath when life was in danger.
3. David took a priestly prerogative and so too can Jesus.
4. The eschatological time allowed for the suspension of the law.
5. Jesus was only challenging the oral law of the Pharisees.
6. David was appointed a priest and so too Jesus and his apostles are priests and thus allowed to profane the Sabbath (Matt 12:5).
7. If David can break the law, then so too can the messianic Son of David.

None of these options can be read as diametrically opposed with another. There is little support for option 2 in the passage, and likewise option 4 seems unlikely given the respect for the law elsewhere in the text (cf. Matt 5:17–18). Also, while the oral law no doubt played into the conversation, it is nonetheless important to recognize that the OT is already clear on the matter of reaping on the Sabbath, and Jesus appeals directly to the OT rather than the teachings of the Pharisees. As this encounter is read, it is important to remember that the typological parallel is only the beginning of Jesus' argument, after which follows a legal teaching (Num 28:9–10), and a principle from Hosea 6:6. The quotation of Hosea 6:6, “Ἐλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν,” makes lends credence to option 1. Finally, this episode is summarized with a declaration regarding Jesus' authority over the Sabbath, which means that, however one is to understand the typological parallel, it must be ultimately understood as supporting Jesus' inherent authority. Davies and Allison themselves read options 5, 7, and 8 together as forming a proper understanding, which seems to make the most sense. Matthew has emphasized the parallel between Jesus and David by emphasizing the disciples' hunger. Matthew has also insert-

ed unique material regarding the priests and contains the christological assertion that “something greater than the temple is here” (12:6). Therefore, by the use of the typological parallel, bolstered by the legal teaching and Hosea’s declaration, “Jesus’ authority is illustrated by David’s authority; and if David could act as he did, surely Jesus ... could act similarly.”⁸

5.1.3: The Authority of the Son of David

Once the force of the argument is understood as being about Jesus’ authority, the scholarly debate over whether Jesus’ argument would have been “valid” from a rabbinic perspective because it was haggadic in character (rather than halakaic) becomes secondary in importance.⁹ As Robert McIver has stated, those scholars that have found the appeal to the story of David as illegitimate based on rabbinic grounds miss the point: “These problems should make the interpreter seek the point(s) of comparison between the two events rather than the differences, because the three Synoptic evangelists considered that the argument had merit enough to warrant its inclusion.”¹⁰ Understood in this light, it is the authority of David in the historical situation, not his casual attitude to the holy (or the Sabbath), which is being drawn out.¹¹ As Davies and Allison state: “In both instances a righteous man breaks a commandment, and both times he does so out of hunger. Also implicit is a third point of comparison: Jesus, the Messiah and descendant of David, is like his ancestor the king.”¹² It is Jesus’ authority which is being established by the evangelist, with the typological parallel being the first supporting point in the case. The argument from Jesus can be summarized in this way:

⁸*Ibid.*, 311. The same conclusion is drawn by Cohn-Sherbok. See Cohn-Sherbok, “Analysis,” 33.

⁹*Ibid.*, 33, 36. Herold Weiss, “The Sabbath in the Synoptic Gospels,” *JSNT* 12 (1990), 21. On this basis Weiss considers the mention of David irrelevant.

¹⁰Robert K. McIver, “The Sabbath in the Gospel of Matthew: A Paradigm for Understanding the Law in Matthew?” *AUSS* 2 (1995), 236.

¹¹France, *Matthew*, 459.

¹²Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:308.

1. David, by his own authority, could out of necessity do what only priests were allowed to do (12:3–4).
2. Priests were allowed to break the Sabbath in the service of the temple (v. 5).¹³
3. Over and above every precept is God’s overarching desire for mercy and not sacrifice (v. 7). Therefore,
4. The Son of Man, like his ancestor David, has authority to decide that his companions needs (i.e. hunger) override the normal Sabbath regulations.¹⁴

In respect to the argument Jesus lays out, the authority of David as anti-type to the authority of Jesus stands as the most important point of the argument. The maxim by Hosea is so general that, on its own, it can contribute nothing to the argument being made. While the example of priestly work on the Sabbath is more specific in terms of the timing of actions, the authority by which the priests could “profane the Sabbath” was dictated by God himself. So, while the example of the priests provides precedent for “breaking” the Sabbath, it is the example of David which provides the foundation for ascribing this type of authority over the Sabbath to Jesus. “Jesus as the interpreter of Sabbath Law has the right to go beyond existing tradition: he is the proper authority. He is Lord of the Sabbath. He is the Messianic Son of Man who embodies the kingdom of God. He alone discerns what is the true will of God.”¹⁵

5.1.4: Summary and Relevance for Thesis

Matthew’s intentional use of Davidic tradition is displayed in this first-order typology between Jesus and David. This interaction with Davidic tradition comes at an important point in

¹³“Exactly in what way they profane the Sabbath is not spelled out, but we read that their prescribed duties did involve activities which would have been described as unlawful for the Sabbath besides the temple.” McIver, “Sabbath,” 237.

¹⁴“The point in common between 1 Samuel 21:1–6 and Matthew 12:3–4 is satisfying the hunger of the followers of David/Son of David.” Harrington, “Sabbath Tensions,” 48.

¹⁵Hicks, “Sabbath Controversy,” 89.

the narrative, as this is the first conflict with the religious leaders in Matthew, and centers around the main point of contention with the religious leaders (i.e. Sabbath observance) which ultimately leads to the Pharisees plotting “against him in order that they could destroy him” (12:14). As is typical of typology with its escalation between type and anti-type, the authority of king David is displayed as the core part of the argument and reasoning for Jesus ultimate authority over the Sabbath – and more broadly over the interpretation of the scriptures as a whole:

It was David, as David, who was permitted to do what was not lawful; and now Jesus places his own authority alongside that of David. Matthew, as the evangelist who most often portrays Jesus as “Son of David,” is the more likely to have appreciated the force of this christological argument. Such a logic seems required here by the following analogy (v. 5), which also speaks of those whose special position allowed them to do what others might not do. The concluding declaration that “something greater is here” (v. 6) may then be seen as implied here too: something greater than David is here. In 22:41–45 Jesus will argue that the Messiah is more than just a Son of David, and that claim is applied in a veiled form to establish his special authority here.¹⁶

Finally, it is important to note that Jesus’ preferred epithet Son of Man is used in the midst of a very clear use of Davidic typology. This hints towards another one of Matthew’s objectives which will be more fleshed out in Matt 22:41–46: that the evangelist equates the Son of David with the Son of Man in Dan 7:13–14 (see §5.5.5 below).

5.2: The Son of David’s Triumphal Entry

The triumphal entry is the first instance of Jesus entering Jerusalem in Matthew’s narrative. Although Jesus’ identity as Davidic messiah has been well established in the story already, the triumphal entry stands as the most overt act by Jesus himself to that effect: “the heir of David to be anointed rode the royal ass to coronation.”¹⁷ Significant again is the fact that the Son of

¹⁶France, *Matthew*, 459.

¹⁷James A. Sanders, “A New Testament Hermeneutic Fabric: Psalm 118 in the entrance narrative,” in *Early Jewish and Christian exegesis: studies in memory of William Hugh Brownlee* (eds. Craig A. Evans and William

David title as well as use of messianic Davidic tradition is infused throughout this pericope.

Matthew narrates the event of riding the colt into Jerusalem as orchestrated by Jesus. The riding of the donkey carried with it a royal motif in the Jewish world, and was unique in not portraying the king on a war horse (cf. *Pss. Sol.* 17:33).¹⁸

The Gospels have often been called the story of Jesus' final week with an extended introduction. While this may be a slight exaggeration, it does highlight the importance of the passion week in the narrative of Matthew. In terms of Matthew's interaction with Davidic tradition and typology, the entrance into Jerusalem signals a crescendo within the narrative portrayal of Jesus as the Son of David. The evangelist weaves this portrayal by drawing lines of connection with earlier material in the narrative, with important Davidic messianic tradition, with echoes of David's own life, and by portraying Jesus as accepting Psalm 118 as proper praise.

5.2.1: Davidic Typology and the Triumphal Entry

A typological echo exists between the triumphal entry and a story from David's life. In 2 Samuel 15 Absalom declares himself king and draws many in Israel to himself. David leaves Jerusalem with many of his household. In 2 Sam 15:30 David exits Jerusalem up the Mount of Olives.¹⁹ A little past the summit, David receives a pair of donkeys from Ziba the servant of Mephibosheth (2 Sam 16:1).²⁰ After the defeat of Absalom's rebellion, David returns to his

F. Stinespring; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 179. This symbolic act is also performed by Absalom (2 Sam 18:9), Mephibosheth (2 Sam 19:26), and Solomon (1 Kgs 1:33). For the messianic significance of Jesus riding from the Jordan Valley, see Joseph Blenkinsopp, "The Oracle of Judah and the Messianic Entry," *JBL* 80/1 (1961), 55-64.

¹⁸Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:116-17. Davies and Allison note some of the Rabbinic literature, which clearly expanded upon Zechariah 9:9; namely *b. Ber.* 56b and *b. Sanh.* 98a. Although of late origin, Davies and Allison note the intriguing discussion in *b. Sanh.* 98a, which states that the Messiah (Son of David) will come with the clouds of heaven (Dan 7:13) if Israel has merit, otherwise he will come riding on an ass (Zech 9:9). Davies and Allison also note other non-Jewish texts which attest to the ceremonial use of mules to enter a city (p. 3:117).

¹⁹The Mount of Olives, upon which Bethphage sits, is a significant geographic point in Matthew's Gospel, as is attested in this pericope as well as the story of betrayal (see §6.3.2 below).

²⁰See §5.3.3 below.

city (2 Sam 19–20).²¹ Regarding Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem, Davies and Allison state: “If David went from Jerusalem to the Mount of Olives amid cries of lamentation (2 Sam 15:30), Jesus, the Son of David, goes from the Mount of Olives to Jerusalem amid shouts of jubilation.”²² France regards the enacted allusion as unmistakable.²³ While France’s certainty is perhaps overstated, Matthew has already utilized Davidic typology elsewhere, and the triumphal entry is soaked in Davidic tradition (more on this below). It is reasonable, then, to assume that Jesus’ entrance into the city of Jerusalem utilizes a typological connection to David’s story found in 2 Sam 15(–20).

5.2.2: *Parallels with 20:29–34*

The triumphal entry contains a number of verbal links with Matt 20:29–34 that have been noted by Davies and Allison:²⁴

Matt 20:29–30	Matt 21:1–11
ἠκολούθησεν (20:29)	ἀκολουθοῦντες (21:9)
ὄχλος (20:29)	ὄχλος (21:8)
ἰδοῦ (20:30)	ἰδοῦ (21:5)
δύο (20:30)	δύο (21:1)
καθήμενοι (20:30)	ἐπεκάθισεν (21:7)
παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν (20:30)	ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ (21:8)
κύριε (20:30)	κύριος (21:3)
ἔκραξαν λέγοντες (20:30)	ἔκραξαν λέγοντες (21:9)
υἱὸς Δαυίδ (20:30)	υἱῷ Δαυίδ (21:9)
εὐθέως (20:30)	εὐθέως (21:2, 3)

²¹Douglas Jones has argued that it is this story which influences Zechariah 9’s prophecy of a triumphant king coming in peace. Douglas R. Jones, “Fresh Interpretation of Zechariah 9-11,” *VT* 12/3 (1962), 257;. Jones is followed by Smith, *Micah–Malachi*, 256. Jones is also followed by France, *Matthew*, 773-74; Ham, *Coming King*, 90.

²²Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:114.

²³France, *Matthew*, 774. Supported also by Ham, *Coming King*, 90.

²⁴Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:113.

Although these verbal links within Matthew have only been noted by Davies and Allison, they are significant. It has previously been established that the story of healing in Matt 20:29–31 was intended to be read in concert with the healing stories found in Matt 15:22 and Matt 9:27 (see §4.1). The most prominent thread through these portions of the narrative is the title Son of David. The list of connections above means that the evangelist is also drawing the triumphal entry into this fold of stories revolving around the Son of David's therapeutic activity. This has been unrecognized by commentators and under-appreciated even by Davies and Allison: Matthew has not finished defining what it means to be the Son of David. While focus on the therapeutic activities of Jesus have been researched extensively, scholars have not often recognized that the evangelist connects the triumphal entry with these healing stories.

The entrance into Jerusalem as well as his healing of the blind and the lame (§4.2.5) immediately upon entry marks the last time that "Son of David" is used by Matthew. These passages, all read in concert with one another, display for readers what it means to be the Son of David according to the Evangelist. As the therapeutic Son of David and expected king, Jesus' first act will be a symbolic act of cleansing that effects the entire nation. Rather than the militant warrior king which was expected by some, Jesus as the Son of David is the Shepherd pronounced in Ezekiel, and Zechariah's humble leader riding on the foal of a donkey (see below).

5.2.3: Structural and Thematic Parallels with Infancy Narrative

Matthew's fulfillment formulas have long been studied together due to the unique formulation of the citations. The concentration of these citations in the infancy narrative and their Davidic overtones have already been discussed (Chapter 3). The evangelist used his fulfillment formulas to highlight particular events in the narrative and imbue them with a heightened sense of relevance within the unfolding story of God's salvation plan: "It is Matthew himself who

added the formula citations to the Gospel tradition. In many instances, he was the one who first recognized the applicability of a particular text to a particular incident in Jesus' career. In such cases he seems to have chosen the OT text tradition that best illustrated this applicability."²⁵

Jacques Nieuviarts, followed by Maarten Menken, has highlighted the structural connection of the fulfillment formulae of Matt 1:18–25, 2:13–15, 2:19–23, and 21:1–7.²⁶ In particular, Matt 1:22 and Matt 21:4 are grammatically the closest of all the fulfillment formulae. The underlined portions indicate the only difference between the two verses.

Matt 1:22	Matt 21:4
τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῆ τὸ ρηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος	τοῦτο δὲ γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῆ τὸ ρηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος

Nieuviarts and Menken note that these two formulae are unique in that the fulfillment quotation have been placed between command and execution. Menken states: “that the OT quotation precedes the event that fulfils it, serves to show that execution of the command of Jesus and fulfillment of the word of the prophet coincide.”²⁷ This structural parallel draws these two sections together.

In addition, the connection between the infancy narrative and the triumphal entry is significant for its focus on the claim of kingship for Jesus. βασιλεύς occurs nineteen times in Matthew. The word applies to David once (1:6), God once (5:35), Herod four times (2:1, 3, 9; 14:9), the king of a parable seven times (18:23, 22:2, 7, 11, 13; 25:34, 40), and Jesus six times

²⁵Brown, *Birth Of The Messiah*, 104.

²⁶Jacques Nieuviarts, *L'entrée de Jésus à Jérusalem (Mt 21, 1-17): messianisme et accomplissement des écritures en Matthieu* (Paris: Cerf, 1999), 216-18; Maarten J. J. Menken, *Matthew's Bible: the Old Testament text of the evangelist* (BETL 173; Dudley, MA: University Press, 2004), 107.

²⁷*Ibid.*, 107.

(2:2, 21:5, 27:11, 29, 37, 42). Of the times it refers to Jesus, the final four instances occur in the context of the trial and crucifixion: Pilate asks Jesus if he is king of the Jews (27:11) and the final three are words of mockery (27:29, 37, 42). Only the magi's declaration ("Where is the one who has been born king of the Jews?" Matt 2:2) and the declaration of Zechariah applied to Jesus by the evangelist in 21:5 are positive declarations of Jesus' kingship.

Finally, an additional parallel draws these two sections together. The infancy narrative marks the first time that Jerusalem enters the story. Upon hearing the message of the magi, Herod and all Jerusalem are troubled by the news (Ἡρώδης ἐταράχθη καὶ πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα μετ' αὐτοῦ, 2:1). After this, the story takes place almost exclusively in the Galilee, with Jerusalem forming the backdrop in Matthew's narrative once again at the triumphal entry. At this point, the "entire city" again is troubled (καὶ εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἐσεΐσθη πᾶσα ἡ πόλις, 21:10).²⁸

In an early chapter, the Davidic allusions and overtones of the infancy narrative were discussed at length (Chapter 3). Jesus has been declared king in the infancy narrative, his deeds as Son of David were presented by the evangelist (Chapter 4), and now in the triumphal entry the type of king he is (i.e. the humble Davidic king of Zechariah) is presented. The humility of the king is then confirmed, albeit ironically, by Pilate and the crowds. This thematic parallel draws these two passages together, passages replete with Davidic tradition. The evangelist has at various points created inner-narrative connections which seek to draw passages together such that they compliment one another. In this case, the inner-narrative connections reinforces the contention that Jesus' Davidic kingship is a focus of these sections. While the infancy narrative established Jesus as the legitimate Davidic king over against Herod, the evangelist now uses the triumphal entry pericope to explain what it means to be the Davidic

²⁸Martinus J. J. Menken, "The Quotations from Zech 9,9 in Mt 21,5 and in Jn 12,15," in *John and the Synoptics* (Leuven: University Press, 1992), 572.

king: Jesus will not challenge Herod or the Romans, but will be the humble shepherd king of Zechariah.

5.2.4: *Foreshadowing the Jerusalem Narrative*

In addition to pointing backwards, the triumphal entry also points forward in the narrative:

“its structural position in the narratives [of the four Gospels] inevitably makes it the opening of the account of the Passion itself.”²⁹ The following table is adapted from Davies and Allison:³⁰

Parallel word or theme	Triumphal Entry	Subsequent narrative
Jerusalem	21:1, 10	23:37
Mount of Olives	21:1	24:3; 26:30
Sending disciples ahead to prepare	21:2–3	26:17–18
Fulfilment of Scripture	21:4	26:56; 27:3–10
Citations or Allusions to Zechariah 9–14	21:5	21:12–13; 26:15–16, 26–29, 30–35; 27:3–10, 51–53
Kingship of Jesus	21:5	27:11, 29, 37, 42
Obedience of Disciples	21:6	26:19
Role of the Crowds	21:8, 9, 11	21:26, 46; 22:33; 23:1; 26:47, 55; 27:15, 20, 24
Jesus as David’s Son	21:9, 15	22:42–44
“Blessed is he that comes in the name of the Lord”	21:9	23:39
πόλις	21:10	21:17, 18; 23:37; 26:18; 27:53; 28:11
Who is Jesus	21:10	26:63; 27:11
Jesus as prophet	21:11	21:46; 26:68
Nazareth	21:11	26:71
Galilee	21:11	26:32; 27:55; 28:7, 10, 16
Use of Davidic Psalms	21:9, 15 (<i>Tg. Ps.</i> 118), 16 (<i>Ps</i> 8)	27:46 (<i>Ps</i> 22)
Davidic Typology	21:1–11	26:1–56

²⁹Lindars, *Apologetic*, 111.

³⁰Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:128.

As the table shows, the main geography, numerous characters, Davidic traditions, and themes are all present in the triumphal entry in micro-form, and will be repeated and expanded upon in the subsequent chapters of Matthew's narrative. This reinforces what has been generally recognized by commentators already: the triumphal entry is a hinge point in the narrative and a "prelude to the passion."³¹

5.2.5: Summary and Relevance for Thesis

The triumphal entry stands as an important event in the narrative in that it is Jesus' first entry into Jerusalem and an outright messianic act.³² The passage is typologically parallel with David's exit and re-entrance into Jerusalem in 2 Sam 15–20. In addition, it contains parallels with two previous sections of the Gospel, both of which contain significant interaction with Davidic tradition and are replete with Davidic overtones. The connection with 20:29–34 invites the reader to view the triumphal entry in concert with the therapeutic activities of Jesus in his capacity as Son of David, and the parallels with the infancy narrative draw together the only two positive affirmations of Jesus as king in the narrative. These parallels make clear that the triumphal entry is part of Matthew's sustained interaction with Davidic tradition and forms part of his overarching portrayal of Jesus as the Son of David. Finally, Jesus' entry into Jerusalem contains many foreshadowing elements to the remainder of Matthew's narrative.

5.3: Zechariah's Humble King in Matthew

The Zech 9:9 quote in Matt 21:5 is both conflated and abbreviated (the first four words being from Isa 62:11).³³ Its presence in the pericope is found also in John (12:15) and it likely lay in

³¹Hagner, *Matthew*, 591.

³²Unlike Luke who has Jesus in Jerusalem as a boy in Luke 2:41–52.

³³For a full discussion of the text of Matthew's quote see Ham, *Coming King*, 20-47; Menken, "Quotations," 571–75. In regards to Matthew's use of Zechariah here, Nolland states: "Once again Matthew shows himself to

the background of Mark (11:7–9).³⁴ This deliberate drawing out of what is only an inference in Matthew’s source displays Matthew’s consistent emphasis on Jesus as the fulfillment of the scriptures and also continues his sustained and deliberate interaction with Davidic tradition, this time as it is found in Zechariah. With the use of Zech 9:9, Matthew carefully combines the idea of humility and exaltation together.³⁵

5.3.1: *Davidic Character of Zechariah*

The Davidic character of Zechariah’s messianic hope is almost universally recognized.³⁶ The early portions of Zechariah (chs. 1–8) focus their hope for restoration of the Davidic kingdom upon Zerubbabel.³⁷ In the later portion of Zechariah this hope is rekindled upon an unnamed messianic figure. Leading up to Zech 9:9–10, the oracle of 9:1–8 “envisages the same consummation as Amos 9:11–12, the restoration of the ‘Greater Israel’ of David’s time.”³⁸

Zech 9:9–10 makes use of Isaiah (9:6–7, 11:1–5), Micah (5:2–4), as well as the promise to Judah in Gen 49:10–11.³⁹ Jacob’s parting words to Judah in particular were used within the mix of Davidic messianic texts. Gen 49:10’s phrase *עד כי יבא שילה* (until Shiloh comes) was translated by *Tg. Onkelos*, *Tg. Ps-Jonathan*, *Tg. Neophyti*, and *Fragmen-*

be master of multiple text forms” (Nolland, *Matthew*, 835).

³⁴Rikk E. Watts, “Mark,” in *Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament* (eds. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2007), 206.

³⁵McAfee Moss, “Zechariah Tradition,” 96.

³⁶For the most up to date summary of the Davidic tradition in Zechariah, see Joseph Blenkinsopp, *David Remembered: Kingship and National Identity in Ancient Israel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 138–160. For a more critical view, see Pomykala, *Davidic Dynasty*, esp. 112–136. It should be noted that Pomykala does not address Zechariah 9 in any significant way, confining his discussion mostly to Zech 12. It should also be noted that Pomykala attempts throughout his work to deal with what he believes is the original intent of the author, without regard for reception and later use of the Davidic traditions. Matthew’s use provides ample confirmation that Zechariah 9 was read as a messianic text.

³⁷See Blenkinsopp, *David Remembered*, 71–102.

³⁸*Ibid.*, 145.

³⁹As noted in Smith, *Micah–Malachi*, 255. See also Wilhelmus Weren, “Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem: Mt 21,1–17 in the light of the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint,” in *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (ed. Christopher M. Tuckett; Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1997), 132–33.

tary Tg. as “until King Messiah comes.” 4Q252 (Commentary on Genesis) is even more explicit:

The sceptre shall [no]t depart from the tribe of Judah. While Israel has the dominion, there [will not] be cut off someone who sits on the throne of David. For «the staff» is the covenant of royalty, [and the thou]sands of Israel are «the standards». *Blank* Until the messiah of righteousness comes, the branch of David. For to him and to his descendants has been given the covenant of the kingship of his people for everlasting generations (v. 1–4)⁴⁰

The above evidence, as well as some scant later Jewish references, supports a messianic reading of Zech 9:9: “Matthew concurs with both the Jewish rabbis and the early Church Fathers in their understanding of Zech. 9.9 as messianic and with their primary application of the text to emphasize the lowliness of the Messiah’s coming.”⁴¹

5.3.2: *Messianic Meekness*

It is well recognized that Matthew has carefully redacted the quotation from Zechariah, and these redactions highlight the humble character of the messiah. The two most prominent changes in the quotation are the use of Isa 62:11 in place of the first words of Zech 9:9 and the omission of “he is righteous and victorious” from Zech 9:9 as well. The reason for the use of Isa 62:11 seems sufficiently clear from Matthew’s narrative: Jerusalem, as represented by its religious leaders, has not embraced Jesus – this becomes abundantly clear in the response of the religious leaders to the children in the temple (Matt 21:15–16). This makes the beginning words of Zech 9:9 incongruous: “Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion! Shout aloud, O daughter of Jerusalem!” Given that the hostility of the city’s religious leaders has already been established in the story, the triumphal entry serves as “an evangelistic challenge to unconverted Israel.”⁴² This narrative reality caused Matthew to change the first words to Isa

⁴⁰García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSS Study Edition*, 2:505.

⁴¹Ham, *Coming King*, 46. The Jewish discussion of Zech 9 is found in *b. Sanh.* 98a; 99a; *Gen. Rab.* 75:6.

⁴²Gundry, *Matthew*, 408.

62:11, “say to daughter Zion.” This change would have been viewed as acceptable by the evangelist and early Jewish readers due to the similarity of words and comparable message.⁴³ This change also allows “the crowds” to execute this embedded command (i.e. “say to the daughter of Zion [Jerusalem]”), as shown in Matt 21:9, 11.

The second point of redaction, the removal of “he is righteous and victorious,” works to enhance the character of humility for the coming king.⁴⁴ The use of the donkey represents the humble king and kingdom, rather than a war horse.⁴⁵ The earlier change of the Zechariah quote makes it clear that his entry is a call for recognition, not a traditional triumph. Because of the narrative circumstances, the phrase “he is righteous and victorious” was removed. The removal of this heightens the humble nature of the king, which has already been highlighted elsewhere (11:29; 12:18–21; 20:28).⁴⁶ France rightly comments:

In deliberately presenting himself before Jerusalem as its messianic king, Jesus has chosen an OT model which subverts any popular militaristic idea of kingship. The meek, peaceful donkey-rider of Zech 9:9 is not a potential leader of an anti-Roman insurrection. In 20:25–28 Jesus has spoken of a type of leadership which is completely opposed to the world’s notions of kingship and authority, and now he models it in the “meekness” of his royal procession to the city.⁴⁷

⁴³Menken, “Quotations,” 571. This usage would fall under one of the seven rules of Hillel (cf. *t. Sanh.* 7:11; *Abot R. Nat. A* 37.10). For a summary of Hillel’s rules see Craig A. Evans, *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: a guide to the background literature* (Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publishers, 2005), 219.

⁴⁴Stendahl notes that the meekness and donkey were the most important points: “It is to a Jewish tradition that Matthew wants to relate his argument for the prophecy as fulfilled by Jesus’s entry,” Krister Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament* (ASNU 20; 2d ed. Ramway, NJ: Sigler Press, 1991), 119.

⁴⁵Blenkinsopp, *David Remembered*, 147. Blenkinsopp notes that even in Zechariah the king is not coming as a victorious warrior. Contrast this with *Pss. Sol.* 17:23–7, 37; and *Rev* 19:11–16.

⁴⁶Clay Alan Ham, “Reading Zechariah and Matthew’s Olivet Discourse,” in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels* (ed. Thomas R. Hatina; LNTS 310; New York: T&T Clark, 2008), 87.

⁴⁷France, *Matthew*, 775.

5.3.3: *Matthew's Two Donkeys*

Unlike the other Gospels, Matthew alone records two donkeys in the story, and seems to even make the awkward assertion that Jesus rode both of them in 21:7 (ἐπεκάθισεν ἐπάνω αὐτῶν).⁴⁸ Several options have been proposed to explain this Matthean distinction:

1. Matthew is simply reflecting what would have been natural in this situation. Blomberg states, “It would be natural for the mother to come along if her colt had never previously been ridden.”⁴⁹
2. Matthew misunderstood the Hebrew parallelism in Zech 9:9.⁵⁰
3. In keeping with the doublets created elsewhere (Matt 8:28, Matt 20:30) Matthew reported two animals.⁵¹
4. Given that the LXX of Zech 9:9 is a little more ambiguous on the matter, Matthew simply sought to show a very literal fulfillment. The LXX phrase is ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον νέον, which can be read as two separate animals. France states: “he enjoyed the fact that the wording of Zechariah’s oracle can be read as including both mother and foal, and so mentioned them both.”⁵²

⁴⁸S. Vernon McCasland calls Matthew’s retelling a “circus spectacle.” See S. Vernon McCasland, “Matthew Twists the Scripture,” *JBL* 80/2 (1961), 144. David Instone-Brewer argues that Matthew sought simply to show that both animals were involved in the process, and the language suggests that Jesus sat on multiple garments. David Instone-Brewer, “The Two Asses of Zechariah 9:9 in Matthew 21,” *TynBul* 54/1 (2003), 87-98. cf. Mark C. Black, “The Rejected and Slain Messiah who is coming with his angels: the messianic exegesis of Zechariah 9-14 in the passion narratives” (PhD Diss., Emory University, 1990), 171. For a counter argument to Instone Brewer, see Wayne Coppins, “Sitting on Two Asses? Second thoughts on the two-animal interpretation of Matthew 21:7,” *TynBul* 63/2 (2012), 275-290.

⁴⁹Blomberg, *Matthew*, 312. This is echoed also by France, *Matthew*, 778; Evans, *Matthew*, 359; Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:594-95; Gundry, *Matthew*, 198, 408-410.

⁵⁰McCasland, “Twists,” 144-45.

⁵¹Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:28.

⁵²France, *Matthew*, 778. Keener also takes this position. See Keener, *Matthew*, 491. Keener states there, “his contemporaries regularly read more into a text than it required where it suited their purposes to do so.” For a NT example of this, see Gal 3:16.

5. Davies and Allison argue that Matthew is building upon his Moses typology. In LXX Exod 4:20 Moses travelled with asses (the MT is singular), and later rabbinic texts read Zech 9:9 in the light of Exod 4:19–20.⁵³
6. Martinus Menken has suggested that Matthew was encouraged to see two animals because of the story of Ziba paying homage to king David in 2 Sam 16.⁵⁴

It is important to note that the above suggestions are not all mutually exclusive; indeed several of the suggestions may actually make the most sense together. While McCasland argued that Matthew did not understand Hebrew parallelism, this is presumptuous as Matthew handles parallelism at 4:16 and 8:17.⁵⁵ For the suggestion that Matthew doubled intentionally, Nolland has noted that this does not fit the situation of two beasts of burden as they are not eyewitnesses as in the other situations.⁵⁶ In contrast to Gundry, who is convinced that this is an obvious case of “prophecy creating tradition,”⁵⁷ it seems to make more sense that the natural circumstances (newly ridden colts would walk alongside their mother) gave rise to this detail.⁵⁸ However, given that only Matthew amongst the Gospels made this change, it is reasonable to assume that there was another motivation.

