



Durham E-Theses

'I Desire Mercy but not Sacrifice': Kindness and the Law in the Gospel of Matthew

CHAN, CHI YEE

How to cite:

CHAN, CHI YEE (2023) *'I Desire Mercy but not Sacrifice': Kindness and the Law in the Gospel of Matthew*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online:
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/15302/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Chi Yee Chan

‘I Desire Mercy but not Sacrifice’: Kindness and the Law in the Gospel of Matthew

Abstract

This study explores the significance of the double citation of Hosea 6.6 ‘I desire mercy but not sacrifice’ in the Gospel of Matthew and the meaning of ἔλεος therein. By comparing Matthew with Mark, this study highlights the difference between their parallel accounts to examine the implications of Matthew’s distinctiveness. A possible omission of Mark’s allusion to Hosea 6.6 suggests that Matthew understands the double love commandments as a summary of the whole Law. Adding the words from Hosea 6.6 to Mark’s narration of Jesus’s table fellowship with sinners and of the Sabbath stories, Matthew strengthens the portrayal of Jesus as the merciful Son of David, who gives his people healing, rest, and forgiveness of sins. Matthew’s designation of ἔλεος as among ‘the weightier matters of the Law’ indicates how the disciples should take heed of God’s commandments: by following Jesus, who does the will of God and performs kindness, which is one of the all-encompassing elements threaded throughout the Law. This relationship between kindness and the Law is further explored in light of comparable concepts found in Philo of Alexandria’s treatises. Philo summarises the Law by describing that, of the vast number of ordinances in the Law, there are ‘two highest heads’, piety and holiness towards God and justice and ‘philanthropy’ (φιλανθρωπία) towards humans, to which every particular commandment can be referred. Philo regards the Law as guiding people to imitate God just as God possesses and performs virtues, of which Philo highlights φιλανθρωπία. These concepts might help discern the purpose of Matthew’s emphasis on ἔλεος: to point out mercy and kindness as the character of God, Jesus and the Law. To be perfect like God and well-pleasing to God, following Jesus and keeping God’s commandments are both indispensable.

‘I Desire Mercy but not Sacrifice’: Kindness and the Law
in the Gospel of Matthew

Chi Yee Chan

Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Theology and Religion
Durham University
2023

Contents

Abstract	i
Abbreviations	vii
Declaration	viii
Statement of Copyright	viii
Acknowledgements	ix
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
1.1 The research question.....	1
1.2 A survey of recent research	2
1.2.1 A summary of recent studies	3
1.2.2 Critique.....	10
1.3 Methodology: comparison.....	15
1.3.1 In comparison with Mark	15
1.3.2 In comparison with Philo of Alexandria	17
1.3.3 Limitations	19
1.3.4 Brief remarks on the form of the Old Testament known to Matthew	20
1.4 Structure and arrangement	21
Chapter 2 The double love commandments in Matthew and Mark: priority or summary?	25
2.1 The love commandments as a priority (Mark 12.28–34)	26
2.1.1 Prioritising the commandments.....	28
2.1.1.1 The use of the ordinal adjectives and the comparatives.....	28
2.1.1.2 The allusion to Hosea 6.6 as prioritising the love commandments.....	33
2.1.2 The implications of prioritising certain commandments.....	37
2.1.2.1 The overriding of the observance of some commandments.....	38
2.1.2.2 The abrogation of certain commandments	42
2.1.3 Summary	43
2.2 The love commandments as a summary (Matt 22.36–40)	44
2.2.1 Matthew’s distinctiveness in comparison with Mark 12.28–34.....	44
2.2.2 The practice of summarising the commandments among the ancient Jews.....	52
2.2.2.1 The juxtaposition of love for God and love for one’s neighbour.....	52

2.2.2.2 The juxtaposition of εὐσέβεια and δικαιοσύνη as a summary of the Law.....	55
2.2.3 Summary	57
2.3 Conclusion.....	58
Chapter 3 Philo’s summary of the Law.....	60
3.1 The unwritten laws and the written laws.....	62
3.1.1 Unwritten laws in ancient Greek literature	63
3.1.2 The implications of ἄγραφοι νόμοι in Philo’s Exposition of the Law	68
3.2 The categories of the written laws.....	74
3.2.1 The Decalogue commandments as the headings of the particular laws.....	74
3.2.2 The division of the legislation into two sets of duty	82
3.2.3 Virtues and the particular laws.....	86
3.2.3.1 The discussion of laws within the frame of virtues.....	89
3.2.3.2 The observance of the laws and the practice of virtues.....	94
3.3 Conclusion.....	97
Chapter 4 ‘I desire mercy but not sacrifice’: forgiveness as God’s grace and demand (Matt 9.9–13).....	99
4.1 The broader context of Matthew 9.9–13: Jesus’s healing.....	100
4.1.1 God’s promise of healing and forgiveness as fulfilled through his servant.....	102
4.1.2 Jesus as the merciful Son of David	105
4.1.2.1 The highlighting of God’s mercy: ἐλεέω and σπλαγχνίζομαι.....	106
4.1.2.2 The Son of David brings God’s promised healing and forgiveness.....	112
4.2 The significance of the citation of Hosea 6.6 in Matthew 9.9–13	121
4.2.1 The meaning of ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν.....	122
4.2.1.1 The meaning of ἔλεος in Hosea 6.6 LXX	123
4.2.1.2 The negation καὶ οὐ θυσίαν rhetorically emphasises ἔλεος θέλω	127
4.2.2 God’s mercy and God’s demand for mercy	131
4.2.2.1 Ἐλεος as restoring sinners: to ‘heal’ the lost.....	133
4.2.2.2 Ἐλεος as showing kindness towards repentant sinners	139
4.3 Conclusion.....	140
Chapter 5 ‘I desire mercy but not sacrifice’: deeds of kindness are essential for Sabbath observance (Matt 12.1–14)	142
5.1 Jesus gives rest in his role as the promised Davidic shepherd-king.....	143
5.1.1 The connection between the yoke, learning and giving rest	144
5.1.2 The promise of rest indicates Jesus as the Davidic shepherd-king	149
5.2 Ἐλεος, the deeds on the Sabbath and the Lord of the Sabbath	152

5.2.1 The debate regarding ‘lawful’ deeds on the Sabbath	153
5.2.2 Deeds of kindness accord with God’s will for Sabbath observance	160
5.2.3 The significance of ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν in Matthew 12.7.....	166
5.2.3.1 Mercy as greater than the temple?.....	167
5.2.3.2 Johanan’s use of Hosea 6.6 as a response to the destruction of the temple ...	170
5.3 Covenant faithfulness and God’s demand for ἔλεος.....	175
5.4 Conclusion.....	177
Chapter 6 The emphasis on ἔλεος and its relation to Law observance	179
6.1 Ἔλεος as a ‘weightier matter of the Law’ (Matt 23.23)	179
6.1.1 The meaning of ‘the weightier matters of the Law’	180
6.1.2 The relation of κρίσις, ἔλεος and πίστις to the Law.....	183
6.1.3 The implications of naming ἔλεος as among ‘the weightier matters of the Law’ .	191
6.2 Ἔλεος, the ‘exceeding righteousness’ and the aim of Law observance	192
6.2.1 Ἔλεος as indispensable to the ‘exceeding righteousness’	193
6.2.2 The ‘exceeding righteousness’ and perfection	196
6.2.2.1 The ‘Antitheses’ and the Law	196
6.2.2.2 The righteousness which exceeds that of the Pharisees	198
6.2.2.3 Perfection as the aim of Law observance.....	199
6.2.3 Deeds of mercy, following Jesus, and imitating God	206
6.2.3.1 Perfection, keeping the commandments, and deeds of kindness	208
6.2.3.2 Perfection, deeds of kindness, and following Jesus	210
6.3 Conclusion.....	212
Chapter 7 Philo and Matthew on kindness, Law observance and the imitation of God	214
7.1 Philo’s emphasis on philanthropy and its relationship to the imitation of God	214
7.1.1 Philanthropy relates closely to piety and justice	217
7.1.1.1 The pious Abraham as characterised by justice and philanthropy	217
7.1.1.2 The laws pertaining to philanthropy have notions of piety and justice.....	219
7.1.2 The Law, philanthropy, and the imitation of God.....	223
7.1.2.1 Imitating God to benefit others and to give.....	224
7.1.2.2 Ἔλεος and φιλανθρωπία as virtues of humans and of God.....	229
7.1.2.3 Philo’s understanding of imitating God as the goal of human life.....	236
7.1.3 Summary and concluding remarks	244
7.2 Matthew and Philo: points of similarity and distinctiveness concerning their emphasis on love for humans and its relation to the whole Law	246
7.2.1 Kindness as the all-encompassing element suffusing the whole Law	246

7.2.2 The imitation of God as the goal of Law observance	248
7.2.3 Matthew's use of ἔλεος and Philo's use of φιλανθρωπία	249
7.2.4 Understanding Matthew's use of Hosea 6.6 in Philo's terms	251
7.3 Conclusion.....	252
Chapter 8 Conclusions	254
8.1 Love for God and love for humans as a summary of the Law	255
8.2 Matthew's double citation of Hosea 6.6: mercy but not sacrifice?	259
8.3 Kindness, Law observance and the imitation of God.....	263
8.4 The findings in relation to current scholarship.....	268
8.4.1 The fundamental issues concerning the study of Matthew's use of Hosea 6.6.....	269
8.4.2 Philo and Matthew	271
8.4.3 Matthew and Judaism.....	274
Bibliography.....	278

Abbreviations

Abbreviations follow *The SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd edn (Atlanta: SBL, 2014); with the exception of the following:

AJEC	Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity
ALGHJ	Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums
BHGNT	Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament
<i>BrillDAG</i>	Montanari, Franco, <i>The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek</i> , ed. by Madeleine Goh and Chad Schroeder (Leiden: Brill, 2015)
BzA	Beiträge zur Altertumskunde
CHAT	<i>Philo von Alexandria: Die Werke in deutscher Übersetzung</i> , ed. by Leopold Cohn, Isaak Heinemann, Maximilian Adler, and Willy Theiler, 7 vols (Breslau: Marcus, 1909–1938 [vol. 1–6]; repr. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1962 [vol. 1–6]; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1964 [vol. 7])
CW	<i>Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt</i> , ed. by Leopold Cohn and Paul Wendland, 7 vols (Berlin: Reimer, 1896–1906 [vol. 1–6]; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1928–1930 [vol. 7]; repr. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1962–1963)
ECBAT	Edition C Bibelkommentar Altes Testament
EUSS	European University Studies Series
HTA	Historisch-Theologische Auslegung
JCPS	Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series
JCTC	Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
LOPA	Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1961–1992)
<i>OED</i>	Simpson, J. A., and E. S. C. Weiner, eds., <i>The Oxford English Dictionary</i> , 2nd edn, 20 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989; repr. [with corrections] Oxford: Clarendon, 1991)
RPT	Religion in Philosophy and Theology
SAPERE	Scripta Antiquitatis Posterioris ad Ethicam RELigionemque pertinentia
SupJSJ	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
SVTG	Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum
ThKNT	Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
ZECOT	Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the Old Testament

Declaration

This thesis is my own work. No part of it has been previously submitted for a degree in Durham University or any other institution.

Statement of Copyright

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without the author's prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

Acknowledgements

Seeing the completion of this thesis, I only have these words of Paul in my mind: ‘Thanks be to God for his inexpressible gift!’ (2 Cor 9.15) Throughout the process, I was blessed with the support from various people, to whom I would like to express my sincere thanks.

My deepest gratitude goes to my supervisor, Professor John Barclay, whose guidance and expertise shaped my research. Supervision meetings were always inspiring and enjoyable. The comments marked on my drafts always reflected his kindness and patience, as well as his insights. He offered not only constructive feedback but also unceasing encouragement. I sometimes doubted myself, but he constantly showed confidence in me and my work. Without him, I could not have kept going and crossed the finish line.

I also thank Dr. Jan Dochhorn and his Greek reading group for being my good companions over these years in Durham. The weekly gatherings were a great source of knowledge and joy. As my secondary supervisor, Jan also read through my thesis, and I am indebted to his helpful comments. I am also grateful for the academic writing support from the University’s DCAD (Durham Centre for Academic Development). Their workshops and consultation services were instrumental in developing my English writing skills. Moreover, thanks are due to Rebecca Watts, who offered her help in checking my English.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my family. They made it possible for me to study abroad without worries. I had been away from home for more than ten years to achieve this goal. During such an extended period, their care and support from afar did not pause for a single moment. I will forever remember their love for me and their dedication to God.

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 The research question

‘I desire mercy but not sacrifice’ (ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν),¹ a text from Hosea 6.6, is cited twice in the Gospel of Matthew.² The first appearance of the citation is in the story of Jesus’s table fellowship with sinners, and the second is in the story of Jesus’s disciples plucking grain on the Sabbath (Matt 9.13; 12.7). The citation, however, appears neither in Mark’s nor Luke’s account of the same stories.³ Matthew’s distinctiveness suggests that Hosea 6.6 is significant to his account of Jesus’s story.

However, the double citation creates a puzzle. ‘I desire mercy but not sacrifice’ looks like an abrogation of the cultic commandments. This understanding then generates tension within the gospel. In Matthew’s narration, Jesus states that no commandment is to be abolished (5.17–19). Moreover, concerning ἔλεος and the tithes, Jesus says that both of them ought not to be neglected (23.23). In fact, this tension is relevant to the larger discussion concerning Matthew and his understanding of the continuity of the commandments in the Old Testament.

The present study aims at solving this puzzle by exploring the ways in which Matthew’s emphasis on ἔλεος relates to his understanding of Law observance. Why does Matthew cite ‘I desire mercy but not sacrifice’ twice? How should we understand the negation

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, the Greek texts of the New Testament are taken from NA²⁸, and the translations are my own.

² In the present study, ‘Matthew’ refers either to ‘the Gospel of Matthew’ or ‘the author of the Gospel of Matthew’ unless otherwise indicated. This rule also applies to ‘Mark’, ‘Luke’ and ‘John’.

³ The table fellowship: Matt 9.9–13 // Mark 2.13–17 // Luke 5.27–32. The Sabbath incident: Matt 12.1–8 // Mark 2.23–28 // Luke 6.1–5.

of *θυσία* in the citation, and how does this understanding accord with other passages in Matthew?

1.2 A survey of recent research

This section focusses on the studies which primarily explore the significance of the double citation of Hosea 6.6 and the meaning of *ἔλεος* in Matthew. Other studies which discuss the use of Hosea 6.6 in Matthew but do not explore it as the primary research question,⁴ or those which focus only on one of the two pericopae,⁵ are engaged with (when appropriate) in the main Chapters instead.

Matthew's double citation of Hosea 6.6 has continuously drawn the attention of researchers in recent decades. There have been monographs dedicated to the theme of 'mercy' (*ἔλεος*) in Matthew, in which the discussion of Hosea 6.6 contributes to a significant part.⁶

The publication of essays across the decades shows that Matthew's double citation of Hosea 6.6 is intriguing,⁷ has been revisited at times, and can be worthy of further study in doctoral

⁴ For example, studies concerning Matthew's use of the Old Testament; e.g., Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2016).

⁵ That is, the studies which focus only on either Matthew 9.13 or 12.7; e.g., Eric Ottenheijm, 'The Shared Meal—A Therapeutical Device: The Function and Meaning of Hos 6:6 in Matt 9:10–13', *Novum Testamentum*, 53.1 (2011), 1–21; Lena Lybæk, 'Matthew's Use of Hosea 6,6 in the Context of the Sabbath Controversies', in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*, ed. by C. M. Tuckett, BETL, 131 (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1997), pp. 491–99.

⁶ For example: Josef Seeanner, *Die Barmherzigkeit (ἔλεος) im Matthäusevangelium: rettende Vergebung* (Kleinhain: St. Josef, 2009); Jens-Christian Maschmeier, *Reziproke Barmherzigkeit: Theologie und Ethik im Matthäusevangelium*, BWANT, 227 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2020).

⁷ For example: David Hill, 'On the Use and Meaning of Hosea 6:6 in Matthew's Gospel', *New Testament Studies*, 24.1 (1977), 107–19; Mary E. Hinkle, 'Learning What Righteousness Means: Hosea 6:6 and the Ethic of Mercy in Matthew's Gospel', *Word & World*, 18.4 (1998), 355–63; Pierre Keith, 'Les citations d'Osée 6:6 dans deux péripécopes de l'Évangile de Matthieu (Mt 9:9–13 et 12:1–8)', in *'Car c'est l'amour qui me plaît, non le sacrifice...': recherches sur Osée 6:6 et son interprétation juive et chrétienne*, ed. by Eberhard Bons, JSJSup, 88 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. 57–80; Francois P. Viljoen, 'Hosea 6:6 and Identity Formation in Matthew', *Acta Theologica*, 34 (2014), 214–37; Benjamin J. Ribbens, 'Whose "Mercy"? What "Sacrifice"? : A Proposed Reading of Matthew's Hosea 6:6 Quotations', *Bulletin for Biblical Research*, 28.3 (2018), 381–404; Adam

research projects. This, in fact, is proved by the fact that two doctoral dissertations which study this topic have been completed recently.⁸ After summarising the findings of these recent studies on their own terms, the ways in which the present study may contribute differently to the discussion of this topic will be stated.

1.2.1 A summary of recent studies

Regarding Matthew's use of Hosea 6.6, among the studies from recent decades, Glynn's doctoral dissertation is an earlier one with a detailed discussion of the meaning of $\tau\sigma\pi$ / $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ in Hosea, the citation of Hosea 6.6 in Matthew (9.13; 12.7), and the meaning of $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ in Matthew 23.23.⁹ Glynn suggests that, in Hosea, each occurrence of $\tau\sigma\pi$ / $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ appears in a covenant context,¹⁰ and he regards the 'Hosean sense' of $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ as 'covenant virtue of steadfast love ($\tau\sigma\pi$)',¹¹ which is 'covenant loyalty'.¹² He then examines the three occurrences of $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ in Matthew respectively (9.13, 12.7, 23.23),¹³ argues that every occurrence carries the same sense of $\tau\sigma\pi$ in Hosea, meaning the 'practice of the steadfast covenant loyalty desired by

Kubiś, "I Delight in Love, Not in Sacrifice": Hosea 6:6 and Its Rereading in the Gospel of Matthew', *Collectanea Theologica*, 90.5 (2020), 295–320.

⁸ Daniel Ahn, 'The Significance of Jesus's Use of Hosea 6:6 in the Gospel of Matthew' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2020). Baiju John, "I Desire Compassion, and Not Sacrifice": Hos 6,6 in Matthew's Gospel: An Exegetical and Theological Study' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pontifical Gregorian University, 2021). The present study began in 2018; I was unaware of any of these two recent research projects until early 2022.

⁹ Leo Edward Glynn, 'The Use and Meaning of $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ in Matthew' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, 1971).

¹⁰ Glynn, 'The Use and Meaning', pp. 35, 205.

¹¹ Glynn, 'The Use and Meaning', p. 50.

¹² In his discussion of the meaning of $\tau\sigma\pi$ in Hosea, Glynn sees 'steadfast love' as the same as 'covenant loyalty'. Glynn, 'The Use and Meaning', pp. 7, 27, 71, 153.

¹³ Glynn, 'The Use and Meaning', pp. 52–152.

God in one's dealings with Him and with one's covenant brothers and sisters'.¹⁴ Finally, Glynn explores the ways in which ἔλεος relates to δικαιοσύνη in Matthew. He suggests that, in Hosea, the practice of קִרְבָּנִים /δικαιοσύνη ('righteousness') is 'a manifestation of ἔλεος'.¹⁵ In light of this, Glynn understands ἔλεος in Matthew as 'the steadfast, unconditional doing of the Father's will' and 'is the heart of the δικαιοσύνη' which exceeds that of the Pharisees (Matt 5.20).¹⁶

The relationship between ἔλεος and the exceeding δικαιοσύνη in Matthew (5.20) is also pointed out by Hill and Hinkle respectively. Both of them do so in a study of Matthew's use of Hosea 6.6. Similar to Glynn, Hill suggests that ἔλεος in Matthew, through the citation Hosea 6.6, carries the sense of covenant loyalty expressed by רַחֲמֵי in Hosea:¹⁷ ἔλεος in Matthew denotes 'constant love for God which issues in deeds of compassion'.¹⁸ Hill argues that Jesus did not quote Hosea 6.6: the citation is inserted into the stories at a later time by Matthew,¹⁹ probably as a response to Johanan ben Zakkai's reinterpretations of Hosea 6.6, in order to counteract 'the revived Pharisaic legalism' after the destruction of the Jerusalem temple.²⁰ Matthew's use of Hosea 6.6, Hill suggests, is to indicate that ἔλεος 'denotes, in part, the content [of] the "better righteousness"'.²¹ Likewise, Hinkle suggests that the exceeding righteousness described in Matthew is 'abounding in steadfast love', and that mercy and

¹⁴ Glynn, 'The Use and Meaning', p. 136; cf. p. 100.

¹⁵ Glynn, 'The Use and Meaning', p. 47.

¹⁶ Glynn, 'The Use and Meaning', p. 203; cf. p. 205.

¹⁷ Hill, 'On the Use and Meaning', pp. 109–10.

¹⁸ Hill, 'On the Use and Meaning', p. 110; cf. p. 118.

¹⁹ Hill, 'On the Use and Meaning', pp. 107–8.

²⁰ Hill, 'On the Use and Meaning', p. 119.

²¹ Hill, 'On the Use and Meaning', pp. 116–17.

righteousness 'are very nearly identified with each other' in Matthew.²² She regards Matthew's use of Hosea 6.6 as designed to explain that 'to be righteous is to show mercy'.²³

Keith's study focusses on the possible implications of a repeated citation of Hosea 6.6 in Matthew.²⁴ He suggests that, as the citation repeats, its meaning develops along the progression of the story.²⁵ That is, the reappearance of the citation recalls the previous context in which it is cited; in the latter context (Matt 12.8), the citation should be understood with reference to its meaning discerned from the previous context (Matt 9.13).²⁶ Concerning the use of Hosea 6.6 in Matthew 9.13, Keith understands ἔλεος as 'mercy'; the citation invites the readers to recognise the fulfilment of God's will through the 'mercy' (miséricorde) embodied in Jesus's life: to call sinners so that they can respond to his call, reintegrate into the people of God and live in God's presence.²⁷ The phrase 'not sacrifice' in the citation indicates that forgiveness of sins and the encounter with God, which were carried out by means of sacrifice in the past, are now achieved by the mercy embodied in Jesus.²⁸ Keith suggests that the repetition of the citation in Matthew 12.7 recalls the context of Matthew 9.13 and its themes of the presence of God and God's relationship with his people,²⁹ thus explaining why the disciples are innocent: they act in the presence of Jesus, just as the priests perform sacrifices in the temple on the Sabbath.³⁰ The repetition of the citation of Hosea 6.6 in Matthew, Keith

²² Hinkle, 'Learning', p. 362.

²³ Hinkle, 'Learning', p. 356.

²⁴ Keith, 'Les citations', pp. 60–61.

²⁵ Keith, 'Les citations', p. 60.

²⁶ Keith, 'Les citations', p. 64.

²⁷ Keith, 'Les citations', p. 73.

²⁸ Keith, 'Les citations', p. 73.

²⁹ Keith, 'Les citations', p. 77.

³⁰ Keith, 'Les citations', p. 78.

suggests, is intended to remind the readers of the fact that ‘mercy’ (miséricorde) is the essential attribute of God and is embodied in Jesus.³¹

Seeanner also suggests that ἔλεος in Matthew means ‘mercy’. He offers a linguistic study and analyses the passages where ἔλεος, ἐλεέω and ἐλεήμων appear in Matthew.³² Regarding the citation Hosea 6.6 in Matthew 9.13, Seeanner suggests that the context of healing and forgiveness of sins depicts Jesus’s mission as ‘the manifestation of God’s mercy’ (die Offenbarung der Barmherzigkeit Gottes).³³ He thinks that 𐤇𐤐𐤏 in the original context of Hosea 6.6 can mean ‘devotion’ (Hingabe) to God,³⁴ however, when the citation is put into the context of Matthew 9.13, ἔλεος is better understood as ‘pity’ or ‘mercy’ («Erbarmen» oder «Barmherzigkeit».³⁵ He suggests that Matthew’s use of ἐλεέω and ἐλεήμων emphasises mercy towards humans, thus facilitating a ‘theological reinterpretation’ (theologischen Neuinterpretation) of Hosea 6.6 when it is cited in the two stories, to indicate God’s will for mercy to be shown to humans.³⁶ Concerning Matthew 12.7, Seeanner suggests that the use of Hosea 6.6 explains Jesus as the Lord of the Sabbath, who gives full meaning to the Sabbath by manifesting God’s mercy, which includes caring for the hungry and the sick.³⁷

By contrast, Ribbens suggests that Matthew uses ἔλεος differently from his use of ἐλεέω.³⁸ While ἐλεέω in Matthew denotes showing compassion or mercy on humans, ἔλεος in Matthew, Ribbens suggests, should be understood in light of its linkage to the prophetic texts:

³¹ Keith, ‘Les citations’, p. 79.

³² Seeanner, *Die Barmherzigkeit*, pp. 9–17.

³³ Seeanner, *Die Barmherzigkeit*, p. 74; cf. p. 64.

³⁴ Seeanner, *Die Barmherzigkeit*, pp. 57–58.

³⁵ Seeanner, *Die Barmherzigkeit*, p. 84.

³⁶ Seeanner, *Die Barmherzigkeit*, pp. 83–84.

³⁷ Seeanner, *Die Barmherzigkeit*, p. 107; cf. 102–3.

³⁸ Ribbens, ‘Whose “Mercy”’, p. 389.

the sense of ἔλεος in Matthew links to the sense of רַחֲמִים in those prophetic texts.³⁹ Ribbens thinks that ἔλεος in those prophetic texts (in the Septuagint) can mean ‘covenant faithfulness’.⁴⁰ Regarding Matthew 9.13, Ribbens understands the citation as Jesus’s identifying himself with the Lord in Hosea 6.6.⁴¹ He suggests that ἔλεος in Matthew 9.13 may refer to the ‘covenant faithfulness’ that sinners should have towards Jesus, just as ἔλεος in Hosea 6.6 denotes the ‘covenant faithfulness’ that the Israelites should have towards the Lord.⁴² Ribbens suggests, this understanding of Hosea 6.6 in Matthew 9.13 may indicate that ἔλεος in Matthew 12.7 means similarly the disciples’ ‘covenant faithfulness (ἔλεος) to Jesus’, and Hosea 6.6 explains why the disciples are innocent: because ‘they are faithfully committed to the one greater than the temple’.⁴³ Ribbens suggests that θυσία in both Matthew 9.13 and 12.7 may refer to ‘sacrifice and the sacrificial system’;⁴⁴ since forgiveness and restoration have been given to those who have ἔλεος towards Jesus,⁴⁵ the negation *καὶ οὐ θυσίαν* indicates that sacrifice is ‘surpassed by covenant faithfulness to the new mechanism of achieving forgiveness and purification’.⁴⁶

Viljoen explores the ways in which Hosea 6.6 relates to the identity formation of Matthew’s community. He suggests that the use of Hosea 6.6 might reflect the situation of Matthew’s community:⁴⁷ the citation is used as a response to the opposition they were facing

³⁹ Ribbens, ‘Whose “Mercy”’, pp. 388–89.

⁴⁰ Ribbens, ‘Whose “Mercy”’, pp. 387–88 note 24.

⁴¹ Ribbens, ‘Whose “Mercy”’, p. 393.

⁴² Ribbens, ‘Whose “Mercy”’, p. 393.

⁴³ Ribbens, ‘Whose “Mercy”’, pp. 401–2.

⁴⁴ Ribbens, ‘Whose “Mercy”’, p. 402; cf. pp. 394–95.

⁴⁵ Ribbens, ‘Whose “Mercy”’, pp. 394, 402.

⁴⁶ Ribbens, ‘Whose “Mercy”’, pp. 403–4.

⁴⁷ Viljoen, ‘Hosea 6:6’, pp. 215–16.

and is used for distinguishing them from their opponents.⁴⁸ Viljoen suggests that the citation in Matthew 9.13 legitimises the community's inclusion of Gentile Christians;⁴⁹ and the citation in Matthew 12.7 shows the ways in which the Sabbath observance of the community is characterised by practising mercy, which is God's intention for the Sabbath.⁵⁰

Maschmeier's study of ἔλεος in Matthew begins with the parable of the unmerciful slave (Matt 18.23–35).⁵¹ He understands רַחֲמִים in the Old Testament as denoting 'an act of affection that is not enforceable and at the same time aims at reciprocity',⁵² and suggests that the ἔλε- stem in the parable of the unmerciful slave reflects this 'original reciprocal character of רַחֲמִים'.⁵³ He defines ἔλεος, which is depicted in the parable, as 'mercy' (Barmherzigkeit) that 'goes beyond the law' (über das Recht hinausgehende) and 'aims at reciprocity' (auf Gegenseitigkeit zielt).⁵⁴ Maschmeier suggests that this reciprocal character of ἔλεος accords with Matthew's understanding of mercy as a non-cultic sacrifice.⁵⁵ He thinks that Matthew's use of Hosea 6.6 should be understood with reference to the 'double structure' (Doppelstruktur) of רַחֲמִים in Hosea 6.6, which indicates that 'devotion' (Hingabe) to God is shown both in cultic worship and in devotion to fellow humans,⁵⁶ and with reference to Johanan ben Zakkai's interpretation of Hosea 6.6, which regards רַחֲמִים as works of love that

⁴⁸ Viljoen, 'Hosea 6:6', pp. 232–33.

⁴⁹ Viljoen, 'Hosea 6:6', pp. 223–24.

⁵⁰ Viljoen, 'Hosea 6:6', pp. 230–31.

⁵¹ Maschmeier, *Reziproke Barmherzigkeit*, pp. 22–159.

⁵² 'Er bezeichnet einen Akt der Zuwendung, der nicht einklagbar ist, und gleichzeitig auf Gegenseitigkeit zielt'; Maschmeier, *Reziproke Barmherzigkeit*, pp. 109–10.

⁵³ 'der ursprüngliche Gegenseitigkeitscharakter von רַחֲמִים'; Maschmeier, *Reziproke Barmherzigkeit*, p. 97.

⁵⁴ Maschmeier, *Reziproke Barmherzigkeit*, p. 334.

⁵⁵ Maschmeier, *Reziproke Barmherzigkeit*, p. 217; cf. p. 262.

⁵⁶ Maschmeier, *Reziproke Barmherzigkeit*, p. 170.

are equivalent to sacrifices.⁵⁷ In light of these two references, Maschmeier suggests that, in Matthew 9.13, Hosea 6.6 is used to show that the Pharisees should learn to express their ‘devotion’ (Hingabe) to God in their ‘affection’ (Zuwendung) to sinners;⁵⁸ and in Matthew 12.7, the citation is used to show that, if the Pharisees do not condemn Jesus’s disciples, their mercy would then be a non-cultic sacrifice to God that shapes their relationship with God.⁵⁹

Ahn’s study focusses on the use of Hosea 6.6 in Matthew and expands the discussion to other citation(s) of and possible allusions to Hosea in Matthew.⁶⁰ He argues that the use of Hosea 6.6 goes back to Jesus himself,⁶¹ and that Jesus’s use of Hosea 6.6 is influential to Matthew’s use of Hosea in the rest of the Gospel.⁶² Ahn discusses the use of Hosea 6.6 in Matthew with reference to the concepts of typology and salvation history.⁶³ He thinks that ἔλεος in Matthew 9 and 12 carries the same meaning of רַחֵם as in Hosea 6, which refers to ‘a lasting love and loyalty to God’.⁶⁴ Ahn suggests that, in Matthew 9.13, Jesus uses Hosea 6.6 ‘typologically’ to indicate the sin with which Jesus comes to deal as ‘spiritual adultery’.⁶⁵ Concerning Matthew 12.7, Ahn regards the citation as a ‘salvation-historical use’, pointing to ‘God’s intention for his plan of salvation’:⁶⁶ the goal of salvation is רַחֵם, ‘a relationship of

⁵⁷ Maschmeier, *Reziproke Barmherzigkeit*, pp. 169–76.

⁵⁸ Maschmeier, *Reziproke Barmherzigkeit*, p. 184.

⁵⁹ Maschmeier, *Reziproke Barmherzigkeit*, p. 244.

⁶⁰ Ahn, ‘The Significance’, pp. 2–3.

⁶¹ Ahn, ‘The Significance’, pp. 22–29.

⁶² Ahn, ‘The Significance’, pp. 121–84.

⁶³ Ahn, ‘The Significance’, pp. 13–14.

⁶⁴ Ahn, ‘The Significance’, p. 189.

⁶⁵ Ahn, ‘The Significance’, pp. 71–72.

⁶⁶ Ahn, ‘The Significance’, pp. 119–20.

covenant love and faithfulness’, to which sacrifices point; ‘sacrifices were meant to be temporary and provisional’.⁶⁷

In his discussion of Matthew’s use of Hosea 6.6, Kubiś summarises four possible interpretations of ‘I delight in love, not in sacrifice’ in the context of Hosea.⁶⁸ He suggests that Hosea 6.6 neither rejects the cult nor prioritises ethics over the cult, but calls for a proper cult which is accompanied by moral conduct.⁶⁹ He suggests that Matthew’s use of Hosea 6.6 is better understood in light of this ‘symbiosis’ between love and sacrifice: the cult is neither rejected nor placed in a lower priority.⁷⁰

The above survey shows that Matthew’s use of Hosea 6.6 is still a matter of debate with fundamental disagreement concerning the meaning, purpose, and significance of the citation. The next section will point out the contributions and the limitations of these studies, followed by indicating how the present study might provide a better answer to the question.⁷¹

1.2.2 Critique

The meaning of ἔλεος and the meaning of the negation καὶ οὐ θυσίαν in Matthew are the crucial keys for identifying the significance of the double citation of Hosea 6.6 in Matthew. However, despite the efforts of the above-mentioned studies, there is still work necessary for

⁶⁷ Ahn, ‘The Significance’, p. 111.

⁶⁸ Kubiś, ‘I Delight in Love’, pp. 296–306.

⁶⁹ Kubiś, ‘I Delight in Love’, p. 306.

⁷⁰ Kubiś, ‘I Delight in Love’, pp. 311, 314.

⁷¹ This survey cannot be complete without including the findings from John’s recent doctoral dissertation (mentioned above, note 8). However, John’s dissertation has yet to be published and is unavailable from electronic theses databases. I was not able to borrow a copy through inter-library loan. I also attempted to get in touch with the author by contacting Pontifical Gregorian University and by other means but was not successful. Their library was kind enough to provide me with some scanned pages of the thesis, but a summary or critique based on merely some pages of the thesis is inappropriate. Therefore, I regret that I am unable to include John’s findings in this survey.

finding these ‘keys’ so that a better understanding of Matthew’s emphasis on ἔλεος and its relation to Law observance can be obtained.

First, concerning the meaning ἔλεος in Matthew and its relationship to the meaning of ἄσπ/ἔλεος in Hosea, the debate has been ongoing. Still, some of the discussions are not entirely helpful for achieving a better reading. Glynn’s doctoral dissertation examines the meaning ἄσπ/ἔλεος in Hosea in detail and suggests its sense as ‘covenant loyalty’ and regards this as the sense of ἔλεος in Matthew.⁷² Consequently, he suggests that the meaning of ἔλεος in Matthew is ‘far richer’ than ‘acts of mercy’.⁷³ However, as shown in his work, this suggestion hinders him from providing a translation for ἐλεέω. Although he acknowledges that, in Matthew, ἐλεέω is used in the descriptions of forgiveness and healing, he merely states that these are ‘acts manifesting the ἔλεος that is willed by God’,⁷⁴ but does not spell out the meaning of ἐλεέω.⁷⁵ This shows that the understanding of ἔλεος as ‘covenant loyalty’ might create difficulties in explaining Matthew’s use of ἐλεέω and its relation to ἔλεος.

Among the subsequent studies which also suggest reading ἔλεος as ‘covenant loyalty’ (e.g., Hill, Ribbens, Ahn), Hill articulates ἔλεος as ‘loyal love to God which manifests itself in acts of mercy and loving-kindness’.⁷⁶ This understanding retains the close relationship between the cognates ἐλεέω and ἔλεος. Four decades later, Ribbens points in the opposite direction, suggesting that Matthew uses ἐλεέω and ἔλεος for different meanings. Ribbens

⁷² Mentioned above, §1.2.1.

⁷³ Glynn, ‘The Use and Meaning’, p. 66 note 1.

⁷⁴ Glynn, ‘The Use and Meaning’, p. 140.

⁷⁵ In discussing the meaning of ἔλεος in Matt 23.23, Glynn points out that the frequent use of the verb ἐλεέω is a characteristic of Matthew. In that section, Glynn cites the texts in Greek without translating them into English; the cited texts are Matt 5.7; 9.27; 15.22; 17.15; 18.33; 20.30–31. Glynn, ‘The Use and Meaning’, pp. 137–40.

⁷⁶ Hill, ‘On the Use and Meaning’, p. 110.

argues that, in Matthew 9.13 and 12.7, ἔλεος refers to the ‘covenant faithfulness’ which sinners and the disciples should have towards Jesus.⁷⁷ This creates difficulties again: how might Matthew and the first-century Greek readers understand the cognates ἐλεέω and ἔλεος as conveying different meanings in the same context (Matt 9.13, 27; cf. Isa 54.8 LXX; Rom 11.31; Philo, *Spec.* 4.72, 76)? Further explanation for this is needed. It is fundamental to the present study that the citations from Hosea 6.6 should not be taken in isolation but should be studied in relation to the nexus of texts in which Matthew uses the cognate verb ἐλεέω. Perhaps it is better to approach the matter the other way round: explore the ways in which Matthew uses ἐλεέω and ἔλεος first, and then see what meaning of ἔλεος (as a translation of ἔλεος from Hosea) would best fit in the context of Matthew.⁷⁸

Second, regarding the meaning of the negation καὶ οὐ θυσίαν, the above studies show that this issue cannot be decided by taking Matthew’s citations of Hosea 6.6 in isolation: we must relate these citations both to Matthew’s notion of ἔλεος as a ‘weightier matter of the Law’ (Matt 23.23) and to his narration of the double love commandments (Matt 22.36–40). This is an area where the present study can make a distinct and significant contribution. Keith, Ribbens, and Ahn understand the citation of Hosea 6.6 as showing that ἔλεος has replaced sacrifices,⁷⁹ but they offer this reading without exploring the possible implications of Matthew’s notion of ἔλεος as a ‘weightier matter of the Law’,⁸⁰ despite the fact that ‘the Law’

⁷⁷ Mentioned above, §1.2.1.

⁷⁸ Ahn’s view can be mentioned here as a note. He recognises mercy/compassion (ἐλεέω/ἐλεήμων/σπλαγγνίζομαι) as an important theme in Matthew but does not see this theme as relevant to Matthew’s citation of Hos 6.6. He particularly refuses to read Matt 12.1–8 as a story concerning compassion. Ahn, ‘The Significance’, pp. 79–85.

⁷⁹ Mentioned above, §1.2.1.

⁸⁰ Keith merely mentions Matt 23.23 as alluding to Mic 6.8 and as a denunciation of sacrifice, which he understands as no longer necessary for dealing with the problem of sin. Ribbens mentions that ‘there is a debate regarding the meaning of ἔλεος in Matt 23.23’ without spelling out what he would regard as the meaning of ἔλεος

(νόμος) appears in the context where Hosea 6.6 is cited (Matt 12.5, 7). On the other hand, Hill and Seeanner, recognising the relevance of the notion of ἔλεος as a ‘weightier matter of the Law’, draw in the double love commandments and regard the citation of Hosea 6.6 (by relating it to Matt 22.40 and 23.23) as indicating that ἔλεος is given priority over Sabbath observance or ritual practice.⁸¹ This reading recognises that Matthew 22.36–40 is relevant and can be crucial for understanding the meaning of Hosea 6.6 in Matthew, but further research is needed at this point to explore exactly how Matthew understands the relation between the ‘weightier’ matters of the Law and all the other commandments contained in the Law.

Regarding the above, one fundamental issue should be addressed but has yet to be discussed: how does Matthew understand the relationship between Hosea 6.6 and the double love commandments in light of the possibility that Matthew omits an allusion to Hosea 6.6 which he might have recognised in Mark’s account of the double love commandments (Mark 12.33)? Glynn has mentioned this omission. He claims that ‘the point made in Mark 12.32–33 is of course the very point affirmed by the Hosean quotation in Matthew 9.13 and 12.7’ but does not provide justification for his claim.⁸² None of the subsequent studies (§1.2.1) mentioned Mark 12.33 or discussed Matthew’s narration of the double love commandments, except Maschmeier’s monograph.⁸³ Maschmeier thinks that Matthew might have recognised Hosea 6.6 in Mark 12.33;⁸⁴ but he does not explore further Matthew’s possible omission of Mark’s allusion to Hosea 6.6. Maschmeier’s focus is on the ways in which Hosea 6.6

in Matt 23.23. Ahn merely mentions Matt 23.23 as Jesus’s condemnation against the Pharisees. Keith, ‘Les citations’, pp. 63 note 8, 73 note 24; Ribbens, ‘Whose “Mercy”’, p. 389; Ahn, ‘The Significance’, p. 87.

⁸¹ Hill, ‘On the Use and Meaning’, pp. 115–17; Seeanner, *Die Barmherzigkeit*, p. 84.

⁸² Glynn, ‘The Use and Meaning’, p. 179 note 1.

⁸³ Maschmeier, *Reziproke Barmherzigkeit*, pp. 250–58.

⁸⁴ Maschmeier, *Reziproke Barmherzigkeit*, p. 250; where Maschmeier describes Matthew as having ‘his Markan original’ (seiner Markusvorlage).

becomes the ‘hermeneutical key’ (hermeneutischer Schlüssel) for understanding Matthew 22.34–40: the citation of Hosea 6.6 explains how Matthew equates the commandment of love for one’s neighbour to the commandment of love for God but the latter retains its rank as ‘the highest commandment’ (das höchste Gebot),⁸⁵ because Hosea 6.6 denotes both devotion to God and to fellow humans.⁸⁶

Therefore, the exploration of the implications of Matthew’s omission of the allusion to Hosea 6.6 in his narration of the double love commandments becomes necessary to fill the gap in the research regarding the significance of the double citation of Hosea 6.6 in Matthew. It is crucial because this ‘omission’ might indicate what Matthew might have (or have not) meant in his use of Hosea 6.6. With regard to this, in addition to examining the passages where ἔλεος appears in Matthew, the present study will contribute by examining Matthew’s narration of the double love commandments, focussing on the ways in which Matthew modifies Mark’s account, in order to find out the implications of his modifications. Moreover, since the subject matter relates to the understanding of the double love commandments as the ‘greatest’ (Matt 22.34–40) and the designation of ἔλεος as among the ‘weightier matters of the Law’ (Matt 23.23), it is crucial to examine how Matthew might understand these concepts by considering similar concepts circulating among the Jewish people at the turn of the first century. Can we shed light on Matthew’s nuanced understanding of the Law by placing his comments on this matter into comparison with Jews of (roughly) his own day who also reflected on this matter? Regarding this, the present study will contribute by demonstrating a rather undeveloped way to study Matthew’s understanding of ἔλεος and the Law: to put Matthew and Philo of Alexandria into comparison with one another, a task much overlooked

⁸⁵ Maschmeier, *Reziproke Barmherzigkeit*, p. 257.

⁸⁶ Mentioned above, §1.2.1.

in studies of Matthew.⁸⁷ In this way, the findings of the present study might also be used to reflect on a larger debate, namely, Matthew and Judaism. In the following section, the methods and the reasons for comparing Matthew with Mark and comparing Matthew with Philo will be explained.

1.3 Methodology: comparison

Reading texts in comparison presupposes that the texts involved are similar enough to be compared, and at the same time, there is difference to be discussed. The similarity might shed light on the understanding of a similar concept shared by both texts, and the difference might indicate points of emphasis. The exploration of Matthew's use of Hosea 6.6 can be benefited from comparing Matthew with Mark, and with Philo of Alexandria, respectively.

1.3.1 In comparison with Mark

Reading Matthew alongside Mark is one of the oldest practices because both of them are included in the canon. The existence of the fourfold canonical gospel suggests that Matthew, Mark, Luke and John are similar in their telling of Jesus's story, and at the same time there is difference between them; both their similarity and difference are essential and integral in their canonical form.⁸⁸ This canonical form thus indicates that one indispensable way to read Matthew is to observe the ways in which Matthew is similar to or different from the other three canonical gospels.

⁸⁷ Despite its potential contribution to research in Matthew, comparing Matthew with Philo has rarely been performed (about once a decade). The rare examples appeared over the recent decades include Philip L. Shuler, 'Philo's Moses and Matthew's Jesus: A Comparative Study in Ancient Literature', *The Studia Philonica Annual*, 2 (1990), 86–103; Rudolf Hoppe, 'Gerechtigkeit bei Matthäus und Philo', in *'Dies ist das Buch ...': das Matthäusevangelium; Interpretation - Rezeption - Rezeptionsgeschichte; für Hubert Frankemölle*, ed. by Rainer Kampling (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004), pp. 141–55; Walter T. Wilson, 'Matthew, Philo, and Mercy for Animals (Matt 12,9–14)', *Biblica*, 96.2 (2015), 201–21.

⁸⁸ Francis Watson, *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), p. 13.

Concerning the use of Hosea 6.6, the best counterpart of comparison for Matthew is Mark. On the one hand, Mark is more similar to Matthew than the other two canonical gospels because only Matthew and Mark have either cited or alluded to Hosea 6.6. On the other hand, Matthew and Mark are different because Mark's allusion to Hosea 6.6 does not appear in Matthew's parallel account of the same story (Mark 12.28–34 // Matt 22.34–40),⁸⁹ and Matthew's citation from Hosea 6.6 does not appear in Mark's parallel accounts of the same stories (Matt 9.9–13 // Mark 2.13–17; Matt 12.1–8 // Mark 2.23–28). In the previous studies of Matthew's use of Hosea 6.6, however, Mark's allusion to Hosea 6.6 is not much discussed.⁹⁰ The task of comparison is then important: it discusses not only the pericopae where Matthew has cited Hosea 6.6 but Mark did not, but also the pericopae where Mark has alluded to Hosea 6.6 but Matthew did not. By doing a comparison in this way, the possible implications of an inclusion or an omission might further be discerned.

For a comparison of Matthew and Mark, it is important to understand the relationship between the two. The fact that Matthew, Mark and Luke (the synoptic gospels) share a similar narrative framework, a similar arrangement of pericopae and a vast amount of verbal agreements in the shared pericopae indicate a literary relationship between them.⁹¹ In the current state of research, Markan priority is mostly accepted: scholars mostly accept the hypothesis which suggests that, among the synoptic gospels, Mark is the earliest written and is used by both Matthew and Luke.⁹² The present study also assumes Markan priority. Since

⁸⁹ The allusion to Hosea 6.6 in Mark 12.33 is recognised; see, for example, the list of citations or allusions (Loci citati vel allegati) printed as an appendix in NA²⁶ (so also NA²⁷ and NA²⁸).

⁹⁰ For example, the studies mentioned in the above survey.

⁹¹ Michael F. Bird, *The Gospel of the Lord: How the Early Church Wrote the Story of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), pp. 125–38.

⁹² For example, Foster describes this acceptance as 'widespread (although not quite universal)', and Bird states 'Markan priority seems to be the one nearly indubitable premise we can build on'. Paul Foster, 'The Rise of the Markan Priority Hypothesis and Early Responses and Challenges to It', in *Theological and Theoretical*

Matthew has adopted Mark's narrative framework and absorbed 85% (roughly) of Mark's content, which accounts for 47% (roughly) of Matthew's entire content,⁹³ it is reasonable to assume that Mark is a major written source for Matthew, and Matthew is dependent on Mark.

The assumption of Matthew's dependence on Mark is decisive in the explanation of the difference between Matthew and Mark: Matthew has used Mark, and not vice versa. The difference can then be described as Matthew's modification, which, as Watson suggests, can be regarded as 'an intentional act with potential significance for interpretation'.⁹⁴ Matthew does not merely copy or borrow from Mark, but also modifies whenever he regards a modification as necessary and appropriate, to compile an account that is fitting for conveying his message.⁹⁵ Therefore, for example, the citation Hosea 6.6 in Matthew 9 and 12 can be described as Matthew's addition. Similarly, the allusion to Hosea 6.6, which appears in Mark 12 but not in Matthew's parallel account, can be described as omitted by Matthew. In the discussion of the relevant pericopae in the present study, the places where Matthew differs from Mark are highlighted when they are deemed important to the understanding of Matthew's use of Hosea 6.6.

1.3.2 In comparison with Philo of Alexandria

In contrast to Matthew's close affinity to Mark that shows Matthew's direct literary dependence on Mark, the 'relationship' between Matthew and Philo is of another kind. Philo

Issues in the Synoptic Problem, ed. by John S. Kloppenborg and Joseph Verheyden, LNTS, 618 (London: T&T Clark, 2020), p. 89; Bird, *The Gospel*, p. 160.

⁹³ The figure 85% is stated by Bird; the figure 47% is calculated from the information given by Bird: around 500 verses of Mark recur in Matthew, and Matthew has 1,068 verses in total. Bird, *The Gospel*, pp. 127–28.

⁹⁴ Watson, *Gospel Writing*, p. 156.

⁹⁵ Cf. Luke's notion of the ways in which he writes his gospel (Luke 1.1–4).

is a Jew who lived in Alexandria at the turn of the Common Era (c. 20 BCE–c. 50 CE).⁹⁶ Although he is contemporary to Jesus and had travelled to Jerusalem (*Prov.* 2.64), he did not mention Jesus or any Christian community in his treatises.⁹⁷ He is not a Christian but ‘a Jewish author writing in Greek’.⁹⁸ However, both Philo and Matthew understand the Jewish Law against the backdrop of the first-century Graeco-Roman world. Their works reflect their contemporary exegetical traditions, among which there are both similarity and difference for performing a fruitful comparison. Philo is a suitable comparison counterpart for Matthew because they share similar concepts of the Law, a comparison of which can be helpful for the purpose of understanding the citation of Hosea 6.6, the narration of the double love commandments, and the notion of ‘the weightier matters of the Law’ in Matthew.⁹⁹

Similar to Matthew’s understanding of the whole Law as hanging on the double love commandments (Matt 22.40), Philo summarises all the laws under the headings of the Decalogue commandments, which he further summarises as two groups in accordance with the two Decalogue tablets, and describes the two in terms of φιλόθεος (‘having love for God’) and φιλόανθρωπος (‘having love for humankind’, *Decal.* 110) respectively. Moreover, Philo

⁹⁶ Philo was a grey-haired ‘old man’ (γέρων) when he visited Rome during 38–41 CE (*Legat.* 1; cf. *Opif.* 105); according to this information, his birth year can be deduced as around 20 CE. His death year is more difficult to date; Niehoff deduces it as around 49 CE. John M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), pp. 159, 450; Maren R. Niehoff, *Philo of Alexandria: An Intellectual Biography* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018), pp. 3, 47, 245–46.

Unless otherwise indicated, all the Greek texts of Philo are taken from *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, ed. by Leopold Cohn and Paul Wendland, 7 vols (Berlin: Reimer, 1896–1906 [vol. 1–6]; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1928–1930 [vol. 7]; repr. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1962–1963), and the English translations are my own.

⁹⁷ David T. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey*, CRINT, III/3 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1993), p. 3.

⁹⁸ Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, p. 31.

⁹⁹ The major challenges to those who perform a comparison include choosing the right phenomena and setting the purpose of comparison. John M. G. Barclay and B. G. White, ‘Introduction: Posing the Questions’, in *New Testament in Comparison: Validity, Method, and Purpose in Comparing Traditions*, ed. by John M. G. Barclay and B. G. White, LNTS, 600 (London: T&T Clark, 2020), pp. 1–7 (pp. 3–4).

highlights the virtue *φιλανθρωπία* ('love for humans') in his discussion of the Law and relates the practice of this virtue to the imitation of God. This is comparable to the ways in which Matthew designates *ἔλεος* as among 'the weightier matters of the Law' (Matt 23.23) and describes the imitation of God in terms of love and mercy (Matt 5.44–48; 18.33). A discussion of the ways in which Philo expresses these concepts in his own right, followed by a comparison with Matthew, can be helpful for understanding what a summary of the Law in terms of the double love commandment would entail and what an emphasis on *ἔλεος* or *φιλανθρωπία* with regard to law observance would imply.

1.3.3 Limitations

For the purpose of exploring the significance of Hosea 6.6 in Matthew, the comparison conducted in the present study might inevitably seem one-sided and unbalanced. First, regarding Matthew and Mark, the pericope where Mark alludes to Hosea 6.6 is discussed in its own right and is compared with Matthew's account of the same story, which is also discussed in its own right. Since the purpose is to explore the ways in which Matthew might understand the allusion to Hosea 6.6 in Mark's account, the comparison inevitably turns out to be an understanding of Matthew through Mark (one-sided). On the other hand, in the discussions of the pericopae where Matthew has cited Hosea 6.6, Mark's parallel accounts are not discussed separately. The comparison involved serves mainly to highlight places of difference which are important for explaining Matthew's use of Hosea 6.6. Therefore, it is inevitable that the discussion of these pericopae includes an exegesis only on Matthew's account (unbalanced).

Second, regarding Matthew and Philo, although Philo is discussed in his own right, and the length of the discussion of his concepts accounts for almost two entire chapters of the present study, these two chapters are not placed together as a self-contained part. Each of the

chapters for Philo is placed immediately after the chapter where a relevant concept of Matthew is discussed, respectively (see further in §1.4). Since the present study is primarily an exploration of Matthew's use of Hosea 6.6, it is inevitable that the comparison of the similarity between Matthew and Philo should be one-sided for shedding light on the understanding of Matthew.

1.3.4 Brief remarks on the form of the Old Testament known to Matthew

It is recognised that the scriptures existed in more than one text form in the first century.¹⁰⁰ It is also well known that the quotations of the Old Testament in Matthew appear not only in the form which agrees with the Septuagint.¹⁰¹ Some quotations agree with the Septuagint;¹⁰² there are readings against the Septuagint and closer to the Hebrew texts;¹⁰³ there are also readings that differ from both the Septuagint and the Masoretic Tradition.¹⁰⁴ The issue concerning the form of the scriptures known to Matthew has been much debated,¹⁰⁵ as well as the question of

¹⁰⁰ Susan E. Docherty, 'New Testament Scriptural Interpretation in Its Early Jewish Context', *Novum Testamentum*, 57.1 (2015), 1–19 (pp. 3–4); Steve Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction*, 2nd edn (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), pp. 22–24.

¹⁰¹ In the present study, the label 'Septuagint' ('LXX') refers to those Greek texts gathered and edited in *Septuaginta: id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, ed. by Alfred Rahlfs, 2 vols (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935).

¹⁰² Gundry identifies twenty quotations peculiar to Matthew and regards seven of them as 'Septuagintal' (Matt 1.23; 5.21, 27, 38, 43; 13.14–15; 21.16); 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), p. 149. Davies and Allison suggest that there are twenty-one quotations peculiar to Matthew, among which the 'non-formular quotations are generally LXX in form'; W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, ICC, 3 vols (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–1997), I, p. 52.

¹⁰³ One of the examples is the citation of Isa 53.4 in Matt 8.17. Matthew's citation differs from the LXX but is closer to the Hebrew texts preserved in 1QIsa^a, 1QIsa^b, and the MT. See further below, §4.1.1.

¹⁰⁴ E.g., regarding the quotation of Isa 42.1–4 in Matt 12.18–21, the readings in Matt 12.18b–20 are distinct from both the LXX and the MT. Richard Beaton, *Isaiah's Christ in Matthew's Gospel*, SNTSMS, 123 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 133–35.

¹⁰⁵ See, for example, Gundry's summary of the many explanations offered by various scholars; Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament*, pp. 151–71. Beaton outlines the history of research regarding the text form of Matthew's quotations and describes it as a 'well-worn issue'; Beaton, *Isaiah's Christ*, pp. 24–30.

Matthew's knowledge of Hebrew. For example, regarding the readings which are closer to the Hebrew texts, Menken argues that Matthew cited from 'a revised LXX',¹⁰⁶ in which there was 'adaptation of the Greek translation to the current Hebrew text'.¹⁰⁷ He thinks that it was not Matthew who translated the Hebrew.¹⁰⁸ By contrast, more scholars think that Matthew knew the Old Testament both in Greek and in Hebrew.¹⁰⁹ It seems more likely that Matthew sometimes offered his own translation when citing the scriptures.¹¹⁰ In light of the fluidity of the text form of the scriptures in the first century and the possibility that Matthew might have known the scriptures both in Greek and in Hebrew, in the present study, where the texts of the Old Testament are discussed, both the Hebrew texts (e.g., the MT) and the Greek translations (e.g., the LXX) are employed to explore how Matthew might have understood specific terms and concepts from the scriptures.

1.4 Structure and arrangement

The present study is arranged according to the order of the appearance of Hosea 6.6 (citations and allusions) in Matthew and Mark. Based on the hypothesis that Mark was written earlier than Matthew, the present study begins with the passage where Mark has alluded to Hosea 6.6 (Mark 12.28–34), followed by the passages where Matthew has cited or alluded to Hosea 6.6, according to the sequence of their appearance: Matthew 9.1–13 is discussed first, then 12.1–

¹⁰⁶ Maarten J. J. Menken, *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist*, BETL, 173 (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), pp. 48, 280.

¹⁰⁷ Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, p. 8.

¹⁰⁸ Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, pp. 47, 280.

¹⁰⁹ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, I, p. 33; John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), p. 33; Matthias Konradt, 'Israel's Scriptures in Matthew', in *Israel's Scriptures in Early Christian Writings: The Use of the Old Testament in the New*, ed. by Matthias Henze and David Lincicum (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2023), pp. 209–35 (pp. 230–32).

¹¹⁰ See, for example, Beaton's arguments for a higher possibility that Matthew translated Isa 53.4 from the Hebrew; Beaton, *Isaiah's Christ*, p. 114. However, he does not exclude the possibility that a revised Greek translation might have been known to Matthew; Beaton, *Isaiah's Christ*, pp. 120, 139.

14, and subsequently 23.23. As mentioned above, Philo is discussed in his own right, but primarily for the purpose of comparison of similar concepts with Matthew. Therefore, each of the two chapters on Philo is placed next to the relevant Chapter on Matthew.

The first of the main chapters, Chapter 2, compares Mark's narration of Jesus's answer concerning the most important commandments (12.28–34) with Matthew's parallel account (22.34–40). In Mark's narration, Jesus recognises the scribe's statement which regards the love commandments as better than all sacrifices. This comparison between the love commandments and sacrifices, which is likely an allusion to Hosea 6.6, does not appear in Matthew's narration of the same. By comparing Mark and Matthew, the discussion shows that Mark's allusion to Hosea 6.6 might imply a priority of the love commandments over the cultic commandments, and Matthew's modification might reflect that he is concerned about this priority and the possible implications. The discussion of Matthew's modification then shows the ways in which Matthew understands the importance of the love commandments: they are important because they summarise the Law. Chapter 2 concludes by suggesting that an exploration of Philo's summary of the Law might shed further light on Matthew's concept of the most important commandments as the summary of the Law.

Chapter 3 explores the ways in which Philo summarises the Law. This Chapter begins with discussing Philo's concepts of the 'unwritten laws' and the 'written laws', showing how Philo carefully explains the written legislation as not inferior to the often prioritised 'unwritten law'. Subsequently, Philo's exposition of the written laws is discussed to explore how Philo uses the Decalogue commandments as headings, discusses all the particular laws under these headings, and ultimately summarises all the laws as the duty to God and the duty to humans. This Chapter concludes by stating that Philo's connection of all the laws to the 'highest heads' can shed light on the ways in which Matthew understands the double love commandments as the most important commandments. This discussion establishes an

understanding of all the commandments as pointing towards love for God and love for humans. With this understanding, the discussion turns to the next Chapter, the pericope in which Matthew first cites ‘I desire mercy but not sacrifice’.

Chapter 4 discusses Matthew’s first citation of Hosea 6.6 at 9.13 in his account of Jesus’s table fellowship with sinners (9.9–13). It is discussed in light of its larger context, Matthew 8–9, which Matthew arranges as a block of narrative that describes the healing ministry of Jesus. The discussion shows the ways in which Matthew picks up Mark’s description of Jesus as the Son of David who ‘shows mercy’ (ἐλεέω) on the sick, and then relates this to Jesus’s identity as the Davidic shepherd promised in Ezekiel 34, who brings healing and forgiveness of sins. The reason why Matthew cites Hosea 6.6 in the story about Jesus’s healing of sinners, the meaning of ἔλεος in 9.13, and the possible meaning of the negation ‘but not sacrifice’ are then discussed.

Chapter 5 discusses Matthew’s second citation of Hosea 6.6 at 12.7 in his account of the Sabbath stories (12.1–14). Firstly, Jesus’s promise of rest (11.28–30), which is placed just before the Sabbath stories, is discussed. This shows how Matthew connects this promise to Jesus’s identity as the Davidic shepherd and how this promise of rest provides a clue for understanding the following Sabbath stories. The discussion of the Sabbath stories is then arranged in three parts: each part is based on Matthew’s difference from Mark. First, it is argued that Matthew frames the stories as a debate upon which deeds are lawful on the Sabbath. Second, Matthew’s emphasis on the disciples’ hunger is discussed, to show the ways in which the Sabbath stories link to the deeds of kindness mentioned in the Son of Man’s judgement (25.31–46). Third, Matthew’s citation of Hosea 6.6 at 12.7 is discussed to explore the meaning of the citation and how it relates to the Law and sacrifice mentioned in the Sabbath stories (12.5–7).

Chapter 6 discusses Matthew 23.23, which mentions both ἔλεος and the tithes (sacrifice), a possible allusion to Hosea 6.6. After exploring what the designation of ἔλεος as among ‘the weightier matters of the Law’ would entail, the discussion turns to explore how ἔλεος relates to the righteousness which exceeds that of the Pharisees (Matt 5.17–48). The relation between Law observance and deeds of kindness, and their relation to imitating God and following Jesus (Matt 5.48; 19.16–22) are then discussed. Chapter 6 concludes by stating that Matthew’s concept of ἔλεος can be further discerned by a comparison with Philo’s concepts, who, in his exegesis of the Law, emphasises φιλανθρωπία (‘love for humans’) and its relation to the imitation of God.

Chapter 7 begins with a discussion of Philo’s emphasis on φιλανθρωπία, showing how Philo understands φιλανθρωπία as closely related to both piety and justice, which are the terms of Philo’s summary of the Law: duties towards God and duties towards humans. Subsequently, the discussion explores how Philo understands φιλανθρωπία in terms of ἔλεος and describes φιλανθρωπία and ἔλεος as God’s virtues that humans should practise to imitate God and be pleasing to God. A comparison of the points of similarity between Matthew and Philo with regard to their concepts of imitating God and observing the Law is then conducted. The outcomes of this comparison show that it is possible to rephrase Matthew’s use of Hosea 6.6 by using Philo’s terms.

Lastly, in the Conclusions, the summary of the findings of the present study will be followed by reflections on Matthew and Judaism. This is because these findings are clearly relevant to the larger discussion concerning Matthew’s relationship to the Law of Moses and to the Jewish tradition. Although the focus of the present study remains on only one part of that larger debate, the Conclusions will indicate in outline where the findings might contribute to scholarship on such questions.

Chapter 2

The double love commandments in Matthew and Mark: priority or summary?

Mark 12.28–34 narrates an unusually friendly moment between Jesus and a scribe.¹ The scribe asks Jesus which commandment is the first of all; Jesus replies that no other commandment is more important than love for God and love for one's neighbour. The scribe agrees and praises Jesus, adding that love for God and love for one's neighbour is more than all sacrifices; Jesus, in turn, recognises the scribe's response. This exceptional agreement between Jesus and a scribe reflects a recognised practice during the first-century: concerning the observance of the Law, the relative importance between certain commandments is sometimes discussed.

The emphasis on the importance of the double love commandments does not necessarily mean that they are prioritised over all other commandments. The parallel account of Mark 12.28–34 in Matthew 22.36–40 differs at significant places. The points of difference show that Matthew is concerned about the potential implications of prioritising the love commandments over sacrifices at Mark 12.33, which contains an allusion to Hosea 6.6. The present chapter will investigate Mark 12.28–34 and Matthew 22.36–40 in order to explore the significance of Matthew's modifications of Mark's account of the discussion concerning the double love commandments. Firstly, the ways in which Mark's account reflects a priority of

¹ Scribes, along with other interpreters of the Law (the Pharisees, the Sadducees and the lawyers), are usually narrated as in dispute with Jesus, described in many passages: 21 in Matthew, 21 in Mark, 20 in Luke and 7 in John. Matt 9.1–8, 9–13, .32–34; 12.1–8, 9–14, 22–37, 38–45; 15.1–20; 16.1–12, 21; 19.3–12; 20.18–19; 21.15–46; 22.15–22, 23–33, 34–40; 41–46; 23.1–39; 26.57–66; 27.41–43, 62–66; Mark 2.1–12, 13–17, 23–28; 3.1–6, 22–30; 7.1–15; 8.11–21, 31; 10.2–9, 33–34, 35–40; 11.15–18, 27–33; 12.1–12, 13–17, 18–27; 14.1, 43, 53–65; 15.1, 31–32; Luke 5.17–26; 27–39; 6.1–11; 7.36–50; 9.21–22; 11.37–54; 12.1–2; 13.31–35; 14.1–6; 15.1–32; 16.13–15; 18.10–14; 19.37–40; 41–48; 20.1–8; 19–26; 20.42–47; 22.2, 66–71; 23.10; John 7.32–53; 8.2–11, 12–59; 9.13–41; 11.46–57; 12.42; 18.3.

the love commandments over other commandments will be discussed. Secondly, the ways in which Matthew's account differs from Mark's will be examined to show that Matthew understands the same discussion as summarising the whole Law as love for God and love for one's neighbour. This investigation will then provide basic ideas concerning Matthew's use of Hosea 6.6 and his understanding of the Law.

2.1 The love commandments as a priority (Mark 12.28–34)

Mark 12.28–34 follows the dispute stories between Jesus and different groups (the Pharisees, the Sadducees, scribes, chief priests and elders) in the temple. 'One of the scribes' (εἷς τῶν γραμματέων), recognising that Jesus answered well in these disputes, asked Jesus: ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη πάντων (Mark 12.28). Regarding this question, various translations are possible, and it is necessary to discuss this first.

In the scribe's question, ποῖος can refer to 'of what kind';² it can also function as τίς ('which').³ Some commentators suggest reading ποῖος as 'of what kind', that is, the scribe's question is about a certain kind of commandments, or commandments of a certain nature.⁴ Reading ποῖος in this way, the question can be understood as: 'What kind of commandment is the first of all other kinds?'

However, since Jesus's answer to the scribe's question designates a specific commandment as 'the first' (πρώτη, 12.29), ποία ἐντολή in the question should be understood

² This usage is usual in ancient Greek literature like Homer. LSJ, s.v. 'ποῖος'.

³ BDAG, s.v. 'ποῖος'; BDF §298.

⁴ For example, Ezra P. Gould, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1896), p. 231; Klaus Berger, *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu: ihr historischer Hintergrund im Judentum und im Alten Testament, Teil I: Markus und Parallelen*, WMANT, 40 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1972), p. 188.

as ‘which commandment’ but not ‘what kind of commandment’.⁵ Therefore, the scribe’s question is about a certain commandment: ‘Which commandment is the first of all?’

The sense of the ‘first’ (πρῶτος) commandment of all then needs clarification. Πρῶτος can refer to the sequence in a list; for example, Josephus uses ὁ πρῶτος λόγος to refer to the first commandment of the Decalogue (*Ant.* 3.91).⁶ Alternatively, πρῶτος can refer to the highest prominence, ‘the most important’;⁷ for example, πρῶτος can be used to describe a person of the highest rank, which is in contrast to ‘the last’ (Mark 9.35) or to a ‘slave’ (Mark 10.44).⁸ In Mark 12.29–31, Jesus’s reply shows that the discussion of πρώτη ἐντολή refers to the importance of the commandments because μείζων (the comparative form of μέγας) is used to compare the commandments (12.31). Μέγας can mean ‘big’, ‘high’, ‘many’ or ‘strong’ with reference to measurement, quantity or intensity; it is also used with reference to the prominence of a person (e.g., Sir 10.24) or a thing (e.g., 1 Cor 12.31; 13.13).⁹ When referring to a commandment, μέγας pertains to prominence (cf. *Let. Aris.* 228).¹⁰ Therefore, Jesus’s answer is: no other commandment is more important than loving God and loving one’s

⁵ Robert H. Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), p. 714. Mann, France and Meier also point out that ποία ἐντολή is not likely to mean ‘what kind of commandment’. C. S. Mann, *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB, 27 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1986), p. 478; R. T. France, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), p. 479; John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus Volume 4: Law and Love*, ABRL (New York: Doubleday, 2009), p. 585 note 27.

⁶ Unless otherwise indicated, the Greek texts of Josephus’s *Jewish Antiquities* are taken from *Jewish Antiquities*, trans. by H. St. J. Thackeray, The Loeb Classical Library, 9 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965); the English translations are my own.

⁷ Wilhelm Michaelis, ‘πρῶτος’, *TDNT*, VI, pp. 865–68; BDAG, s.v. ‘πρῶτος’.

⁸ Gundry, *Mark*, p. 715.

⁹ BDAG, s.v. ‘μέγας’.

¹⁰ *Let. Aris.* 228: ὁ θεὸς πεποιήται ἐντολὴν μεγίστην περὶ τῆς τῶν γονέων τιμῆς. ‘God has given the greatest commandment concerning honor of one’s parents’. Wright’s translation; taken from Benjamin G. Wright III, *The Letter of Aristeas: ‘Aristeas to Philocrates’ or ‘On the Translation of the Law of the Jews’*, CEJL (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015), p. 367. The Greek text is taken from *Aristeas to Philocrates*, ed. & trans. by Moses Hadas (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1951), p. 188.

neighbour (12.29–31). The discussion of the ‘first’ (πρῶτος) commandment thus pertains to an evaluation of the commandments according to their importance.

2.1.1 Prioritising the commandments

Several features suggest that Mark’s narration of the discussion shows a priority of the double love commandments.¹¹ These features include the ways in which the ordinal adjectives and the comparative adjectives are used in the narration. Moreover, the contrast between the love commandments and sacrifices suggests that an allusion to Hosea 6.6 is involved in prioritising love for God and love for one’s neighbour over all sacrifices.

2.1.1.1 The use of the ordinal adjectives and the comparatives

Jesus replies to the scribe by stating two quotations from the Law using the ordinal adjectives, πρώτη ἐστίν ... δευτέρα αὕτη (‘the first is ... the second [is] this’):

ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι πρώτη ἐστίν· ἄκουε, Ἰσραήλ, κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἷς ἐστίν, καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου. δευτέρα αὕτη· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. μείζων τούτων ἄλλη ἐντολὴ οὐκ ἔστιν. (Mark 12.29–31)¹²

Jesus answered, ‘The first is: “Hear, Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one; you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind, and with all your strength.” The second [is] this: “You shall love your neighbour as yourself.” No other commandment is more important than these.’

The first quotation is from Deuteronomy 6.4–5, an exhortation to love God. The second quotation is from Leviticus 19.8, an exhortation to love one’s neighbour as oneself.

The ordinal adjectives πρῶτος and δεύτερος in this passage can imply a ranking of the commandments: loving your God is the most important, and loving your neighbour as

¹¹ As Loader points out, in Mark 12.28–34, there is ‘prioritising’ of the double love commandments ‘over against other commandments’. William R. G. Loader, *Jesus’ Attitude Towards the Law: A study of the Gospels*, WUNT, 2/97 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), p. 100.

¹² Some important witnesses (e.g., A 33) have *ομοια* between *δευτερα* and *αυτη* at Mark 12.31, probably an assimilation to Matt 22.39.

yourself is the second most important.¹³ This designation of the first and the second can also mean that the two themselves are distinct from each other and not equal in rank.¹⁴

Nonetheless, the use of *πρῶτος* and *δεύτερος* retains a certain ambiguity, because they can also refer to a list without the sense of priority.¹⁵ For example, the second is just another one following the first (e.g., Acts 12.10; Rev 4.7; 21.19); sometimes the second is regarded as better than the first (e.g., 1 Cor 15.47; Heb 8.7), depending on the context. In the context of Mark 12.28–34, the sense of ranking the commandments is suggested by the comparative adjectives *μείζων* (12.31) and *περισσότερον* (12.33).

Μείζων ('more important') appears immediately after the citation of the first and the second commandments. Jesus stated: *μείζων τούτων ἄλλη ἐντολὴ οὐκ ἔστιν* ('no other commandment is more important than these'). This statement shows a distinction between the double love commandments and all other commandments:¹⁶ the two commandments are grouped as the most important commandments, all other commandments then fall outside this group.¹⁷ These other commandments are regarded as less important: they are not more important than the double love commandments.

There are also discussions concerning the commandments in terms of what is *גדול* ('great') in the rabbinic texts. These texts were written later (e.g., the Mishnah was not written until around 200 CE), and there is uncertainty over whether they have recorded concepts and

¹³ Meier, *Law and Love*, p. 494. Meier also suggests that the first and the second give an idea of a continuation of the list: other commandments as third, fourth, fifth, etc. Meier, *Law and Love*, p. 494 note 59.

¹⁴ Meier, *Law and Love*, p. 494; Birger Gerhardsson, 'The Hermeneutic Program in Matthew 22:37', in *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity; Essays in Honour of William David Davies*, ed. by Robert Hamerton-Kelley, SJLA, 21 (Leiden: Brill, 1976), p. 138.

¹⁵ BDAG, s.v. 'δεύτερος'.

¹⁶ Robert J. Banks, *Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition*, SNTSMS, 28 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), p. 167.

¹⁷ Gerhardsson, 'Matthew 22:37', p. 140.

teachings from the first-century CE.¹⁸ However, since these texts contain discussion of the commandments, they can be helpful illustrations for understanding the ways in which ancient Jews compare the commandments, and for understanding what the term ‘great’ would entail in such comparison. For example:

גדולה מילה ששקולה כנגד כל המצות שבתורה (b. Ned. 32a)¹⁹

Great is circumcision, for it counterbalances all the [other] precepts of the Torah.²⁰

In this case, a precept is expressed as having a weight that is equivalent to the total weight of all other precepts in the Torah: ‘weighs as much as’ (שקל כנגד, or ‘counterbalances’) all other precepts, showing that the precept is of the highest importance. It is noteworthy that such a precept (or ‘commandment’, מצוה) is regarded as גדול (‘great’). In the Septuagint, μέγας usually corresponds to גדול,²¹ which can refer to the significance of a thing;²² and ἐντολή is often used to translate מצוה, which refers to a specific requirement of the Torah (תורה).²³ The terms גדול and מצוה in the above statement regarding circumcision are then comparable to the terms μέγας and ἐντολή in Mark 12.28–34.

¹⁸ Some teachings are attributed to first-century rabbis. There are also teachings not attributed to a specific person. For a biography of the rabbis and the origin of the rabbinic texts, see H. L. Strack and G. Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, trans. by Markus Bockmuehl, 2nd edn (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), pp. 62–100, 108–359.

¹⁹ Unless otherwise indicated, the Hebrew texts and the German translations of the Babylonian Talmud are taken from Lazarus Goldschmidt, *Der Babylonische Talmud*, 9 vols (Haag: Martinus Nijhoff, 1933–1935), and the English translations are taken from *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. by I. Epstein (London: Sonico, 1936–1948).

²⁰ English translation is taken from Epstein’s edition. Brackets original.

²¹ Walter Grundmann, ‘μέγας’, *TDNT*, VI, pp. 529–41 (p. 530).

²² *HALOT*, s.v. ‘גָּדוֹל’.

²³ Gottlob Schrenk, ‘ἐντολή’, *TDNT*, II, pp. 545–56 (p. 546). In the OT, מצוה and תורה (ἐντολή and νόμος respectively in the LXX) are frequently juxtaposed to represent the requirements from the Lord; e.g., Exod 16.28; 24.12; Josh 22.5; 2 Kgs 17.34 [4 Kgdms 17.34 LXX]; 2 Chr 14.3.

Circumcision (*b. Ned.* 32a) is one of several precepts that are regarded in the rabbinic texts as counterbalancing all the precepts in the Torah. Other examples include charity (*t. Pe'ah* 4.19), the rite of fringes (*b. Menah.* 43b), the prohibition of idolatry (*b. Hor.* 8a) and Sabbath observance (*Exod. Rab.* 25.12; cf. *y. Ber.* 3c).²⁴ These precepts are regarded as equivalent to all other precepts of the Torah, in terms of שקל כנגד ('weighs as much as'). Urbach points out that the purpose of such evaluation is to 'raise the importance of the precept'.²⁵ This sense of prioritising the commandments is also reflected in some translations of שקל כנגד as 'outweighs'. For example, regarding the above saying concerning circumcision (*b. Ned.* 32a), Neusner translates שקל כנגד as 'outweighs': 'Great is circumcision, for it outweighs all the other religious duties that are in the Torah.'²⁶ Likewise, Brooks translates שקל כנגד in a saying about charity and righteous deeds as 'outweighs':

צדקה וגמילות חסדים שקולין כנגד כל מצות שבתורה (*t. Pe'ah* 4.19)²⁷

Charity and righteous deeds outweigh all other commandments in the Torah.²⁸

These translations thus show that the designation of certain precepts as weighing as much as all other commandments in the Torah has a sense of prioritising the commandments: these

²⁴ Ephraim E. Urbach, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*, trans. by Israel Abrahams (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1975), pp. 347–48. Cf. Joel Marcus, *Mark 8–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB, 27A (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), p. 842; France, *Mark*, p. 477 note 61.

²⁵ Urbach, *Sages*, p. 347.

²⁶ Jacob Neusner, *The Talmud of Babylonia: An American Translation. Volume 15A: Tractate Nedarim Chapters 1–4*, BJS, 262 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1992), p. 80. See also Goldschmidt, who translates שקל כנגד (*b. Ned.* 32a) as German 'aufwiegt'.

²⁷ The Hebrew texts of the Tosefta are taken from *Tosefta: Based on the Erfurt and Vienna Codices*, ed. by M. S. Zuckermann, 2nd edn (Jerusalem: Bamberger & Wahrmann, 1937).

²⁸ The English translation is taken from Roger Brooks, 'Mishnah-Tosefa Peah', in *The Law of Agriculture in the Mishnah and the Tosefta: Translation, Commentary, Theology*, ed. by Jacob Neusner, Handbook of Oriental Studies, 79/1 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 583–786 (p. 785). See also Jeffrey P. García, 'Matthew 19:20: "What Do I Still Lack?" Jesus, Charity, and the Early Rabbis', in *The Gospels in First-Century Judaea: Proceedings of the Inaugural Conference of Nyack College's Graduate Program in Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins, August 29th, 2013*, ed. by R. Steven Notley and Jeffrey P. García, JCPS, 29 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), pp. 20–43 (p. 42).

precepts are regarded as more important than all other commandments. This idea is similar to the comparative language *μείζων* in Mark 12.31: no other commandment is ‘more important than’ (*μείζων*) the double love commandments.²⁹

In addition to *μείζων*, the comparative adjective *περισσότερον* also suggests that a higher priority is given to the love commandments:

καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν αὐτὸν ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς συνέσεως καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν τὸν πλησίον ὡς ἑαυτὸν περισσότερόν ἐστιν πάντων τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων καὶ θυσιῶν. (Mark 12.33; cf. 12.30–31)

And to love him [God] with all the heart and with all the understanding and with all the strength, and to love one’s neighbour as oneself, is more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices.

The scribe responds to Jesus, stating that loving God and loving one’s neighbour ‘is more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices’. The comparative adjective *περισσότερον* means ‘more’³⁰; in Mark 12.33, it is joined with genitive nouns, forming an adjectival phrase for comparison. This syntax also appears in a description concerning John the Baptist: *περισσότερον προφήτου* ‘more than a prophet’ (Matt 11.9; Luke 7.26). From the phrase itself, the ways in which John is ‘more than a prophet’ is uncertain. Likewise, in Mark 12.33, the way in which loving God and loving one’s neighbour is ‘more than’ all offerings is ambiguous. However, a clearer sense can be discerned when similar expressions from the Old Testament are considered, particularly 1 Samuel 15.22 and Hosea 6.6.

²⁹ Collins even considers that this rabbinic concept of a precept weighing as all other precepts ‘is equivalent to’ the commandment that ‘is the first of all’ in Mark 12.28. Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), p. 572.

³⁰ Friedrich Hauck, ‘*περισσός*’, *TDNT*, vi, pp. 61–62. According to Hauck, the neuter comparative form *περισσότερον* is often used for *πλέον* (the neuter comparative of *πόλυς*, ‘more’) in Koine Greek; e.g., Josephus, *Ant.* 3.30.

2.1.1.2 The allusion to Hosea 6.6 as prioritising the love commandments

Mark 12.33 is an expression of something that is more than sacrifices. In this statement, *ὄλοκαυτώματα καὶ θυσίαι* ('whole burnt offerings and sacrifices') refer to all offerings to God: this Greek phrase is often a translation of *עֹלָה וְזֶבַח* ('burnt offering and sacrifice'; e.g., Exod 18.12)³¹ or *עֹלָה וּמִנְחָה* ('burnt offering and gift'; e.g., Judg 13.23),³² both of which can be used as a collective name for all offerings. Mark 12.33 recalls the notions of the contrast between the attitude to God and sacrifices,³³ and might further echo the prophetic critique of the cultic practices.³⁴ Its allusion to 1 Kingdoms 15.22 and Hosea 6.6 LXX is stronger,³⁵ because they share the exact words *ὄλοκαύτωμα* and *θυσία*, and a comparison 'more than'.³⁶

1 Kingdoms 15.22 reads:

*καὶ εἶπεν Σαμουὴλ Εἰ θελητὸν τῷ κυρίῳ ὄλοκαυτώματα καὶ θυσίαι ὡς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι φωνῆς κυρίου; ἰδοὺ ἀκοὴ ὑπὲρ θυσίαν ἀγαθὴ καὶ ἡ ἐπακρόασις ὑπὲρ στέαρ κριῶν (1 Kgdms 15.22 LXX)*³⁷

And Samuel said, '[Are] whole burnt offerings and sacrifices desired to the Lord just as to listen to the voice of the Lord? Look! Listening [is] better than sacrifice and obedience than the fat of rams.'

³¹ Other places include: 1 Sam 15.22; 2 Chr 7.1; Isa 56.7; Jer 7.22; Ezek 44.11; cf. Exod 10.25. Unless otherwise indicated, the Hebrew texts of the Old Testament (MT) are taken from *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, ed. by K. Elliger, W. Rudolph, and A. Schenker, 5th edn (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997), and the English translations are my own.

³² Other places include: Amos 5.22; Jer 14.12; cf. Ps 20.3 [19.4 LXX].

³³ For example, 1 Sam 15.22 [1 Kgdms 15.22 LXX]; Ps 40.6–8 [39.7–9 LXX]; Ps 51.16–17 [50.18–19 LXX]; Hos 6.6.

³⁴ For example, Isa 1.11–17; Jer 6.20; 7.21–23; Amos 5.22–24; Mic 6.6–8.

³⁵ The allusion to these two texts is well recognised. Berger, *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu*, pp. 192–202; Collins, *Mark*, p. 576; Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, WBC, 34B (Nashville: Nelson, 2008), p. 265; Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, p. 840; France, *Mark*, p. 481. This is also mentioned in NA^{26/27/28} at Mark 12.33.

³⁶ Ps 39.7 LXX; 50.18 LXX; Isa 1.11; Jer 7.22 and Amos 5.22 contain a negation concerning both *ὄλοκαυτώματα* and *θυσία*, but not in the comparative language 'more than'.

³⁷ Unless otherwise indicated, the Greek texts from the LXX are taken from *Septuaginta: id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, ed. by Alfred Rahlfs and Robert Hanhart, rev. edn (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006), and the English translations are my own. Regarding this verse, the LXX is quite close to the MT (1 Sam 15.22).

In this verse, the comparative language ‘more than’ is expressed in the form of ὑπέρ with the accusative nouns.³⁸ This syntax expresses the Hebrew מִן (‘more than’):³⁹ ὑπὲρ θυσίαν ἀγαθή is a translation of מִזְבַּח טוֹב (‘better than sacrifice’), and ὑπὲρ στέαρ κριῶν is a translation of מִחֶלֶב אֵילִים (‘than the fat of rams’). This verse compares listening and obedience with sacrifice in the context of what is ‘desirable’ (θελητός, 1 Kgdms 15.22) to the Lord. Therefore, the sense of ‘better than’ here refers to ‘more desirable than’: to the Lord, listening and obedience is more desirable than offerings.

Similarly, in Hosea 6.6 LXX, the comparison concerning θυσία and ὀλοκαυτώματα is about what the Lord ‘desires’ (θέλω). Regarding this verse, the readings attested in the Septuagint witnesses vary. For example, Codex Alexandrinus (LXX-A) reads καὶ οὐ for וְלֹא, while Codex Vaticanus (LXX-B) reads ἢ (‘more than’) for וְלֹא.⁴⁰

διότι ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν καὶ ἐπίγνωσιν θεοῦ ἢ ὀλοκαυτώματα (Hos 6.6 LXX-A)

διότι ἔλεος θέλω ἢ θυσίαν καὶ ἐπίγνωσιν θεοῦ ἢ ὀλοκαυτώματα (Hos 6.6 LXX-B)

כי חסד חפצתי ולא־זבח ודעת אלהים מעלות (Hos 6.6 MT)

Because I desire mercy but not sacrifice, and [I desire] knowledge of God more than whole burnt offerings.⁴¹

LXX-A reflects a word-for-word translation of וְלֹא as καὶ οὐ and מִן as ἢ,⁴² while LXX-B reflects a translation of reading both וְלֹא and מִן as ἢ, which interprets Hosea 6.6 according to

³⁸ BDAG, s.v. ‘ὑπέρ’.

³⁹ HALOT, s.v. ‘מִן’.

⁴⁰ Both readings (καὶ οὐ and ἢ) are supported by other witnesses respectively. For details, see the critical apparatus in *Duodecim prophetae*, ed. by Joseph Ziegler, SVTG, 13 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943), p. 160.

⁴¹ Translated based on Rahlfs’s edition of the LXX, which reads καὶ οὐ for וְלֹא.

⁴² A similar word-for-word translation of וְלֹא as καὶ μὴ and מִן as ὑπὲρ appears in Prov 8.10 LXX: ‘Receive instruction but not (καὶ μὴ/וְלֹא) silver, and knowledge rather than (ὑπὲρ/מִן) tested gold’ (translated from the LXX).

its parallel structure in Hebrew: both **וְלֹא** and **מִן** are regarded as carrying the same meaning and are translated by the same word, *ḥ*.⁴³

Scholars recognise that the parallel structure of Hosea 6.6 in Hebrew allows two possible interpretations.⁴⁴ First, it is possible to interpret **וְלֹא** in the first half according to **מִן** in the second half, reading both as ‘more than’: ‘For I desire kindness (**דְּחַסְדִּי**) more than sacrifice, and knowledge of God more than whole burnt offerings’.⁴⁵ The sense is then a comparison which prioritises love and knowledge of God over sacrifice.⁴⁶ Alternatively, it is possible to read **מִן** in the second half as ‘but not’ according to **וְלֹא** in the first half: ‘For I desire kindness but not sacrifice, and knowledge of God but not whole burnt offerings’.⁴⁷ The sense is then a negation of sacrifice.

The understanding of Hosea 6.6 as prioritising love and knowledge of God over sacrifice also appears in *Targum Jonathan*:

⁴³ It is difficult to decide whether the original reading of the LXX has *καὶ οὐ* or *ἢ* for **וְלֹא**. Swete regards *ἢ* as the original reading, while Rahlfs regards *καὶ οὐ* as the original reading (so also Ziegler). For a discussion which argues for *ἔλεος θέλω ἢ θυσίαν* as the original reading, see Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament*, p. 111.

⁴⁴ Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman, *Hosea: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB, 24 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980), p. 430; Eberhard Bons, ‘Osée 6:6 dans le Texte Massorétique’, in ‘*Car c’est l’amour qui me plaît, non le sacrifice...*’: recherches sur Osée 6:6 et son interprétation juive et chrétienne, ed. by Eberhard Bons, JSJSup, 88 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), p. 10.

⁴⁵ Translated from the MT. The meaning of **דְּחַסְדִּי** in Hos 6.6 is a matter of debate and will be discussed in Chapter 4, §4.2.1.1.

⁴⁶ Scholars who suggest this interpretation include: Heinz Kruse, ‘Die “dialektische Negation” als semitisches Idiom’, *Vetus Testamentum*, 4.4 (1954), 385–400 (p. 391); Andersen and Freedman, *Hosea*, pp. 426, 430; Marvin A. Sweeney, *The Twelve Prophets*, 2 vols (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2000), I, p. 73; cf. Walter Gisin, *Das Buch Hosea*, ECBAT, 37 (Witten: SCM R. Brockhaus, 2014), p. 279.

⁴⁷ Scholars who suggest this interpretation include: William Rainey Harper, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1905), p. 287; Andrew A. Macintosh, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Hosea*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), p. 233; Hans W. Wolff, *Hosea: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Hosea*, trans. by Gary Stansell (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), p. 120. Note also Martin Luther’s translation of Hos 6.6, in which both **וְלֹא** and **מִן** are interpreted as ‘and not’ (‘und nicht’; *Lutherbibel* 1545, 2017); GKC §119w.

ארי בעבדי חסדא רעוא קדמי מדדבח ועבדי אוריתא דיוי ממסקי עלון:⁴⁸

For those who do acts of kindness are more desirable before me than he that sacrifices, and those who carry out the law of the Lord more than those that offer up burnt offerings.⁴⁹

In light of the understanding of Hosea 6.6 which is reflected in LXX-B and *Targum Jonathan*, it is possible that Mark 12.33 alludes to this understanding of Hosea 6.6, which regards love and knowledge of God as more desirable than all sacrifices. The allusion to 1 Kingdoms 15.22 and Hosea 6.6 LXX then suggests that the sense of *περισσότερον* in Mark 12.33 is likely ‘more desirable than’. To the Lord, loving God and loving one’s neighbour is more desirable than all offerings. This desirability pertains to the ‘will’ of God (*θελητός*, 1 Kgdms 15.22; *θέλω*, Hos 6.6).

Moreover, the allusion to Hosea 6.6 in Mark 12.33 might be even stronger if two more factors are considered. First, in Mark 12.33, the scribe recites the commandment of loving your God in terms of ‘with all the understanding’ (*ἐξ ὅλης τῆς συνέσεως*, Mark 12.33),⁵⁰ which might further echo ‘the knowledge of God’ (*ἐπίγνωσις θεοῦ*/אִלְהִיָּם דַּעַת in Hosea 6.6.⁵¹ In Hosea, the knowledge of God pertains to Israel’s faithfulness to God: Israel is regarded as not knowing the Lord because of idolatry (Hos 4.12; 5.4). Thus, the demand for the knowledge of God in Hosea 6.6 echoes the commandment of loving your God cited in Mark 12.28–34 which includes the notion of ‘God is one’ (Mark 12.29, 32), highlighting no idolatry.

⁴⁸ Hos 6.6 *Tg. Jon.*; taken from *The Latter Prophets According to Targum Jonathan*, ed. by Alexander Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1962), p. 395.

⁴⁹ Cathcart’s translation; taken from K. J. Cathcart and R. P. Gordon, *The Targum of the Minor Prophets: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes*, *The Aramaic Bible*, 14 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989), p. 42.

⁵⁰ The term *σύνεσις* in Mark 12.33 is peculiar. This term does not appear in the commandment of loving your God just cited in Mark 12.30, and does not appear in Deut 6.5 LXX.

⁵¹ Cf. Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, p. 840; Meier, *Law and Love*, p. 496 note 65. In the LXX, *σύνεσις* is sometimes employed to translate דַּעַת; e.g., Job 15.2; 21.22; 33.3; 34.35; Isa 53.11.

Second, as shown in LXX and *Targum Jonathan*, חסד in Hosea 6.6 has been translated as ἔλεος ('kindness') and בעבדי חסדא ('those who do acts of kindness') respectively. Both translations can be understood as kindness towards humans.⁵² In this way, the whole verse of Hosea 6.6 in these traditions (e.g., LXX-B and *Targum Jonathan*) can be an expression which regards both love for God (in terms of knowledge of God) and love for humans (in terms of kindness towards humans) as more than all sacrifices, which is very close to what Mark 12.33 expresses.⁵³ Therefore, it is very likely that a strong allusion to Hosea 6.6 appears in Mark 12.33, and this allusion is involved in prioritising the double love commandments over the cultic laws.

In sum, Mark 12.28–34 reflects a priority of the commandments. The use of ordinal adjectives πρῶτος ('the first') and δεύτερος ('the second') suggests a ranking of the commandments, in which the double love commandments are given the highest rankings: the top two. Furthermore, the use of comparative adjectives μείζων ('more important') and περισσότερον ('more than') suggests that they are regarded as more important than other commandments, and the observance of them is regarded as more desirable to God.

2.1.2 *The implications of prioritising certain commandments*

Prioritising the commandments according to their importance has various possible implications. When certain commandments are given higher priority over other

⁵² For the meaning of ἔλεος in Hos 6.6 LXX, see the discussion below, Chapter 4, §4.2.1.1.

⁵³ Similarly, Joosten points out that the translation of חסד as ἔλεος in Hos 6.6 LXX has 'created something like a double command of love – "be charitable to your neighbor, and know, that is, love God"', and suggests that Mark 12.33 points to Hos 6.6. Jan Joosten, 'The Text of Old Testament Quotations in Matthew', in *The Gospel of Matthew in Its Historical and Theological Context: Papers from the International Conference in Moscow, September 24 to 28, 2018*, ed. by Michail Seleznev, William R. G. Loader, and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, WUNT, 459 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021), pp. 201–15 (p. 212). Likewise, Ziegert suggests that Hos 6.6 is the tradition underlying Mark 12.33: חסד in Hos 6.6 corresponds to 'love your neighbour', and דעת אלהים ('knowledge of God') corresponds to 'love your God'; Carsten Ziegert, 'What Is חסד? A Frame-Semantic Approach', *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, 44.4 (2020), 711–32 (p. 729).

commandments, it can affect the observance of those commandments which are regarded as of a lower priority: when the observance of two commandments is in the situation of one competing with another, the more important commandment would override the less important commandment. Alternatively, prioritising the commandments can cause abrogation of some commandments: only the more important ones are kept, others are gradually not observed. Both implications can be seen from the story narrated in Mark 7.1–23.

Mark 7.1–23 consists of two parts. The first part narrates the dispute between Jesus and the Pharisees about eating with unclean hands (7.1–15); the second part is Jesus's subsequent teaching on defilement and purity (7.17–23). The first part contains a discourse which shows how the observance of a commandment might be overridden, and the second part contains an explanation which shows the abrogation of some commandments because of the light esteem of their importance.

2.1.2.1 The overriding of the observance of some commandments

The dispute narrated in Mark 7.1–15 includes a description of a practice of the Pharisees, who think that honouring parents can be overridden by giving gifts to God. The dispute happened as the Pharisees and the scribes accused Jesus and his disciples that they 'do not walk according to the tradition of the elders' (οὐ περιπατοῦσιν κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, 7.5). Jesus, in turn, condemned them for abandoning the commandment of God by upholding their tradition (7.8–9). From the description of the ways in which the tradition of the elders teaches about honouring parents, evaluations of the importance of commandments can be discerned. These evaluations affect the ways in which people observe the commandments, and in this case the commandment of honouring parents has been overridden.

The commandments of God must be observed. However, different groups of Jews in the first-century dispute the issue of holding other regulations that are preserved in their

tradition. For example, one of the differences between the Pharisees and the Sadducees is their perspective on the ‘tradition of the fathers’ (παράδοσις τῶν πατέρων, *Ant.* 13.297).⁵⁴ The regulations in the tradition of the fathers are those ‘not written in the laws of Moses’ (οὐκ ἀναγέγραπται ἐν τοῖς Μωυσέως νόμοις, *Ant.* 13.297). For this reason, the Sadducees differentiated the tradition of the fathers from the laws of Moses, and only regarded the latter as obligatory. By contrast, the Pharisees held fast to the tradition of the fathers and regarded the regulations in it as obligatory (*Ant.* 13.297). The obligatory nature of a commandment entails that failure in observance would lead to a penalty.⁵⁵

In Mark 7.10, Jesus states that honouring parents is a commandment given by Moses, with reference to a differentiation of it from the tradition of the elders: the former is ‘the commandment of God’ (ἡ ἐντολή τοῦ θεοῦ, 7.9), and the latter are ‘human precepts’ (ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων, 7.7). Honouring parents is the commandment of God. The obligatory nature of this commandment is further emphasised: ‘whoever speaks evil of father or mother must be put to death’ (ὁ κακολογῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα θανάτῳ τελευτάτω, 7.10).⁵⁶

The reference to the severity of the penalty can be one of the ways for identifying the importance of a commandment.⁵⁷ For example, the rabbinic tradition regards the avoidance of idolatry, incest and murder as such important commandments that a transgression would result in the most severe punishment: death is seen as more preferable than transgressing these

⁵⁴ Cf. Joel Marcus, *Mark 1–8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB, 27 (New York: Doubleday, 2000), pp. 441–42.

⁵⁵ Urbach, *Sages*, p. 338.

⁵⁶ The phrase θανάτῳ τελευτάτω means ‘let the person die the death’. This phrase is also used for translating מוֹת יוֹמָת, ‘he surely dies’ (Exod 21.16 MT/21.17 LXX), that is, to receive a death penalty. BDAG, s.v. ‘τελευτάω’.

⁵⁷ Urbach, *Sages*, p. 345; Israel Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels: First Series* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1917), p. 27.

(*b. Sanh. 74a*).⁵⁸ By mentioning the death penalty, Jesus emphasises the importance of the commandment of honouring parents: this commandment must be observed.

By contrast, the tradition of the elders has another evaluation regarding the importance of the commandment of honouring parents. The tradition of the elders exempts people from giving money (or materials) to their parents when the same is used for offering to God. Jesus criticised this tradition:

ὕμεις δὲ λέγετε· ἐὰν εἴπῃ ἄνθρωπος τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ· κορβᾶν, ὃ ἐστὶν δῶρον, ὃ ἐὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφελῆθῃς, οὐκέτι ἀφίετε αὐτὸν οὐδὲν ποιῆσαι τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ, ἀκυροῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παραδόσει ὑμῶν ἣ παρεδώκατε· καὶ παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλὰ ποιεῖτε.
(Mark 7.11–13)

But you say, ‘If a man tells his father or his mother, “What you would have gained from me is Korban (that is, a gift [for God])”, then you no longer permit him to do anything for his father or mother, thus making void the word of God by your tradition that you have handed down. And many such things you do.’⁵⁹

This shows a situation in which offering to God is given at the expense of honouring parents: if a person has a sum of money (or certain materials) and designates it as a gift to God,⁶⁰ the giving to God would exempt the person from giving to parents. This teaching reflects a similar situation in which people observe one commandment at the expense of not observing another one. This situation pertains to the evaluation of the importance of the commandments. Discussions attested in the rabbinic texts can offer helpful illustrations of how people respond in a situation when the observance of one commandment competes with that of another commandment.

⁵⁸ Urbach, *Sages*, p. 351. See also Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism: 1*, p. 27.

⁵⁹ The translation is taken from RSV; slightly modified.

⁶⁰ Κορβᾶν (‘Korban’) is a transliteration of קֹרְבָן, means ‘a gift [to God]’ (δῶρον, cf. Lev 2.1 LXX). BDAG, s.v. ‘κορβᾶν’. Josephus mentions an oath called κορβᾶν and explains it as δῶρον θεοῦ ‘a gift for God’ (*Ag. Ap.* 1.167; cf. *Ant.* 4.73). Thus, κορβᾶν in Mark 7.11 might indicate that the materials have been employed in vows and consecrated for religious use. Cf. John M. G. Barclay, *Against Apion*, FJTC, 10 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), p. 99. Unless otherwise indicated, the Greek texts of *Against Apion* are taken from Flavius Josephus, *The Life. Against Apion*, LCL, 186 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926), and the English translations are my own.

One discussion shows that the non-observance of a commandment will be justified if another commandment is observed at the same time: ‘he who is engaged on one religious duty is free from any other’ (*b. Sukkah* 25a).⁶¹ In this situation, the person is exempted from performing another religious duty.⁶² Another discussion shows that the observed commandment is regarded as more important. Both circumcision and Sabbath are regarded as the most important commandments.⁶³ Of these two, circumcision is regarded as even more important, because it overrides the Sabbath: ‘Circumcision is a great precept, for it overrides (הקפד) [the severity of] the Sabbath’ (*b. Ned.* 31b).⁶⁴ The verb הקפד can be understood in the sense of ‘to suspend’ or ‘to make [something] inoperative’.⁶⁵ This saying points out that the prohibition of work is inapplicable to the act of circumcision on the Sabbath day.⁶⁶ In this way, the commandment of circumcision is regarded as more important.⁶⁷

The above examples show that the evaluation of the importance of commandments affects the ways of observance. The observance of the less important commandment can give way to the more important commandment. Permitting a person not to give to parents (Mark 7.11–12) is likely a result of similar prioritisation, with which people can be justified in not observing the commandment of honouring parents, that is, the gift to God overrides the material support to parents.⁶⁸ Jesus’s refutation of this tradition shows that he evaluates the

⁶¹ The English translation is taken from Epstein’s edition.

⁶² Urbach, *Sages*, p. 350.

⁶³ Mentioned above, pp. 30–31.

⁶⁴ The English translation is taken from Epstein’s edition. Square brackets original. The performance of circumcision on the Sabbath is also mentioned in John 7.22–23.

⁶⁵ Jastrow, s.v. ‘הקפד’.

⁶⁶ Epstein’s edition notes: ‘Circumcision, though entailing work, is performed on the Sabbath’; *The Babylonian Talmud*, v, p. 93.

⁶⁷ Urbach, *Sages*, p. 348.

⁶⁸ It is noteworthy that an opposite evaluation is attested later in the rabbinic tradition, that the material support to parents is regarded as more important than the offerings to God: if people do not have substance, they

commandments differently: for him, the commandment of honouring parents is more important; it must be given priority and must be observed.

2.1.2.2 *The abrogation of certain commandments*

The dispute narrated in Mark 7.1–15 ends with Jesus’s conclusion: ‘there is nothing outside a person that by going in can defile, but the things that come out are what defile’ (7.15). These words are explained in the subsequent narration (7.17–23), which is similar to Mark 12.28–34 in its notion of a comparison of the commandments.

In this passage, Jesus explains to his disciples concerning what can defile:

καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς: [...] πᾶν τὸ ἔξωθεν εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον οὐ δύναται αὐτὸν κοινῶσαι ὅτι οὐκ εἰσπορεύεται αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ἀλλ’ εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν, καὶ εἰς τὸν ἀφεδρώνα ἐκπορεύεται, καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα; ἔλεγεν δὲ ὅτι τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορευόμενον, ἐκεῖνο κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον. ἔσωθεν γὰρ ἐκ τῆς καρδίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἱ διαλογισμοὶ οἱ κακοὶ ἐκπορεύονται, [...] πάντα ταῦτα τὰ πονηρὰ ἔσωθεν ἐκπορεύεται καὶ κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

He said to them, ‘[...] whatever goes into a man from outside cannot defile him, since it enters, not his heart but his stomach, and goes out into the sewer?’ (declaring all foods clean) And he said, ‘What comes out of a man is what defiles a man. For from within, out of the heart of man, come evil thoughts [...] All these evil things come from within, and they defile a man.’ (Mark 7.18–23)⁶⁹

Like Mark 12.28–34, this passage contains a comparison pertaining to the quest for the more important thing regarding the observance of commandments.

Mark 12.28–34 compares the double love commandments with all other commandments; and Mark 7.18–23 compares the purity of food with the evil from one’s heart. In both passages, Mark identifies certain commandments as downgraded or even abrogated. In Mark 12.33, the scribe’s response spells out the commandments about

are not obliged to honour God with substance; but they must honour their parents with substance even if they have to be beggars (y. *Peah* 1.1 [fol. 15d]); Urbach, *Sages*, p. 346. It is possible that the evaluation of the importance of the commandments would change in different contexts. An example is the rabbinic evaluation of sacrifices and charity after the destruction of the Second Temple; Urbach, *Sages*, pp. 348–49.

⁶⁹ The translation is taken from RSV; slightly modified.

sacrifices; these commandments are regarded as less desirable to God. Similarly, in Mark 7.18–23, Mark regards Jesus’s teaching as ‘declaring all foods clean’ (*καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα*, 7.19), a comment which connects the teaching to the food laws.⁷⁰ A declaration of all foods as clean means that the food laws are regarded as no longer applicable.⁷¹ Mark’s addition of this comment reflects his view on the food laws: they are not essential to a person’s purity.

Therefore, both Mark 7.17–23 and 12.28–34 reflect a differentiation between the moral aspect and the cultic (or ritual) aspect concerning the observance of commandments and emphasise the importance of the former.⁷² The emphasis on inner purity in Mark 7.17–23 clearly shows a tendency to abrogate the food laws. The abrogation of certain commandments might also be implied in Mark 12.28–34: when certain commandments fall outside the group of the most important commandments, the obligation of observing these commandments will then be in question. This uncertainty might be interpreted to mean that these commandments are no longer a matter of concern and have become obsolete.

2.1.3 Summary

Mark 12.28–34 narrates the discussion of the most important commandment as giving priority to the commandments of loving God and loving one’s neighbour. A prioritisation of the commandments is also present in Mark 7.1–23, which also reflects the possible implications of evaluating the commandments. The commandments which are regarded as more important would override those which are regarded as less important. The differentiation of

⁷⁰ Commentators generally suggest that ‘declaring all foods clean’ is Mark’s editorial comment on Jesus’s teaching in this pericope. Gundry, *Mark*, p. 355; Marcus, *Mark 1–8*, p. 455; Collins, *Mark*, p. 356; France, *Mark*, p. 291.

⁷¹ Gundry, *Mark*, p. 355.

⁷² Collins, *Mark*, pp. 354–55; Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism: 1*, p. 25.

commandments according to their importance also implies the possibility of the abrogation of the less important commandments.

Matthew is concerned about the tendency to abrogate certain commandments. In his narration of the same story about purity and defilement (Matt 15.1–20 // Mark 7.1–23), Matthew does not regard Jesus’s teaching as ‘declaring all foods clean’ and removes this comment (Matt 15.17–18 // Mark 7.19–20). This omission focusses the teaching on inner purity and avoids any sense of abrogation of the food laws.⁷³ Moreover, Matthew’s account of the discussion of the most important commandment differs significantly from Mark’s account (Matt 22.36–40 // Mark 12.28–34), showing that Matthew regards the double love commandments as the overarching principle which is embedded in all the commandments.

2.2 The love commandments as a summary (Matt 22.36–40)

Matthew 22.36–40, like Mark 12.28–34, narrates a dialogue between Jesus and a questioner concerning the most important commandment. Matthew’s account of Jesus’s reply also juxtaposes ‘love your God’ and ‘love your neighbour as yourself’. However, Matthew’s account differs from Mark’s account at significant points. The difference shows that, for Matthew, the designation of love for God and love for fellow humans as the most important commandments is understood as a summary of the Law. In this section, the distinctiveness of Matthew’s narration will be discussed, followed by a discussion of the practice of summarising the Law into the love commandment(s).

2.2.1 Matthew’s distinctiveness in comparison with Mark 12.28–34

The first significant difference between Matthew and Mark is their understanding of the meaning of the ordinal adjectives in the story. Matthew tones down the sense of ranking the

⁷³ Cf. Matthias Konradt, *The Gospel According to Matthew: A Commentary*, trans. by M. Eugene Boring (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2020), p. 237; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II, p. 535.

commandments with his modifications concerning the word *πρῶτος* in the scribe's question and in Jesus's answer. In Mark 12.28, the word *πρῶτος* in the scribe's question carries a sense of asking which commandment is the first of all, implying that other commandments are comparably downgraded.⁷⁴ By contrast, Matthew uses the phrase *μεγάλη ἐν τῷ νόμῳ* instead of Mark's *πρώτη πάντων*:

<p>Matt 22.36 <i>ποία ἐντολὴ μεγάλη ἐν τῷ νόμῳ;</i> Which commandment is the most important in the Law?</p>	<p>Mark 12.28 <i>ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη πάντων;</i> Which commandment is the first of all?</p>
---	---

In Matthew 22.36, *μέγας* is used as a superlative (a Semitic pattern),⁷⁵ like the use of *לְגַד* in Hebrew (cf. Jer 6.13 MT & LXX). The use of *μέγας* then indicates that the question is about the most important commandment in the Law,⁷⁶ but not necessarily in the sense of ranking the commandments. The sense of *πρῶτος* is then further clarified in Matthew's account of Jesus's reply:

ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ· ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου· αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μεγάλη καὶ πρώτη ἐντολὴ. δευτέρα δὲ ὁμοία αὐτῇ· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. (Matt 22.37–39)

He said to him, “You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind.” This is the most important and the first commandment. The second is like it: “You shall love your neighbour as yourself.”

In contrast to Mark's *πρώτη ἐστίν* (Mark 12.29), Matthew writes *ἐστὶν ἡ μεγάλη καὶ πρώτη* (22.38). Matthew's juxtaposition of *πρῶτος* with *μέγας* indicates that *πρῶτος* is expressed in the sense of ‘the most important’ (*μέγας*). Moreover, in contrast to Mark's *δευτέρα αὕτη*

⁷⁴ Cf. Boris Repschinski, *The Controversy Stories in the Gospel of Matthew: Their Redaction, Form and Relevance for the Relationship Between the Matthean Community and Formative Judaism*, FRLANT, 189 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), p. 217.

⁷⁵ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III, p. 240; BDF §245.

⁷⁶ As discussed above, *μέγας* means ‘important’ when it is employed to describe a commandment; pp. 27–28.

(Mark 12.31), Matthew writes δευτέρα ὁμοία αὐτῇ (22.39). Matthew's addition of ὅμοιος indicates that the second mentioned is just like the first mentioned. By using ὅμοιος, Matthew shows that πρῶτος and δεύτερος in Jesus's reply do not mean a ranking of the double love commandments, but only shows a sequence of appearance in a speech.⁷⁷ Therefore, the two commandments are regarded as of equal importance.⁷⁸ Furthermore, Matthew omits the sentence 'no other commandment is more important than (μείζων) these [two commandments]' in Jesus's reply,⁷⁹ indicating that he is concerned about the sense of downgrading other commandments.⁸⁰ This concern is further reflected in the second significant point of distinctiveness in Matthew's account.

The second significant point in which Matthew differs from Mark is their narration following Jesus's reply with the double love commandments. Mark 12.32–34 narrates a second round of the dialogue, which includes the scribe's response to Jesus's reply by regarding the double love commandments as more than all sacrifices (an allusion to Hosea 6.6), and Jesus's recognition of the scribe's response. Matthew omits this second round, but continues the narration with Jesus's statement concerning the double love commandments:

ἐν ταύταις ταῖς δυσὶν ἐντολαῖς ὅλος ὁ νόμος κρέμαται καὶ οἱ προφῆται (Matt 22.40)

On these two commandments hang the whole Law and the Prophets.

In this statement, the verb 'hang' (κρεμάννυμι) is employed to express the relation between the double love commandments and the whole Law and the Prophets. This statement suggests that the double love commandments are a summary of all God's commandments.

⁷⁷ As discussed above, the use of πρῶτος and δεύτερος can mean that the second is just the one following the first mentioned; pp. 28–29.

⁷⁸ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III, p. 243; Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution*, 2nd edn (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), p. 449.

⁷⁹ Cf. Mark 12.31; cited above, p. 28.

⁸⁰ Matthew thus omits the comparative μείζων, and then uses μέγας as a superlative to clarify the sense of πρῶτος.

First, the verb ‘hang’ (κρεμάννυμι) can be used figuratively to express a sense of dependence: all commandments are dependent on the double love commandments. A similar figurative use appears in Judith: ‘their lives depend upon us’ (ἐξ ἡμῶν κρέματαί ἡ ψυχῆ αὐτῶν, Jdt 8.24). The use of an image of ‘hanging’ in describing all instructions as depending on one or two principles is also attested elsewhere. For example, the verb ἀρτάω, which means ‘hang’,⁸¹ has been used in this way:⁸²

There are two of the inscriptions at Delphi which are most indispensable to living (τὰ μάλιστα ἀναγκαιότατα πρὸς τὸν βίον). These are: “Know thyself” and “Avoid extremes,” for on these hang all the rest (ἐκ τούτων γὰρ ἤρτηται καὶ τὰλλα πάντα). (Plutarch, *Cons. Apoll.* 116C–D)⁸³

This text expresses all other instructions as hanging on the two principles which are regarded as ‘most indispensable’, that is, all the instructions for living are attached to and dependent on these two principles, which are indispensable.

A similar use of an image of ‘hanging’ is also attested in the rabbinic texts:

איזוהי פרשה קטנה שכל גופי תורה תלוין בה
בכל דרכיך דעהו והוא יישר ארחתך⁸⁴
(*b. Ber.* 63a)⁸⁴

What is the smallest portion of scripture from which all essential regulations of the Torah hang? ‘In all your ways acknowledge him, and he will direct your paths.’⁸⁵

⁸¹ LSJ, s.v. ‘ἀρτάω’.

⁸² This example is mentioned by: Georg Bertram, ‘κρεμάννυμι’, *TDNT*, III, p. 919; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III, p. 240.

⁸³ The Greek text and the English translation are taken from Plutarch, *Moralia: Volume II*, trans. by Frank Cole Babbitt, LCL, 222 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928). The translation is slightly modified.

⁸⁴ The text is often mentioned in the discussions of Matt 22.40; for example: Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III, p. 246; Terence L. Donaldson, ‘The Law That Hangs (Matthew 22:40): Rabbinic Formulation and Matthean Social World’, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 57 (1995), 689–709 (pp. 689–90); Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 21–28: A Commentary*, trans. by James E. Crouch, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), pp. 84–85; Nolland, *Matthew*, p. 912.

⁸⁵ The English translation is taken from Donaldson, ‘The Law That Hangs’, p. 689.