Without excluding the likely possibility of the mother accompanying her colt, Martinus Menken’s suggestion carries the most argumentative weight out of the remaining suggestions. The following points support Menken’s proposition:

⁵³Davies and Allison cite *Eccles. Rab.* 1:28; cf. *Sam. Rab.* 14:9 (45b); *Pirke R. El.* 31.

⁵⁴Menken, “Quotations,” 574. Menken’s suggestion is adopted by Nieuviarts, *L’entrée de Jésus*, 54-55;

⁵⁵Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:120; Menken, *Matthew’s Bible*, 110; Nolland, *Matthew*, 837.

⁵⁶*Ibid.*, 837.

⁵⁷Gundry, *Use Of The Old Testament*, 197.

⁵⁸Hagner, *Matthew*, 594; Keener, *Matthew*, 491.

1. The tradition of riding a donkey was practiced by David (cf. 2 Sam 16:1–2) but abandoned by Absalom and Solomon.⁵⁹ This connects the humility of Jesus, who is heralded here as the Son of David (21:9), with the humility of king David.
2. 1 Kgs 1:32–40 contains a story from David’s life that also lays stress upon the king’s animals. In other entry stories “transportation is not so much as mentioned.”⁶⁰
3. An element of “Davidic geography” seems to be at work: Jesus proceeds from the Mount of Olives (21:1) and Ziba’s gift to David happens a little past the Mount of Olives outside of Jerusalem in 2 Sam 16:1 (cf. 2 Sam 15:30).⁶¹
4. Ziba’s gift includes donkeys for “the king’s household to ride on” (2 Sam 16:2). A short time later in the narrative, king David does return to Jerusalem (his own triumphal entry). Jones states, “we cannot forget that Ziba the servant of Mephibosheth had provided David with a ‘couple of asses’ ‘for the king’s household to ride on’ (2 Sam. xvi 1, 2) and it was no doubt on one of these that David made his triumphal entry.”⁶²
5. The word choice of LXX Zech 9:9 and Matt 21:5 for donkey is ὑποζύγιον. The plural of this lemma is also used in 2 Sam 16:2.⁶³

This connection has the most coherence with the OT text, and builds upon the clustering effect of typological echoes: Jesus is called Son of David, the Davidic text of Zechariah is used, and soon after a clear allusion to another Davidic story appears (21:14–15). This clustering of Davidic material alerts the reader to the predisposition of the evangelist at this point: he

⁵⁹Blenkinsopp, *David Remembered*, 147.

⁶⁰Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:112–13. Davies and Allison compare this with John 12:14, who only devotes one verse to the animals.

⁶¹This connection to a “Davidic geography” will also be discussed in §6.3.2.

⁶²Jones, “Zechariah 9–11,” 257.

⁶³Menken, “Quotations,” 574–75.

is interacting heavily with Davidic tradition and it is Davidic typology that readers should look to when seeking to understand the choice to highlight two animals.

5.3.4: Additional Uses of Zechariah 9–14 in Matthew

Much scholarship has gone into studying the use of Zechariah in Matthew.⁶⁴ For the purposes of this chapter, a small sampling will suffice to show that Matthew interacts significantly with the Davidic messianic tradition in Zechariah in order to accomplish his goal of presenting Jesus as the Son of David. In this case, the messianic shepherd tradition of Zechariah bolsters the Ezekiel 34 and 37 shepherd tradition which Matthew has used to present the therapeutic Son of David. It is also important to note that the chapters of Zechariah in question (chs.9–14) were read by Matthew as portraying a single messianic figure, and contained a sustained theme of shepherding:⁶⁵ 1) In Zech 9:16 Yahweh delivers “the flock of his people”. Zech 10:3 also states that God is angry with the ruling shepherds; 2) Zech 11 YHWH commands the prophet to serve as a shepherd to the flock because they are being exploited by the current shepherds; 3) the shepherd is impatient with the ungrateful sheep, and is paid the insulting sum of thirty silver shekels; 4) the prophet-as-shepherd acts throughout as the representative of the true shepherd, YHWH. As such YHWH rejects the price and throws the money into the temple; 5) and the flock receives a new harsh shepherd.⁶⁶

In a detailed monograph on the structure of Zechariah 9–14, P. Lamarche has argued that the four figures discussed in four sections of Zechariah (9:9–10, 11:4–17, 12:10–13:1,

⁶⁴The finest monograph on the issue is Ham, *Coming King*. See also the thesis by McAfee Moss, “Zechariah Tradition.”

⁶⁵On the issue of Zech 9–14’s role in Matthew, see Nolland, “King as Shepherd,” 133–46. Contrast Nolland’s view with Paul Foster’s more pessimistic view of Zecharian influence. Foster only finds one allusion to Zechariah, borrowed from Mark. See Paul Foster, “The Use of Zechariah in Matthew’s Gospel,” in *The Book of Zechariah and Its Influence* (ed. Christopher M. Tuckett; Burlington, VT.: Ashgate, 2003), 68–85.

⁶⁶F. F. Bruce, “The Book of Zechariah and the Passion Narrative,” *BJRL* 43/2 (1961), 345–46. C. H. Dodd also argued that Matthew read and understood Zechariah 9–14 as a whole. See C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: the sub-structure of New Testament theology* (London: Nisbet, 1952), 126.

13:7–9) form a chiastic structure.⁶⁷ Whether the unity came at the authorial level or editorial level, the unity clearly exists and Zechariah’s messianic figure throughout these chapters was read together as a united portrait by Matthew.⁶⁸ This is significant for the evangelist because the Davidic character of the messianic figure in other portions of Zechariah is even more pronounced than in Zech 9:9 (cf. Zech 12:10–14, 13:7–9). This is why Matthew continues his interaction with Zechariah in later portions of the narrative.

5.3.4.1: *Zech 11:12–13 in Matthew*

The typological connections in the betrayal narrative will be dealt with in Chapter 6. For the purposes of this chapter, it is important to recognize the citations of Zechariah. Both Matt 21:5 and Matt 27:3–10 draw upon Zech 11:12–13 and its price of thirty silver shekels for the work of the shepherd.⁶⁹ Both this quotation and the quotation of Zech 9:9 are without parallel in Mark. Matt 27:9–10 in particular contain another conflated formula quotation. In keeping with his preference to attribute his formula quotations only to the major prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah (2:17; 3:3; 4:14; 8:17; 12:17; 13:14; 15:7; 27:9), Matthew attributes the quotation to Jeremiah.⁷⁰ Zech 11:13’s detail of “the potter” provided the bridge for Matthew to conflate the

⁶⁷Paul Lamarche, *Zacharie IX-XIV; structure littéraire et messianisme* (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, J. Gabalda, 1961). With some reservation, Lamarche’s study is followed by others. See Eugene H. Merrill, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi: An Exegetical Commentary* (Biblical Studies Press, 2003), 271 n.1; France, *Old Testament*, 108–09. Anthony Petterson also argues for a literary unity of Zech 9–14. See Anthony R. Petterson, “The Shape of the Davidic Hope across the Book of the Twelve,” *JSOT* 35/2 (2010), 225–246.

⁶⁸Boda and Porter urge a little more caution, arguing specifically against the idea of Dodd’s *testimonia*. See Mark J. Boda and Stanley E. Porter, “Literature to the Third Degree: prophecy in Zechariah 9–14 and the passion of Christ,” in *Traduire la Bible Hébraïque: de la Septante à la Nouvelle Bible Segond* (ed. Robert David; Montréal: Médiaspaul, 2005), 251–52. I agree with Boda and Porter’s assessment that “One certainly cannot show that the pattern of events in Zechariah was necessarily set or that it had a controlling influence upon the creation of the Passion accounts.” However, this does not predicate against wide-spread usage and influence of Zechariah. This also stands in contrast with the rigid assessment of Foster, “Use of Zechariah,” 65–85. Foster argues that only 1 of the 11 allusions to Zechariah cited by the NA27 are legitimate allusions to Zechariah. Clay Ham offers an appropriate critique of Foster, noting in particular that he treats the allusions prior to the citations of Zechariah. See Ham, “Reading Zechariah,” 89–90.

⁶⁹As Bruce has noted, the association of this shepherd is disputed by commentators, and is even unclear in the *Zadokite Work*. But regardless of whether this shepherd is seen as good or bad, there is no doubt that its NT use is being applied to Jesus as the crucified Messiah. See Bruce, “Zechariah,” 342–43; cf. McAfee Moss, “Zechariah Tradition,” 202–217.

⁷⁰The exception to this, though it is not a formula quotation, is the reference to Daniel in Matt 24:15. The

quote with Jeremiah, as Jeremiah contains a number of similar motifs in Jer 18, 19, and 32: “Echoes of all these Jeremiah passages, especially Jer 19:1–13, would no doubt be heard by readers well-versed in the OT, so that they would recognize Matthew’s adapted version of Zech 11:13 not as a quotation of that text alone but as a mosaic of familiar and related prophetic motifs.”⁷¹

5.3.4.2: Allusions to Zechariah in the Olivet Discourse

Several scholars have noted that Matt 24:30’s reference to the coming of the Son of Man borrows language from Zech 12:12.⁷² The immediate reference is most obviously to the Son of Man in Daniel, but the verse shares several words in common with Zech 12:10–14.

quotations from the minor prophets are left anonymous (2:5, 15; 11:10; 21:4; 26:31). Stendahl regards Matthew’s attribution to Jeremiah as a “slip or rather a confusion of memory.” See Stendahl, *School of St. Matthew*, 123.

⁷¹France, *Matthew*, 1043. Regarding Jer 19, Blomberg states: “It may be that Jer. 19 offers a better cluster of images that Matthew may be citing, especially with its references to “the blood of the innocents” (27:4), the “potter” (27:1, 11), the renaming of a place in the Valley of Hinnom (27:6 [the traditional site of the Potter’s Field]), violence (27:11), and the judgment and burial of the Jewish leaders by God (27:11).” Craig L. Blomberg, “Matthew,” in *Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament* (eds. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2007), 95.

⁷²France notes this allusion as certain, France, *Old Testament*, 90, 106-07.

LXX Zech 12:10–14	Matt 24:30
<p>καὶ ἐκχεῶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Δαυιδ καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας Ἱερουσαλημ πνεῦμα χάριτος καὶ οἰκτιρμοῦ, καὶ ἐπιβλέφονται πρὸς με ἄνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο καὶ <u>κόψονται</u> ἐπ' αὐτὸν κοπετὸν ὡς ἐπ' ἀγαπητὸν καὶ ὀδυνηθήσονται ὀδύνην ὡς ἐπὶ πρωτοτόκῳ. ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ μεγαλυθήσεται ὁ κοπετὸς ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ ὡς κοπετὸς ῥοῶνος ἐν πεδίῳ ἐκκοπτομένου, καὶ <u>κόψεται</u> ἡ γῆ κατὰ φυλὰς φυλάς, φυλὴ καθ' ἑαυτὴν καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες αὐτῶν καθ' ἑαυτάς, φυλὴ οἴκου Δαυιδ καθ' ἑαυτὴν καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες αὐτῶν καθ' ἑαυτάς, φυλὴ οἴκου Ναθαν καθ' ἑαυτὴν καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες αὐτῶν καθ' ἑαυτάς, φυλὴ οἴκου Λευι καθ' ἑαυτὴν καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες αὐτῶν καθ' ἑαυτάς, φυλὴ τοῦ Συμεων καθ' ἑαυτὴν καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες αὐτῶν καθ' ἑαυτάς, <u>πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ</u> αἱ ὑπολειμμέναι φυλὴ καθ' ἑαυτὴν καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες αὐτῶν καθ' ἑαυτάς</p>	<p>καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ τότε <u>κόψονται</u> πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς·</p>

Clay Ham also notes the similarity of “they will see” with Zech 12:10, although the Greek verbs are different. He concludes, “the density of language from Zech. 12.10–14 strongly supports the presence of the allusion in Mt. 24.30.”⁷³ Finally, although there is no messianic connection, this section of Zechariah makes explicit reference to the house of David and its restoration (vv. 12:10, 12; 13:1).

Some scholars have also noted a possible echo to Zech 14:4 in Matt 24:3 (cf. 26:30) as well as 21:1, 21.⁷⁴ LXX Zech 14:4 contains the precise phrase used in the Gospels to refer to the location, τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἔλαιων. Given that it is simply a geographic location, it is hard to

⁷³Ham, “Reading Zechariah,” 91; Nolland, “King as Shepherd,” 140.

⁷⁴Blomberg, “Matthew,” 63; N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Christian Origins and the Question of God 2; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 344; Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:593; Black, “The Rejected and Slain Messiah who is coming with his angels: the messianic exegesis of Zechariah 9-14 in the passion narratives,” 222-232.

assert for certain a quotation or allusion, even with four words in the exact order. But the messianic connotations of Zechariah, as well as the sustained interaction with Zechariah, make it more than likely that Zechariah was in mind.⁷⁵

5.3.4.3: *Zech 13:7 in Matthew*

A clear use of Zechariah's messianic shepherd tradition comes in Matt 26:31 in another direct quotation, this time referencing the paradoxical Zech 13:7: "O sword, awake against my shepherd, against the man who is my associate," declares Yahweh of hosts. "Strike the shepherd, so that the sheep may be scattered."⁷⁶ It is Yahweh himself who commands the sword to strike, yet the victim is "my shepherd...my associate."⁷⁷ Building upon the assumption that Zech 9–14 was read as a literary unit, it is worth noting that this same Davidic figure is the one who is pierced in Zech 12:10. Petterson states that these verses "refer to the coming Davidic king, who is killed in the coming battle by Yahweh's intent. The result is a restored covenant relationship between Yahweh and his people (13.9; cf. 11.10). Zechariah 14 pictures the fruit of the coming king."⁷⁸

As in Ezekiel 34, the people of Israel are the sheep, and the Davidic messiah is their God-appointed shepherd. It has been previously established that the evangelist is conscious of the wider context of the passages which he cites (§3.2, §3.3, §3.4, §3.5). Accordingly, it is no surprise that the context of Zech 13:7 seems to have made an impression elsewhere, and this direct reference to Zechariah makes the allusions to Zechariah noted elsewhere that much

⁷⁵The Mount of Olives also occurs in 2 Sam 15:30 and its part of the vision of Ezek 11:23. Ham also notes several other possible connections in the Olivet Discourse: Matt 24:30–31's use of Zech 14:5, and the motif of "that day" through the Olivet discourse (Matt 24:36 in particular) and Zech 14. For discussion on these connections, see Ham, "Reading Zechariah," 87–88, 94–97. Ham notes the emphasis on the Mount of Olives in Matt 24:3 and Zech 14:1–5, Matt 24:30–31's use of Zech 14:5, and the motif of "that day" through the Olivet discourse (Matt 24:36 in particular) and Zech 14. Nolland has also argued that the upheaval of the Mount of Olives in Zech 14:4 likely lays behind Matt 21:21. See Nolland, "King as Shepherd," 140.

⁷⁶For a discussion of the textual form quoted, see Stendahl, *School of St. Matthew*, 80–83; Gundry, *Use Of The Old Testament*, 25–28.

⁷⁷The shepherd is explicitly called king (מלך) in the Targum paraphrase of Zech 13:7.

⁷⁸Petterson, "Shape of the Davidic Hope," 244.

more likely.⁷⁹ France notes that immediately after the cited phrase, the sheep are referred to as “little ones.”⁸⁰ The believing community is referred to as little ones by Jesus (18:6, 10; cf. 10:42).⁸¹ Ham also notes: “If Mt. 26.31 presupposes the context of Zech. 13.7–9, in which a remnant of the people is purified and in this manner becomes the renewed people of Yahweh, it may also intimate the promise of the disciples’ restoration to Jesus, anticipated in Mt. 26.32: ‘But after I am raised up, I will go ahead of you to Galilee’.”⁸²

5.3.5: Summary and Relevance for Thesis

The use of Zechariah, particularly the quotation of Zechariah at the triumphal entry, is part of the evangelist’s sustained interaction with Davidic tradition and typology in the Gospel. Zechariah’s anonymous messianic figure in chs. 9–14 were read as a single portrait of a Davidic king. Matthew shows evidence of interaction with this entire section of Zechariah. The presence of additional interaction with Zechariah shows that Matthew is interested in the entire messianic portrait of Zechariah and displays the coherence of motifs. While modern scholars rightly discuss the formation of Zechariah (deutero-Zechariah and trito-Zechariah), Matthew gives evidence that all of Zechariah was read as a unified piece, and the messianic figure which appears in the various oracles of Zechariah were read as one figure. The recognition of Matthew’s use of Zechariah not only shows his interest in the wider context of his quotations, but also gives evidence of the importance of Zechariah’s Davidic tradition. It is this messianic portrait, one of a humble shepherd-king, which Matthew continues to use in his portrait of the Son of David.⁸³

⁷⁹contra Foster, “Use of Zechariah,” 65–85.

⁸⁰France, *Matthew*, 998-99.

⁸¹This motif carries through to 11:25 and 25:40, 45 as well.

⁸²Ham, “Reading Zechariah,” 87.

⁸³Evans, “Messianic Hope,” 382. France concurs with this assessment stating: “the correspondence of this figure with the actual mission of Jesus is striking, and it is clear that he expected it to be so. In alluding to these passages of Zechariah he made clear both to his disciples and to the crowds the sort of messianic work he envisaged himself as accomplishing. It was not to be one of triumphant and majestic sovereignty, bringing political

5.4: The Reception of the Son of David in Jerusalem

Jesus' entrance into Jerusalem and reception by the people represents the culminative point in the entry narrative. The reception once in the holy city continues the Davidic motif of the triumphal entry. This section is also the last two times that Jesus is addressed as Son of David.⁸⁴ As such, it represents a point of cohesion and brings into focus the use of the title thus far in the narrative.

5.4.1: The Jerusalem Crowd's Reaction to the Son of David

With an editorial change to Mark, Matthew enhances the size of the crowd. Mark states the crowd was πολλοί (Mark 11:8), whereas Matthew says πλεῖστος ὄχλος (Matt 21:8), utilizing the superlative form of the word. Matthew also makes certain to add ὄχλος as well, since the ὄχλος is a significant character in the narrative (see §5.4.1.1 below). Nolland notes that at no other time does Matthew do this with the size of the crowds, which perhaps speaks to the significance of the crowd's reactions.⁸⁵

The symbolic gesture of the crowds laying their cloaks down may echo the story found in 2 Kgs 9:12–13 of Jehu and the throwing down of garments (2 Kgs 9:13, Josephus, *Ant.* 9.111). Davies and Allison note that this a symbolic act of positioning themselves under the authority of the other.⁸⁶ While it seems clear that this is a messianic act in the other Synoptics, Matthew has heightened the act to a “popular triumph” and declaration of Jesus' status as Son of David, something Matthew adds to his account. Both Keener and Evans indicate that an allusion to the Maccabean triumphs may be at work.⁸⁷ The irony will soon not be lost on

deliverance for the Jews, but one of loneliness, suffering and death. If he was their king, it was in the character of the lowly and rejected Shepherd–King.” (France, *Old Testament*, 109).

⁸⁴The title Son of David will occur once more in a conversation with the Pharisees in Matt 22:42–46.

⁸⁵Nolland, *Matthew*, 838.

⁸⁶Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:123.

the reader, as the crowd will turn against Jesus. But for this moment, “The greeting to the Son of David would carry the wish/prayer that his purposes may prosper.”⁸⁸

5.4.1.1: *The Character of the Crowds*

It is important at this point to assess briefly the importance of the crowds (ὄχλος) in Matthew’s narrative. The most comprehensive look at the function of the crowds to date has been J. R. C. Cousland’s monograph *The Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew*.⁸⁹ Cousland, as well as Paul Minear, has convincingly argued that the crowds in Matthew represent a corporate character with a traceable progression.⁹⁰ Whereas Mark and Luke use varied terminology to represent the people (λαός, ὄχλος, πλῆθος, and πολλοί), Matthew confines his use almost entirely to ὄχλος, using λαός only three times and using πολλοί in combination with ὄχλος six times (4:25, 8:1, 13:2, 15:30, 19:2).⁹¹ To this list it is possible to add 12:15, but the textual evidence is debated.⁹² It is the ὄχλος who is the primary recipient of Jesus’ miracles (12:15, 15:30), and Jesus sends his disciples to heal the ὄχλος (9:36).⁹³

Cousland argues that the geographical dimensions of ὄχλος in Matthew suggest that it is a Jewish group hailing from an idealized Davidic Israel. All instances of geographic location of the crowds are within this ideal Eretz Israel. The only non-Jewish reference to crowds is the crowds in the Decapolis at 4:25. Yet, even this section was part of the Davidic kingdom:

⁸⁷Keener, *Matthew*, 494; Evans, *Matthew*, 357-58.

⁸⁸Nolland, *Matthew*, 839. This greeting may also reflect the understanding that all of Jerusalem was considered the city of David (Josephus, *Ant.* 7:65).

⁸⁹J. R. C. Cousland, *The Crowds In The Gospel Of Matthew* (NovTSup 102; Boston: Brill, 2002).

⁹⁰Paul S. Minear, “Disciples and the Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew,” *ATRSup* 3 (1974), 29-30. This position is contrary to Kingsbury who sees the ὄχλος as a “flat” character. See Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Matthew As Story* (rev. and enl. ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 24-25.

⁹¹Cousland argues that the ὄχλος should be understood as a component of the more general λαός. See Cousland, *The Crowds*, 84-86.

⁹²All other occurrences of πολλοί are used in other contexts. Of the above list, 12:15 can possibly be added, as later manuscripts have ὄχλοι πολλοί, but Metzger notes that it is more likely that ὄχλοι was added by later scribes to conform to the familiar phrasing. Assuming Metzger is correct, this is the only time in the Gospel when the crowds are referred to as simply πολλοί. See Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 26. Cousland argues for homoeoteleuton, given the prevalence of ὄχλοι πολλοί elsewhere. See Cousland, *The Crowds*, 31 n.2.

⁹³Minear, “Disciples,” 30-31.

“the Israel of Jesus, the Son of David is to some extent contiguous with the Israel of David, his forebear. By the same token, the regions that produce crowds of followers for Jesus represent an idealized Israel similar in conception to ‘all the tribes of Israel,’ who flock to David at 2 Sam 5:1.”⁹⁴ The predominantly Jewish flavour of this group is important as well, as Matthew identifies the ὄχλος as the “sheep without a shepherd” in 9:36. This metaphor, and indeed the entire grounds for presenting Jesus as a therapeutic Son of David, is Ezekiel 34 – Jesus is the shepherd and the ὄχλος are the sheep.⁹⁵ Cousland argues that Jesus’ actions towards the sheep and their positive reaction for a time is an instance of fulfilled prophecy in Matthew: “the following of the crowds serves as another instance where Matthew demonstrates that Jesus is the Davidic Messiah.”⁹⁶

5.4.1.2: *The Confession of the Crowds*

It was important to recognize the role of the ὄχλος so far in the narrative, as it is precisely the ὄχλος who hail Jesus as Son of David at the triumphal entry. Not only does the ὄχλος represent idealized Israel, but the evangelist shows a progression in their understanding of Jesus in the narrative. Cousland charts their understanding from amazement (9:33), interest in the miracles of Jesus (12:23), a positive declaration (21:9), to an immediately vaguer recognition of Jesus as prophet (21:11, 46), and then to complicity with Jesus’ trial and execution where the crowd is now fully aligned with the religious leaders: καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς πᾶς ὁ λαὸς εἶπεν, Τὸ αἶμα αὐτοῦ ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ἡμῶν (27:25; cf. 26:47, 55; 27:20, 24).⁹⁷ The understanding and turning of the crowds is “paralleled by the behaviour of Jesus’ own disciples.”⁹⁸

This move from recognition of Jesus as the messianic Son of David to that of prophet lays the

⁹⁴Cousland, *The Crowds*, 66.

⁹⁵See Chapter 4.

⁹⁶*Ibid.*, 170.

⁹⁷Warren Carter also charts this understanding in the same manner as Cousland. See Warren Carter, “The Crowds in Matthew’s Gospel,” *CBQ* 55/1 (1993), 58-64.

⁹⁸Cousland, *The Crowds*, 239. Cousland specifically points out the defection of Judas and betrayal by Judas.

foundation for Jesus to be rejected just like the prophets of old (cf. Matt 5:11). This progression and interest in the crowd is conscious on the part of the evangelist, as it stems from his own sources (Matt 21:11). Matthew has also added to Mark the blood libel.⁹⁹

The triumphal entry thus stands as both the apex of the crowds' understanding and a hinge point in the crowds' understanding, as the crowds' recognition moves to Jesus as prophet, and on to their eventual realignment with their old shepherds. Regarding this immediate change of understanding, Cousland states:

On the one hand, "Son of David" in the crowds' mouths encapsulates much of the interaction between the crowds and Jesus prior to the Triumphal Entry. On the other hand, the crowds' use of "prophet" anticipates the Passion narrative and suggests that the very moment of the crowds' clearest perception of Jesus' identity is immediately followed by a movement away from it.¹⁰⁰

I concur with the observations of Minear and Cousland. Cousland's analysis shows that the triumphal entry represents a very important moment in the narrative, as the crowd comes to understand who Jesus is: the Son of David. Confirmation that this is precisely the recognition that is correct is Jesus' assessment of the children's cry "Hosanna to the Son of David" only a few verses later (see §5.4.3.1 below).¹⁰¹

5.4.2: Psalm 118 and David

As Jesus enters on the colt, the royal procession of his followers and the ὄχλος cry out:

"Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord! Hosanna in the highest" (Matt 21:9).¹⁰² Part of Psalm 118:25–26 is clearly quoted in the cries of the

⁹⁹Cousland further explores this change of the crowds attitude in *Ibid.*, 227-239.

¹⁰⁰*Ibid.*, 225. Contrast this with Kingsbury, who argues, curiously, that the crowds are not recognizing Jesus as Son of David. See Jack Dean Kingsbury, "The Title "Son of David" in Matthew's Gospel," *JBL* 95/4 (1976), 601.

¹⁰¹Cousland, *The Crowds*, 194. This assessment stands in contrast to Carter who states: "Crowds in Jerusalem betray their lack of understanding when they greet Jesus as the Son of David and as a prophet," Carter, "Crowds," 63.

¹⁰²Hagner notes how οἱ προάγοντες αὐτὸν καὶ οἱ ἀκολοθοῦντες indicates the picture of a royal procession, as people are both in front and behind Jesus, laying their cloaks, and waiving the palm branches. See Hagner, *Matthew*, 595.

crowd—this shout is an “ascription of praise.”¹⁰³ More specifically, it was the officiating priests in Psalm 118 who were to welcome pilgrims into the gates.¹⁰⁴ Matthew has done two subtle things in this cry: he has made the crowds the welcomers, and he has used the same praise formula for both God and the Son of David.¹⁰⁵ Matthew’s editing of Mark also reveals his focus on hailing Jesus as the Son of David: Mark 11:10 says “Blessed is the coming kingdom of our father David.” Matthew’s change brings the focus entirely onto Jesus and the recognition of him as the Son of David: “Here the one ‘who comes in the name of the Lord’ is not simply a pilgrim approaching the temple during a festival ... but none other than that promised descendant of David who would bring the promised blessing of that kingdom.”¹⁰⁶

The Davidic character of the crowds’ cry is emphasized by the Targum version of Psalm 118. Evans has highlighted how the psalm has been historicized. The Aramaic version says:

¹⁹ Open to me the entrances of the city of righteousness; I will enter them, I will praise Yah.

²⁰ This is the entrance of the sanctuary of the LORD; the righteous will enter by it.

²¹ I will give thanks in your presence, for you have received my prayer, and become for me a redeemer.

²² The child the builders abandoned was among the sons of Jesse; and he was worthy to be appointed king and ruler.

²³ “This has come from the presence of the LORD,” *said the builders*; “it is wonderful before us,” *said the sons of Jesse*.

²⁴ “This day the LORD has made,” *said the builders*; “let us rejoice and be glad in it,” *said the sons of Jesse*.

²⁵ “If it please you, O LORD, redeem us now,” *said the builders*; “if it please you, O LORD, prosper us now,” *said Jesse and his wife*.

¹⁰³France, *Matthew*, 780. The same section of Ps 118 is quoted by Jesus in Matt 23:39.

¹⁰⁴Weren, “Jesus’ entry,” 135; Craig A. Evans, “The Aramaic Psalter and the New Testament: Praising the Lord in History and Prophecy,” in *From Prophecy to Testament: The Function of the Old Testament in the New* (ed. Craig A. Evans; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004), 82–85.

¹⁰⁵This will happen again only a few verses later. See §5.4.3.1 below.

¹⁰⁶Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:596.

²⁶ “Blessed is he who comes in the name of the word of the LORD,” *said the builders*; “they will bless you from the sanctuary of the LORD,” *said David*.

²⁷ “God, the LORD, has given us light,” *said the tribes of the house of Judah*; “bind the lamb for a festal sacrifice with chains until you sacrifice him, and sprinkle his blood on the horns of the altar,” *said Samuel the prophet*.

²⁸ “You are my God, and I will give thanks in your presence; my God, I will praise you,” *said David*.

²⁹ *Samuel answered and said*, “Sing praise, assembly of Israel, give thanks in the presence of the LORD, for he is good, for his goodness is everlasting.” (*Tg. Ps. 118:19–28*)

The Aramaic paraphrase makes explicit the antiphonal structure of the psalm, and places the phrases on the lips of Samuel, David, the sons of Jesse, and Jesse and his wife (italics above). The setting seems to be the selection of David as king.¹⁰⁷ This historicized reading is present also in *b. Pesah* 119A. While scholars must be careful to not assume that the Aramaic paraphrase (much less Talmudic tradition) was extant during the time of the NT’s writing, this impressive coherence between Psalm 118 and its use in the triumphal entry should not be overlooked.