This saying describes ‘all essential regulations in the Torah’ as ‘hanging’ (תלה)⁸⁶ on a short verse from the Scripture (Prov 3.6), which can mean that this smallest portion is the essential element of all the Torah.

The above examples show that, when all other instructions are described as hanging on one or two instructions, the concept is about these one or two instructions being regarded as the indispensable element which is embedded in and connected to all the instructions. Therefore, it is likely that the hanging image used in Matthew 22.40 indicates that love for God and love for fellow humans is the most essential element embedded in all the commandments. This concept can be further understood in light of the ways in which the commandment ‘love your neighbour as yourself’ is regarded as the summary or the most important principle of the Law.

In the New Testament, the commandment ‘love your neighbour as yourself’ is regarded as the summary of the Law: the commandments ‘are summed up in this word: you shall love your neighbour as yourself’ (ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται [ἐν τῷ] ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν, Rom 13.9; cf. Gal 5.14; Jas 2.8).⁸⁷ Similarly, in the rabbinic texts, a saying which is attributed to Aqiba identifies the commandment ‘love your neighbour as yourself’ as ‘the greatest general principle in the Law’:⁸⁸

ואהבת לרעך כמוך. רבי עקיבא אומר זה כלל גדול בתורה.
⁸⁹(*Sifra* Lev 19.18)

Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself: R. Aqiba said, This is the greatest general principle in the Law.⁹⁰

⁸⁶ תלה means ‘hang’. BDB, s.v. ‘תלה’; Jastrow, s.v. ‘תלה’.

⁸⁷ The square brackets in the Greek text are from NA²⁸.

⁸⁸ Aqiba was active during around 90–130 CE; Strack and Stemberger, *Introduction*, pp. 71–72.

⁸⁹ The Hebrew text is taken from *Sifra*, ed. by J. H. Weiss (Wien: Jacob Schlossberg, 1862), p. 89.

⁹⁰ The English translation is taken from Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism: 1*, p. 20.

In this saying, *בתורה גדול כלל* can be translated as ‘the encompassing principle of the Torah’,⁹¹ suggesting that when *גדול* is used to describe *כלל* (‘a principle’),⁹² it entails the encompassing nature of the principle. In this way, ‘you shall love your neighbour as yourself’ can be regarded as a principle which encompasses the Law.

Another saying, which is attributed to Hillel,⁹³ shows a summary of the Torah in terms similar to ‘love your neighbour as yourself’:

דעלך סני לחברך לא תעביד זו היא כל התורה כולה
ואידך פירושה הוא זיל גמור (b. *Šabb.* 31a)

What is hateful to you, do not to your neighbour: that is the whole Torah, while the rest is the commentary thereof; go and learn it.⁹⁴

Concerning this saying, Alexander notes that what Hillel gave is a ‘maxim’ rather than citing a commandment from the Torah.⁹⁵ Nonetheless, this maxim essentially expresses the meaning of ‘love your neighbour as yourself’.⁹⁶ Hillel summarises the whole Torah by giving this maxim and regards the rest as the commentary. This is one way of showing what it would entail to summarise the Torah: a maxim, as the summary, is regarded as the whole, and the rest is regarded as its commentary.

In light of the above examples, it is likely that Matthew uses a similar concept to express the concept of seeing the most important commandments as a summary of the Law. The double love commandments are regarded as the most important with reference to their

⁹¹ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III, p. 245.

⁹² *כלל* means ‘general rule, principle’; Jastrow, s.v. ‘כָּלֵל’.

⁹³ Hillel is regarded as lived during the time of Herod; Strack and Stemberger, *Introduction*, pp. 64–65.

⁹⁴ The English translation is taken from Epstein’s edition.

⁹⁵ P. S. Alexander, ‘Jesus and the Golden Rule’, in *Hillel and Jesus: Comparative Studies of Two Major Religious Leaders*, ed. by James H. Charlesworth and Loren L. Johns (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997), pp. 363–88 (pp. 374–75).

⁹⁶ A similar saying appeared earlier in Tobit: *ὃ μισεῖς μηδενὶ ποιήσης* (‘Whatever you hate, do to no one’; Tob 4.15). Cf. Alexander, ‘Jesus’, p. 372.

role as the encompassing principle, which is the most essential element embedded in all the commandments. This principle neither supersedes nor abrogates other commandments; rather, all other commandments are dependent on this principle. It is in this sense that the whole Law hangs on the double love commandments.

The ways in which Matthew regards the double love commandments as a summary of all God's commandments can be further explained with reference to Matthew 7.12. 'The Law and the Prophets' (ὁ νόμος [...] καὶ οἱ προφῆται) connects 22.40 to 7.12,⁹⁷ in which the Law and the Prophets are summarised as a principle:⁹⁸

Πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς· οὗτος γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται. (Matt 7.12)

Therefore, whatever you wish that people would do to you, do also to them, for this is the Law and the Prophets.

Matthew's use of the phrase 'the Law and the Prophets' (ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται) most likely refers to the commandments and the teachings recorded in writings, which include 'the Law, the Prophets and other books'.⁹⁹ The main feature of 'the Law and the Prophets' are that these writings contain the commandments and the oracles from God, given by God through Moses and the prophets (cf. Zech 7.12).¹⁰⁰

'The Law and the Prophets' connects Matthew 7.12 and 22.40, both of which summarise all God's commandments into an overarching principle. Furthermore, this phrase also points to Matthew 5.17, which explicitly states that the Law and the Prophets are not to

⁹⁷ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III, p. 245; Luz, *Matthew 21–28*, p. 84; Nolland, *Matthew*, p. 913.

⁹⁸ It is well recognised that this saying is strikingly similar to Hillel's saying concerning the 'whole Torah' (*b. Šabb.* 31a); cited above.

⁹⁹ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων [...] βιβλίων, Sirach Prologue 8–10; cf. 2 Macc 15.9; Luke 24.44–45. Cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, I, p. 484.

¹⁰⁰ See also Josephus's description of the twenty-two books which are regarded as 'decrees of God' (*Ag. Ap.* 1.42). These include five books of Moses and the writings by the prophets (*Ag. Ap.* 1.38–40). Moses and the prophets are regarded as 'learned, by inspiration from God' (*Ag. Ap.* 1.37). Barclay, *Against Apion*, pp. 28–32.

be abolished. Matthew is aware of the comparative language used in describing the commandments: there are ‘one of the least of these commandments’ (μία τῶν ἐντολῶν τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων, Matt 5.19) and ‘the weightier matters of the Law’ (τὰ βαρύτερα τοῦ νόμου, Matt 23.23).¹⁰¹ However, for Mathew, these descriptions concerning the commandments must not lead to the abrogation of any commandments. Therefore, even if a commandment is regarded as the least, it cannot be abolished (λύω, Matt 5.19). Similarly, those lighter matters of the Law are not to be abandoned (μὴ ἀφίέναι, Matt 23.23). These passages further suggest that Matthew is concerned about the tendency towards the abrogation of any commandments which is implied in Mark 12.28–34, and explain why Matthew differs from Mark’s account at significant places.

In sum, the differences between Matthew 22.34–40 and Mark 12.28–34 reflect Matthew’s clarification concerning the discussion of the most important commandments. He clarifies the ambiguities of the meanings of *πρῶτος* and *δεύτερος* in Mark’s narration, showing that these ordinal adjectives do not mean a ranking. Matthew also omits the statement which regards other commandments as less important than the double love commandments (cf. Mark 12.31), and omits the scribe’s statement concerning sacrifices (cf. Mark 12.33). Instead, he includes ‘on these two commandments hangs the whole Law and the Prophets’ (Matt 22.40), in order to show that the discussion concerning the ‘most important’ commandment is an identification of the double love commandments as the overarching and encompassing principle of all the commandments of God. This principle serves as the fundamental element of all commandments. This fundamental element exists in all commandments and does not supersede any commandments.

¹⁰¹ Concerning Matt 5.17–20 and 23.23, see further discussion in Chapter 6.

A summary of the commandments as love for God and love for one's neighbour can be further understood in light of the similar juxtaposition of love for God and love for fellow humans in some Jewish writings from around the turn of the Common Era, as will be discussed below.

2.2.2 *The practice of summarising the commandments among the ancient Jews*

In Matthew 22.36–40 and Mark 12.28–34, Jesus's answer juxtaposes the citations from Deuteronomy 6.4–5 and Leviticus 19.18.¹⁰² The combination of these two citations is first attested in Mark and is not found in earlier Jewish literature.¹⁰³ However, some earlier Jewish writings show the juxtaposition of love for God and love for one's neighbour in terms similar to Deuteronomy 6.4–5 and Leviticus 19.8,¹⁰⁴ appearing as the focus of keeping the commandments of the Lord, and as the summary of the Law.

2.2.2.1 *The juxtaposition of love for God and love for one's neighbour*

Firstly, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, which was probably written before the Common Era,¹⁰⁵ contains several passages juxtaposing the exhortation of loving God and

¹⁰² Luke also takes up the double love commandments from Mark. In Luke's narration, the mention of the double love commandments is a response to the question 'what shall I do to inherit eternal life' (Luke 10.25–27); the focus of that story is on love for one's neighbour (Luke 10.29–37).

¹⁰³ As mentioned above, the commandment 'love your neighbour as yourself' (Lev 19.18) is regarded as a summary of the Law (Rom 13.8, Gal 5.14; Jas 2.8); but in these texts the commandment 'love your God' (Deut 6.4–5) is not cited alongside. Meier, *Law and Love*, p. 15; Collins, *Mark*, p. 566; France, *Mark*, pp. 477–48; Luz, *Matthew 21–28*, p. 84.

¹⁰⁴ Dale C. Allison, 'Mark 12.28–31 and the Decalogue', in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. by Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner, JSNTSup, 104 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994), pp. 270–78 (pp. 270–71), in which Allison lists a number of texts which are 'near parallels' to Mark 12.28–31, including texts from *Jubilees*, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *The Letter of Aristeas* and Philo of Alexandria's treatises.

¹⁰⁵ The discovery of the fragments of the Aramaic Testament of Levi at Qumran shows that the literature originates before the Common Era. Charles and Kugel suggest that *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* was written in around second century BCE. R. H. Charles, 'The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Introduction', in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, ed. by R. H. Charles, 2 vols (Oxford:

loving one's neighbour (*T. Iss.* 5.1–2; 7.6; *T. Dan.* 5.1, 3; *T. Benj.* 3.1, 3). Three of these are situated in the context of an exhortation of keeping the Law or the commandments of God:

Φυλάξατε οὖν νόμον θεοῦ, τέκνα μου, καὶ τὴν ἀπλότητα κτήσασθε, καὶ ἐν ἀκακίᾳ πορεύεσθε, μὴ περιεργαζόμενοι ἐντολὰς κυρίου καὶ τοῦ πλησίον τὰς πράξεις· ἀλλ' ἀγαπᾶτε κύριον καὶ τὸν πλησίον, πένητα καὶ ἀσθενῆ ἐλεᾶτε. (*T. Iss.* 5.1–2)¹⁰⁶

Therefore, keep the Law of God, my children, and acquire sincerity, and walk in guiltlessness, not meddling in the commandments of the Lord and the activities of [your] neighbour; but love the Lord and [your] neighbour, show mercy on the poor and weak.

Φυλάξατε οὖν, τέκνα μου, τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ τὸν νόμον αὐτοῦ τηρήσατε· [...] ἀγαπᾶτε τὸν κύριον ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ζωῇ ὑμῶν, καὶ ἀλλήλους ἐν ἀληθινῇ καρδίᾳ. (*T. Dan.* 5.1, 3)

Therefore, my children, keep the commandments of the Lord and observe his Law. [...] Love the Lord with all your life, and [love] one another with a true heart.

Καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν, τέκνα μου, ἀγαπήσατε κύριον τὸν θεὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ φυλάξατε ἐντολὰς [...]. φοβεῖσθε κύριον καὶ ἀγαπᾶτε τὸν πλησίον. (*T. Benj.* 3.1, 3)

Therefore, you, my children, love the Lord God of heaven and keep the commandments [...]. Fear the Lord and love [your] neighbour.

These passages show that the children of the patriarchs are exhorted to keep the Law (νόμος) and the commandments (ἐντολαί) of the Lord by loving God and loving one's neighbour or loving one another.¹⁰⁷ *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* contains Christian

Clarendon, 1913), II, 282–95 (pp. 289–90); James L. Kugel, 'Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', in *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture*, ed. by Louis H. Feldman, James L. Kugel, and Lawrence H. Schiffman, 3 vols (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 2013), II, 1697–1855 (pp. 1697–1703). For a suggestion to read this literature as a Christian text, see Marinus de Jonge, 'The Two Great Commandments in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', *Novum Testamentum*, 44.4 (2002), 371–92.

¹⁰⁶ Unless otherwise indicated, the Greek texts of *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* are taken from *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*, ed. by Marinus de Jonge, PVTG, I.2 (Leiden: Brill, 1978), and the English translations are my own.

¹⁰⁷ To love fellow humans is a prominent exhortation in *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. In addition to these three cited passages (*T. Iss.* 5.1–2; *T. Dan.* 5.1, 3; *T. Benj.* 3.1, 3), the exhortation 'love one another' (ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους) appears in another three passages (*T. Zeb.* 8.5; *T. Gad.* 7.7; *T. Jos.* 17.2), and the exhortation 'everyone love his brother' (ἀγαπήσατε ἕκαστος τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ) appears in another two passages (*T. Sim.* 4.7; *T. Gad.* 6.1).

elements;¹⁰⁸ this raises a query whether these exhortations which juxtapose loving God and loving one's neighbour are Christian interpolations.¹⁰⁹ However, the existence of similar exhortations before the Common Era can be further supported by evidence from *Jubilees*.¹¹⁰

Jubilees narrates that Noah, Abraham and Isaac gave their wills and testaments to their descendants with exhortations regarding keeping the commandments, serving the Lord and loving one another. First, Noah 'prescribe[d] for his grandsons the ordinances and the commandments' and exhorted them to 'bless the one who had created them' and to 'love one another' (*Jub.* 7.20). Second, Abraham ordered his children 'to keep the way of the Lord [...] and that they should love one another' (*Jub.* 20.2). Third, Isaac ordered Esau and Jacob to 'practise brotherly love among yourselves', 'love one another', worship and serve the Lord (*Jub.* 36.3–8).¹¹¹ These passages, in which the patriarchs in their testaments exhorted their descendants to love God and love one another, are similar to the above examples from *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. This similarity suggests that the juxtaposition of love for God and love for each other in *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is probably pre-Christian.

Allison points out that the examples from *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, which have the exhortations ἀγαπᾶτε κύριον and ἀγαπᾶτε τὸν πλησίον (or ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους) together (particularly *T. Iss.* 5.2; *T. Dan* 5.3), are close parallels of the juxtaposition of loving God and loving one's neighbour in Mark.¹¹² For the patriarchs, loving the Lord and loving

¹⁰⁸ Examples of the Christian elements include: 'the saviour of the Gentiles' (ὁ σωτὴρ τῶν ἐθνῶν, *T. Dan* 6.9); 'there the Lord will be mistreated, disdained and lifted up on a tree' (ἐκεῖ κύριος ὑβρισθήσεται, καὶ ἐξουθενωθήσεται, καὶ ἐπὶ ξύλον ὑψωθήσεται, *T. Benj.* 9.3). Kugel, 'Testaments', II, pp. 1850, 1854 notes 202, 299.

¹⁰⁹ For example, Gundry and Collins are concerned about the possible Christian influences on *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Gundry, *Mark*, p. 713; Collins, *Mark*, p. 566.

¹¹⁰ Vanderkam suggests that *Jubilees* was written in the second century BCE. James C. VanderKam, *Jubilees*, Hermeneia, 2 vols (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2018), I, pp. 37–38.

¹¹¹ The English translations (translated from Ethiopic) are taken from VanderKam, *Jubilees*.

¹¹² Allison, 'Mark 12.28–31', p. 270.

one's neighbour (or 'one another') are very important, so that in wills and testaments they focussed on these and ordered their descendants to do these. Thus, loving God and loving one another can be regarded as an implicit summary of the patriarch's most important instructions. Loving God and loving one's neighbour, amongst a few other exhortations, appeared as a summary of the essential ways for keeping the commandments of the Lord, without any sense of ranking.

The juxtaposition of love for God and love for one's neighbour as a summary of the Law is comparable to the juxtaposition of εὐσέβεια ('piety') and δικαιοσύνη ('justice') in *The Letter of Aristeas* and in Philo of Alexandria's treatises. In these texts, there are descriptions of the relationship between εὐσέβεια and δικαιοσύνη and the commandments in the Law. These descriptions can shed further light on what a summary of the Law would entail.

2.2.2.2 *The juxtaposition of εὐσέβεια and δικαιοσύνη as a summary of the Law*

Aristeas and Philo discuss the commandments by juxtaposing εὐσέβεια ('piety') and δικαιοσύνη ('justice'), which for them are the expressions of one's duty to God (εὐσέβεια) and to fellow humans (δικαιοσύνη). These expressions are comparable to love for God (Deut 6.4–5) and love for one's neighbour (Lev 19.8).¹¹³

The Letter of Aristeas was written within the second century BCE.¹¹⁴ It describes the Jewish Law (the Pentateuch) as matters concerning εὐσέβεια and δικαιοσύνη:

διαστειλάμενος οὖν τὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας καὶ δικαιοσύνης πρῶτον ὁ νομοθέτης ἡμῶν, καὶ διδάξας ἕκαστα περὶ τούτων. (*Let. Aris.* 131)

Therefore, our lawgiver first defined matters concerning piety and justice, explaining each in detail.¹¹⁵

¹¹³ Berger, *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu*, pp. 155–60.

¹¹⁴ Barclay, *Jews*, p. 445.

¹¹⁵ Wright's translation; taken from Wright III, *Aristeas*, p. 246.

This statement expresses an idea of the whole and the details. The Law as a whole concerns matters concerning piety and justice, and these matters are explained by the lawgiver (Moses) in detail. This concept is similar to Hillel's saying, which regards the rest of the commandments as the explanation ('commentary') of the whole Torah, which he summarises in a maxim concerning love for fellow humans (*b. Šabb. 31a*).¹¹⁶ The relation between the whole and the details can be discerned further from an illustration given by Philo, in which *εὐσέβεια* and *δικαιοσύνη* are juxtaposed and are designated respectively as duty to God and duty to fellow humans:

ἔστι δ' ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἀμυθῆτων λόγων καὶ δογμάτων δύο τὰ ἀνωτάτω κεφάλαια, τό τε πρὸς θεὸν δι' εὐσεβείας καὶ ὁσιότητος καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους διὰ φιλανθρωπίας καὶ δικαιοσύνης· ὧν ἑκάτερον εἰς πολυσχιδεῖς ἰδέας καὶ πάσας ἐπαινετὰς τέμνεται. (*Spec. 2.63*)

And there are, so to say, of the vast number of particular words and ordinances, two highest heads: one towards God through piety and holiness, and one towards humans through philanthropy and justice. Each of them is cut into much-divided classes and all laudable things.¹¹⁷

In this passage, the 'particular words and ordinances' are the words studied by the Jews on the seventh day; these words and ordinances are the 'sacred instructions' (*ἱεραὶ ὑφηγήσεις*) given through Moses (*Spec. 2.62–64*). Philo regards 'piety and holiness' to God and 'philanthropy and justice'¹¹⁸ to humans as the 'two highest heads' (*δύο τὰ ἀνωτάτω κεφάλαια*) among the vast number of particular laws.¹¹⁹ In this context, Philo uses *κεφάλαιον* in the sense of 'a summary'. This sense is clear when Philo designates the Decalogue as the 'heads' (*κεφάλαια, Decal. 19*), the summary of all the particular laws (*Decal. 154, 156, 158*). Likewise, the 'two

¹¹⁶ Cited above; p. 49.

¹¹⁷ Colson's translation (LCL); slightly modified.

¹¹⁸ In the present study, *φιλανθρωπία* is translated as 'philanthropy' to mean 'love for humans'. This use of 'philanthropy' appears in older English literature; *OED*, s.v. 'philanthropy', §1. Colson translates *φιλανθρωπία* as 'humanity'.

¹¹⁹ *κεφάλαιος*, a derivative of *κεφαλῆ* ('head'), means 'principal' (an adjective); its substantive form is used to refer to 'summary', 'main point'. *LSJ*, s.v. 'κεφάλαιος'.

highest heads' of duty to God and duty to humans are the summary of the vast amount of words and ordinances (*Spec.* 2.63). All the particular laws are the parts of these heads, as Philo describes them in the terms μέρος ('part') and κεφάλαιον ('head', or 'sum'),¹²⁰ and illustrates their relationship as: 'each of them [the two highest heads] is cut into much divided classes and all laudable things' (*Spec.* 2.63).

Philo's designation of piety, holiness, philanthropy and justice as 'heads' shows a summary of the Law into principal elements. The use of the term 'highest heads' is not meant to prioritise these headings over other laws; rather, all the laws are parts of the heads, as illustrated by the cutting image. This description of the relationship between the principal elements and all the commandments is comparable to the hanging image in Matthew 22.40. Philo's description of duty to God and duty to humans as 'heads' and Matthew's description of the whole Law as hanging on the double love commandments can be understood similarly as: the principal element of the Law, love for God and love for fellow humans, is embedded in all commandments.

2.2.3 Summary

Matthew understands the discussion of the most important commandment as summarising all the commandments of God with the encompassing principle of love for God and love for fellow humans. He removes Mark's descriptions which prioritise the double love commandments over other commandments. Using the hanging image, Matthew shows that the designation of 'the most important' can be used as referring to the principal element which is embedded in all the laws. This relationship between the summary and other commandments can also be understood in light of Philo's description of duty to God and duty to humans as the 'highest heads' of all the commandments. For Matthew, the designation of

¹²⁰ LSJ, s.v. 'κεφάλαιος', §II.5.b; *BrillDAG*, s.v. 'κεφᾶλαιον'.

the double love commandments as the most important commandments is a summary rather than a priority: the emphasis on love for God and love for humans does not downgrade other commandments.

2.3 Conclusion

The discussion of the most important commandments is narrated differently by Matthew and Mark. Mark's account shows a prioritisation of the double love commandments and implies a tendency towards the possible abrogation or non-observance of other commandments.

Matthew is concerned about this tendency and narrates the same discussion as a summary of the commandments. One of the significant points of Matthew's modification of Mark 12.28–34 is the omission of the allusion to Hosea 6.6, which appears in Mark's account as regarding love for God and love for one's neighbour as more desirable than all sacrifices. The ways in which Matthew modifies Mark's account indicates that he likely understands Hosea 6.6 in a way which does not downgrade the cultic commandments. This understanding is indicative for exploring the significance of Matthew's double citation of Hosea 6.6 in his gospel.

Before investigating the passages where Matthew cites Hosea 6.6, a discussion of Philo's summary of the Law would be helpful for further understanding the ways in which the 'heads' of the Law relate to all the commandments. As mentioned above, Philo designates the Decalogue as the headings of the particular laws. Moreover, he summarises the Decalogue further into two sets of duty and describes each set in terms of *φιλόθεος* ('having love for God') and *φιλόανθρωπος* ('having love for humankind').¹²¹ An investigation of Philo's discussion concerning the Law can then be helpful for understanding the meaning of summarising all the commandments in terms of love for God and love for fellow humans, and

¹²¹ As will be discussed in the next Chapter.

might be helpful for articulating Matthew's understanding of the relationship between the double love commandments and other commandments, especially the cultic commandments.

Chapter 3

Philo's summary of the Law

As mentioned in the previous Chapter, Philo's summary of the Law as duty to God and duty to humans is similar to Matthew's summary of the Law as love for God and love for one's neighbour. The present Chapter will explore how Philo summarises the law and distinguishes between different laws, in order to examine whether he establishes a hierarchy of importance among the laws, or whether the distinctions still affirm the equal importance of all the laws discussed. To this end we will explore here Philo's distinctions between written and unwritten laws (§3.1), and the different categories of written laws (§3.2). At each point our concern will be to show how distinctions in kind, or in scope, do not entail differences in significance or importance, even where they may, at first glance, appear to do so.

Philo classifies the oracles delivered through Moses into 'three kinds' (τρεῖς ἰδέαι): the first is the story of creation, the second is history, and the third is legislation (*Praem.* 1; cf. *Mos.* 2.46–47). This division reflects the order and the structure of the Pentateuch, which begins with the story of creation, is followed by the life stories of the patriarchs and contains subsequently the written words of the Law (Deut 28.58). Philo discusses these three kinds in several treatises, which are named his 'Exposition of the Law',¹ including *On the Creation of the World*, *On the Life of Abraham*, *On the Life of Joseph*,² *On the Decalogue*, *On the Special*

¹ 'Exposition of the Law' is a conventional term used nowadays for naming this group of Philo's treatises. This phrase does not appear in ancient sources. James R. Royse and Adam Kamesar, 'The Works of Philo', in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*, ed. by Adam Kamesar (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 32–64 (p. 45 note 35).

² Prior to *On the Life of Joseph*, Philo had written on the lives of Isaac and Jacob (*Ios. 1*), but the treatises on these two patriarchs are now lost.

Laws I–IV, On Virtues, On Rewards and Punishments. His two treatises *On the Life of Moses* are also closely related to (but are most likely not part of) the Exposition of the Law.³

Philo uses transitional statements to show the ways in which the above treatises relate to each other.⁴ For example, at the beginning of *On the Life Abraham*, Philo mentions that his discussion is the examination of ‘the holy laws’ (οἱ ἱεροὶ νόμοι, *Abr.* 1) which are written ‘in five books’ (ἐν πέντε βίβλοις, *Abr.* 1). His Exposition of the Law is thus the examination of the Pentateuch, and his sequence is to discuss the lives of the patriarchs before examining the legislative part (*Abr.* 3). Similarly, in the opening sentence of *On the Decalogue*, Philo states that he has discussed the lives of the patriarchs and will continue with the examination of the written laws (*Decal.* 1). Philo summarises the overall content and sequence of these treatises in *On Rewards and Punishments* 1–3, stating that he has begun the examination of the holy laws with the treatise about the creation of the world,⁵ which is followed by the discussion of the lives of the Patriarchs,⁶ and subsequently the examination of the legislation and the discussion of virtues.⁷ Finally, he concludes the examination of the laws with *On Rewards and Punishments*.

³ The ways in which *On the Life of Moses* relates to Philo’s other treatises is a matter of debate. Goodenough argues that *Mos.* was not written as part of the Exposition but that the two were ‘companion pieces’. Erwin R. Goodenough, ‘Philo’s Exposition of the Law and His De vita Mosis’, *Harvard Theological Review*, 26 (1933), 109–25 (p. 113). Runia agrees and suggests that *Mos.* was written before the treatises of the Exposition. David T. Runia, *On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses*, PACS, 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), pp. 1–4. A recent discussion concerning this matter is offered by Sterling, who similarly suggests that *Mos.* is not part of but ‘an introductory biography to the Exposition’; Gregory E. Sterling, ‘Philo of Alexandria’s Life of Moses: An Introduction to the Exposition of the Law’, *The Studia Philonica Annual*, 30 (2018), 31–45 (p. 44).

⁴ For a study of these transitional statements, see Peder Borgen, ‘Philo of Alexandria – a Systematic Philosopher or an Eclectic Editor?’, *Symbolae Osloenses*, 71 (1996), 115–34. Wilson also provides a helpful introduction to the ways in which these treatises are linked in sequence; Walter T. Wilson, *Philo of Alexandria, On Virtues*, PACS, 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), pp. 1–4.

⁵ *On the Creation of the World*.

⁶ *On the Life of Abraham* [Isaac, Jacob] and *On the Life of Joseph*.

⁷ *On the Decalogue, On the Special Laws* and *On Virtues*.

Since these treatises are Philo's examination of the laws, the present Chapter will focus on them to see the ways in which Philo classifies and categorises the laws. The first section discusses the ways in which Philo explains the relationship between the historical part and the legislation in terms of 'unwritten laws' and 'written laws'. The second section discusses the ways in which Philo subsumes the particular laws under the main headings.

3.1 *The unwritten laws and the written laws*

For Philo, the holy laws are 'written' (*ἀναγραφέντες*) in five books (*Abr.* 1). However, he further categorises the content of these books in terms of 'unwritten laws' and 'written laws'. These terms are explicitly mentioned when Philo transitions from the discussion of the Patriarchs' lives to the discussion of the legislation:

Τοὺς βίους τῶν κατὰ Μωυσέα σοφῶν ἀνδρῶν, οὓς ἀρχηγέτας τοῦ ἡμετέρου ἔθνους καὶ νόμους ἀγράφους αἱ ἱερὰ βιβλίοι δηλοῦσιν, ἐν ταῖς προτέραις συντάξεσι μεμνηκῶς κατὰ τὰ ἀκόλουθα ἐξῆς τῶν ἀναγραφέντων νόμων τὰς ἰδέας ἀκριβῶσω (*Decal.* 1)

Having related in the preceding treatises the lives of those whom Moses judged to be wise men, who are set before us in the holy books as founders of our nation and as unwritten laws, I shall now proceed in due course to investigate accurately the kinds of the written laws.⁸

The 'unwritten laws' (*νόμοι ἄγραφοι*) are the 'wise men' themselves, and the 'written laws' (*ἀναγραφέντες νόμοι*) are the Decalogue and the particular laws. The designation of 'unwritten laws' as the wise men has already appeared in Philo's earlier treatise *On the Life of Abraham*.

On concluding the life story of Abraham, Philo mentions Moses' praise of this 'wise man' (*σοφός*), Abraham: 'this man did the divine law and all divine ordinances' (*τὸν θεῖον*

⁸ Colson's translation; slightly modified.

νόμον καὶ τὰ θεῖα προστάγματα πάντα ἐποίησεν ὁ ἀνὴρ οὗτος, *Abr.* 275).⁹ Philo explains that

Abraham did the divine law in the manner of not being taught by writings:

οὐ γράμμασιν ἀναδιδασκόμενος, ἀλλ' ἀγράφῳ τῆ φύσει σπουδάσας ὑγιαίνουσιν καὶ ἀνόσοις ὁρμαῖς ἐπακολουθῆσαι (*Abr.* 275)

[Abraham did the divine law] not being instructed by writings, but hastening with unwritten nature, to follow the healthy and uncontaminated impulses'.¹⁰

In this passage, Philo mentions the ways in which the wise men relate to the 'written' and the 'unwritten', and links the 'unwritten' to 'nature'. These notions correlate to some terms and concepts that are found in other literature. The differentiation of 'unwritten' and 'written' laws has appeared in ancient Greek literature; later the Stoics imply that 'unwritten' is a feature of the 'true law' and relate the 'true law' to 'nature'. Since Philo employs these terms in his discussion of the Law, it would be helpful to explore the relevant concepts in Graeco-Roman literature before continuing with the discussion of the ways in which Philo differentiates the 'unwritten' and the 'written' laws.

3.1.1 Unwritten laws in ancient Greek literature

The term 'unwritten laws' (ἄγραφοι νόμοι) literally means laws that are not written; in ancient Greek literature this term refers to different ideas. For example, the Athenian politician Andocides (c.440–c.390 BCE) uses ἄγραφος to describe a law that is no longer written.¹¹

⁹ This is a paraphrase of Gen 26.5: 'your father Abraam obeyed my voice and kept my ordinances, my commandments, my statutes and my precepts' (ὑπήκουσεν Αβρααμ ὁ πατήρ σου τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς καὶ ἐφύλαξεν τὰ προστάγματά μου καὶ τὰς ἐντολάς μου καὶ τὰ δικαιώματά μου καὶ τὰ νόμιμά μου, Gen 26.5 LXX).

¹⁰ The English translation is taken from Ellen Birnbaum and John M. Dillon, *Philo of Alexandria, On the Life of Abraham: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, PACS, 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2021), p. 136; slightly modified.

¹¹ Unless otherwise indicated, the life years of the Graeco-Roman people are taken from *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, ed. by Simon Hornblower, Antony Spawforth, and Esther Eidinow, 4th edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

Laws of this kind were previously written in the legislation but were discarded in the revised legislation, becoming ‘unwritten’, thus no longer having legal force (*De Mysteriis* 85).¹²

‘Unwritten laws’ is also used to refer to customs.¹³ Plato (c.429–347 BCE) uses *ἄγραφα νόμιμα* to mean the ‘ancestral laws’ (*πατριοὶ νόμοι*) which are not enacted ‘in writings’ (*ἐν γράμμασιν*) but are the ‘bonds of every constitution’ (*δεσμοὶ πάσης πολιτείας*) and should not be left aside (*Leg.* 793a–c).¹⁴ Aristotle (384–322 BCE), categorising laws into ‘common law’ (*νόμος κοινός*) and ‘particular law’ (*νόμος ἴδιος*), further divides the ‘particular law’ into ‘written’ (*γεγραμμένος*) and ‘unwritten’ (*ἄγραφος*) such that ‘unwritten’ refers to the custom of the particular community (*Rhet.* 1.1373b–1374a).¹⁵ Dio Chrysostom (c.40/50–110/120 CE) also uses ‘unwritten law’ (*νόμος ἄγραφος*) with reference to the custom of a particular community (*Consuet.* 1).¹⁶

One form of ‘unwritten laws’ in Greek philosophy takes ‘unwritten laws’ to be laws given by gods and prioritises divine laws over human laws. Sophocles’ *Antigone*, which contains the earliest witness to the idea of ‘unwritten laws’ in Greek literature,¹⁷ contrasts human ‘laws’ (*νόμοι*) with ‘unwritten and unfailing statutes of gods’ (*ἄγραπτα κάσφαλῆ θεῶν νόμιμα*). These divine statutes are regarded as incapable of being overridden (*ὑπερδραμεῖν*) by

¹² John W. Martens, *One God, One Law: Philo of Alexandria on the Mosaic and Greco-Roman Law*, SPhA, 2 (Boston: Brill Academic, 2003), pp. 3–4. The Greek text is taken from Andokides, *On the Mysteries*, ed. by Douglas M. MacDowell (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962). Unless otherwise indicated, the English translations of the Greek texts cited in the present Chapter are my own.

¹³ Martens, *One God*, p. 5.

¹⁴ The Greek text is taken from Plato, *Laws*, LCL, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926).

¹⁵ See below (on the next page) for Aristotle’s other use of ‘written’ and ‘unwritten’: to differentiate particular law and common law. The Greek text is taken from Aristotle, *Art of Rhetoric*, LCL, 193 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926).

¹⁶ Martens, *One God*, pp. 6–7. The Greek text is taken from Dio Chrysostom, *Discourses 61–80*, LCL, 385 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1951).

¹⁷ Martens, *One God*, p. 7.

mortals (*Antigone* 450–55).¹⁸ The divine statutes thus are regarded as superior to human decrees.

Socrates (469–399 BCE) also recognises ἀγραφοὶ νόμοι as laws that are made by gods,¹⁹ emphasising the universality of these laws: such laws, like fearing gods and honouring parents, ‘are customary’ (νομιζόμενοι) in every country; only gods, not humans, can achieve uniformity of such kind (Xenophon, *Mem.* 4.4.19–20).²⁰ Similarly, Aristotle regards the ‘common law’ (νόμος κοινός) as ‘unwritten [things]’ (ἀγραφα) that are ‘universally recognised’ (παρὰ πᾶσιν ὁμολογεῖσθαι), in contrast to the ‘particular law’ (νόμος ἴδιος), which is ‘the written [law] (γεγραμμένον) in accordance with which a state is administered’ (*Rhet.* 1368b).²¹

‘The common law’ is also mentioned by the Stoics, who equate it with Zeus.²² They see a virtuous life as ‘the life following nature’ (τὸ ἀκολουθῶν τῇ φύσει ζῆν, Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 7.1 Zeno 88) which is led by ‘the common law’ (ὁ νόμος ὁ κοινός), and regard ‘the common law’ as ‘the right reason’ (ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος) which is identical to Zeus:

ὁ νόμος ὁ κοινός, ὅσπερ ἐστὶν ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος, διὰ πάντων ἐρχόμενος, ὁ αὐτὸς ὢν τῷ Διί, καθηγεμόνι τούτῳ τῆς τῶν ὄντων διοικήσεως ὄντι. (Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 7.1 Zeno 88)

¹⁸ The Greek text is taken from Sophocles, *Antigone*, LCL, 21 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994).

¹⁹ Cf. Martens, *One God*, p. 8.

²⁰ Νομίζω can mean ‘use customarily’ and, in passive, ‘to be customary’. LSJ, s.v. ‘νομίζω’. The Greek text is taken from Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, LCL, 168 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1923).

²¹ Cf. Martens, *One God*, p. 10. The Greek texts and the English translations are taken from Aristotle, *Art of Rhetoric*, trans. by J. H. Freese, LCL, 193 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926); the translation is slightly modified.

²² Martens, *One God*, p. 19.

[T]he law common to all things, that is to say, the right reason which pervades all things, and is identical with this Zeus, lord and ruler of all that is.²³

This linkage of a common law, the right reason and the deity is further elaborated by Cicero (106–43 BCE):²⁴

True law (*vera lex*) is right reason, consonant with nature (*recta ratio naturae congruens*), spread through all people. It is constant and eternal; [...] It is wrong to pass laws obviating this law; it is not permitted to abrogate any part of it; it cannot be repealed as a whole. [...] There will not be one law at Rome and another at Athens, one now and another later; but all nations at all times will be bound by this one eternal and unchangeable law, and the god (*deus*) will be the one common master and general (so to speak) of all people. He is the author, expounder, and mover of this law. (Cicero, *Rep.* 3.33)²⁵

Cicero regards God as the author of the ‘true law’ (*vera lex*), which is ‘right reason, consonant with nature’ (*recta ratio naturae congruens*). This concept of ‘right reason’ follows closely after the concept of ‘the true reason’ (ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος) mentioned by the early Stoics.²⁶ Cicero emphasises the universality and eternality of the ‘true law’: it is not to be altered, repealed or abrogated; it is eternal, unchangeable and valid for all nations in all times. In other words, the ‘true law’ is superior to any human legislation, which are changeable and can be abolished.

In another passage, Cicero states that the law which is ‘the highest reason, rooted in nature’ is the ‘highest law’:²⁷

Law is the highest reason, rooted in nature (*lex est ratio summa, insita in natura*), which commands things that must be done and prohibits the opposite. [...] But since all our speech is based on popular conceptions, we must sometimes speak in popular terms, and call that a law (in the language of the common people) which prescribes in

²³ Unless otherwise indicated, the Greek texts and the English translations of *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* are taken from Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, trans. by R. D. Hicks, LCL, 184 & 185 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925).

²⁴ Martens, *One God*, p. 20.

²⁵ The Latin texts of Cicero’s *De Re Publica* and *De Legibus* are taken from Marcus Tullius Cicero, *De Re Publica, De Legibus*, LCL, 213 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928). The English translations are taken from *Cicero: On the Commonwealth and On the Laws*, ed. & trans. by James E. G. Zetzel, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017).

²⁶ Martens, *One God*, p. 20.

²⁷ Cicero’s *Rep.* 3.33 and *Leg.* 1.18–19 are both cited by Christine E. Hayes, *What’s Divine about Divine Law? Early Perspectives* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015), p. 57.

writing (*quae scripta sancit*) what it wants by ordering or forbidding. But in establishing the nature of justice, let us begin from that highest law (*summa lege*), which was born aeons before any law was written or indeed before any state was established (Cicero, *Leg.* 1.18–19).²⁸

Cicero contrasts ‘the highest law’ (*summa lex*) with the law ‘which prescribes in writing’ (*quae scripta sancit*) and states that the highest law was born before any law was written or any state was established. The eternity and the unwritten nature of this law is highlighted. Therefore, a concept of true law, which is right reason in agreement with nature, authored by God, eternal, universal and unwritten is clearly discussed by Cicero. Cicero regards this unwritten true law as the highest law and prioritises it over any written law.

The above survey shows that in Graeco-Roman literature, ‘unwritten laws’ can mean the unwritten customs in particular communities, or customs that are generally recognised in every country. One prominent feature of the discussions of unwritten law(s) relates such law(s) to deity. Socrates relates such universal unwritten laws to gods, and the Stoics relate one true law to God, to right reason and to nature. This unwritten law is given by God, universal and eternal, and is regarded as superior to all human laws which are prescribed in writings.

Therefore, regarding the concepts of unwritten laws which existed around the turn of the Common Era, one feature of these concepts is the priority of the unwritten law(s) over the written laws in terms of the superiority of God over humans, universal over particular, and eternal over temporary. Since Philo categorises the historical part and the legislative part of the Pentateuch in terms of unwritten laws and written laws, it is necessary to examine the ways in which Philo relates the written laws to the unwritten laws so that the significance of this differentiation can be discerned.

²⁸ Zetzel’s translation.

3.1.2 The implications of ἀγραφοὶ νόμοι in Philo's Exposition of the Law

Philo uses the phrase ‘unwritten laws’ (ἀγραφοὶ νόμοι) in two main respects. First, ἀγραφοὶ νόμοι is used to contrast the lives of the Patriarchs (the historical part) with the written legislation in the Pentateuch (*Abr.* 5; *Decal.* 1); within this respect the concept of ‘unwritten’ also pertains to the law of nature and virtuous lives (*Abr.* 16, 275; *Virt.* 194). Second, ἀγραφοὶ νόμοι refers to ‘ancestral customs’ (ἀρχαῖα ἔθνη, *Spec.* 4.149–150), which are the instructions handed down without being written, in contrast to the ‘written laws’ (οἱ ἀναγραφέντες νόμοι, *Spec.* 4.149–150). Closely related to this respect is Philo’s use of ‘unwritten customs’ (ἀγραφα ἔθνη) to denote those that function like the written laws but are unwritten (*Hypoth.* 7.6; *Legat.* 115).²⁹ The discussion below focusses on Philo’s use of ‘unwritten laws’ with regard to the first respect, to discern the implications of his contrast of the Patriarchs’ lives with the legislation in terms of ‘unwritten laws’ and ‘written laws’.

In the conclusion of *On the Life of Abraham*, Philo indicates the ways in which Abraham relates to the legislative part of the Pentateuch:

τοιούτος ὁ βίος τοῦ πρώτου καὶ ἀρχηγέτου τοῦ ἔθνους ἐστίν, ὡς μὲν ἔνιοι φήσουσι, νόμιμος, ὡς δ’ ὁ παρ’ ἐμοῦ λόγος ἔδειξε, νόμος αὐτὸς ὢν καὶ θεσμὸς ἀγραφος. (*Abr.* 276)

Such, then, is the life of the first and founder of the nation—as some would have it, one who kept the law, but as my account has made clear, himself a law and an unwritten ordinance.³⁰

For Philo, Abraham ‘did the divine law and all divine ordinances’ (*Abr.* 275), but Abraham did this even though the legislation was not written down: he was not taught by the written words.³¹ In other words, he was not an observer of the written laws. Instead, Abraham did the

²⁹ See also the categories used by Martens in describing Philo’s notions of ‘unwritten law’. John W. Martens, ‘Unwritten Law in Philo: A Response to Naomi G. Cohen’, *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 43 (1992), 38–45 (p. 45).

³⁰ The English translation is taken from Birnbaum and Dillon, *Abraham*, p. 136.

³¹ Mentioned above, p. 63.

divine law and all divine ordinances by ‘hastening with unwritten nature’ (*Abr.* 275; cf. *Abr.* 16); he himself was ‘a law’ (νόμος) and ‘an unwritten law’ (θεσμὸς ἄγραφος).³² Philo explains the relationship between this unwritten law (Abraham) and the written laws in two ways. These two ways, at first glance, might imply a sense of prioritising the unwritten laws over the written laws.

First, Philo uses ‘originals’ and ‘copies’ to refer to the lives of the Patriarchs and the written laws respectively:

ἐπεὶ δὲ τοὺς νόμους κατὰ τὸ ἐξῆς <καὶ> ἀκόλουθον ἀναγκαῖον διερευνᾶσθαι, τῶν ἐπὶ μέρους καὶ ὡς ἂν εἰκόνων ὑπέρθεσιν ποιησάμενοι τοὺς καθολικωτέρους καὶ ὡς ἂν ἀρχετύπους προτέρους διερευνήσωμεν. οὗτοι δὲ εἰσιν ἀνδρῶν οἱ ἀνεπιλήπτως καὶ καλῶς βιώσαντες, ὧν τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐν ταῖς ἱερωτάταις ἐστηλιτεῦσθαι γραφαῖς συμβέβηκεν. (*Abr.* 3–4)

But, since it is necessary to carry out our examination of the law in regular sequence, let us postpone consideration of particular laws, which are, so to speak, copies, and examine first those which are more general and may be called the originals of those copies. These are such men as lived good and blameless lives, whose virtues stand permanently recorded in the most holy scriptures.³³

The ‘originals’ (ἀρχέτυποι) in this passage, as Philo states, are the men who lived virtuous lives. They are the ‘the living and rational laws’ (οἱ ἔμψυχοι καὶ λογικοὶ νόμοι, *Abr.* 5; cf. *Mos.* 1.162; 2.4) and the ‘unwritten laws’ (νόμοι ἄγραφοι).³⁴

νόμοι δὲ τινες ἄγραφοι καὶ οἱ βίοι τῶν ζηλωσάντων τὴν ἀρετὴν. (*Virt.* 194)

The lives of those who strive for virtue are unwritten laws of a certain kind.³⁵

³² Martens suggests that θεσμὸς ἄγραφος in *Abr.* 276 ‘can only be translated as “unwritten law”’. Martens, ‘Unwritten Law’, p. 43 note 31.

³³ Colson’s translation.

³⁴ Philo is probably the only person in the Graeco-Roman world who explicitly regards the ‘living laws’ as the ‘unwritten laws’. Martens, ‘Unwritten Law’, p. 43 note 31.

³⁵ Wilson’s translation; in idem, *On Virtues*, p. 84.

These lives are the unwritten laws, which are recorded in the holy scriptures for instructing the later generations to follow and do the same (*Abr.* 4). Philo describes them as the ‘originals’ of the particular laws, which are the ‘copies’ (εἰκόνας, or ‘images’, *Abr.* 3).

Philo is familiar with the possible implications of a contrast between the ‘originals’ and the ‘copies’. He says elsewhere that ‘an original is superior to a copy’ (διαφέρει ἀρχέτυπον εἰκόνας, *QG* 4.110b),³⁶ and that ‘every likeness by its deceptive resemblance falsifies the original’ (πᾶσα δὲ εἰκὼν ὁμοιότητι εὐπαραγωγῶ ψεύδεται τὸ ἀρχέτυπον, *Praem.* 29).³⁷ Therefore, a contrast in terms of ‘originals’ and ‘copies’ might imply a comparison which regards the written laws as inferior to the unwritten laws.

The second way in which Philo explains the relationship between the lives of the Patriarchs and the legislation is by stating that the patriarchs (who are the living laws, the unwritten laws) managed to live virtuous lives even before the written laws have been enacted. They followed an unwritten law, which is ‘nature’ (φύσις, *Abr.* 5, 16, 275). As mentioned above, the Stoics regard a virtuous life as a life following nature, and regard the unwritten highest law as right reason which is in agreement with nature.³⁸ When Philo states that the Patriarchs followed unwritten nature and lived virtuous lives, a sense of undermining the written legislation seems implied. Therefore, the connection of the Patriarchs’ lives to the unwritten nature might imply that Philo, like the Stoics, prioritises the unwritten law of nature

³⁶ The Greek text is taken from Philo of Alexandria, *Philo: Supplement*, LCL, 380 & 401, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953), II, p. 223; cf. *idem*, I, p. 395. Διαφέρω can mean ‘to differ from’ in a comparative sense of ‘to be superior to’, ‘to surpass’; BDAG, s.v. ‘διαφέρω’ §4; LSJ, s.v. ‘διαφέρω’ §III.4.

³⁷ Colson’s translation.

³⁸ See above, pp. 65–67.

over any written legislation including the Mosaic laws.³⁹ It might also imply that the written laws are superfluous or redundant because there is already an unwritten law which guides people towards virtuous lives.⁴⁰ The Patriarchs are the clear examples of those who live virtuous lives without a written legislation.

However, Philo's notion of the 'originals/copies' and the 'unwritten laws/written legislation' relationship does not assign an inferior position to the written legislation. Regarding the 'originals/copies' relationship, Philo has a nuanced understanding: he is aware of a kind of 'copy' (εἰκῶν) which exactly reflects the 'original' (ἀρχέτυπον), 'is an accurate and clearly marked casting' (εἰς ἔμφασιν ἀκριβοῦς ἐκμαγείου τρανὸν τύπον ἔχοντος, *Opif.* 71).⁴¹ This perspective fits well in Philo's discussion of the relationship between the Patriarchs' lives and the written legislation, because Philo states that 'the established laws are nothing other than reminders of the life of the men of old' (τοὺς τεθέντας νόμους μηδὲν ἄλλ' ἢ ὑπομνήματα εἶναι βίου τῶν παλαιῶν, *Abr.* 5).⁴² This statement clarifies the meaning of the Patriarchs' lives as the 'originals' of the particular laws: the legislation is an accurate impression of these unwritten living laws.

This concept of the 'copy' as an accurate impression of the 'original' can be further confirmed by Philo's understanding of the purpose of the written legislation: as guiding people to live virtuous lives, the goal of human existence (*Virt.* 15).⁴³ This, in turn, clarifies Philo's understanding of the relationship between unwritten nature and the written legislation:

³⁹ Some scholars are concerned about this implication; e.g., Hindy Najman, 'The Law of Nature and the Authority of Mosaic Law', *The Studia Philonica Annual*, 11 (1999), 55–73 (p. 65); Martens, *One God*, pp. xix, 103–10.

⁴⁰ Cf. Martens, *One God*, pp. xvii–xix, 111–18; Hayes, *Divine Law*, pp. 134–39.

⁴¹ Runia's translation; in idem, *On the Creation*, p. 65. See also *Somn.* 1.232, where Philo says that the 'image' (εἰκῶν) of God is not an 'imitation' (μίμημα) but his 'original' (ἀρχέτυπον).

⁴² The English translation is taken from Birnbaum and Dillon, *Abraham*, p. 89.

⁴³ For further discussion of Philo's concept of the 'goal' (τέλος) of human existence, see below, Chapter 7.

both of them have the same function as guiding people towards the goal. As discussed above, Philo summarises the written legislation as piety towards God and justice towards humans (*Spec.* 2.63).⁴⁴ He also summarises the life of Abraham (the unwritten law who lived in accordance with nature) in these very terms, using ‘piety’ (εὐσέβεια) and ‘justice’ (δικαιοσύνη), the chief virtues (*Abr.* 27, 60), as the major themes of Abraham’s life story. He describes firstly Abraham’s piety (*Abr.* 60–207) and subsequently his justice (*Abr.* 208–276):⁴⁵

Τοσαῦτα μὲν περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀνδρὸς εὐσεβείας, εἰ καὶ πολλῶν ἄλλων ἐστὶν ἀφθονία, λελέχθω. διερευνητέον δὲ καὶ τὴν πρὸς ἀνθρώπους αὐτοῦ δεξιότητα· τῆς γὰρ αὐτῆς φύσεώς ἐστὶν εὐσεβῆ τε εἶναι καὶ φιλόανθρωπον, καὶ περὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκάτερον, ὁσιότης μὲν πρὸς θεόν, δικαιοσύνη δὲ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους, θεωρεῖται. (*Abr.* 208)

Let so much be said, then, about the piety of the man, even though an abundance of other examples might be adduced. We must also investigate, however, his constructive dealings with humans; for it is characteristic of the same nature to be both pious and philanthropic, and one may observe in the same person each virtue, holiness in relation to God, justice in relation to humans.⁴⁶

By summarising Abraham’s life in terms of piety and justice, and by summarising the written legislation in these same terms, Philo shows the ways in which the ‘copies’ are the exact resemblance to the ‘originals’. The manifestation of the chief virtues in Abraham’s life is the result of Abraham’s practice of the divine law and divine commands (*Abr.* 275). The divine law and the divine commands are later given by God through Moses in the written form of the Decalogue and the particular laws. Such are the genuine copies and the accurate casting of the originals.

In fact, Philo’s use of ‘original/copy’ is one of his ways to show the superiority of the Mosaic legislation. Cicero regards the true law as the highest law, authored by God and

⁴⁴ Mentioned above, §2.2.2.2. See the next section for a further investigation of the ways in which Philo summarises the written legislation.

⁴⁵ Samuel Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), p. 59.

⁴⁶ The translation is taken from Birnbaum and Dillon, *Abraham*, p. 125; slightly modified.

superior to any written laws,⁴⁷ and expresses that ‘we possess no substantial, life-like image (*imago*) of true Law and genuine Justice; a mere outline sketch (*expressa effigies*) is all that we enjoy’ (Cicero, *Off.* 3.69).⁴⁸ By contrast, for Philo, the Mosaic legislation is the accurate copy of the true law, and equates to unwritten nature.⁴⁹ On the one hand, the Patriarchs attained virtuous lives by following a law ‘which nature has laid down’,⁵⁰ ‘a law unwritten yet intuitively learnt’.⁵¹ They did the divine law without having been taught by a written legislation (*Abr.* 275). On the other hand, the written laws and commandments, which are given by God through Moses, are the same divine law which guides people towards virtuous lives. This means that the written legislation is not inferior to the unwritten law.⁵²

Therefore, Philo’s use of the terms ‘unwritten’ and ‘written’ in his Exposition of the Law does not show any sense of prioritising the unwritten law(s) over the written laws. In his subsequent treatises, Philo shows the ways in which the written laws are all about the virtues which the living laws have also attained. He shows that the Decalogue summarises the particular laws into two sets of duty to God and duty to humans. He discusses the particular laws by using the Decalogue commandments as headings, and further discusses the particular laws in the framework of virtues.

⁴⁷ Cicero, *Leg.* 1.18–19; cited above, pp. 66–67.

⁴⁸ Martens, *One God*, pp. 97, 119. The Latin text and the English translation are taken from Marcus Tullius Cicero, *De Officiis*, trans. by Walter Miller, LCL, 30 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1913).

⁴⁹ Martens and Hayes suggest that the Philo equates the Mosaic legislation with the law of nature. Martens, *One God*, p. 126; Hayes, *Divine Law*, p. 139.

⁵⁰ ὃν ἡ φύσις ἔθηκε (*Abr.* 16); Colson’s translation.

⁵¹ ἀγράφω μὲν νόμῳ δὲ πάλιν αὐτομαθεῖ (*Abr.* 16); Colson’s translation.

⁵² As Najman points out, the achievement of Abraham ‘does not imply that the unwritten *law* is greater than the written law’. Najman, ‘The Law’, p. 67. Italics original.

3.2 *The categories of the written laws*

In his discussion of the ‘written laws’ (the legislative part of the Pentateuch), Philo categorises the laws under respective headings. He first discusses each commandment of the Decalogue in *On the Decalogue*. Then, in the subsequent treatises *On the Special Laws*, he uses each commandment as a heading to categorise the particular laws respectively. In the final part of *On the Special Laws*, Philo recognises two kinds of laws: those that relate to each specific commandment of the Decalogue and those that relate to the whole Decalogue (*Spec.* 4.133). He then discusses the latter by using ‘virtues of universal value’ (κοινωφελεῖς ἀρεταί, *Spec.* 4.134) as categories in the last part of *On the Special Laws* (4.133 onwards) and the subsequent treatise *On Virtues*.

3.2.1 *The Decalogue commandments as the headings of the particular laws*

At the beginning of *On the Decalogue*, Philo states that he is going to investigate ‘the kinds of the written laws’ (τῶν ἀναγραφέντων νόμων αἱ ἰδέαι, *Decal.* 1). Among the written laws, which is the legislative part of the Pentateuch, Philo singles out the Decalogue, which is given by God to the people in the desert (*Decal.* 2). The Decalogue and other laws are of different ‘kinds’ (ἰδέαι) such that a clear distinction exists between the two:

τοὺς μὲν οὖν αὐτοπροσώπως θεσπισθέντας δι’ αὐτοῦ μόνου συμβέβηκε καὶ νόμους εἶναι καὶ νόμων τῶν ἐν μέρει κεφάλαια, τοὺς δὲ διὰ τοῦ προφήτου πάντας ἐπ’ ἐκείνους ἀναφέρεσθαι. (*Decal.* 19)

Now those which he [God] pronounced in his own person by himself alone are at the same time laws and the heads of the particular laws; and those which he pronounced through the prophet are all derived from those [laws].⁵³

⁵³ Colson’s translation; modified. Ἐκείνους refers to ‘the laws’ which God pronounced by himself, which are at the same time the heads of the particular laws: the Decalogue. The passive of ἀναφέρω can mean ‘to be traced to, derived from’; LSJ, s.v. ‘ἀναφέρω’ §II.5. Colson translates ἀναφέρεσθαι as ‘belong to’; Yonge translates it as ‘are referred to’. Cf. Treitel’s translation: ‘Die von Gott selbst geoffenbarten Gesetze sind zugleich Gesetze und Grundprinzipien der Einzelgesetze, und die durch den Propheten gegebenen lassen sich sämtlich auf jene zurückführen’ (‘The laws revealed by God himself are at the same time laws and basic principles of the

Those which are delivered by God in his own person are ‘the ten oracles’ (τὰ δέκα λόγια),⁵⁴ or the Decalogue (οἱ δέκα λόγοι, ‘the ten words’).⁵⁵ For Philo, the major contrast between the Decalogue and the other laws in the legislation is the ways of delivery: the Decalogue commandments are delivered by God in his own person, the other laws are delivered by the prophet Moses. This distinction is mentioned several times in Philo’s *Exposition of the Law*.⁵⁶

Termini suggests that Philo’s distinction between the ways of delivery of the Decalogue and the other laws forms ‘a hierarchy, according to which the laws delivered through Moses are on a lower level than the ones revealed directly by God, i.e., the Decalogue’.⁵⁷ She also suggests that Philo’s designation of the Decalogue as the ‘heads’ (κεφάλαια) of the particular laws further supports this hierarchy within the legislation,⁵⁸ although this ‘hierarchization of the laws according to Decalogue’s precepts does not imply a delegitimation of what is subordinate, nor a diminution in the level of obligation’.⁵⁹

However, it is more likely that Philo’s differentiation of the Decalogue from the particular laws is not meant to regard the particular laws as on a lower level.⁶⁰ This can be

individual laws, and those given through the prophet can all be traced back to them’). Yonge’s translation is taken from: C. D. Yonge, *The Works of Philo Judaeus, the Contemporary of Josephus: Translated from the Greek*, 4 vols (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1854), III, p. 140; Treitel’s translation is taken from: CHAT, I, p. 375.