5.4.3: Jerusalem’s Response to the Son of David

While the traditional unit labeled the triumphal entry ends at verse 11, the evangelist wants his readers to see Matt 21:1–17 as a textual unit.¹⁰⁸ Whereas in Mark the triumphal entry and the temple cleansing are separated by days (Mark 11:11–12), Matthew immediately follows the triumphal entry with the cleansing of the temple and ends Jesus’ first day in Jerusalem in Matt 21:17.¹⁰⁹ As has been claimed above, immediately upon entrance into Jerusalem, the change in the crowd’s understanding begins, with their designation of Jesus as prophet (Matt 21:11, 46). Conspicuous by its absence is any word from the religious leadership of Jerusalem upon entrance, but immediately following the cleansing, Matthew will show that their under-

¹⁰⁷Evans, “Aramaic Psalter,” 83.

¹⁰⁸Luz, *Matthew*, 3:4.

¹⁰⁹Weren, “Jesus’ entry,” 117–18.

standing has not changed (21:15).¹¹⁰ Upon entering Jerusalem, the evangelist draws attention to the enormity of Jesus' entrance into the holy city: "Jerusalem had been 'troubled' at Jesus' birth (2:3), a strong term (reused in 14:26), but Matthew employs even stronger language here (21:10): Jerusalem was caused great anxiety (σείω) (27:51; 8:24; 24:7; 28:2)."¹¹¹

Following the temple cleansing, readers are confronted immediately with 1) an act of Jesus, 2) two different reactions to Jesus, and 3) Jesus' assessment of the reactions. The act of healing the blind and the lame has been previously discussed (see §4.2.5), but it is important to remember again that this is very likely an allusion to David at 2 Sam 5:8. The cries of the children and Jesus' assessment are discussed below.

5.4.3.1: *The Cry of the Children*

The cries of the children "Hosanna to the Son of David," follows immediately after Jesus' healing of the blind and the lame—which is the only instance of Jesus healing in Jerusalem and is built upon a Davidic typology. The sequence of healing followed by the acclaim "Son of David" aligns this episode with the earlier healing stories of Matthew, particularly 20:29–34.¹¹² As the last usage of the title "Son of David," it is significant that it is used once again in the context of healing.¹¹³ The echoing of "Hosanna to the Son of David," should perhaps be viewed as a Matthean doublet. Evans notes that the repetition of Son of David not only strengthens Jesus' Davidic identity, but also sheds light on the cleansing of the temple: "Jesus is portrayed as the royal reformer of Israel's faith and as such stands in the tradition of Israel's righteous kings"¹¹⁴ David, Solomon, Hezekiah, and Josiah. The title possibly forms an *inclusio* around the temple cleansing, reinforcing the assertion that Jesus' temple cleansing is

¹¹⁰Nolland, *Matthew*, 840.

¹¹¹Keener, *Matthew*, 495.

¹¹²Nolland, *Matthew*, 847 n.13.

¹¹³The title will of course be alluded to again in 22:41–46, but this is the final occurrence of υἱός Δαβίδ.

¹¹⁴Evans, *Matthew*, 362.

done in his capacity as the messianic Son of David. The act of cleansing as the Son of David has already been emphasized in Jesus' acts of healing, and now his acts of healing comes to the Temple establishment. Important also is the sense of irony: the Jewish leaders cannot perceive the truth of children's words.¹¹⁵

The acclamation doublet provides further evidence that Matt 21:1–17 composes a unit. Because of this connection and exact verbal echo, it can safely be assumed that the assessment of the children's praise by both the religious leaders and Jesus can and should be applied to the acclamation of the crowds at Jesus' entry as well. Seeing Jesus' healing of the blind and the lame, and hearing the shouts of the children, the chief priests and scribes are indignant and expect Jesus to be so as well. This reaction clearly separates the religious leadership from the crowds of 21:9 as well as the spiritually insightful children. Jesus has already prepared his followers for the religious leaders' hostility in 20:18: their indignation is the beginning of the fulfillment of Jesus' Passion prediction.

The evangelist has previously held up children as models of God-inspired faithfulness in 11:25: "unknowingly, the children utter the truth of God."¹¹⁶ It is no surprise, then, that Jesus not only affirms their cry, but heightens the significance of their words considerably. Jesus quotes Psalm 8 in order to explain to the religious leaders what they are hearing.¹¹⁷ France states, "the most striking feature of this quotation... is the bold assumption by Jesus that what the psalm says about the praise of God (in distinction from mere human beings, Ps 8:4) is applicable to the children's praise of him."¹¹⁸ Accordingly, Jesus' use of Psalm 8 is more than

¹¹⁵Daniel B. Howell, *Matthew's Inclusive Story: A Study In The Narrative Rhetoric Of The First Gospel* (University of Oxford, 1990), 150.

¹¹⁶Hagner, *Matthew*, 602.

¹¹⁷For the connections in the narrative with Ps 8, see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:142.

¹¹⁸France, *Matthew*, 789; echoed also in Blomberg, *Matthew*, 316. France says elsewhere "unless he is here setting himself in the place of Yahweh, the argument is a *non sequitur*" France, *Old Testament*, 152.

mere affirmation: The cries of the children—and the crowds— shows that the acclamation “Son of David” is considered to be perfect praise.

Yet in the face of this transparent demonstration of divine mercy, the temple authorities belligerently confront Jesus in an effort to silence the shouts of the children heralding the Son of David (21:15–17). By way of reply, Jesus acknowledges the children’s cries to be the “perfect praise” placed by God in the mouths of babes in accordance with Ps 8:2. There is certainly no attempt upon Matthew’s part to distance Jesus from the Davidic hope. Nor does he in any way emphasize a discrepancy between Jesus and the Jews regarding the Davidic agenda.¹¹⁹

As stated previously, these affirmations outside the walls of Jerusalem and immediately inside the temple represent the apex of understanding and the recognition to which the evangelist has been working towards ever since the opening incipit. Jesus’ interpretation of the children’s praise also shows the adequacy of the Christological title Son of David for Jesus the messiah.

5.4.4: Summary and Relevance for Thesis

The reaction of the crowds differ from one side of Jerusalem’s wall to the other. The crowds cry to the Son of David represents the apex of their understanding, but is swiftly followed by a change of understanding once in Jerusalem to that of a prophet in order to extend the prophet-martyr motif.¹²⁰ The assessment of Jesus concerning the children’s praise in the temple, and by extension the crowd’s praise outside the city, is entirely positive. Jesus accepts this designation, and heightens its significance to equate the recognition of Jesus as Son of David with the praise of Yahweh himself—to praise the Son of David is to praise Yahweh. This recognition seems to be the culmination point of the narrative which has sought to present Jesus as the Son of David utilizing Davidic tradition and typology.

¹¹⁹Verseput, “Davidic Messiah,” 114. This stands in contrast to Carter’s assessment that the title Son of David is inadequate, as his view on the title was strictly in terms of the militaristic understanding. See Carter, “Crowds,” 63.

¹²⁰Cousland, *The Crowds*, 225.

5.5: The Son of David as David's Lord

The discussion between Jesus and the Pharisees in Matt 22:41–46 completes a series of questions and testing by the religious leaders, but this time it is Jesus who poses the question. The final verse of this passage summarizes all of the interactions: “And no one was able to answer him a word, nor did anyone dare from that day on to ask him any more” (22:46). This interaction is also unique in that it does not have to do solely with a matter of interpretation, but addresses Jesus’ own self-understanding.¹²¹

Matthew’s retelling of this story is in a more formal setting, with a more defined progression:¹²²

- Setting, 22:41
- Question, 22:42a
- Answer, 22:42b
- Evaluation of answer, 22:43–45
- Conclusion, 22:46

Whereas Mark’s version has Jesus simply teaching this with no interaction, Matthew has made the discussion about Psalm 110 a dividing line in scriptural understanding with his opponents.¹²³

¹²¹Hagner, *Matthew*, 649.

¹²²Terence Y. Mullins, “Jesus, the ‘Son of David’,” *AUSS* 29/2 (1991), 125.

¹²³For Matthew’s editing of Mark 12:35–37 see Davies and Allison. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:251-52.

5.5.1: *David's Voice in the Psalms*

The use of the psalms becomes increasingly significant in the later portions of the Gospel, and contains significant connections with David and traditions about David. It is important, then, to understand that the psalms were read as the voice of David.

5.5.1.1: *Psalm Superscriptions*

Psalms scholars generally agree that the superscriptions affixed to the psalms post-date the original composition of the psalms.¹²⁴ The MT contains many superscriptions, with seventy-four of them containing references to David.¹²⁵ The examples of the Psalms at Qumran also attest to the superscriptions, which indicates that these headings have provided contextual information on the Psalms from very early on.

Additionally, both Qumran and the LXX attest to additional superscriptions not found in the MT, along with additional information added to superscriptions already in the MT. The LXX contains sixteen superscriptions not found in the MT, with three of these superscriptions also being attested at Qumran, showing that the additional superscriptions cannot simply be attributed to the LXX translator(s).¹²⁶ All but four of these LXX superscriptions mention David in some fashion.¹²⁷ Six superscriptions that mention David in the MT are expanded upon in the LXX as well. While two simply add the word *Ψαλμός*,¹²⁸ LXX Psalm 26 adds the words “before he was anointed” to the superscription. LXX Psalm 28 adds *σκηνῆς ἑξοδίου*

¹²⁴Peter Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (STDJ 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 117. A somewhat dissenting opinion on this matter comes from Roger Beckwith who argues that the superscriptions are much earlier. See Roger T. Beckwith, “The Early History of the Psalter,” *TynBul* 46/1 (1995), 1–27.

¹²⁵Pss (MT) 3:1; 4:1; 5:1; 6:1; 7:1; 8:1; 9:1; 11:1; 12:1; 13:1; 14:1; 15:1; 16:1; 17:1; 18:1; 19:1; 20:1; 21:1; 22:1; 23:1; 24:1; 25:1; 26:1; 27:1; 28:1; 29:1; 30:1; 31:1; 32:1; 34:1; 35:1; 36:1; 37:1; 38:1; 39:1; 40:1; 41:1; 51:1; 52:1–2; 53:1; 54:1–2; 55:1; 56:1; 57:1; 58:1; 59:1; 60:1; 61:1; 62:1; 63:1; 64:1; 65:1; 68:1; 69:1; 70:1; 86:1; 101:1; 103:1; 108:1; 109:1; 110:1; 122:1; 124:1; 131:1; 132:1; 133:1; 138:1; 139:1; 140:1; 141:1; 142:1; 143:1; 144:1, 10; 145:1.

¹²⁶A full and detailed list of the superscriptions in the MT, LXX, and Qumran can be found in Flint, *Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 118–134.

¹²⁷The following superscriptions add simply *Ἀλληλουία*: Pss (LXX) 113; 114; 117; 118.

¹²⁸Pss (LXX) 13:1; 24:1.

to the superscription.¹²⁹ Ps 98:1 in the MT has the simple superscription **מִזְמוֹר**—the LXX adds to this by saying $\Psi\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{o}\varsigma\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \Delta\alpha\upsilon\iota\delta$ (97:1). Ps 144:1 (MT) contains the simple **לְדָוִד**, to which the LXX adds $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma\ \tau\acute{o}\nu\ \Gamma\omicron\lambda\iota\alpha\delta$. Goliath is also mentioned in the Davidic superscription of Psalm 151, a psalm attested to in the LXX as well as at Qumran but not included in the MT.

To this should be added the postscript found in Ps 72:20: **כָּלֹו תְּפִלּוֹת דָּוִד בְּיַד־יְהוֹשִׁיָּא**. This postscript not only contextualizes Psalm 72 as a prayer of David (likely a prayer for Solomon),¹³⁰ but acts as a closing for the second (and first?) book of the psalter. This postscript is an obvious indication of the early process of the collection and arrangement of the psalms, as nineteen more psalms bear a Davidic superscription in the MT after Psalm 72.

The common early superscription of **לְדָוִד** can imply not that the author was David, but that the composition was “for David” or “to David.”¹³¹ However, “Whatever the expression **לְדָוִד** may once have meant, the claim of authorship now [in light of the textual evidence] seems most probable. This point is confirmed by the final clause in those titles which specify a particular historical incident in David’s life as providing the occasion for composition.”¹³² Further confirmation of this interpretive tradition is found in the *Psalms Targum*, where **לְדָוִד** frequently became **עַל יַד דָּוִד**.¹³³ The LXX too shows signs of changes in the textual transmission to clarify the superscription $\tau\tilde{\omega}\ \Delta\alpha\upsilon\iota\delta$ to more accurately state Davidic authorship by its use of $\tau\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\ \Delta\alpha\upsilon\iota\delta$ in five instances.¹³⁴ While Albert Pietersma has determined

¹²⁹The *NETS* translation of this is “Of the going forth of the tent.” The *Lexham English Septuagint* translates it as “commemorating the feast of Exodus, of the temple.”

¹³⁰Marvin E. Tate, *Psalms 51-100* (WBC 20; Thomas Nelson, 2006), 225.

¹³¹Dahood argued that **לְדָוִד** meant “belonging to the cycle of David tablets.” See M. Dahood, *Psalms* (3 vols.; AB. Garden City: Doubleday, 1965–1970), 1.26.

¹³²Brevard S. Childs, “Psalm Titles and Midrashic Exegesis,” *JSS* 16/2 (October, 1971), 138.

¹³³*Targum Pss.* 52:1; 53:1; 54:1; 55:1; 57:1; 58:1; 59:1; 60:1; 69:1; 70:1; 101:1; 103:1; 108:1; 109:1; 110:1; 124:1; 138:1; 139:1; 140:1; 142:1; 144:1.

¹³⁴*Pss* 16, 25–27, 36. Albert Pietersma, “David in the Greek Psalms,” *VT* 30/2 (1980), 215 ff.

that τοῦ Δαυίδ is not original, he does argue that it was a further attempt during transmission to “clarify Davidic authorship.”¹³⁵

The cumulative evidence and research from the various versions of psalms superscriptions thus show that early on these compositions of praise, confession, and individual and corporate lament began to be not only attributed to David, but also placed the psalms into historical situations of David’s life. This contextualization continued as the psalter took shape, with additional Davidic superscriptions being added. They also provided an interpretive matrix for early readers of the psalter to hear in these compositions David’s own voice and circumstances.

5.5.1.2: *David as Prophet*

While the separation between king and prophet is well understood in the OT, there nonetheless was a gradual view towards seeing David as a prophet. The earliest attestation of this is in 11QPs^a.¹³⁶ After stating that David composed 3,600 psalms, 364 songs for altar offerings, 52 sabbath offering songs, 30 songs for festival and day of atonement days, 446 additional songs, and 4 songs to sing over the possessed, the author of the scroll states: “All these he spoke through (the spirit of) prophecy which had been given to him from before the Most High” (27.11).¹³⁷ Further evidence is found in the NT, where David is called προφητής in Acts 2:30, and his words are clearly viewed as prophecy in Acts 1:16, which states: ἦν προεῖπεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον διὰ στόματος Δαυίδ.

Josephus also portrays David as foretelling events: “[God] had shown all things that were come to pass to David his father...[God] told to David what he should be called before he was born and foretold that, when he should be king, after his father’s death he should build

¹³⁵*Ibid.*, 225.

¹³⁶11Q5 is dated to 1–50 CE. See Sanders, *Psalms Scroll 4.*, 29.

¹³⁷As translated in García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSS Study Edition*, 1179.

him a temple, which, since they saw accomplished, according to his prediction, he required them to bless God” (*Ant.* 8.109–110). Later the *Epistle of Barnabas* states about Psalm 110: “See again Jesus, not as son of man but as Son of God, and being made manifest in the flesh as a type. Since, therefore, they are about to say that the Christ is the Son of David, David himself prophesies, fearing and understanding the error of the sinners.”

It is important to note that David is not specifically called προφητής except in Acts 1:16. However, James Kugel also makes note of Philo who calls the author of Psalm 84 τις προφητικὸς ἀνὴρ (*Heir* §290).¹³⁸ While there is no attribution to David in the superscription nor by Philo, it at least sets precedent for understanding a psalmist as a prophet. Regardless of how this transformation of opinion took place specifically regarding David, it is clear that by the time of Jesus and the early church, the utterances of David in the psalms were viewed as prophetic and even predictive.¹³⁹

5.5.1.3: Later Jewish Readings of the Psalms

While readings from the Talmud and Midrash are not necessarily early, they nonetheless can shed some light on a trend already recognized in the LXX and Qumran: the tendency to hear the voice of David speaking in the Psalms, as well as the tendency to contextualize the psalms to a particular event of David’s life. The rabbis assumed that the content of the psalms were about David (*b. Pesah.* 117a; *Midr. Ps.* 4.1). The Midrash on Psalm 3, which has the superscription “when he fled from Absalom his son,” made the rabbis believe that David composed the psalm while in the very midst of fleeing (*Midr. Ps.* 3.3).¹⁴⁰

¹³⁸James L. Kugel, “David the Prophet,” in *Poetry and Prophecy: the beginnings of a literary tradition* (ed. James L. Kugel; vol. 4 of *Myth and Poetics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990), 54.

¹³⁹See *Ibid.*, 45-55, for further discussion on how David came to be understood as a prophet. For understanding the psalms as prophecy, Subramanian states: “That David wrote the Psalms and songs through ‘prophecy’ could well include the idea that David predicted events to come in the future, as claimed in the *pesharim* on the Psalm.” J. Samuel Subramanian, *The Synoptic Gospels and the Psalms as Prophecy* (LNTS 351; New York: T & T Clark, 2007), 23.

¹⁴⁰Bassler states: “The rabbis did not limit David’s psalmody to the contexts defined in the superscriptions,

5.5.1.4: Summary and Relevance for Thesis

It is clear that during the transmission of the psalter “David became an increasingly important figure with regard to the Psalms.”¹⁴¹ This desire stemmed from understanding the context of the psalms, as well as the “interest in David as founder of the Temple and organized worship.”¹⁴² The evolution of the psalter saw the stamp of David placed upon the original compositions, often times with additional detail regarding the historical situation that caused David to write the psalms. The unfolding tendency to hear David’s voice in the psalms continued as additional Davidic superscriptions were affixed to psalms, as attested in the DSS and LXX. The Targums also stand in this tradition, clarifying at times the Hebrew superscription לְדָוִד to על יד דָּוִד.¹⁴³ In addition, David is mentioned more times in the Aramaic Psalter overall and at times his story is read directly into the psalms (see §6.1.2.2). Later Jewish readings of the Psalms also heard the voice of David throughout the psalms.

Finally, the voice of David came to be recognized as the voice of a prophet by the time of the NT. When hearing and reading the psalter, early Jewish and Christian readers understood the words in the context of David’s life and at times also heard it as predictive prophecy. Margaret Daly-Denton states that it is highly unlikely that some of the references to the Psalms “would not have carried for the original readers resonances of David and his story. This is especially true of references to ‘laments of the individual’ such as Psalm (21) 22 or Psalm (68) 69 which could easily be envisaged as actual utterances of David.”¹⁴⁴ This recog-

for he saturated God constantly with his songs (*b. Ber.* 7b; *Midr. Ps.* 7.13). Indeed, he hymned God not only with his mouth but with every part of his body throughout his life (*Midr. Ps.* 18.2, 35.2). He sang with mystical insight and fervor while in the womb, on the day of his birth, even on the day of his death (*b. Ber.* 10a), and he always sang and composed under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit (*Cant. R.* 2.1,3; *Midr. Ps.* 1.1, 24.1).” Julette M. Bassler, “A Man For All Seasons: David In Rabbinic and New Testament Literature,” *Int* 40/2 (1986), 159.

¹⁴¹Stephen P. Ahearne-Kroll, “Challenging the Divine: LXX Psalm 21 in the passion narrative of the gospel of Mark,” in *Trial and death of Jesus: Essays on the Passion Narrative in Mark* (eds. Geert Van Oyen and Tom Shepherd; CBET 45; Dudley, Mass: Peeters, 2006), 125.

¹⁴²Flint, *Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 117.

¹⁴³*Tg. Pss.* 53:1, 54:1, 55:1, 57:1, 58:1, 59:1, 60:1, 69:1, 70:1, 144:1.

¹⁴⁴Margaret Daly-Denton, *David in the Fourth Gospel: the Johannine Reception of the Psalms* (AGJU 47;

dition was important for other areas of Matthew, as the evangelist made use of Davidic psalms, and will also be significant in the Passion narrative's use of Psalm 22. Elsewhere the voice of David in the psalms was understood as giving testimony to Jesus (§5.4.2)

5.5.2: *Understanding Jesus' Argument*

Richard France succinctly summarizes Jesus' argument as resting upon three premises: 1) David is the speaker of Psalm 110; 2) Yahweh is addressing the messiah in Psalm 110:1; 3) the term יְהוָה designates superiority.¹⁴⁵ The third premise can be dealt with swiftly: almost every usage of יְהוָה is used as an address to someone superior, with God being the superior in a majority of cases. *HALOT* only notes two times when יְהוָה is used as an address indicating respect among equals (Gen 32:5–6).¹⁴⁶ The Davidic attribution of the psalms have been established in the previous section; suffice it to say that the superscription of the psalm attributes it as לְדָוִד , and it is clear, and uncontested by the Pharisees in the exchange, that David was viewed as the author of this psalm and much of the psalter.

Premise two is the more contentious premise of Jesus' argument. As France has rightly noted, the strength of premise one (that Psalm 110 was read as the voice of David) strengthens premise two considerably: “to recognize David as the speaker is to demand a Messianic reference.”¹⁴⁷ Evidence supporting the messianic reading of Psalm 110 is also plentiful.¹⁴⁸ In-

Boston: Brill, 2000), 110-11.

¹⁴⁵France, *Old Testament*, 147, 163-69. Davies and Allison discuss Ishmael's thirteen *middoth* (expanded from Hillel's seven rules) where two contradicting texts are mitigated by a third. In this case it is only one text set against each other. Ishmael's principle holds that in this case, both of the seeming contradictions need to be upheld. This does indeed seem to be what is happening in this interaction, but scholars must be careful not to retroject later rabbinic material to the NT. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:255.

¹⁴⁶Walter Baumgartner et al., “ יְהוָה ,” *HALOT*, 12-13.

¹⁴⁷France, *Old Testament*, 167.

¹⁴⁸The most comprehensive look at the use of Ps 110 in early Christianity is D. M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity* (SBLMS 18; Nashville: Abingdon, 1973). It needs to be stressed that the original meaning of the psalm is not of ultimate import here – how it was read and understood in Jesus' day is the issue at hand. Regarding its original meaning, Hay argues for it being a legitimation of an Israelite king in the Pre-exilic period (*Ibid.*, 33). Even this, though, is implicitly messianic in a generic sense, as kings were anointed to rule. France has serious reservations with this exegesis, though, as the clear ascription of priesthood to this figure is highly inappropriate for a pre-exilic king—“verging on blasphemy” (France, *Old Testament*, 166). Luz

deed, just the internal evidence of the NT, and even of this passage in isolation, is impressive. The argument so stated by Jesus would not make sense if it were not a commonly held assumption with his opponents. Viewing more broadly in the Gospel, Jesus clearly references Psalm 110 when he self-identifies as the Christ during his trial (26:64). Beyond this passage, Psalm 110 is the most frequently cited OT passage in the NT, and in all instances a messianic reading is assumed.¹⁴⁹

When looking to non-Christian literature, the evidence varies. Both Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 33, 83) and Tertullian (*Marc.* 5.9) attest to Jewish opponents reading Hezekiah as the figure. There is no attestation to the Hezekiah reading in Rabbinic literature. The seemingly earliest Rabbinic reading is attributed to Rabbi Ishmael in the early second century and regards the figure as Abraham (*b. Sanh.* 108A). Later into the Rabbinic literature, the messianic reading becomes the prominent reading. Based upon the literature, Hay concludes that the custom of reading Psalm 110 messianically was probably the norm in Jesus' day.¹⁵⁰

Further confirmation of the messianic reading of Psalm 110 comes from the Aramaic translation of Psalm 110. The psalm is expressly attributed to David (*Tg. Ps.* 110:1 "composed by David") and is historicized in verse one: "The LORD said in his decree to make me lord of all Israel, but he said to me, 'Wait still for Saul of the tribe of Benjamin to die, for one reign must not encroach on another; and afterwards I will make your enemies a prop for your feet.'" Later in verse 4, it then becomes clear that a future David is in mind: "The LORD has sworn and will not turn aside, that you are appointed leader *in the age to come*, because of the merit that you were a righteous king." Evans notes: "from this we realize that the David men-

cautiously suggests that early Jewish messianic readings of Ps 110 were repressed because of early Christian readings. See Luz, *Matthew*, 3:89.

¹⁴⁹The *UBS* lists eleven quotations of Ps 110 in the NT. The next closest would be Lev 19:18 which is quoted nine times.

¹⁵⁰Hay, *Glory*, 33. Hay, as well as France, base their assumption upon the argument given by Strack and Billerbeck that Rabbi Ishmael introduced the non-Messianic interpretation due to his anti-Christian stance. See France, *Matthew*, 851.

tioned in v. 1 is not just the historical David but the David who will return ‘in the age to come’.”¹⁵¹ A final indicator of at least an eschatological reading is the eschatological role of Melchizedek in the fragmentary 11QMelchizedek. Although the extant fragments do not quote or allude to Psalm 110, it is reasonable to assume that Psalm 110 had an influence on this tradition, since Melchizedek only appears in Gen 14:18 and Ps 110:4. Anything explicitly messianic is lacking in the fragment.

5.5.3: The Implications of Matt 22:41–46 for Matthew’s Son of David Christology

As Jouette Bassler has noted, this passage has become a *crux interpretum* for understanding Davidic messianism, as well as understanding the Christology of Matthew (and Jesus).¹⁵²

Scholarly opinions on this passage and its implications for Christology is sometimes clear and at other times more confused, depending on the scholar in question. Three basic understandings are presented: 1) a rejection of the title, 2) the inadequacy of the title, or 3) an expansion of the title. These categories are my own, and scholars do not always fit neatly into them. At times an individual scholar may make statements that seem to fall under different categories. The following subsections will briefly treat some scholarly opinions on the meaning of this passage.

5.5.3.1: Rejection of Title

J. D. Kingsbury has been the strongest proponent for understanding Matt 22:41–46 as a rejection of the title Son of David.¹⁵³ Kingsbury builds his case by focusing on the Immanuel prophecy (1:23), God’s voice at the baptism declaring Jesus as his son (3:16–17), and Jesus’ own declaration of a filial relationship with God (11:27). Based upon these passages, Kings-

¹⁵¹Evans, “Aramaic Psalter,” 86.

¹⁵²Bassler, “All Seasons,” 167.

¹⁵³Kingsbury, *Matthew As Story*, 43-58; Kingsbury, “Son of David,” 596. Hay also believes that the pericope is ultimately pointing to “Son of God” being the title that should supplant Son of David. See Hay, *Glory*, 117. So too Joseph Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth: His Life, Times, and Teaching* (New York: Macmillan, 1927), 320.

bury believes Matthew does not develop a Son of David christology, but rather subordinates this to the Son of God christology: “Matthew intends the reader to think of him specifically as the Son of David only at those places in the text where this title actually occurs, and otherwise to look upon him in the main as the Son of God.”¹⁵⁴ Carson in a less dramatic fashion also argues for the dominance of the Son of God title, arguing that Matt 22:41–46 declares the title Son of David to be inadequate.¹⁵⁵

As a counter to this, Gundry notes that if Jesus sought to imply negation of the title, $\mu\eta\ \upsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$; could have been used, although one needs to be cautious against this type of argument.¹⁵⁶ As it is, Jesus’ question and evaluation does not necessitate negation. Another counter-point to this argument involves the title Son of God, which is assumed to be the more dominant christology in Matthew. John Nolland has argued persuasively that Matt 1:18–25 is focused on “the initiative of God in the incorporation of Jesus into the line of David.”¹⁵⁷ This is an important recognition, as those who argue for a dominant Son of God typology do so primarily on the basis of Matt 1:18–25 and the Immanuel prophecy. Once this earlier passage is correctly understood, the argument that the evangelist is seeking to reject the title Son of David in Matt 22:41–46 becomes untenable.

The most compelling argument for the rejection hypothesis is that this is the final time that the title “Son of David” is discussed or implied in the narrative, leading to the idea that it has been abandoned in favor of “Son of Man” or “Son of God.”¹⁵⁸ France has suggested that it is because it “could foster too political and nationalistic a view of his mission.”¹⁵⁹ While there

¹⁵⁴Kingsbury, “Son of David,” 598. Kingsbury goes so far as to say that scholars have misread the triumphal entry and entrance into Jerusalem as showing the crowds recognition of Jesus. See pp. 595 ff.

¹⁵⁵D. A. Carson, “Matthew,” *Expositor's Bible Commentary: Matthew, Mark, Luke*, 8:8468.

¹⁵⁶Gundry, *Use Of The Old Testament*, 201 n.7.

¹⁵⁷Nolland, “Son-of-God Christology,” 11.

¹⁵⁸Fitzmyer takes the view that the emphasis lies on expanding the understanding of Jesus towards Son of Man. See Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “The Son of David Tradition and Mt 22:41–46 and Parallels,” in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars’ Press, 1974), 44.

¹⁵⁹France, *Matthew*, 849. So too Marinus de Jonge, “Jesus, Son of David and Son of God,” in *Jewish Es-*

is some truth to this, one must question why the pressure did not apply itself to earlier portions of the narrative, and in particular the entry into Jerusalem. Taking the absence of the title as implying its rejection also goes against what has already been shown earlier in this study: that the evangelist has sustained action with Davidic tradition, emphasizes the Son of David title, and intentionally highlights a growing understanding by the ὄχλος, with the culmination of their understanding at the triumphal entry. Furthermore, the remaining chapters show that, while Matthew will not use the Son of David title after Matt 22, he is not done interacting with Davidic tradition and using Davidic typology in his presentation of Jesus.