⁵⁴ *Decal.* 36, 175; *Spec.* 3.7, 4.78, 132; cf. *Decal.* 50.

⁵⁵ *Decal.* 32, 154, 176, *Spec.* 1.1; *Her.* 168; *Mut.* 23; cf. *Congr.* 120. Philo also has used the phrase οἱ δέκα χρησμοί (‘the ten oracles’) to refer to the Decalogue (*Spec.* 4.134; cf. *Decal.* 32).

⁵⁶ *Decal.* 18–19, 175; *Spec.* 4.132; cf. *Spec.* 2.189; 3.7; *Praem.* 2.

⁵⁷ Cristina Termini, ‘Taxonomy of Biblical Laws and Φιλοτεχνία in Philo of Alexandria: A Comparison with Josephus and Cicero’, trans. by C. Peri, *Studia Philonica Annual*, 16 (2004), 1–29 (p. 2).

⁵⁸ Termini, ‘Taxonomy’, p. 2.

⁵⁹ Termini, ‘Taxonomy’, p. 8.

⁶⁰ As Amir and Najman point out, Philo does not regard the particular laws as on a lower level than the Decalogue. Yehoshua Amir, ‘The Decalogue According to Philo’, in *The Ten Commandments in History and Tradition*, ed. by Ben-Tsiyon Segal and Gershon Levi, trans. by Yvonne Glikson (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1990), pp. 121–60 (p. 126); Hindy Najman, ‘Decalogue’, in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, ed. by John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), pp. 526–28 (p. 527).

seen in Philo's emphases on the divine origin of the particular laws,⁶¹ and his clarification on the meaning of *κεφάλαια* regarding the relationship between the Decalogue and the particular laws.

First, Philo's notion of the Decalogue's being delivered by God in his own person is a reflection upon scripture. According to Deuteronomy 5.22, the people received the Decalogue from 'fire' (πῦρ); 'a loud voice' (φωνή μεγάλη) was there, and God 'wrote' (ἔγραψεν) the Decalogue on 'two stone tablets' (δύο πλάκας λιθίνας).⁶² Based on these elements, Philo describes that the Decalogue was given to the people through the divine 'voice' (φωνή) in 'fire' (πῦρ, *Decal.* 33, 46), and that God himself 'engraved' (ἐνεχάραξε, *Decal.* 50) these words on 'two stone pillars' (δύο στῆλαι, *Decal.* 50; cf. *Her.* 167). Therefore, these descriptions from the scripture provide the basis for Philo to differentiate the Decalogue from other laws. However, Philo does not regard these descriptions as meaning a downgrade of the laws which are delivered through Moses. In the conclusion of *On the Decalogue* (*Decal.* 175–78), when Philo reiterates the difference in the ways of delivery of the Decalogue and other laws, he adds that Moses is chosen by God and filled with the divine spirit to interpret the Decalogue:

ἦν γὰρ ἀρμόττον αὐτοῦ τῆ φύσει, κεφάλαια μὲν τῶν ἐν εἴδει νόμων αὐτοπροσώπως θεσπίσαι, νόμους δὲ τοὺς ἐν τῷ μέρει διὰ τοῦ τελειοτάτου τῶν προφητῶν, ὃν ἐπικρίνας ἀριστίνδην καὶ ἀναπλήσας ἐνθέου πνεύματος ἐρμηνεῖα τῶν χρησιμωδουμένων εἴλετο. (*Decal.* 175)

For it was in accordance with his nature to pronounce in his own person the heads of the special laws, but to pronounce the particular laws by the most perfect of the prophets, whom he chose to be the interpreter of the sacred utterances by selecting for his merits and filling him with the divine spirit.⁶³

⁶¹ See also Najman, 'Decalogue', p. 527.

⁶² Deut 5.22 LXX.

⁶³ Colson's translation; modified. Philo uses both μέρος ('part') and εἶδος ('species') to describe the laws other than the Decalogue (see especially *Spec.* 1.1; 3.7). In the present study, the translation 'particular [laws]'

The emphasis on the fact that Moses was chosen by God and was filled with the divine spirit highlights the divine origin of Moses' interpretation of the Decalogue. Both the 'heads' and the interpretation, the Decalogue and the particular laws, are on the same level in terms of their origin: they are all from God.

Second, Philo's concept of the Decalogue as the 'heads' of the particular laws should be discerned from the terms and illustrations which he employs to explain the relationship between the Decalogue and the particular laws. A prominent concept employed by Philo to contrast the Decalogue and the particular laws is the genera-species relationship.⁶⁴ The Decalogue commandments are described in terms of γένη ('genera'; *Spec.* 1.1; 3.7, 125; 4.132) and γενικός ('generic', *Spec.* 2.189; *Her.* 167; *Congr.* 120), and correspondingly the specific laws in terms of ἐν εἴδει ('in species', *Spec.* 1.1; 2.189; 3.7, 125; cf. *Decal.* 154, 168, 175).

In *On the Decalogue*, Philo uses κεφάλαια to refer to the Decalogue;⁶⁵ this term is then connected to γένη in the subsequent treatises about the particular laws. In *On the Special Laws*, Philo begins by stating that the Decalogue commandments are 'the genera of the laws in species' (τὰ μὲν γένη τῶν ἐν εἴδει νόμων, *Spec.* 1.1),⁶⁶ and later designates the Decalogue as

refers to a phrase containing μέρος (e.g., οἱ ἐν μέρει in *Decal.* 19, οἱ κατὰ μέρος in *Spec.* 4.132), and 'specific [laws]' refers to a phrase containing εἶδος (e.g., οἱ ἐν εἴδει in *Decal.* 154).

⁶⁴ As generally suggested by scholars: Richard D. Hecht, 'Preliminary Issues in the Analysis of Philo's De Specialibus Legibus', *Studia Philonica*, 5 (1978), 1–55 (pp. 3–4); Termini, 'Taxonomy', pp. 1–10; Amir, 'Decalogue', p. 126; Sarah Pearce, 'On the Decalogue', in *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture*, ed. by Louis H. Feldman, James L. Kugel, and Lawrence H. Schiffman, 3 vols (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 2013), 1, 989–1032 (p. 996); Hans Svebakken, *Philo of Alexandria's Exposition of the Tenth Commandment*, SPhiloM, 6 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), pp. 6–7.

⁶⁵ *Decal.* 19, 154, 175. The singular κεφάλαιον is also employed to refer to a particular commandment of the Decalogue in this treatise: *Decal.* 156, 158, 168, 170.

⁶⁶ Philo does not use γένη ('genera') to refer to the Decalogue in *On the Decalogue*. Termini, 'Taxonomy', p. 8 note 29.

‘heads, genera of laws’ (κεφάλαια γένη νόμων, *Spec.* 4.132). He also gives an illustration of the Decalogue functioning as ‘generic heads’ (γενικὰ κεφάλαια) in another treatise:

τὴν γὰρ ἱερὰν καὶ θεῖαν νομοθεσίαν δέκα τοῖς σύμπασι λόγοις Μωυσῆς ἀναγέγραφεν· οὗτοι δὲ εἰσι θεσμοί, τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἀπείρων νόμων γενικὰ κεφάλαια, ῥίζαι καὶ ἀρχαί <καὶ> πηγαὶ ἀέναοι διαταγμάτων προστάξεις καὶ ἀπαγορεύσεις περιεχόντων ἐπ’ ὠφελεία τῶν χρωμένων. (*Congr.* 120)

Moses displayed in an engraved form the holy and divine legislation in words which are ten in all. These are the statutes, generic heads of the vast multitude of particular laws, the roots, the sources, the perennial fountains of ordinances, containing all commands and prohibitions for the profit of those who follow them.⁶⁷

The description of ten ‘generic heads’ (γενικὰ κεφάλαια) as ‘roots’ (ρίζαι), ‘sources’ (ἀρχαί) and ‘fountains’ (πηγαί) explains the role of Decalogue as the origin: all the particular laws originate from the Decalogue.

With reference to the description of the Decalogue as ‘generic heads’ (γενικὰ κεφάλαια), the logical relationship between the Decalogue and the particular laws can be understood as a vertical top-to-bottom, just as the head is the highest point of a body or a structure. This is also reflected by Philo’s use of the superlative ἀνωτάτω (‘the highest’),⁶⁸ which pertains to height, to describe the ‘heads’ of the laws (τὰ ἀνωτάτω κεφάλαια, ‘the highest heads’; *Spec.* 2.63). The logical relationship between the Decalogue and the particular laws is then like a taxonomy chart of genera and species which has the starting point at the top and the branches develop down from it.

However, for Philo, this logical relationship is not necessarily top-to-bottom because he also describes the Decalogue as the ‘roots’ (ρίζαι, *Congr.* 120) of the particular laws, which is a bottom-to-top relationship. In this description, more importantly, ῥίζαι is juxtaposed with ἀρχαί (‘sources’) and πηγαί (‘fountains’), which pertain to the concept of source and origin.

⁶⁷ Colson’s translation; modified. ‘Containing all’ is translated from περιεχόντων, which can also mean ‘encompass, embrace’; LSJ, s.v. ‘περιέχω’.

⁶⁸ LSJ, s.v. ‘ἄνω (B)’ §C.II.

Philo also has the concept of genus being the origin of species: ‘the genera of living creatures, of which the world had carried before innumerable species’ (τὰ ζώων γένη, ὧν καὶ ἡ σύμπασα γῆ τὰ ἀμύθητα εἶδη καὶ πρότερον ἤνεγκε, *Mos.* 2.62).⁶⁹ Therefore, Philo’s designation of κεφάλαια as γένη has a focus on the Decalogue’s role as the origin of the particular laws. It can be described as the head of a body, the root of a tree, the beginning point of a taxonomy chart that can start from any edge or from the centre of the whole picture: the description represents the particular laws as originating from the Decalogue. Philo also expresses this relationship in terms of the particular laws ‘being derived from’ the Decalogue (ἀναφέρεσθαι, *Decal.* 19).⁷⁰ Because the particular laws are derived from the Decalogue, they carry the principal elements of their origin, like species of living creatures carry the principal elements of the genus to which they belong. Therefore, Philo’s description of the Decalogue as the genera can be understood conversely as the Decalogue ‘containing all’ (περιεχόντων)⁷¹ the principal elements of all particular laws which originate from them. These principal elements can be regarded as the encompassing principle of all the laws, as suggested by the term περιεχόντων, which can also be understood as ‘encompassing, embracing’.⁷²

This genera-species relationship fits well with Philo’s understanding that the particular laws are the interpretation of the Decalogue. Moses’ role in delivering the particular laws is to be the ‘interpreter of sacred oracles’ (ἱεροφάντης, *Decal.* 18);⁷³ he is chosen by God to be the ‘interpreter’ (ἐρμηνεύς) of his ‘sacred utterances’ (χρησιμωδηθέντα, i.e., the Decalogue) to

⁶⁹ Colson’s translation; slightly modified.

⁷⁰ Cited above, p. 74.

⁷¹ *Congr.* 120, cited above, in which περιεχόντων is translated as ‘containing all’; p. 78.

⁷² Mentioned above, p. 78 note 67.

⁷³ Cf. LSJ, s.v. ‘ἱεροφάντης’.

deliver the particular laws.⁷⁴ The concept that the particular laws emerge from Moses' interpretation of the Decalogue is mentioned again in Philo's conclusion of his discussion of the particular laws according to each commandment of the Decalogue:

Τοσαῦτα καὶ <περὶ> τῶν εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν ἀναφερομένων ἀποχρώντως κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν εἴρηται πρὸς συμπλήρωσιν τῶν δέκα λογίων καὶ τῶν τούτοις ὑποστελλόντων· | εἰ γὰρ δεῖ τὰ μὲν φωνῇ θείᾳ χρησιμωθέντα κεφάλαια γένη νόμων ἀποδείξαι, τοὺς δὲ κατὰ μέρος πάντας οὓς διηρμήνευσε Μωυσῆς ὑποστέλλοντα εἶδη, πρὸς τὸ ἀσύγχυτον τῆς ἀκριβοῦς καταλήψεως φιλοτεχνίας ἐδέησεν, ἧ χρησάμενος ἐκάστῳ τῶν γενῶν ἐξ ἀπάσης τῆς νομοθεσίας τὰ οἰκεία προσένειμα καὶ προσέφυσα. (*Spec.* 4.132)⁷⁵

In these remarks we have discussed the matters relating to desire as adequately as our abilities allow, and thus completed our survey of the Decalogue and of those which are dependent on them. For if we are right in describing the heads delivered by the voice of God as the genera of laws, and all particular laws of which Moses interpreted as dependent species, for accurate apprehension free from confusion scientific study was needed, with the aid of which I have assigned and attached to each of the genera what was belonging to them throughout the whole legislation.⁷⁶

In this passage, Philo summarises his fundamental understanding about the relationship between the Decalogue and the particular laws: the Decalogue commandments are delivered by the divine voice, and the particular laws are delivered through Moses' interpretation of the Decalogue. The Decalogue commandments are the genera, and the particular laws are the

⁷⁴ *Decal.* 175; cited above, p. 76. Cf. *Spec.* 2.189; 3.7; *Praem.* 2.

⁷⁵ Cited from Colson's edition (LCL), which differs slightly from Cohn's edition (CW). See the following note for the details.

⁷⁶ Colson's translation; slightly modified. The phrase ὑποστέλλοντα εἶδη is a conjectured reading by Colson (see his notes in *Philo*, VIII, p. 90), amending ὑποστέλλων τὰ εἶδη (cf. CW). Colson's conjectured reading fits better in the context, being parallel to the previous phrase τῶν τούτοις ὑποστελλόντων (in the same verse), in which ὑποστελλόντων modifies the specific laws. Termini agrees with Colson's conjecture; Termini, 'Taxonomy', p. 8. Cohen and Niehoff also adopt Colson's translation of this phrase; Naomi G. Cohen, *Philo Judaeus: His Universe of Discourse*, BEATAJ, 24 (Frankfurt a.M.: P. Lang, 1995), p. 74; Maren R. Niehoff, 'Philo's Rationalization of Judaism', in *Rationalization in Religions: Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, ed. by Yohanan Friedmann and Christoph Marksches (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2019), pp. 21–44 (p. 36 note 27). The reading in the manuscript, τοὺς δὲ κατὰ μέρος πάντας οὓς διηρμήνευσε Μωυσῆς ὑποστέλλων τὰ εἶδη, shows that the nominative singular ὑποστέλλων modifies διηρμήνευσε, which means that Moses 'draws' the particular laws to the heads. This reading is more difficult in this context, but is supported by Philo's description in *Decal.* 157 which says that Moses 'draws' (ὑποστέλλει) the particular laws to the head (i.e., Moses is the subject of the verb). In either reading, the overall sense is to mean that the particular laws belong to the heads.

species ‘dependent’ (ὑποστέλλοντα) on them.⁷⁷ This relationship provides for Philo a principal structure to categorise the particular laws. Therefore, upon the completion of the discussion of the Decalogue and the particular laws, Philo states that he has ‘assigned and attached to each of the genera what was belonging to them (τὰ οἰκεῖα) throughout the whole legislation’. Like the use of γένη and εἶδη, οἰκεῖα in this passage also expresses the connection between each particular law to the Decalogue, like the kinship of the members from the same family.⁷⁸ This ‘genera-species’ relationship facilitates Philo’s survey of the whole legislation by assigning and attaching each particular law back to the genus to which it belongs. The understanding of the Decalogue as the genera also clarifies the meaning of κεφάλαια that Philo uses to refer to the Decalogue:⁷⁹ the κεφάλαια are the summaries of the particular laws.⁸⁰

However, just after the completion (συμπλήρωσις, *Spec.* 4.132) of categorising the particular laws according to each of the Decalogue commandments, Philo states that an additional move on categorising the particular laws is needed: a survey of the particular laws according to virtues (*Spec.* 4.133–34). Indeed, he regards all laws as ultimately summarised in ‘two highest heads’: duty to God and duty to humans (*Spec.* 2.63). The basis of this concept is the division of the Decalogue commandments into two sets of five.

⁷⁷ Ὑποστέλλω mainly refers to ‘draw in’, ‘reduce’, ‘draw back’, but occasionally governs a dative to mean ‘belong to’; LSJ, s.v. ‘ὑποστέλλω’. Colson understands ὑποστέλλω as ‘is dependent’; he translates τῶν τούτοις ὑποστέλλοντων as ‘which are dependent on them’, and translates his conjectured reading ὑποστέλλοντα εἶδη as ‘dependent species’. This understanding of ὑποστέλλω is similar to the understanding of ὑποστέλλω as ‘belong to’.

⁷⁸ Οἰκεῖος primarily means ‘of the house’. LSJ, s.v. ‘οἰκεῖος’.

⁷⁹ The term κεφάλαια (singular: κεφάλαιον) in *On the Decalogue* and *On the Special Laws* is used exclusively to refer to the ‘head(s)’ of the laws (*Decal.* 19, 154, 156, 158, 168, 170, 175; *Spec.* 2.1; 2.39; 2.63; 2.223; 2.242; 2.261; 4.41; 4.132). For a summary of various meanings of κεφάλαιον in Philo’s treatises, see Termini, ‘Taxonomy’, pp. 5–6; Ronald Williamson, *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews*, ALGHJ, 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1970), pp. 123–27.

⁸⁰ Cf. Philo also describes that each of the ten ‘has a form of a summary’ (κεφαλαιώδη τύπον περιέχουσιν) of many particular laws (*Decal.* 168; cf. *Spec.* 4.160).

3.2.2 The division of the legislation into two sets of duty

While the Decalogue commandments are the ten heads of the particular laws, these heads and the particular laws can be summarised into two further heads: Philo regards the head ‘towards God through piety and holiness’ and the head ‘towards humans through philanthropy’ and as the ‘two highest heads’ of the laws; each of the heads ‘is cut (τέμνεται) into much-divided classes and all laudable things’ (*Spec.* 2.63).⁸¹

In this image of ‘cutting’, the ‘two highest heads’ (δύο τὰ ἀνωτάτω κεφάλαια) is an expression implying that the ten heads can be further summarised into two heads; or conversely, the ‘two highest heads’, the duty to God and the duty to humans, are ‘cut’ into the divisions of ten heads (the Decalogue) and subsequently into all particular laws. This illustration then suggests the relationship between the heads and the divisions as a sum-and-parts relationship, clarifying the meaning of ‘the highest head’: a higher head is a bigger sum of more parts, a bigger portion before being further cut into smaller parts; the sums and the parts are all components of the whole. Philo’s use of εἶδος and μέρος as interchangeable attributives for the particular laws (cf. *Spec.* 1.1, 3.7) also reflects his key understanding of the particular laws being divisions of the heads as well as being parts of the whole.⁸²

For Philo, the Decalogue commandments (the ten heads) are divided into two sets of five: ‘the former comprises duties to God, and the other comprises duties to humans’ (ἡ μὲν προτέρα τὰ πρὸς θεὸν δίκαια, ἡ δὲ ἕτερα τὰ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους περιέχει, *Her.* 168; cf. *Decal.* 106, 110).⁸³ This division is made by God, who inscribed the Decalogue on two tablets (*Her.* 167–

⁸¹ Cited in Chapter 2; see above, p. 56.

⁸² Philo refers to the particular laws mainly in the expressions of ἐν εἴδει (*Decal.* 154, 168, 175; *Spec.* 1.1, *Spec.* 2.189; *Spec.* 3.7, 125), ἐν μέρει (*Decal.* 19, 175, *Spec.* 1.1) and κατὰ μέρος (*Spec.* 2.242; 3.7; 4.132; *Congr.* 120). See also above, p. 76 note 63.

⁸³ Colson’s translation; slightly modified.

68; *Decal.* 50). Philo records the sequence of the Decalogue with ordinal numerals.⁸⁴ The first set of five comprises the duty to God: the ‘first’ (πρῶτος) commandment is about monotheism, the ‘second’ (δεύτερος) forbids the making of pictures and sculptures as idols, the ‘third’ (τρίτος) is about not taking the name of God in vain; the ‘fourth’ (τέταρτος) is about the number seven; the ‘fifth’ (πέμπτος) is about honouring parents (*Her.* 169–72; *Decal.* 154–167). The second set comprises the duty to humans, which are the prohibitions of ‘adultery, murder, theft, false witness, covetousness’ (*Her.* 173; cf. *Decal.* 168–174).⁸⁵ This two-part division of the Decalogue is the underlying concept for Philo to state that all laws are summarised into duty to God through piety and holiness, and duty to humans through justice and philanthropy (*Spec.* 2.63). Philo has summarised Abraham’s life as having manifested piety towards God and justice towards humans in the preceding treatise;⁸⁶ in the discussion of the legislation, he summarises the Decalogue similarly: the first tablet is about piety towards God, the second tablet is about justice towards humans.

Concerning the duty to God and duty to humans, it seems that Philo shows to some extent a tendency to prioritise the first tablet over the second:

⁸⁴ The Decalogue is recorded in Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5 without assigning ordinal numerals to each of the ten. The sequence of some commandments among the ten (notably the prohibitions of murder, adultery and theft) in the MT also differs from that in the LXX. The sequence used by Philo is in accordance with Deuteronomy 5 LXX. For a summary of the sequence of these three commandments attested in different traditions, see Richard A. Freund, ‘The Decalogue in Early Judaism and Christianity’, in *The Function of Scripture in Early Jewish and Christian Tradition*, ed. by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, JSNTSup, 154 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998), p. 135. According to Pearce, among the existing ancient witnesses, Philo is the earliest attestation to naming each commandment of the Decalogue with ordinal numerals. Pearce, ‘On the Decalogue’, I, p. 989.

⁸⁵ *Her.* 167–173 is a brief summary of the Decalogue, in which the sequence of the ten corresponds to the sequence recorded in *On the Decalogue* and *On the Special Laws*. ‘Adultery, murder, theft, false witness, covetousness’ are counted as the first to fifth of the second set of five, or the sixth to the last of the whole Decalogue (*Decal.* 121, 132, 135, 138, 142; *Spec.* 3.8; 4.1; 4.41; 4.78); e.g., ‘do not steal’ is the ‘third’ (τρίτος) in the second table, but is the ‘eighth’ (ὀγδοός) among both tables (*Spec.* 4.1).

⁸⁶ See above, p. 72.

δέκα τοίνυν ὄντα διένειμεν εἰς δύο πεντάδας, ἅς δυσὶ στήλαις ἐνεχάραξε, καὶ ἡ μὲν προτέρα πεντὰς τὰ πρωτεῖα ἔλαχεν, ἡ δ' ἑτέρα δευτερείων ἤξιούτο. (*Decal.* 50)

We find that he divided the ten into two sets of five which he engraved on two tables, and the first five obtained the first place, while the other was awarded the second.⁸⁷

Philo notes that the first set of five received ‘the first place’ (πρωτεῖα), and the other set is considered worthy of ‘the second [place]’ (δευτερεῖα). Πρωτεῖον and δευτερεῖος carry the meaning of ‘the first prize’ and ‘the second prize’ respectively,⁸⁸ probably suggesting that they refer to more than a mere sequence of numbering, because the first prize recipient is usually considered to be superior to the second prize recipient.⁸⁹ He then describes the first set as ‘the better five’ (ἡ ἀμείνων πεντὰς, *Decal.* 51), which might mean that the first tablet is superior to the second tablet.

However, it is more likely that the comparative language in these descriptions expresses the sense of a summary (what encompasses the whole as its source) rather than a priority (what is more important). Philo regards the first five as better because of the fact that they are about God and piety; this is also why they should be discussed first:

ἀρχὴ δ' ἀρίστη πάντων μὲν τῶν ὄντων θεός, ἀρετῶν δ' εὐσέβεια· περὶ ὧν ἀναγκαιότατον πρῶτον διεξελθεῖν. (*Decal.* 52)

The most excellent source of all existing things is God, of all virtues is piety. It is absolutely necessary to discuss them first.⁹⁰

The first set is ‘better’ (ἀμείνων, or ‘more excellent’) because it pertains to the ‘best’ (ἀρίστη, or ‘most excellent’):⁹¹ God and piety. The description of piety as the most excellent ‘source’

⁸⁷ Colson’s translation.

⁸⁸ LSJ, s.v. ‘πρωτεῖον’, ‘δευτερεῖος’.

⁸⁹ Yonge’s translation shows a sense of superior and inferior: ‘And the first five have the precedence and pre-eminence in honour; but the second five have an inferior place assigned to them’ (*Decal.* 50).

⁹⁰ My translation.

⁹¹ Ἀμείνων and ἀρίστη are respectively the comparative and the superlative of the same ἀγαθός (‘good’). LSJ, s.v. ‘ἀγαθός’, §III.

(ἀρχή) of all virtues carries a sense of summary with regard to its role as the origin, because ἀρχή is a term used by Philo to illustrate the Decalogue as the origin of the particular laws (*Congr.* 120). The description concerning the ‘source’ of virtues can be further understood from another statement by Philo: ‘virtue is the whole and in genus, which is divided into closely connected species’ (τὸ γὰρ ὅλον καὶ ἐν γένει ἡ ἀρετή, ἢ κατὰ εἶδη τὰ προσεχῆ τέμνεται, *Sacr.* 84).⁹² In this statement, the illustration of cutting (‘is divided’, τέμνεται) of ‘the whole’ (τὸ ὅλον), and the terms genus (γένος) and species (εἶδος) are the expressions used by Philo to describe the Decalogue as the summary of the particular laws. Like the particular laws, the specific virtues are the divisions from a whole, that is, the ‘origin’ (ἀρχή). Piety as the ἀρχή of virtues thus means that it is the summary and the whole of all specific virtues. A similar concept is expressed by Josephus, who says that Moses (in the legislation) established virtues like justice (δικαιοσύνη) and moderation (σωφροσύνη) as ‘parts’ (μέρη) of piety (*Ag. Ap.* 170), expressing that piety encompasses all other virtues.⁹³ This is comparable to Philo’s understanding of piety as the whole of the specific virtues.

Therefore, when Philo’s states that piety is the most excellent source of virtues, the superlative ἀρίστη would suggest a sense of pointing to the ultimate source:⁹⁴ the sum of all specific virtues is piety.⁹⁵ The term ‘better’ (ἀμείνων, *Decal.* 51), which is used to compare

⁹² The species of virtue mentioned in *Sacr.* 84 are prudence, moderation, courage and justice (φρόνησις, σωφροσύνη, ἀνδρεία, δικαιοσύνη).

⁹³ Regarding this description, Barclay suggests that Josephus understands piety as ‘not just one of the virtues, or even just its first: it encompasses all the others’; Barclay, *Against Apion*, p. 266 note 665.

⁹⁴ See also, Sterling translates *Decal.* 52 as: ‘The supreme source of all that exists is God; just as piety is (the supreme source) of the virtues’, and states that this verse is concerned with the issue of ‘the ultimate source’. Gregory E. Sterling, ‘“The Queen of Virtues”: Piety in Philo of Alexandria’, *The Studia Philonica Annual*, 18 (2006), 103–23 (p. 121).

⁹⁵ Cf. Winston’s similar expression: ‘Philo gives the chief place to piety or holiness, since the love of God is primary and our highest good, all else being derivative from it.’ David Winston, ‘Philo’s Ethical Theory’, in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, II.21.1* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984), pp. 372–416 (p. 395).

the first tablet and the second tablet, being understood within this context, is then likely another expression which highlights piety as the origin of all virtues, but not an expression which makes the second tablet inferior in importance to the first tablet.

Since Philo speaks of the ‘two highest heads’ of the legislation in terms of piety and justice, and regards piety as the source of all virtues, the implications of these notions should be considered alongside an investigation of Philo’s scheme of surveying the particular laws according to different virtues, as will be discussed below.

3.2.3 *Virtues and the particular laws*

Upon the completion of assigning the particular laws to their corresponding heads, Philo recognises that it is necessary to discuss them further by relating them to virtues:

οὐ δεῖ δ’ ἀγνοεῖν, ὅτι ὡσπερ ἰδίᾳ ἐκάστῳ τῶν δέκα συγγενῆ τινα τῶν ἐπὶ μέρους ἐστίν, ἃ πρὸς ἕτερον γένος οὐδεμίαν ἔχει κοινωνίαν, οὕτως ἕνια κοινὰ πάντων συμβέβηκεν, οὐχ ἐνὶ ἡ δυσίν, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, τοῖς <δὲ> δέκα λογίοις ἐφαρμόττοντα. ταῦτα δ’ εἰσὶν αἱ κοινωφελεῖς ἀρεταί· καὶ γὰρ ἕκαστος ἰδίᾳ τῶν δέκα χρησμῶν καὶ κοινῇ πάντες ἐπὶ φρόνησιν καὶ δικαιοσύνην καὶ θεοσέβειαν καὶ τὸν ἄλλον χορὸν τῶν ἀρετῶν ἀλείφουσι καὶ προτρέπουσι. (*Spec.* 4.133–134)

But we must not fail to know that, just as each of the ten separately has some particular laws akin to it having nothing in common with another genus, there are some things common to all which fit in not with one or two, so to speak, but with the ten commandments. These are the virtues of universal value. For each of the ten pronouncements separately and all in common incite and exhort us to prudence, justice and godliness and the rest of the chorus of virtues.⁹⁶

The referent of ἕνια (‘some things’) in this passage is not obvious. It might refer to the particular laws, suggesting that some particular laws fit in with more than one of the Decalogue commandments. Alternatively, ἕνια might refer to the ‘virtues’, because the following sentence is ‘these are the virtues of universal value’.⁹⁷ These two interpretations

⁹⁶ Colson’s translation; slightly modified.

⁹⁷ As Cohen points out, both interpretations are supported by different translators. Naomi G. Cohen, ‘The Greek Virtues and the Mosaic Laws in Philo: An Elucidation of De Specialibus Legibus IV 133–135’, *Studia Philonica Annual*, 5 (1993), 9–23 (p. 10).

would lead the understanding of Philo's strategy in his subsequent discussion (*Spec.* 4.135–238 and *Virt.*) in two different directions.

If Philo means that some particular laws (i.e., *ἔνια* refers to 'the particular laws') fit in with not one or two of the Decalogue commandments but to the entire Decalogue, this would imply that there are limitations in assigning all the particular laws to each of the Decalogue commandments, the genus to which they belong. For example, Termini points out that Philo 'does not manage to insert' all the particular laws 'into the Decalogue's framework' and 'completes the organization work according to the taxonomy of virtues'.⁹⁸ Similarly, Sterling suggests that Philo 'proceeded to organize the laws that spanned more than one of the ten commandments under the headings of specific virtues'⁹⁹, each of these virtues (*δικαιοσύνη, ἀνδρεία, φιλανθρωπία*) 'served as a heading for various laws'.¹⁰⁰ If this is the case, the survey of the laws in these categories of virtues might serve as, in Sterling's words, 'appendices to the laws in *De specialibus legibus*'.¹⁰¹

Alternatively, if Philo in *Spec.* 4.133 means that some virtues (i.e., *ἔνια* refers to 'the virtues') fit in with not one or two of the Decalogue commandments but with the entire Decalogue, this would imply that he has turned to another strategy to discuss the legislation. The reason for those laws being discussed in the categories of virtues is not simply because they cannot be assigned to one of the Decalogue commandments, but because Philo turns to show that these virtues of universal value fit in with the entire Decalogue, in the way that 'each of the ten pronouncements separately and all in common incite and exhort us to wisdom and justice and godliness and the rest of the chorus of virtues' (*Spec.* 4. 134). Then, as Wilson

⁹⁸ Termini, 'Taxonomy', p. 7 note 28.

⁹⁹ Sterling, 'The Queen', p. 107.

¹⁰⁰ Sterling, 'The Queen', p. 111.

¹⁰¹ Sterling, 'The Queen', p. 111.

suggests, the purpose of this task is ‘to elaborate on those laws that most clearly exemplify’ those virtues.¹⁰²

The latter understanding is more likely Philo’s strategy for discussing the laws within the frames of virtues. Firstly, some of the laws discussed in these frames have already been discussed according to the Decalogue. One example is the duty of offering the first fruits (*Virt.* 95). Philo has already discussed this law under the head of the first commandment (*Spec.* 1.132–144), regarding this law as teaching people ‘the way leading to piety’ (ἡ εἰς εὐσέβειαν ἀγούσης ὁδός, *Spec.* 1.132). He discusses it again with reference to philanthropy (φιλανθρωπία), elaborating on the ways in which this law exemplifies this virtue.¹⁰³ Another example is about the laws of the seventh and the fiftieth year. They pertain to the seventh day (the Sabbath), and have been discussed previously under the head of the fourth commandment (*Spec.* 2.86–109).¹⁰⁴ In the discussion concerning philanthropy, Philo explains the ways in which the laws of the seventh year and the fiftieth year exemplify philanthropy, saying that these laws are ‘kind and philanthropic’ (χρηστὰ καὶ φιλάνθρωπα, *Virt.* 97) and ‘go beyond all philanthropy’ (πᾶσαν ὑπερβάλλει φιλανθρωπίαν, *Virt.* 99). These examples show that the discussion within the frames of virtues is to explain the ways in which these laws exhort people to virtues, rather than to show that these laws cannot be assigned to one of the Decalogue commandments such that categories of virtues are needed as a solution for this.

Moreover, Philo emphasises the completeness of the number ten at the beginning of his survey of the Decalogue: ‘one must at once admire the number, inasmuch as they are completed in the perfect number, ten’ (ὧν εὐθέως ἄξιον θαυμάσαι τὸν ἀριθμὸν δεκάδι τῇ

¹⁰² Wilson, *On Virtues*, p. 3.

¹⁰³ Cf. Colson’s note on *Virt.* 95, VIII, pp. 220–221.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Colson’s note on *Virt.* 97, VIII, pp. 223. Wilson lists ten parallels of the laws which have been surveyed in *On the Special Laws* and are discussed again in *Virt.* 51–174. Wilson, *On Virtues*, p. 201.

παντελεία περατουμένων, *Decal.* 20).¹⁰⁵ It is then not likely that he regards extra heads as necessary for being supplements to the ten. It is more probable that Philo's discussion from *Spec.* 4.135 onwards consists of another scheme which is 'within' his basic scheme of categorising the particular laws according to the Decalogue.¹⁰⁶ As mentioned above, Philo regards the 'two highest heads' of the laws as duty to God and duty to humans, expressing them in terms of virtues: duty to God through piety and holiness, duty to humans through justice and philanthropy (*Spec.* 2.63). This is based on the bipartite division of the Decalogue, which is part of Philo's scheme of categorising the laws according to the ten heads. It is also noteworthy that even if Philo expresses the 'two highest heads' in terms of 'through' (διὰ) the virtues (*Spec.* 2.63), he does not designate each of the virtues which he discusses as κεφάλαιον, unlike the way he uses this term as a designation of the Decalogue commandments.¹⁰⁷ This could be a sign of his reluctance to use κεφάλαιον in the discussion of virtues such that any misunderstanding of extra 'heads' as necessary can be avoided.

Therefore, the referent of ἔνια in *Spec.* 4.134 should be 'the virtues'. For Philo, the virtues fit with the entire Decalogue, because the Decalogue commandments separately and as a whole exhort people to virtues (*Spec.* 4.134). In this way, the laws should also be discussed with reference to the themes of virtues. Philo's next task is to explain the ways in which the laws exhort people to justice and other virtues.

3.2.3.1 The discussion of laws within the frame of virtues

Philo introduces the discussion of the laws within the frame of virtues with this statement:

¹⁰⁵ Yonge's translation; slightly modified. The term περατούμενοι ('are completed') pertains to the sense of boundary and limit, 'to be terminated, finished off'. LSJ, s.v. 'περᾶτώω'.

¹⁰⁶ Harry A. Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, rev. edn, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962), II, p. 202.

¹⁰⁷ Furthermore, κεφάλαιον does not appear in *Spec.* 4.133–238 and *On Virtues*.

περὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς ἡγεμονίδος τῶν ἀρετῶν, εὐσεβείας καὶ ὀσιότητος, ἔτι δὲ καὶ φρονήσεως καὶ σωφροσύνης εἴρηται πρότερον, νυνὶ δὲ περὶ τῆς ἐπιτηδεύσεως ἀδελφὰ καὶ συγγενῆ ταύταις δικαιοσύνης λεκτέον. (*Spec.* 4.135)

We have spoken before of the queen of virtues, piety and holiness, and also of prudence and moderation; we must now speak of justice, which practises ways akin and closely related to them.¹⁰⁸

Philo states that the virtues piety, holiness, prudence and moderation have been spoken before. Mosès suggests that the reference to piety and holiness in this passage might refer to Philo's now lost section *περὶ εὐσεβείας* ('on piety'), or to his previous discussion in *On the Special Laws I–II*.¹⁰⁹ Heinemann suggests that Philo probably means that his survey of the laws in his four treatises *On the Special Laws* concerns all these virtues (piety, holiness, prudence, moderation, and justice).¹¹⁰ Heinemann's interpretation implies that Philo possibly uses piety and holiness as referring to the duty to God (the first tablet), and prudence, moderation, and justice as the duty to humans (the second tablet). This interpretation is more likely,¹¹¹ because Philo's previous discussion is a survey of the laws according to the Decalogue, which are divided into duty to God and duty to humans.

As such, Philo thinks that his previous survey of the laws can be regarded as a kind of discussion of the laws within the frame of virtues, and now he does it more explicitly. In *Spec.* 4.135 he states that 'we must now speak of justice', and later gives similar statements at the beginning of the discussion of courage (*Virt.* 1) and philanthropy (*Virt.* 51), to indicate that the subsequent content is part of his discussion of the laws thematically, by reference to virtues.

¹⁰⁸ Yonge's translation; slightly modified.

¹⁰⁹ See the translation notes by Mosès on *Spec.* 4.135; *De specialibus legibus III et IV*, LOPA, 25, p. 284 note 5. For a discussion of the possible existence of a lost section *περὶ εὐσεβείας*, see Sterling, 'The Queen', pp. 105–12.

¹¹⁰ See Heinemann's translation notes on *Spec.* 4.135; CHAT, II, p. 285 note 1.

¹¹¹ Wilson, *On Virtues*, p. 6; Cohen, 'Virtues', p. 15.

The discussion of courage clearly follows the discussion of justice:

Περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτὴν ὅσα καίρια πρότερον εἰπὼν μέτειμι τῶν ἐξῆς ἐπ' ἀνδρεία. (*Virt.* 1)

Having spoken previously on justice and the matters pertaining to it, I proceed in what follows to courage.¹¹²

This statement and *Spec.* 4.135 are then linked together and reflect the list of the four prominent virtues which are highly regarded in the Graeco-Roman world: 'prudence' (φρόνησις), 'moderation' (σωφροσύνη), 'justice' (δικαιοσύνη) and 'courage' (ἀνδρεία).¹¹³ At the same time, 'piety and holiness' (εὐσέβεια καὶ δσιότης)¹¹⁴ are juxtaposed with these four but regarded as 'the queen of virtues' (ἡ ἡγεμονὶς τῶν ἀρετῶν, *Spec.* 4.135). It is thus necessary to investigate the implications of Philo's mention of the four prominent virtues and the phrase 'the queen of virtues'.

Prudence, moderation, justice and courage are the four virtues described by Plato as the primary virtues.¹¹⁵ Plato defines 'justice' (δικαιοσύνη), 'moderation' (σωφροσύνη), 'courage' (ἀνδρεία) and 'prudence' (φρόνησις) as the four universal requirements on which an ideal city should be laid (*Resp.* 427d–435c; especially 433a–b).¹¹⁶ Likewise, Cicero highlights

¹¹² Wilson's translation; in idem, *On Virtues*, p. 45.

¹¹³ Cohen, 'Virtues', p. 16.

¹¹⁴ Or: 'piety or holiness'; i.e., 'piety' and 'holiness' are synonyms here referring to the same virtue, 'the queen of virtues'; cf. Wilson, *On Virtues*, p. 2. Cohen suggests that Philo probably uses 'piety' as a short form for 'piety and holiness'; Cohen, 'Virtues', p. 17 note 27.

¹¹⁵ Wilson points out that these four virtues became almost the standard content of the so-called 'canon of cardinal virtues' in the Hellenistic era, but the Graeco-Roman philosophers have various views on the number and arrangement of the virtues in that canon. Walter T. Wilson, *The Mysteries of Righteousness: The Literary Composition and Genre of the Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*, TSAJ, 40 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), pp. 42–59. According to North, the first use of the term 'cardinal virtues' as referring to the Platonic primary virtues appeared in the fourth century; Helen F. North, 'Canons and Hierarchies of the Cardinal Virtues in Greek and Latin Literature', in *The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan*, ed. by Luitpold Wallach (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966), pp. 165–83 (p. 166 note 2).

¹¹⁶ The Greek texts are taken from Plato, *Republic 1–5*, LCL, 237 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013).

the prominence of prudence, justice, courage and moderation. He discusses the ways in which these four virtues bring forth all moral goodness (*Off.* 1.15–161).¹¹⁷ This expression is similar to Philo’s understanding of the four primary virtues as the origin of all good deeds. In his allegorical interpretation of the four branches of the river from Eden,¹¹⁸ Philo interprets the four as ‘prudence’ (φρόνησις), ‘courage’ (ἀνδρεία), ‘moderation’ (σωφροσύνη) and ‘justice’ (δικαιοσύνη), describing these four as the ‘four sources’ (τέτταρες ἀρχαί, *Leg.* 1.63), from which numerous streams of ‘good deeds’ (καλαὶ πράξεις) flow out (*Leg.* 1.64). The ways in which Philo relates these four virtues to the Mosaic legislation is also comparable to Plato’s designation of these four virtues as essential for an ideal city and its people. For Philo, the Mosaic laws provide the Jews with the best ‘philosophy’ (φιλοσοφία, *Opif.* 8; *Virt.* 65) and the best ‘polity’ (πολιτεία, *Spec.* 3.167; *Vir.* 175).¹¹⁹ These laws guide people to virtues, which are ‘prudence, moderation, courage, justice and other virtues’ (φρονήσεως καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ ἀνδρείας καὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν, *Spec.* 2.62; cf. *Mos.* 2.216).¹²⁰ In this way, Philo employs concepts which are embraced by his contemporaries to present the Mosaic laws. This shows his effort to connect the Mosaic laws to Greek culture, but at the same time to show the superiority and the universal significance of the Mosaic

¹¹⁷ Wilson, *Mysteries*, pp. 46–47. Cicero discusses these four virtues in terms of ‘wisdom and prudence’ (*sapientia et prudentia*, *Off.* 1.16–18), ‘justice’ (*iustitia*, *Off.* 1.20–60), ‘courage’ (*fortitudo*, *Off.* 1.61–92) and ‘temperance and moderation’ (*temperantia et modestia*, *Off.* 1.93–151), and considers that all ‘moral goodness’ (*honestum*) originates from the four virtues: *omne, quod est honestum, id quattuor partium oritur ex aliqua* (‘all that is morally right rises from some one of four sources’, *Off.* 1.15). The Latin texts and the English translations are taken from Cicero, *De Officiis*, trans. by Walter Miller, LCL, 30 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1913).

¹¹⁸ *Leg.* 1.63–87; cf. Gen 2.10–14 LXX.

¹¹⁹ Wilson, *On Virtues*, p. 5.

¹²⁰ Wilson, *On Virtues*, p. 6.

laws.¹²¹ Thus he also hopes that other nations would follow this best legislation and give up their own (*Mos.* 2.20, 44).¹²²

Philo's allegorical interpretation of the four branches of the river from Eden shows that he understands the four primary virtues as the branches of the greatest river (*Leg.* 1.63); this ultimate source is 'goodness' (*ἀγαθότης*), the 'generic virtue' (*ἡ γενικὴ ἀρετή*) which 'takes the sources (*αἱ ἀρχαί*) from Eden, the wisdom (*σοφία*) of God' (*Leg.* 1.64).¹²³ This concept is comparable to Philo's statement that God is the ultimate source of everything and piety is the ultimate source of virtues (*Decal.* 52).¹²⁴ This then sheds light on the meaning of the term 'the queen of virtues' when Philo introduces his discussion of the laws according to the virtues, where he mentions piety as 'the queen of virtues' and subsequently mentions the four primary virtues (*Spec.* 4.135).¹²⁵ Piety is 'the queen of virtues' in the sense that it is the ultimate source, the generic virtue, from which the main branches flow out.¹²⁶ Piety, as the ultimate source, encompasses all virtues and is the whole sum of all the particular laws.

¹²¹ Barclay, *Jews*, pp. 172–73.

¹²² Barclay, *Jews*, p. 176; Julia Annas, *Virtue and Law in Plato and Beyond* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), p. 210. Other than this wish, Philo might aim to exhort Jewish readers not to be alienated from their ancestral customs, or might have apologetic motives; but as Wilson suggests, the audience of Philo's Exposition of the Law cannot be ascertained. Wilson, *On Virtues*, p. 37.

¹²³ Cf. *Spec.* 1.277, where Philo describes God as 'the primal good, the most perfect, the perennial fountain of prudence and justice and every virtue' (*τὸ πρῶτον ἀγαθόν, τὸ τελειότατον, ἡ ἀέναος πηγὴ φρονήσεως καὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ πάσης ἀρετῆς*). Colson's translation; slightly modified.

¹²⁴ Cited above, p. 84.

¹²⁵ Cited above, p. 90.

¹²⁶ Piety (*εὐσέβεια*) as 'the queen' (*ἡγεμονίς/βασιλῆς*) of virtues is also mentioned in *Decal.* 119, *Spec.* 4.147 and *Virt.* 95. Additionally, Philo uses various similar phrases to express the idea, such as 'the greatest' (*μεγίστη*, *Abr.* 60; *Spec.* 4.97) and 'the finest and most beneficial' (*τὸ κάλλιστον καὶ ὠφελιμώτατον*, *Mos.* 1.146). For more similar expressions, see Sterling, 'The Queen', p. 120.

3.2.3.2 *The observance of the laws and the practice of virtues*

For Philo, all particular laws have reference to each head of the Decalogue; at the same time, all particular laws exemplify the ways in which they lead people to virtues, among which the queen is piety. Both ideas reflect that all particular laws are essential: some of them are classified as duty to God, some of them are classified as duty to humans, but all of them lead people to virtues. Regarding the observance of the particular laws, some duties to God through piety actually have reference also to duties to man, and some duties to humans through justice and philanthropy actually have reference also to piety. Since piety is the queen of virtues encompassing all virtues, it can be said that every particular law exemplifies certain virtues and that ultimately all laws come together to exemplify piety.

For Philo, ‘piety’ (εὐσέβεια) to God as a virtue pertains not only to correct ritual service to God, but also to a correct knowledge of God from the Mosaic laws (*Opif.* 170–2).¹²⁷ Philo also understands ‘piety’ (εὐσέβεια) in terms of ‘to love’ (ἀγαπᾶν) God (*Deus* 69).¹²⁸ In the Mosaic laws, piety closely relates to duty to humans, and, conversely, duty to humans closely relates to piety. The two cannot be separated from each other.

One example is the commandment regarding honouring parents. For Philo, this ‘head’ is the fifth on the first tablet, but it clearly pertains to the duties to humans (*Her.* 172; cf. *Decal.* 106, 110), thus he has to explain the ways in which the commandment ‘honour your parents’ relates to the duties to God. For example, he explains that parents procreate particular persons and thus they are those who ‘imitate’ (μιμούμενοι) God’s nature (*Decal.* 51), because the act of procreation is an ‘assimilation’ (ἐξομοίωσις) of God’s immortal nature (*Decal.* 107). Thus honouring parents pertains to the correct knowledge of God and gives the honour and love due to God through honouring and loving parents. Consequently, those who disregard

¹²⁷ Annas, *Virtue*, p. 204; Sterling, ‘The Queen’, pp. 112–18.

¹²⁸ Cf. Sterling, ‘The Queen’, p. 113.

parents are ‘hostile to both parts, namely, piety towards God, and their duty towards men’ (ἐκατέρας μερίδος ὄντες ἐχθροὶ καὶ τῆς πρὸς θεὸν καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἀνθρώπους, *Decal.* 110).¹²⁹ In the explanation of this commandment, Philo emphasises that duty to God and duty to humans cannot be separated. He disagrees with those who associate themselves only with one of the two tablets: some ‘lovers of God’ (φιλόθεοι) devote their lives wholly to piety, and some ‘lovers of humans’ (φιλόανθρωποι) have their hearts only for humans (*Decal.* 108–110). Philo comments that both kinds are ‘half perfect in virtue; for those only are perfect who have a good reputation in both points’ (ἡμιτελεῖς τὴν ἀρετὴν· ὀλόκληροι γὰρ οἱ παρ’ ἀμφοτέροις εὐδοκιμοῦντες, *Decal.* 110).¹³⁰

Another example showing that duty to God and duty to humans cannot be separated from each other is Philo’s portrayal of Abraham’s life. Abraham is the ‘living law’ in that his life shows the ways in which the divine commandments are exemplified. Philo frames Abraham’s life in terms of ‘piety’ (εὐσέβεια, 60–207) and ‘justice’ (δικαιοσύνη, 208–276).¹³¹ The piety of Abraham is featured in terms of his God-loving character, θεοφιλῆς (*Abr.* 50, 89, 98, 123, 167, 181, 196, 247),¹³² which relates closely to his human-loving deeds, φιλανθρωπία (*Abr.* 79, 107, 109). The justice of Abraham is also featured in terms of his human-loving character, φιλόανθρωπος (*Abr.* 208, 232). This is why Philo regards ‘philanthropy’ (φιλανθρωπία) as ‘the sister and the twin’ (ἀδελφὴ καὶ δίδυμος) of piety (*Virt.* 51), because philanthropy is the featured element exemplified in the piety towards God and justice towards

¹²⁹ Yonge’s translation; slightly modified.

¹³⁰ Yonge’s translation.

¹³¹ See above, p. 72. This frame is thus in accordance with the ‘two highest heads’ of the legislation (*Spec.* 2.63), and ‘piety and justice’ (εὐσέβεια καὶ δικαιοσύνη) can be a phrase for Philo as a reference to the Mosaic laws as a whole (*Virt.* 175; *Praem.* 162).

¹³² In this treatise, Philo juxtaposes θεοφιλῆς (‘God-loving’) with φιλόθεος (‘having love for God’) and ἀγαπήσας τὸν ἀληθῆ θεόν (‘loving the true God’, *Abr.* 50).

humans, as the life of Abraham has demonstrated. If piety encompasses all virtues, then philanthropy, the twin of piety, acts similarly as an essential element in a life of piety and justice.¹³³

Philo's concept of the relationship between the particular laws and the virtues thus focusses on the laws as exhorting people to practise virtues, but does not imply that the laws are to be reduced to virtues or to ethical principles. For Philo, the particular laws pertain to virtues and have moral purposes, but the attainment of these purposes cannot replace the outward observance or the literal performance of the laws.¹³⁴ For example, on the sacrificial rites, Philo emphasises the inward attitude of the person who offers sacrifice (*Spec.* 1. 283–288).¹³⁵ On criticising those who come to the altar with an impure soul, Philo says: 'God does not rejoice even if a man brings hecatombs to his altar; [...] But he rejoices in minds which love God, and in men who practice holiness' (ὁ θεὸς οὐ χαίρει, καὶν ἑκατόμβας ἀνάγη τις [...] χαίρει δὲ φιλοθέοις γνώμαις καὶ ἀνδράσιν ἀσκηταῖς ὁσιότητος, *Spec.* 1.271).¹³⁶ At the same time, it is also impiety if one does not perform sacrificial rites as prescribed by the laws (*Ebr.* 18).¹³⁷ For Philo, even if the symbolic meaning of a particular law is discerned and embraced, the literal practice of that law cannot be neglected (*Migr.* 89–93). Both the literal practice and the symbolic meaning of the laws are essential, like the body and the soul of a person (*Migr.* 93).¹³⁸ For Philo, an allegorical interpretation must not lead to subverting or downgrading the

¹³³ For Philo's emphasis on philanthropy in his Exposition of the Law, see below, Chapter 7.

¹³⁴ Wolfson, *Philo*, II, p. 223; Annas, *Virtue*, p. 205.

¹³⁵ Cf. Jutta Leonhardt, *Jewish Worship in Philo of Alexandria*, TSAJ, 84 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), p. 184.

¹³⁶ Yonge's translation; slightly modified. Cf. Francesca Calabi, 'Les sacrifices et leur signification symbolique chez Philon d'Alexandrie', in 'Car c'est l'amour qui me plaît, non le sacrifice...': *recherches sur Osée 6:6 et son interprétation juive et chrétienne*, JSJSup, 88 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. 97–117 (p. 98).

¹³⁷ Sterling, 'The Queen', p. 113.

¹³⁸ Annas, *Virtue*, p. 205.

literal practice; he insists that the literal practice is indispensable.¹³⁹ Therefore, even if moral principles are found from the particular laws, they cannot replace the particular laws themselves. Rather, virtues are practised through the observance of all particular laws.

3.3 Conclusion

Philo differentiates the Pentateuch into the historical part and the legislative part in terms of ‘unwritten laws’ and ‘written laws’; subsequently, in his survey of the legislative part, he highlights the Decalogue as the ‘heads’ of the particular laws. Comparative language is also found in his discussion: the first tablet is ‘better’, and piety is ‘the queen of virtues’. As the present Chapter has shown, all these descriptions are not meant to prioritise certain parts of the law. The relationship between the unwritten and the written laws is described in terms of originals and copies, focussing on the sense that the copies are the genuine and accurate casting of the originals. Likewise, the unity of the Decalogue and the particular laws is emphasised. It is described in a whole-and-part cutting image and is further explained in terms of a genus-species relationship. All the particular laws originate from the Decalogue, to which every particular law can be referred. All the particular laws can be summarised as duty to God and duty to humans, based on the fact that the Decalogue commandments are given in two tablets which pertain to love for God (φιλόθεος) and love for humans (φιλόανθρωπος) respectively.

For Philo, the division of the Law as these two sets of duties can be expressed in terms of virtues, as he also describes the ‘two highest heads’ of the laws as piety and holiness towards God and justice and philanthropy towards humans. He further demonstrates that all the laws can be referred to the virtues, of which the ultimate source is piety. The designation

¹³⁹ John M. G. Barclay, ‘Paul and Philo on Circumcision: Romans 2:25–9 in Social and Cultural Context’, *New Testament Studies*, 44 (1998), 536–56 (pp. 539–41).

of piety as the ultimate source shows that Philo understands piety as encompassing all the laws, just as the Decalogue is the genus that embraces all its species, the particular laws. This, in turn, shows that his discussion of the laws in terms of virtues is not a reduction of the laws into moral principles which prioritises the principles over the particular laws themselves. For Philo, neither is any written law superfluous, nor is its literal observance dispensable.

Philo's description of duty to God and duty to humans as the 'two highest heads' of the Law shows what a summary of the Law in terms of love for God and love for humans would entail: the sums are understood as encompassing all the parts, and all the parts are understood as originating from the sums. Their unity is emphasised. The highlighting of love for God and love for humans does not downgrade the particular laws. Instead, Philo's emphasis on every particular law as leading back towards the heads demonstrates that every particular law is indispensable for exemplifying the virtues in relation to both duty to God and duty to humans.

Therefore, Philo's concept concerning the 'heads' of the Law, which does not prioritise the heads over the particular laws but affirms the indispensability of every particular law, might provide a valuable and relevant parallel to Matthew's understanding of the Law. It illustrates further the ways in which Matthew might have understood the most important commandments: the double love is the encompassing principle to which all the Law and the Prophets can be referred; no commandment of God is regarded as inferior to the double love commandments. Having established these concepts that Matthew might have in his understanding of the relationship between the love commandments and other commandments, it is now the task to investigate the significance of his double citation of 'I desire mercy but not sacrifice'.

Chapter 4

‘I desire mercy but not sacrifice’: forgiveness as God’s grace and demand (Matt 9.9–13)

As discussed in Chapter 2, Matthew is concerned about Mark’s tendency to prioritise the love commandments over other commandments. The comparison of Matthew 22.36–40 and its parallel account Mark 12.28–34 shows that one of the features is Matthew’s omission of the scribe’s statement, which regards loving God and loving one’s neighbour as ‘more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices’ (Mark 12.33). This statement, as discussed above, strongly alludes to Hosea 6.6.¹ The absence of this allusion in Matthew 22.40 is intriguing in view of the fact that Matthew cites Hosea 6.6 on two other occasions (Matt 9.9–13; 12.1–8), and that the parallel passages in Mark and Luke conversely do not include the citation.² In order to understand the meaning and significance of Hosea 6.6 in Matthew, the two pericopae in which Matthew cites Hosea 6.6 will be examined in the present and the next Chapter respectively.

The first citation of Hosea 6.6 in Matthew appears in the story of Jesus’s table fellowship with sinners and tax collectors (9.9–13), which follows immediately after the story of Jesus’s healing of a paralysed man (9.2–8). The juxtaposition of the two stories is also seen in Mark 2.1–17 and Luke 5.17–32, suggesting that both Matthew and Luke follow Mark in seeing the two stories as closely related. This suggests that Matthew 9.9–13 and the citation of Hosea 6.6 therein should be understood with reference to Matthew 9.2–8 and even to its broader context, Matthew 8–9.

¹ See above, §2.1.1.2.

² Mark 2.14–17; 2.23–28; Luke 5.27–32; 6.1–5.

The present Chapter will begin with examining the broader context of Matthew 9.9–13, focussing on the distinctiveness of Matthew in comparison with Mark, namely: concerning the narration of the healing stories, how Matthew understands and highlights Jesus as the servant of God and the Davidic shepherd-king (§4.1). Based on this portrait of Jesus, the meaning and significance of Hosea 6.6 in Matthew 9.13 will then be explored (§4.2).

4.1 The broader context of Matthew 9.9–13: Jesus's healing

Matthew 8–9 is mainly a description of Jesus's healing ministry in Galilee. After describing the call of the first disciples (4.18–22), Matthew continues to describe Jesus's teaching (Matt 5–7) and healing (Matt 8–9). Matthew summarises these ministries as 'teaching in their synagogues, and proclaiming the gospel of the kingdom, and curing every disease and every sickness' (διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ θεραπεύων πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν, 4.23; 9.35). This summary appears both before and after Matthew 5–9, in order to introduce and conclude Jesus's ministry in 'all Galilee' (4.23; cf. 9.35) as teaching and healing.³ The narrative then turns to Jesus's sending of his disciples: he gives them authority to cast out unclean spirits and 'to cure every disease and every sickness' (θεραπεύειν πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν, 10.1), and tells them: 'Cure the sick, raise the dead, cleanse lepers, cast out demons' (ἀσθενοῦντας θεραπεύετε, νεκροὺς ἐγείρετε, λεπροὺς καθαρίζετε, δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλετε, 10.8). These are precisely the deeds of Jesus described in Matthew 8–9.⁴ Therefore, Matthew 8–9 is a demonstration of these

³ It is likely that 'all cities and villages' in Matt 9.35 refers to those in the area of Galilee (cf. Matt 11.20–23), that is, Matt 4.23 and 9.35 are a doublet of the same statement.

⁴ Jesus cures the sick: 8.5–17; 9.2–8, 20–22, 27–31; raises the dead: 9.23–25; cleanses the leper: 8.2–4; casts out demons: 8.28–34; 9.32–34.

healings: a portrayal of Jesus's healing ministry as well as a demonstration for Jesus's disciples to follow.⁵

The healing stories in Matthew 8–9 are basically those that appear in Mark 1.23–2.22.⁶

Some healing stories found in other parts of Mark are also included in Matthew 8–9:

1. Jesus heals a leper	Matt 8.2–4	cf. Mark 1.40–45
2. Jesus heals the servant of a centurion	Matt 8.5–13	(not in Mark)
3. Jesus heals Simon's mother	Matt 8.14–15	cf. Mark 1.29–31
4. Jesus heals all the sick brought before him	Matt 8.16–17	cf. Mark 1.32–34
5. Jesus heals two demon-possessed men ⁷	Matt 8.28–34	cf. Mark 5.1–17
6. Jesus heals a paralysed man	Matt 9.1–8	cf. Mark 2.1–12
7. Jesus comes as a healer of sinners	Matt 9.9–13	cf. Mark 2.13–17
8. Jesus raises the dead daughter of Jairus and heals a woman with a haemorrhage	Matt 9.18–26	cf. Mark 5.21–43
9. Jesus heals two blind men	Matt 9.27–31	cf. Mark 10.46–52
10. Jesus heals a demon-possessed mute man	Matt 9.32–34	(not in Mark)

As this list shows,⁸ it is clear that Jesus's healing is the main focus of Matthew 8–9.⁹

Comparing Matthew's arrangement with Mark's narrative, two features unique to Matthew show that Matthew highlights Jesus's healing ministry as a fulfilment of God's promises, namely: the identity of Jesus as God's servant foretold by Isaiah and the Davidic shepherd-king foretold by Ezekiel. In Matthew's narration, these two identities highlight the ways in

⁵ The connection of Jesus's healing ministry and his sending of disciples is particularly close in Matthew. Matthew includes the phrase 'curing every disease and every sickness' in 10.1 (sending the disciples), which echoes Matt 4.23 and 9.35 (Jesus's ministry); cf. Matt 10.1 // Mark 6.7 // Luke 9.1.

⁶ For an analysis showing the ways in which Matthew follows and rearranges Mark's structure, see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, I, pp. 100–3.

⁷ 'Demon-possessed' (δαιμονιζομένους) are included in those 'diseases and afflictions' (νόσοις και βασάνοις) Jesus 'cures' (θεραπεύω, Matt 4.24). Matthew includes some examples of diseases or afflictions which are caused by demons (Matt 9.32–34; 12.22–24; 15.21–28; 17.14–18).

⁸ This list is built upon the information (cross references) provided in NA²⁸.

⁹ This is not to say that Matthew includes all healing stories here (Jesus's healing also appears in other parts of the gospel: Matt 12.9–14, 15, 22–23; 14.14; 15.21–28, 29–31; 17.14–18; 19.2; 20.29–34; 21.14), nor to say that Matthew 8–9 includes only healing stories (cf. Matt 8.18–27 and 9.14–17). Regarding Matthew 8–9, Davies and Allison show that scholars have various opinions on the leading theme, the structure and the Christology. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II, pp. 1–5.

which God’s mercy is shown on his people because the terms pertaining to ‘mercy’ (ἐλεέω, and σπλαγχνίζομαι)¹⁰ are deliberately included in the narration of Jesus’s healing ministry.

4.1.1 God’s promise of healing and forgiveness as fulfilled through his servant

Matthew includes a citation from Isaiah 53.4 in the summary of Jesus’s healing ministry (Matt 8.16–17),¹¹ identifying Jesus as the servant of God foretold in Isaiah, whose healing fulfils the promise of God.¹²

ὅπως πληρωθῆ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος Αὐτὸς τὰς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν ἔλαβεν καὶ τὰς νόσους ἐβάστασεν. (Matt 8.17)

So that what was spoken through the prophet Isaiah might be fulfilled: ‘He took away our sicknesses and removed [our] diseases.’

When citing Isaiah 53.4, Matthew focusses on the sicknesses of the people. His citation of Isaiah 53.4 is different from the LXX but closer to the MT:¹³

חָלֵינוּ הוּא נִשָּׂא וּמַכְאִבֵּנוּ סָבַלָם (Isa 53.4 MT)¹⁴

Our sicknesses he has lifted up and our pains he carried them.

οὗτος τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν ὀδυνᾶται (Isa 53.4 LXX)

He bears our sins and suffers pain for us.¹⁵

¹⁰ Matt 9.27, 36.

¹¹ This citation is unique to Matthew (cf. Mark 1.32–34; Luke 4.40).

¹² For Matthew, what was spoken through the prophet is the word of the Lord (cf. ἵνα πληρωθῆ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου ‘so that what was spoken by the Lord through the prophet might be fulfilled’; Matt 1.22). A fulfilment of prophecy is a fulfilment of God’s promise.

¹³ For discussions, see: Krister Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament*, ASNU, 20, 2nd edn (Lund: Gleerup, 1968), pp. 106–7; Maarten J. J. Menken, ‘The Source of the Quotation From Isaiah 53:4 in Matthew 8:17’, *Novum Testamentum*, 39.4 (1997), 313–27 (pp. 313–27); Beaton, *Isaiah’s Christ*, pp. 111–14; Lidija Novakovic, ‘Matthew’s Atomistic Use of Scripture: Messianic Interpretation of Isaiah 53.4 in Matthew 8.17’, in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels: Volume 2: The Gospel of Matthew*, ed. by Thomas R. Hatina (London: T&T Clark, 2008), pp. 147–62 (pp. 155–58).

¹⁴ The Hebrew text of Isa 53.4 preserved in the Dead Sea Scrolls is in accordance with that in the MT; cf. 1QIsa^a XLIV 8–9; 1QIsa^b VIII 13.

¹⁵ The interpretation of sickness as sins at Isa 53.4 also appears in *Targum Jonathan*, which interprets חָלֵינוּ (‘sickness’) and מַכְאִב (‘pain/suffering’) as חַוְנָא (‘guilt’, *Tg. Jon.*) and עוֹיְדָה (‘iniquity’, *Tg. Jon.*)

In the Septuagint, חלינו ('our sicknesses') is translated as 'our sins' (τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν), and סבלם ('our pains he has carried them') is paraphrased as 'he suffers pain for us' (περὶ ἡμῶν ὀδυνᾶται).¹⁶ This translation reflects the understanding of the Hebrew metaphor sickness as sin.¹⁷ By contrast, Matthew cites Isaiah 53.4 by focussing on the literal sense of sickness. Regarding חלי ('sickness')¹⁸ and מכאוב ('pain/suffering'),¹⁹ Matthew translates literally to mean physical sicknesses.²⁰ He renders חלי by ἀσθένεια ('sickness/weakness')²¹ and מכאוב as νόσος ('sickness/diseases').²² For the verbs נשא ('lift up/take away')²³ and סבל ('bear/carry'), Matthew, in translation, uses λαμβάνω ('take away')²⁴ and βαστάζω ('carry away/remove')²⁵ respectively: 'he took away our sicknesses and removed our diseases'. As a result, Matthew interprets Isaiah 53.4 to indicate that Jesus heals the people by removing

respectively. Stendahl, *The School*, pp. 106–7; Joachim Gnilka, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, HThKNT, 1, 2 vols (Freiburg: Herder, 1986), I, pp. 307–8.

¹⁶ Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000), p. 221.

¹⁷ Jobes and Silva, *Invitation*, p. 221.

¹⁸ BDB, s.v. 'חָלִי'; HALOT, s.v. 'חָלִי'; DCH, s.v. 'חָלִי'.

¹⁹ HALOT, s.v. 'מְכָאֹב'; DCH, s.v. 'מְכָאֹב'; BDB, s.v. 'מְכָאֹב'.

²⁰ Regarding the citation of Isa 53.4, it is likely that Matthew cited and translated from Hebrew, as suggested by Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament*, pp. 109, 111; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II, pp. 37–38; Novakovic, 'Matthew's Atomistic Use', p. 157. For an argument for the possibility that Matthew's *Vorlage* is a Greek translation which differs from the LXX, see Menken, 'The Source', pp. 323–27.

²¹ BDAG, s.v. 'ἀσθένεια'; LSJ, s.v. 'ἀσθένεια'. Comparing the LXX and the MT, ἀσθένεια is not found as a translation of חָלִי. But there are occasions where ἀσθενέω is employed to translate חָלִי (e.g., Judg 16.7; Ezek 34.4). Hatch and Redpath, s.v. 'ἀσθένεια', 'ἀσθενεῖν'.

²² BDAG, s.v. 'νόσος'; LSJ, s.v. 'νόσος'. Cf. the literal translation of Isa 53.4 in Symmachus (or Aquila cod. 86), which reads: οὐτως [Aq: +αυτος] τας νοσους ημων [Sy: +αυτος] ανελαβε(ν) και τους πονους (Aq: πολεμους) ημων υπεμεινεν 'surely our diseases he took up and our afflictions he endured'. The Greek texts are taken from the critical apparatus of Isa 53.4 in *Isaias*, ed. by Joseph Ziegler, SVTG 14 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939), p. 321.

²³ BDB, s.v. 'נָשָׂא', §1, 3; cf. DCH, s.v. 'נָשָׂא I', §1a.

²⁴ BDAG, s.v. 'λαμβάνω', §2.

²⁵ BDAG, s.v. 'βαστάζω', §3; cf. LSJ s.v. 'βαστάζω', §III.

sicknesses and diseases, rather than bearing their sicknesses (which might mean becoming sick himself).²⁶ Matthew's translation of Isaiah 53.4 thus fits with the preceding context in which Jesus removes diseases and casts out demons (Matt 8.2–17).

Nevertheless, Matthew's use of the literal sense 'sickness' rather than the metaphorical sense 'sin' does not necessarily eliminate the resonance of 'sin' from the context of Isaiah 53.4.²⁷ The major portrayal of the servant of God in Isaiah 53 is his suffering due to 'the transgression of my [God's] people' (עֲמֵי מִפְּשַׁע / ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν τοῦ λαοῦ μου, Isa 53.8; cf. 53.11). Matthew recognises this portrait. He follows Mark and narrates Jesus's suffering by alluding to Isaiah 53. In Matthew 20, Jesus foretells that he 'will be given over' (παραδοθήσεται, Matt 20.18 // Mark 10.33) to the hands of the Jewish leaders, and he will 'give his life as a ransom for many' (δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, Matt 20.28 // Mark 10.45). The key terms in this description appear in Isaiah 53.12 LXX, where the servant's 'life' (ψυχὴ) 'was given over' (παρεδόθη) because of 'the sins of many' (ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν).²⁸

Therefore, by citing Isaiah 53.4, Matthew connects both healing of sickness and forgiveness of sins in his portrayal of Jesus's healing ministry and regards this as the

²⁶ Gundry, *Matthew*, p. 150; R. T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), p. 323.

²⁷ It has been suggested that the use of Isa 53.4 at Matt 8.17 serves to emphasise Jesus's ministry of physical healing and does not draw in the role of the servant's suffering at this point (Matt 8.17). Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 8–20: A Commentary*, trans. by James E. Crouch, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), p. 14; Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, WBC, 33A (Dallas: Word, 1993), p. 211. However, given the close relationship of physical healing and the forgiveness of sins in Matthew 8–9 (see the discussion below), it is more likely that, when citing Isa 53.4, Matthew also considers the role of the servant's bearing sins of many described in Isa 53; D. A. Carson, 'Matthew', in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Volume 8*, ed. by Frank E. Gæbelein (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), pp. 1–599 (pp. 205–6); Gundry, *Matthew*, p. 150; Beaton, *Isaiah's Christ*, pp. 114–19.

²⁸ Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, WBC, 33B (Dallas: Word, 1995), pp. 507–8, 582; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II, p. 734 note 15. The description of the servant as pouring out his life and bearing the sin of many corresponds to that in Isa 53.12 MT: העֲרַדָּה לְמוֹת נַפְשׁוֹ ('he poured out his life to death'); וְהָאָ חָטָא דְרַבִּים נִשָּׂא ('he bore the sin of many').

fulfilment of God's promises. The promised healing from God includes both curing of physical sickness and forgiveness of sins. The sin of the people of God is described metaphorically as sickness which needs to be healed,²⁹ and sin is also regarded as the cause of sickness.³⁰ Therefore, 'sickness' can be used both literally and metaphorically (sin represented as sickness). The relationship could be closer such that both sin and sickness are components of Israel's plight. For example, Isaiah speaks of the sinful Israel as being sick and wounded: they are smitten because of their rebellion (Isa 1.4–6).³¹ But God promises a day of healing: he will 'heal' his people (אָרְפֵּא/ἰάομαι, Isa 30.26; cf. Jer 30.17), which includes forgiveness of sins and restoration of prosperity (Jer 33.6–8);³² the future restoration also includes curing of sickness: the blind will regain sight, the deaf will hear, the lame will leap and the mute will speak (Isa 35.5–6; cf. Matt 11.2–5). Matthew identifies Jesus as the servant of God who brings forth both the promised curing of physical sickness and forgiveness of sins. As will be discussed below, Matthew narrates both healing of sickness and forgiveness of sins especially in terms of 'mercy' and in relation to Jesus's identity as the merciful Son of David.

4.1.2 Jesus as the merciful Son of David

In comparison with Mark, Matthew's narration highlights Jesus as the Son of David, identifying Jesus as the Davidic shepherd-king who shows mercy to his people. The inclusion of the healing of two blind men in Matthew 9.27–31 contains a cry: 'Have mercy on us, Son of David' (Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, υἱὸς Δαυὶδ, Matt 9.27). This cry is significant in Matthew: it appears in three healing stories (Matt 9.27–31; 15.21–28; 20.29–34), while it appears only once in

²⁹ E.g., 'I will heal your faithlessness' (אָרְפֵּא מְשׁוּבָתֵיכֶם, Jer 3.22 MT; cf. Hos 14.5 MT).

³⁰ E.g., Deut 28.58–61.

³¹ Cf. M. L. Brown, 'אָרְפֵּא', *TDOT*, XIII, pp. 593–602 (p. 598).

³² Brown, 'אָרְפֵּא', p. 598.

Mark (Mark 10.47–48). This suggests that Matthew intends to connect the healing stories to Jesus’s mercy and his identity as the Son of David, which are important for exploring the meaning of ἔλεος in Matthew 9.9–13.

4.1.2.1 *The highlighting of God’s mercy: ἐλεέω and σπλαγχνίζομαι*

Matthew emphasises God’s mercy in his portrayal of Jesus’s healing ministry. In the healing stories, God’s mercy is highlighted by the cry from the needy: ‘have mercy on me/us’ (ἐλέησόν με/ἡμᾶς, Matt 9.27; 15.21; 20.30, 31; cf. 17.15). Jesus responds and shows mercy by healing the needy. Remarkably, in all these scenarios, Jesus is addressed as ‘Lord’ (κύριος, Matt 9.28; 15.21; 17.15; 20.31),³³ which is distinctive to Matthew. For instance, regarding the healing story near Jericho, Mark records the blind man’s words as ‘Son of David, have mercy on me’ (Υἱὲ Δαυίδ, ἐλέησόν με, Mark 10.48) and ‘Rabbuni, that I may regain my sight’ (Ραββουνι, ἵνα ἀναβλέψω, Mark 10.51). Matthew, by contrast, writes κύριος at these places correspondingly: ‘Have mercy on us, Lord, Son of David!’ (Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε, υἱὸς Δαυίδ, Matt 20.31) and ‘Lord, that our eyes may be opened’ (Κύριε, ἵνα ἀνοιγῶσιν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν, Matt 20.33). Matthew’s portrayal of the needy addressing Jesus as κύριος echoes the prayer ‘Have mercy on me, Lord’ (ἐλέησόν με, κύριε) in the Septuagint,³⁴ by which people seek God’s mercy when they are helpless and need healing, forgiveness or deliverance from God. In this way, Matthew portrays Jesus’s healing ministry as bringing forth the mercy of God.

³³ Some manuscripts (N f¹³ 892^c) also have κυριε at Matt 9.27, probably an assimilation to Matt 20.31. The reading κυριε at Matt 20.30 may be an assimilation to Matt 20.31, too. NA²⁸ puts κυριε at Matt 20.30 in square brackets to indicate this uncertainty.

³⁴ Ps 6.3; 9.14; 26.7; 30.10; 40.5, 11; 55.2; 85.3 LXX. See also ‘Lord, have mercy on us’ (κύριε, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς) in Ps 122.3; Isa 33.2; Sir 36.11, 17; Jdt 6.19; Bar 3.2 LXX; and ‘God, have mercy on me’ (ὁ θεός, ἐλέησόν με) in Ps 50.3; 56.2 LXX.

This portrait is clear when Matthew puts the cry ‘have mercy on us’ (ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς) within the context of Matthew 8–9 (Matt 9.27), which is Matthew’s major section narrating Jesus’s healing ministry. This account (Matt 9.27–31) is similar to the healing story near Jericho later in the narrative (Matt 20.29–34), which is taken up from Mark.³⁵ However, Matthew twice portrays blind men being shown mercy by the Son of David (Matt 9.27–31; 20.29–34): the additional case is placed at 9.27–31. Consequently, the cry ‘have mercy on us’ appears in this block of healing stories. This is significant because in the immediate context Matthew summarises Jesus’s ministry with a reference to Jesus’s ‘having compassion’ (σπλαγχνίζομαι) for the crowds:

Καὶ περιῆγεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς πόλεις πάσας καὶ τὰς κώμας διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ θεραπεύων πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν. Ἴδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους ἐσπλαγχνίσθη περὶ αὐτῶν, ὅτι ἦσαν ἐσκυλμένοι καὶ ἐρριμμένοι ὡσεὶ πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα. (Matt 9.35–36)

And Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and proclaiming the gospel of the kingdom, and curing every disease and every sickness. When he saw the crowds, he had compassion for them, because they were harassed and dejected, like sheep not having a shepherd.

The phrase ‘when he saw the crowds, he had compassion for them’ (Ἴδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους ἐσπλαγχνίσθη περὶ αὐτῶν) is taken up from Mark, which is part of the story of feeding five thousand men, the parallel account of which is also found in Matthew (Mark 6.32–44 // Matt 14.13–21).³⁶ In this way, Matthew characterises Jesus’s ministry with ‘mercy’ by placing the blind men’s cry for mercy (ἐλεέω, 9.27) and Jesus’s having compassion (σπλαγχνίζομαι, 9.36) on the crowd within the context of Matthew 8–9, in which the appearance of terms ἐλεέω and

³⁵ Mark 10.46–52; cf. Luke 18.35–43.

³⁶ Mark describes that Jesus ‘saw a great crowd and had compassion on them, because they were like sheep not having a shepherd’ (εἶδεν πολλὸν ὄχλον καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ’ αὐτούς, ὅτι ἦσαν ὡς πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα). Mark describes that Jesus has compassion and ‘teaches’, while Matthew describes that Jesus has compassion and ‘heals’ (Mark 6.34; Matt 14.14).

σπλαγχνίζομαι is a result of duplication.³⁷ This strongly suggests that Matthew deliberately emphasises ‘mercy’ in this block of healing stories.

Both ἐλεέω and σπλαγχνίζομαι pertain to helping the needy with healing, forgiveness and deliverance. In Matthew, σπλαγχνίζομαι (18.27) and ἐλεέω (18.33) are employed in the story of the unmerciful slave (18.25–35) to describe the forgiveness of debt as showing mercy to the debtor.³⁸ Moreover, both verbs are employed to describe Jesus’s having mercy on the blind men (ἐλεέω, 20.30; σπλαγχνίζομαι, 20.34).³⁹ The close affinity between σπλαγχνίζομαι and ἐλεέω is also attested elsewhere in the Septuagint and the New Testament. In the Septuagint, ἐλεέω and σπλαγχνίζομαι appear together to indicate that the person showing compassion to others will obtain mercy from God: ‘The one who has compassion will be shown mercy’ (ὁ σπλαγχνιζόμενος ἐλεηθήσεται, Prov 17.5 LXX).⁴⁰ Luke, writing the story of the merciful Samaritan (Luke 10.29–37), uses both σπλαγχνίζομαι (Luke 10.33) and ποιήσας ἔλεος (Luke 10.37) to describe the assistance (which includes bandaging the wound – ‘healing’) for the injured man. Luke also expresses the eschatological salvation as God’s ‘showing mercy’ (ποιήσας ἔλεος, Luke 1.72), which is described as ‘because of the tender

³⁷ A double description of the two blind men’s cry: ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς (Matt 9.27, 20.30; cf. Mark 10.47); a double description of Jesus’s compassion on the crowd: ἐσπλαγχνίσθη (Matt 9.36, 14.14; cf. Mark 6.34).

³⁸ Cf. Mirguet, who suggests that σπλαγχνίζομαι and ἐλεέω are equated in Matthew 18. Françoise Mirguet, *An Early History of Compassion: Emotion and Imagination in Hellenistic Judaism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), p. 177 note 77.

³⁹ Konradt points out that Matt 18.27–35 and 20.29–34 reflect the ‘togetherness’ (Zusammengehörigkeit) of σπλαγχνίζομαι and ἐλεέω. Matthias Konradt, *Studien zum Matthäusevangelium*, WUNT, 358 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), p. 414.

⁴⁰ This sentence is the extended part of Prov 17.5, which is in the LXX but has no counterpart in the MT. Σπλαγχνιζόμενος is a reading attested in Codex Alexandrius, which is regarded by Rahlfs as the best reading. Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus have ἐπισπλαγχνιζόμενος.

mercy of our God' (διὰ σπλάγχχνα ἐλέους θεοῦ ἡμῶν, Luke 1.78).⁴¹ These examples show that the cognates of ἐλεέω and σπλαγχνίζομαι are employed together to express God's forgiveness and deliverance as well as God's expectation on his people to show deeds of kindness and forgiveness.

Other Jewish literature in Greek also uses both ἐλεέω and σπλαγχνίζομαι to depict the human need for mercy from God. In the *Apocalypse of Moses*, Adam seeks that God 'may have compassion and show mercy to [him]' (σπλαγχνισθῆ καὶ ἐλέησῃ με, *Apoc. Mos.* 27.2)⁴² after he sinned against God.⁴³ The *Testament of Job* also uses the two verbs together to express that God will deliver Job from his affliction: 'the Lord, being compassionate, may show mercy on us' (ὁ Κύριος σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἐλέησῃ ἡμᾶς, *T. Job* 26.5).⁴⁴ A frequent use of the cognates of ἐλεέω and σπλαγχνίζομαι is found in the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, which expresses divine mercy and human mercy with these terms, to describe Israel's hope for God's deliverance and God's demand from Israel.⁴⁵

⁴¹ Σπλάγχχνα basically means 'inner parts', and metaphorically 'the seat of the affections'; LSJ, s.v. 'σπλάγχχον'. Köster suggests that σπλάγχχνα ἐλέους is equivalent to the Hebrew phrase מַחְמֵי רַחֲמֵי (1QS 1.22; '[God's] loving mercies') or רַחֲמֵי מַחְמֵי (1QS 2.1; 'the loving deeds of [God's] mercy'), which pertains to the hope for God's eschatological salvation. Helmut Köster, 'σπλάγχχον', *TDNT*, VII, pp. 548–59 (p.552). The English translation of 1QS is taken from *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*, ed. by Michael O. Wise, Martin G. Abegg Jr., and Edward M. Cook, rev. edn (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2005), pp. 117–18.

⁴² The Greek text of *The Apocalypse of Moses* is taken from Jan Dochhorn, *Die Apokalypse des Mose: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*, TSAJ, 106 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), p. 416.

⁴³ Compare Prayer of Manasseh 7, in which God is described as 'compassionate' (εὐσπλαγχνος) and 'greatly merciful' (πολυέλεος) because he has promised forgiveness for repentant sinners.

⁴⁴ The Greek text of *The Testament of Job* is taken from *Testamentum Iobi*, ed. by Sebastian P. Brock, PVTG, 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1967), p. 38.

⁴⁵ Words pertaining to divine mercy include: ἐλεέω (*T. Jud.* 19.3; *T. Zeb.* 8.1; *T. Dan* 5.9); ἐλεήμων (*T. Jud.* 19.3; *T. Iss.* 6.4; *T. Zeb.* 9.7); ἔλεος (*T. Levi* 15.4; *T. Jud.* 23.5; *T. Naph.* 4.3); εὐσπλαγχνία (*T. Zeb.* 9.8; *T. Ash.* 7.7); εὐσπλαγχνος (*T. Zeb.* 9.7); σπλαγχνίζομαι (*T. Zeb.* 8.1, 3 [implied]); σπλάγχχον (*T. Levi* 4.4; *T. Zeb.* 8.2; *T. Naph.* 4.5). Words pertaining to human mercy include: ἐλεάω (*T. Iss.* 5.2; *T. Zeb.* 7.2; *T. Ash.* 2.6; *T. Benj.* 4.2); ἐλεέω (*T. Jud.* 18.3; *T. Ash.* 2.5, 7; *T. Zeb.* 2.2; *T. Benj.* 4.4; 5.4); ἐλεήμων (*T. Sim.* 4.4; *T. Ash.* 4.3); ἔλεος (*T. Zeb.* 5.1, 3, 4; 7.3; 8.1, 2, 6; *T. Naph.* 4.5; *T. Gad* 2.1); εὐσπλαγχνία (*T. Zeb.* 5.1; 8.1; *T. Benj.* 4.1); εὐσπλαγχνος (*T. Sim.* 4.4); σπλαγχνίζομαι (*T. Zeb.* 4.2; 6.4; 7.1, 2); σπλάγχχον (*T. Zeb.* 8.2, 6). Cf. 'Index of Words' in *The*

In the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, one recurring element is Israel's apostasy and the Lord's mercy on them in the eschatological age.⁴⁶ God is described as 'merciful' (ἐλεήμων) and 'compassionate' (εὐσπλαγχνος) such that he will show mercy to Israel after they have repented:

καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μνησθήσεσθε κυρίου, καὶ μετανοήσετε, καὶ ἐπιστρέψει ὑμᾶς, ὅτι ἐλεήμων ἐστὶ καὶ εὐσπλαγχνος. (*T. Zeb.* 9.7)⁴⁷

After these things you will remember the Lord and repent. He will bring you back, because he is merciful and compassionate.

Since 'forsaking the commandment of the Lord' (καταλιπόντες τὰς ἐντολὰς κυρίου, *T. Iss.* 6.1) denotes the apostasy of Israel, 'walking in all commandments of God' (πορευόμενοι ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς τοῦ θεοῦ, *T. Jud.* 23.5) entails their repentance. When Israelites repent and keep God's commandments, God shows mercy to them: God will bring them back to their land from captivity (*T. Jud.* 23.5; *T. Iss.* 6.4; *T. Naph.* 4.3), and give them victory, peace and rest (*T. Dan.* 5.9, 11). The deliverance and restoration are described in terms of God's 'mercy' (ἔλεος, *T. Jud.* 23.5; *T. Naph.* 4.3); God is 'merciful' (ἐλεήμων, *T. Iss.* 6.4) and Israel 'will be shown mercy' (ἐλεηθήσεσθε, *T. Dan.* 5.9).

It is noteworthy that in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, keeping the Lord's commandments is explicitly juxtaposed with showing mercy to others:⁴⁸

Καὶ νῦν, τέκνα μου, ἀναγγεῶ ὑμῖν τοῦ φυλάσσειν τὰς ἐντολὰς κυρίου, καὶ ποιεῖν ἔλεος ἐπὶ τὸν πλησίον, καὶ εὐσπλαγχνίαν πρὸς πάντας ἔχειν, οὐ μόνον πρὸς ἀνθρώπους, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς ἄλογα. [...] ἔχετε οὖν ἔλεος ἐν σπλάγγχοις ὑμῶν, τέκνα μου, ὅτι ὡς ἂν τις ποιήσῃ τῷ πλησίον αὐτοῦ, οὕτως καὶ ὁ κύριος ποιήσῃ αὐτῷ. (*T. Zeb.* 5.1, 3)

Now, my children, I tell you of keeping the commandments of the Lord, showing mercy to [your] neighbour, and having compassion to all, not only to humans, but

Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text, ed. by Marinus de Jonge, PVTG, 1.2 (Leiden: Brill, 1978), pp. 207–51.

⁴⁶ *T. Levi* 10.1–5; 14.1; *T. Jud.* 23. 1–5; *T. Iss.* 6.1–4; *T. Dan* 5.4–8; *T. Nap.* 4.1–5.

⁴⁷ Regarding καὶ ἐπιστρέψει ὑμᾶς, some Greek manuscripts read καὶ ἐλεήσει ὑμᾶς ('and he will show mercy to you'). Charles, *The Greek Versions*, p. 128.

⁴⁸ Cf. Mirguet, *Compassion*, p. 180.

even to animals. [...] Therefore, have mercy in your hearts, my children, because just as a person does to his neighbour, so also the Lord will do to him.

The above passage highlights showing mercy to others in the exhortation for keeping the commandments of God.⁴⁹ The significance of showing mercy is explained: the Lord would show mercy to those who show mercy to others (*T. Zeb.* 5.3; cf. *T. Zeb.* 8.1–3).⁵⁰ The exhortation to keep God’s commandments in terms of showing mercy is based on the fact that Israel has sinned: they themselves are the needy who require God’s mercy for deliverance and restoration. In this way, the language of Israel’s repentance and hope is reconfigured in terms of ‘mercy’: Israel seeks God’s mercy, and God also demands Israel to show mercy to others.⁵¹

The cognates of ἐλεέω and σπλαγχνίζομαι, as shown in the above examples, come together to express Israel’s hope for God’s mercy and to express God’s demand for humans to show mercy to others. This interrelationship between divine mercy and human mercy is important for Matthew (especially Matt 18.25–35). When Matthew puts ἐλεέω (Matt 9.27) and σπλαγχνίζομαι (Matt 9.36) within the context of Matthew 8–9, he highlights God’s mercy for his people through Jesus’s healing ministry, and at the same time connects this context (Matt 8–9) to the larger theme of ‘mercy’ in his gospel. Therefore, this interrelationship is relevant to Matthew 9.9–13 and might help explain the significance of the citation of Hosea 6.6 and the meaning of ἔλεος at Matthew 9.13.

⁴⁹ See also *T. Iss.* 5.1–2 (cited above, p. 53), which equates guarding the ‘law of God’ (νόμον θεοῦ) with loving God and loving one’s neighbour, juxtaposing these with ‘showing mercy’ (ἐλεάω) to others. Cf. *T. Sim.* 4.4–6, *T. Zeb.* 8.1–6 and *T. Benj.* 3.1–4.5, which all regard Joseph as merciful and as an exemplar of loving his brothers.

⁵⁰ *T. Zeb.* 8.1–3 is not attested in a group of manuscripts; Charles and Becker regard this part as an interpolation. Charles, *The Greek Versions*, pp. 125–26; Jürgen Becker, *Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen*, JSHRZ, 3.1 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher, 1974), p. 89. It is difficult to confirm the date of these later additions.

⁵¹ See also an observation by Mirguet, who regards the reshaping of the love command in *The Testament of Zebulun* in terms of compassion as functioning to ‘urge that it [the love command] be practiced towards all human beings’. Mirguet, *Compassion*, p. 182.

4.1.2.2 *The Son of David brings God's promised healing and forgiveness*

Another point of significance relating to ἐλεέω and σπλαγχνίζομαι in Matthew 8–9 is Jesus's identity 'Son of David' (υἱὸς Δαυίδ, 9.27). The cry 'Have mercy on us, Son of David' itself already designates Jesus as the Son of David who 'shows mercy' (ἐλεέω) on the needy. In addition, Matthew portrays that Jesus 'has compassion' (σπλαγχνίζομαι) on the crowd because they are 'like sheep not having a shepherd' (ὥσει πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα, Matt 9.36). This image echoes the plight of God's people described in Ezekiel 34.5 and Zechariah 10.2,⁵² suggesting that the narrative in Matthew 8–9 pertains to Matthew's overall portrayal of Jesus as the coming king foretold in Ezekiel 34 and Zechariah 9–10. This merciful king, the Son of David, comes to bring forth God's healing and forgiveness of sins.

Matthew emphasises the identity of Jesus as the Son of David in his gospel. Jesus is introduced as 'Jesus Christ, son of David, son of Abraham' (Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαυίδ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ) at the very beginning (Matt 1.1). The genealogy and the birth narrative tell the ways in which Jesus is 'adopted' by Joseph, who is a 'son of David' (Matt 1.20).⁵³ Jesus is a descendant of David;⁵⁴ he is 'Christ' (Χριστός, 'the anointed' or 'Messiah'; Matt 1.1, 16, 17), succeeding to David's kingship.⁵⁵ In the subsequent narrative, Jesus is addressed or mentioned as 'Son of David' (υἱὸς Δαυίδ) seven times (Matt 9.27; 12.23; 15.22; 20.30, 31;

⁵² The phrase ὥσει πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα echoes Num 27.17; Jdt 11.19 and 2 Chr 18.16 LXX (see also 1 Kings 22.17 MT). The imagery of sheep without a shepherd also appears in Ezek 34.5 (LXX & MT) and Zech 10.2 MT. Cf. the cross references at Matt 9.36 in NA²⁸.

⁵³ Matthias Konradt, *Israel, Church, and the Gentiles in the Gospel of Matthew*, trans. by Kathleen Ess (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014), p. 29.

⁵⁴ Cf. Rom 1.3.

⁵⁵ In writing Jesus's genealogy, Matthew particularly mentions David as 'the king' (ὁ βασιλεύς, 1.6) and records the succeeding kings accordingly (from Solomon to Jeconiah and his brothers; 1.6–11).

21.9, 15), a frequency much exceeding that in Mark and Luke.⁵⁶ Remarkably, of these seven occurrences, the majority (Matt 9.27; 12.23; 15.22; 20.30, 31; 21.15) relate to the healing ministry of Jesus. The blind men and the Canaanite woman's faith in the Son of David (Matt 9.28; 15.28) and the crowd's question regarding the healing works of Jesus ('Can this man be the Son of David?', Matt 12.23) imply that there is a general perception of the Son of David as having the ability to heal.⁵⁷

Therefore, scholars are interested in studying the background concepts regarding the connection between Son of David and healing.⁵⁸ It has been suggested that the concept concerning Son of David as a healer relates to the portrayal of Solomon (David's son) as an exorcist in early Jewish literature.⁵⁹ The Messianic expectation attested in Qumran literature (4Q521) is also regarded as the exegetical background concerning the healing works of the Messiah.⁶⁰ This Qumran text describes the expectation in which the Lord will 'set prisoners free', 'open the eyes of the blind', 'heal the critically wounded', 'revive the dead' and 'send good news to the afflicted'.⁶¹ The description in 4Q521 has parallels to Matthew 11.2–5, the answer regarding 'the works of Christ' (τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Matt 11.2): 'the blind receive

⁵⁶ In Mark and Luke, Jesus is addressed as 'Son of David' only in the story of healing a blind man around Jericho (Mark 10.47, 48; Luke 18.38, 39). Another occasion where the description 'Son of David' appears is in the discussion of Christ's identity: he is both David's son and David's Lord (Mark 12.35–37; Luke 20.41–44), which is also included in Matthew (Matt 22.41–46).

⁵⁷ Cf. Konradt, *Israel*, p. 44.

⁵⁸ For a recent sketch of the views on this issue, see H. Daniel Zacharias, *Matthew's Presentation of the Son of David: Davidic Tradition and Typology in the Gospel of Matthew* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017), pp. 87–95.

⁵⁹ Wis. 7.17–22, 11Q11(ApPs^a) and Josephus, *Ant.* 8.42–49; Dennis C. Duling, 'Solomon, Exorcism, and the Son of David', *The Harvard Theological Review*, 68.3 (1975), 235–52 (p. 248); Zacharias, *Matthew's Presentation*, pp. 89–90.

⁶⁰ 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), pp. 163–84; Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2016), pp. 149–50.

⁶¹ The English translation of the Dead Sea Scrolls are taken from *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*, ed. by Florentino G. Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, 2 vols (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, and the poor have good news brought to them'. These parallels reflect a shared exegetical tradition of Psalm 146.7–8 and Isaiah 61.1 regarding the healing works of the Messiah.⁶²

However, it should also be noted that Matthew's understanding of a healing Son of David relates closely to the concept of David as the shepherd-king. In Matthew, one significant portrayal of Jesus is his identity as the shepherd-king: the king who shepherds the people of God. The genealogy already suggests that Jesus, son of David (1.1), is born to be the king of Israel. The identity of Jesus as the Davidic king is further expounded when Matthew describes Jesus being born in 'Bethlehem' (Βηθλέεμ, 2.1) and being a 'ruler' (ἡγούμενος) who 'shepherds my people Israel' (ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ, Matt 2.5–6).⁶³ This description strengthens Jesus's identity as the Davidic shepherd-king,⁶⁴ as David himself was from Bethlehem, and was described as a ruler who shepherds Israel (1 Sam 20.6; 2 Sam 5.2). This identity is then exemplified in Matthew 8–9, in the context of the healing stories, in that Jesus is addressed as 'Son of David' (9.27), and that he has compassion on the crowds who are 'like sheep without a shepherd' (9.36). These notions show that Matthew sees Jesus as the promised Davidic shepherd foretold in Ezekiel 34.

Ezekiel 34 speaks of God's people Israel (34.30) as 'sheep' (אֶבְרָתָא/πρόβατα, 34.2) being mistreated by wicked 'shepherds' (רועים/οἱ ποιμένες, 34.2). These shepherds (the rulers of Israel) feed themselves and neglect the sheep (34.2–6). They neither heal 'the sick'

⁶² Hays, *Echoes*, pp. 149–50.

⁶³ Matthew cites Mic 5.1–3 LXX and 2 Kgdms 5.2 LXX to describe Jesus as the Davidic shepherd-king who comes from Bethlehem and shepherds Israel. Mic 5.1–3 LXX mentions that there will be a 'ruler' (ἄρχων) from 'Bethlehem' (Βηθλεεμ) who will 'shepherd his flock' (ποιμανεῖ τὸ ποίμνιον αὐτοῦ, Mic 5.3), and 2 Kgdms 5.2 LXX describes David as the 'ruler' (ἡγούμενος) who 'shepherds my [God's] people Israel' (ποιμανεῖς τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ).

⁶⁴ Cf. Joel Willitts, *Matthew's Messianic Shepherd-King: In Search of 'the Lost Sheep of the House of Israel'*, BZNW, 147 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), p. 110.

(הַלֹּוֹקִים/τὸ κακῶς ἔχον, 34.4) nor seek ‘the lost’ (תַּתְּחַבֵּד/τὸ ἀπολωλός, 34.4). The sheep are scattered ‘because there are not shepherds’ (διὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι ποιμένας, 34.5 LXX).⁶⁵ Therefore, God will rescue his sheep, seek the lost and strengthen the sick (34.16). He will set up a shepherd over his sheep, who is ‘[his] servant David’ (דַּוִּד עַבְדִּי/ὁ δοῦλος μου Δαυὶδ, 34.23). A Davidic shepherd coming to heal the sick, who are like sheep without a shepherd, is the imagery echoed in Matthew 9: Jesus is the Son of David (9.27) having compassion on the people who are like sheep without a shepherd (9.36). He comes for ‘the lost sheep of the house of Israel’ (τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραήλ, Matt 10.6; 15.24) and heals ‘the sick’ (οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες, Matt 4.24; 8.16; 9.12; 14.35).⁶⁶ The explicit appearance of ‘David’ and ‘healing’ in Ezekiel 34 has been highlighted by scholars, who explain this as the scriptural background for Matthew to connect ‘healing’ to the Son of David.⁶⁷

While Matthew draws elements from Ezekiel 34, it is noteworthy that the shepherd-king imagery in Zechariah is also employed in Matthew’s depiction of Jesus. Nolland demonstrates the ways in which Matthew draws elements from Zechariah 9–14 to depict Jesus as the ideal shepherd-king in contrast to the wicked shepherds mentioned in Zechariah:

⁶⁵ This phrase in the MT is רַעֲוָה מִבְּלִי, literally ‘because of without a shepherd’. בְּלִי is בְּלִי (‘without’) with preposition מִן, expressing causation. BDB, s.v. ‘בְּלִי’.

⁶⁶ The terms shared by Ezek 34 LXX and Matt 8.1–10.8 include: πρόβατα (Ezek 34.2; Matt 9.36), ποιμήν (Ezek 34.2; Matt 9.36), κακῶς (Ezek 34.4; Matt 8.16), ἀπολωλός (Ezek 34.4; Matt 10.6); Δαυὶδ (Ezek 34.23; Matt 9.27). Cf. John Paul Heil, ‘Ezekiel 34 and the Narrative Strategy of the Shepherd and Sheep Metaphor in Matthew’, *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 55.4 (1993), 698–708 (pp. 700–702); Young S. Chae, *Jesus as the Eschatological Davidic Shepherd: Studies in the Old Testament, Second Temple Judaism, and in the Gospel of Matthew*, WUNT, 2/216 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), pp. 205–19.

⁶⁷ Wayne S. Baxter, ‘Healing and the “Son of David”’: Matthew’s Warrant’, *Novum Testamentum*, 48 (2006), 36–50; Zacharias, *Matthew’s Presentation*, pp. 95–101. Novakovic also points out the ways in which Ezekiel 34 underlies Matthew’s connection of ‘Son of David’ to Jesus’s healing activities, but her focus is to explain the underlying principle for Matthew to interpret Isa 53.4 (at Matt 8.17) as a text describing the healing activities of the Davidic Messiah. Novakovic, ‘Matthew’s Atomistic Use’, pp. 160–61.

he suggests that Zechariah 10.2–3 is itself an echo of Ezekiel 34.5–10,⁶⁸ and the important features in Zechariah 10 are at play in Matthew 9, including a description of the people wandering like sheep, suffering from lack of a shepherd (Zech 10.2; cf. Matt 9.36),⁶⁹ and being shown ‘compassion’: God ‘has compassion’ (רַחֵם) on his people (Zech 10.6), and Jesus ‘has compassion’ (σπλαγχνίζομαι) on the crowds (Matt 9.36).⁷⁰ In contrast to the wicked shepherds who neither ‘care for’ (רַקֵּב/ἐπισκέπτομαι) nor ‘heal’ (רַפֵּא/ἰάομαι) the sheep (Zech 11.16), the Lord himself will ‘care for’ (רַקֵּב/ἐπισκέπτομαι) his sheep Judah (Zech 10.3), implying that the Lord will heal his people.⁷¹ Therefore, elements from Zechariah 10 are also present in Matthew’s depiction of Jesus as the one who cares for the sheep, has compassion on them and heals them.

More importantly, the broader context of both Ezekiel 34 and Zechariah 10 point to the promise of forgiveness of sins upon the coming of the shepherd-king. Zechariah 9–10 foretells the coming of the king of Israel into Zion for the deliverance of his people, and Ezekiel 34–37 foretells the coming of a Davidic ruler with an establishment of an everlasting covenant which includes the deliverance of the people from their sins. The elements of these prophecies are specifically included by Matthew in the Passion narrative.

⁶⁸ John Nolland, ‘The King as Shepherd: The Role of Deutero-Zechariah in Matthew’, in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels: The Gospel of Matthew*, ed. by Thomas R. Hatina (London: T&T Clark, 2008), pp. 133–46 (p. 134).

⁶⁹ Zech 10.2: ‘therefore, they have wandered like sheep, they are afflicted because there is no shepherd’ (עַל־כֵּן נָסְעוּ כַּמֹּרְצָאִין יַעֲנֹו כִּי־אֵין רֹעֵה). The LXX has ἰασις (‘healing’) for רֹעֵה. Scholars suggest that the LXX translated from a Hebrew text which reads רַפֵּא instead of רֹעֵה at Zech 10.2. Gelston (the critical apparatus of Zech 10.2 in BHQ); Nolland, ‘The King’, p. 134 note 5; Mark J. Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), p. 597.

⁷⁰ Nolland, ‘The King’, p. 135. The LXX has ἀγαπάω (‘love’) for רַחֵם at Zech 10.6.

⁷¹ As Nolland suggests, the negative features of wicked shepherds in Zechariah conversely imply how the king described in Zech 9.9–10 would be positively a good shepherd. Nolland, ‘The King’, p. 144.

Firstly, in the narrative of Jesus's entry into Jerusalem (Matt 21.1–11), Matthew cites Zechariah 9.9 and highlights Jesus as the 'Son of David'. Jesus, entering Jerusalem by riding on a donkey and a colt (Matt 21.2, 5),⁷² is regarded by Matthew as fulfilling (πληρώω, Matt 21.4) the prophecy: 'Look, your king is coming to you, meek and riding on a donkey and on a foal, the son of a donkey' (ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεύς σου ἔρχεται σοι πραῦς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκῶς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ ἐπὶ πῶλον υἷόν ὑποζυγίου, Matt 21.5). That is, Jesus is the king who comes to Jerusalem as prophesied in Zechariah 9. Matthew then connects this event to the title 'Son of David'. In the words of praise by the people, Mark has 'Hosanna! Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord! Blessed is the coming kingdom of our ancestor David!' (Mark 11.9–10). Matthew modifies these words to include the title 'Son of David': 'Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord!' (Matt 21.9)⁷³ By citing Zechariah 9.9 and highlighting 'Son of David' in this event (Matt 21.1–11), Matthew expresses subtle implications regarding Jesus's entry to Jerusalem.

'Son of David', as this phrase appears in Matthew, is connected mostly to Jesus's healing ministry, including once in the Passion narrative: Matthew connects Jesus's healing the blind and the lame in the temple to the children's praise: 'Hosanna to the Son of David!' (Matt 21.14–15).⁷⁴ On the other hand, Matthew's emphasis on 'Son of David' in the moment when Jesus enters Jerusalem links this title to Jesus's life mission: the forgiveness of sins. The purpose of Jesus entering Jerusalem is to give his life as a ransom for many (Matt 20.28),

⁷² Matthew follows Zech 9.9 which describes the king riding on two animals (cf. Mark 11.2–7 and Luke 19.30–35, which only record one: πῶλος 'a foal'). Matthew describes the two animals as 'a donkey' (ὄνος) and 'a foal, son of a donkey' (πῶλος υἷός ὑποζυγίου), probably reflecting a literal translation of חמור ('a donkey') and בן־אתנור עיר ('a male donkey, son of a donkey') in Zech 9.9 MT. The LXX has ὑποζύγιον 'a donkey' and πῶλος νέος 'a young foal' respectively.

⁷³ Cf. Luke 19.38, where 'David' is not mentioned and Jesus is referred to as 'the king' (ὁ βασιλεύς).

⁷⁴ This healing and the praise that follows is mentioned only by Matthew. The connection between this healing and the praise is pointed out by Baxter, 'Healing', p. 38.

which is Jesus's life mission revealed in the genealogy, where 'son of David' appears: Jesus, 'son of David' (Matt 1.1), is born to 'save his people from their sins' (Matt 1.21). In the narration of the Last Supper, Matthew again highlights Jesus's life mission as for the forgiveness of sins when he narrates Jesus's notion concerning his blood as 'my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins' (τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, Matt 26.28). In Mark and Luke, the phrase εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν refers to the purpose of John's baptism: 'a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins' (Mark 1.4; cf. Luke 3.3). Matthew, by contrast, relates it to Jesus's blood,⁷⁵ emphasising that the forgiveness of sins is accomplished upon the death of Jesus.

Moreover, concerning Jesus's saying in the Last Supper, Matthew might have recognised the prophecy of deliverance in Zechariah 9 from the phrase 'blood of the covenant':

גַּם־אֵת בְּדָם־בְּרִיתְךָ שְׁלַחְתִּי אֶסִּירֶיךָ מִבּוֹר אֵין מַיִם בּוֹ (Zech 9.11)

As for you, because of the blood of your covenant, I will release your prisoners from a pit without water in it.⁷⁶

The 'prisoners' in this passage refer to the captives who hope for return and restoration (Zech 9.12). In other words, the coming of the king (Zech 9.9) marks the end of exile. This concept is crucial in Matthew, as he highlights the exile in the genealogy of Jesus, in which the generations beginning from 'the deportation to Babylon' are ended with the coming of Christ

⁷⁵ Matthew does not include the phrase εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν in his account of John's baptism (Matt 3.1–6). On the other hand, this phrase does not appear in Mark and Luke regarding the blood of Jesus (Mark 14.24; Luke 22.20).

⁷⁶ The first half of Zech 9.11 is slightly different in the LXX, which has ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης ἐξαπέστειλας 'because of the blood of covenant you will send' for שְׁלַחְתִּי בְּדָם־בְּרִיתְךָ 'because of the blood of your covenant I will send'. 'The blood of your covenant' can be understood as 'the blood of the covenant with you', which means the blood of the covenant that the Lord made with Israel (cf. Exod 24.8).

(Matt 1.17), who is born to save his people from their sins (Matt 1.21).⁷⁷ Matthew understands Jesus as the coming king mentioned in Zechariah 9.9 (cf. Matt 21.4–5), the connection of ‘for the forgiveness’ to the ‘blood of the covenant’ (Matt 26.28) then further resonates with the deliverance of God’s people described in Zechariah 9.9–12. This resonance strengthens the designation of Jesus as the king who comes to Jerusalem to pour out his blood for the forgiveness of sins, marking the end of exile and fulfilling the word of God through the prophets.

Furthermore, Matthew’s portrayal of Jesus, Son of David, pouring out his blood of the covenant for the forgiveness of sins also indicates that the promise about the Davidic shepherd mentioned in Ezekiel 34–37 is fulfilled in Jesus. Jesus’s pouring out of his ‘blood of the covenant’ means an inauguration of a covenant:⁷⁸ the phrase ‘the blood of the covenant’ (τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης), which appears both in Mark 14.24 and Matthew 26.28, is generally recognised as alluding to Exodus 24.8,⁷⁹ where ‘the blood of the covenant’ (דָּם־הַבְּרִית/τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης) appears in the ceremony when the Lord made a covenant with Israel at Sinai.⁸⁰ Given that pouring the blood means making a covenant, Matthew might have in mind the fulfilment of the promise about the inauguration of the everlasting covenant, particularly when he links the forgiveness of sins to the blood of the covenant.

⁷⁷ Hays, *Echoes*, pp. 107–16; Francis Watson, *The Fourfold Gospel: A Theological Reading of the New Testament Portraits of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2017), pp. 33–40. Matthew shows that the deportation to Babylon is the key moment in the history of Israel, which he summarises as: ‘So all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations, and from David to the deportation to Babylon fourteen generations, and from the deportation to Babylon to the Christ fourteen generations’ (Matt 1.17).

⁷⁸ Cf. Heb 9.18 ‘not even the first covenant was inaugurated without blood’. Cf. Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, p. 773.

⁷⁹ Davies and Allison, III, p. 473; Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, pp. 958, 966–67; France, *Mark*, p. 570.

⁸⁰ Scholars also point out that Zech 9.11 alludes to Exodus 24.8, and Matthew has both texts in mind. Nolland, *Matthew*, p. 1079; Clay Alan Ham, *The Coming King and the Rejected Shepherd: Matthew’s Reading of Zechariah’s Messianic Hope*, NTM, 4 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2005), pp. 100–101; Charlene McAfee Moss, *The Zechariah Tradition and the Gospel of Matthew*, BZNW, 156 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), p. 155.

Prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel foretell that God will make a covenant in the future: in Isaiah and Ezekiel, an ‘everlasting covenant’ (ברית עולם/διαθήκη αἰωνία, Isa 55.3; Ezek 37.26) is mentioned; in Jeremiah, a ‘new covenant’ (ברית חדשה, Jer 31.31 MT // διαθήκη καινή, Jer 38.31 LXX) is mentioned. All of these are mentioned with the forgiveness or cleansing of sins.⁸¹ Among these passages, Ezekiel 37 has further implications concerning the context of Matthew. In Ezekiel 34 and 37, ‘a covenant of peace’ (ברית שלום/διαθήκη εἰρήνης, 34.25; 37.26), which is an ‘everlasting covenant’ (ברית עולם/διαθήκη αἰωνία, 37.26), is mentioned along with the promise of the future shepherd-ruler David (דוד/Δαυιδ, 34.23–24; 37.24–25), who will forever be the king of God’s people (37.24).⁸² The inauguration of the everlasting covenant marks the end of the exile (37.21–28), at which God will save his people from their sins:⁸³

ῥύσσομαι αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν ὧν ἡμάρτοσαν ἐν αὐταῖς καὶ καθαρῶ αὐτούς (Ezek 37.23 LXX)

I will rescue them from all their lawless acts, whereby they have sinned, and I will cleanse them.⁸⁴

⁸¹ Isa 55 LXX: God ‘will show mercy that he will abundantly forgive your sins’ (ἐλεηθήσεται ὅτι ἐπὶ πολὺ ἀφήσει τὰς ἀμαρτίας ὑμῶν, Isa 55.7). Jeremiah 38 LXX [31 MT]: God ‘will be merciful to their iniquities’ (ἴλεως ἔσομαι ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν, 38.34 LXX // אסלח לעונם ‘I will forgive their iniquities’, 31.34 MT) and ‘will remember their sins no more’ (τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ ἔτι, Jer 38.34 LXX).

⁸² At Ezek 37.24, the MT has ‘David will be a king’ (דוד מלך) while the LXX has ἄρχων (‘a ruler’) for מלך. It is also noteworthy that, speaking of the future restoration of Israel, Isa 54.10 also mentions the covenant of peace (ἡ διαθήκη τῆς εἰρήνης σου, ‘the covenant of your peace’/ברית שלומי, ‘my covenant of peace’), which is characterised by God’s mercy (ἔλεος/ἐλεέω): ‘in everlasting mercy, I will show mercy on you’ (ἐν ἐλέει αἰωνίῳ ἐλεήσω σε/רחמתך עולם, ובחסד עולם, Isa 54.8).

⁸³ See also Piotrowski’s arguments for Ezek 37.23 as the scriptural basis of Matt 1.21. Nicholas G. Piotrowski, “‘I Will Save My People from Their Sins’: The Influence of Ezekiel 36:38b–29a; 37:23b on Matthew 1:21”, *Tyndale Bulletin*, 64.1 (2013), 33–54 (pp. 7–11).

⁸⁴ The translation is taken from NETS. Regarding ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν (‘from all their lawless acts’), MT has מושבתיהם מכל (‘from all their dwelling places’).