5.5.3.2: Inadequacy of Title

The majority of scholarly opinion has argued that the evangelist (and Jesus) is not seeking to reject the title, but to indicate that “the title is christologically inadequate.”¹⁶⁰ Regarding the title, William Loader states:

Matthew does not mean to deny its validity. It is, after all, important in his scheme of showing the appropriate response of Jews to Jesus. But, more strongly than in his source, and in a way reminiscent of the infancy narrative, he shows that messianic categories only have validity if they are transposed into a higher key—only if we see that Israel’s Messiah is really God’s Son and David’s Lord.¹⁶¹

The difficulty in assuming this position is that it is hard to understand what definition of Son of David is being targeted as inadequate. Within the primary literature, there is the expectation of a militant messiah at Qumran (War Scroll) that coheres with parts of the New Testament—this was the messianism extant during the time of Jesus (e.g. John 6:15). There is also the violent (and somewhat priestly) Son of David in *Pss. Sol.* 17.¹⁶² But the wider prima-

chatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: collected essays (NovTSup 63; Leiden: Brill, 1991), 96.

¹⁶⁰Keener, *Matthew*, 495. See also Hay, *Glory*, 111; Evans, *Matthew*, 386. It is somewhat difficult to categorize the individual treatments of this passage, as even the scholars pointed out in the above section (with the exception of Kingsbury) would fall into this category of opinion.

¹⁶¹Loader, “Son of David,” 584. Loader ultimately ascribes to a Solomonic typology. See §4.2.2.

¹⁶²See Zacharias, *Raise up*; H. Daniel Zacharias, “The Son of David in *Psalms of Solomon* 17,” in “Non-

ry literature and popular messianism should not supplant Matthew's own narrative – the evangelist has already provided his definition of the Son of David. It is the immediate literary context that should be given primary importance when seeking to understand Matthew's terms. The evangelist himself has gone to great lengths to define what he means by the title Son of David. As Davies and Allison state: "our text, rightly understood, in no way denigrates Davidic Christology but instead presupposes its truth. The tension between 'Son of David' and 'Lord' is creative, not diminishing."¹⁶³

5.5.3.3: *Expanding the Son of David*

Because of the inadequacies of the above options, a clarified understanding and clearer terminology is needed. This present study has so far shown the prevalent use of Davidic typology and extensive use of Davidic tradition in Matthew. It is inconceivable that the evangelist would in this episode seek to reject this motif, but rather that the title in scriptural context has "a pregnant meaning."¹⁶⁴ The presentation of the question and the Pharisees' response "affirms that they have answered correctly."¹⁶⁵ In the present chapter in particular it has been shown that the acclamation of the crowds outside of Jerusalem's walls is the pinnacle of their understanding, and the children's acclamation within the temple is considered perfect praise (§5.4):

Whatever the words may have meant on Jesus' lips...they cannot be taken as a rejection of this title. Nor can they suggest in this context a denial of Jesus' Davidic connections, for just prior to this episode in all three Synoptic Gospels Jesus has accepted the acclamation, Son of David.¹⁶⁶

canonical" *Religious Texts in Early Judaism and Early Christianity* (eds. Lee Martin McDonald and James H. Charlesworth; Jewish and Christian Texts 14; London: T&T Clark, 2012), 73–87.

¹⁶³Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:250-51.

¹⁶⁴de Jonge, "Jesus," 96–99.

¹⁶⁵Van Egmond, "Son of David," 56.

¹⁶⁶Bassler, "All Seasons," 167.

Therefore, I would suggest that the evangelist's narrative provides the best context for interpreting Matt 22:41–46, particularly the passages discussed in this and the previous chapter. The previous chapter has shown how Matthew has presented Jesus as a therapeutic Son of David and shepherd in fulfillment of Ezekiel 34 and 37. Matthew then moves on to present Jesus as a humble king by utilizing the Davidic tradition found in Zechariah. Through the narrative, *Matthew himself is defining what it means to be the Son of David*. The evangelist seeks to define the Son of David exclusively in terms of the scriptures of Israel.

If this view is correct, then the evangelist is not rejecting the title, nor is he claiming the title is inadequate. The evangelist, instead, turns to the scriptures of Israel and is drawing out the full implications of what it means for the messiah to be the Son of David.¹⁶⁷ In this interaction, then, “his purpose is not to win a debate but to elicit from them [i.e. the Pharisees] what the Scriptures themselves teach about the Messiah, thus helping people to recognize who he really is.”¹⁶⁸ In his final debate with the religious leaders, Jesus turns once again to the scriptures to complete his definition of the Son of David, arguing that the Son of David is in fact greater than David.¹⁶⁹ The evangelist had to enter into the current understanding of the messiah as Son of David because Davidic descent was a messianic requirement. As John Jones has stated:

In order to subvert the textuality of an interpretive community, a writer first must agree to enter that textuality and to deal with it. The strategy is rhetorical: grant your audience the privilege of using its own terminology and ideology, yet manipulate that terminology and that ideology to present your new ideology in a persuasive manner.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁷Nolland states: “What is being questioned is a restricted view of the messianic programme that went along with seeing the messiah as one whose action would follow the paradigm of the establishment of the early united kingdom of Israel, under David and Solomon. The messiah would be greater, and his messianic programme would transcend such limitations.” Nolland, *Matthew*, 916-17.

¹⁶⁸D. A. Carson, “Matthew,” *Expositor's Bible Commentary: Matthew, Mark, Luke*, 8:8466.

¹⁶⁹France, *Matthew*, 848.

¹⁷⁰Jones, “Subverting the Textuality,” 271. Jones would in some ways fit better into the “inadequacy” understanding.

5.5.4: Matt 22:41–46 in the Trajectory of Matthew’s Davidic Theme

Given the above discussions on this pericope, a clarified understanding of this passage in the context of Matthew’s narrative, as well as its usage of Psalm 110, can now be put forth.

Matthew’s final discussion between Jesus and the Pharisees continues the evangelist’s presentation of what it means to be the Son of David. Once again, the author turns to the scriptures of Israel to display a proper understanding of the Son of David. Rather than a warrior, the Son of David is a healer; Rather than a conquering king, the Son of David is a humble king; And now, rather than being an inferior progeny, the Son of David is in fact superior to David himself. D. M. Hay goes even further, arguing that the superiority of the Son of David also implies that the messiah’s kingdom will be more than a renewal of David’s kingdom and that his kingdom will not be worldly.¹⁷¹

This aspect of Matthew’s redefinition of the Son of David is in some sense the most daring, as it hints to far more than a simple understanding of the restoration of the kingdom under a Davidic successor. The reader of Matthew’s Gospel has already come to understand Jesus’ superiority and his direct relationship with God, particularly through his virginal conception and baptism. But the character of the Pharisees, devoid of such knowledge, must be convinced from the scriptures. In this exchange, his usage of Psalm 110 brings to the foreground Jesus’ own superiority over king David himself, as it is sufficiently clear that Psalm 110 was read messianically. Furthermore, the title κύριος, applied to the messiah in Psalm 110 and therefore to Jesus, “carried with it the clear suggestion that he was somehow on a par with Yahweh of the Old Testament.”¹⁷² It is for this reason that the recognition of David as the voice of Psalm 110 is so important – it is from David’s own mouth that he de-

¹⁷¹Hay, *Glory*, 111.

¹⁷²Fitzmyer, “Son of David,” 45.

clares the Son of David as his κύριος. While Jesus has already displayed superiority to David in terms of knowledge and healing, Matthew now makes it clear that being the υἱός of David does not mean inferiority.

This is a pointer to the issue of authority which underlies this whole section and which comes into the open in the demand for a sign in v. 38. Jesus sets his own status alongside that of the highest authority figures of the OT, David the king, the priests in the temple, Jonah the prophet and Solomon the king and wise man, and (implicitly in the case of David but explicitly for the others) claims that ‘something greater’ has now superseded those recognized authorities. Here is one of the most striking examples of the typological character of Matthew’s presentation of Jesus: king, priest, temple, prophet, wise man all provide models against which Jesus stands as ‘something greater.’ It is the failure of Israel’s current religious leadership to recognize this new and decisive phase in God’s dealings with his people which makes them more culpable even than Israel’s old pagan neighbors.¹⁷³

5.5.5: Summary and Relevance for Thesis

In view of the arguments of the previous chapters, the dialogue between Jesus and the Pharisees in Matt 22:41–46 need not be labeled as a *crux interpretum* nor should it be read as a rejection of the title Son of David. Even the label of inadequacy is imprecise once the immediate literary context of the Gospel is given priority over the wider messianic traditions of early Judaism. The pericope is, rather, the continuance of Matthew’s thematic presentation of Jesus and the redefinition of what it means to be the Son of David drawn from Israel’s scriptures. He has already subverted the popular ideology of a militant Son of David by presenting Jesus as the therapeutic Son of David (Chapter 4) and the humble king of Zechariah (§5.3). In Jesus’ final confrontation with his opponents, the understanding of Son of David is expanded once more from Israel’s scriptures, and from David’s own mouth, that the Son of David is in fact greater than David, and is something greater than the religious leaders have ever comprehended. The readers already know this: “At the very beginning Matthew had already told

¹⁷³France, *Matthew*, 452.

[them] that the Son of David was the Son of God (1:18–25), and Scripture foretold it (2:15). God himself had revealed it (3:17; 17:5; cf 16:17), and the devil had tested it (4:3, 5).¹⁷⁴ Ultimately the point of Jesus' quotation, then, is to point the Pharisees to an elevated understanding of the Son of David.¹⁷⁵

As commentators have rightly pointed out, this is the last reference to the title, and it seems that this point acts as a bridge upon which Jesus moves the conversation along and allows the evangelist to start focusing on Jesus as Son of Man and Son of God without giving up, putting down, or doing away with the title Son of David. He has already used both scripture and deed to show how Jesus is indeed the humble Davidic shepherd expected in scripture, and now Psalm 110 provides the bridge for understanding that the Son of David is in fact David's Lord who will sit at God's right hand. At this point, Matthew has now opened up another scriptural text, Dan 7:13–14, which speaks of the Son of Man presented before God in heaven and given dominion. This passage provides the bridge for understanding that the Son of Man and the Son of David are understood by the evangelist as one and the same in the scriptures. Indeed, it is precisely because he has elevated the meaning for the title Son of David that the evangelist is now able to merge these titles. This merging of these two Christological titles is made explicit by Jesus as he answers the high priest using words from both Psalm 110 and Dan 7:13 at his trial: "I tell you, from now on you will see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of the Power and coming on the clouds of heaven." This in some sense completes the revision and redefinition of the title Son of David as it is merged with the exalted title Son of Man.

¹⁷⁴Luz, *Matthew*, 3:90.

¹⁷⁵*Ibid.*, 3:91.

5.6: Conclusion

In the three episodes highlighted in this chapter, the author of Matthew resumes his pervasive interaction with Davidic tradition and continues to portray Jesus using Davidic typology. In the confrontation over Sabbath, Matthew clearly references the story of David from 1 Sam 21:1–6 and proceeds to compare the two with a straight-forward type and anti-type typology. The implication of the story is Jesus' own ultimate authority over the law and Sabbath, foreshadowed by King David himself.

The next episode, the triumphal entry and immediate entrance into Jerusalem, stands as one of the major hinge points of Matthew's narrative. There once again typological elements of David's life present (2 Sam 15–20), and the parallels within the narrative with the infancy narrative, the healing of the blind in 20:29–34, and the foreshadowing of the Passion narrative make its importance in the narrative clear. Matthew also makes use of Zechariah here in a crucial element of his redefinition of what it means to be the Son of David—namely the humble shepherd king of Zech 9. This direct quotation of Zechariah is only one of many connection points with Zech 9–14, making it clear that the entire messianic portrait of Zech 9–14 was an important piece of Davidic tradition of which the evangelist makes continuous use.

Matthew also capitalizes upon his deliberate presentation of the ὄχλος through the narrative, with the apex of their understanding of Jesus' coming just outside Jerusalem's walls with the shout "Hosanna to the Son of David" (21:9). Immediately after this comes a change of their understanding of Jesus to prophet, which then progresses to the point that they too call for Jesus' death in 27:25. Yet, it is precisely within this narrative unit that the children within Jerusalem hail Jesus as the Son of David, and it is at this point for the first time that Jesus explicitly endorses the use of this title. Jesus' use of Psalm 8 heightens the interpretation of the

children's and the crowd's cries of "Ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαβὶδ" to equate them with the praise of Yahweh himself. The recognition of Jesus as Son of David is considered perfect praise.

Finally, in Jesus's last encounter with the Pharisees in Matt 22:41–46, Matthew continues to define what it means for Jesus to be the Son of David. While viewed by some as a negation of the use of the title Son of David, or a significant qualification, these assessments are not quite accurate. The pericope is, rather, the continuance of Matthew's thematic presentation of Jesus and the redefinition of what it means to be the Son of David drawn from Israel's scriptures. He has already subverted the popular ideology of a militant Son of David by presenting Jesus as the therapeutic Son of David (Chapter 4). The evangelist then moved on to present the Son of David as the humble king of Zechariah (§5.3). In Jesus' final confrontation with his opponents, the understanding of Son of David is expanded once more from Israel's scriptures, and this time from David's voice in the Psalms, that the Son of David is in fact greater than David. This should come as no surprise to the reader, nor should it be seen as a subversion or arguing for the incorrectness of the title. Matthew has been working through much of his narrative to redefine what it means to be the Son of David, and has done so by interacting with Davidic tradition in the scriptures: "The events of Jesus' life are illuminated and their authority revealed in the light of the Old Testament."¹⁷⁶ Confirmation of this analysis will be reinforced in the following chapters, as the evangelist, despite no longer using the title Son of David, continues his interaction with Davidic tradition and use of Davidic typology to craft his narrative.

¹⁷⁶Senior, "The Lure," 104.

Chapter 6: David's Betrayal and the Betrayal of Jesus

Within the two testaments, two infamous traitors stand out in biblical history: the betrayal of David by Ahithophel (and Absalom) and the betrayal of Jesus by Judas Iscariot. It is unsurprising that some scholars have found connections between Ahithophel and the accounts of Judas' betrayal in the four Gospels. My contention in this chapter is that Matthew (and in fact all of the Gospel writers), when reflecting on Judas' betrayal, were drawn to traditions about Ahithophel. This colored his narrative, to include minor elements which increased the thematic connection between the two stories. It has been noted that Matthew sticks very closely to his Markan source in the passion narrative, but Matt 27:3–10 and its story of Judas is unique to Matthew.¹ It was ultimately Matthew amongst the evangelists who made the connection most explicit with his typological description of the suicide of Judas as the conclusion of the betrayal narrative.

The types of thematic parallels which I suggest serve to strengthen my thesis by showing how the evangelist went beyond the reuse of Davidic tradition, messianic and non-messianic, in portraying Jesus as David's rightful heir. As the true Son of David, even Jesus' experience of betrayal reflects David's own trials, but to an even greater degree, as Jesus' betrayal results in his death. This chapter also serves to show that, although the title Son of David is no longer utilized after the entrance into Jerusalem, the evangelist is not done with his interaction of Davidic tradition.

¹Kim Paffenroth, "The Stories of the Fate of Judas and Differing Attitudes Towards Sources," in *Proceedings: Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies* (Cincinnati: Eastern Great Lakes & Midwest Biblical Societies, 1992), 68.

6.1: Ahithophel in the Hebrew Bible

The following section will summarize the character of Ahithophel as he was encountered in the scriptures.

6.1.1: Ahithophel in 2 Samuel 15-17

Ahithophel was a prominent royal counselor who was trusted by both David and Absalom: “Now in those days the counsel that Ahithophel gave was as if one consulted the oracle of God; so all the counsel of Ahithophel was esteemed, both by David and by Absalom” (2 Sam 16:23). Although he was a trusted member of David’s court, his decision to support the rebellion of Absalom may have been because of David’s sin with Bathsheba and the murder of Uriah, as it seems that Bathsheba was Ahithophel’s granddaughter.² It was at Ahithophel’s suggestion that Absalom slept with David’s concubines, but it was Absalom’s decision not to follow Ahithophel’s advice which brought about Absalom’s defeat. Ahithophel was so certain of Absalom’s impending defeat, that when his advice to strike David immediately with 12,000 men was not heeded, Ahithophel committed suicide by hanging.

6.1.2: Ahithophel in the Davidic Psalms

2 Samuel 15–17 contains the narrative in which Ahithophel appears. However, Ahithophel was read into the context of several Davidic psalms, a number of which are also applied to Judas in the NT.

²Keith Bodner, “Motives for Defection: Ahithophel’s agenda in 2 Samuel 15-17,” *SR* 31/1 (2002), 63-78; Donald G. Schley, “Ahithophel,” *AYBD*, 1:121; Roger D. Aus, “The Name Judas ‘Iscariot’ and Ahithophel in Judaic Tradition,” in *My name is Legion: Palestinian Judaic traditions in Mark 5:1-20 and other gospel texts* (Studies in Judaism; Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2003), 183.

6.1.2.1: Psalm 41

Psalm 41, a Davidic psalm, is sometimes read as referring to David's trouble with Ahithophel, particularly at verse 9: "Even my bosom friend in whom I trusted, who ate of my bread, has lifted the heel against me." Commenting on this psalm, A. F. Kirkpatrick states, "The words 'he that eateth my bread lifted up his heel against me' are quoted by Christ in John xiii. 18 as fulfilled by the treachery of Judas. The words of the Psalm are not a direct prediction, but the treachery and the fate of Ahithophel foreshadowed the treachery and the fate of Judas."³ This reading is reflected in early Rabbinic reading of the text as well. In the Babylonian Talmud, *Sanhedrin* 106b discusses David and Ahithophel. In its discussion, R. Yohanan cites both Ps 55:13–14 and Ps 41:9 as referring to Ahithophel.

And said R. Yohanan, "At the outset David called Ahitophel his master, at the end he called him his friend, and finally he called him his disciple. At the beginning he called him his master: 'But it was you, a man my equal, my guide and my acquaintance. Then his companion: 'We took sweet counsel together and walked into the house of God in company'. Finally, his disciple: 'Yea, my own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, who ate my bread, has lifted his heel against me'. (106b-107a)⁴

Psalm 41 also appears in the Hodayot in a section which speaks of betrayal and strife with people close to the speaker:

"But I myself have become [...] strife and contentions for my fellows, jealousy and anger to those who have entered into my covenant, a grumbling and a complaining to all who are my comrades. *Ev[en those who sha]re my bread have lifted up their heel against me*, and all those who have committed themselves to my counsel speak perversely against me with unjust lips. The men of my [coun]cil rebel and grumble round about. And concerning the mystery which You hid in me, they go about as slanderers to the children of destruction. Because [You] have exal[ted Yourself] in me, and for sake of their guilt, You have hidden in me the spring of understanding and the counsel of truth. But they devise the ruination of their heart; [and with the words of] Belial they have exhibited a lying tongue; as the poison of serpents it bursts forth continuously. As those who crawl in the dust, they lie in wait so as to lay hold [of the poison] of serpents" (1QH^a 13:24–29).⁵

³A. F. Kirkpatrick, *Psalms 51-100* (Cambridge Press: Cambridge University Press, 1902), 218-19.

⁴Translation from Jacob Neusner, *The Babylonian Talmud: a Translation and Commentary* (Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publishers, 2005).

This psalm along with a number of others seem to belong to a collection of “betrayal” psalms (Pss 41, 55, 69, 109) which were used when talking about betrayal or treachery and often connected to David’s trouble with Ahithophel. In the NT, these same psalms are used of Judas.

6.1.2.2: Psalm 55

Psalm 55 is another Davidic psalm which was frequently applied to Ahithophel. The passage above from *Sanhedrin* 106b cited Ps 41:9 and Ps 55:13–14 when discussing Ahithophel. There are a number of other passages in Rabbinic literature which applied Psalm 55 to Ahithophel as well. The first example is from *Avot* 6.3 which says: “For so we find with David, king of Israel, who did not learn anything from Achitofel except for two things alone, yet he called him his ‘master,’ his ‘guide’ and his ‘intimate,’ as is stated, ‘And you are a man of my worth, my guide and intimate friend’.”⁶ Ps 55:24, “the bloodthirsty and treacherous shall not live out half their days,” is cited twice in tractate *Sanhedrin* (69b, 106b) as referring to Ahithophel as well. So too does *Numbers Rabbah* 18.17 discuss Ahithophel, using Ps 55:13 in reference to him.

The targum of Psalm 55 is also instructive for showing how readers imagined Ahithophel’s betrayal as the backdrop of David’s complaint. *Targum Psalms* says, “For an enemy will not belittle me, else I would bear it; my foe has not vaunted himself against me, else I would hide from his presence. But you, O Achitophel, a man who is like me; a leader who taught me, and who tells me wisdom.” (*Targ.-Ps. 55:12–13*).⁷ Bertil Gärtner reflects on this portion of the Targum: “Thus in the Targum on Psalm 55 Ahithophel’s name and work are

⁵Translation from Martin G. Abegg, Edward M. Cook, and Michael O. Wise, eds., *Qumran Sectarian Manuscripts: A New Translation* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996), 98, Italics mine.

⁶Translation from www.Chabad.org (<http://tinyurl.com/kohswgy>). *Avot*. chapter 6 was added from the baraita and not included in the Mishnah of R. Judah Hanasi, though the baraita are recognized as being from the Tannaitic period.

⁷Translation from Edward M. Cook, ed., *Targums to Psalms* (Accordance ed. OakTree Software, 2014).

read into the psalm text—so intimately were this person and his treachery linked with Psalm 55 in Jewish traditions.”⁸

6.1.2.3: Pss 69 and 109

Psalms 69 and 109 are nowhere connected specifically to Ahithophel and his treachery in early Jewish readings, but both psalms are attributed to David and belong in the classification of “betrayal psalms.” The most forthright use of Pss 69 and 109 come from Luke in Acts 1:20, which cites these psalms as predictions for the death of Judas. The eternal condemnation from Ps 69:28, applied to Judas, is not unlike other Rabbinic traditions which similarly condemn Ahithophel.⁹ Numerous allusions to Psalm 109 are noted by Van de Water in Matthew as well:¹⁰ The refusal of Judas’ plea (Matt 27:4/Ps 109:7, 12); Judas’ remorse and suicide (Matt 27:5) is connected with Ps 109:7 by Jerome;¹¹ the curse of the betrayer by Jesus (Matt 26:24) echoes the curses in Ps 109:6–19; and the allusion to Ps 109:25 in Matt 27:39 when passersby shake their heads at Jesus. These connections show that the betrayal psalms were drawn upon by Matthew in his Gospel.

6.1.3: Summary and Relevance for Thesis

The narrative of 2 Samuel 15–17 was not the only place where Ahithophel was read as a character in the text. The examples of Rabbinic and Targumic readings of Pss 41 and 55 show that some early readers understood David’s words to be reflecting the betrayal of Ahithophel.¹²

Modern scholarship has disputed this connection,¹³ perhaps rightly so. The important thing for

⁸Gärtner, *Iscairiot*, 35.

⁹*Ibid.*, 37. See further discussion at 6.2.3.

¹⁰R. Van De Water, “The Punishment of the Wicked Priest and the Death of Judas,” *DSD* 10/3 (2003), 403.

¹¹Jerome, *Comm. in Matt.* 27.4–5.

¹²One must be careful when using Rabbinic and Targumic sources as material for New Testament interpretation, as it is from a considerably later period. In this case, I am not trying to establish dependance of the NT on rabbinic material, simply a pattern of reading. The material discussed below on Judas confirms this, as these psalms were applied to Judas, another traitor.

¹³Tate, *Psalms 51-100*, 55.

the purpose of this study is that early readers made the connection to Ahithophel and it is reasonable to assume that readers from the time of Jesus and the early church did so as well. The fact that both of these betrayal psalms, as well as other betrayal like Psalms 69 and 109, are alluded to in reference to Judas within the NT at least confirms that numerous psalms were used when speaking of betrayal and that the Gospel authors sought confirmation and connections with the Davidic psalms of betrayal when reflecting on Judas and his treachery. Rick Van de Water states well why this collection becomes important when approaching the Gospels:

What argues most convincingly for the presence of psalm allusions is the context in which any specific detail occurs. Where a number of details in a given passage coincide with the words or ideas of the same psalm or group of psalms, it is probable that allusion to the psalms is intended. The establishment of that general intention for a given passage increases the probability of individual details within it constituting allusions.¹⁴

6.2: The Profile of Biblical Betrayers: Judas and Ahithophel

With the primary literature at hand, Matthew can now be approached to assess whether it alludes to Ahithophel traditions.

6.2.1: Betrayer as Friend

In Psalm 41 and 55 the “betrayers” of the author is described as a friend—and this friend was commonly read as being Ahithophel. It needs no repeating that Judas Iscariot was one of Jesus’ twelve disciples, and may even have been one of Jesus’ more trusted disciples if John’s assertion that he was the keeper of the purse is true (12:6; 13:29). Luke 22:3 and Acts 1:17 also emphasizes that Judas was part of the inner circle, which may well allude to Psalm 55 as well. Another important connection is Matt 26:50, where Jesus addresses Judas as “friend”

¹⁴Van De Water, “Wicked Priest,” 402.

when Judas leads the arresting party to Gethsemane.¹⁵ This is an addition unique to Matthew, and has been noted by several scholars as drawing a connection to Ps 41:9 and 55:14,¹⁶ psalms of betrayal that were seen as related to Ahithophel and used to refer to Judas.¹⁷

6.2.2: Name of the Betrayer

There has been no consensus on the name “Iscariot.”¹⁸ The most popular choices are that it (1) refers to Judas as one of the *Sicarii*; (2) it was derived from the Hebrew root שָׁקַר whose derivatives mean false, deceit, etc.; or (3) it designates Judas as a “man from Kerioth”, in Hebrew אִישׁ plus קְרִיּוֹת. It seems unlikely that Judas would have been a member of the *Sicarii*, as interesting a theory as it may be.¹⁹ Given that the *Sicarii* were urban assassins, it makes no sense that Judas would not kill Jesus himself. Further, the *Sicarii* as an identifiable group did not arise until the 40s or 50s.²⁰

The Gospel of John may provide the best support that “Iscariot” designated Judas’ hometown, as Judas is called “the son of Simon Iscariot” three times (John 6:71; 13:2, 26).²¹

¹⁵As is sometimes the case in biblical Hebrew, the word commonly rendered as friend can be either a combination of אִישׁ and שָׁלוֹם (Jer 38:22, Obad 1:7, Ps 37:37), as in Ps 41:9, or in the case of Ps 55:14 the Hebrew participle מִיַּדְּעִי (Ps 31:12, 76:2, 88:9, 19). The LXX translators render these pedantically, as ἄνθρωπος τῆς εἰρήνης and γνωστέ. Neither of these ways of conveying the idea of “friend” is used in the NT, rather the common word used is φίλος—a word used only four times in the LXX. Matthew, however, prefers the Greek word εταῖρος for the word “friend.” Matthew uses φίλος once in 11:19 and εταῖρος 3 times, Matt 20:13; 22:12; 26:50. When the NT conveys the idea of friend, then, it does not reflect the Hebrew idiom replicated in the LXX.

¹⁶Aus, “The Name,” 176–78; Gärtner, *Iscariot*, 14; Van De Water, “Wicked Priest,” 402; Michael D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew; the Speaker's Lectures in Biblical Studies, 1969-71* (London: SPCK, 1974), 446.

¹⁷Though stemming from later Jewish tradition, Roger Aus notes that Ahithophel was also considered a disciple of David in *b. Sanh.* 106b and *Midr. Pss.* 41/7 on Ps 49:10. See Aus, “The Name,” 159. Aus goes too far in stating “this tradition formed the basis for Judas...who also cruelly turned against his teacher at the end” (p. 160).

¹⁸*Iscarioth* (Matt 10:4; Mark 3:19; 14:10; Luke 6:16), *Iscariot*, the Greek form (Matt 10:3; 26:14; Luke 22:3; John 6:71; 12:4; 13:2, 26; 14:22, variants on the name (Mark 3:19; 14:10, 43; Luke 6:16), *the one called Judas Iscariot* (Matt 26:14; Luke 22:3; John 6:71); and *son of Simon Iscariot* (John 6:71; 13:2, 26).

¹⁹Charles Torrey says the theory “deserves no attention.” See Charles C. Torrey, “The Name ‘Iscariot,’” *HTR* 36/1 (1943), 58.

²⁰John P. Meier, *Companions and Competitors* (A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus 3; New York: Doubleday, 2001), 210.

²¹Charles Torrey has argued that the Greek syntax was an incorrect translation of the Aramaic original and that there was no “Simon Iscariot”, but that it should be translated “Judas Iscariot son of Simon.” See Torrey, “Iscariot,” 56. This view is also embraced by Gärtner, *Iscariot*, 6-7.

However, besides the fact that this would make Judas the only disciple from Judah, this option is not without difficulty. The Hebrew from Josh 15:25, Amos 2:2, and Jer 48:24, 41 may well be rendered as “the towns of Hesron,”²² not “Kerioth-Hesron”. In addition, there is “no satisfactory evidence of any Palestinian town named Καριώθ.”²³ Other towns, Askar and Kartah, have been suggested, and G. Schwarz argued that the nickname simply meant “man from the city” based on later Targumic use of the word *Keriotha* for Jerusalem.²⁴ Given the difficulty surrounding the etymology of the nickname, it is understandable why some scholars have taken a somewhat neutral stance on the issue. Raymond Brown concludes, following G. Dalman, that the sobriquet “Iscariot” was already unintelligible by the time the evangelists wrote it down.²⁵ A survey of the secondary literature leans in favor of taking “Iscariot” as a place of origin,²⁶ but what the hometown of Judas or his father was continues to be a matter of dispute and may not have even been known by the evangelists themselves.

Both Raymond Brown and John Meier dismiss the second option in a rather simplistic way, stating that Judas was not known as a liar and the betrayal did not involve lying to or about Jesus.²⁷ It should be taken as quite certain that Judas did not announce his intentions to Jesus and the Twelve when leaving the upper room. Both scholars also fail to take into account the wider meaning of the root form שָׁקַר which does not mean simply “to lie” but “to act against contractual terms” and “to break faith.”²⁸

²²The LXX translation of קַרְיֹוֹת הַחֲצֵרֹוֹן is πόλεις Ἀσερῶν.

²³Torrey, “Iscariot,” 52. Torrey argues for the name being a derivation of the Semitic word שָׁקַר. Torrey is followed by Gärtner, *Iscariot*, 5-7.