Therefore, Matthew's emphasis on 'Son of David' upon Jesus's entry into Jerusalem (Matt 21.9) and the connection of 'forgiveness of sins' to the 'blood of the covenant' shows his understanding of the promise regarding the coming of a Davidic shepherd-king in Ezekiel 34 and 37 as fulfilled in Jesus. The healing Son of David (Ezek 34) is also the Son of David who saves his people from their sins (Ezek 37).

The above discussion shows that the shepherd imagery and the coming of the king of Israel in Ezekiel and Zechariah are carefully woven together by Matthew in the descriptions of Jesus's healing and forgiveness of sins. Jesus is the Davidic shepherd-king foretold by the prophets who brings forth God's promised healing and forgiveness. The introduction of a healing Son of David in Matthew 9.27 and the people as sheep without a shepherd in Matthew 9.36 connect the healing ministry and the forgiveness of sins, as shown by Matthew's use of the Davidic shepherd-king imagery both in Matthew 9 and in the Passion narrative. More importantly, in both Matthew 9.27 and 9.36, Jesus is at the same time portrayed as merciful (*ἐλέεω*, 9.27; *σπλαγχνίζομαι*, 9.36). Therefore, the significance of the citation Hosea 6.6 in the story of Jesus's table fellowship with sinners (Matt 9.9–13), which contains elements of both healing and forgiveness of sins, should be explored with reference to Matthew's portrayal of Jesus as the merciful shepherd-king who heals and saves his people from their sins.

4.2 The significance of the citation of Hosea 6.6 in Matthew 9.9–13

Matthew 9.9–13 contains a story about Jesus's table fellowship with 'sinners and tax collectors' (*τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοί*), which is also narrated in Mark 2.14–17 and Luke 5.27–32. All three accounts record that the Pharisees ask why Jesus eats with sinners and tax collectors. Jesus responds by stating that the sick need a physician and that his purpose is to call sinners. In contrast to Mark and Luke, however, Matthew includes a citation from Hosea 6.6 in Jesus's response:

καὶ ἰδόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· διὰ τί μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν; ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας εἶπεν· οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχουσιν οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἰατροῦ ἀλλ’ οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες. πορευθέντες δὲ μάθετε τί ἐστίν· ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν· οὐ γὰρ ἤλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς. (Matt 9.11–13)

When the Pharisees saw [this], they said to his disciples, ‘Why does your teacher eat with tax collectors and sinners?’ But when he heard [it], he said, ‘Not those who are well have need of a physician, but those who are sick. Go and learn what is “I desire ἔλεος but not sacrifice.” For I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.’

The phrase ‘Go and learn what is “I desire ἔλεος but not sacrifice”’, which is peculiar to Matthew’s account of this story, is placed between Jesus’s first statement about the sick and the second statement about sinners (cf. Mark 5.17; Luke 31–32). In this way, the quotation ‘I desire ἔλεος but not sacrifice’ (Hos 6.6 in Matt 9.13) becomes part of the explanation of eating with sinners, and the phrase ‘go and learn’ suggests that a correct understanding of this quotation is the key to understanding Jesus’s table fellowship with sinners. It is then necessary to explore the possible meanings of ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν in order to investigate the reason why Matthew cites these words in this story.

4.2.1 The meaning of ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν

The citation of ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν in Matthew 9.13 is situated in a story that pertains to both healing and forgiveness of sins. Before exploring the function of this citation in this story and to its broader context, Matthew 8–9, two matters of debate should be discussed. First, the meaning of ἔλεος, which is a translation of $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, is much debated. Second, the meaning of the negation καὶ οὐ θυσίαν is also a matter of concern.

4.2.1.1 The meaning of ἔλεος in Hosea 6.6 LXX

The meaning of ἔλεος in Hosea 6.6 LXX is much debated. Scholars dispute whether רַחֲמִים in Hosea 6.6 refers, broadly speaking, to ‘faithfulness to God’,⁸⁵ ‘kindness to humans’,⁸⁶ or ‘love (to God and fellow humans)’.⁸⁷ Consequently, it is a matter of debate whether ἔλεος refers to faithfulness to God or kindness to humans in Hosea 6.6 LXX.⁸⁸

In its earliest attestations in Greek literature, ἔλεος (and its verb ἐλεέω) refers to the emotion ‘pity’.⁸⁹ However, ἔλεος in the Septuagint denotes much more than an emotion. Ἐλεος is employed mostly in translating רַחֲמִים .⁹⁰ This Hebrew word has been frequently employed to describe kindness and benevolence, such as God’s kindness towards his creatures and human kindness towards fellow humans.⁹¹ Sometimes it is mentioned with reference to one’s faithfulness in relationship with fellow humans (e.g., Gen 20.13; 21.23;

⁸⁵ Examples include: ‘loyalty’ (Wolff, Stuart, Joosten), ‘devotion’ (Mays) and ‘steadfast love [to God]’ (Dearman). Wolff, *Hosea*, p. 105; Douglas Stuart, *Hosea–Jonah*, WBC, 31 (Dallas: Word, 1987), p. 98; Jan Joosten, ‘ רַחֲמִים , “Benevolence”, and ἔλεος, “Pity”’: Reflections on Their Lexical Equivalence in the Septuagint’, in *Collected Studies on the Septuagint: From Language to Interpretation and Beyond*, FAT, 83 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), pp. 97–111 (p. 109); James Luther Mays, *Hosea: A Commentary* (London: SCM, 1969), p. 86; J. Andrew Dearman, *The Book of Hosea*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), pp. 196–97.

⁸⁶ Examples include: ‘mercy’ (Andersen and Freedman) and ‘kindness/goodness’ (Macintosh, Gruber). Andersen and Freedman, *Hosea*, p. 426; Macintosh, *Hosea*, p. 233; Mayer I. Gruber, *Hosea: A Textual Commentary*, LHBOTS, 653 (New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017), p. 294.

⁸⁷ Examples include: ‘love’ (Harper) and ‘Güte (obedience to God and kindness to fellow humans)’ (Gisin). Harper, *Amos and Hosea*, p. 286; Gisin, *Hosea*, pp. 279–80.

⁸⁸ For example, Joosten suggests that the meaning of the term has shifted from ‘loyalty toward God’ (רַחֲמִים in Hos 6.6) to ‘mercy toward humankind’ (ἔλεος in Hos 6.6); Joosten, ‘ רַחֲמִים , “Benevolence”’, p. 109. By contrast, Ribbens argues that ἔλεος in Hos 6.6 maintains the meaning of רַחֲמִים in Hos 6.6, meaning ‘human covenant faithfulness to God’; Ribbens, ‘Whose “Mercy”’, p. 387 note 24.

⁸⁹ See further below, §7.1.2.2.

⁹⁰ Around 170 occurrences; Hatch and Redpath, s.v. ‘ἔλεος’. Conversely, רַחֲמִים is mostly translated as ἔλεος in the LXX; Hans-Jürgen Zobel, ‘ רַחֲמִים ’, *TDOT*, v, p. 44–64 (p. 45).

⁹¹ BDB, s.v. ‘I. רַחֲמִים ’. Recently, Ziegert has provided a definition of רַחֲמִים as ‘an action performed by one person for the benefit of another to avert some danger or critical impairment from the beneficiary’ and suggested that ‘kindness’ is the most fitting word for its English translation; Ziegert, ‘What Is רַחֲמִים ’, pp. 726, 731.

47.29; 1 Sam 20.8).⁹² Sometimes it is combined with ברית ('covenant') to describe God's faithfulness towards his people (Deut 7.9; 1 Kgs 8.23 // 2 Chr 6.14; Neh 9.32).⁹³ Having been mostly employed to translate חסד, ἔλεος in the Septuagint means more than an emotion or an attitude because it often refers to concrete deeds of kindness in these contexts,⁹⁴ and thus it can be understood as moral excellence. For example, Micah 6.8 and Zechariah 7.9 states that ἔλεος (translating חסד) is required by God. In both texts, it is juxtaposed with κρίμα (translating משפט, 'justice'; Mic 6.8; Zec 7.9), which relates to social justice (Mic 6.10–12; Zec 7.10).

Similarly, a connection of ἔλεος to moral excellence is present in Hosea. Ἐλεος (translating חסד) first appears in a description concerning covenant-making and is juxtaposed with 'righteousness' (צדק/δικαιοσύνη) and 'justice' (משפט/κρίμα):

(Hos 2.21 MT) וארשתוך לי בצדק ובמשפט ובחסד וברחמים

καὶ μνηστεύσομαι σε ἐμαυτῶ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ἐν κρίματι καὶ ἐν ἐλέει καὶ ἐν οἰκτιρμοῖς
(Hos 2.21 LXX)

And I will betroth you to me in righteousness, in justice, in kindness and in compassion.⁹⁵

Speaking within the context in which God will make a covenant (בריתי/διαθήσομαι διαθήκη, 'I will make a covenant', Hos 2.20 MT/LXX), the phrase 'in righteousness, in justice, in kindness and in compassion' indicates 'the foundational components' of this

⁹² Cf. HALOT, s.v. 'חַסַד'.

⁹³ Zobel, 'חַסַד', TDOT, v, p. 60.

⁹⁴ Similarly, Ziegert suggests that 'חסד designates an action rather than an attitude'; Ziegert, 'What Is חַסַד?', p. 728.

⁹⁵ Translated from the MT (the LXX expresses similarly). In English Bibles, this verse is in Hos 2.19.

covenantal relationship.⁹⁶ Both parties keep the covenant by showing these virtues:⁹⁷ the Lord performs deeds of righteousness, justice, kindness and compassion towards his people,⁹⁸ and the people's loyalty towards God is reflected by whether they have these virtues.⁹⁹

חסד/ἔλεος then appears again in the context concerning keeping the Law of God. In Hosea 4.1–2, cursing, lying, murder, stealing, and adultery are regarded as lacking 'kindness' (חסד/ἔλεος) and 'knowledge of God' (אלהים דעת/ἐπίγνωσις θεοῦ). Lacking these is the result of forsaking 'the Law of your God' (אלהיך תורת/νόμος θεοῦ σου, 4.6),¹⁰⁰ which is regarded as 'sin' (חטא/ἁμαρτία, 4.8) and as forsaking the Lord (4.10, 12). God's demand for חסד/ἔλεος is then mentioned in Hosea 6 (6.4, 6), which is again juxtaposed with 'knowledge of God' (אלהים דעת/ἐπίγνωσις θεοῦ, 6.6; cf. 4.1). This suggests that what God demands in Hosea 6.6 (חסד/ἔλεος and אלהים דעת/ἐπίγνωσις θεοῦ) entails what God wants to find from his people mentioned in Hosea 4.1–2: no cursing, no lying, no murder, no stealing, and no adultery. Therefore, חסד/ἔλεος in Hosea 6.6 most likely refers back to Hosea 4.1–2 and means kindness towards fellow humans.

⁹⁶ Andersen and Freedman, *Hosea*, p. 283.

⁹⁷ Cf. Scholars' description of חסד as among the 'covenant virtues' (Glynn) or 'virtues of covenant fidelity' (Hwang); Glynn, 'The Use and Meaning', p. 50; Jerry Hwang, *Hosea: A Discourse Analysis of the Hebrew Bible*, ZECOT (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2021), p. 144.

⁹⁸ In Hosea, there are descriptions concerning God's righteousness (10.12) and mercy (2.25 MT/LXX; 14.4 MT/LXX) towards his people. As commentators suggest, the four elements mentioned in Hos 2.21 MT/LXX are described as the bride-price which a bridegroom would pay to establish a marriage; these elements thus are what the Lord does towards his people in this relationship; Mays, *Hosea*, p. 51; Hwang, *Hosea*, pp. 113–14. By contrast, Sakenfeld regards these as the gifts the Lord gives to the people of God so that they can possess these virtues; Katharine D. Sakenfeld, *The Meaning of Heseḏ in the Hebrew Bible: A New Inquiry*, HSM, 17 (Missoula: Scholars, 1978), p. 182.

⁹⁹ Hosea speaks of the people of God as required to show צדקה/δικαιοσύνη (10.12), משפט/κρίμα (12.7 MT/LXX) and חסד/ἔλεος. (4.1; 6.4, 6; 12.7 MT/LXX).

¹⁰⁰ Lying, murder, stealing, and adultery mentioned in Hosea 4.1–2 are precisely the prohibitions stated in the Decalogue.

The understanding of ἔλεος in Hosea 6.6 should also include its relation to its cognate verb ἐλεέω in Hosea (1.6, 7; 2.3, 6, 25, 14.3 LXX; all translating ׀ק׀ר). Just as the people's lack of ἔλεος (4.1, 6.4) is reiterated, their fate of not being shown mercy is also emphasised (1.6; 2.6 LXX). Because the people forsake God, God 'will not have mercy' (οὐ μὴ ἐλεήσω, 2.6 LXX) on them and will bring judgement upon them: destruction, desolation, exile and oppression by enemies (4.3; 5.7; 8.10). The people are described as being struck by God (6.1) and wounded (5.13). Conversely, when they return to God, God will 'have mercy' (ἐλεέω, 14.4; cf. 2.25 LXX) on them: God will restore and forgive them (14.5–8 LXX).¹⁰¹ Returning to God is mentioned in terms of 'keeping kindness and justice' (שמר ומשפט שמר/ἔλεον καὶ κρίμα φυλάσσου, 12.7 MT/LXX) and hoping for God's healing (6.1). In this way, in Hosea LXX, the pair of cognates ἔλεος and ἐλεέω together express an interrelationship between God's willingness to show mercy and God's demand to his people to show kindness towards their fellow humans.

This interrelationship, as discussed above, is present in the use of the verbs ἐλεέω and σπλαγχνίζομαι in Matthew 18.21–35,¹⁰² which is about forgiveness of sins.¹⁰³ This suggests that the meaning of ἔλεος in Matthew 9.13 might pertain to this interrelationship because Matthew 9.9–13 is a story about sinners. In other words, regarding Matthew 9.13, the meaning of ἔλεος should be explored with the consideration of this interrelationship between

¹⁰¹ God's forgiveness is expressed in terms of God's anger being turned away from them (14.5 MT/LXX), which can be referred to the people's prayer: 'Take away all iniquity' (כל־תשא עון, 14.3 MT; cf. LXX, which has μὴ λάβητε ἀδικίαν, 'Do not take injustice [into account]'). In describing God's restoration, the MT has 'I will heal their apostasy' (אֲרַפֵּא מְשׁוּבָתָם, 14.5), while the LXX has 'I will heal their dwellings' (ιάσομαι τὰς κατοικίας αὐτῶν). Wolff points out that the LXX might have understood מְשׁוּבָתָם as derived from ישב 'dwell' (cf. Hos 11.7; Jer 2.19; 3.22; 5.6); Wolff, *Hosea*, p. 192.

¹⁰² See above, §4.1.2.1.

¹⁰³ See further below, §4.2.2.

God's mercy and God's demand for mercy, which is reflected by the cognates ἔλεος and ἐλεέω in Hosea LXX.

4.2.1.2 *The negation καὶ οὐ θυσίαν rhetorically emphasises ἔλεος θέλω*

The meaning of καὶ οὐ θυσίαν ('but not sacrifice') in Matthew's citation of Hosea 6.6 is also a matter of concern. Καὶ οὐ in Matthew's citation is in accordance with the translation reflected in Codex Alexandrinus and some witnesses, which give a word-for-word translation of וְלֹא as καὶ οὐ and מִן as ἧ in Hosea 6.6.¹⁰⁴ Since Matthew only cites the first half of Hosea 6.6, writing καὶ οὐ, which appears as a negation of θυσία, it is important to discern what meaning is conveyed through such negation.¹⁰⁵

Since Matthew highlights that the salvation of people from their sins is achieved by Jesus (Matt 1.21; 26.28),¹⁰⁶ it might be possible that Matthew would regard temple sacrifice as no longer necessary for taking away sins and use Hosea 6.6 to indicate this.¹⁰⁷ However, Matthew 9.9–13 does not appear as a story about negation of sacrifice. It seems more likely that Matthew uses Hosea 6.6 in the sense which is expressed by the rhetorical character of the negation.

As scholars suggest, the negation 'but not' (וְלֹא) in Hosea 6.6 belongs to a kind of idiom for rhetorical purpose, that is, the negation can serve, rhetorically, to throw emphasis on the one thing that is not negated. Concerning the use of this idiom, Guillaume points out that

¹⁰⁴ As discussed above, §2.1.1.2; some witnesses show a translation of both וְלֹא and מִן in Hos 6.6 as ἧ.

¹⁰⁵ As discussed above, §2.1.1.2, it is possible to interpret the parallel structure of Hos 6.6 as reading both halves as a negation, or reading both halves as a comparison.

¹⁰⁶ Matt 20.28, which is taken up from Mark 10.45, also points out that Jesus's sacrifice is for the redemption of many people, while 1.21 and 26.28 are unique to Matthew.

¹⁰⁷ For example, Keith regards Matthew's citation of Hos 6.6 as indicating that sacrifices are no longer necessary for forgiveness of sins; Keith, 'Les citations', p. 73.

the negation is often juxtaposed with an exception.¹⁰⁸ Emphasis is gained by denying something, for affirming the exception; the negation is not absolute but is relative to the exception.¹⁰⁹ The repudiation of sacrifice (e.g., Jer 7.22–23; Hos 6.6; Amos 5.21–24; Mic 6.6–8), which is juxtaposed with the demand for righteousness or obedience, is ‘an intentional emphasis on the latter without any condemnation of the former’.¹¹⁰ Kruse has a similar observation concerning a juxtaposition of two statements, a negation and an affirmation, which is meant to emphasise the affirmed thing.¹¹¹ He calls this idiom ‘dialectical negation’.¹¹² This idiom usually appears as ‘not A, but B’.¹¹³ Sometimes the order of the two statements is reversed, appearing as ‘B but not A’, an example of which is ‘I desire mercy but not sacrifice’ (Hos 6.6).¹¹⁴ In Greek, the sentence pattern οὐ ... ἀλλά (‘not ... but’; so similarly μή ... δέ) can also be employed to express this idiom.¹¹⁵

In juxtaposing a negation (‘not A’) with an affirmation (‘B’), the use of the negation in this idiom is meant to emphasise the one thing which is not negated. Conversely, the

¹⁰⁸ Alfred Guillaume, *Prophecy and Divination among the Hebrews and Other Semites*, Bampton Lectures, 1938 (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938), p. 370.

¹⁰⁹ Guillaume, *Prophecy*, p. 371.

¹¹⁰ Guillaume, *Prophecy*, p. 372.

¹¹¹ Kruse, ‘Dialektische Negation’, p. 386.

¹¹² Kruse, ‘Dialektische Negation’, p. 391.

¹¹³ The statement that is negated ‘usually placed first’ (meist steht sie an erster Stelle); Kruse, ‘Dialektische Negation’, p. 386.

¹¹⁴ Andrew H. Bartelt, ‘Dialectical Negation: An Exegetical Both/And’, in *Hear the Word of Yahweh: Essays on Scripture and Archaeology in Honor of Horace D. Hummel*, ed. by Dean O. Wenthe, Paul L. Schrieber, and Lee A. Maxwell (St. Louis, MO: Concordia, 2002), pp. 57–66 (p. 60). Another example of ‘B but not A’ is Joel 2.13: ‘Rend your hearts but not (לִבְנֵי/כִּלְיֵי מִי) your garments’. This is an emphasis on being sorrowful for sins from one’s heart, which is not meant to restrain people from rending of garments. Both Hos 6.6 and Joel 2.13 are included in Kruse’s list of the examples of this idiom; Kruse, ‘Dialektische Negation’, p. 389.

¹¹⁵ See BDF §448, note 1, which regards one of the meanings of οὐ ... ἀλλά as ‘not so much...as’, with which ‘the first element is not entirely negated, but only toned down’. Guillaume also discusses examples of this idiom in the New Testament, such as Matt 6.19 (μή ... δέ); Guillaume, *Prophecy*, p. 371.

expression ‘not A’ is not meant to negate or condemn ‘A’. Kruse suggests that this idiom should be understood as ‘not so much A as B’¹¹⁶ or as ‘rather’ B.¹¹⁷ That is, A is not absolutely negated, and the emphasis is rather on B, in the sense that B is comparatively more important.¹¹⁸ Similarly, Bartelt suggests that ‘the negated side’ is ‘not really negated’ but is ‘in some way subordinated to or qualified by the positive statement’. He suggests that the idiom should be understood as ‘not just ... but especially’ or ‘not so much A but more importantly B’.¹¹⁹ Consequently, both Kruse and Bartelt suggest that ‘but not’ (אֲלֵכֶּם) in Hosea 6.6 should be understood as a comparative: ‘more than’.¹²⁰

However, when the emphasis is on the positive statement and the negation is only rhetorical, it does not necessarily mean that there is a comparison between the two statements in the sense that the negated side is subordinated to the positive statement. One example can be found precisely from Matthew 9.13: ‘for I came not to call the righteous, but sinners’ (οὐ γὰρ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς).¹²¹ It is in the form of the idiom of rhetorical negation (οὐ ... ἀλλά, not A but B),¹²² which is employed to emphasise the importance of

¹¹⁶ ‘nicht so sehr A als vielmehr B’; Kruse, ‘Dialektische Negation’, p. 386; cf. p. 390.

¹¹⁷ Kruse, ‘Dialektische Negation’, p. 390.

¹¹⁸ Kruse gives Exod 16.8 as an example: ‘Your murmurings are not against us, but against the Lord’. He points out that this saying is not to deny the fact that the Israelites murmured against Moses. He suggests that the sense of this saying is: ‘the fact that [your murmurings] is against us can be neglected; it is not worth mentioning. The important thing here is rather the consideration under which your murmuring is directed against God.’ (Dass es gegen uns geht, kann man vernachlässigen; es ist nicht der Rede wert. Das Wichtige, worauf es hier ankommt, ist vielmehr die Rücksicht, unter der euer Murren gegen Gott gerichtet ist.) Kruse, ‘Dialektische Negation’, p. 390. This suggests that Kruse understands this idiom as regarding the murmuring against Moses as comparatively less important because it is the murmuring against the Lord that matters.

¹¹⁹ Bartelt, ‘Dialectical Negation’, pp. 59–60.

¹²⁰ Both Kruse and Bartelt also point out that the use of מִן in the second half of Hosea 6.6 supports the understanding of אֲלֵכֶּם in the first half as ‘more than’; Kruse, ‘Dialektische Negation’, p. 391; Bartelt, ‘Dialectical Negation’, p. 60. Similarly, Guillaume, *Prophecy*, pp. 372–73 note 1.

¹²¹ Matt 9.13 // Mark 2.17 // Luke 5.32.

¹²² This saying has been recognised as the idiom of relative or dialectical negation; e.g., Guillaume, *Prophecy*, p. 374; Arnulf Kuschke, ‘Das Idiom der »relativen Negation« im NT’, *Zeitschrift für die*

Jesus's call for sinners; it is not meant to deny the righteous.¹²³ This emphasis, at the same time, is not likely to be a comparison which regard the righteous as less important than sinners or suggest that the call for sinners is more important than the call for the righteous.¹²⁴ It is more reasonable to regard the negation as making an effect of throwing all emphasis on the one thing that is not negated: above all, Jesus comes to call sinners.

Concerning the negation 'I desire mercy but not sacrifice' (καὶ οὐ, 'B but not A') in Matthew 9.13, Luz understands Hosea 6.6 in Matthew 9.13 as a dialectical negation in the sense of comparison, suggesting that *θυσία* is not denied but made inferior to *ἔλεος*: 'I desire mercy more than sacrifice'.¹²⁵ However, since Matthew cites only the first half of Hosea 6.6 (writing καὶ οὐ) and places it right before the negation 'not the righteous but sinners' in which the righteous is not likely to be regarded as less important, it is more reasonable to understand the rhetorical effect of 'mercy but not sacrifice' in light of the rhetorical effect of the negation 'not the righteous but sinners', such that both negations are employed for the same rhetorical effect. They throw all emphasis on 'I desire mercy' and 'I came to call sinners', while 'sacrifice' and 'the righteous' are neither denied nor downgraded. This understanding is also fitting in the context of Matthew 9.9–13, in which matters concerning sacrifice are not

Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche, 43 (1951), 263; Rudolf Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium*, 2 vols (Freiburg: Herder, 1976), I, p. 166; France, *Matthew*, p. 135.

¹²³ It is hard to understand if this saying is meant to deny Jesus's call for the righteous. It is difficult to discern what this saying would mean concerning the status of 'the righteous', as various suggestions for the possible meaning have shown. For a summary of the suggestions, see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II, p. 106, in which they conclude: 'we regrettably fail to see any way to judge between them'.

¹²⁴ Contrary to Pesch, who understands the negation as rhetorical, but regards it as a comparative which sets 'priority' (Vorzug) of sinners over the righteous; Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium*, I, p. 166; he is followed by Peter Dschulnigg, *Das Markusevangelium*, ThKNT, 2 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2007), pp. 98–99.

¹²⁵ '[Matthew] did not abolish the cultic law but made it inferior to the love command' (Luz's German original: 'der das Kultgesetz nicht abschaffte, sondern gegenüber dem Liebesgebot zurücktreten ließ'); Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, pp. 33–34; Ulrich Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8–17)*, EKK, I/2 (Zürich: Benziger, 1990), p. 44.

described.¹²⁶ There is no good reason to understand the citation of Hosea 6.6 in this passage as indicating that sacrifice has been made inferior. It is more reasonable to see the citation as merely an emphasis on God's will for ἔλεος.

Therefore, the significance of Hosea 6.6 in Matthew 9.13 should be explored focussing on the reason why God's demand for ἔλεος is emphasised in this story, and on the ways in which this demand relates to God's 'mercy' (ἐλεέω and σπλαγχνίζομαι) shown in Jesus's healing ministry.

4.2.2 God's mercy and God's demand for mercy

Matthew 8–9 speaks of God's mercy shown through Jesus's healing and forgiveness. In this context, Matthew speaks of God's demand for ἔλεος by citing Hosea 6.6 at 9.13. As discussed above, the terms ἐλεέω and σπλαγχνίζομαι, which are deliberately placed into Matthew 8–9, reflects a contemporary concept of the interrelationship between God's mercy and God's demand for mercy. This interrelationship, as discussed above, is also reflected by the cognates ἔλεος and ἐλεέω in Hosea LXX: those who have ἔλεος will be 'shown mercy' (ἐλεέω). This indicates that the demand for ἔλεος expressed in Matthew 9.13 should be understood with reference to this interrelationship.

This interrelationship, or in what situation humans are being shown mercy, is Matthew's concern. In the beatitudes, Matthew highlights who would be shown mercy:

μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθήσονται. (Matt 5.7)

Blessed are the merciful, for they will be shown mercy.

¹²⁶ So Luz also observes, 'Nothing has been said thus far about a sacrifice'; Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, p. 33. Furthermore, not even 'ceremonial law' is in question in Matt 9.13; as Barth points out, 'there is no question of opposition to the ceremonial law being meant'; Gerhard Barth, 'Matthew's Understanding of the Law', in *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, by Gunther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz Joachim Held, trans. by Percy Scott, 2nd edn (London: SCM, 1982), pp. 58–164 (p. 83).

While the blessing of being shown mercy is only mentioned as a statement at Matt 5.7, it is expressed in detail in the parable of the unmerciful slave (Matt 18.23–35).¹²⁷ This parable shows the ways in which being shown mercy is the result of showing mercy, but is expressed ‘conversely’. The slave who does not show mercy to his fellow slave is condemned by his lord: ‘Should you not have shown mercy (ἐλέεω) on your fellow slave, as I have shown mercy (ἐλέεω) on you?’ (Matt 18.33) and is eventually not shown mercy (Matt 18.34).

More importantly, the parable of the unmerciful slave is about forgiveness of sins, as both the background (Matt 18.21–22) and the conclusion (Matt 18.35) of this parable suggest. The description ‘he forgave him the debt’ (τὸ δάνειον ἀφῆκεν αὐτῷ, 18.27) in this parable also connects to the idea of ‘forgiving debts’ (ἄφες τὰ ὀφειλήματα, Matt 6.12) as ‘forgiving trespasses’ (ἀφῆτε τὰ παραπτώματα, Matt 6.14) in Matthew 6.12–15. Furthermore, both statements in Matthew 6.15 and 18.35 express that those who do not ‘forgive’ (ἀφίημι, Matt 6.15; 18.35) others will not be forgiven by God. Therefore, in the parable of the unmerciful servant, forgiving and being forgiven is equated to showing mercy and being shown mercy. In other words, God’s expectation of his people for forgiving each other is spoken in terms of God’s requiring his people to ‘show mercy’ (ἐλέεω). Just as God has shown mercy and forgiven the sins of his people, so also his people are required to show mercy and forgive sins among themselves.

When God’s will for ἔλεος is emphasised in Matthew 9.9–13, which is about forgiving sins and Jesus’s call to sinners, the story is then connected to Matthew 18.23–25. The cognates ἔλεος and ἐλέεω would suggest this connection. More importantly, both stories share the key idea of sinners being shown mercy, and speaks of God’s demand from his people.

¹²⁷ Both Matt 5.7 and the parable of the unmerciful slave are unique to Matthew.

Matthew 9.9–13 is a story about sinners which is situated within the narration of Jesus’s healing ministry, in which Matthew highlights the sick are being shown mercy. God’s merciful healing not only pertains to cure of sickness but also forgiveness of sins. This is suggested by the citation of Isaiah 53.4 at Matthew 8.17, which implies that Jesus is the servant who removes both sickness and sins from the people of God. The connections of sickness and sin, as well as healing and forgiving, are then described explicitly in Matthew 9.1–13. Jesus heals the paralysed man by declaring that the sins of the paralysed man are forgiven (9.2–8). Then, in the following story, those sinners who come and join Jesus’s banquet are regarded as sick and in need of the physician, Jesus (9.13). The terms ‘sinner’ (ἁμαρτωλός, 9.10, 11, 13), ‘healer’ (ιατρός, 9.12) and ‘the sick’ (ὁ κακῶς ἔχων, 9.12) connects this story (9.9–13) to the previous story (9.2–8) with the themes of healing the sick and forgiving sins. In this way, Matthew 9.1–13 is part of the ‘healing’ (Matt 8–9), which is described in terms of the people of God being shown mercy.

Since Matthew 9.9–13 is a story of sinners being shown mercy and ‘healed’, in light of Matthew’s emphasis on the interrelationship between forgiving and being forgiven in terms of ‘showing mercy’ (Matt 5.7; 6.12, 14–15; 18.33, 35), God’s will for ἔλεος at Matthew 9.13 might entail two respects. First, it expresses God’s willingness to ‘show mercy’ (ἐλέεω) on sinners and ‘heal’ their sins. Second, it expresses the ways in which God requires those who have been shown mercy to show kindness towards their fellows.

4.2.2.1 *Ἐλεος as restoring sinners: to ‘heal’ the lost*

The Pharisees criticise Jesus for eating with sinners, probably because associating with sinners might lead one to sin against God (cf. Ps 1.1; 26.5; Sir 13.1).¹²⁸ It has been suggested

¹²⁸ Cf. Eric Ottenheijm, ‘The Shared Meal—A Therapeutical Device: The Function and Meaning of Hos 6:6 in Matt 9:10–13’, *Novum Testamentum*, 53.1 (2011), 1–21 (pp. 9–10).

that, ‘sinners’ (ἀμαρτωλοί) in this story refer to those עמי הארץ (literally ‘people of the land’) mentioned in rabbinic literature, who are less strict on ritual purity than the Pharisees.¹²⁹ In order to keep their purity, the Pharisees would avoid eating or associating with these עמי הארץ (cf. *b. Ber.* 43b; *t. Demai* 2.2). However, the term ‘sinners’ in Matthew 9.10–11 is probably not what עמי הארץ in rabbinic literature might entail. They are, as other commentators point out, more likely those who have forsaken the Law of God.¹³⁰ Associating with sinners (and tax collectors) is regarded as improper not only by the Pharisees but also by many Jews (cf. *Matt* 11.19; *Luke* 15.1–2; 19.1–7).¹³¹

However, Matthew narration of Jesus’s table fellowship with sinners shows that he regards reaching out to sinners as necessary, so that they might be ‘healed’. He narrates that Jesus proclaims the gospel by calling for repentance and healing the sick (*Matt* 4.17, 23) and then sends his disciples to do the same (*Matt* 10.1–8).¹³² Reaching out to sinners is part of the healing ministry. This is implied when the story of the table fellowship is placed alongside Jesus’s healing stories, and it becomes apparent with the features of the story. First, a proverb about the sick needing a physician is used to explain the importance of reaching out to sinners. Second, Matthew’s description of Jesus as ‘teacher’ (διδάσκαλος, 9.11) and the citation of Hosea 6.6 further indicate that the table fellowship is an act for the purpose of bringing forth God’s ‘healing’ to sinners.¹³³

¹²⁹ William L. Lane, *The Gospel According to Mark*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), p. 103.

¹³⁰ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II, p. 100; Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), p. 295; Marcus, *Mark 1–8*, p. 226. Sanders regards these sinners as those who ‘renounce the covenant’; E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (London: SCM, 1985), p. 178.

¹³¹ Note the generality of ‘all’ (πάντες) of the ‘crowd’ (ὄχλος) in *Luke* 19.1–7.

¹³² As mentioned above, Matthew brackets Jesus’s ministry in terms of ‘proclaiming the gospel’ and ‘healing every disease and every sickness’ (4.23; 9.25) and then describes in the same terms that Jesus sends his disciples to ‘heal every disease and every sickness’ and ‘proclaim’ the message about the kingdom of heaven (10.1, 7). See above, pp. 100–1.

¹³³ The description of Jesus as διδάσκαλος in this story is unique to Matthew; cf. *Mark* 2.16; *Luke* 5.30.

In Jesus's response to the Pharisees, the proverb 'not those who are well have need of a physician, but those who are sick' (οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἰατροῦ ἀλλ' οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες)¹³⁴ is recognised as similar to some sayings attested in Graeco-Roman literature.¹³⁵ For example, 'physicians are wont to spend their time not among the healthy, but where the sick are' (οὐδ' οἱ ἰατροὶ παρὰ τοῖς ὑγιαίνουσιν, ὅπου δὲ οἱ νοσοῦντες, διατρίβειν εἰώθασιν, Plutarch, *Apoph. lac.* 230F).¹³⁶ A saying of Dio Chrysostom is noteworthy:

Just as the good physician (ἰατρός) should go and offer his services where the sick are most numerous, so, said he, the man of wisdom should take up his abode where fools are thickest in order to convict (ἐξελέγχω) them of their folly and reprove (κολάζω) them. (Dio Chrysostom, *Virt. (Or. 8) 5*)¹³⁷

This saying reflects a concept that 'the man of wisdom' (ὁ φρονίμος ἀνὴρ) has a role in correcting (ἐξελέγχω, 'convict'; κολάζω, 'reprove') the fools, just as a good physician goes towards the sick and heals them. Another saying also depicts the 'philosopher' (φιλόσοφος) as a 'physician' (ἰατρός).¹³⁸ Similarly, Matthew's designation of Jesus as both a 'teacher' and a 'physician' in this story reflects Jesus's role in both teaching and healing sinners by associating with them.¹³⁹

The task of instructing sinners is also deemed necessary by certain rabbis. For example, the house of Hillel thinks that it is necessary to instruct sinners:¹⁴⁰

¹³⁴ Matt 9.12 // Mark 2.17 // Luke 5.31.

¹³⁵ Collins, *Mark*, pp. 195–96; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II, p. 103.

¹³⁶ The Greek text and the English translation are taken from Plutarch, *Moralia Volume III*, trans by Frank Cole Babbitt, LCL 245, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931), pp. 382–83.

¹³⁷ The Greek text and the English translation are taken from Dio Chrysostom, *Discourses 1–11*, trans by J. W. Cohoon, LCL, 257 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932), pp. 378–79.

¹³⁸ Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 2.8 Aristippus 70. For more cross references, see Collins, *Mark*, pp. 195–96.

¹³⁹ The description of wise words as healing is also present in Prov 4.20–22; 12.18. Brown, 'אפג', p. 599. Another description of Jesus's eating with sinners as a way to teach them is in Luke 15.1–2: the sinners come and listen to Jesus; Jesus receives them and eats with them. For a discussion regarding the meal in Matthew 9.10–13 as a way to heal the sinners, see Ottenheijm, 'The Shared Meal', pp. 10–14.

¹⁴⁰ Ottenheijm, 'The Shared Meal', p. 10.

One ought to teach every man, for there were many sinners in Israel who were drawn to the study of Torah, and from them descended righteous, pious, and worthy folk. (*'Abot R. Nat. A 3*).¹⁴¹

However, not every rabbi takes this approach.¹⁴² The house of Shammai contends that 'one may instruct a person only if he is wise and modest and is from a good background and rich' (*'Abot R. Nat. A 3*).¹⁴³ This might suggest that sinners, who are not likely to be regarded as 'wise and modest', have no place to study the Torah in the eyes of certain rabbis.

Therefore, a tension regarding the approach towards sinners exists: on the one hand, it is important to keep one's purity before God by avoiding association with sinners; on the other hand, it is necessary to instruct sinners with the Law of God. Such tension is similar to that which exists between the Pharisees and Jesus in Matthew 9.9–13. The phrase 'your teacher' (ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν, 9.11) from the mouth of the Pharisees expresses a distinction between Jesus and them. In this story, their difference concerns the issue of a teacher's approach towards sinners. The Pharisees regard eating with sinners as inappropriate, while Jesus regards that as necessary, because sinners are in need of hearing the proclamation of the kingdom of heaven, so that they can repent and be forgiven (cf. Matt 4.17).

The 'uncleanness' of sinners is not a problem for Jesus because he is a physician (Matt 9.12).¹⁴⁴ Just as he is able to touch and cleanse a leper without getting leprosy (Matt 8.2–3), so also he is able to dine with and teach sinners without being involved in their sins. Just as he wills (θέλω) to make the leper clean (8.3), so also he wills (θέλω) to show mercy on sinners, so

¹⁴¹ Ottenheijm's translation; in idem, 'The Shared Meal', p. 10.

¹⁴² Ottenheijm, 'The Shared Meal', p. 10.

¹⁴³ Ottenheijm's translation; in idem, 'The Shared Meal', p. 10.

¹⁴⁴ A similar idea is present in Greek literature: οἱ ἰατροὶ μετὰ τῶν νοσοῦντων εἰσὶν ἀλλ' οὐ πυρέττουσιν, literally 'the physicians are with those who are sick, but they do not fall ill of a fever' (Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 6.1 Antisthenes 6); mentioned by Collins, *Mark*, p. 195.

that they can be restored and their sins forgiven (9.13).¹⁴⁵ This willingness is expressed by the citation of Hosea 6.6 right after the proverb about the need of the sick for a physician (Matt 9.12–13). The citation of Hosea 6.6, in turn, connects Matt 9.9–13 to the shepherd imagery in Matthew 9.35–36: both passages depict that Jesus goes actively towards the needy with ‘mercy’ (ἔλεος, 9.13; σπλαγχνίζομαι, 9.36).

It is also noteworthy that, in Sirach, the ἔλεος of the Lord is depicted as teaching with a shepherd imagery:¹⁴⁶

ἔλεος δὲ κυρίου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα· ἐλέγχων καὶ παιδεύων καὶ διδάσκων καὶ ἐπιστρέφων
ὡς ποιμὴν τὸ ποίμνιον αὐτοῦ. (Sir 18.13)

But the mercy of the Lord is towards all flesh. He reproves, chastises, teaches and turns them back, like a shepherd does these to his flock. (Sir 18.13)

Therefore, the connection of Matthew 9.9–13 to the shepherd imagery by the theme ‘mercy’ further suggests the ways in which the Pharisees lack ἔλεος: Jesus is the merciful shepherd who is willing to go and find the lost sheep, while the Pharisees are not willing to do so. As discussed above, Matthew describes Jesus as the merciful Davidic shepherd-king, a shepherd imagery which is based on Ezekiel 34 and Zechariah 10.¹⁴⁷ The echoes of Ezekiel 34 and Zechariah 10 in Matthew, on the one hand, show that God’s promises of healing and forgiveness are fulfilled through Jesus. On the other hand, these echoes carry the condemnation of the shepherds who have neglected and oppressed the flock (Ezek 34.10; Zech 10.3). In Matthew, the Pharisees’ objection to Jesus’s eating with sinners implies their neglect of the lost sheep. By contrast, Jesus is the physician and the merciful shepherd who

¹⁴⁵ Keith points out the ways in which Jesus’s healing of the leper in Matt 8.2–3 connects to Matt 9.9–13; Keith, ‘Les citations’, pp. 70–71.

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Konradt, *Studien*, p. 430 note 50.

¹⁴⁷ See above, §4.1.2.2.

searches for and ‘heals’ the lost.¹⁴⁸ This contrast thus suggests that God’s will for ἔλεος includes caring for others, as good shepherds care for their sheep, bind the wounded, search for the lost, and so on (cf. Ezek 34.4; 16).

Jesus asks the Pharisees go and ‘learn’ (μανθάνω) the meaning of God’s will for ἔλεος (Matt 9.13).¹⁴⁹ He himself sends his ‘disciples’ (μαθηταί), those who learn from him, to heal the sick (Matt 10.1). He himself proclaims the gospel by calling people to repent (Matt 4.17), so his disciples also learn to do the same (Matt 10.7). He also teaches his disciples to go and reproach sinful brothers, so that the lost can be gained (ἐκέρδησας τὸν ἀδελφόν σου, ‘you have gained your brother’; Matt 18.15). Remarkably, in the story of the healing of the paralysed man (Matt 9.1–8), Matthew concludes by highlighting the authority to forgive sin. The crowd glorify God because God has given the authority of forgiving sins to humans (ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν τὸν δόντα ἐξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, 9.8).¹⁵⁰ The plural noun ἀνθρώποις (‘humans’) might mean that not only the Son of Man has the authority to forgive sins (Matt 9.6); this authority is also given to the church (cf. Matt 18.18).¹⁵¹ In this way, Jesus’s disciples learn from him and receive ‘authority’ (ἐξουσία) from him to heal, to forgive and to proclaim the gospel of the kingdom of heaven (Matt 10.1, 7–8; cf. 9.8; 28.18–20). Unlike the Pharisees, Jesus teaches and sends his disciples to show mercy on the needy: to heal the sick and find the lost. This is the meaning of ‘I desire mercy but not sacrifice’ that the Pharisees have to go and ‘learn’ (μανθάνω, Matt 9.13).

¹⁴⁸ See also Chae, *Jesus*, pp. 270–73, who also understands the contrast between Jesus and the Pharisees in Matt 9.9–13 in light of the depiction of the shepherds in Ezek 34.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Hays, who regards Hos 6.6 in Matt 9.13 as showing that, if the Pharisees ‘learn what Hosea means, they will understand God is a God of mercy (ἰσχυρὸς, ἔλεος) who desires to bring back the erring’; Hays, *Echoes*, p. 125.

¹⁵⁰ This emphasis is unique to Matthew; cf. Mark 2.12; Luke 5.26.

¹⁵¹ Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, p. 28; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II, p. 96. Cf. John 20.23.

4.2.2.2 *Ἐλεος as showing kindness towards repentant sinners*

Two features in Matthew 9.9–13 imply that those who eat with Jesus are repentant sinners. First, the table fellowship follows immediately after the repentance of the tax collector Matthew (Matt 9.9; or ‘Levi’, Mark 2.14; Luke 5.27). Repentance becomes the background of this table fellowship. Second, Matthew uniquely specifies the active action of sinners and the tax collectors: they ‘come’ (ἔρχομαι, 9.10) and eat with Jesus.¹⁵² This action is comparable to those who ‘come towards’ (προσέρχομαι, Matt 8.2; 9.28) Jesus for healing, notably the two blind men: they ‘come to’ (προσέρχομαι) Jesus and ask Jesus ‘have mercy’ (ἐλεέω) on them (Matt 9.27–30). Coming to Jesus implies the sinner’s desire for the mercy of God, and eating with Jesus implies their willingness to enter the kingdom of God (cf. Matt 22.2–3; 25.10). Indeed, ‘tax collectors’ (οἱ τελῶναι) are specified in Matthew 21.31–32 as those who enter the kingdom of God because they believe John, who baptises with water ‘for repentance’ (εἰς μετάνοιαν, Matt 3.11). These sinners and tax collectors are willing to return to God and seek God’s mercy.

Furthermore, Matthew’s inclusion of ἔρχομαι at 9.10 makes an explicit connection between the sinners’ ‘coming’ and Jesus’s ‘coming’ (ἔρχομαι in 9.10 and 9.13). In a story narrated by Luke, the tax collector and sinner Zacchaeus ‘seeks’ Jesus, and Jesus ‘seeks’ Zacchaeus (ζητέω in Luke 19.3 and 19.10). These stories depicted that Jesus comes for and seeks sinners, and those who come to Jesus and seek God’s mercy are shown mercy. When sinners repent, God forgives them, and the people of God should accept them. One should forgive and accept repentant sinners, and, at the same time, one should not condemn others for receiving repentant sinners. This ‘kindness’ is what God demands from his people, which Matthew indicates by connecting this story (Matt 9.9–13) to the parable of the unmerciful

¹⁵² The verb ἔρχομαι is neither in Mark 2.15 nor Luke 5.29.

slave (Matt 18.23–25) with the cognates ἔλεος and ἐλεέω (9.13; 18.33), showing that God wills for forgiveness between fellow humans, namely, one’s ‘brother’ (ἀδελφός, 18.21) and ‘fellow slave’ (σύνδουλος, 18.33).

Therefore, Matthew’s citation of Hosea 6.6 indicates that the Pharisees should ‘go and learn’ from these words to understand that God’s mercy has been shown to his people through Jesus’s ministry. The citation affirms Jesus’s merciful actions towards the sick and sinners as deeds in accordance with the will of God.¹⁵³ The people of God should recognise Jesus as the one who has come and brought forth the promised healing and forgiveness in the eschatological age. They should go towards Jesus and receive mercy from God, so they also should have mercy and kindness towards their fellow humans.

4.3 Conclusion

In Matthew 8–9, the depiction of Jesus as the servant of God and the Davidic shepherd-king foretold by the prophets highlight that healing and forgiveness are the fulfilment of God’s promise pertaining to the end of exile and the everlasting covenant. Situated in this major narrative of Jesus’s healing ministry, the citation Hosea 6.6 (in 9.13) links Jesus’s table fellowship with sinners with an emphasis on God’s mercy shown to his people. Matthew’s intention to highlight the mercy of God and Jesus is reflected by the ways in which he duplicates ἔλεος, ἐλεέω and σπλαγχνίζομαι and puts all these three in Matthew 8–9.¹⁵⁴ This strongly suggests that all the three terms pertain to ‘mercy’ and indicate that God’s promised healing and forgiveness of sins are given through Jesus’s life ministry. The use of Hosea 6.6,

¹⁵³ Cf. Heinz Joachim Held, ‘Matthew as Interpreter of the Miracle Stories’, in *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, by Gunther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz Joachim Held, trans. by Percy Scott (London: SCM, 1963), pp. 165–299 (p. 258).

¹⁵⁴ ἔλεος in Matt 9.13 is from the double citation of Hos 6.6. As discussed above, ἐλεέω and σπλαγχνίζομαι in Matt 9.27 and 9.36 are the duplicates of 20.30 and 14.14 respectively; see above, pp. 107–8.

together with the use of ἐλεέω and σπλαγχνίζομαι, express God's mercy as well as God's demand for mercy from his people: a demand for forgiveness and being merciful towards others, as one hopes for being shown mercy by the Lord. Therefore, the use of Hosea 6.6 in Matthew 9.13 is intended to throw an emphasis on mercy by means of the use of a rhetorical negation, indicating that the story is all about the importance of 'mercy', and that a denial or downgrade of 'sacrifice' is not meant.

Matthew's second use of Hosea 6.6 (in 12.7) will be discussed in the next Chapter. As Matthew's narration of Jesus's story proceeds, the theme of ἔλεος will further be developed, and its relation to Law observance will be gradually spelt out.

Chapter 5

‘I desire mercy but not sacrifice’: deeds of kindness are essential for Sabbath observance (Matt 12.1–14)

Matthew 12.1–14 narrates the two Sabbath stories (plucking the heads of grain and the healing of a man with a withered hand), which Mark and Luke also include.¹ In Mark and Luke, these two stories are situated in the same context as the story of Jesus’s table fellowship with sinners and tax collectors (Mark 2.1–3.6; Luke 5.17–6.11). Matthew, by contrast, breaks the sequence found in Mark and includes other material before the Sabbath stories, yet, retains the tight connection of the Sabbath stories with the story of Jesus’s table fellowship with sinners.

First, the citation of Hosea 6.6 at Matthew 9.13 and 12.7 connects these stories with the theme of God’s will for *ἔλεος*. Second, the fulfilment citations of Isaiah 53.4 in Matthew 8.17 and Isaiah 42.1–4 in Matthew 12.18–21 connect these stories with the depiction of Jesus’s deeds as fulfilling the prophecies about the servant of God.² All these citations (Hos 6.6; Isa 53.4; Isa 42.1–4) are unique to Matthew, suggesting that Matthew puts both 9.9–13 and 12.1–14 in contexts which highlight the theme of *ἔλεος* and the identity of Jesus as God’s servant who brings forth healing and forgiveness of sins. Furthermore, Jesus’s identity as the Davidic shepherd-king, as highlighted in Matthew 8–9, also has a vital role in the Sabbath stories. In Matthew’s narration, the Sabbath stories are surrounded by echoes of Ezekiel 34. Preceding the Sabbath stories, Matthew includes Jesus’s promise of giving rest to the weary (11.28–30), and after the Sabbath stories, Matthew depicts Jesus as the one who brings forth

¹ Mark 2.23–3.6; Luke 6.1–11.

² Both citations are introduced by ‘this was to fulfil what had been spoken through Isaiah the prophet, saying’ (πληρωθῆναι τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος, Matt 8.17; 12.17).

justice by helping the afflicted (12.18–21). These descriptions accord with the Davidic shepherd-king foretold in Ezekiel 34, who gives rest (*ἀναπαύω*, Ezek 34.15; Matt 11.28) to the people of God and rules them with justice (*משפט/κρίμα*, Ezek 34.16; *κρίσις*, Matt 12.20).

Therefore, it is reasonable to read the two Sabbath stories with particular attention to the above features that are already highlighted in Matthew 8–9 and examine how the significance of these features, which includes the citation of Hosea 6.6, develop along the narration. The ways in which the rest given by the Davidic shepherd-king relates to the merciful actions in the Sabbath stories will be discussed first (§5.1), followed by a demonstration of the ways in which Hosea 6.6 explains *ἔλεος* as the will of God with regard to Sabbath observance (§5.2). The present Chapter will conclude by offering reflections concerning the debated understanding of *ἔλεος* as ‘covenant faithfulness’ towards God (§5.3).

5.1 Jesus gives rest in his role as the promised Davidic shepherd-king

Matthew’s account of the two Sabbath stories follows immediately after Jesus’s promise of rest (11.28–30). Their close connection is indicated by the very first words of the Sabbath stories ‘at that time’ (*ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ*, 12.1),³ suggesting that Jesus’s action on the Sabbath should be read in the light of his promise of rest. The concepts of rest and Sabbath are, in fact, readily linked together because the keywords in Jesus’s promise, *ἀναπαύω* (‘give rest’; 11.28) and *ἀνάπαυσις* (‘rest’; 11.29), are the terms frequently employed to express the Sabbatical rest in the Pentateuch LXX.⁴ Therefore, in this section, the meaning and the significance of this

³ Donald Verseput, *The Rejection of the Humble Messianic King: A Study of the Composition of Matthew 11–12*, EUSS, XXIII/291 (Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1986), p. 157; Yong Eui Yang, *Jesus and the Sabbath in Matthew’s Gospel*, JSNTSup, 139 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), p. 143.

⁴ Exod 16.23; 23.12; 31.15; 35.2; Lev 16.31; 23.3, 24, 39; 25.2, 4, 5, 8; Deut 5.14. Josephus also explains the seventh-day rest in the terms of *ἀναπαύω*, *ἀνάπαυσις* and *σάββατον* (*Ant.* 1.133). Cf. Elizabeth Talbot, ‘Rest, Eschatology and Sabbath in Matthew 11:28–30: An Investigation of Jesus’ Offer of Rest in the Light of the

promise of rest will be explored to show that this rest refers to Jesus's teaching and demonstration of the Law, and that the promise of rest further identifies Jesus as the Davidic shepherd-king foretold by Ezekiel.

5.1.1 *The connection between the yoke, learning and giving rest*

Jesus's promise of rest comes with the command of taking up his yoke and learning from him:

Δεῦτε πρὸς με πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι, καὶ γὰρ ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς. ἄρατε τὸν ζυγόν μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς καὶ μάθετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ὅτι πραῦς εἰμι καὶ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ, καὶ εὐρήσετε ἀνάπαυσιν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν. (Matt 11.28–29)

Come to me, all you who labour and are burdened, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn from me; for I am gentle and humble in heart, and you will find rest for your souls.

The idea of taking up a yoke to find rest seems contradictory because 'yoke' (ζυγός/עול) pertains to slavery or oppression.⁵ However, the juxtaposition of taking up Jesus's yoke and learning from him suggests that Jesus's yoke relates to his teaching. In the scriptures, 'yoke' (ζυγός/עול) is used as a metaphor for the Law (Jer 5.5; Acts 15.10).⁶ It is likely that taking up Jesus's yoke means keeping the Law of God according to the teaching of Jesus.

The relation of the yoke, the Law and finding rest can be further understood in the light of Jeremiah 6.16 and Sirach 51.26–27. Jeremiah 6.16 expresses an instruction for God's people to walk in 'the good way' (הַטוֹב הַדֶּרֶךְ/ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἀγαθή) 'and find rest for your souls' (וּמְצְאוּ מְרִיטוֹת לְנַפְשֵׁיכֶם). For the latter phrase, the Septuagint has καὶ εὐρήσετε ἀγνισμὸν

Septuagint's Use of Anapausis', in *'What Does the Scripture Say?': Studies in the Function of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity*, ed. by Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias, LNTS, 470 (London: T&T Clark, 2012), pp. 57–69 (p. 58).

⁵ Lev 26.13; 2 Chr 10.4; Isa 9.3; 10.27; Ezek 34.27; 1 Macc 8.18; Gal 5.1; 1 Tim 6.2.

⁶ Cf. Dale C. Allison, *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), p. 226. In rabbinic literature, there are also expressions of 'yoke of the Torah' (עול תורה, *m. 'Abot* 3.5) and 'yoke of the commandments' (עול מצוה, *m. Ber.* 2.2); Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, 3 vols (München: Beck, 1922), I, pp. 608–9.

ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν (Jer 6.16 LXX), which is almost identical to Matthew’s καὶ εὐρήσετε ἀνάπαυσιν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν (Matt 11.29). The only difference is Matthew has ἀνάπαυσις (‘rest’), which is equivalent to מְנוּחָה (‘rest’; Jer 6.16 MT), but not ἀγνισμός (‘purification’; Jer 6.16 LXX). In Jeremiah 6.16–19, walking in the good way equates to listening to God’s ‘words’ (דְּבָרַי/λόγοι, 6.19) and keeping God’s ‘Law’ (דְּרֹרָה/νόμος, 6.19). Therefore, it gives instructions on how to find rest: obeying God and keeping God’s Law. It is likely that Matthew has this passage in mind. His use of ἀνάπαυσις for מְנוּחָה further connects Jeremiah 6.16 to Jesus’s promise ἀναπαύσω (‘I will give you rest’; Matt 11.28).⁷ Reading Jesus’s promise of rest in light of Jeremiah 6.16, it is appropriate to understand taking Jesus’s yoke and learning from him as similar to keeping the words and the Law of God.

Likewise, both ‘yoke’ and ‘rest’ appear in Sirach 51.23–27 in a context pertaining to instruction. In this passage, Wisdom exhorts the uneducated ‘place your neck under a yoke and let your soul receive instruction’ and see that Wisdom found rest for herself. Several terms and concepts in this text overlap those in Matthew 11.28–29:

Sirach 51.23–27	Matthew 11.28–29
ἐγγίσατε πρὸς με ‘draw near to me’ (23)	δεῦτε πρὸς με ‘come to me’ (28)
τὸν τράχηλον ὑμῶν ὑπόθετε ὑπὸ ζυγόν ‘place your neck under a yoke’ (26)	ἄρατε τὸν ζυγόν μου ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς ‘take my yoke upon you’ (29)
ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν ‘your soul(s)’ (26)	ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν ‘your souls’ (29)
ἐκοπίασα ‘I laboured’ (27)	οἱ κοπιῶντες ‘those who labour’ (28)
εὗρον ἑμαυτῷ πολλήν ἀνάπαυσιν ‘I found much rest for myself’ (27)	εὐρήσετε ἀνάπαυσιν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν ‘you will find rest for your souls’ (28)

⁷ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II, p. 290; Dale C. Allison, ‘Two Notes on a Key Text: Matthew 11:25–30’, *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 39.2 (1988), 477–85 (pp. 483–84); Talbot, ‘Rest’, p. 65.

According to Betz, the affinity of Sirach 51.23–27 and Matthew 11.28–30 is first discussed by Strauss.⁸ Since then, Sirach 51.23–27 has been widely recognised as the tradition underlying Matthew 11.28–30. Whether Matthew develops a Wisdom Christology by alluding to this text is debated and is beyond the discussion in the present study;⁹ it is noteworthy, however, that wisdom is also identified as the Law (*νόμος*) of God in Jewish tradition.¹⁰ This implies that, in Sirach 51.23–27, drawing near to Wisdom and taking up a yoke are both expressions for being instructed by the Law. Therefore, this passage also indicates that one can find rest by following the Law of God. It has been pointed out that while Wisdom exhorts the uneducated to take up a yoke and receive instruction (Sir 51.23–27), Jesus invites everyone to take up ‘his’ yoke and learn from him (Matt 11.28–29).¹¹ For Matthew, Jesus is the giver of the yoke and is the giver of rest, which underpins his authority to show what is lawful regarding Sabbath observance in Matthew 12.1–14.

The echoes of Jeremiah 6.16 and that of Sirach 51.23–27 found in Matthew 11.28–29 suggest that Jesus’s promise of rest and the invitation to take up his yoke should be understood against the concepts of taking up a yoke and finding rest as pertaining to keeping the Law of God. Since the Sabbath stories follow immediately after Jesus’s saying about his yoke and his promise of rest, it is most likely that the Sabbath stories explain how one may find rest by following Jesus’s pattern of Law observance. The characteristics of Sabbath

⁸ Hans Dieter Betz, ‘Logion of the Easy Yoke and of Rest (Matt 11:28–30)’, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 86.1 (1967), 10–24 (p. 11). The discussion by Strauss is in: David Friedrich Strauss, ‘Jesu Weheruf über Jerusalem und die σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ. Matth. 23, 34–39, Luc. 11, 49–51, 13, 34f. Ein Beitrag zur johanneischen Frage’, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 6 (1863), pp. 84–93.

⁹ See, for example, Deutsch’s arguments for identifying Jesus in Matthew as the Wisdom in Sirach. Celia Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke: Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11.25–30*, JSNTSup, 18 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), pp. 130–39.

¹⁰ Sir 24.1–27, particularly 24.13; also Wis 6.18; Bar 3.28–4.4; 4 Macc 1.16–17. Allison, *New Moses*, p. 229; Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom*, pp. 56–60.

¹¹ Cf. Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom*, pp. 133–35; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II, p. 289.

observance instructed by Jesus, in turn, are suggested in Jesus's statement about the character of his yoke:

ὁ γὰρ ζυγός μου χρηστός καὶ τὸ φορτίον μου ἕλαφρόν ἐστιν. (Matt 11.30)

Because my yoke is kind and my burden is light.

It is interesting that *χρηστός* is employed to describe the yoke of Jesus. *Χρηστός* in this verse is often translated in English as 'easy':¹² 'my yoke is easy'. This translation makes sense in light of the juxtaposed expression 'my burden is light', but it possibly hinders the further implications which *χρηστός* might express in Matthew 11.30.

Χρηστός is a word employed to describe both God and the Law of God. In the Septuagint, *χρηστός* frequently appears a translation of **טוב** ('good'), mostly in describing God: **יהוה טוב**/*χρηστός* ὁ κύριος, 'the Lord is good' (Ps 34.9 [33.9 LXX]).¹³ This description is often juxtaposed with God's **טוב יהוה לעולם חסדו**/*χρηστός* κύριος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ ('The Lord is good. His kindness is everlasting.' Ps 100.5 [99.5 LXX]).¹⁴ This might explain the fact that *χρηστός* is also employed to describe God in terms of his kindness towards humans: *χρηστός* can mean 'kind' or 'merciful' in such contexts.¹⁵ It is noteworthy that *χρηστός* (translating **טוב**) appears in a description of God in a context concerning the Law of God:

¹² Matthew W. Mitchell, 'The Yoke Is Easy, but What of Its Meaning?: A Methodological Reflection Masquerading as a Philological Discussion of Matthew 11:30', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 135.2 (2016), 321–40 (p. 321). Mitchell suggests that *χρηστός* in Matt 11.30 should not be translated as 'easy'; Mitchell, 'The Yoke', p. 339.

¹³ Also 86.5 [85.5 LXX]; 100.5 [99.5 LXX]; 145.9 [144.9 LXX]; Nah 1.7; Jer 40.11 [LXX 33.11]; cf. Ps 25.8 [24.8 LXX]; 69.17[68.17 LXX]; 106.1 [105.1 LXX]; 107.1 [106.1 LXX]; 119.68 [118.68 LXX]; 136.1 [135.1 LXX]; cf. Dan 3.89 LXX; 2 Macc 1.24; Wis 15.1; 1 Pet 2.3.

¹⁴ Ps 69.17[68.17 LXX]; 106.1 [105.1 LXX]; 107.1 [106.1 LXX]; 136.1 [135.1 LXX]; Jer 40.11 [LXX 33.11]; cf. Dan 3.89 LXX; Wis 15.1.

¹⁵ Luke 6.35; Rom 2.4; cf. Eph 4.32.

χρηστός εἶ σύ, κύριε, καὶ ἐν τῇ χρηστότητί σου διδάξόν με τὰ δικαιώματά σου.

You are kind, Lord. In your kindness, teach me your ordinances. (Ps 118.68 LXX)

In this verse, *χρηστός* translates *טוב*, and *χρηστότης* translates *מטיב*. The LXX is slightly different from that in the MT, which is:

ךקִיך לַמְדִנִי לְטוֹב־אֲתָהּ וּמְטִיב (Ps 119.68 MT)

You are good and do good; teach me your statutes.

This description might suggest that the character of the Law-giver determines the character of the Law: God's Law is *χρηστός* because God is *χρηστός*.¹⁶ This might shed light on the meaning of Jesus's yoke as *χρηστός*. Jesus is *χρηστός* (cf. 1 Pet 2.3–4), so is his yoke.¹⁷ The description of Jesus's yoke as *χρηστός* is then likely to highlight that both Jesus and his instructions are 'kind'.¹⁸ Taking up Jesus's 'kind' yoke and learning from Jesus can pertain to learning to be 'kind' like Jesus.

¹⁶ Psalm 119 (118 LXX) is about the 'Law' of God (*תורה/νόμος*, especially verses 70 and 72). In this context, *ךקִיך* and *τὰ δικαιώματά σου* can be synonyms for God's commandments.

¹⁷ The wordplay or interrelationship of *χρηστός* and *χριστός* ('Christ') is apparent in the first centuries (Justin *Apol.* 4.1, 7; Tertullian *Apol.*, 3.5; *Nat.* 1.3). For all occurrences of the term *Χριστιανοί* 'Christians' in the New Testament (Acts 11.26; 26.28; 1 Pet 4.16), Codex Sinaiticus consistently has *Χρηστιανοί* at these places. Konrad Weiss, 'Χρηστός', *TDNT*, IX, p. 488.

¹⁸ Cf. Nolland's comment: 'So an alternative metonymy might allow us to understand a yoke that is *χρηστός* as the kind of burden that might be imposed by an owner who is kind'. Nolland, *Matthew*, p. 478. Mitchell prefers translating *χρηστός* as 'beneficial' instead of 'easy'. Mitchell, 'The Yoke', p. 339 note 65. Note also: Gathercole provides a translation 'my yoke is kind' for the Coptic *οὐχρηστος πε παναϑβ*, a phrase from *The Gospel of Thomas* 90, which is parallel to Matt 11.28–30; Simon J. Gathercole, *The Gospel of Thomas: Introduction and Commentary*, TENTS, 11 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), p. 531. *χρηστος* is equivalent to Greek *χρηστός*. Gathercole's translation thus reflects a reading of *χρηστός* as 'kind' in a description concerning Jesus's yoke. The original Greek of *οὐχρηστος πε παναϑβ* might have been *χρηστός ἐστιν ὁ ζυγός μου*, Johannes Baptist Bauer, 'Das milde Joch und die Ruhe, Matth. 11,28–30', *Theologische Zeitschrift*, 17.2 (1961), 99–106 (p. 103); Betz, 'Logion', p. 19.

A ‘kind’ (χρηστός) person does not put a heavy yoke on others.¹⁹ Matthew 11.30 thus implies a contrast between Jesus and the Pharisees, who load ‘heavy burdens’ (φορτία βαρέα) of Law observance upon people (Matt 23.4).²⁰ Jesus’s yoke is ‘kind’ (χρηστός), unlike the Pharisees’ negligence of ‘mercy’ (ἔλεος, Matt 23.23). This contrast becomes apparent in the Sabbath stories, in which the Pharisees are regarded as not understanding God’s will for ἔλεος (Matt 12.7). The Pharisees’ emphasis on Sabbath restrictions leads to neglect of the hungry and the sick; they are comparable to the bad shepherds described in Ezekiel 34: ‘you do not feed the sheep... you have not healed the sick’ (Ezek 34.3–4). Jesus, by contrast, is the Davidic shepherd-king who has come to replace the bad shepherds (Ezek 34.10, 23). This identity of Jesus is already highlighted in Matthew 8–9 and is further suggested by Jesus’s promise of rest.

5.1.2 *The promise of rest indicates Jesus as the Davidic shepherd-king*

Jesus’s promise ἀναπαύσω (‘I will give rest’, Matt 11.28) might recall God’s promise of rest to Moses, which pertains to God’s presence and guidance: ‘my presence will go with you and I will give you rest’ (Exod 33.14).²¹ Ἀναπαύσω also appears in God’s promise to David of rest, which pertains to peace: ‘I will give you rest from all your enemies’ (ἀναπαύσω σε ἀπὸ

¹⁹ Josephus narrates that Rehoboam is asked to be ‘more benevolent’ (χρηστότερος) than his father Solomon who put ‘a heavy yoke’ (βαρὺν ζυγόν) on the people (*Ant.* 8.213). cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II, p. 291 note 246.

²⁰ As it is often suggested, φορτίον (‘burden’) possibly shows a connection between Matt 11.30 and 23.4, contrasting Jesus and the Pharisees with reference to their instructions of Law observance. Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, pp. 324–25; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II, pp. 291–92; France, *Matthew*, pp. 450–51; Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, p. 172.

²¹ Translated from the MT. In this verse, the LXX has καταπαύσω for הַנְחִיחֵנִי (cf. 2 Kgdms 7.11 LXX translates הַנְחִיחֵנִי as ἀναπαύσω). Allison argues that God’s promise of rest in Exodus 34 is the closest parallel to Jesus’s promise of rest in Matthew 11, according to his observation that in both contexts the promise of rest is spoken after the description of mutual knowledge between God and Moses/Jesus. Allison, *New Moses*, p. 222.

πάντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν σου, 2 Kgdms 7.11).²² However, it should also be noted that Matthew 11.28 might allude to Ezekiel 34.15, in which God promises his people a Davidic shepherd, by whom God ‘will give them rest’ (ἀναπαύσω αὐτά, Ezek 34.15).²³ This promise of rest pertains to restoration and salvation, in which feeding and healing of the flock are highlighted (Ezek 34.13–16, 23, 29). Feeding the hungry and healing the sick are precisely Jesus’s deeds performed on the Sabbath (Matt 12.1–8, 9–14). Therefore, it is likely that Jesus’s deeds on the Sabbath demonstrate the ways in which he gives rest, as he is the Davidic shepherd-king, fulfilling God’s promise of rest in Ezekiel 34.

There are further contextual features in Matthew 11–12 suggesting that the promise of rest and the Sabbath stories relate to the theme Son of David in Matthew.²⁴ Firstly, Jesus’s humility is specified in the context surrounding the Sabbath stories. Jesus is ‘humble’ (πραῦς) and is the servant who does not strive or cry aloud (Matt 11.29; 12.19). This description links to his appearance as a ‘humble’ (πραῦς) king when entering into Jerusalem, a narration which also highlights his identity as Son of David (Matt 21.5, 9). Second, in the healing story in Matthew 12.23, the designation ‘Son of David’ appears again as it does in other healing stories.²⁵ Third, the story of David in Matthew 12.1–8 might suggest an analogy between David and Jesus. These features thus suggest that Jesus’s identity as the Davidic king underlies the Sabbath stories as it underlies Jesus’s healing ministry in Matthew 8–9.²⁶

²² Jon C. Laansma, *‘I Will Give You Rest’: The ‘Rest’ Motif in the New Testament with Special Reference to Mt 11 and Heb 3–4*, WUNT, 2/98 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), p. 228.

²³ Talbot, ‘Rest’, pp. 62–63; Matthias Konradt, “‘Nehmt auf euch mein Joch und lernt von mir!’” (Mt 11,29). Mt 11,28-30 und die christologische Dimension der matthäischen Ethik’, *ZNW*, 109.1 (2018), 1–31 (p. 22).

²⁴ Cf. Laansma, *Rest*, pp. 218–22.

²⁵ See above, Chapter 4.

²⁶ The identity of Jesus as the Son of David thus downplays the suggestions that the allusion to Sirach 51 is intended to form part of a Wisdom Christology at Matthew 11.

This close connection of Jesus's promise of rest to his identity as the Davidic king thus further links this rest to the salvation brought by the eschatological shepherd. The promise regarding the Davidic shepherd in Ezekiel pertains to the end of exile and to the cleansing of sins of God's people (Ezek 37.21–28). These are precisely the emphases of Matthew in his description of the salvation of Christ (Matt 1.17, 21). Indeed, the narration in Matthew 11–12 begins with the notion of the deeds of 'Christ' (Χριστός), 'the one who is to come' (ὁ ἐρχόμενος, Matt 11.2–3).²⁷ This, in turn, suggests the salvific dimension in the immediate Sabbath stories (Matt 12.1–14), which might shed light on the implications of Jesus's actions on the Sabbath and the meaning of Hosea 6.6 at Matthew 12.7.

As commentators suggest, the ways in which Matthew introduces the citation of Hosea 6.6 indicate that the significance of the second citation in 12.7 (εἰ δὲ ἐγνώκειτε, 'if you had known') has reference to what it means in 9.13 (πορευθέντες μάθετε, 'go and learn').²⁸ Keith further suggests that the reappearance of the citation (12.7) recalls the previous context in which it is cited (9.13).²⁹ He suggests that repetitions might show a development of the meaning of the repeated elements as the story progresses.³⁰ Since the elements of the Davidic shepherd described in Ezekiel, which have played a vital role in Matthew 8–9, also appear in the context of the Sabbath stories, it is then reasonable to explore the significance of the citation of Hosea 6.6 in the Sabbath stories with reference to these relevant elements which had appeared in the context of Matthew 9.13.

²⁷ It should be noted that this notion ὁ ἐρχόμενος, citing Ps 117.26 LXX, designates Jesus as the one who enters Jerusalem to die and rise again for salvation (Matt 21.9; Mark 11.9; Luke 19.38; John 12.13).

²⁸ Barth, 'Matthew's Understanding', p. 83; Lena Lybæk, 'Matthew's Use of Hosea 6,6 in the Context of the Sabbath Controversies', in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*, ed. by C. M. Tuckett, BETL, 131 (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1997), pp. 491–99 (p. 496).

²⁹ Keith, 'Les citations', p. 64.

³⁰ Keith, 'Les citations', p. 60.

In sum, the reappearance of the citation of Hosea 6.6 and the elements of the description of the Davidic shepherd in and around the Sabbath stories provide a clue for understanding Jesus's actions on the Sabbath. Moreover, Jesus's promise of rest (Matt 11.28–30) indicates that the Sabbath stories show the ways in which both Jesus and the Law are 'kind'.³¹ It is then appropriate to explore the Sabbath stories and the citation of Hosea 6.6 therein by focussing on the identity of Jesus as the Davidic shepherd and on the character of the Law as 'kind'.

5.2 *Ἐλεος, the deeds on the Sabbath and the Lord of the Sabbath*

The two stories in Matthew 12.1–14 pertain to what deed 'is lawful' (ἔξεστιν)³² on the Sabbath. The first story begins with the Pharisees accusing Jesus's disciples of doing 'what is not lawful' on the Sabbath (ὁ οὐκ ἔξεστιν),³³ and the second story concludes with Jesus's statement of 'it is lawful to do good on the Sabbath' (ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασι καλῶς ποιεῖν).³⁴ Matthew links the second story even more tightly to the first one by adding the term ἔξεστιν. At the beginning of the second story, Mark describes those in the synagogue as seeing whether Jesus heals on the Sabbath.³⁵ By contrast, Matthew rephrases this description as those people's question to Jesus: 'is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath?' (εἰ ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασι θεραπεῦσαι; Matt 12.10). Both the first and the second story then share the same setting at

³¹ Luz states that ἔλεος in Matthew 12.7 'will unfold what was meant by the "kind yoke"' ('kind yoke' is 'milde Joch' in Luz's German original). Verseput regards the Sabbath stories as illustrating Jesus's yoke as 'the yoke of mercy and love'. Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, p. 180; Luz, *Matthäus (Mt 8–17)*, p. 229; Verseput, *Rejection*, p. 184.

³² The word ἔξεστιν can mean 'to be authorised for the doing of something'; BDAG, s.v. 'ἔξεστιν'. In this context, it can be understood as 'is lawful' because the stories concern the Law (Sabbath observance).

³³ Matt 12.2 // Mark 2.24 // Luke 6.2.

³⁴ Matt 12.12 // Mark 3.4 // Luke 6.9.

³⁵ Mark 3.2; cf. Luke 6.7, which follows Mark closely.

their beginning with the key term ἔξεστιν (Matt 12.2, 10), indicating that both stories demonstrate what deeds are lawful on the Sabbath.

In narrating the two Sabbath stories, Matthew relates the lawful Sabbath deeds closely to the deeds of kindness: caring for the hungry and the sick. In the first story, Matthew particularly emphasises the disciples' hunger. The satisfaction of the disciples' hunger in the first story and the healing of the sick in the second story then form a link to the deeds of kindness mentioned in the judgement scene in Matthew 25.31–46. The present section will begin by exploring what deeds are lawful on the Sabbath (§5.2.1, §5.2.2), and the significance of the citation of Hosea 6.6 in Matthew 12.7 will be subsequently discussed (§5.2.3).

5.2.1 The debate regarding 'lawful' deeds on the Sabbath

As mentioned above, the narration of the two Sabbath stories begins with what is not lawful to do on the Sabbath (Matt 12.2) and concludes with what is lawful to do on the Sabbath (Matt 12.12). This shows a shift of the focus from 'not lawful' to 'lawful', indicating that although work is prohibited on the Sabbath, one should also pay attention to the deeds which are allowed.

'Remember/observe the Sabbath day' is one of the Decalogue commandments (Exod 20.8; Deut 5.12). The people of God must keep the seventh day holy and 'must not do any work' (כֹּל-מְלָאכָה לֹא-תַעֲשֶׂה/οὐ ποιήσεις πᾶν ἔργον, Exod 20.10; Deut 5.14).³⁶ Doing work is profaning (לְלַחֵד/βεβηλόω) the Sabbath (Exod 31.14). The Israelites were accused of profaning the Sabbath, which is regarded as one of the reasons for their destruction and exile (Neh 13.15–19).³⁷ After the exile, the Jews affirmed their covenantal relationship with God, determined to keep the Law, which includes Sabbath observance (Neh 10.31). Sabbath

³⁶ Cf. Exod 31.14–15; 35.2; Lev 23.3–4; Jer 17.22.

³⁷ Cf. Jer 17.21–27; Ezek 20.12–24; 22.8, 26; 23.38; Amos 8.5.

observance was a well-known distinctive feature of the Jews in the Graeco-Roman era.³⁸

There are occasions on which the rivals challenged the Jews to abandon their Law and profane the Sabbath (1 Macc 1.43, 45; 2.34). It also appears that the Jews had to explain or defend their idleness (ἀργεῖν) on the seventh day (Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 1.209; 2.175). The enemies of the Jews even took advantage of this Jewish ‘day of rest’ (ἡ τῆς καταπαύσεως ἡμέρα) and chose to attack the Jews on the Sabbath day (2 Macc 5.25; 15.1).

Although the Law clearly states that one must keep the Sabbath holy— one must rest and do no work—the ways in which this commandment should be kept need to be clarified. Some examples are given in the scriptures as prohibited on the Sabbath, such as no kindling of fire (Exod 35.3),³⁹ no ploughing or harvesting (Exod 34.12),⁴⁰ no carrying of burdens or trading (Jer 17.21–27),⁴¹ and no deeds for one’s own pleasure (Isa 58.13). Since a comprehensive list of prohibited deeds is not given in the Law, there are diverse views on Sabbath observance in the Second Temple period,⁴² the instructions regarding activities prohibited or allowed on the Sabbath vary in different contexts. One example is concerning warfare: the Jews did not engage in warfare on the Sabbath even if attacked by enemies (1 Macc 2.38–41; 9.34–49; 2 Macc 8.26–27; cf. *Jub.* 50.12; Josephus, *Ant.* 12.272–77), but there is also a notion that the Law allows the Jews to defend themselves on the Sabbath.⁴³ The

³⁸ Barclay, *Jews*, pp. 440–42.

³⁹ Gathering sticks is also not allowed (Num 15.32).

⁴⁰ Cf. Manna is not provided on the seventh day (Exod 16.23–30).

⁴¹ Cf. Amos 8.5; Neh 13.15–22.

⁴² For detailed discussions, see Lutz Doering, *Schabbat: Sabbathalacha und-praxis im antiken Judentum und Urchristentum*, TSAJ, 78 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999); Herold Weiss, *A Day of Gladness: The Sabbath among Jews and Christians in Antiquity* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003).

⁴³ Josephus states that ‘the Law gives [us permission] to defend’ (ἀμύνασθαι δίδωσιν ὁ νόμος) on the seventh day (*Ant.* 14.63–64). See also Josephus *Ant.* 14.226; *J.W.* 2.517–22. Cf. Barclay, *Jews*, p. 441; Weiss, *Sabbath*, pp. 73–80; Michael H. Burer, *Divine Sabbath Work*, BBRSup, 5 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012), pp. 62–65, 71–73; Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism: I*, pp. 130–31.

instructions about prohibited activities on the Sabbath are in some contexts elaborated in great detail,⁴⁴ suggesting that the definition of ‘work’ is a matter of great concern, needing full explanation.

While the Sabbath is a day of rest and no work, keeping the Sabbath holy does not mean inactivity.⁴⁵ The ‘rest’ (ἀνάπαυσις) on the Sabbath is designated as ‘a holy convocation to the Lord’ (κλητὴ ἁγία τῷ κυρίῳ, Lev 23.3 LXX; cf. 23.24).⁴⁶ The Law states that sacrifices are to be offered on the Sabbath (Num 28.9–10), which means that priests and Levites are required to work on the Sabbath.⁴⁷ Sabbath is thus a day of assembly for worship and sacrifice.⁴⁸ Therefore, while Sabbath observance is to rest and not to work, there are also deeds required on the Sabbath and activities related to Sabbath observance. Singing praises is, for example, a related activity. Psalm 92 is a song ‘for the day of Sabbath’ (ליום השבת/εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ σαββάτου, Ps 92.1 [91.1 LXX]). Interestingly, this psalm for the day of Sabbath includes praises to the Lord for his work (Ps 92.4), a concept which is comparable to Philo’s understanding of God’s rest on the seventh day: ‘on the seventh [day] God ceased

⁴⁴ For example, *Jub.* 2.29–30 and 50.6–13 lists more activities as profaning the Sabbath than those mentioned in the Pentateuch. Qumran literature CD X–XI has detailed instructions for Sabbath observance. Later the rabbis commented ‘the rules about the Sabbath, Festal-offerings, and Sacrilege are as mountains hanging by a hair, for [teaching of] Scripture [thereon] is scanty and the rules many’ (*m. Hag.* 1.8). The English translation is taken from Herbert Danby, *The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933), p. 212; square brackets original.

⁴⁵ For example, Burer points out that, in Philo’s understanding (*Cher.* 87–90), God’s ‘rest’ on the Sabbath (Gen 2.1–3) ‘does not mean inactivity’; Burer, *Sabbath*, p. 74.

⁴⁶ Ἀνάπαυσις in Lev 23.3 LXX is a translation of שְׁבֻתוֹן, which can mean ‘Sabbath observance’. BDB, s.v. ‘שְׁבֻתוֹן’.

⁴⁷ So Matt 12.5. See also descriptions about the duty of the Levites to prepare the showbread every Sabbath (1 Chr 9.32; cf. Lev 24.8) and the priests and the Levites being on and off duty on the Sabbath (2 Chr 23.4, 8; cf. 2 Kings 11.9). See also Josephus, *Ant.* 3.237. There are also sacrifices and duties required every day (Num 28.3; cf. 1 Chr 16.39; 2 Chr 2.3MT/LXX; 8.13–14; 13.10–11; Ezra 3.4) or over a period of seven days (Num 28.24), which must include the Sabbath/seventh day.

⁴⁸ Cf. *Jub.* 50.11, which explains that the only work to be done on the Sabbath is to offer sacrifices in the sanctuary of the Lord.

from his works and began to contemplate what had been so well created'⁴⁹ (τῆ δ' ἐβδόμη παυσάμενον τῶν ἔργων τὸν θεὸν ἄρξασθαι τὰ γεγονότα καλῶς θεωρεῖν, *Decal.* 97; cf. *Decal.* 100). Therefore, humans are commanded to 'follow God' (ἔπεσθαι θεῷ) and contemplate: on the seventh day, they should 'devote themselves to the contemplation of the things of nature' (θεωρίαις μὲν τῶν τῆς φύσεως σχολάζοντας, *Decal.* 98), which is 'to pursue wisdom' (φιλοσοφεῖν, *Decal.* 98, 100; *Mos.* 2.211, 215). This pursuit of wisdom is the study of the Law: the Jews gathered on the seventh day in their houses of prayer to learn the sacred instructions (*Spec.* 2.62–63; cf. *Mos.* 2.216).⁵⁰ Gathering in the synagogues and reading the Law as the activity on the Sabbath is also attested in the New Testament:⁵¹ Jesus and Paul are described as teaching (διδάσκω, Mark 1.21, 6.2; Luke 4.31; 6.6; 13.10) or giving exhortation (παράκλησις, Acts 13.15) on the Sabbath. These activities are deemed appropriate, or at least do not appear as a matter of debate regarding Sabbath observance.⁵²

Therefore, resting from work and keeping the Sabbath, on the one hand, is about doing no work, and on the other hand, is about doing what is permitted or instructed on the Sabbath. It is stated in the Law that the rest on the Sabbath is a holy convocation to the Lord, and thus the Sabbath is recognised as a day to worship God, to offer sacrifice, and to study the Law of

⁴⁹ Colson's translation.

⁵⁰ See also a similar description by Josephus (*Ant.* 16.43; cf. *Ag. Ap.* 2.175). The rabbinic literature also mentions that studying Torah and enjoying meals are the ways of Sabbath observance (*y. Šabb.* 15, 15a, 48; cf. *b. Pesah.* 68b); Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, I, pp. 611–12. *Jubilees* highlights eating and drinking as the activities for keeping the Sabbath (*Jub.* 2.21, 29, 31; 50.9, 10), and accordingly, fasting is prohibited on the Sabbath (*Jub.* 50.12).

⁵¹ Matt 12.9–10; Mark 1.21; 6.2; Luke 4.16, 31–33; 6.6; 13.10; Acts 13.14–15; 15.21; 18.4.

⁵² Interestingly, according to Luke, a leader of the Pharisees hosted a meal at his house for Jesus on the Sabbath (Luke 14.1). While food and drink must be prepared on the sixth day (cf. *Jub.* 2.29; 50.9; Josephus, *J.W.* 2.147; *m. Šabb.* 4.1–2), hosting guests might involve other work on the Sabbath. The rabbinic literature also mentions the participation of guests in Sabbath meals (*b. Šabb.* 119a); cf. Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, II, 202–3. With regard to Sabbath prohibitions, rinsing utensils on the Sabbath for enjoying food and drink on that day is allowed (*b. Šabb.* 118a).

God. These are the activities on the Sabbath in accordance with the will of God. More importantly, rest from work on the Sabbath does not mean that it is allowed to put God's other commandments aside. As seen in Matthew 12.5, the priests work on the Sabbath but are 'guiltless' (ἀναίτιος), probably because the Law requires them to offer sacrifice on the Sabbath (e.g., Num 28.9–10). They work on the Sabbath in order to fulfil the commandment of God.

Another prominent example is the performance of circumcision on the Sabbath. The Law requires every male child to be circumcised on his eighth day (Lev 12.3), which means that in many cases circumcision has to be performed on the Sabbath. On an occasion of dispute concerning healing on the Sabbath, Jesus points out that a man receives circumcision on the Sabbath 'so that that law of Moses is not broken' (ἵνα μὴ λυθῆ ὁ νόμος Μωϋσέως, John 7.23). That is, the commandment of circumcision has to be observed even if it happens on the Sabbath. Some rabbis regard this situation as the commandment of circumcision overriding (הקד) Sabbath observance (*b. Ned.* 31b; cf. *m. Šabb.* 19.1).⁵³ However, instead of describing Sabbath observance as being overridden, it is more appropriate to understand that keeping the commandments of the Lord on the Sabbath is a way of observing the Sabbath, even if keeping the commandments entails 'work'. This is because God's will for Sabbath observance is more than doing no work.

It is then important to consider the reason for Sabbath observance to discern God's will with regard to it. The Sabbath commandment, which is one of those written on the two tablets, is mentioned in Exodus 20.8–11 and reiterated in Deuteronomy 5.12–15:

Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy (שֶׁבִּעֵת/ἀγιαζέιν αὐτήν). Six days you shall labour and do all your work (כָּל־מְלָאכְתָּךְ עֲשִׂיתָ/ποιήσεις πάντα τὰ ἔργα σου), but the seventh day is a Sabbath to the LORD your God: you shall not do any work (כָּל־מְלָאכְתָּךְ לֹא־תַעֲשֶׂה/οὐ ποιήσεις πᾶν ἔργον)—you, or your son, or your daughter,

⁵³ See above, §2.1.2.1, for the meaning of the rabbinic notion about one commandment overriding another.

your male or female slave, or your livestock, or the sojourner who is within your gates. (Exod 20.8–10; cf. Deut 5.12–14)⁵⁴

After stating this commandment, both passages mention the reason for Sabbath observance but they differ from each other. Exodus 20 gives the reason on the basis of God's rest after the six-day creation:

For (כִּי/γὰρ) in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and he rested on the seventh day. Therefore (כֵּן-לְעַלְיָ/διὰ τοῦτο) the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it (וַיְקַדְּשֵׁהוּ/ἡγάσεν αὐτήν). (Exod 20.11; cf. Gen 2.2–3)⁵⁵

The emphasis is on the sacredness or the consecration of the Sabbath day: God rested on the seventh day and 'hallowed' it (שָׁבַת/ἡγιάζω, Exod 20.11).⁵⁶ Therefore, the Israelites should do no work on the Sabbath day, 'to keep it holy' (לְקַדְּשׁוֹ/ἡγιάζειν αὐτήν, Exod 20.8).⁵⁷

By contrast, the reason given in Deuteronomy 5 emphasises the relief of the slaves:

You shall not do any work [...] so that your male slave or your female slave can rest as well as you (וְיָנוּחַ עַבְדְּךָ וְאִמְתְּךָ כַּמּוֹךָ/ἵνα ἀναπαύσῃται ὁ παῖς σου καὶ ἡ παιδίσκῃ σου ὡσπερ καὶ σύ). You shall remember that you were a slave (עַבְדְּךָ/οἰκέτης)⁵⁸ in the land of Egypt, and the Lord your God brought you out from there with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm; therefore (כֵּן-לְעַלְיָ/διὰ τοῦτο) the LORD your God commanded you to observe the Sabbath day. (Deut 5.14–15)⁵⁹

This passage mentions a purpose for not doing any work on the seventh day: 'so that your male and female slave can rest as you'. This is then connected to Israel's release from slavery, which is the reason for Sabbath observance ('therefore', כֵּן-לְעַלְיָ/διὰ τοῦτο). Similarly,

⁵⁴ The translation is based on the MT, taken from RSV, slightly modified. The LXX is close to the MT.

⁵⁵ The translation is based on the MT, taken from RSV, slightly modified. The LXX is close to the MT.

⁵⁶ Cf. Gen 2.3 explains why God blessed and hallowed the seventh day: 'because' (כִּי/ὅτι) on that day 'God rested from all the work' (מְלַאכְתּוֹ מִכָּל-מְלַאכְתּוֹ שָׁבַת/κατέπαυσεν ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων) that he has done in the creation.

⁵⁷ Cf. Exod 31.13–17; *Jub.* 2.16–31.

⁵⁸ οἰκέτης means 'a house slave'; it can mean generally 'slave' (e.g., Luke 16.13). BDAG, s.v. 'οἰκέτης'.

⁵⁹ The translation is based on the MT, taken from RSV, slightly modified. The LXX is close to the MT, despite placing the inclusion of the phrase 'and keep it holy' (καὶ ἡγιάζειν αὐτήν) after 'to observe the Sabbath day'.

according to Exodus 23.12, the Israelites are commanded to rest on the seventh day, ‘so that’ their ox, donkey, slave and sojourner ‘may rest’ (יָנוּחוּ לְמַעַן / ἵνα ἀναπαύσῃται). Sabbath observance is thus not only about doing no work, but is also about giving relief to the afflicted: those who are prone to become subject to forced labour (e.g., animals and slaves) can take a rest.

The purpose of Sabbath as giving relief can also be seen in the commandment concerning the seventh year, which is called ‘the sabbath of the land’ (שַׁבַּת הָאָרֶץ, Lev 25.6)⁶⁰ and is featured with remission of debts (Neh 10.31). Remission of debts and release of slaves are required every fiftieth year (Lev 25.10–55). This ‘year of remission’ (τὸ ἔτος τῆς ἀφέσεως, Lev 25.40; usually translated as ‘the jubilee’ in English)⁶¹ relates closely to Sabbath observance. Like the Sabbath day, the fiftieth year is to be ‘hallowed’ (שָׁדַד / ἁγιάζω, Lev 25.10); like the seventh year (the Sabbath of the land), no cultivation on the fields is allowed in the fiftieth year (Lev 25.11–12). Therefore, Sabbath observance also pertains to giving relief to those suffering from toil, debt and slavery. Rest from work and giving relief to the afflicted are two sides of the same coin of Sabbath observance.

The above discussion shows that doing no work on the Sabbath does not mean inactivity on that day. There are ‘lawful’ activities on the Sabbath, some of which are explicitly required by the Law. This might to an extent suggest that keeping God’s commandments is part of Sabbath observance. Moreover, God’s will for Sabbath observance relates to giving relief to the afflicted. Therefore, it is likely that Matthew’s emphasis on deeds of kindness in his narration of the Sabbath stories is to show the ways in which these deeds are the will of God for Sabbath observance and thus are ‘lawful’ on the Sabbath.

⁶⁰ Lev 25.6 LXX has τὰ σάββατα τῆς γῆς (‘the Sabbaths of the land’).

⁶¹ The Hebrew phrase is שַׁנַּת הַיָּבֶל, literally means ‘year of the ram(’s horn)’, that is, a year marked by blowing the ram’s horn. BDB, s.v. ‘יָבֶל’.

5.2.2 Deeds of kindness accord with God's will for Sabbath observance

Matthew's account of the two Sabbath stories highlights the importance of deeds of kindness with regard to Sabbath observance. First, in narrating the story of David in Jesus's response, Matthew emphasises the hunger of the disciples (Matt 12.1–4; cf. Mark 2.23–26; Luke 6.1–4). The category 'deeds of kindness' then comes to the foreground when the healing of the sick in the secondary story is read together with the feeding of the hungry in the first story. Second, in Matthew's account of the first story, Jesus has further arguments in his response to the Pharisees, which include an example from the Law to illustrate certain deeds as required by the Law on the Sabbath (Matt 12.5) and include the citation of Hosea 6.6 to emphasise God's will for ἔλεος (Matt 12.7). Through these points of distinctiveness, Matthew demonstrates the ways in which Jesus fulfils the commandment of Sabbath by performing deeds that accord with the will of God.

When Matthew narrates Jesus's disciples plucking the heads of grain, he focusses on the disciples' hunger instead of their actions. In the parallel accounts, Mark describes the disciples as 'making a path' in the grain field (ὁδὸν ποιεῖν, Mark 2.23),⁶² and Luke describes how the disciples picked and ate by 'rubbing (the corn) in their hands' (ψώχοντες ταῖς χερσίν, Luke 6.1). By contrast, Matthew does not describe these. Rather than paying attention to the actions of the disciples, Matthew mentions that the disciples 'were hungry' and ate (ἐπείνασαν, Matt 12.1), focussing more on the satisfaction of their hunger. In fact, satisfying the hungry is also God's will regarding Sabbath observance: in the seventh year the land must rest so that 'the poor of your people shall eat' (וְאָכְלוּ אֶבְיֹנֵי עַמְךָ/ἔδονται οἱ πτωχοὶ τοῦ ἔθνους σου, Exod 23.11).

⁶² Regarding the phrase ὁδὸν ποιεῖν: witnesses B^f 892 have ὁδοποιεῖν 'to make a path', f¹³ 565^{mg} have ὁδοιποροῦντες 'walking', and some do not have this phrase (D W it).

Matthew's focus on the disciples' hunger is then linked to the hunger of David's companions and their act of eating, which is the story Jesus employed in his response to the Pharisees. In that story, David and those who were with him were hungry (ἐπείνασεν καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ, Matt 12.3; Mark 2.25; Luke 6.3). Matthew clarifies that David's companions also ate the bread, that is, not just David (ἔφαγον, Matt 12.4; cf. ἔφαγεν, Mark 2.26; Luke 6.4).⁶³ As a result, in Matthew's description, both Jesus's disciples and David's companions were hungry and ate. If Matthew recognises the presence of an analogy between David and Jesus in this pericope,⁶⁴ the importance of this analogy for Matthew might then be in the notion that both Jesus and David care for the hungry and make provision for them to eat. This is the character pertaining to the merciful Davidic shepherd-king promised in Ezekiel 34, who tends his sheep that they will no longer suffer from 'hunger' (כֹּבֵד/לִימוֹס, Ezek 34.29). For Matthew, Jesus's hungry disciples being fed on the Sabbath pertains to the ways in which Jesus shows mercy because he is the Davidic shepherd-king who cares for his people.

The mercy of the Davidic shepherd-king continues in the subsequent story, which is about healing the sick on the Sabbath (Matt 12.9–14). Matthew's inclusion of Jesus's argument of caring for 'one sheep' (πρόβατον ἓν, Matt 12.11–12) on the Sabbath might suggest that this story continues with the theme of receiving mercy through the shepherd who

⁶³ Concerning Matt 12.4, the variant ἔφαγεν is attested in many witnesses (e.g., \mathfrak{P}^{70} C D L W Θ $f^{1.13}$ 33. 579. \mathfrak{M} latt sy co), possibly an assimilation to Mark 2.26 and Luke 6.4. Ἐφαγον is regarded as the best reading and is supported by \mathfrak{N} B. It is noteworthy that the description about David's companions eating the bread is also clear in 4QSam^b and the LXX. 1 Sam 21.5: 'The priest answered David, "I have no common bread on hand, but there is holy bread – only if the young men have kept themselves from women."' (translated from the MT). At the end of the last sentence, 4QSam^b has extra words מִמֶּנּוּ וְאֵכְלֵתֶם 'and they may eat from it'. Similarly, 1 Kdgs 21.5 LXX has εἰ πεφυλαγμένα τὰ παιδάριά ἐστιν ἀπὸ γυναικός, καὶ φάγεται ('if the young men have been kept from women, then they shall eat'). The text of 4QSam^b is taken from *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants*, ed. by Eugene Ulrich, VTSup, 134 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), p. 279. Cf. Max Botner, 'Has Jesus Read What David Did? Probing Problems in Mark 2:25–26', *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 69.2 (2018), 484–99 (p. 494 note 27).

⁶⁴ This story about David is taken from Mark 2.25–26.

gives rest to his sheep.⁶⁵ The phrase *πρόβατον ἓν* also suggests a link to the parable of the stray sheep, where a man searches for his ‘one’ (*ἓν*) sheep which has gone astray (Matt 18.12; cf. Luke 15.4).⁶⁶ It is noteworthy that the terms *πρόβατα* (‘sheep’), *ζητέω* (‘search’) and *τὸ πλανώμενον* (‘the stray [sheep]’) in Matthew 18.12 also appear in Ezekiel 34.15–16 LXX, the context in which the Lord promises to give rest to his sheep through the Davidic shepherd-king.⁶⁷ For Matthew, Jesus’s healing on the Sabbath shows that this promise of rest is fulfilled.

Moreover, the reference to the situation of the sheep suggests that giving relief to afflicted animals on the Sabbath is generally accepted,⁶⁸ which shows that giving relief to an afflicted person on the Sabbath is even more appropriate, or in Matthew’s term, *ἔξεστιν*. The illustration of caring for a sheep is employed precisely to explain why ‘doing good’ is lawful on the Sabbath:

τίς ἔσται ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἔξει πρόβατον ἓν καὶ ἐὰν ἐμπέσῃ τοῦτο τοῖς σάββασιν εἰς βόθυνον, οὐχὶ κρατήσῃ αὐτὸ καὶ ἐγερεῖ; πόσω οὖν διαφέρει ἄνθρωπος προβάτου. ὥστε ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν καλῶς ποιεῖν. (Matt 12.11–12)

Which one of you who has a sheep, if it falls into a pit on the Sabbath, will not take hold of it and lift it out? How much a man is worth more than a sheep! So it is lawful to do good on the Sabbath.

⁶⁵ As Chae suggests, the use of ‘sheep’ in Matt 12.11–12 contributes to Matthew’s portrayal of Jesus as the Davidic shepherd; Chae, *Jesus*, pp. 236–39.

⁶⁶ Gundry, *Matthew*, p. 226. By contrast, Luz suggests that *πρόβατον ἓν* in Matt 12.11 ‘certainly’ points to ‘a poor man’s only sheep’, which is comparable to ‘the only little lamb’ (*הַיֶּחָדָה קָטָן אֶחָד מִכֹּבָבִים*/ἀμνάς μία μικρά) that appears in the speech of Nathan to David (2 Sam 12.3). Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, p. 187; and similarly, Versepunt, *Rejection*, p. 181. Their point is on the great worth of that sheep to the owner.

⁶⁷ Cf. Chae, *Jesus*, pp. 239–43. See also Konradt, ‘Mt 11,28–30’, p. 22 note 76.

⁶⁸ See also Luke 13.10–17; 14.16. ‘Which one of you’ (*τίς ἔσται ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος*, Matt 12.11), ‘does not each of you’ (*ἕκαστος ὑμῶν*, Luke 13.15) and ‘which of you’ (*τίνος ὑμῶν*, Luke 14.5) all indicate that these arguments are based on the audience’s common experience of caring for animals on the Sabbath. It should be noted that, however, the legitimacy of helping animals on the Sabbath is not undisputed. The Qumran community forbids lifting fallen animals out of pits, traps or water on the Sabbath (CD 11.13–14; 4Q265 frag. 7, I, 6–7); Doering, *Schabbat*, pp. 193–95, 231–32.

The comparison ‘a man is worth more than a sheep’, on the one hand, forms an *a fortiori* argument to justify doing good on the Sabbath: if caring for afflicted animals on the Sabbath is accepted, so giving relief to humans on the Sabbath is also lawful. On the other hand, the term διαφέρω (‘be worth more than’),⁶⁹ which also appears in Matthew 6.26 and 10.31, expresses the fact that God cares for humans even more than he cares for animals (sheep, birds, sparrows).⁷⁰

The relief of both humans and animals is God’s will for the Sabbath. In the Jewish tradition, this is regarded as God’s ‘philanthropy’ (φιλιανθρωπία). For example, when Philo discusses the fourth commandment, he comments that the ordinances concerning the seventh and the fiftieth year are ‘kind and philanthropic’ (χρηστὰ καὶ φιλιανθρωπα, *Virt.* 97).

Concerning the seventh day, Philo writes:

τίς γὰρ τὴν ἱερὰν ἐκείνην ἑβδόμην οὐκ ἐκτετίμηκεν, ἄνεσιν πόνων καὶ ῥαστώνην αὐτῷ τε καὶ τοῖς πλησιάζουσιν, οὐκ ἐλευθέρους μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ δούλους, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ὑποζυγίοις διδούς; φθάνει γὰρ ἡ ἐκεχειρία καὶ πρὸς πᾶσαν ἀγέλην καὶ ὅσα πρὸς ὑπηρεσίαν γέγονεν ἀνθρώπου καθάπερ δοῦλα θεραπεύοντα τὸν φύσει δεσπότην, φθάνει καὶ πρὸς δένδρων καὶ φυτῶν ἅπασαν ἰδέαν· οὐ γὰρ ἔρνος, οὐ κλάδον, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ πέταλον ἐφεῖται τεμεῖν ἢ καρπὸν ὄντινοῦν δρέψασθαι, πάντων διαφειμένων κατ’ ἐκείνην | τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ ὥσπερ ἐλευθερίαν ἀγόντων. (*Mos.* 2.21–22)

For, who does not highly honour that sacred seventh day, by giving relief and relaxation from labour to himself and his neighbours, freemen and slaves alike, and beyond these to beasts of burden? For the cessation of work extends also to every herd, and to all creatures made to minister to man, who serve their natural master like slaves. It extends also to every kind of trees and plants; for it is not permitted to cut any shoot or branch, or even a leaf, or to pluck any fruit whatsoever. All such are set at liberty on that day, and live as it were in freedom.⁷¹

The seventh day is a relief to humans and their slaves, beasts of burden (ὑποζύγιον, cf. Exod 23.12; Deut 5.14 LXX) and even to plants, ‘all such are set at liberty on that day’. For Philo, through giving these laws, God shows his ‘mercy and kindness’ (τὸ ἴλεων καὶ χρηστόν, *Virt.*

⁶⁹ BDAG, s.v. ‘διαφέρω’.

⁷⁰ Wilson, ‘Mercy’, pp. 219–20.

⁷¹ Colson’s translation; slightly modified.

160) to all creatures.⁷² Likewise, Josephus regards the Jewish laws as exhorting people to show ‘philanthropy’ (φιλανθρωπία) even to brute beasts (*Ag. Ap.* 2.213).⁷³ An *a fortiori* argument can be understood: if the Law concerns kindness even to beasts, how much more to humans.⁷⁴

Therefore, the significance of including an *a fortiori* argument in Matthew 12.11–12 is not only to justify the act of healing by drawing an inference from a generally accepted practice of giving aid to afflicted animals on the Sabbath: by mentioning kindness to animals, the *a fortiori* argument reminds the readers of what is demanded in the Law, particularly what is demanded on the Sabbath, namely, showing kindness or giving relief to afflicted humans.

Furthermore, the emphasis on caring for the hungry and the sick connects the Sabbath stories to the judgement scene in Matthew 25.31–46.⁷⁵ This judgement indicates that caring for the hungry and for the sick are deeds of the ‘righteous’ (δικαίος, Matt 25.37–40).⁷⁶ This concept is rooted in the established tradition that the ‘righteous’ (צדיק/δικαίος, Ezek 18.5) are characterised by their deeds of caring for the needy, in which feeding the hungry and clothing the naked are frequently mentioned together (Ezek 18.5–9; cf. Job 22.6–7; 31.17, 19; Tob

⁷² In *On Virtues*, Philo discusses the ways in which the particular laws relate to φιλανθρωπία (‘philanthropy’) towards humans (*Virt.* 82–124), animals (*Virt.* 125–147) and plants (*Virt.* 148–160). For a discussion concerning Philo’s understanding of mercy to animals, see Wilson, ‘Mercy’, pp. 207–15. For further discussion concerning Philo’s understanding of philanthropy and the Law, see below, §7.1.

⁷³ Josephus summarises the Jewish laws as exhorting people to do εὐσέβεια (‘piety’), κοινωνία (‘fellowship’), φιλανθρωπία (‘philanthropy’) and δικαιοσύνη (‘justice’, *Ag. Ap.* 2.146).

⁷⁴ Barclay, *Against Apion*, pp. 293–94.

⁷⁵ Konradt, *Studien*, pp. 413–41.

⁷⁶ The judgement is administered by the Son of Man (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, 25.31), who is the ‘king’ (βασιλεύς, 25.34) and like a ‘shepherd’ (ποιμήν, 25.32). These descriptions might further connect this judgement to both Matt 9.1–13 and Matt 12.1–14, where ἔλεος is highlighted in the context where Jesus is also mentioned as the Son of Man (9.6; 12.8) and is depicted as the Davidic shepherd-king.

1.16–17; 4.16).⁷⁷ These deeds are also described in terms of ποιέω ἐλεημοσύνην ('to show kindness').⁷⁸

The connection of Matthew 12.1–14 and 25.31–46 then sheds light on the meaning of ἔλεος in the Sabbath stories: ἔλεος most likely has a similar sense to ἐλεημοσύνη that refers to deeds of kindness. Specifically, both feeding the hungry and clothing the naked are mentioned in Isaiah 58.7 in the context concerning fasting and Sabbath observance (Isa 58.1–14). The Lord demands deeds of kindness from his people in their fasting and Sabbath observance: not to seek their own interests and oppress others,⁷⁹ but to give relief to the afflicted such as loosing the bonds of injustice, setting free the oppressed, giving bread to the hungry and giving clothes to the naked (Isa 58.6–7, 9–10). This is because 'righteousness' (תִּרְצוּת/δικαιοσύνη, Isa 58.2, 8) includes both honouring the Sabbath (Isa 58.13) and giving relief to the afflicted (Isa 58.6–8). Both of them are demanded by the Lord. In other words, deeds of kindness are what God wills for Sabbath observance, just as righteousness before the Lord is characterised by caring for the needy and the afflicted.⁸⁰ In light of this, Matthew's emphasis on Jesus's care for the hungry and the sick goes beyond the concern about the

⁷⁷ Cf. Luz, *Matthew 21–28*, p. 278 note 132. So Matthew also designates feeding the hungry and clothing the naked as the deeds of the righteous (25.37–40).

⁷⁸ For example, in Tob 1.16–17, concerning the 'many merciful deeds' (ἐλεημοσύναι πολλαί) that Tobit has performed, feeding the hungry, clothing the naked and burying the dead are named. Cf. Francis M. Macatangay, *When I Die, Bury Me Well: Death, Burial, Almsgiving, and Restoration in the Book of Tobit* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2016), p. 29.

⁷⁹ The condemnation of their 'seeking' (סֵדָד) of their own 'pleasure' (רְצוֹן) is mentioned twice with regard to fasting (Isa 58.3) and Sabbath observance (Isa 58.13) respectively. This relates to oppression of others (Isa 58.3–5). The LXX has τὰ θελήματα ('desires') for רְצוֹן in Isaiah 58.3, 13.

⁸⁰ It is also noteworthy that the *Sibylline Oracles* uses Hos 6.6 (οὐ θυσίην, ἔλεος δὲ θέλει θεὸς ἀντὶ θυσίης, 'not sacrifice, but mercy God desires instead of sacrifice'; *Sib. Or.* 2.82) in a text where giving bread to the hungry and clothes to the naked are regarded as ἔλεος demanded by God (*Sib. Or.* 2.82–84). This is another example where ἔλεος in Hos 6.6 is understood as deeds of kindness. The Greek texts are taken from J. L. Lightfoot, *The Sibylline Oracles: With Introduction, Translation, and Commentary on the First and Second Books* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 458–60; the English translation is my own.

‘lawfulness’ of deeds of kindness on the Sabbath: they are not only ‘lawful’, but in fact are the completion of Sabbath observance.

Based on the above, it is clear that deeds of kindness should not be neglected but should be performed on the Sabbath. The deeds of Jesus on the Sabbath demonstrate the ways in which Sabbath observance is fulfilled by giving relief to the afflicted. This is the will of God because Sabbath entails God’s gift of rest to his people by saving them from oppression and afflictions.

5.2.3 The significance of ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν in Matthew 12.7

The above discussion suggests that deeds of kindness are essential to Sabbath observance, that ἔλεος at Matthew 12.7 most likely refers to kindness towards people, as God gives rest to his people on the Sabbath. It is then necessary to explore the significance of the citation ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν (‘I desire mercy but not sacrifice’) in the Sabbath stories.

This citation is part of Jesus’s response to the Pharisees against their accusation of his disciples. In Matthew’s narration of Jesus’s response, after mentioning the hungry David and companions being satisfied (Matt 12.3–4), Jesus continues:

ἢ οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὅτι τοῖς σάββασι οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τὸ σάββατον βεβηλοῦσιν καὶ ἀναίτιοί εἰσιν; λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῦ ἱεροῦ μείζον ἐστὶν ὧδε. εἰ δὲ ἐγνώκειτε τί ἐστὶν ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν, οὐκ ἂν κατεδικάσατε τοὺς ἀναίτιους. κύριος γάρ ἐστιν τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. (Matt 12.5–8)⁸¹

Or have you not read in the Law that on the Sabbath the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath but are guiltless? I tell you: something greater than the temple is here. If you had known what is ‘I desire mercy but not sacrifice’, you would not have condemned the guiltless. For the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath.

The fact that priests work on the Sabbath shows that certain deeds are permitted by the Law on the Sabbath. This ‘lawfulness’ explains the reason why priests are ‘guiltless’ (ἀναίτιος)

⁸¹ The parallel accounts Mark 2.27–28 and Luke 6.5 do not have these arguments before the statement ‘the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath’.

concerning their work on the Sabbath. Following this illustration is a pronouncement ‘something greater than the temple is here’ and the citation Hosea 6.6 as further arguments against the Pharisees’ condemnation of the ‘guiltless’. Specifically, with a correct knowledge of Hosea 6.6, the ‘guiltless’ disciples would not be condemned: ‘If you had known what is “I desire mercy but not sacrifice”, you would not have condemned the guiltless’ (12.7).

Nevertheless, the citation ‘I desire mercy but not sacrifice’ within this train of arguments has created difficulties for readers. On the one hand, the story concerning David and his companions is about ‘mercy’: the hungry are shown mercy and fed. On the other hand, the work of the priests is about ‘sacrifice’: the Law requires priests to work in the temple (to offer sacrifice) on the Sabbath. Both illustrations, which are about ‘mercy’ and ‘sacrifice’ respectively, are employed together to show the innocence of those who seem to have done what is not lawful. They are thus supplementary to each other in the arguments against the Pharisees. However, what follows immediately is the citation ‘I desire mercy but not sacrifice’. It is then necessary to investigate the relationship between the elements concerning ‘mercy’ and ‘sacrifice’ in this story.

5.2.3.1 Mercy as greater than the temple?

The citation of Hosea 6.6 (12.7) follows immediately after the statement ‘something greater than the temple is here’ (τοῦ ἱεροῦ μείζον ἐστὶν ὧδε, 12.6). Some commentators suggest that μείζον ‘something greater’ refers to ἔλεος: ‘mercy’ is greater than the temple; because both words are neuter in gender.⁸² Based on this reading, the comparison ‘mercy is greater than the temple’ indicates the meaning of the following citation ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν, which should

⁸² Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, pp. 181–82; Lutz Doering, ‘Sabbath Laws in the New Testament Gospels’, in *New Testament and Rabbinic Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 207–53 (pp. 222–24); Konradt, *Israel*, p. 111n129. Recently, Maschmeier has further argued for this reading; Maschmeier, *Reziproke Barmherzigkeit*, pp. 222–32.

then be understood as a comparison: I desire mercy more than sacrifice.⁸³ Both statements of comparison then might express mercy as more acceptable than sacrifice. Arguing for this reading, Luz points out that ‘the issue is not that parts of the Torah, viz., the ceremonial law, are annulled, but that the entire Torah is subordinate to its own center, mercy’.⁸⁴ The logic of the arguments is thus: if offering sacrifice in the temple is allowed despite the prohibition of work on the Sabbath, and since mercy is greater than the temple, mercy towards the afflicted is allowed on the Sabbath because God desires mercy more than sacrifice.⁸⁵ Luz further suggests that Matthew ‘*fundamentally* subordinates the Sabbath command to the love command’.⁸⁶

Some commentators, by contrast, suggest that *μείζον* refers to Jesus.⁸⁷ This is supported by Matthew’s use of another neuter adjective *πλείον* ‘something much more’ to refer to Jesus, comparing Jesus with Solomon and Jonah (Matt 12.41–42).⁸⁸ Understanding *μείζον* as a reference to Jesus, ‘Jesus is greater than the temple’, fits better in the context because the train of arguments running through 12.5–8 concludes with the Christological pronouncement: ‘for (*γάρ*) the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath’ (12.8). It is likely that two

⁸³ Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, p. 182. For the possible readings of *καὶ οὐ θυσίας* in Hos 6.6, see above, §4.2.1.2.

⁸⁴ Luz’s German original: ‘Nicht um Außerkraftsetzung von Teilen der Tora, nämlich des Zeremonialgesetzes, geht es also, sondern um Unterordnung der ganzen Tora unter ihre eigene Mitte, die Barmherzigkeit’; Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, p. 183; Luz, *Matthäus (Mt 8–17)*, p. 233.

⁸⁵ Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, p. 182.

⁸⁶ Luz’s German original: ‘ordnet *grundsätzlich* das Sabbatgebot dem Liebesgebot unter’; Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, p. 184; Luz, *Matthäus (Mt 8–17)*, p. 234. Italics original.

⁸⁷ Gundry, *Matthew*, p. 223; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II, p. 314; Yang, *Jesus and the Sabbath*, pp. 180–81; Repschinski, *Controversy*, pp. 99–100; Nolland, *Matthew*, p. 484; France, *Matthew*, pp. 460–61; Gerhard Maier, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus, Kapitel 1–14*, HTA (Witten: SCM R. Brockhaus, 2015), p. 659; Ribbens, ‘Whose “Mercy”’, pp. 398–99.