²⁴Günther Schwarz, *Jesus und Judas: aramaistische Untersuchungen zur Jesus-Judas-Überlieferung der Evangelien und der Apostelgeschichte* (BWANT 6; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1988), 6-12.

²⁵Raymond E. Brown, *The Death Of The Messiah: From Gethsemane To The Grave* (2 vols.; ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1994), 1415-16. This is also suggested by Meier, *Companions*, 209-210.

²⁶*Ibid.*, 211; Richard Bauckham, *Jesus And The Eyewitnesses: The Gospels As Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 106-6; William Klassen, *Judas: Betrayer Or Friend Of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 34.

²⁷Meier, *Companions*, 210; Brown, *Death*, 1416.

²⁸Walter Baumgartner et al., “שָׁקַר,” *HALOT*, 1647-48.

The second option has been most rigorously argued by Charles Torrey.²⁹ He argued that Iscariot comes from the semitic root שָׁקַר, connecting it more specifically to Aramaic, which shares the root and meaning with Hebrew. Torrey argues that the Aramaic epithet שְׁקִרָא “false one, liar, hypocrite” was prepended with a distinct beginning syllable and appended with a denominative form -וּתִישׁ.³⁰ Once the form ἰσκαριώτης came into common usage, the ης ending was taken as inflectional, and the name was treated as “Iscariot.”

Even if “Iscariot” was a designation of origin, the similarity of sound with the Hebrew root שָׁקַר was probably not lost on the Gospel authors and early church.³¹ If the second option of “Iscariot” being a derivation of a semitic word was the origin of the epithet, or even if it was a later connection made by the early church or Evangelists, it may also help to provide yet another allusive connection to Ahithophel. The connection to Ahithophel lies in the word’s use in the Psalms. שָׁקַר appears in both Pss 69:5 and 109:2, texts both cited in Acts 1:20 in reference to Judas. Although these psalms are not connected directly to Ahithophel, they were undoubtedly part of the “betrayal” psalms, as evidenced by Luke’s usage. The more direct connection to Ahithophel comes in *Targ.-Ps. 55*, a psalm connected directly to Ahithophel by the Targum translator and elsewhere, where three times (vv. 4, 11, 12) *Targ.-Ps. 55* uses the noun שָׁקַר to describe the action of the betrayer Ahithophel.³² *Targ.-Ps. 41:7* also uses this lemma to describe the action of the betrayer. The sobriquet by which Judas came to be known may derive from a word which figured into the psalms of betrayal which were in turn connected to Ahithophel.

²⁹Torrey, “Iscariot,” 51-62.

³⁰Brown, *Death*, 2:1412, notes that these different Greek word endings were common of words taken over from Hebrew/Aramaic.

³¹The same may be said of the similarity of sound with *Sicarii*, which derives from the Latin *sicarius*.

³²Gärtner, *Iscariot*, 36.

6.2.3: *Fate of the Betrayers*

In *Sanhedrin* 69b, 106b of *Talmud Yerushalmi* Ahithophel and his fate is described in dire terms. He is counted as one of the eternally lost men from the biblical narrative (along with Jeroboam, Ahab, Manasseh, Balaam, Doeg, and Gehazi). Similar sentiments are given in *b.Hagigah* 15b: “Three kings and four ordinary folk have no portion in the world to come.... Four ordinary folk: Balaam, Doeg, Ahitophel, and Gehazi.” *b.Sanhedrin* 90a also denies resurrection of the dead to Balaam, Doeg, Ahitophel, and Gehazi. So too does *Targ.-Ps.* 55:16 condemn both Ahithophel and Doeg: “He will condemn them to the judgement of death, and he will decree for them evil things, for Doeg and Achitophel; they will descend to Sheol while alive, for evil things are in their dwellings, in their bodies.” Ahithophel, then, is part of a small circle of men in the OT narrative whose fate is secured for eternal damnation.

Similar sentiments are given concerning the destiny of Judas in the Gospels. In Mark 14:21 Jesus states, “For the Son of Man goes away just as it is written of him, but woe to that man through whom the Son of Man is handed over. It would have been better for that man if he had not been born.” These words are adopted by both Matthew (26:24) and Luke (22:22).³³

6.2.4: *Death of the Betrayers*

Ahithophel’s suicide is recorded in 2 Sam 17:23: “When Ahithophel saw that his counsel was not followed, he saddled his donkey and went off home to his own city. He set his house in order, and hanged himself.” Ahithophel’s radical action to end his own life came as a result of Absalom’s failure to heed Ahithophel’s advice to pursue David and overtake him before

³³In John 17:12 Jesus in his great prayer says, “I guarded them [the disciples], and not one from them is destroyed except the son of destruction, in order that the scriptures might be fulfilled.” In all four Gospels, Jesus makes a statement regarding the fate of his betrayer— with the strongest sentiments recorded in the Gospel of John. The author of Matthew certainly parallels this with the repentance of Judas. See Aus, “The Name,” 190–91.

David regrouped (2 Sam 17:1–3). When Absalom chose the advice of Hushai over Ahithophel, Ahithophel knew it was only a matter of time before David would regain the throne and exact vengeance for Ahithophel's betrayal.³⁴ While there are a number of suicides within the OT, his is the only suicide by hanging.³⁵

The Gospel of Matthew details Judas' remorse after his betrayal, his confession to the religious leaders, throwing of the thirty silver pieces into the temple, and subsequent suicide by hanging (27:3–10).³⁶ There have been numerous scholars who have drawn a connection between Judas' death and the death of Ahithophel,³⁷ with just as many detractors. Raymond Brown went so far as to state that “the Ahithophel story generated Matt's account of suicide by hanging.”³⁸ It is more likely that the author of Matthew has passed on the tradition received regarding Judas' death and not created it, and then crafted his narrative to display this typological connection.³⁹

Numerous scholars find the connection between Judas and Ahithophel on this point suspect.⁴⁰ Most of these scholars are following the work of Van Unnik, who states:

³⁴Klassen makes the curious statement that there was no betrayal in the Ahithophel narrative. See Klassen, *Judas*, 170.

³⁵Judg 9:54; 1 Sam 31:4, 5; 1 Kgs 16:18.

³⁶Whether this confession and death should be viewed as redemptive or shameful is disputed. For the redemptive understanding, see David A. Reed, ““Saving Judas”—A Social Scientific Approach to Judas's Suicide in Matthew 27:3–10,” *BTB* 35 (2005), 51-59; C. F. Whelan, “Suicide in the Ancient World: A Re-examination of Matthew 27:3-10,” *LTP* 49/3 (1993), 505-522; A. G. Moeser, “The Death of Judas,” *Bible Today* 30/3 (1992), 145-151; Nolland, *Matthew*, 1149 ff. For the view that Judas died in shame see France, *Matthew*, 1039-40; Brown, *Death*, 1:656-57, 2:1404-10.

³⁷Maarten J. J. Menken, “The Old Testament Quotation in Matthew 27,9-10: Textual Form and Context,” *Bib* 83 (2002), 322-23; Anthony Cane, *The Place Of Judas Iscariot In Christology* (Hants, England: Ashgate, 2005), 53 n.125; Van De Water, “Wicked Priest,” 400; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:509 n.23, 565-66; France, *Matthew*, 1041; Brown, *Death*, 1:656-57. Athanasius also drew a connection between Ahithophel and Judas, see *Expositiones in Psalmos* 27.553.30.

³⁸*Ibid.*, 657. So too Van De Water, “Wicked Priest,” 400. Foakes-Jackson *et al* take a midway approach which may be the best option. “if the account in Matthew be taken for history, the coincidence in language is due to the perception of the parallel ; but if it be regarded as historical, it is probably the LXX parallel which produced the story in Matthew... The truth probably is that there was a loose tradition of the way in which the death of a traitor ought to correspond to his offence. One writer put in one detail, the next added another, until finally nearly all had been incorporated.” F. J. Foakes-Jackson *et al.*, *The Acts of the Apostles* (The Beginnings of Christianity 5; London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1920), 29, 30.

³⁹Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:566.

⁴⁰Willem C. Van Unnik, “The Death of Judas in Saint Matthew's Gospel,” *ATHRSup* 3 (1974), 44-57; Kim

The whole parallelism dwindles down to a single word. Now it is evident that early Christians could use the Old Testament in a queer way ... I fail to see any light coming from that Old Testament story to illuminate the gloomy end of Jesus' disciple; on the contrary, till further notice it is sheer prejudice to derive this detail of the Judas story from the Old Testament.⁴¹

Van Unnik's argument fails on a number of levels. First, he is correct that of the two words commonly held up as a verbal parallel (ἀπέρχομαι and ἀπάγω) the first is a very common word. However, to therefore make the jump to saying the parallel is only a single word is misleading. LXX 2 Sam 17:23 and Matt 27:5 are the *only* verses in the Bible, Philo, Josephus, the Apostolic Fathers, and the Greek Pseudepigrapha to have these two lemmas in the same verse.⁴² This should not necessarily be labeled a citation, but can certainly be considered an allusion. Given how central the OT was for the early church and how entrenched the Gospel of Matthew is in the scriptures, it would have been quite amazing for both Matthew and his audience to *not* draw to mind Ahithophel upon hearing about the death of Judas, the only suicide by hanging in their scriptures! Finally, Van Unnik, and those who have adopted his view, have stressed that this is the sole connection. On the contrary, the author of Matthew uses this as the final and strongest connection. Three other connections between Judas and Ahithophel have already been presented, and further thematic parallels will be discussed below. Matthew has thus firmly placed the story of Judas within the biblical narrative: "Judas, by turning against the Son of David, has thus joined the ranks of the great traitors."⁴³

Paffenroth, *Judas: Images Of The Lost Disciple* (1st ed ed. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 114; Hagner, *Matthew*, 813; Klassen, *Judas*, 170; John A. Upton, "The Potter's Field and the death of Judas," *Concordia Journal* 8/6 (1982), 218; Frederick Dale Bruner, *Matthew: The Churchbook* (2 vols.; Rev. and Exp. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 707-08; Audrey Conard, "The Fate of Judas: Matthew 27:3-10," *TJT* 7/2 (1991), 164. Conard makes the extraordinary claim (p.164) that there is "no hint that Ahithophel betrayed David."

⁴¹Van Unnik, "Death of Judas," 50.

⁴²The lemmas also occur together in Nicetas Seides Scr. Eccl., *Conspectus librorum sacrorum*, Chapter 12, page 154, line 24 and Joannes Zonaras Hist. et Gramm., *Epitome historiarum (lib. 1-12)*, Volume 1, page 112, line 23— both in reference to the story of Ahithophel.

⁴³France, *Matthew*, 1041.

6.2.5: Summary and Relevance for Thesis

Ahithophel and Judas share a number of things in common which undoubtedly led Matthew in particular to color his narrative to heighten the allusion to Ahithophel tradition in the OT. Luke emphasizes that Judas was part of the inner circle, with Matthew alone having Jesus address Judas as friend. These undoubtedly point to the “betrayal” Psalms 41 and 55, psalms connected with Ahithophel, in order to draw a comparison with Judas and Ahithophel. Judas’ epithet “Iscariot” may be a derivation from a semitic root, a root which appears three times in Psalm 55 and once in Psalm 41. The fate of Ahithophel and Judas were spoken of in dire terms—the Rabbis condemn Ahithophel as eternally lost, and the Gospel authors similarly condemn Judas. Finally, and most decisively, both men committed suicide by hanging—the only suicides by hanging in the scriptures and the only two verses in the scriptures and other early Greek texts to use both ἀπέρχομαι and ἀπάγω in the same verse. These connections present a first-order typology between Ahithophel and Judas as type and anti-type.

6.3: The Profile of Biblical Betrayals: Thematic Parallels in the Gospel Narratives

A number of thematic parallels exist between the Gospel narratives of the betrayal in Gethsemane and the narrative in 2 Samuel of Ahithophel and Absalom’s betrayal, in addition to other Ahithophel traditions in the OT. While not every parallel can claim exact verbal or lexical parallelisms, the impressive number of thematic elements leaves little doubt that Matthew intentionally colored his narrative to reflect the betrayal of king David.

6.3.1: Leading up to the Betrayal

Prior to the events of Gethsemane is Jesus’ last meal with his intimate group of followers, including Judas.⁴⁴ During the meal Jesus says in Mark 14:18, “truly I say to you that one among you will hand me over, one eating with me.” Commentaries on Mark have noted the likely

reference to Ps 41:9.⁴⁵ Matthew and Luke both make use of Mark at this point, though they add to it by adding more specifics, particularly the “hand” of the betrayer being “in the bowl” (Matt 26:23) or “on the table” (Luke 22:21).⁴⁶ While Mark’s allusion is adopted with modification by Matthew and Luke, it is John who has Jesus quote Ps 41:9 outright in 13:18. As previously stated, Psalm 41 was read as referring to Ahithophel’s betrayal of David, and all of the Gospels allude to this psalm and apply it to Judas. Joel Green states:

The language employed would not lead anyone to argue for direct borrowing. It is nonetheless probable, given the scandal of Jesus’ having been betrayed by his close associate and the reference to Ps 41:9 in the Supper scene, that Judas’s role was seen in typological relationship to the insidious man of the texts [Pss 41, 43, 55, 109].⁴⁷

6.3.2: The Movements of King David/Son of David

A number of scholars haven’t noted the similarity of movement when comparing David’s flight from Absalom and Jesus’ travels to the Garden of Gethsemane.⁴⁸ Francis Glasson states, “the Son of David repeats the sad journey of his ancestor.”⁴⁹ Consider:

- David crosses the Kidron (2 Sam 15:23) // Jesus crosses the Kidron (John 18:1).
- David’s destination is the Mount of Olives (2 Sam 15:30) // Jesus prays in the garden of Gethsemane on the Mount of Olives (Matt 26:30/Mark 14:26/Luke 22:39).⁵⁰

⁴⁴T. Francis Glasson states, “David was dealt with treacherously by members of his own family and household ... Jesus was betrayed by one of his own ‘family’, Judas,” Glasson, “Davidic Links,” 118.

⁴⁵France, *Mark*, 566; Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20* (WBC 34B; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 2001), 375.

⁴⁶France, *Matthew*, 989.

⁴⁷Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus: tradition and interpretation in the Passion narrative* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1988), 233.

⁴⁸Cane, *Place Of Judas*, 42n.86; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:565; Glasson, “Davidic Links,” 118; Pitre, *End of the Exile*, 481; Selwyn, *Oracles*, 349-350.

⁴⁹Glasson, “Davidic Links,” 118.

⁵⁰Selwyn argued that the very name Gethsemane was a Hebrew composite name whose elements can be traced back to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of LXX 2 Sam 15:18. The LXX version of 15:18 states: “And all his servants were passing close by him, and every Chetti and every Phelethi, and they stood by the olive tree in the wilderness. And all the people were passing by near him, and all those about him and all the prominent men and all the warriors, six hundred men, and they were passing by at his hand, and every Cherethi and every Phelethi and all the Geththites, six hundred men, who came on their feet from Geth, going in front of the king.” The word “Geth” in Greek is semitized as simply Γεθ, the first element of “Gethsemane.” The second element would have been the Hebrew *Vorlage* for the Greek word ἐλαίας, ἡλιών. This is an enticing option, but requires a few wilcard

- David prays and weeps on the Mount of Olives (2 Sam 15:30–31) // Jesus prays (Matt 26:36, 39, 42, 44; Mark 14:32, 35, 39; Luke 22:40, 44) and sweats drops of blood (Luke 22:44).

To these movements can also be added the time and place of Ahithophel and Judas' schemes: both men are in Jerusalem when they offer to betray Jesus (2 Sam 16:15; 17:1–4 / Matt 26:14–16) and Ahithophel proposes to capture David in the night (2 Sam 17:1) while Judas and the arresting party come to Jesus at night (Matt 26:47–56).⁵¹ So it is that the great time of lament during a time of betrayal by both King David and the Son of David happen in a similar manner. Brant Pitre says, “He [Jesus] has chosen the site of David’s suffering and lament to offer up his final petitions regarding his own fate as the shepherd of Israel who will be struck down.”⁵²

6.3.3: *Distress of Jesus*

All of the synoptics make mention of Jesus’ agony in Gethsemane during his time of prayer, but Mark and Matthew make special mention of his distress and agitation. In Mark 14:34/ Matt 26:38 Jesus says, “my soul is very sorrowful even to death.” Craig Evans notes the deliberate echo of biblical language.⁵³ While Ps 42:4–5, 11 and Ps 43:5 (attributed to David in the LXX [Ps 42]) are the psalms mentioned by commentators,⁵⁴ it has been noted by Gärtner that the element of “even to death” is not part of Pss 42 or 43. However, the threat of death is

factors and leaps. First, the MT does not have the Olive tree, so we need to assume a Hebrew vorlage for the LXX. Second, even if this were true, the word for olive in the LXX is ἔλαιον which translates תַּיִן, never she-men—שֶׁמֶן is always translated with ἔλαιον (olive oil). So, a reconstruction of a theoretical Hebrew Vorlage would likely have תַּיִן, not שֶׁמֶן. So David is standing by an olive tree at Gath—but this composite would have been Gethzayit, not Gethsemane.

⁵¹Aus, “The Name,” 164.

⁵²Pitre, *End of the Exile*, 481-82.

⁵³Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 410; Willitts, *Shepherd-King*, 100.

⁵⁴France, *Matthew*, 1004.

spelled out in Ps 55:4, a Davidic psalm read as referring to Ahithophel: “My heart was troubled within me, and death’s terror fell upon me.” (*NETS* Ps 54:5)

It therefore seems to me not impossible to hear a hint of Psalm 55 too in Jesus’ saying, for we find there the basic theme of the entire Gethsemane pericope: the fervent prayer of the Righteous One in the face of fear of death (55:2–7), as well as anxiety in the face of betrayal by a close friend (vv. 10–16); in addition, there is also the fact that this Psalm was widely used in Jewish typology about a betrayer.⁵⁵

Worthy of note as well is Ahithophel’s words about David in 2 Sam 17:2 that Ahithophel will come upon David while he is “weary and faint in hands.” This further promotes the thematic parallel in the sequence of events mentioned in §6.3.2, as Judas comes upon Jesus who was just “grieved and distressed” (Matt 26:37) in the garden.⁵⁶

6.3.4: Ahithophel’s Advice taken by Judas

Not only did Jesus’ movement towards the Mount of Olives replicate David’s own movements, but Judas’ actions also seem to replicate or fulfill Ahithophel’s intentions.⁵⁷ In the story of David’s flight from Absalom, Ahithophel gives Absalom advice to over-run David—advice that is not heeded by Absalom. Ahithophel says: “I will now choose for myself twelve thousand men, and I will set out and pursue closely after David tonight. And I will come suddenly upon him, and he will be weary and faint in hands, and I will astound him, and all the people who are with him shall flee, and I will strike only the king all alone” (*NETS* 2 Sam 17:1–2).

In the Gospels, a scaled down version of this scenario plays out: Judas leads an arresting party to Jesus in the night and comes upon a “grieved and agitated” (Matt 26:37) Jesus. Finally, all of those with Jesus flee (Matt 26:56, Mark 14:50), and Jesus alone (John 18:8) is

⁵⁵Gärtner, *Iscaiot*, 36.

⁵⁶Aus, “The Name,” 165.

⁵⁷Trudinger, “Further Observations,” 278-79.

taken by the arresting party and handed over. This correlation implies that Judas does to the Son of David what Ahithophel planned to do to King David.

6.3.5: The Hand of the Betrayer(s)

As already stated in §6.3.1, Matthew (and Luke) make curious mention of the “hand” of the betrayer. The “hands” of the arresting party are also mentioned in Matt 26:50 (cf. Mark 14:46). Both of these verses feature the awkward statement ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκράτησαν αὐτόν. It is an awkward statement because ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας is already an idiomatic way of stating that someone is arrested (c.f. Acts 4:3 and 5:18). To the Greek ear it would sound like Matthew (and Mark) have stated the same thing twice. Luke evidently recognized the awkwardness, as he omits Mark’s construction. In Luke 22:54, Jesus is seized and led away (Συλλαβόντες δὲ αὐτὸν ἤγαγον), but not before Jesus addresses the arresting party in Luke 22:53. In this verse Jesus states that they did not lay their hands on Jesus when he was in the temple. Thus, Jesus in Matthew has hands thrown on him and is arrested, while Luke omits that construction but still has Jesus mention the laying on of hands in contempt.

While Luke omitted the awkward statement of arresting Jesus twice, he still saw fit to include the idea of hands reaching out in contempt for Jesus. In the betrayal Psalm 55, David states: “My companion laid hands on a friend and violated a covenant with me” (v. 20). Luke, in his reworking of Mark’s material, has Jesus speak of the hands being laid upon him to arrest him. But in his change from Mark’s action to Jesus’ speech, the verb ἐκτείνω is used rather than ἐπιβάλλω. This is the same verb used in the LXX of Ps 55:20 [LXX 54:21]. Given the number of allusions to the Ahithophel traditions in the OT, it may be that the awkward mention of “contemptuous” hands in Mark and Matthew, as well as Luke’s choice to still men-

tion hands despite omitting Mark's awkward construction, may be a further allusion to Psalm 55.⁵⁸

6.3.6: In Fulfillment of the Scriptures

A number of allusions have been introduced which show the interaction with the betrayal psalms, many of which were connected to Ahithophel. Although some of these allusions are slight, it seems that the author of Matthew helps readers in confirming that these allusions are purposeful. Only in Matt 26:50 does Jesus tell Judas “ἔταῖρε, ἐφ’ ὃ πάρει.” ἐφ’ ὃ πάρει is translated variously as an interrogative (“why have you come?”), an implied command (“do what you here to do”), or an emphatic statement (“for this you come!”).⁵⁹ Whichever way one decides to translate, it is seems clear that Jesus knows and expects what is about to happen: “The implication is that what had been prophesied concerning Judas’ betrayal is about to be fulfilled.”⁶⁰ This is confirmed not only in Matt 26:54//Mark 14:49, but the author of Matthew has Jesus reiterate the belief that the events happened in fulfillment of the scriptures.⁶¹ In Matt 26:56, unique to Matthew, Jesus states: “But all this has happened in order that the scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled.”⁶² Matthew emphasizes that all of the elements leading up to his arrest were in fulfillment of the scriptures. This reiteration by the evangelist invites the reader to reflect upon the scriptures, and it seems likely that the betrayal psalms were specifically in the mind of the evangelist. This usage invites a typological reading of both Jesus as David and Judas as Ahithophel.

⁵⁸Aus has also suggested that Matt 26:23 and the dipping of the bread in the bowl (bread is implied) may hearken back to Ps 41:10. See Aus, “The Name,” 161–62.

⁵⁹The options are given in Hagner, *Matthew*, 789 and France, *Matthew*, 1012-13.

⁶⁰Van De Water, “Wicked Priest,” 402.

⁶¹Gärtner, *Iscaiot*, 14.

⁶²As the Gospels are saturated with the scriptures, this no doubt referred to a wide range of texts in the OT, texts like Isaiah and Zechariah (Hagner, *Matthew*, 790). However, David was regarded as a prophet as well and his voice in the psalms were undoubtedly regarded as prophecy as well. See for example 11QPs^a 27.11.

6.3.7: Additional Parallels

Numerous thematic parallels and allusions have been listed above. A number of other more allusive connections may possibly be present, connections that may be more likely given that they are in the presence of stronger allusions already established (i.e. clustered echoes). These parallels come from the works of Edward Selwyn and Roger Aus.⁶³

1. “Get up, and let us flee” (Ἀνάστητε καὶ φύγωμεν) in 2 Sam 15:14 (cf. 17:2) is compared to “get up, let us be going” (ἐγείρεσθε ἄγωμεν in Matt 26:46/Mark 14:42/John 14:31; ἀναστάντες προσεύχεσθε in Luke 22:46).⁶⁴
2. “According to everything which our lord the king chooses, behold, your servants” in 2 Sam 15:15 is compared to “Peter said to him, ‘Even if it is necessary for me to die with you, I will surely not deny you.’ And all the disciples said likewise.” (Matt 26:35/Mark 14:31).
3. “Turn back, and turn back your brothers with you” (ἐπιστρέφου καὶ ἐπίστρεψον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου μετὰ σοῦ) in 2 Sam 15:20 is compared to “when you have turned back, strengthen your brothers” (ἐπιστρέψας στήρισον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου) in Luke 22:32.
4. Ahithophel choosing twelve thousand men (2 Sam 17:1) is compared to Jesus indicating his ability to ask the Father for twelve legions of angels in Matt 26:53.
5. “In the sight of all the elders of Israel” in 2 Sam 17:1–4 is compared to Judas arriving with “chief priests and the elders” (Matt 26:47).⁶⁵
6. Luke 21:37 (paralleled in Matt 21:17 but without the mention of the Mount of Olives) states that Jesus lodged on the Mount of Olives. The word ἀυλίζομαι occurs in the NT only here. David is told not to lodge (ἀυλίζομαι) in the wilderness in 2 Sam 17:16.
7. In the midst of betrayal by Absalom Ittai professed his loyalty to David unto death (2 Sam 15:19–24) as does Peter to Jesus (Matt 26:33 and parallels).⁶⁶
8. Ahithophel takes counsel (βουλή): LXX 2 Sam 15:31, 34; 16:20, 23; 17:7, 14, 23 So too the religious leaders in Matthew take counsel (συμβούλιον) in Matt 27:1, 7.⁶⁷

⁶³Selwyn, *Oracles*, 350. Selwyn argues for about twenty connections between the Gospel betrayal narratives and the narrative of David’s betrayal in 2 Samuel. A number of these have already been discussed, and a number of his observations were dismissed as either highly likely or tenuous at best. See n. 50 on page 188 for one such example. Aus, “The Name,” 164–85. These parallels will draw connection to all of the Gospels. Only the possible echoes relevant to Matthew are included.

⁶⁴All LXX translations are taken from *NETS* and all NT translations are my own.

⁶⁵Suggested also by *Ibid.*, 167–68.

⁶⁶Bassler, “All Seasons,” 169.

9. Although an argument from silence, Roger Aus has noted the peculiar silence in terms of motive for both of these biblical betrayals.⁶⁸

6.3.8: Summary and Relevance for Thesis

Numerous thematic parallels exist between Matthew and the OT Ahithophel material. The betrayal psalms are alluded to prior to Gethsemane during the last supper; the sequence of actions by Jesus is strongly reminiscent of David's own flight; Jesus' distress in the garden draws to mind David's agony in the betrayal psalms; Judas' actions of betrayal follow quite closely Ahithophel's desired actions towards David; and all of these things are emphasized by Matthew as being in fulfillment of the scriptures, inviting the reader to draw connections with the scriptures of Israel, particularly the psalms of betrayal. The presence of these stronger allusions allows for the likelihood of further echoes as well. When Matthew portrayed the betrayal of Jesus, he did so by coloring his narrative with Davidic material.

6.4: Conclusion

Numerous solid allusions to OT Ahithophel tradition as well as several possible echoes exist in Matthew's betrayal narrative. As the evangelist (and the later church) reflected on Judas' betrayal of Jesus, they thought of Ahithophel and colored his narrative accordingly. When Matthew described and passed on the tradition of Jesus' agony on the Mount of Olives and arrest, he reminded them of David's own agony on the Mount of Olives. This use of Davidic typology invites a complex comparison of an event and the main characters involved. And it should come as no surprise by this time in Matthew's narrative that the author would have David's story and David's own voice from the psalms readily at hand. The evangelist went be-

⁶⁷Timothy W. Berkley, "OT exegesis and the death of Judas," in *Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies* (Cincinnati: Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies, 1994), 37.

⁶⁸Aus, "The Name," 185–86.

yond the reuse of Davidic tradition in portraying Jesus as David's rightful heir and typologically colored the narrative of the betrayal of Jesus to reflect David's own trials. This serves to bolster even more Barnabas Lindars' words that "every detail of the known history of Judas was prefigured in Scripture."⁶⁹

Judas, like Ahithophel, was a friend and companion. Their treachery was spoken of in dire terms, and their suicide by hanging serves to solidify the parallels and allusions which through this narrative section have been light and sometimes allusive. While Judas follows the Ahithophel typology, Jesus follows a David typology at the last supper, the sequence of actions to the garden, and his manner of arrest. The betrayal by Judas and subsequent arrest of Jesus is a crucial event in the life of Jesus, and infamous in history even to the present. All the more significant, then, that the evangelist colors this part of the Son of David's story with allusions to King David and his own betrayal by a trusted friend.

David himself became a 'type', a model, of 'great David's greater Son', the promised Messiah. This did not mean that everything that happened to David had to find its echo in Jesus. It meant that many of the broad themes of his life were understood that way—especially where language was so hyperbolic when applied to David alone that many readers of Scripture, Jews and Christians alike, were driven to seeing in such texts an anticipation, an adumbration, of the coming King ... amongst the great themes of David's life that are repeatedly picked up in the New Testament are those that focus on his suffering, weakness, betrayal by friends, discouragement ... Christians who came to see that the greatest display of the glory of the incarnate Word lay in the suffering and death so despised by the blind world, could not help but emphasize the similar strand in David's life, and see in it part of the mosaic that established a Davidic 'typology'.⁷⁰

⁶⁹Lindars, *Apologetic*, 121.

⁷⁰D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John* (Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1991), 470.

Chapter 7: David's Passion in the Psalms and the Passion of the Son of David

The cumulative focal point of Matthew's Gospel occurs with the death of Jesus, and it is this point that provides the last major interaction with Davidic typology. As with other significant points in Jesus' ministry, the condemnation of Jesus by the religious leaders and his death on the cross is also colored with Davidic motifs and makes use of later Davidic tradition. An allusion to Psalm 110 is offered along with the reference to the "Son of Man," which provide the last words spoken by Jesus in Matthew (26:64) until he is on the cross and cries out the words of Psalm 22. In light of Matthew's presentation up to this point, it is not surprising that the focal event of the Gospel's narrative—Jesus' death on the cross—has the crucified Son of David using the language of King David from Psalm 22. In his birth, ministry, and death, Jesus is consistently portrayed with Davidic overtones.

7.1: Jesus' Quotation of Psalm 22

Just as David's story influenced Matthew's retelling of Jesus' betrayal, so too, without explicit reference to David, David's voice weighs heavy on the narrative of Jesus' death in Matthew. Rather than an allusion to a story of David, Matthew (and the other Gospel writers) draw heavily upon Psalm 22 in portraying Jesus' death on the cross and the events surrounding it. The actual quotation of Psalm 22 by Jesus on the cross shows the reliance on Psalm 22, but Matthew's passion also has other solid references to Psalm 22 as well as thematic parallels. These will be discussed in turn.

7.1.1: Ancient Readings of Psalm 22

While Psalm 22's superscription does not detail a specific circumstance in the life of David, it does contain the standard Davidic superscription. In light of the previous information about the increasing importance of David for the Psalms (§5.5.1), it is important to understand that the Davidic superscription "points to a clear change in the identity of the individual prominently featured in the Psalms from an anonymous, ordinary member of the community to an exemplary figure in Israel's history, specifically an ideal king."¹ Matthew has already made typological use of the Davidic psalms, and the use of Psalm 22 continues this practice.

7.1.1.1: Jewish Readings of Psalm 22

The Jewish reading of Psalm 22 specifically is worthy of a few comments. It can first be noted that Qumran provides at least one parallel example of another lament psalm being transformed into the words of someone specific. The author of 1QH^a 13, often thought to be the Teacher of Righteousness, seems to have understood himself as having an eschatological role. Words are used from Ps 41:10: "Ev[en those who e]at my bread have raised their heel against me" (1QH^a 13.23–24 [García Martínez numbering]). While not Psalm 22, this example "implies that the Teacher re-wrote the psalm with himself as the speaker."² This usage by the Teacher of Righteousness represents how lament psalms seem to have been used. In the case of Psalm 22, it "was recited in its earliest usage within communal offices for afflicted members. The psalm may have served for cases of extreme and prolonged suffering... Thus the original intention of the psalm was to save members of the congregation from certain death."³

¹Esther Menn, "No Ordinary Lament: Relecture and the Identity of the Distressed in Psalm 22," *HTR* 93/4 (2000), 314. For discussion on David's voice in the psalms, see §5.5.1.

²Adela Yarbro Collins, "The Appropriation of the Psalms of Individual Lament by Mark," in *Scriptures in the Gospels* (ed. Christopher M. Tuckett; Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1997), 226.

³*Ibid.*, 224.

There have been attempts to find a messianic or eschatological reading of Psalm 22, but there is no early evidence of this. Esther Menn suggests that *Pesiqta Rabbati* 34–37 and *Yalqut. Šim ‘oni* on Ps 60.1 connects Psalm 22 to a possible messianic figure, but by her own admission the late date of this literature makes it of little use.⁴ What has gained only slightly more traction is the suggestion that the early Greek translations of לְמִנְצִיחַ in the superscription that may indicate early Jewish perceptions of some sort of eschatological significance to Psalm 22:

Table 1: Superscription of Ps 22

MT	לְמִנְצִיחַ עַל־אֵילָת הַשָּׁחַר מִזְמוֹר לְדָוִד To the leader: according to The Deer of the Dawn. A Psalm of David.
LXX	Εἰς τὸ τέλος, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀντιλήψεως τῆς ἑωθινῆς· ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυίδ. For the end, on behalf of the help of the early morning, a psalm of David.
Aquila ⁵	τῷ νικοποιῶ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐλάφου τῆς ὀρθρινῆς μελωδῆμα τῷ Δαυίδ To the one causing victory over the stag of the dawn. A melody to David.
Symmachus	ἐπινίκιος ὑπὲρ τῆς βοηθείας τῆς ὀρθρινῆς ᾠδὴ τοῦ Δαυίδ Of victory over the help of the dawn. An ode of David.
Targum	לְשַׁבַּח עַל תְּקוּף קוֹרְבָן תְּדִירָא דְקָרִי צֵתָא תּוֹשְׁבַח תָּא לְדָוִד For praise; concerning the strength of the regular morning sacrifice; to David.

Esther Menn, and in particular L. Paul Trudinger, have argued that the Greek translations of the first word may be eschatological, with Trudinger going so far as to say that τέλος and νικοποιός / ἐπινίκιος is signifying the end-time and “the beginning of Messiah’s reign.”⁶ As attractive as this might be to some scholars, the assertion must be rejected. The

⁴Menn, “No Ordinary Lament,” 329 n.122.

⁵All excerpts from Aquila and Symmachus are from Frederick Field, ed., *Origen Hexapla* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1875).

LXX, Aquila, and Symmachus are all following their stereotyped translations for לְמִנְצֵחַ.⁷ Psalm 22 is not unique in translating לְמִנְצֵחַ with τέλος.⁸ Unless one is willing to argue eschatological and messianic significance for every psalm that began this way (fifty-five of them), there is no ground for believing that this Greek superscription had eschatological significance; it was simply the way the Greek translator chose to translate לְמִנְצֵחַ in the superscription.

Later talmudic discussion on Psalm 22 discusses it as a prayer of Esther—she is the “doe of the dawn.” Some scholars believe the talmudic readings arose to counter the Christian reading.⁹ What makes the Esther reading interesting is that the Psalm was appropriated as the words of another:

[T]hey maintained that David composed this “Psalm of David,” not about his own personal experiences, as one might suppose in light of other psalms headed by descriptions of events from his life, but about events much later in Israel’s history that he foresaw through divine inspiration... *Midrash Tehillim* claims that “when David saw through the holy spirit that ‘my Strength’ was the wording that [Esther] would [use to] call upon the Holy One, blessed be He, he composed this psalm concerning her, To the Director, Concerning the ‘Strength of the Dawn.’” According to this midrash, the holy spirit revealed to David not only the general circumstances of Esther’s life that would lead her to call upon God, but even the very wording of her prayer. A similar understanding of David’s authorship of Psalm 22 as a revelation concerning the details of Jesus’ passion, including his exact words on the cross, seems to underlie the gospel citations of and allusions to the psalm.¹⁰

So while Jewish reading of Psalm 22 was not messianic, its reading of Esther into the text is crucial for understanding how early readers viewed this psalm: as the lament of David

⁶L. Paul Trudinger, “Eli, Eli, Lama Sabachthani: a Cry of Dereliction or Victory?” *JETS* 17/4 (October, 1974), 236.

⁷Pss 4:1; 5:1; 6:1; 8:1; 9:1; 10:1; 11:1; 12:1; 13:1; 17:1; 18:1; 19:1; 20:1; 21:1; 29:1; 30:1; 35:1; 38:1; 39:1; 40:1; 41:1; 43:1; 44:1; 45:1; 46:1; 48:1; 50:1; 51:1; 52:1; 53:1; 54:1; 55:1; 56:1; 57:1; 58:1; 59:1; 60:1; 61:1; 63:1; 64:1; 65:1; 66:1; 67:1; 68:1; 69:1; 74:1; 75:1; 76:1; 79:1; 80:1; 83:1; 84:1; 87:1; 108:1; 138:1; 139:1.

⁸See Walter Baumgartner et al., “נִצְחָה,” *HALOT*, 716.

⁹Catherine Brown Tkacz, “Esther, Jesus, and Psalm 22,” *CBQ* 70/4 (2008), 709-728. At least one other believes the Esther reading simply arose due to common rabbinic hermeneutics. See Hanneke Reuling, “Rabbinic responses to Christian appropriation of the Hebrew Bible: the case of Psalm 22:1 (MT),” *StPatr* 44 (2010), 177-182.

¹⁰Menn, “No Ordinary Lament,” 336.

about a later figure. In some instances that figure was Esther, in Christian circles it was Jesus. Menn states, “Instead of a late or perhaps even arbitrary exegetical association between an ancient liturgical composition...the connection between Psalm 22 and Esther’s or Jesus’ story becomes the original intent of David’s divinely inspired composition, long before either was born.”¹¹

Finally, one medieval rabbinic commentary connects David with Psalm 22.¹² That there is a lack of discussion about David and Psalm 22 in rabbinic tradition is hardly surprising, as the voice of David was assumed through the psalter as a matter of course.

7.1.1.2: Christian Readings

The use of Psalm 22 by Matthew will be discussed at length below. Suffice it to say that Psalm 22 seems to have been connected with Jesus’ death at a very early stage. Even John, who seems to be uncomfortable with the seeming cry of abandonment and removes it (instead adding statements like 16:32), kept the allusions to Psalm 22 in his passion account with the dividing of Jesus’ clothes (19:24).

Another important NT example of this connection is Heb 2:11–12: “For he who sanctifies and those who are sanctified all have one source. That is why he is not ashamed to call them brothers, saying, ‘I will tell of your name to my brothers; in the midst of the congregation I will sing your praise’.” Paul Ellingworth argues that the use of Ps 22:23 (MT) here stems from the early Christian use of the cry of dereliction and the readers were expected to be aware of the traditional understanding of this psalm.¹³ J. C. McCullough has gone so far as to state that the author of Hebrews “is quoting, not so much the Old Testament as Jesus Christ.”¹⁴ While this may be an overstatement, it is not entirely inconsistent with the early

¹¹*Ibid.*, 337.

¹²As noted in *Ibid.*, 315.

¹³Paul Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: a Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 167.

reading of Psalm 22 as the voice of David, and consistent with hearing the voice of another within that psalm—whether it be Jesus or Esther.

Jewish readings of Psalm 22 as David’s voice transposed to Esther likely arose subsequent to, or in reaction to, the reading of the early church.¹⁵ “Within Christianity, the motif of David’s prophetic foresight of Jesus’ passion in Psalm 22 appears prominently in anti-Jewish polemics, that charge the Jews with failing to recognize the significance of their own scriptures.”¹⁶ The anti-Jewish polemic is found especially in Justin Martyr’s *Dialogue with Trypho*. In *Dial.* 104 Justin discusses Psalm 22, stating that it “was a prediction, as I said before, of the death to which the synagogue of the wicked would condemn Him.” So too Tertullian in the fifth book *Against Marcion* states:

If you require still further prediction of the Lord’s cross, the twenty-first Psalm [LXX] is sufficiently able to afford it to you, containing as it does the entire passion of Christ, who was even then prophetically declaring His glory. “They pierced,” says He, “my hands and my feet,” which is the special cruelty of the cross. And again, when He implores His Father’s help, He says, “Save me from the lion’s mouth,” that is, the jaws of death, “and my humiliation from the horns of the unicorns;” in other words, from the extremities of the cross, as we have shown above. Now, David himself did not suffer this cross, nor did any other king of the Jews; so that you cannot suppose that this is the prophecy of any other’s passion than His who alone was so notably crucified by the nation (*Marc.* 5.19).

While it is true that the early church was predisposed to read Christ into the Old Testament, this nonetheless is consistent with other early Jewish readings and early perspectives on the Psalms.¹⁷ Indeed, both Tertullian and Justin Martyr (as well as Cyprian)¹⁸ capitalized upon the connections to Psalm 22, particularly 22:17 (LXX) and the piercing/gouging of the hands and feet, in a way in which the NT, curiously, did not (see §7.2.7 below).

¹⁴J. C. McCullough, “Hebrews and the Old Testament” (Ph.D. diss., Queen’s University, 1971), 288.

¹⁵See footnote 9.

¹⁶Menn, “No Ordinary Lament,” 336 n.151.

¹⁷As Jean-Claude Basset points out, this reading was not universal in the the early church. Theodore of Mopsuestia refuted the idea of Ps 22 as a prophecy of Jesus’ passion. See Jean-Claude Basset, “Le psaume 22 (LXX 21) et la croix chez les pires,” *RHPR* 54/3 (1974), 383-89.

¹⁸Cyprian *Treatises* 12.2.20; Justin *1 Apol.* 1.35 5–7, *Dial.* 97.3–4, Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 8: 10, 13 10–11.

7.1.2: Jesus' Cry of Psalm 22

Although Matt 27:46 (following Mark 15:34) is the only formal quotation of Psalm 22, elements of Psalm 22 are woven throughout the passion narrative (see §7.2 below). It is highly likely, therefore, that the evangelist quoted Psalm 22:1 in the light of the entire psalm, not atomistically.¹⁹ The following table compares Jesus' quotations along with the ancient versions of Psalm 22:2.

Table 2: Ps 22 Quotation

Matt 27:46	Mark 15:34
ηλι ηλι λεμα σαβαχθανι; τουτ' εστιν· θεε μου θεε μου, ινατι με εγκατελιπες;	ελωι ελωι λεμα σαβαχθανι; ο εστιν μεθερμηνευομενον· ο θεος μου ο θεος μου, εις τι εγκατελιπες με;
OT Versions	
LXX Ps 21:2	Ο θεός ο θεός μου, πρόσχες μοι, ίνα τί εγκατέλιπές με; O God, my God, pay attention to me. Why did you abandon me?
Aquila Ps 21:2	ισχυρε μου, ισχυρε μου... My power, my power...
Symmachus/θ Ps 21:2	Ο θεός μου, ο θεός μου... My God, my God...
MT Ps 22:2	אֱלֹהֵי אֱלֹהֵי לָמָּה עֲזַבְתָּנִי My God, my God why have you forsaken me?
Tg. Ps. 22:2	אֱלֹהֵי אֱלֹהֵי מִטּוֹל מָה שְׂבַקְתָּנִי My God, my God, why have you left me far from my redemption?

¹⁹Gundry, along with many other commentators, takes the view that the entire psalm is in view. See for example Loren R. Fisher, "Betrayed by Friends: an expository study of Psalm 22," *Int* 18/1 (1964), 22; Gundry, *Use Of The Old Testament*, 216. Gundry states, "Jesus and Mt's use of the OT should not offend the best in modern OT scholarship." For the atomistic understanding, see Luz, *Matthew*, 350; Brown, *Death*, 1050; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 159-160. Soares Prabhu states: "Matthew reads the Old Testament [and] picks out passages in which he finds (in an atomistic reading of the text) relevant to the person and mission of Jesus as he understands them."

Jesus' cry from the cross as recorded in Matthew is changed from Mark's $\epsilon\lambda\omega\iota \epsilon\lambda\omega\iota$ to $\eta\lambda\iota \eta\lambda\iota$, in order to better reflect the Aramaic.²⁰ The translation offered by Matthew is also closer to the LXX translation with $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}$. Finally, Matthew changes the case of $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ to the vocative, which perhaps is intended to bring more of an intimacy to the words spoken, as Jesus has used the vocative to address God in prayer on the Mount of Olives already (Matt 26:39).

Commentators have long discussed how exactly this cry from the cross should be taken. Ought readers to assume the entirety of Psalm 22, which itself moves from lament to praise, therefore taking the sting out of the cry? Or should the full force of the pain of Jesus' only word from the cross in Matthew be taken as utter despair and abandonment?²¹ The two options need not be mutually exclusive—the feeling of pain and abandonment is certainly real, but this does not need to imply an atomistic reading of the text on Matthew's part. The lamenter in Psalm 22 indicated a very real sense of pain and abandonment, while still maintaining a connection with God (*my* God). At the same time, it is clear that this cry of desperation is for a reason—to ask God to act (more on this below at §7.2.8). It is clear, given the other connections that will be discussed, that the entirety of the Psalm, as opposed to just the lament, is in view for Matthew. Early Jewish understanding of the Psalms was that they were the voice of David. It seems that Psalm 22 was understood as a lament of David and understood in some circles as a prophetic voice. Second, Matthew more than any other Gospel makes use of other themes within Psalm 22—the quotation from the cross does not stand in isolation. Matthew read and understood Psalm 22 as informing numerous elements of Jesus' passion, and so readers should not hesitate to do so as well. Psalm 22 provided a unique op-

²⁰William J. Kenneally, “‘Eli, eli, lamma sabachtani’ (Mt. 27:46),” *CBQ* 8/2 (1946), 125-26; Evans, “Aramaic Psalter,” 87. 4Q381 Frag. 79:6 attests to this version of God's name.

²¹R. T. France cannot see how the cry can be viewed as anything but unqualified desolation. France, *Matthew*, 1076.

portunity for Matthew to show how David was a typological anti-type for Jesus' passion, and in some sense may have also been understood as David' prophetic voice about the Son of David's suffering.

7.1.3: Abandonment of the Righteous Sufferer

The usage of the Psalm 22 lament by Jesus is also important in that the situations are uniquely parallel. Both the lamenter and Jesus are righteous sufferers in Matthew's view, and for both the suffering is temporary. John Nolland states:

Ps. 22 is an example of a far more puzzling form of abandonment: the situation where the righteous are at the mercy of their enemies with no help in sight...the abandonment is only temporary. If one will continue to look to God, he will come through with deliverance. Jesus' situation is being identified not as that of an abandoned sinner but as that of a rather special instance of what is outlined in Ps. 22...Ps. 22 does not deny the difficulty, but it finds solace in recognising that the situation is only temporary. And so it will be with Jesus. Though in Gethsemane Jesus found assurance that drinking the cup was his Father's will, Ps. 22:1 on his lips on the cross may be seen as a vestige of the concern that led to his Gethsemane prayers.²²

The quotation of Ps.22:1 by Jesus not only captures the emotion of the speaker, but Matthew draws the connection between Jesus and David's prophetic passion—the one who laments is a righteous sufferer. But the suffering, while real, is only temporary.

7.1.4: Summary and Relevance for Thesis

Psalm 22 was firmly understood as the voice of David, and in some sense a prophetic word concerning the suffering of another. David's lament is drawn upon explicitly by Jesus' citation of Ps 22:1 from the cross. With this citation comes the reality of abandonment, but with an eye to the future. It has been shown elsewhere that Matthew makes both explicit use and implicit use of OT passages: in this case a clear citation gives way to recognition of numerous other allusions and clustered echoes that are more specific to Matthew. As will be shown,

²²Nolland, *Matthew*, 1207.

Matthew through this section draws upon Psalm 22 at numerous times, indicating strongly that this citation should not be read in isolation, but with the whole of Psalm 22 in mind. Jesus, like the individual of Psalm 22, is a righteous sufferer whose pain is real but temporary.

7.2: Further Typological Connections with Psalm 22

Beyond the direct quotation of Psalm 22, numerous parallels exist between David's own passion in Psalm 22 and the passion narrative of Matthew. The following parallels show that the entirety of Psalm 22 was in view for the Gospel author, and not simply the quotation.

7.2.1: Trust in God

Matt 27:43 adds to Mark 15:31 the phrase πέποιθεν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, ῥυσάσθω νῦν εἰ θέλει αὐτόν. This additional comment about trusting in God is a sure connection to Psalm 22.

“Matthew’s Greek wording is not close enough to either the LXX or the MT to call it a true quotation. Still, it is more than allusion; perhaps ‘paraphrase’ is the best designation to the phenomenon. In any event, Matthew’s typological use of Ps. 22 (21 LXX) clearly continues.”²³ Matt 27:43 shares several words with LXX Ps 21:9, ῥυσάσθω and θέλει αὐτόν. These two verbs only occur together in LXX Pss 17:20, 21:9; Dan 8:4, and Matt 27:43. When the addition of the masculine personal pronoun is added, it is only Ps 21:9 and Matt 27:43, which makes Matthew’s dependence on LXX Ps 21:9 all but certain. Davies and Allison note that Matthew’s choice of πέποιθεν and εἰ seem to reflect the Hebrew.²⁴

The significance of this typological connection is further enhanced by the characters who make the statements regarding trust, namely those who witness the suffering of the individual. They “remind the sufferer that God appears to have deserted him. Though the words

²³Blomberg, “Matthew,” 98.

²⁴Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 620.

are spoken in derision, they strike home in the heart of the worshiper precisely because they appear to have the essence of truth in them.”²⁵ In Matthew the connection is the same, with those seeing the punishment of Jesus making the statement regarding trust.

7.2.2: Inability To Save Himself

Closely connected to the taunt about trusting in God is the parallel of the lamenter’s and Jesus’ inability to save themselves. Through the early part of Psalm 22 (MT) the lamenter prays without his prayer being answered (v. 3), talks of the hope of his ancestors (vv. 5–6), then goes on to speak of how his experience has been different from theirs.

Jesus also prays, evidently without his prayer being answered (Matt 26:39, 41). Then shortly before his death, the deriding comments signify that his trust in God is not resulting in delivery. The scribes and elders begin their statement by declaring that “he cannot save himself” (Matt 27:42). So both Jesus and his enemies use Psalm 22, “Jesus to express commitment to God, and the religious authorities to scoff the promised one Himself.”²⁶

Finally, the verb σφύζω is made use of frequently in Matthew’s passion narrative, as a challenge from the mockers (Matt 27:40, 42, 49). This word is frequent also in LXX Psalm 21 (vv. 6, 9, 22).

7.2.3: Mockery

Ps 22:7 (MT) states, “all who see me mock me; they make mouths at me; they wag their heads.” The theme of mockery in fact runs through much of the psalm (see vv. 9, 13–14, 17–19). The theme of mockery in Psalm 22 is paralleled in Matthew’s passion narrative numerous times. Matt 27:42–43 (discussed above) is introduced as “the chief priests, with the scribes and elders, mocked him, saying...” (v. 41). Prior to this point, Jesus has already been mocked

²⁵Peter C. Craigie, *Psalms 1–50* (WBC 19; Word Books, 1983), 199.

²⁶Harvey D. Lange, “Relationship between Psalm 22 and the Passion narrative,” *CTM* 43/9 (1972), 617.

during the trial (Matt 26:67–68) and, in 27:27–31, endures, at the hands of Pilate’s soldiers, the quintessential example of mockery in the Gospels.

The mocking continues around the cross. The two who were crucified with Jesus deride him (27:38, 44), with Matthew’s verb (ὄνειδίζω) being the same root as the noun used in LXX Psalm 21:7 (ὄνειδος). Those who pass by Jesus also mock (27:39–40), as well as the chief priests, scribes, and elders (27:41–43). It is in the description of those passing by that Matthew’s parallel becomes an explicit allusion, describing them as κινούντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν (27:39). The wagging of their heads uses the exact same lexical forms as LXX Ps 21:8 (ἐκίνησαν κεφαλὴν), both κινέω and κεφαλή.

7.2.4: Casting of Lots for Clothing

LXX Ps 21:19 states διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον. Matthew’s wording is a paraphrase of the LXX, with a 3-word sequence being identical (διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτια), the dropping of 7 words, followed by an identical lemma (βάλλω) and identical word form (κλῆρον).

Table 3: Allusion to LXX Ps 21:19

Mark 15:24	Matt 27:35	LXX Ps 21:19
Καὶ σταυροῦσιν αὐτὸν καὶ διαμερίζονται τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ	Σταυρώσαντες δὲ αὐτὸν διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ	διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον
βάλλοντες κλῆρον	βάλλοντες κλῆρον	

The differences between Mark and Matthew is important because it shows that Matthew intentionally changed διαμερίζονται to διεμερίσαντο to align more closely with LXX Ps 21:19.²⁷ He retains Mark’s participle form of βάλλω—so both Mark and Matthew

²⁷It is important to note that this connection was made most explicit by John, who cites the LXX more exactly (John 19:24).

match the LXX's lexical usage. Whereas LXX Ps 21:19 should be read as an example of Hebrew parallelism (where part A and part B describe the same thing), both Mark and Matthew read LXX Ps 21:19 as a sequential event rather than as parallelism.²⁸

Matthew makes a further, somewhat surprising, grammatical change to his source by making "divided his clothing" the main clause of the section, with even "he was crucified" being grammatically subordinate to it.²⁹ These changes by the evangelist serve to heighten the connection between type and anti-type. "Christians were including in the [passion narrative] the customary stripping of the prisoner but doing so in the language of a psalm about the suffering just one. This helped to illustrate God's detailed preparation for the fate of the Son."³⁰

7.2.5: Surrounded by Enemies

From the time of arrest on the Mount of Olives until his death on the cross, Matthew portrays Jesus as being surrounded by enemies. Matt 27:27 states, "Then the soldiers of the governor took Jesus into the governor's headquarters, and they gathered the whole battalion before him." Soon after, during the trial process, Matt 27:36 states, "Then they sat down and kept watch over him there." After this, the evangelist states that he is hung with two robbers (27:38) who are also antagonistic towards him (27:44). While on the cross, Jesus is derided by passers-by (27:39–40) and then mocked by the religious authorities (27:41–43). Within this short span of verses Matthew makes it clear that Jesus is pressed in on all sides by enemies. There is no mention of anyone sympathetic to Jesus during this time.

This picture of Jesus coheres quite nicely with Psalm 22 and the individual's torment by those around him. What's more, the MT text of Ps 22:13 states that bulls surround the lamenter, with v. 16 later stating "dogs are all around me; a company of evildoers encircles

²⁸Menn, "No Ordinary Lament," 332.

²⁹As noted by Lange, "Passion narrative," 618; Brown, *Death*, 952.

³⁰*Ibid.*, 954.

me.” The Hebrew is using the metaphorical language of animals to describe the individual’s enemies, with v. 16 making it clear that people are in view, not actual animals. This reading is also confirmed by the Aramaic paraphrase.³¹ *Targ. Ps.* 22:13 changes “bulls” to “The Gentiles surround me, who are *like* many bulls.” The Aramaic also makes the metaphoric language explicit in its rendition of v. 16: “Because the wicked have surrounded me, who are *like* many dogs; a gathering of evildoers has hemmed me in, biting my hands and feet like a lion.” Although there are no specific lexical connections between the passage and Psalm 22, it is quite possible that, in view of the other noted connections, this played a part in Matthew’s portrayal.

7.2.6: Thirst

Commentators rightly connect Matt 27:34, 48 with Ps 69:22: “They gave me poison for food, and for my thirst they gave me sour wine to drink.”³² The connection with Psalm 69 (which is also attributed to David in the superscription) seems clear. But it needs to be recognized that the concept of thirst is not foreign to Psalm 22 either: “I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint; my heart is like wax; it is melted within my breast; my strength is dried up like a potsherd, and my tongue sticks to my jaws; you lay me in the dust of death” (v. 15). So, while the words and idea of sour wine likely stem from Psalm 69, the idea of thirst contributes as well to the Psalm 22 prophetic passion which Matthew is using to shape his portrayal.³³

³¹Evans, “Aramaic Psalter,” 87.

³²Brown, *Death*, 1059; Nolland, *Matthew*, 1209; Hagner, *Matthew*, 445.

³³Noted also by Lange, “Passion narrative,” 613. It is also important to note that John 19:28–30 makes this connection most explicit, with Jesus stating “I thirst.” Ps 22 may have also been on the mind of John when in his parallel to this passage Jesus states that he thirsts “to fulfill the scripture” (John 19:28), France, *Matthew*, 1077. See also Gerald L. Borchert, *John 12–21* (NAC 25B; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2002), 271, who says both Ps 22 and 69 are in view here.

7.2.7: Piercing

Matthew, following Mark, never mentions Jesus' hands or feet being nailed to the cross. Luke mentions Jesus' hands and feet in a resurrection appearance (Luke 24:40) and John is the most explicit in the resurrection appearances with doubting Thomas's statement in John 20:25 followed by Jesus' statement in 20:27 (though feet are not mentioned). Despite no mention of hands and feet in Mark and Matthew, crucifixion was well understood in the ancient world and the nailing of the accused to the cross would have been all but assumed.³⁴

While it is nowhere explicit in Matthew beyond the statement in 27:35 that he was crucified, there is a potential connection with Psalm 22. The following table shows the various versions of Ps 22:16.

Table 4: Psalm 22:16c

MT	כִּאֲרֵי יָדַי וְרַגְלָי like a lion (are) my hands and feet
LXX	ὤρυξαν χεῖράς μου καὶ πόδας They have gouged/pierced my hands and feet
Aquila	ἐπέδησαν χεῖράς μου καὶ πόδας μου They bind my hands and feet
Symmachus	ὡς ζητοῦντες δεῖσαι χεῖράς μου καὶ πόδας μου They seek to bind my hands and feet
5/6Hev Psalms	כִּאֲרֵי יְדֵי וְרַגְלָי They have pierced my hands and feet
4Q88 fl 2.25	כר[ו] ידֵי וְרַגְלָי [They have pierced?] my hands and feet

The difference between the MT and the earlier Hebrew version found at Naḥal Ḥever is only a vav at the end of the first word. 4Q88 is unfortunately fragmentary, but those who

³⁴ Although the Gospels are reserved in their description of Jesus' crucifixion, the mention of the nail marks in Jesus' hands in John 20:25 assumes matter-of-factly that Jesus was nailed to the cross (Luke 24:39 and Col 2:14 can also be mentioned here as well). It should also be noted that the recent work of Gunnar Samuelsson on crucifixion has brought Jesus' crucifixion into question. I concur with Brian Pounds in his review of Samuelsson that the collective evidence from the Gospels as well as second century evidence speaks against Samuelsson's hypothesis. See Brian Pounds, review of Gunnar Samuelsson, *Crucifixion in Antiquity: an inquiry into the background of the New Testament terminology of crucifixion*, JSNT 33 (2011), 398–405.

have reconstructed the text believe the missing letter is a vav.³⁵ If this is the case, then there are two early Hebrew examples that corroborate the LXX reading of “pierced my hands and feet.”³⁶

A possible mitigating factor against reading the “piercing” version of this text is that the connection is (oddly) not discussed in the Gospels³⁷—though it is picked up by later church authors.³⁸ The other early Greek translations from Aquila and Symmachus also give pause for adopting the MT version, as they evidently understood כָּאֲרִי differently as well. Nonetheless, it is possible that early readers, familiar with the seemingly earlier version of Ps 22:16 as represented in the LXX—or even Aquila and Symmachus—could have drawn the connection between David’s passion and the crucifixion of Jesus.

7.2.8: *Happy Resolution*

Without negating the forceful feeling of abandonment that the first half of Psalm 22 (and Jesus’ quotation) displays, it is important to remember that Psalm 22 has a happy resolution:

For kingship belongs to the LORD, and he rules over the nations. All the prosperous of the earth eat and worship; before him shall bow all who go down to the dust, even the one who could not keep himself alive. Posterity shall serve him; it shall be told of the Lord to the coming generation; they shall come and proclaim his righteousness to a people yet unborn, that he has done it (Ps 22:28–31).

Indeed, it has been emphasized by Psalms scholars that the entire psalm, both the beginning lament and the resolution, are tightly integrated. Stephen Ahearne-Kroll notes that the main function of the lament is an appeal to God for action in order to persuade him to act on behalf of the lamenter.³⁹ Beginning with Ps 22:23 all verbs (except vv. 24–25) occur in the fu-

³⁵Eugene Ulrich et al., eds., *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles* (DJD 16. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 85–106.

³⁶Conrad R. Gren, “Piercing the Ambiguities of Psalm 22:16 and the Messiah’s Mission,” *JETS* 48/2 (2005), 287–88.

³⁷France suggests that the uncertainty about the text and meaning of Ps 22:16 may have been just as present at the time of Jesus as it is now. See France, *Matthew*, 1060 n.1.

³⁸Menn, “No Ordinary Lament,” 334.

ture tense (imperfect in the Hebrew, future in the LXX). The psalm thus promises praise to God and the results of that praise if the lamenter is delivered. Loren Fisher has also made note of a thanksgiving psalm found in 1QH^a 5:5–19 which makes use of Psalm 22: “If it is possible at Qumran to have a Lament based on Psalm 22 and then to thank God in such a positive way, it is entirely possible that Jesus (or the Gospel writer) would have used Psalm 22 in the same way.”⁴⁰

Given the outright quotation and numerous allusions to David’s passion of Psalm 22, it seems not only possible but likely that the happy resolution of the psalm was also seen as fulfilled in the later portions of Matthew’s gospel.⁴¹ Esther Menn discusses this in connection with the Gospels’ narratives:

Many of the phrases in the final part of the psalm lend themselves to correlations with the conclusions of the gospels, even though these correlations are not made in the New Testament itself. For example, the vision at the end of the psalm of all nations coming to recognize God’s sovereignty (Ps 22:28–32) appears to be illustrated by the Roman centurion’s recognition of Jesus as God’s son in Mark and Matthew (Mark 15:39; Matt 27:54). Similarly, at the end of Matthew (Matt 28:19), Jesus’ final commissioning of his inner circle of followers to make disciples of all nations resonates with this theme of universalism at the psalm’s conclusion.⁴²

Scholars like John Reumann and Rikk Watts have also suggested that the loud cry on the cross may be a sign of victory, with the torn veil being confirmation. It is confirmation of Psalm 22’s vision of the worship of the nations, as the way to God is made open.⁴³

³⁹Ahearne-Kroll, “Challenging the Divine,” 131–32. Stephen Cook has argued that the final lines of Ps 22 may have been added later as the first messianic/eschatological conversation. See Stephen L. Cook, “Relecture, hermeneutics, and Christ’s passion in the Psalms,” in *Whirlwind: Essays on Job, Hermeneutics and Theology in Memory of Jane Mors* (New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 196.

⁴⁰Fisher, “Betrayed by Friends,” 27.

⁴¹Evans, *Matthew*, 463–64.

⁴²Menn, “No Ordinary Lament,” 334–35.

⁴³John Henry Paul Reumann, “Psalm 22 at the Cross: lament and thanksgiving for Jesus Christ,” *Int* 28/1 (1974), 51; Rikk E. Watts, “The Lord’s House and David’s Lord: the Psalms and Mark’s Perspective on Jesus and the Temple,” *BibInt* 15/3 (2007), 322. Loren Fisher has made the argument that Ps 22 forms the basis of a lament in the Qumran Thanksgiving Scroll which also ends in a positive way. See Fisher, “Betrayed by Friends,” 26–27.

7.2.9: Summary and Relevance for Thesis

The number of parallels, whether they be allusions or echoes or otherwise, make it all but certain that the wider context of Psalm 22 was in the mind of the evangelist when composing the passion narrative and constitutes a significant sustained Davidic typology. “Jesus made Ps. 22 His own cry to God in that last tragic hour. Jesus’ use of Ps. 22 in His passion linked this psalm with His last hours. Once this identification was made, the evangelists found other language from Ps. 22 to portray various aspects of the crucifixion event.”⁴⁴ David’s own lament and circumstances were seen as the anti-type to Jesus’ own passion.

7.3: Conclusion

When reading the psalms, early readers increasingly heard the voice and story of David, in some instances even reading the psalms as the prophetic voice of David. This is confirmed by early Jewish and Christian readings, as the lamenter of Psalm 22 was read as the voice of others: “The details of their idiosyncratic narratives and the distinctive expressions and language of Psalm 22 become so intertwined in these Jewish and Christian sources that it might well appear as if the psalm were originally composed about the unique situations of Esther and of Jesus.”⁴⁵ As in the previous chapter, the story of David in the psalms were used as an anti-type to portray Jesus. This particular psalm provided a unique connection with David: David’s lament in the psalm was the typological anti-type for Jesus’ own passion. In addition, if Psalm 22 was understood as prophecy, then it is possible that the psalm was even read as David’s prophetic prediction of Jesus’ passion.

As Matthew’s passion narrative unfolds, it is evident that David’s passion in Psalm 22 looms large in the background. Its influence went beyond Jesus’ quotation from the cross to

⁴⁴Lange, “Passion narrative,” 613.

⁴⁵Menn, “No Ordinary Lament,” 336.

color much of the passion narrative. Jesus' cry from the cross echoes the emotion of Psalm 22 while at the same time paralleling the temporary abandonment of the righteous sufferer. But Matthew is unique when compared with the other Gospel authors by going beyond this citation to add numerous parallels in order to create a sustained typological connection with David. It is clear that the whole of Psalm 22 was in the mind of the evangelist. This use of David as type further advances Matthew's goal of portraying Jesus as the Son of David: one who fulfills the promise for a new David, one who acts like David, laments like David, and one who went through a passion experience not unlike David's own passion in Psalm 22.

Chapter 8: Conclusions

The goal of this thesis was to provide a comprehensive portrait of Matthew's extensive interaction with Davidic tradition and use of Davidic typology in its presentation of Jesus. There have been numerous studies on many individual parts of Matthew's Gospel that have bearing on the study at hand. But while these studies have borne much fruit, a comprehensive look has not previously been done. Building upon the fruit of much research, this thesis has shown how foundational and pervasive this Davidic motif really is. We have in the narrative a sustained, deliberate, and omnipresent motif weaved by the masterful evangelist. Matthew utilizes a multi-faceted approach to present Jesus as the Son of David. He utilizes formula quotations, allusions, clustered echoes, typology (first-order), and typological fulfillment. It is present at major junctures like the birth and infancy narrative, the ministry of healing, the sending of Jesus' disciples, his entry into Jerusalem, his last debate with his religious opponents, his betrayal, and his crucifixion.

8.1: Summary of Study

The second chapter of this thesis looked at the Davidic motif which appears in the opening verse. The incipit is, as it were, the first drop of a pebble into a pond. The Son of David title is introduced at the outset, preparing readers for what is ahead and preparing them to be on the lookout for Davidic motifs. The first ripple in Matthew's narrative pond comes in the genealogy, which showed substantial interest in David in both overt and subtle ways. Matthew counts creatively to arrive at his 3 x 14 scheme. This scheme shines the spotlight on David by

making him the fourteenth name in the list, giving him the sobriquet “the king,” basing the number fourteen on gematria of David’s name, and counting David twice in the genealogy. This front-loaded emphasis in the narrative capitalizes upon the primacy effect, making Davidic messianism the determining factor for understanding the evangelist’s presentation of Jesus. The evangelist at the outset weaves a literary matrix for his readers such that they are now predisposed to see both the overt and subtle ways in which the narrative is colored with the Davidic motif.

The third chapter analyzed the infancy narrative. While it is still popular in academic circles to view Matthew’s infancy narrative as establishing divine sonship; it was shown that this section is not primarily about son-of-God Christology, but links to the Davidic line and the establishment of Jesus as the one born as the legitimate Davidic king. Through the infancy narrative, the formula quotations reveals Matthew’s awareness of the wider context of the prophetic books that he quotes. His perspective on the fulfillment of these texts is best understood as typological fulfillment, with the focus on how Jesus as the legitimate Son of David fulfills more completely the messianic narrative found in the OT prophets. While it is true that no one OT model structures the passage, it is nonetheless clear that the Davidic motif stands above any other typology (Moses or otherwise) which Matthew is creating. The infancy narrative both confirms and expands upon Matthew’s primacy effect.

Chapter four discussed the uniquely Matthean presentation of the Son of David as healer. The use of the title Son of David in the context of healing is no accident in Matthew. The various passages dealing with this topic revealed that Matthew once again turned to Davidic tradition in order to help his readers understand in what way Jesus is the Son of David. The Davidic shepherd motif of Ezekiel 34 provides the scriptural basis for Matthew’s presentation of the therapeutic Son of David. Matthew does not simply utilize this prophetic tradition, but also draws upon an allusion to the life of David in 2 Sam 5:6–8 as Jesus heals the

blind and the lame within the temple. Matthew's eye is upon not only prophetic tradition related to David, but also the life of David as a type. These passages are deliberately tied together to create a sustained chorus of passages that declare Jesus as the healing Son of David and the expected Davidic shepherd.

Chapter five looked at three particular passages which served to portray Jesus' authority and humility as the Son of David. These passages, along with those researched in the previous chapter, serve an important role for the evangelist: to define what it means to be the Son of David. In the opening of the Gospel, the evangelist established him as the rightful Davidic heir. But as his narrative unfolds, the evangelist reveals from the scriptures that the Son of David will not be a king like his forebearer. In the confrontation over Sabbath, Matthew clearly references the story of David from 1 Sam 21:1–6 and proceeds to compare the two with first-order typology. The implication of the story is Jesus' own ultimate authority over the law and Sabbath, foreshadowed by King David himself.

The next episode, the triumphal entry and immediate entrance into Jerusalem, is one of the major hinge points of Matthew's narrative. Once again, typology of the life of David (2 Sam 15–20) is drawn out. Matthew also makes extensive use of Zechariah and its Davidic traditions. This is a crucial element of his redefinition of what it means to be the Son of David—namely the humble king of Zech 9. This direct quotation of Zechariah is only one of many connection points with Zech 9–14, making it clear that the entire messianic portrait of Zech 9–14 was an important piece of Davidic tradition which the evangelist made use of. The recognition by the crowds and the children within the temple of Jesus as Son of David draws together the previous passages of the Son of David as healer. Within the walls of Jerusalem, Jesus performs his final miracle, which deliberately alludes to David in 2 Sam 5:6–8. It is in the entrance to Jerusalem that the crowd reaches its apex of understanding with the shout “Hosanna to the Son of David” (21:9). This is confirmed by the children's cries of Ὡσαννά

τῷ υἱῷ Δαβίδ within the temple. At this point the reader also hears what Jesus thinks of the sobriquet Son of David: it is considered perfect praise, and heightens the understanding of the title considerably, as the praise of Jesus is implicitly compared to the praise of God.

Finally, in Jesus' last encounter with the Pharisees in Matt 22:41–46, Matthew continues to define what it means for Jesus to be the Son of David. The pericope is a continuance of Matthew's presentation of Jesus and the redefinition of what it means to be the Son of David, drawn from Israel's scriptures. In Jesus' final confrontation with his opponents, the understanding of Son of David is expanded once more from Israel's scriptures, and this time from David's own voice in the Psalms. David declares that the Son of David is in fact greater than David; he is κύριος. This should come as no surprise to the reader, nor should it be seen as a subversion or arguing for incorrectness of the title. Matthew has been working through much of his narrative to redefine what it means to be the Son of David, and has done so by interacting with Davidic tradition in the scriptures.

Chapter six presented the extensive first-order typology invoked in Jesus' betrayal. This sustained parallel confirms the conclusion of the earlier chapter that Matthew does not seek to downgrade or dismiss the title Son of David, as he turns once again to the life of David to color his narrative of Judas' betrayal. Judas, like Ahithophel, was a friend and companion. Their treachery was spoken of in dire terms, and their suicide by hanging serves to solidify the parallels and allusions through the passage. While Judas follows the Ahithophel typology, Jesus follows a David typology at the last supper, the sequence of actions to the garden, and his manner of arrest. The betrayal by Judas and subsequent arrest of Jesus is an infamous story in history even to the present. All the more significant, then, that the evangelist colors this part of the Son of David's story with allusions to King David and his own betrayal by a trusted friend.

Chapter seven described the use of Psalm 22 in Matthew's passion narrative. This type of interaction with David's voice in the psalms had already been utilized by Matthew, as Jesus turned to David's own testimony about the Son of David in Matt 22:41–46. These instances form a unique part of the evangelist's multi-faceted approach to his Davidic theme. Not only Davidic tradition and typology is utilized, but David himself brings testimony forth to present the Son of David. As Jesus' passion unfolds, David's own passion in Psalm 22 looms large. Its influence went beyond Jesus' quotation from the cross to color much of the passion narrative. Jesus' cry from the cross echoes the emotion of Psalm 22 while at the same time paralleling the temporary abandonment of the righteous sufferer. Matthew is unique from the other Gospel authors by going beyond this citation to include numerous allusions and paraphrases of Psalm 22. It is clear that the whole of Psalm 22 was in the mind of the evangelist. This use of David's own prophetic voice further advanced Matthew's Davidic theme. Jesus, the Son of David, fulfills the promise for a new David, he acts like David, and David himself prophesied about him.

On the surface he merely begets and foretells, but beneath the surface his story exerts a strong influence on the gospel narrative. Although Jesus' resurrection set him apart from his ancestor, his passion was described by David in the Psalms and to some extent foreshadowed by his actions, especially by his anguished flight from Absalom. The rabbis said of David and his son Solomon, "Whatever is stated of one is stated of the other," and an echo of that sentiment seems also to be at work in the New Testament traditions about David's messianic son.¹

8.2: Contribution

The following sections summarize what I believe are my contributions to Matthean scholarship.

¹Bassler, "All Seasons," 169.

8.2.1: Davidic Explanations of Various Passages

As stated in the introduction, there have been many excellent studies on individual portions or aspects of the Gospel of Matthew that have contributed significantly to the understanding of Matthew. As I have taken up many of these arguments and interacted with them, I believe I have significantly enhanced the arguments in favor of seeing Davidic tradition and typology as often being the best option for understanding individual portions of Matthew. For instance, there have been numerous attempts at an explanation for Matthew's odd counting of the genealogy, and I have argued that gematria and double-counting David is indeed the best explanation. Likewise I have strengthened the case for seeing Ezekiel 34 as the reason for Matthew portraying Jesus as a therapeutic Son of David.

In other chapters I have taken what have previously been only smaller suggestions at Davidic typology and have firmly shown that this was indeed the case. I have, for instance, argued and presented much evidence in favor of Davidic typology surrounding Jesus' betrayal and the passion narrative.

Finally, I have argued somewhat against the flow of Matthean scholarship to argue for an increased presence of Davidic influence, in particular in the infancy narrative and Jesus' interaction with the Pharisees in Matt 22:41–46. While some have argued for a strong Son of God christology in the infancy narrative and a rejection of the Son of David title in 22:41–46, I have added to the arguments of others in seeing these sections as contributing to and strengthening Matthew's overall focus on Jesus as the Son of David. The Son of David theme stands alongside the other significant Christological motifs in Matthew.

8.2.2: Understanding Matthew's Wider Davidic Theme

What I hope is an important contribution is my attempt at an overarching portrait of Matthew's Davidic theme. Many of the fine studies cited have focused in one particular topic

or passage of Matthew, but this study attempted a more comprehensive look at Matthew as whole. The evangelist's utilization of Davidic tradition and typology is extensive and has not been fully appreciated. From the incipit up to the final words from the cross, Matthew utilizes the OT scriptures in multiple ways to portray Jesus as the fulfillment of the hope for the messianic Son of David. In addition to interaction with Davidic tradition, he utilizes Davidic typology to further advance his portrayal of Jesus. The evangelist does this in order to help his reader understand precisely what it means for Jesus to be the Son of David. Matthew goes back to the scriptures to help the reader understand that the Son of David would not be the violent messiah as portrayed in *Pss. Sol. 17* or the Dead Sea Scrolls. Rather, he would be the humble king and the healing shepherd. I believe that this wider Davidic theme is core to a proper understanding of Matthew's Gospel.

8.2.3: Understanding of Typology

Insofar as I sought to properly understand and identify when and how Matthew used the OT, Porter's terminology was helpful, and helped me to keep an author-centric approach to my study. While some readers may object to such stringent definitions, in the end the importance was in identifying when Matthew made use of the OT and how he did so. To this end, I found Porter's taxonomy reasonable.

My discussion and attempt at more precise understanding of typology has also been helpful and I believe can enhance further scholarly understanding of Matthew's use of the OT. Seeing within the narrative the various levels of typology and having a label for them (eg. global, sustained) helped as I sought to understand Matthew's use of typology when presenting Jesus. In particular, a clarified understand of second-order typology (i.e. typological fulfillment) was very helpful for understanding, in particular, Matthew's formula quotations in the infancy narrative. Typological fulfillment helps to understand the evangelist's own per-

spective on the OT and how Jesus was understood as the fulfillment of these texts. If I am correct that second-order typology is the best way to understand these texts, then it means that the evangelist did not misunderstand or misread the OT; rather typological fulfillment is predicated upon the assumption that the prophecy and its original fulfillment were properly understood and formed the basis of the typological connection.

8.3: Suggestions for Further Research

In the following sections I would like to briefly suggest some areas of further research in light of this thesis.

8.3.1: The “Son of...” Titles in Matthew

A comprehensive look at Matthew’s Davidic portrayal in this thesis has hopefully closed the door on suggestions that Matthew sought to downplay the title Son of David, or arguing for its inadequacy. Assuming this as a starting point, future research in Matthew can more closely look at how the titles “Son of David,” “Son of Man,” and “Son of God” intersect with one another in Matthew. In the thesis, I hinted at the idea that Matthew seeks to ultimately merge all three titles (Son of David, Son of Man, Son of God) together, but this needs to be explored more thoroughly. It is clear that the other titles used are also significant in Matthew’s Christology, and the interplay between these themes by the evangelist will be a fruitful area of further research.

8.3.2: Mark, Luke, and John

The chapter on the betrayal narrative was one of the few spots where I delved somewhat into the other Gospels, but the focus remained primarily on Matthew. Having completed this

study, it would be worthwhile to compare passages where Matthew employed Davidic typology to see if the other Gospels do so in parallel passages as well.

8.3.3: Historical Jesus Research

This study has been of a literary nature. While I am deeply interested in the historical events and the historical Jesus, I steered clear as much as possible from addressing these questions. This has born fruit in my own mind for a clarified understanding of the interplay between the Gospels and the historical Jesus. If my assertions about first-order and second-order typology laid out in the introduction and displayed throughout my thesis are correct, then the evangelist should not as a matter of course be charged with the creation of these stories. Rather, the evangelist was aware of dominical tradition, saw in it a correspondence to the life of David or certain prophetic texts, and through his retelling of the Jesus story, colored his narrative to draw out the typology. While this certainly does mean elements of embellishment were introduced, it does mitigate against the idea of wholesale creation of events on the part of the evangelist. Evans states:

The embellishment of the Gospel narratives with words, phrases, and details drawn from the biblical text did not originate with the evangelists and the tradents that preceded them; it originated with Jesus himself. Early Christian tradents and the later evangelists embellished, formalized, and made explicit what in the *Sitz im Leben Jesu* was implicit and allusive.²

This has potential implications for many of the events found in Matthew, including events that historical Jesus scholars typically shy away from, such as the infancy narrative. Given the interplay of typology and historical circumstance, it could be that narrative typology on the part of the evangelist could be considered, with qualifications, a criteria of authenticity.

²Evans, “Messianic Hope,” 374. As an example, Evans further states in regards to the betrayal narrative: “No one reading Zechariah 11 and Jeremiah 18 and 32 would have dreamed up the story of Judas. But one searching the scriptures for clarification of this shocking story could have found in these ancient prophecies helpful details and the sense that the actions of this disciple were foreordained” (p. 375).

8.3.4: Christology

The last chapter to be written in this thesis was chapter 5. I intentionally put off that chapter, in particular Matt 22:41–46, because on first glance it seemed to be the fly in the ointment of my thesis. But as I worked through all of the other chapters, and at last read widely on that passage, I came to see how beautifully that passage fits into Matthew’s Davidic theme. If my arguments are correct that the Son of David title is not being rejected, but expanded, this has implications for understanding Son of David in the area of Christology. The title Son of David is more than just the “human element” of Jesus’ messianic claim. Matt 22:41–46 holds on to the title more fiercely than ever, and imbues it with a scriptural understanding that far surpasses what has previously been acknowledged by scholars.

8.3.5: Typology

I found the definition and categorization of typology outlined in my methodology rewarding in my study of Matthew. In my introduction, I suggested that this understanding of typology may be applicable to the entirety of the NT. Subsequent research into other typological uses of the OT by other NT authors may also find my categories of typology helpful.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abegg, Martin G., Edward M. Cook, and Michael O. Wise, eds. *Qumran Sectarian Manuscripts: A New Translation*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996.
- Abel, Ernest L. "Genealogies of Jesus O XPICTOC." *New Testament Studies* 20/2 (1974), 203–210.
- Ackroyd, Peter R. "The 153 Fishes In John XXI. 11— A Further Note." *Journal of Theological Studies* X/1 (1959), 94.
- Ahearne-Kroll, Stephen P. "Challenging the Divine: LXX Psalm 21 in the passion narrative of the gospel of Mark," Pages 119–148 in *Trial and death of Jesus: Essays on the Passion Narrative in Mark*. Edited by Geert Van Oyen and Tom Shepherd. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 45. Dudley, Mass: Peeters, 2006.
- Ahrendts, D. R. *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 41 (1898), 129–148.
- Allison, Dale C. *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- . *Studies in Matthew: Interpretation Past and Present*. Grand Rapids: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- Atkinson, Kenneth. "Herod the Great, Sosius, and the Siege of Jerusalem (37 BCE) in Psalm of Solomon 17." *Novum Testamentum* 38 (1996), 313–322.
- . *I Cried to the Lord: A Study of the Psalms of Solomon's Historical Background and Social Setting*. Journal for the Study of Judaism: supplement series 84. Edited by John J. Collins and Florentino García Martínez. Boston: Brill, 2004.
- . *An Intertextual Study of the Psalms of Solomon*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 49. Lewiston, N.Y.: E. Mellen Press, 2001.
- . "On the Herodian Origin of Militant Davidic Messianism at Qumran: New Light from Psalm of Solomon 17." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118 (1999), 435–460.
- . "On the Use of Scripture in the Development of Militant Davidic Messianism at Qumran: new light from Psalm of Solomon 17," Pages 106–123 in *Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Aune, David E. *Revelation*. 3 vols. WBC 52A-C. Nashville: Nelson Reference, 1997.
- Aus, Roger D. *Matthew 1–2 and the Virginal Conception: In Light of Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaic Traditions on the Birth of Israel's First Redeemer, Moses*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2004.
- . "The Name Judas 'Iscariot' and Ahithophel in Judaic Tradition," Pages 155–208 in *My name is Legion: Palestinian Judaic traditions in Mark 5:1–20 and other gospel texts*. Studies in Judaism. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2003.
- Baker, David L. "Typology and the Christian use of the Old Testament." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 29/2 (1976), 137–157.
- Basset, Jean-Claude. "Le psaume 22 (LXX 21) et la croix chez les pères." *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 54/3 (1974), 383–89.
- Bassler, Jouette M. "A Man For All Seasons: David In Rabbinic and New Testament Literature." *Interpretation* 40/2 (1986), 156–169.
- Bauckham, Richard. *Jesus And The Eyewitnesses: The Gospels As Eyewitness Testimony*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Bauer, David R. "The Kingship of Jesus in the Matthean Infancy Narrative: A Literary

- Analysis.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 57/2 (1995), 306–323.
- . “The Literary and Theological Function of the Genealogy in Matthew’s Gospel,” Pages 130–159 in *Treasure Old and New: Contributions to Matthean Studies*. Edited by David R. Bauer and Mark A. Powell. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 1. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Baumgartner, Walter, M. E. J. Richardson, and Ludwig Koehler, eds. *Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. 5 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Baxter, Wayne S. “Healing and the “Son of David”: Matthew’s Warrant.” *Novum Testamentum* 48/1 (2006), 36–50.
- . “Mosaic Imagery in the Gospel of Matthew.” *Trinity Journal* 20/1 (1999), 69–83.
- Beale, G. K. *The Book of Revelation: a Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- . *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation*. Baker Academic, 2012.
- Beckwith, Roger T. “The Early History of the Psalter.” *Tyndale Bulletin* 46/1 (1995), 1–27.
- Bengel, Johann. *Gnomon of the New Testament, Volume 1*. Translated by Andrew R. Fausset. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1858.
- Berger, Klaus. “Die königlichen Messiastraditionen des Neuen Testaments.” *New Testament Studies* 20 (1974), 1–44.
- Berkley, Timothy W. “OT exegesis and the death of Judas,” Pages 29–45 in *Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies*. Cincinnati: Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies, 1994.
- Black, Mark C. “The Rejected and Slain Messiah who is coming with his angels: the messianic exegesis of Zechariah 9–14 in the passion narratives.” PhD Diss., Emory University, 1990.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *David Remembered: Kingship and National Identity in Ancient Israel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.
- . “The Oracle of Judah and the Messianic Entry.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 80/1 (1961), 55–64.
- Block, Daniel I. “Bringing Back David: Ezekiel’s Messianic Hope,” Pages 167–188 in *The Lord’s Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts*. Edited by P. E. Satterthwaite, Richard E. Hess, and Gordon J. Wenham. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995.
- Blomberg, Craig L. *Matthew*. New American Commentary 22. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1992.
- . “Matthew,” *Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Bockmuehl, Markus. “The Son of David and his Mother.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 62/2 (2011), 476–493.
- Boda, Mark J. and Stanley E. Porter. “Literature to the Third Degree: prophecy in Zechariah 9–14 and the passion of Christ,” Pages 215–254 in *Traduire la Bible Hébraïque: de la Septante à la Nouvelle Bible Segond*. Edited by Robert David. Montreal: Médiaspaul, 2005.
- Bodner, Keith. “Motives for Defection: Ahithophel’s agenda in 2 Samuel 15–17.” *Studies in Religion* 31/1 (2002), 63–78.
- Bohak, Gideon. “Greek-Hebrew Gematrias in 3 Baruch and in Revelation.” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 4/7 (1990), 119–121.
- Borchert, Gerald L. *John 12–21*. New American Commentary 25B. Nashville: Broadman &

- Holman, 2002.
- . *John 1–11*. New American Commentary 25A. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1996.
- Brown, Colin, ed. *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. 4 vols. Accordance electronic ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Birth of the Messiah*. Anchor Bible Reference Library. Rev. and enl. ed. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- . *The Death Of The Messiah: From Gethsemane To The Grave*. 2 vols. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- Bruce, F. F. “The Book of Zechariah and the Passion Narrative.” *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 43/2 (1961), 336–353.
- Bruner, Frederick Dale. *Matthew: The Churchbook*. 2 vols. Rev. and expanded ed ed. Grand Rapids, Mich: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 2004.
- Bruns, J. Edgar. “Magi Episode in Matthew 2.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 23/1 (1961), 51–54.
- Burger, Christoph. *Jesus als Davidsson: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.
- Cane, Anthony. *The Place Of Judas Iscariot In Christology*. Hants, England: Ashgate, 2005.
- Carlson, Stephen C. “Making Matthew’s Genealogy Count.” Paper presented at the SECSOR regional meeting. 2009.
- Carson, D. A. *The Gospel According to John*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1991.
- . “Matthew.” in vol. 8 of *Expositor's Bible Commentary: Matthew, Mark, Luke*. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984.
- Carter, Warren. “The Crowds in Matthew’s Gospel.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 55/1 (1993), 54–67.
- . “Evoking Isaiah: Matthean Soteriology and an Intertextual Reading of Isaiah 7–9 and Matthew 1:23 and 4:15–16.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 119 (2000), 503–520.
- . “Matthean Christology In Roman Imperial Key: Matthew 1.1,” Pages 143–165 in *Gospel of Matthew in its Roman Imperial Context*. London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Chae, Young S. *Jesus as the Eschatological Davidic Shepherd: Studies in the Old Testament, Second Temple Judaism, and in the Gospel of Matthew*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 216. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Charlesworth, James H. “From Messianology to Christology: Some Caveats and Perspectives,” Pages 225–264 in *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, William S. Green, and Ernest Frerichs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- , ed. *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity: The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins*. Minneapolis, MN.: Augsburg Fortress Publishers, 1992.
- . “Messianology in the Biblical Pseudepigrapha,” Pages 22–52 in *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Gerbern S. Oegema. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.
- . “The Son of David: Solomon and Jesus (Mark 10.47),” Pages 72–87 in *The New Testament and Hellenistic Judaism*. Edited by Peder Borgen and Giversen Søren. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 1995.

- Childs, Brevard S. "Psalm Titles and Midrashic Exegesis." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 16/2 (1971), 137–150.
- Chilton, Bruce. "Jesus ben David: Reflections On The Davidsohnfrage." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 4/14 (1982), 88–112.
- Cohn-Sherbok, Dan. "An Analysis of Jesus' arguments concerning the plucking of grain on the Sabbath." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 2 (1979), 31–41.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. "The Appropriation of the Psalms of Individual Lament by Mark," Pages 223–241 in *Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by Christopher M. Tuckett. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- Collins, John J. *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1995.
- . "The Sign of Immanuel," Pages 225–244 in *Prophecy and Prophets in Ancient Israel*. Edited by John Day. New York: T & T Clark, 2010.
- . "The Works of the Messiah." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1 (1994), 98–112.
- Conard, Audrey. "The Fate of Judas: Matthew 27:3–10." *Toronto Journal of Theology* 7/2 (1991), 158–168.
- Cook, Edward M., ed. *Targums to Psalms*. Accordance ed. OakTree Software, 2014.
- Cook, Stephen L. "Relecture, hermeneutics, and Christ's passion in the Psalms," Pages 181–205 in *Whirlwind: Essays on Job, Hermeneutics and Theology in Memory of Jane Mors*. New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Coppins, Wayne. "Sitting on Two Asses? Second thoughts on the two-animal interpretation of Matthew 21:7." *Tyndale Bulletin* 63/2 (2012), 275–290.
- Cousland, J. R. C. *The Crowds In The Gospel Of Matthew*. NovTSup 102. Boston: Brill, 2002.
- Craigie, Peter C. *Psalms 1–50*. Word Biblical Commentary 19. Word Books, 1983.
- Cross, Frank Moore. "The Contribution of the Qumrán Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text." *Israel Exploration Journal* 16/2 (1966), 81–95.
- Dahood, M. *Psalms*. 3 vols. Anchor Bible Commentary. Garden City: Doubleday, 1965–1970.
- Daly-Denton, Margaret. *David in the Fourth Gospel: the Johannine Reception of the Psalms*. Arbeiten Zur Geschichte Des Antiken Judentums Und Des Urchristentums 47. Boston: Brill, 2000.
- . "David In The Gospels." *Word and World* 23/4 (2003), 421–29.
- Danker, Frederick W., William Arndt, and Walter Bauer, eds. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3d ed. Chicago Press, 2000.
- Davies, W. D. and Dale C. Allison. *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. 3 vols. ICC. New York: T&T Clark, 1988–1997.
- Dodd, C. H. *According to the Scriptures: the sub-structure of New Testament theology*. London: Nisbet, 1952.
- Duling, Dennis C. "Matthew's Plurisignificant 'Son of David' in Social Science Perspective: Kinship, Kingship, Magic, and Miracle." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 22/3 (1992), 99–116.
- . "Matthew's Plurisignificant 'Son of David' in Social Science Perspective: Kinship, Kingship, Magic, and Miracle." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 22/3 (1992), 99–116.
- . "Solomon, Exorcism and the Son of David." *Harvard Theological Review* 68 (1975), 235–252.
- . "Testament of Solomon," Pages 935–988 in volume 1 of *The Old Testament*

- Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983.
- . “The Therapeutic Son of David in Matthew’s Gospel: an element in Matthew’s christological apologetic.” *New Testament Studies* 24 (1978), 392–410.
- . “Traditions of the Promises to David and His Sons in Early Judaism and Primitive Christianity.” Ph.D. Diss., University of Chicago, 1970.
- Eldridge, Victor J. “Typology - The Key To Understanding Matthew’s Formula Quotations.” *Colloquium* 15/1 (1982), 43–51.
- Ellingworth, Paul. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: a Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Ellis, E. Earle. “Biblical Interpretation in the New Testament Church,” Pages 691–725 in *Mikra: text, translation, reading, and interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in ancient Judaism and early Christianity*. Edited by Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling. *Mikra*. Netherlands: Assen/Maastricht, 1988.
- Emerton, John A. “Gematria in John 21:11.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 11/2 (1960), 335–36.
- Evans, Craig A. *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: a guide to the background literature*. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publishers, 2005.
- . “The Aramaic Psalter and the New Testament: Praising the Lord in History and Prophecy,” Pages 44–91 in *From Prophecy to Testament: The Function of the Old Testament in the New*. Edited by Craig A. Evans. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004.
- . *Jesus and His Contemporaries: comparative studies*. AGJU 25. New York: Brill, 1995.
- . “Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” Pages 573–598 in *Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*. 2 vols. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Boston: Brill, 1999.
- . “Jesus and Zechariah’s Messianic Hope,” Pages 373–388 in *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus*. Edited by Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans. 1999.
- . *Mark 8:27–16:20*. Word Biblical Commentary 34B. Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 2001.
- . *Matthew*. New Cambridge Bible Commentary. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- . “Messianic Hopes And Messianic Figures In Late Antiquity.” *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 3 (2006), 9–40.
- . “A Note on Targum 2 Samuel 5:8 and Jesus’ Ministry to the “Maimed, Halt, and Blind”.” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 15 (1997), 79–82.
- . “Qumran’s Messiah: how important is he?” Pages 135–149 in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- . ““The Book of the Genesis of Jesus Christ’: The Purpose of Matthew in Light of the Incipit,” Pages 61–72 in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels*. Edited by Thomas R. Hatina. LNTS 310. New York: T&T Clark, 2008.
- Faw, Chalmer E. *Acts*. Believers Church Bible Commentary. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1993.
- Fenton, John C. *The Gospel of St. Matthew*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1964.
- . *Gospel of St. Matthew*. Pelican Gospel Commentary. rev. ed. SCM Press, 1977.
- Field, Frederick, ed. *Origen Hexapla*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1875.
- Fisher, Loren R. “Betrayed by Friends: an expository study of Psalm 22.” *Interpretation* 18/1

- (1964), 20–38.
- . “Can This Be The Son Of David?” Pages 82–97 in *Jesus And The Historian: Written In Honor Of Ernest Cadman Colwell*. Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1968.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. “Qumran Messianism,” Pages 73–110 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*. Edited by Joseph A. Fitzmyer. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- . “The Son of David Tradition and Mt 22:41–46 and Parallels,” Pages 40–46 in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars’ Press, 1974.
- Flint, Peter. *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 17. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Foakes-Jackson, F. J., Kirsopp Lake, et al. *The Acts of the Apostles*. The Beginnings of Christianity 5. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1920.
- Foster, Paul. “The Use of Zechariah in Matthew’s Gospel,” Pages 65–85 in *The Book of Zechariah and Its Influence*. Edited by Christopher M. Tuckett. Burlington, VT.: Ashgate, 2003.
- France, R. T. “The Formula-Quotations of Matthew 2 and the Problem of Communication.” *New Testament Studies* 27 (1981), 233–251.
- . *The Gospel Of Mark: a commentary on the Greek text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002.
- . *The Gospel of Matthew*. NICNT. Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 2007.
- . *Jesus and The Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission*. 2d ed. Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Press, 1971.
- . “Relationship Between the Testaments.” Pages 666–672 in *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible*. Edited by Craig G. Bartholomew, Daniel J. Treier, et al. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.
- Fuller, Michael E. “The Davidic Messiah in Early Jewish Literature,” Pages 65–86 in *Spirit and the Mind: Essays on Informed Pentecostalism*. Edited by Terry L. Cross and Emerson B. Powery. Lanham: University Press of America, 2000.
- García Martínez, Florentino and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. Leiden: Brill, 1997–98.
- Gärtner, Bertil E. *Iscaiot*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
- Gibbs, James M. “Purpose and Pattern in Matthew’s Use of the Title ‘Son Of David.’” *New Testament Studies* 10 (1964), 446–464.
- Glasson, T. Francis. “Davidic Links With The Betrayal Of Jesus.” *Expository Times* 85/4 (1974), 118–19.
- Goulder, Michael D. *Midrash and Lection in Matthew; the Speaker's Lectures in Biblical Studies, 1969–71*. London: SPCK, 1974.
- Green, H. B. “Solomon the Son of David in Matthaean Typology,” Pages 227–230 in *Studia Evangelica*. Edited by Elizabeth A. Livingston. Berlin: Akademie- Verlag, 1982.
- Green, Joel B. *The Death of Jesus: tradition and interpretation in the Passion narrative*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1988.
- Green, William Scott, Jonathan Z. Smith, and Jacob Neusner, eds. *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Gren, Conrad R. “Piercing the Ambiguities of Psalm 22:16 and the Messiah’s Mission.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 48/2 (2005), 283–299.

- Grigsby, Bruce. "Gematria and John 21:11 - another look at Ezekiel 47:10." *Expository Times* 95/6 (1984), 177–78.
- Gundry, Robert H. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1994.
- . *The Use Of The Old Testament In St. Matthew's Gospel: With Special Reference To The Messianic Hope*. Novum Testamentum: supplement series 18. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- Hagner, Donald A. *Matthew*. 2 vols. Word Biblical Commentary 33A-B. 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, 2006.
- . "Reading Zechariah and Matthew's Olivet Discourse," Pages 85–97 in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels*. Edited by Thomas R. Hatina. Library of New Testament Studies 310. New York: T&T Clark, 2008.
- Hamilton Jr., James M. "'The Virgin Will Conceive': Typological Fulfillment in Matthew 1:18–23," Pages 228–247 in *Built upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew*. Edited by Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Hann, Robert R. "Christos Kyrios in PsSol 17:32: "the Lord's anointed" reconsidered." *New Testament Studies* 31 (1985), 620–27.
- Harrington, Daniel J. "Pseudo-Philo," volume 2 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983.
- . "Sabbath Tensions: Matthew 12:1–14 and other New Testament Texts," Pages 45–56 in *Sabbath in Jewish and Christian traditions*. New York: Crossroad, 1991.
- Hartman, Lars. "Scriptural exegesis in the Gospel of St Matthew and the problem of communication," Pages 131–152 in *Évangile selon Matthieu: rédaction et théologie*. Edited by M. Didier. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium 29. Gembloux: Duculot, 1972.
- Hay, D. M. *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity*. Society of Biblical Literature Manuscript Studies 18. Nashville: Abingdon, 1973.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. Yale University Press, 1993.
- Heil, John Paul. "Ezekiel 34 and the Narrative Strategy of the Shepherd and Sheep Metaphor in Matthew." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 55 (1993), 698–708.
- Hengel, Martin. *The Zealots: Investigations Into The Jewish Freedom Movement In The Period From Herod I Until 70 A.D.* Translated by David Smith. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989.
- Hicks, John Mark. "The Sabbath Controversy in Matthew: an exegesis of Matthew 12:1–14." *Restoration Quarterly* 27/2 (1984), 79–91.
- Hill, David. *The Gospel of Matthew*. New Century Bible commentary. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1981.
- Hood, Jason B. "Matthew 1:1–17 as a Summary of Israel's Story: The Messiah, His Brothers, and the Nations." PhD Diss, Aberdeen University (Highland Theological College), 2009.
- Hoskins, Paul M. *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*. Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 2006.
- Howell, Daniel B. *Matthew's Inclusive Story: A Study In The Narrative Rhetoric Of The First Gospel*. University of Oxford, 1990.
- Huizenga, Leroy A. "Matt 1:1: "Son of Abraham" as Christological Category." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 30/2 (2008), 103–113.

- . “The Matthean Jesus and the Isaac of the Early Jewish Encyclopedia,” Pages 63–81 in *Reading the Bible Intertextually*. Edited by Richard B. Hays, Stefan Alkier, and Leroy A. Huizenga. Waco, Tex: Baylor, 2009.
- Instone-Brewer, David. “Balaam-Laban as the Key to the Old Testament Quotations in Matthew 2,” Pages 207–227 in *Built upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew*. Edited by Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- . “The Two Asses of Zechariah 9:9 in Matthew 21.” *Tyndale Bulletin* 54/1 (2003), 87–98.
- Johnson, Marshall D. *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies: with special reference to the setting of the genealogies of Jesus*. 2d ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Jones, Douglas R. “Fresh Interpretation of Zechariah 9–11.” *Vetus testamentum* 12/3 (1962), 241–259.
- Jones, John Mark. “Subverting the Textuality of Davidic Messianism: Matthew’s Presentation of the Genealogy and the Davidic Title.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 56/2 (1994), 256–272.
- de Jonge, Marinus. “Jesus, Son of David and Son of God,” Pages 95–104 in *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: collected essays*. Novum Testamentum Supplement Series 63. Leiden: Brill, 1991.
- Juel, Donald. *Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation Of The Old Testament In Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- Keener, Craig S. *The Gospel Of Matthew: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Kenneally, William J. “‘Eli, eli, lamma sabachtani’ (Mt. 27:46).” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 8/2 (1946), 124–134.
- Kilian, Rudolph. *Die Verheißung Immanuel. Jes. 7,14*. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 35. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1968.
- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. *Matthew As Story*. rev. and enl. ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- . “The Title ‘Son of David’ in Matthew’s Gospel.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95/4 (1976), 591–602.
- Kirkpatrick, A. F. *Psalms 51–100*. Cambridge Press: Cambridge University Press, 1902.
- Klassen, William. *Judas: Betrayer Or Friend Of Jesus*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.
- Klausner, Joseph. *Jesus of Nazareth: His Life, Times, and Teaching*. New York: Macmillan, 1927.
- . *The Messianic Idea In Israel, From Its Beginning To The Completion Of The Mishnah*. New York: Macmillan, 1955.
- Klein, Hans. *Das Lukasevangelium*. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006.
- Knibb, Michael A. “Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2/2 (1995), 165–184.
- . “Eschatology and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” Pages 379–402 in *Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*. 2 vols. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Boston: Brill, 1999.
- Kruse, H. “Magni Pisces Centum Quinquaginta Tres.” *VD* 38 (1960), 129–148.
- Kugel, James L. “David the Prophet,” Pages 45–55 in *Poetry and Prophecy: the beginnings of a literary tradition*. Edited by James L. Kugel. *Myth and Poetics*, vol. 4. Ithaca, NY:

- Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Lachs, Samuel T. "Studies in the Semitic background to the gospel of Matthew." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 67/4 (1977), 195–217.
- Lamarche, Paul. *Zacharie IX-XIV; structure littéraire et messianisme*. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, J. Gabalda, 1961.
- Lampe, G. W. H. "The Reasonableness of Typology," *Essays on Typology*. Studies in Biblical Theology 22. London: SCM Press, 1957.
- Lange, Harvey D. "Relationship between Psalm 22 and the Passion narrative." *Concordia Theological Monthly* 43/9 (1972), 610–621.
- Levin, Yigal. "Jesus, 'Son of God' and 'Son of David': The 'Adoption' of Jesus into the Davidic Line." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 28/4 (2006), 415–442.
- Lichtenberger, Hermann. "Messianic Expectations and Messianic Figures in the Second Temple Period," Pages 9–20 in *Qumran-Messianism*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Gerbern S. Oegema. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.
- , Gerbern S. Oegema, and James H. Charlesworth, eds. *Qumran-Messianism: studies on the Messianic expectations in the Dead Sea scrolls*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. "Contested Paternity and Contested Readings: Jesus' Conception in Matthew 1.18–25." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 34/3 (2012), 211–231.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *New Testament Apologetic*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961.
- Loader, William R. G. "Son of David, Blindness, Possession, and Duality in Matthew." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44 (1982)
- Longenecker, Richard N. "Acts." in vol. 9 of *Expositor's Bible Commentary: John and Acts*. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelin. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981.
- . *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew: A Commentary*. 3 vols. Hermeneia 61A-C. Edited by Helmut Koester. Translated by James E Crouch. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989.
- . *The Theology Of The Gospel Of Matthew*. Translated by J. Bradford Robinson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Martin, Francis. "The Image of Shepherd in the Gospel of Saint Matthew." *Science et Esprit* 27/3 (1975), 261–301.
- Maston, Jason. "How Wrong were the Disciples about the Kingdom? Thoughts on Acts 1:6." *The Expository Times* 125/8 (2014), 1–10.
- Mathew, Reji. "Die Genealogie Matthäus 1, 1–17 im Rahmen der Christologie des Matthäusevangeliums." PhD Diss., 1997.
- McAfee Moss, Charlene. "Zechariah and the Gospel of Matthew: the use of a biblical tradition." PhD Thesis, 2002.
- McCasland, S. Vernon. "Matthew Twists the Scripture." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 80/2 (1961), 143–48.
- McCullough, J. C. "Hebrews and the Old Testament." Ph.D. diss., Queen's University, 1971.
- McIver, Robert K. "The Sabbath in the Gospel of Matthew: A Paradigm for Understanding the Law in Matthew?" *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 2 (1995), 231–243.
- Meier, John P. *Companions and Competitors. A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus* 3. New York: Doubleday, 2001.
- Menken, Maarten J. J. *Matthew's Bible: the Old Testament text of the evangelist*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 173. Dudley, MA: University Press, 2004.
- . "The Old Testament Quotation in Matthew 27,9–10: Textual Form and Context."

- Biblica* 83 (2002), 305–328.
- Menken, Martinus J. J. “The Quotations from Zech 9,9 in Mt 21,5 and in Jn 12,15,” Pages 571–78 in *John and the Synoptics*. Leuven: University Press, 1992.
- Menn, Esther. “No Ordinary Lament: Relecture and the Identity of the Distressed in Psalm 22.” *Harvard Theological Review* 93/4 (2000), 301–341.
- Merrill, Eugene H. *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi: An Exegetical Commentary*. Biblical Studies Press, 2003.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A companion volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament*. New York, N.Y.: United Bible Societies, 1971.
- Minear, Paul S. “Disciples and the Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew.” *Anglican Theological Review: supplement series* 3 (1974), 28–44.
- Miura, Yuzuru. *David in Luke-Acts: His Portrayal in the Light of Early Judaism*. WUNT 232. Tübingen: Eisenbrauns, 2007.
- Moeser, A. G. “The Death of Judas.” *Bible Today* 30/3 (1992), 145–151.
- Moo, Douglas J. “The Problem of Sensus Plenior,” Pages 179–211 in *Hermeneutics, Authority, and Canon*. Edited by John D. Woodbridge and D. A. Carson. 1986.
- Morris, Leon. *The Gospel According to Matthew*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Mullins, Terence Y. “Jesus, the ‘Son of David’.” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 29/2 (1991), 117–126.
- Mussies, Gerard. “Parallels To Matthew's Version Of The Pedigree Of Jesus.” *Novum Testamentum* 28/1 (1986), 32–47.
- Neusner, Jacob. *The Babylonian Talmud: a Translation and Commentary*. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publishers, 2005.
- Nieuviarts, Jacques. *L'entrée de Jésus à Jérusalem (Mt 21, 1–17): messianisme et accomplissement des écritures en Matthieu*. Paris: Cerf, 1999.
- Nineham, D. E. “The Genealogy in St. Matthew's Gospel and Its Significance for the Study of the Gospels.” *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 58 (1975), 421–444.
- Nolan, Brian M. *The Royal Son of God: the Christology of Matthew 1–2 in the Setting of the Gospel*. OBO 23. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- Nolland, John. *The Gospel of Matthew: a Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- . “The King as Shepherd: the Role of Deutero-Zechariah in Matthew,” Pages 133–146 in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels*. Edited by Thomas R. Hatina. LNTS 310. New York: T&T Clark, 2008.
- . “No Son-of-God Christology in Matthew 1.18–25.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 62 (1996), 3–12.
- . “What Kind of Genesis do we Have in Matt 1.1?” *New Testament Studies* 42/3 (1996), 463–471.
- Novakovic, Lidija. *Messiah, The Healer Of The Sick: A Study Of Jesus As The Son Of David In The Gospel Of Matthew*. WUNT 2.170. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- . *Messiah, The Healer Of The Sick: A Study Of Jesus As The Son Of David In The Gospel Of Matthew*. WUNT 2.170. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Oegema, Gerbern S. *The Anointed and his People: Messianic Expectations from the Maccabees to Bar Kochba*. JSPSup 27. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

- O'Dell, J. "The Religious Background of the Psalms of Solomon (Re-evaluated in the Light of the Qumran Texts)." *Revue de Qumran* 3 (1961), 241–257.
- Paffenroth, Kim. "Jesus as Anointed and Healing Son of David in the Gospel of Matthew." *Biblica* 80 (1999), 547–554.
- . *Judas: Images Of The Lost Disciple*. 1st ed ed. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- . "The Stories of the Fate of Judas and Differing Attitudes Towards Sources," Pages 67–81 in volume 12 of *Proceedings: Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies*. Cincinnati: Eastern Great Lakes & Midwest Biblical Societies, 1992.
- Patrick, James E. "Matthew's Peshet Gospel Structured Around Ten Messianic Citations of Isaiah." *Journal of Theological Studies* 61/1 (2010), 43–81.
- Pennington, Jonathan. "Refractions of Daniel in the Gospel of Matthew," Pages 65–86 in *Early Christian Literature And Intertextuality*. 2 vols. Edited by Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias. SSEJC 14. New York: T & T Clark, 2009.
- Pesch, Rudolf. "'He will be called a Nazorean': Messianic Exegesis In Matthew 1–2," Pages 129–178 in *Gospels And The Scriptures Of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and William Richard Stegner. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Peterson, Anthony R. "The Shape of the Davidic Hope across the Book of the Twelve." *JSOT* 35/2 (2010), 225–246.
- Phelan, James and Peter J. Rabinowitz. *A Companion To Narrative Theory*. Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture 33. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub, 2005.
- Pietersma, Albert. "David in the Greek Psalms." *Vetus Testamentum* 30/2 (1980), 213–226.
- Pitre, Brant. *Jesus, the Tribulation, and the End of the Exile*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006.
- Polhill, John B. *Acts*. New American Commentary 26. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1995.
- Pomykala, Kenneth E. *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism: Its History and Significance for Messianism*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Porter, Stanley E. "Allusions and Echoes," Pages 29–40 in *As it is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- . "Further Comments on the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," Pages 98–110 in *The Intertextuality of the Epistles: explorations of theory and practice*. Edited by Thomas L. Brodie, Dennis Ronald MacDonald, and Stanley E. Porter. New Testament Monographs 16. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006.
- . "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: a brief comment on method and terminology," Pages 79–96 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by James A. Sanders and Craig A. Evans. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: supplement series 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Pounds, Brian. Review of Gunnar Samuelsson, *Crucifixion in Antiquity: an inquiry into the background of the New Testament terminology of crucifixion*. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 33 (2011), 398–405.
- Reed, David A. "'Saving Judas'—A Social Scientific Approach to Judas's Suicide in Matthew 27:3–10." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 35 (2005), 51–59.
- Repschinski, Boris. "'For He Will Save His People From Their Sins' (Matthew 1:21): A Christology For Christian Jews." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 68/2 (2006), 248–267.
- Reuling, Hanneke. "Rabbinic responses to Christian appropriation of the Hebrew Bible: the case of Psalm 22:1 (MT)." *Studia patristica* 44 (2010), 177–182.
- Reumann, John Henry Paul. "Psalm 22 at the Cross: lament and thanksgiving for Jesus

- Christ.” *Interpretation* 28/1 (1974), 39–58.
- Rogers, C. L. “The Davidic Covenant in the Gospels.” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 150 (1993), 458–478.
- Romeo, Joseph A. “Gematria and John 21:11, the Children of God.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 97/2 (1978), 263–64.
- Sanders, James A. “A New Testament Hermeneutic Fabric: Psalm 118 in the entrance narrative,” Pages 177–190 in *Early Jewish and Christian exegesis: studies in memory of William Hugh Brownlee*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- , ed. *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPs^a). Discoveries of the Judaean Desert of Jordan 4*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez et al. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Sasson, Jack M. “A Genealogical “Convention” in Biblical Chronography?” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 90/2 (1978), 171–185.
- Schaberg, Jane. *The Illegitimacy Of Jesus: A Feminist Theological Interpretation Of The Infancy Narratives*. New York: Crossroad, 1990.
- Schley, Donald G. “Ahithophel.” in *Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. Yale University Press, 2008.
- Schonfield, Hugh J. *An Old Hebrew Text of St. Matthew’s Gospel*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1927.
- Schöllig, Hugo. “Die Zählung der Generationen im matthäischen Stammbaum.” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 59/3 (1968), 261–68.
- Schwarz, Günther. *Jesus und Judas: aramaistische Untersuchungen zur Jesus-Judas-Überlieferung der Evangelien und der Apostelgeschichte*. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 6. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1988.
- Selwyn, Edward Carus. *The Oracles in the New Testament*. New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1912.
- Senior, Donald. “The Lure of the Formula Quotations: re-assessing Matthew’s use of the Old Testament with the Passion narrative as test case,” Pages 89–115 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by Christopher M Tuckett. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniesium 131. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- Skehan, Patrick William. “Wisdom’s House.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 29/3 (1967), 468–486.
- Smith, Gary. *Isaiah 1–39*. The New American Commentary 15A. Nashville: B & H Publishing Group, 2007.
- Smith, Harold. “Notes and Studies: Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 28 (1926), 60.
- Smith, Ralph L. *Micah–Malachi*. Word Biblical Commentary 32. Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1984.
- Snodgrass, Klyne. “The Use of the Old Testament in the New,” *Interpreting the New Testament: essays on methods and issues*. Edited by David Alan Black and David S. Dockery. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman & Holman, 2001.
- Soares Prabhu, George M. *The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew: an enquiry into the tradition history of Mt 1–2*. Analecta biblica 63. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976.
- Spencer, F. Scott. “Scripture, hermeneutics, and Matthew’s Jesus.” *Interpretation* 64/4 (2010),

- 368–378.
- Stanton, Graham N. *A Gospel for a New People: studies in Matthew*. London: T & T Clark, 1992.
- Stendahl, Krister. *Matthew*. Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Matthew Black. London: Nelson, 1962.
- . “Quis Et Unde: An Analysis Of Matthew 1–2,” Pages 56–66 in *Interpretation of Matthew*. Edited by Graham Stanton. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
- . *The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament*. ASNU 20. 2d ed. Ramwey, NJ: Sigler Press, 1991.
- Strack, Hermann L. and Paul Billerbeck. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. 4 vols. 2d ed. Munich: Beck, 1956.
- Strauss, Mark L. *The Davidic Messiah In Luke-Acts: the Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology*. JSNTSup 110. Sheffield, Eng: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Subramanian, J. Samuel. *The Synoptic Gospels and the Psalms as Prophecy*. LNTS 351. New York: T & T Clark, 2007.
- Tate, Marvin E. *Psalms 51–100*. Word Biblical Commentary 20. Edited by Wally Armstrong and Ken Blanchard. Thomas Nelson, 2006.
- Tatum, W. Barnes. “‘The Origin of Jesus Messiah’ (Matt 1:1, 18a): Matthew’s Use of the Infancy Traditions.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96/4 (1977), 523–535.
- Tkacz, Catherine Brown. “Esther, Jesus, and Psalm 22.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 70/4 (2008), 709–728.
- Torrey, Charles C. “The Name ‘Isariot’.” *Harvard Theological Review* 36/1 (1943), 51–62.
- Trafton, Joseph L. “The Psalms of Solomon in Recent Research.” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 12 (1994), 3–19.
- Trafton, Joseph L. “The Bible, The Psalms of Solomon, and Qumran,” Pages 427–446 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community*. 3 vols. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins 2. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- Tromp, Johannes. “The Davidic Messiah in Jewish Eschatology of the First Century BCE,” Pages 179–201 in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Edited by James M. Scott. JSJSup 72. Boston: Brill, 2001.
- Trudinger, L. Paul. “Davidic Links With The Betrayal Of Jesus: Some Further Observations.” *Expository Times* 86/9 (1975), 278–79.
- . “Eli, Eli, Lama Sabachthani: a Cry of Dereliction or Victory?” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 17/4 (1974), 235–38.
- Turner, David L. *Matthew*. ECNT. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008.
- Ulrich, Eugene, Frank Moore Cross, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Peter W. Flint, et al., eds. *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles. Discoveries in the Judean Desert* 16. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
- Upton, John A. “The Potter’s Field and the death of Judas.” *Concordia Journal* 8/6 (1982), 213–19.
- VanderKam, James. “Messianism in the Scrolls,” Pages 211–233 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam. Notre Dame: Notre Dame Press, 1994.
- van der Ploeg, J. P. M. “Un petit rouleau de psaumes apocryphes (11Q PsAp^a),” Pages 128–139 in *Tradition und Glaube: das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt. Festgabe für*

- Karl Georg Kuhn zum 65. Geburtstag*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.
- Van De Water, R. "The Punishment of the Wicked Priest and the Death of Judas." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 10/3 (2003), 395–419.
- Van Egmond, Richard. "The Messianic 'Son of David' in Matthew." *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 3 (2006), 41–71.
- Van Unnik, Willem C. "The Death of Judas in Saint Matthew's Gospel." *ATHRSS* 3 (1974), 44–57.
- Verseput, Donald J. "The Davidic Messiah and Matthew's Jewish Christianity." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 34 (1995), 102–116.
- von Rad, Gerhard. "Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament." *Interpretation* 15/2 (1961), 174–192.
- Waetjen, Herman C. "Genealogy As The Key To The Gospel According To Matthew." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95/2 (1976), 205–230.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Watts, John D. W. *Isaiah 1–33*. Word Biblical Commentary 24. revised ed. Waco, Tex.: Thomas Nelson, 2005.
- Watts, Rikk E. "Immanuel: Virgin Birth Proof Text or Programmatic Warning of Things to Come (Isa 7:14 in Matt 1:23)?" Pages 92–113 in *From Prophecy to Testament: The Function of the Old Testament in the New*. Edited by Craig A. Evans. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004.
- . "The Lord's House and David's Lord: the Psalms and Mark's Perspective on Jesus and the Temple." *BibInt* 15/3 (2007), 307–322.
- . "Mark," *Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Weiss, Herold. "The Sabbath in the Synoptic Gospels." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 12 (1990), 13–27.
- Weren, Wilhelmus. "Jesus' entry into Jerusalem: Mt 21,1–17 in the light of the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint," Pages 117–141 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by Christopher M. Tuckett. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- Whelan, C. F. "Suicide in the Ancient World: A Re-examination of Matthew 27:3–10." *LTP* 49/3 (1993), 505–522.
- Whitters, Mark F. "Jesus In The Footsteps Of Jeremiah." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 68/2 (2006), 229–247.
- Wildeberger, Hans. *Isaiah 1–12*. Continental Commentary. Translated by Thomas H. Trapp. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1991.
- Willis, John T. "The Meaning of Isaiah 7:14 and its Application in Matthew 1:23." *Restoration Quarterly* 21/1 (1978), 1–18.
- Willitts, Joel. "Matthew and Psalms of Solomon's messianism: a comparative study of first-century messianology." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 22/1 (2012), 27–50.
- . *Matthew's Messianic Shepherd-King*. BZNW 147. New York: Walter De Gruyter, 2007.
- Willoughby, Allen C. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew*. The International critical commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. 3d ed. T and T Clark, 1912.
- Wright, N. T. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God 2. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

- Wright, Robert B. "The Psalms of Solomon, the pharisees, and the Essenes," Pages 136–147 in *International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies and the SBL Pseudepigrapha Seminar, 1972 proceedings*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft. Missoula: SBL, 1972.
- , ed. *The Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. New York: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Zacharias, H. Daniel. "4Q521 (Messianic Apocalypse)." Pages 138–39 in *Encyclopedia of the Historical Jesus*. Edited by Craig A. Evans. New York: Routledge Press, 2008.
- . "The Son of David in *Psalms of Solomon* 17," Pages 73–87 in "*Non-canonical Religious Texts in Early Judaism and Early Christianity*." Edited by Lee Martin McDonald and James H. Charlesworth. *Jewish and Christian Texts* 14. London: T&T Clark, 2012.
- . "*Raise up to them their King*": *Psalms of Solomon 17–18 in the Context of Early Jewish Messianism*. Tübingen: Verlag Dr. Mueller, 2008.
- Zolli, Eugenio. "Nazarenus Vocabitur." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 49/1 (1958), 135–36.