⁸⁸ It should be noted that some manuscripts have *μείζων* instead of *μείζον* at Matt 12.6 (e.g., C L Δ 0233 *f*¹³ 1424 *pm* lat). This might also suggest that the understanding of this word as referring to Jesus has been well established. Cf. Wesley G. Olmstead, *Matthew 1–14: A Handbook on the Greek Text*, BHGNT (Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2019), pp. 274–75.

Christological descriptions (12.6 and 12.8) come together to indicate the logic as this: Jesus is greater than the Sabbath, just as he is greater than the temple, and Jesus is the Lord of the temple, just as he is the Lord of the Sabbath. If the temple defines the sphere where people work on the Sabbath but are innocent (12.5), how much more can the one who is greater than both the temple and the Sabbath define the circumstances where people working on the Sabbath remain innocent (12.6, 8). The circumstances are not arbitrary: they are where the afflicted should be shown mercy because the will of God for the Sabbath is to give relief to the afflicted (12.7–8, 12). On the occasion where the disciples picked and ate the heads of grain, their hunger is emphasised to show that they are those who receive mercy on the Sabbath, like David and his companions who are also recipients of mercy. On the occasion where Jesus healed the sick on the Sabbath, he is the one who shows mercy and gives relief to the afflicted.

Therefore, Hosea 6.6 is cited in Matthew 12.1–14 to emphasise the importance of showing mercy and to criticise the unmerciful Pharisees. It is more fitting to read the citation ‘I desire mercy but not sacrifice’ as a negation that merely rhetorically emphasises God’s will for mercy, just like what the citation has already expressed in its first appearance in Matthew: God desires mercy most of all.⁸⁹ It is clear that, in Matthew 12, neither sacrifice nor Sabbath observance has been made inferior. Matthew includes precisely an example of offering sacrifice (priests working in the temple) in Jesus’s arguments (12.5) and depicts Jesus as fulfilling God’s will for Sabbath by giving rest to his people, showing that both sacrifice and Sabbath observance are important. The relationship between ‘mercy’ and ‘sacrifice’ depicted in this context does not regard deeds of kindness as overriding or replacing Sabbath observance. Rather, the rhetorical negation ‘mercy but not sacrifice’ emphasises that deeds of

⁸⁹ For the discussion concerning the meaning of this negation, see above, §4.2.1.2.

kindness are God's will for Sabbath observance.⁹⁰ For Matthew, deeds of kindness, sacrifice, and Sabbath observance are God's commandments which all hang on the encompassing principle of love for God and love for fellow humans (Matt 22.40).

5.2.3.2 Johanan's use of Hosea 6.6 as a response to the destruction of the temple

Since Matthew connects Hosea 6.6 to 'something greater than the temple' (12.6–7), it is indispensable to mention the story about Johanan ben Zakkai (c. 1–80 CE),⁹¹ in which Hosea 6.6 is cited to reflect on the destruction of the Jerusalem temple:

Once as Rabbi Johanan ben Zakkai was coming forth from Jerusalem, Rabbi Joshua followed after him and beheld the Temple in ruins.
 'Woe unto us!' Rabbi Joshua cried, 'that this, the place where the iniquities of Israel were atoned for, is laid waste!'
 'My son', Rabbi Johanan said to him, 'be not grieved; we have another atonement as effective as this (כפרה אחת שהיא כמותה). And what is it?
 It is acts of loving-kindness (גמילות חסדים), as it is said, *For I desire mercy and not sacrifice* (כי חסד חפצתי ולא זבח).'⁹²

Since it is not impossible that Matthew might show reflections on the destruction of the Jerusalem temple when writing his gospel,⁹³ it might be helpful to consider whether Johanan's

⁹⁰ Similarly, Barth points out that Hos 6.6 in Matt 12.7 is 'a statement about the true will of God'; in this context, the citation means 'in the first place that God himself is the merciful one, the gracious one, and that the Sabbath commandment should therefore be looked upon from the point of view of his kindness'. Barth, 'Matthew's Understanding', p. 83.

⁹¹ The approximate year of birth and death of Johanan is suggested by Jacob Neusner, *A Life of Yohanan Ben Zakkai, ca. 1–80 C.E.*, StPB, 6, 2nd edn (Leiden: Brill, 1970), p. 12. This story has long been mentioned in the studies of Matthew and his use of Hos 6.6; e.g., Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, I, p. 500; W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), pp. 306–7; Hill, 'On the Use and Meaning', p. 119; Ottenheim, 'The Shared Meal', pp. 16–19. Recently, Maschmeier has offered a comparably extensive study of ἔλεος in Matthew in light of Johanan's interpretation of Hos 6.6 in 'Abot de Rabbi Nathan (version A); Maschmeier, *Reziproke Barmherzigkeit*, pp. 160–262.

⁹² 'Abot de Rabbi Nathan version A chapter 4 (ARN-A 4). The English translation is taken from Judah Goldin, *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan*, YJS, 10 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955), p. 34; italics original. The Hebrew text is taken from Solomon Schechter, *Abot de Rabbi Nathan* (New York: Feldhaim, 1945), p. 21.

⁹³ It is uncertain and disputed whether the Gospel of Matthew was written before or after the destruction of Jerusalem. On the one hand, three passages (unique to Matthew) might give a clue to the standing of the temple (Matt 5.23–24; 17.24–27; 23.16–22); Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, p. lxxiv–lxxv; France, *Matthew*, p. 19. On the

interpretation of חסד as גמילות חסדים would shed light on the exploration of the significance of Matthew's use of Hosea 6.6.⁹⁴

In this story, Johanan cites the first half of Hosea 6.6 'I desire mercy but not sacrifice' (כי חסד חפצתי ולא זבח) and regards 'sacrifice' as replaced by 'mercy'. In response to the situation when sacrifices for atonement have ceased after the destruction of the temple, Johanan interprets חסד as גמילות חסדים ('acts of loving-kindness') and point out that this is 'another atonement as effective as this [temple sacrifice]' (כפרה אחרת שהיא כמותה),⁹⁵ which is also understood as 'another atonement instead of it' (כפרה אחרת תחתיה):⁹⁶ deeds of kindness have replaced temple sacrifice for atoning sins.⁹⁷ Johanan's interpretation of deeds of kindness as being as effective as temple sacrifice for atoning sins then triggers further thoughts concerning the relation between *ἔλεος* and *θύσια*.⁹⁸

other hand, Matthew's account of the parable of the wedding banquet seems to reflect the destruction of Jerusalem (Matt 22.7; cf. Luke 14.15–24); Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, I, pp. 131–32; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1–7: A Commentary*, trans. by James E. Crouch, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2007), p. 58. It seems reasonable to let this question remain open.

⁹⁴ The date of the tradition regarding Johanan's interpretation of Hos 6.6 is also a matter of dispute; Hill, 'On the Use and Meaning', p. 108 note 5. Therefore, in the present study, the comparison of Matthew and Johanan will be discussed with an awareness that Matthew and Johanan might have no knowledge of each other. Hill, Davies and Allison regard Matthew's use of Hos 6.6 as a response to Johanan's interpretation. By contrast, Luz thinks that there are no 'direct contacts' between Matthew and Johanan. Hill, 'On the Use and Meaning', p. 119; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, I, p. 135; Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, p. 55.

⁹⁵ ARN-A 4.

⁹⁶ 'Abot de Rabbi Nathan version B chapter 8 (ARN-B 8), which is the parallel account of the story in version A chapter 4. Hebrew text is taken from Schechter, *Aboth*, p. 22. The English translation is taken from Anthony J. Saldarini, *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan (Abot de Rabbi Nathan) Version B: A Translation and Commentary*, SJLA, 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1975), p. 75.

⁹⁷ Cf. Matthias Millard, 'Osée 6,6 dans l'histoire de l'interprétation juive', in *'Car c'est l'amour qui me plaît, non le sacrifice...': recherches sur Osée 6:6 et son interprétation juive et chrétienne* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. 119–46 (pp. 125–27).

⁹⁸ Cf. Gary A. Anderson, *Charity: The Place of the Poor in the Biblical Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013), pp. 20–21.

The concept of deeds of kindness as sacrifice for atoning sins can be traced from similar descriptions in the scriptures. Proverbs 15.27 LXX, understanding $\tau\omicron\pi$ as *ἐλεημοσύνη*, has ‘by deeds of mercy and faithfulness iniquities are purged’ (*ἐλεημοσύναις καὶ πίστεσιν ἀποκαθαίρονται ἁμαρτίαι*).⁹⁹ Such description of *ἐλεημοσύνη* as atonement also appears in Tobit in the same terms: *ἐλεημοσύνη* ‘purges away all sins’ (*ἀποκαθαίρει πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν*, Tob 12.9).¹⁰⁰ Tobit also describes *ἐλεημοσύνη* as a ‘good gift’ (*δῶρον ἀγαθόν*) before God in a passage where *ἐλεημοσύνη* entails giving out possessions (Tob 4.7–11).¹⁰¹ Likewise, Sirach states that *ἐλεημοσύνη* ‘atones for sins’ (*ἐλεημοσύνη ἐξιλάσεται ἁμαρτίας*, Sir 3.30),¹⁰² and relates *ἐλεημοσύνη* to sacrifice in another passage which describes those who keep the Law as those who offer sacrifice:

‘Ο συντηρῶν νόμον πλεονάζει προσφοράς, θυσιάζων σωτηρίου ὁ προσέχων ἐντολαῖς.
ἀνταποδίδους χάριν προσφέρων σεμίδαλιν, καὶ ὁ ποιῶν ἐλεημοσύνην θυσιάζων αἰνέσεως.
εὐδοκία κυρίου ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ πονηρίας, καὶ ἐξιλασμός ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ ἀδικίας.
μὴ ὀφθῆς ἐν προσώπῳ κυρίου κενός· πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα χάριν ἐντολῆς. (Sir 35.1–4)

He who keeps the Law multiplies offerings; he who makes a sacrifice for deliverance is he who heeds to the commandments.

He who repays a kindness is he who offers the finest flour; he who performs a merciful deed is he who makes a sacrifice of praise.

It is pleasing to the Lord to turn away from wickedness; it is an atonement to turn away from injustice.

Do not be seen empty in the presence of the Lord. For all these things are for the sake of a commandment.

⁹⁹ The Hebrew equivalent of this verse is Prov 16.6 MT: $\text{בְּחַסְדִּי וּבְרַחֲמֵי עוֹן}$ (‘by mercy and faithfulness iniquity is atoned for’).

¹⁰⁰ A reading from Codex Sinaiticus. Codices Vaticanus and Alexandrinus have *ἀποκαθαριεῖ* for *ἀποκαθαίρει*. *Ἀποκαθαίρω* means ‘clear’, ‘cleanse off’, ‘remove by purging’, and *ἀποκαθαρίζω* means ‘cleanse, purify’. LSJ, s.v. ‘ἀποκαθαίρω’, ‘ἀποκαθάρζω’.

¹⁰¹ It should be noted that *ἐλεημοσύνη* in Tobit can refer to merciful deeds which are not limited to almsgiving (Tob 1.16–17).

¹⁰² The Hebrew text of this phrase is probably $\text{צְדָקָה תְּכַפֵּר חַטָּאת}$ (‘act of righteousness atones for sin’). See Pancratius C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts*, VTSup, 68 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), p.24.

This passage shows the importance of both merciful deeds and temple sacrifice.¹⁰³ The exhortation ‘do not be seen empty in the presence of the Lord, because all these things are for the sake of the commandment’ suggests that even if one carries out merciful deeds, offerings are still necessary and must not be neglected. Both merciful deeds and temple sacrifice fulfil the commandments, both entail ‘keeping the Law’ (συντηρῶν νόμον, Sir 35.1). Sirach does not see merciful deeds as replacing temple sacrifice,¹⁰⁴ even though his concept of ‘merciful deeds’ (ἐλεημοσύνη) as atonement is clear (Sir 3.30).

Sirach’s description regarding the relationship between merciful deeds and sacrifice is then helpful for discerning the difference between Matthew and Johanan in their use of Hosea 6.6 and their understanding of the relationship between mercy and sacrifice. For Johanan, his understanding of merciful deeds as sacrifice for atoning sins is in line with the already existing concept which has been shown in Tobit and Sirach. However, in response to the destruction of Jerusalem, Johanan further cites Hosea 6.6 as the scriptural support for his explanation that atonement is still available. His interpretation of Hosea 6.6 in this specific context regards ‘mercy’ (חסד) as replacing ‘sacrifice’ (זבח) in the sense that ‘acts of loving-kindness’ (גמילות חסדים) have replaced temple sacrifice for atoning sins.

By contrast, the context in which Matthew cites Hosea 6.6 is different. The two Sabbath stories (Matt 12.1–14) neither suggest the destruction of the temple nor the concept of merciful deeds as replacing sacrifice. The use of Hosea 6.6 is to explain that merciful deeds are ‘lawful’ and even essential on the Sabbath. In this passage, Matthew describes temple sacrifice as part of the Law and as required to be offered even on the Sabbath (Matt 12.5). In

¹⁰³ Anderson mentions that Sirach regards ‘acts of charity towards the poor became the equivalent of temple sacrifice even while the temple was standing’; Anderson, *Charity*, p. 21.

¹⁰⁴ As Gregory points out; Bradley C. Gregory, *Like An Everlasting Signet Ring: Generosity in the Book of Sirach*, DCLS, 2 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), p. 239.

another passage, Matthew describes ‘almsgiving’ (ἐλεημοσύνη) as acts of piety (6.1–18).

Although ‘almsgiving’ (ἐλεημοσύνη) can be understood as sacrifice before God,¹⁰⁵ it does not necessarily mean that they replace sacrifice or are regarded as more desirable than sacrifice.

For Matthew, both mercy and sacrifice are essential for fulfilling the commandments of God.

In short, concerning the use of Hosea 6.6, Matthew differs from Johanan with regard to their

understanding of the relationship between ‘mercy’ (ἔλεος) and sacrifice, but their

interpretation of ἔλεος as deeds of kindness is similar.

Although there is uncertainty over whether Matthew’s use of Hosea 6.6 is a response to Johanan,¹⁰⁶ it is certain that Matthew includes the citation in the stories where Jesus and the Pharisees are in dispute. In Matthew 12.7, the statement ‘If you had known what is “I desire mercy but not sacrifice”, you would not have condemned the guiltless’ indicates that the Pharisees still have not learnt the meaning of Hosea 6.6 (‘Go and learn what is “I desire mercy but not sacrifice”’, Matt 9.13). The correct understanding of Hosea 6.6 is at stake. On the one hand, the citation of Hosea 6.6 emphasises God’s will for mercy and proves the Pharisees wrong in accusing Jesus and his disciples.¹⁰⁷ On the other hand, Hosea 6.6 is cited in the narratives which pronounce Jesus as the one who comes for the forgiveness of sins (9.1–13) and is the Lord of the Sabbath (12.1–14). This, in turn, suggests that the meaning of Hosea 6.6 is given in light of Jesus’s identity and ministry as depicted particularly in Matthew 9 and 12. Only when the Pharisees recognise the importance of mercy to the lost, the sick and

¹⁰⁵ Matthew does not explicitly designate almsgiving as ‘sacrifice’. Nevertheless, this concept is evident in the NT. Paul regards the love gifts from the Philippians as a ‘sacrifice’ (θυσία) to God (Phil 4.18). In Hebrews, to do good and to share possessions are regarded as ‘sacrifices’ (θυσίαι) pleasing to God (Heb 13.16).

¹⁰⁶ See above, p. 171 note 94.

¹⁰⁷ In the words of some commentators, the citation Hos 6.6 ‘justifies’ or ‘legitimizes’ Jesus’s table fellowship with sinners; e.g., Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II, p. 104; Craig L. Blomberg, ‘Matthew’, in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. by Gregory K. Beale and Donald A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), pp. 1–109 (p. 34); Ottenheijm, ‘The Shared Meal’, p. 21; Maschmeier, *Reziproke Barmherzigkeit*, p. 180.

the hungry could they understand that they have ‘neglected’ (ἀφίημι) the ἔλεος demanded by God (Matt 23.23). Only when the Pharisees recognise Jesus as the merciful shepherd-king who comes to find the lost, heal the sick and feed the hungry could they understand that their reluctance to show mercy is similar to the failure of the bad shepherds described in Ezekiel 34.

In sum, Matthew’s use of Hosea 6.6 in the Sabbath stories is to emphasise ἔλεος as God’s will for the Sabbath. This emphasis on ἔλεος relates to Jesus’s identity as the Lord of the Sabbath and the Davidic shepherd who brings forth God’s rest to his people. Jesus gives relief to the afflicted on the Sabbath, showing that God desires Sabbath to be observed in the ways that acts of kindness are carried out for the relief of the needy and the afflicted. Deeds of kindness are integral to Sabbath observance.¹⁰⁸ It is then not likely that, concerning the use of Hosea 6.6 in Matthew 12.7, ἔλεος refers to moral commandments and θυσία refers to cultic commandments and that the latter is made inferior to the former.¹⁰⁹

5.3 Covenant faithfulness and God’s demand for ἔλεος

As mentioned in the introduction,¹¹⁰ whether ἔλεος in Matthew 9.13 and 12.7 refers to ‘covenant faithfulness’ is a matter of debate. For example, Hill suggests that the sense of covenant loyalty, carried by אֱמֶנֶת in Hosea 6.6, has passed into the context of Matthew: ἔλεος in Matthew 9.13 and 12.7 refers to one’s expression of love and faithfulness towards God

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Maschmeier, who suggests that ἔλεος in Matt 9.13 and 12.7 denotes ‘an act of worship’ (gottesdienstliche Handlung) in which ‘devotion’ (Hingabe) to God and devotion to fellow humans are intertwined. Maschmeier, *Reziproke Barmherzigkeit*, pp. 247, 262.

¹⁰⁹ As commentators point out, concerning Hos 6.6 in Matthew, the contrast between ἔλεος and θυσία has been commonly understood as a contrast between moral commandments and ceremonial commandments; Barth, ‘Matthew’s Understanding’, p. 82; Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, p. 184.

¹¹⁰ See above, §1.2.

through merciful actions towards others.¹¹¹ Ribbens argues further that ἔλεος refers to covenant faithfulness, which the tax collectors, sinners, and the disciples have towards Jesus.¹¹² On the contrary, Nolland thinks that ἔλεος in Matthew 9.13 and 12.7 does not carry the sense of covenant loyalty; it is rather the gracious and merciful works of God through Jesus.¹¹³ As we have argued above, in both contexts of Matthew 9 and 12, the citation of Hosea 6.6 contributes to the portrayal of Jesus as the Davidic shepherd-king, such that ἔλεος should be understood with reference to its cognate ἐλέεω in Matthew's description of the healing Son of David. In Matthew 9, ἔλεος entails God's will for mercy (healing and forgiveness) to be shown to humans, and in Matthew 12, ἔλεος refers to deeds of kindness such as caring for the hungry and the sick, which are the deeds in accordance with the will of God regarding Sabbath observance.

Given the fact that covenant faithfulness entails keeping the Law of God, God's demand for faithfulness from his people includes, of course, the demand for showing kindness towards others. As discussed above,¹¹⁴ ἔλεος (translating ἵκεν) in Hosea is juxtaposed with righteousness, justice and compassion (δικαιοσύνη, κρίμα, οἰκτιρισμός) in a description concerning covenant relationship (Hos 2.21 LXX). These are the deeds of God towards his people, who are also expected to show these virtues towards their fellow humans. Ἐλεος is an aspect of the covenant faithfulness towards God by keeping the Law (Hos 4.1–2), although

¹¹¹ Hill, 'On the Use and Meaning', pp. 109–10. Those who similarly regard ἔλεος in Matthew's citation of Hos 6.6 as carrying the sense of covenant loyalty include Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II, p. 105; Repschinski, *Controversy*, p. 79; Wesley G. Olmstead, 'Jesus, the Eschatological Perfection of Torah, and the imitatio Dei in Matthew', in *Torah Ethics and Early Christian Identity*, ed. by Susan J. Wendel and David M. Miller (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), pp. 43–58 (pp. 55–58).

¹¹² Ribbens, 'Whose "Mercy"', pp. 393–94, 401–2.

¹¹³ Nolland, *Matthew*, p. 387.

¹¹⁴ See above, §4.2.1.1.

ἔλεος is performed towards fellow humans. It is then more appropriate to understand that, in Hosea and in Matthew, the word ἔλεος itself does not mean ‘covenant faithfulness’ but means ‘kindness’. Kindness towards humans is part of keeping God’s Law and therefore an aspect of covenant faithfulness.

5.4 Conclusion

Like the context of Matthew 9.9–13, the image of the Davidic shepherd-king is also highlighted in the context of Matthew 12.1–14, which depicts Jesus as the promised shepherd-king who gives rest to his people (Ezek 34.15). The reappearance of the image of the promised shepherd in and around the context of the Sabbath stories suggests these stories, so also the citation of Hosea 6.6 therein, relate to and further develop what has been narrated in Matthew 8–9, namely, Jesus as the Davidic shepherd by whom God shows his mercy and kindness towards his people. Matthew 12 describes the ways in which this Davidic shepherd gives rest to his people by showing what the will of God for Sabbath is: the Sabbath laws are intended to give relief to the afflicted by offering them rest from toil and release from debts, just as the rest given by the eschatological shepherd pertains to God’s salvation and benevolence, which are described in terms of deliverance from slavery (Ezek 34.27), healing the sick (Ezek 34.16), satisfaction of the hungry (Ezek 34.14), forgiveness of sins (Ezek 37.23), and so on.

The Sabbath stories illustrate that both Jesus and the Law are ‘kind’ (χρηστός), a character that is manifested by Jesus’s deeds on the Sabbath. In Matthew 12.7, ἔλεος refers to deeds of kindness, which are not allowed to cease even on the Sabbath because God regards deeds of kindness as integral to Sabbath observance. Showing mercy and doing good, such as caring for the hungry and the sick, are deeds essential for Sabbath observance. By contrast, not showing kindness towards fellow humans entails a failure to serve the Lord and has dire

consequences (Matt 25.31–46). These are based on the fact that all the commandments, including the Sabbath commandment, hang on love for God and love for humans.

Although the temple is mentioned in the Sabbath stories, the context in which Matthew uses Hosea 6.6 is different from that of Johanan ben Zakkai. Johanan uses Hosea 6.6 as the scriptural support for his understanding of deeds of kindness as having replaced temple sacrifice. Matthew, by contrast, uses Hosea 6.6 to emphasise Sabbath observance as a manifestation of God's merciful will on human beings, which has been demonstrated by Jesus, the eschatological Davidic shepherd who gives rest to his people.

Chapter 6

The emphasis on ἔλεος and its relation to Law observance

The present chapter will discuss the third and last occurrence of the term ἔλεος in the Gospel of Matthew, where ἔλεος is designated as one of ‘the weightier matters of the Law’ which the Pharisees and the scribes have neglected (Matt 23.23). This designation may be a reference to Matthew 5.17–20, a passage concerning Law observance in which the Pharisees and the scribes are regarded as deficient in ‘righteousness’ (δικαιοσύνη). The connection between ἔλεος, righteousness and Law observance in these passages further points to the story of the rich young man (Matt 19.16–22), where both observance of the Law and merciful deeds are mentioned in the quest for entering the kingdom of heaven. The discussion below will begin with exploring the meaning of ‘the weightier matters of the Law’ (§6.1), followed by discussing how ἔλεος relates to δικαιοσύνη and the aim of Law observance as to be perfect like God (§6.2). The exploration will show that Matthew’s emphasis on ἔλεος as the will of God is the way in which he understands the relationship between Law observance, imitating God and following Jesus.

6.1 Ἐλεος as a ‘weightier matter of the Law’ (Matt 23.23)

The designation of ἔλεος as a weightier matter of the Law appears in Jesus’s speech against the scribes and the Pharisees in Jerusalem (Matt 23.1–36). The narrative setting basically follows Mark’s account. In the temple, the chief priests and the elders attempted to challenge Jesus’s authority (Matt 21.23–27; cf. Mark 11.27–33), and the Pharisees attempted to find faults in Jesus’s teaching (Matt 22.15–22, 34–40; cf. Mark 12.13–17, 28–31), but they all failed. It was then Jesus’s turn to challenge and silence the Pharisees successfully (Matt

22.21–46; cf. Mark 12.35–37), followed by Jesus’s speech against them (Matt 23.1–36; cf. Mark 12.37b–40).

Matthew’s account of this speech is much longer than Mark’s. The speech begins with a denunciation of the scribes and the Pharisees (Matt 23.1–12), part of which includes sayings from Mark’s account (Matt 23.6–7 // Mark 12.38–39). It continues with seven woes against the scribes and the Pharisees (Matt 23.13–36),¹ one of which concerns their disregard for ‘the weightier matters of the Law’:

Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταί, ὅτι ἀποδεκατοῦτε τὸ ἡδύοσμον καὶ τὸ ἄνηθον καὶ τὸ κύμινον καὶ ἀφήκατε τὰ βαρύτερα τοῦ νόμου, τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὸ ἔλεος καὶ τὴν πίστιν· ταῦτα [δὲ] ἔδει ποιῆσαι καὶ κείνα μὴ ἀφιέναι. (Matt 23.23)²

Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you tithe mint and dill and cumin but have abandoned the weightier matters of the Law: justice, mercy and faithfulness. It is necessary to do these things and not to abandon those things.

In this passage, *κρίσις*, *ἔλεος* and *πίστις* are designated as ‘the weightier matters of the Law’ (τὰ βαρύτερα τοῦ νόμου).³ It is then important to consider what sense this comparative expression might mean.

6.1.1 *The meaning of ‘the weightier matters of the Law’*

The use of comparative language might imply a prioritisation.⁴ The notion of ‘the weightier matters of the Law’ might indicate that other matters in the Law are less weighty. For example, Konradt regards Matthew’s notion of ‘the weightier matters of the Law’ and ‘one of the least of these commandments’ (μίαν τῶν ἐντολῶν τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων, 5.19) as displaying ‘a hierarchy among the laws’ with a differentiation of ‘lesser and greater

¹ Some manuscripts attest one more woe (Matt 23.14), which is absent from earlier witnesses (e.g., \aleph B D). The addition is most likely an assimilation made in light of Mark 12.40 and Luke 20.47; Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd edn (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), p. 50.

² The square brackets are from NA²⁸.

³ The phrase ‘the weightier matters of the Law’ is unique to Matthew; cf. Luke 11.42.

⁴ As discussed in Chapter 2, §2.1.

commandments'.⁵ According to Konradt, such differentiation facilitates a hermeneutical approach, with which the greater commandments will be given priority whenever a conflict appears.⁶ The lesser commandments (the ritual laws) are marginalised but not abrogated.⁷

It is clear, in Matthew 23.23, that 'the weightier matters of the Law' are emphasised without abrogating other commandments: 'it is necessary to do these things and not to abandon those things' (ταῦτα ἔδει ποιῆσαι καὶ ἐκεῖνα μὴ ἀφιέναι). The demonstratives ταῦτα ('these things') and ἐκεῖνα ('those things') refer to the nearer and the more remote of the two antecedents respectively:⁸ ταῦτα refers to 'the weightier matters of the Law', and ἐκεῖνα refers to the tithing of herbs.⁹ The weightier matters must be attended to without neglecting the matters of tithing.

While the emphasis on 'the weightier matters of the Law' does not abrogate the tithing of herbs, it also does not mean to treat the tithing as marginal matters in the sense that they are less important. This is because the word 'weightier' in this passage is most likely used in the sense of a summary (to point out the elements embedded in and encompassing all the commandments) rather than a priority (to marginalise certain commandments).¹⁰

⁵ Matthias Konradt, 'Law, Salvation and Christian Identity in Paul and Matthew', in *Concepts of Law in the Sciences, Legal Studies, and Theology*, ed. by Michael Welker and Gregor Etzelmüller, RPT, 72 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), pp. 181–204 (pp. 196–97).

⁶ With regard to conflict and priority, and based on Matt 12.5–7, Konradt suggests that 'the Sabbath command is superseded by mercy all the more'; Konradt, 'Law', p. 197.

⁷ Konradt, 'Law', p. 199.

⁸ LSJ, s.v. 'ἐκεῖνος'.

⁹ So also in Luke 11.42 ταῦτα refers to justice and love of God, and ἐκεῖνα refers to the tithing of herbs. The οὗτος ... ἐκεῖνος structure also appears in Luke 18.14 where οὗτος 'this man' refers to the nearer antecedent, the tax collector.

¹⁰ For these notions concerning 'summary' and 'priority', see our discussion in Chapter 2.

Firstly, the context of Matthew 23.23 shows that the purpose of this comparative is to point out the seriousness of the ‘blindness’ of the Pharisees,¹¹ who always fail to spot the important things when they teach and observe the Law. These Pharisees give high regard to the gold of the sanctuary but not to the sanctuary, to the gift on the altar but not to the altar (23.16–22). Similarly, they give high regard to tithing, giving detailed instructions even regarding the types of herbs, but fail to pay attention to the essential elements that encompasses the Law (23.23).¹² Their neglect of the important matters of the Law is then illustrated vividly: ‘You blind guides! You strain out a gnat but swallow a camel!’ (23.24). According to the Law, ‘camel’ (κάμηλος/כַּמֶּלֶךְ, Lev 11.4) is impure and must not be consumed. However, these ‘blind guides’ are only able to strain out a tiny gnat but fail to pick out the camel, the size of which is big enough for everybody (except the blind) to see. The ‘weightier matters’ that encompass the Law are what people should see and not neglect. The comparative size of camel and gnat illustrates what ‘weightier matters’ means: to show that these matters are more all-encompassing (general, covering many spheres of life). In this description, other matters are not marginalised in the sense that they are less important, because they are not to be abandoned as well: ‘It is necessary to do these things and not to abandon those things’.

Likewise, the comparative expression ‘the least of these commandments’ in Matthew 5.19 is most likely not meant to say that they are less important. Another use of the superlative ‘the least’ (ἐλάχιστος) in Matthew 25 is comparable to this: the phrase ‘one of the least of my brother’ (ἐνὶ τούτων τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν ἐλαχίστων, 25.40, 45) expresses the fact that every brother matters, on whom every deed of kindness done (or not done) will be

¹¹ ‘Blind’ (τυφλός, 23.16, 17, 19, 24, 26) is a prominent description of the Pharisees in this context.

¹² It is noteworthy that some manuscripts (*f*¹ 205 sy^{s.c.p}) have τὰ βάρεα τοῦ νόμου ‘the weighty matters of the Law’ instead of the comparative τὰ βαρύτερα τοῦ νόμου. This might be an avoidance of the comparative. Joachim Gnilka, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, HThKNT, 1, 2 vols (Freiburg: Herder, 1986), II, p. 289 note 41.

counted (25.31–46). In this context, ‘the least’ at first might suggest that some are more important, but in the end it indicates that, in fact, everyone is of equal importance: least is only in appearance, not reality. This is likely also the case where ‘the least of these commandments’ is mentioned, which indicates that every commandment should not be broken but should be kept (5.18–19). Therefore, the designation of *κρίσις*, *ἔλεος* and *πίστις* as ‘the weightier matters of the Law’ (23.23) can be regarded as a summary of the Law.¹³ The description ‘weightier’ probably indicates these matters as being threaded through the whole Law, and thus not superseding other commandments, but being the inner principle that governs all the commandments.

6.1.2 The relation of κρίσις, ἔλεος and πίστις to the Law

The designation of *κρίσις*, *ἔλεος* and *πίστις* as ‘the weightier matters of the Law’ in a context which also mentions cultic matters (tithing) might suggest an allusion to the Old Testament texts which mention justice and/or mercy and the contrast between them and sacrifices, such as Isaiah 1.17, Hosea 6.6, Amos 5.15 and Micah 6.8.¹⁴ These passages state that the Lord seeks ‘justice’ (*משפט/κρίμα*) and/or ‘kindness’ (*חסד/ἔλεος*) from the Israelites in the context where they are accused of offering sacrifices while being involved in many sins.¹⁵ In this way, Matthew 23.23, like these Old Testament texts, highlights the fact that ‘justice’ and ‘kindness’ towards fellow humans is the will of God and the way of following God and keeping his commandments.

¹³ Cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III, pp. 294–95; Günther Bornkamm, ‘End-Expectation and Church in Matthew’, in *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, by Günther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz Joachim Held, trans. by Percy Scott, 2nd edn (London: SCM, 1982), pp. 15–57 (p. 26).

¹⁴ Cf. the cross references listed at Matt 23.23 in NA²⁸.

¹⁵ Isa 1.4–17; Hos 6.1–9; Amos 5.1–27; Mic 6.6–16.

In order to understand the meaning of κρίσις, ἔλεος and πίστις in Matthew 23.23, it might be helpful to consider it in light of Matthew's notion of the trio as the matters which must be 'performed': 'it is necessary to perform (ποιῆσαι) these' (23.23). An exploration of the ways in which these matters appear as objects of ποιέω in the scriptures might shed light on their meaning in Matthew 23.

First, it is likely that κρίσις in Matthew 23.23 means 'justice'. Κρίσις in Matthew mainly means 'judgement'.¹⁶ However, κρίσις also appears twice in Matthew 12.18–21, in which Isaiah 42.1–4 is cited to conclude the ministry of Jesus described in 12.1–16, which shows the ways in which Jesus helps the needy and the oppressed, and fulfils his mission as to 'bring justice to victory' (ἐκβάλλη εἰς νίκος τὴν κρίσιν, 12.20). Κρίσις in Isaiah 42.1–4 LXX is a translation of משפּט. In the Septuagint, both ποιέω κρίσιν and ποιέω κρίμα have been employed to translate משפּט יהוה. These phrases (the Hebrew and its Greek translations) can mean 'to perform just judgement' and thus 'to execute justice':

He [the Lord] 'who executes justice' (משפּט יהוה/ποιῶν κρίσιν) for the orphan and widow, and loves the sojourner, giving him food and clothing. (Deut 10.18)¹⁷

He [the Lord] 'who executes justice' (משפּט יהוה/ποιούντα κρίμα) for the oppressed, gives food to the hungry. (Ps 146.7 [145.7 LXX])¹⁸

These descriptions of משפּט/κρίσις/κρίμα as the aid for the needy and the oppressed match the meaning of κρίσις in Matthew 12.18–21. It is likely that they should determine the meaning of κρίσις in Matthew 23.23 as well.

¹⁶ Matt 5.21, 22; 10.15; 11.22; 12.36, 41, 42; 23.33.

¹⁷ Translated from the MT.

¹⁸ Translated from the MT.

Second, it is likely that ἔλεος in Matthew 23.23 means ‘kindness’. In the Septuagint, ποιέω ἔλεος (‘to show mercy’) is often a translation of רַחֵם עָשָׂה.¹⁹ This phrase has appeared as referring to deeds of kindness in passages where Law observance is mentioned. For example, in Zechariah 7, a command from the Lord that ‘each person shall show kindness and compassion towards his brother’ (ἔλεος καὶ οἰκτιρμὸν ποιεῖτε ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, Zech 7.9)²⁰ appears in the context where the Israelites are accused of not hearing the ‘Law’ of the Lord (νόμος/תּוֹרָה, Zech 7.12). Moreover, Sirach 29.1 describes ‘the one who shows mercy’ (ὁ ποιῶν ἔλεος) as one who ‘lends to [his] neighbour’ (δανιεῖ τῷ πλησίον) and thus ‘keeps the commandments’ (τηρεῖ ἐντολάς).²¹ In the New Testament, a noteworthy passage where ποιέω ἔλεος appears in relation to Law observance is the description of the deeds of a Samaritan (Luke 10.25–37). The story of the Samaritan is an illustration used in explaining how one should go about loving one’s neighbour,²² in which the Samaritan’s care for the wounded is understood as ‘showing mercy’ (ποιέω ἔλεος, 10.37). This is the deed required with regard to loving one’s neighbour: ‘go and do likewise’ (πορεύου καὶ σὺ ποιεὶ ὁμοίως, 10.37). In this story, ποιέω ἔλεος also refers to performing kindness.

The ways in which both ποιέω κρίσιν and ποιέω ἔλεος relate to the Law can be further understood in light of Ezekiel 18 LXX. In Ezekiel 18, the phrase עָשָׂה מִשְׁפָּט וצְדָקָה (‘to perform justice and righteousness’) appears four times in describing a person who keeps the commandments of God (18.5, 19, 21, 27). The list of the related deeds appears repeatedly,

¹⁹ E.g., Gen 24.12; Exod 20.6; 34.7; Josh 2.12; Ps 17.51 [18.51 MT]; 108.16 [109.16 MT]; Jer 9.23; Zech 7.9.

²⁰ The LXX is close to the MT; ἔλεος καὶ οἰκτιρμὸν ποιεῖτε is a translation of עָשָׂה וְרַחֵם (Zech 7.9 MT)

²¹ There is no extant Hebrew witness for Sir 29.1. Beentjes, *Ben Sira in Hebrew*, p. 182.

²² This story is about keeping the ‘Law’ (νόμος), in which the double love commandments are cited (Luke 10.26–27).

which includes no worshipping of idols, no defiling the wife of one's neighbour, no oppressing the poor, giving food to the hungry and clothing the naked (Ezek 18.6–8; 15–17; cf. 11–12). **עשה משפט וצדקה** appears to summarise the deeds mentioned. Moreover, it is intriguing that **עשה משפט וצדקה** in this context has been translated as two different expressions: as *ποιέω κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην* (18.5, 27)²³ and as *ποιέω δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἔλεος* (18.19, 21), thus:

But the man who shall be 'righteous' (*δίκαιος/צדיק*), 'who executes justice and righteousness' (*עשה משפט וצדקה/ποιῶν κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην*). (Ezek 18.5)²⁴

Because the son 'has done justice and mercy' (*δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἔλεος ἐποίησεν/עשה משפט וצדקה*), has kept 'all my statutes' (*πάντα τὰ νόμιμά μου/כל־חקותי*), and done them, he shall surely live. (Ezek 18.19)²⁵

The fact that different Greek terms (*κρίμα* and *δικαιοσύνη*, and *δικαιοσύνη* and *ἔλεος*) have been employed to translate the same **עשה משפט וצדקה** in Ezekiel 18 might suggest that these terms are to an extent overlapping in their meaning, and are regarded as fitting in summarising the deeds mentioned. This text also shows a rare example where *ἔλεος* is employed to translate **צדקה**,²⁶ which is otherwise mostly translated as *δικαιοσύνη* and sometimes as *ἐλεημοσύνη*.²⁷ Since *ποιέω κρίσιν* can be a synonym of *ποιέω κρίμα* in translating **עשה משפט** to mean 'performing justice',²⁸ Ezekiel 18 LXX can be regarded as an example

²³ In the LXX, *ποιέω κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην* is the usual phrase for translating **עשה משפט וצדקה**, e.g., 2 Kgdms 8.15; 1 Chr 18.14; 2 Chr 9.8; Jer 9.23; 22.15; 23.5; Ezek 33.14, 16, 19; 45.9.

²⁴ Translated from the LXX.

²⁵ Translated from the LXX. See also Ezek 18.21 LXX, in which *כל־חקותי* is translated as *πάσας τὰς ἐντολάς μου* ('all my commandments').

²⁶ The places where *ἔλεος* appears to be the translation of **צדקה** are: Isa 56.1; Ezek 18.19, 21 LXX.

²⁷ In the LXX, **צדקה** is mostly translated as *δικαιοσύνη*, in approximately 130 times; it is sometimes translated as *ἐλεημοσύνη*, for example: Deut 6.25; 24.13; Isa 1.27; 28.17; 59.16; Ps 23.5; 32.5; 102.6 LXX.

²⁸ Compare Deut 10.18 and Ps 145.7 LXX, cited above.

where ποιέω κρίσιν (κρίμα) and ποιέω ἔλεος appear together as summarising the deeds whereby one keeps all the commandments of God (יְתִקְּנֵנִי/πάσας τὰς ἐντολάς μου, ‘all my commandments’, Ezek 18.21; cf. 18.19). Therefore, Ezekiel 18 LXX is also noteworthy for the discussion of Matthew 23.23 because it names concrete deeds that make up ποιέω κρίμα and ποιέω ἔλεος with regard to keeping all the commandments of God; these deeds are deeds of justice and kindness.²⁹

Third, regarding πίστις in Matthew 23.23, whether it means ‘faith’ or ‘faithfulness’ is disputed.³⁰ On the one hand, πίστις and πιστεύω in Matthew mostly pertain to faith in Jesus in the healing stories (8.10, 13; 9.2, 22, 28, 29; 15.28; 17.20), and πίστις also pertains to faith in God (21.21). On the other hand, πιστός (the cognate adjective of πίστις) in Matthew pertains to faithfulness towards the Lord (24.45; 25.21, 23).³¹ Πίστις relates to the Law only at 23.23. It might then be helpful to explore its meaning by considering the phrase ποιέω πίστιν and the ways in which it relates to the Law.

In the Septuagint, πίστις is usually translated from אמונה and sometimes אמת,³² in those contexts πίστις often pertains to ‘faithfulness’. For example, באמונה/ἐν πίστει (‘faithfully’) is frequently employed to describe the act of faithful servants.³³ Moses is

²⁹ There are also texts in which משפט/κρίμα and חסד/ἔλεος appear together as God’s demand from his people (e.g., Jer 9.23; Hos 12.7; Mic 6.8; Zech 7.9), but Ezekiel 18 mentions these in terms of keeping God’s commandments.

³⁰ For example, Gundry, Davies and Allison suggest that πίστις in Matt 23.23 means ‘faith’, while Bornkamm, Barth, Hagner, Luz and France argue for ‘faithfulness’. Gundry, *Matthew*, p. 464; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III, p. 294; Bornkamm, ‘End-Expectation’, pp. 26–27; Barth, ‘Matthew’s Understanding’, p. 115; Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, p. 670; Luz, *Matthew 21–28*, p. 124; France, *Matthew*, pp. 873–74.

³¹ Cf. Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, p. 670.

³² Πίστις for אמונה: around 20 times; for אמת: around 6 times. On the other hand, ἀλήθεια is more frequently used for translating אמונה (around 22 times) and אמת (around 87 times). Hatch and Redpath, s.v. ‘πίστις’, ‘ἀλήθεια’.

³³ 2 Kings [4 Kgdms LXX] 12.16, 22.7; 2 Chr 31.12, 15, 18; 34.12.

described as acting ἐν πίστει καὶ πραΰτητι ('in faithfulness and meekness', Sir 45.4),³⁴ which is a reiteration of his faithful service in the house of the Lord (cf. πραῦς, πιστός, Num 12.3, 7).³⁵ God's work is described as done 'in faithfulness' (בְּאֱמוּנָה/ἐν πίστει, Ps 33.4 [32.4 LXX]).³⁶ God is also described as אֱלֹהֵי אֱמוּנָה ('God of faithfulness', Deut 32.4; the LXX has θεὸς πιστός, 'faithful God').³⁷ Similarly, πίστις appears in *The Psalms of Solomon* pertaining to 'faithfulness'; for example, in a description of God's faithfulness: 'Gather together the dispersed of Israel, with mercy and goodness. For your faithfulness is with us' (συνάγαγε τὴν διασπορὰν Ἰσραὴλ μετὰ ἐλέους καὶ χρηστότητος· ὅτι ἡ πίστις σου μετὰ ἡμῶν, 8.28).³⁸ It is also found in a description of the Davidic king's faithfulness: 'shepherding the flock of the Lord in faithfulness and righteousness' (ποιμαίνων τὸ ποίμνιον κυρίου ἐν πίστει καὶ δικαιοσύνη, 17.40).

Furthermore, אֱמוּנָה/πίστις can mean faithfulness in the sense of honesty, which is the deed of those who keep the commandments of God. For example, in Jeremiah 5 and 9, the Israelites are accused of abandoning God's 'Law' (תּוֹרָה/νόμος),³⁹ such that 'deception but

³⁴ In Sir 45.4, ἐν πίστει is possibly translated from בְּאֱמוּנָתוֹ ('in his faithfulness'). For the Hebrew text, see Beentjes, *Ben Sira in Hebrew*, p. 79.

³⁵ Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, AB, 39 (New York: Doubleday, 1987), p. 511.

³⁶ See also Hos 2.22 MT/LXX, which mentions that God will betroth Israel to him 'in faithfulness' (בְּאֱמוּנָה/ἐν πίστει). In this context, God also states that he will betroth Israel 'in justice' (בְּמִשְׁפָּט/ἐν κρίματι) and 'in kindness' (בְּחַסֵּד/ἐν ἐλέει, Hos 2.21 MT/LXX), which pertains to what God does towards his people and demands from his people; as discussed above, pp. 124–25.

³⁷ It is noteworthy that the description of God's 'faithfulness' in Deut 32.4 is juxtaposed with God's מִשְׁפָּט/κρίσις: 'all his ways are justice' (מִשְׁפָּט כָּל־דַּרְכָיו/πᾶσαι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ κρίσεις).

³⁸ The Greek texts of *The Psalms of Solomon* are taken from Robert B. Wright, *The Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*, JCTC, 1 (London: T&T Clark, 2007). The English translations are my own. It has been suggested that *The Psalms of Solomon* contains features of translating from Hebrew into Greek and is likely written in Hebrew, but there is no extant Hebrew manuscript; Wright, *The Psalms of Solomon*, pp. 11–13.

³⁹ Jer 9.12MT/LXX; cf. Jer 5.4–5.

not faithfulness' (לא לאמונה) ולא שקר/ψεῦδος καὶ οὐ πίστις, Jer 9.2MT/LXX) prevails on the land, and no one 'performs justice and seeks faithfulness' (עשה/ποιῶν κρίμα καὶ ζητῶν πίστιν, Jer 5.1). Similarly, Proverbs 12.22 states that God delights in those who 'perform faithfulness' (עשי/ποιῶν אמונה), contrasting those who have 'lying lips' (שפת-י שקר/χείλη ψευδή),⁴⁰ while 'false witness' (עד שקר/μαρτυρίαν ψευδή) is clearly prohibited in the Law (Exod 20.16). Ποιέω πίστιν also appears in Sirach 15.15 and is juxtaposed with 'keeping the commandments' (συντηρέω ἐντολάς).⁴¹ It is noteworthy that πίστις in Sirach often pertains to faithfulness towards fellow humans: gaining trust of a neighbour who is in poverty (22.23), not betraying secrets (27.16) and not doing bribery (40.12).

The above examples show the ways in which πίστις has been employed to express 'faithfulness'. In this sense ποιέω πίστιν means an action of faithfulness,⁴² that is, being faithful and honest as a result of acting in accordance with the commandments of God. This is likely the sense of ποιέω πίστιν expressed in Matthew 23.23. The juxtaposition of πίστις with κρίσις and ἔλεος suggests that it is reasonable to understand all three of them as virtues resulting from keeping the commandments. A similar juxtaposition of πίστις with love and kindness is found in Galatians 5.22–23, where Paul juxtaposes πίστις with ἀγάπη ('love') and

⁴⁰ See also Prov 12.17.

⁴¹ Sir 15.15 LXX: ἐὰν θέλῃς συντηρήσεις ἐντολάς καὶ πίστιν ποιῆσαι εὐδοκίας ('If you want to, keep the commandments and perform faithfulness in good will'). A Hebrew manuscript also has 'commandment' and 'faithfulness' in Sir 15.15 but the sentence is slightly different: 'If you want to, keep the commandment; faithfulness is to do the good will of God' (אם תחפץ תשמר מצוה ואמונה לעשות רצון אל). Cf. Skehan and Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, pp. 267, 269, 272. For the Hebrew text, see Beentjes, *Ben Sira in Hebrew*, p. 52.

⁴² Morgan also regards πίστις in Sir 15.15 and Prov 12.22 LXX as entailing an 'action'. Teresa Morgan, *Roman Faith and Christian Faith: Pistis and Fides in the Early Roman Empire and Early Churches* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), p. 461 note 60.

χρηστότης ('kindness'), and in that context Paul states that 'the whole law' (ὁ πᾶς νόμος) is 'fulfilled' (πληρώω) in 'love': 'love your neighbour as yourself' (ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν, Gal 5.14).⁴³ As commentators point out, πίστις in Galatians 5.22 is listed as a virtue pertaining to a relationship between humans.⁴⁴ Perhaps πίστις in Matthew 23.23 can be understood as a virtue likewise, although Matthew and Paul express this in different terms: Matthew regards πίστις as a weightier matter of the Law, while Paul regards πίστις as the fruit of the Spirit (Gal 5.22). For Matthew, since πίστις is a weightier matter of the Law, which contains the commandments of God, doing πίστις towards humans is essentially being faithful to God by doing the will of God.⁴⁵

The preceding discussion has shown the ways in which deeds of justice, kindness and faithfulness (ποιέω plus κρίσις, ἔλεος and πίστις) relate to the Law: justice and kindness appear as summarising the commandments (e.g., Ezek 18 LXX), and deeds of kindness, justice and faithfulness towards humans are what God demands from his people. Matthew's inclusion of ἔλεος alongside κρίσις might have been inspired by the expression ποιέω κρίσιν in the Septuagint as referring to the justice shown towards the needy and the oppressed, in which caring for the hungry is mentioned (Deut 10.18).⁴⁶

⁴³ In Romans, Paul also summarises the commandments using the terms of 'fulfil' and 'love': 'for the one who loves another has fulfilled the Law (νόμον πεπλήρωκεν). The commandments [...] are summed up (ἀνακεφαλαιώω) in this word: love your neighbour as yourself' (Rom 13.8–9).

⁴⁴ Morgan, *Roman Faith*, p. 277; Douglas J. Moo, *Galatians*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013), p. 365; David A. deSilva, *The Letter to the Galatians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2018), p. 468.

⁴⁵ By contrast, Bornkamm and Morgan understand πίστις in Matthew as directed towards God only and not denoting relationship between humans. Bornkamm, 'End-Expectation', p. 27; Morgan, *Roman Faith*, p. 374.

⁴⁶ Cited above, p. 184.

6.1.3 *The implications of naming ἔλεος as among ‘the weightier matters of the Law’*

The appearance of ἔλεος in Matthew 23.23 recalls the stories where Hosea 6.6 is cited (Matt 9.13; 12.7), in which ‘the Pharisees’ (οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, 9.11; 12.2) are depicted as not knowing God’s will for mercy: they do not understand God’s mercy towards the sick and sinners (9.1–13), and fail to recognise the ‘lawfulness’ of merciful deeds on the Sabbath (12.1–14). These stories become important illustrations for the discourse against the scribes and the Pharisees in Matthew 23: they teach Law observance (23.2–3) but are in fact ‘full of hypocrisy and lawlessness’ (μεστοὶ ὑποκρίσεως καὶ ἀνομίας, 23.28) because they neither see ‘the weightier matters of the Law’ nor do the will of God, which is especially demonstrated by their ignorance of ἔλεος (Matt 9.13; 12.7; 23.23). By contrast, Jesus is the one who acts in accordance with the will of God. The elements around these passages regarding ἔλεος, namely, the Law and the will of God, and the contrast between Jesus and the Pharisees, suggest a link between Matthew 23 and the Sermon on the Mount.⁴⁷

In particular, several elements link Matthew 23.23 to 5.17–20. Both texts have the notion of the ‘Law’ (νόμος, 5.17–18) and the notion of practising and abandoning the commandments (5.19) which suggests that all commandments are not to be neglected. Moreover, both texts depict the scribes and the Pharisees as inadequate. They do not have the ‘righteousness’ (δικαιοσύνη) which is required for entering the kingdom of heaven (5.20), and are blind to the ‘weightier matters of the Law’ (23.23). These connections between 23.23 and 5.17–20 suggest a close affinity between ἔλεος and the ‘exceeding righteousness’: both of them relate to the Law and are not possessed by the scribes and the Pharisees. An exploration of the meaning of this ‘exceeding righteousness’ becomes necessary for understanding the

⁴⁷ For a discussion of the ways in which Matthew 23 at many points echoes Matthew 5–7, see Kenneth G. C. Newport, *The Sources and Sitz im Leben of Matthew 23*, JSNTSup, 117 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995), pp. 157–77.

relation between ἔλεος and the Law in Matthew. Therefore, the discussion in the following section will argue: Matthew's emphasis on ἔλεος, on the one hand, elaborates the concrete meaning of the 'exceeding righteousness', while on the other hand, it shows the relationship between keeping the Law and following Jesus.

6.2 Ἐλεος, the 'exceeding righteousness' and the aim of Law observance

Matthew 5.17–48 narrates Jesus's teaching concerning Law observance.⁴⁸ Matthew introduces this section by mentioning that Jesus comes to fulfil the Law and the Prophets, and that the commandments are not to be abrogated and should be taught and observed (5.17–19). This introduction is concluded by mentioning the righteousness which exceeds that of the Pharisees and the scribes (5.20), suggesting that Jesus's fulfilment of the Law and his teaching of Law observance lead his disciples towards this 'exceeding righteousness':

Λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ περισσεύσῃ ὑμῶν ἡ δικαιοσύνη πλεῖον τῶν γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. (Matt 5.20)

For I say to you, unless your righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven.

This statement (5.20), in turn, becomes the summary of the subsequent teaching about the Law (5.21–48),⁴⁹ which reaches its conclusion by exhorting the disciples to be perfect like God (5.48). As will be discussed below, ἔλεος plays an important part in explaining the meaning of the 'exceeding righteousness' and of perfection.

⁴⁸ Matthew summarises Jesus's ministry as teaching (Matt 5–7) and healing (Matt 8–9), indicated by the *inclusio* at 4.23 and 9.35. Jesus's teaching begins at Matt 5.1, and the Law (*νόμος*) and its contents are mentioned starting from 5.17.

⁴⁹ Davies and Allison regard Matt 5.21–48 as 'illustrating the better righteousness of 5:20'; idem, *Matthew*, I, p. 499.

6.2.1 *Ἔλεος as indispensable to the 'exceeding righteousness'*

The relationship between the 'exceeding righteousness' (5.20) and ἔλεος has been mentioned by commentators in their discussions of Matthew's use of Hosea 6.6. For example, Glynn regards ἔλεος in Matthew as 'the heart of the δικαιοσύνη' which exceeds that of the Pharisees,⁵⁰ Hill suggests that Matthew characterises this 'better righteousness' with ἔλεος,⁵¹ and Hinkle suggests that the 'higher righteousness' (5.20) is 'mercy'.⁵²

From Matthew 5.17–20, it can be noted that the 'exceeding righteousness' relates closely to Matthew's understanding of ἔλεος in two ways. First, both ἔλεος and the 'exceeding righteousness' are manifested by observing the Law. Those who have this 'exceeding righteousness' are those who observe and do not abandon the Law (5.18–19), suggesting that they also perform and do not neglect ἔλεος, a weightier matter of the Law (23.23). Second, both ἔλεος and the 'exceeding righteousness' are designated as the will of God. The designation of ἔλεος as the will of God is emphasised by the double citation of Hosea 6.6 "I will" for mercy' (θέλω, 9.13; 12.7), and the 'exceeding righteousness' is linked to the 'will' (θέλημα, Matt 7.21) of God by the fact that both are necessary for entering the kingdom of heaven (5.20, 7.21).⁵³ More importantly, for Matthew, one of the contrasts between Jesus and the Pharisees lies precisely in 'doing the will of God', which is depicted in terms of ἔλεος and δικαιοσύνη.⁵⁴

⁵⁰ Glynn, 'The Use and Meaning', p. 203; cf. p. 205.

⁵¹ Hill, 'On the Use and Meaning', p. 117.

⁵² Hinkle, 'Learning', p. 356.

⁵³ Entering the kingdom of heaven is a key theme of Jesus's proclamation and teaching; Matt 4.17, 23; 5.3, 10, 20, 7.21; 8.11–12; 9.35; 13.41–43, 47–50; 18.1–3; 19.23–24; 21.31–32; 23.13; 25.1, 34, etc.

⁵⁴ In the discussion below, 'the Pharisees' may refer to a shorter expression for 'the scribes and the Pharisees' in the relevant passages (οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, Matt 5.20; 12.38; 15.1; 23.1–36). Not all the scribes are Pharisees (e.g., Matt 13.52).

As discussed above, in the stories where Hosea 6.6 is cited, the Pharisees are regarded as neither knowing nor doing God's will for 'mercy' (ἔλεος). The Pharisees' failure in doing the will of God is also mentioned in their refusal to walk in the way of 'righteousness' (δικαιοσύνη), which is illustrated in a parable of the two sons (21.28–32), which is unique to Matthew. In this parable, the son who 'changed his mind' (μεταμέλομαι, 21.29) and went into the vineyard is regarded as doing the 'will' (θέλημα, 21.31) of his father. With this parable, Jesus states that the audience, including the Pharisees (21.45), 'did not change their minds' (μεταμέλομαι). Therefore, they fall behind those who believe John (21.31–32), who came to them 'in the way of righteousness' (ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης, 21.32). In sum, the Pharisees do not do the will of God: they neglect ἔλεος (Matt 23.23) and refuse to walk in the way of δικαιοσύνη (21.31–32).

By contrast, Jesus 'fulfils all righteousness' (πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην, 3.15) and does what God 'wills' (θέλω, 26.39).⁵⁵ These are depicted by highlighting Jesus's merciful deeds. As discussed above, the double citation of Hosea 6.6 links Jesus's merciful deeds to the will of God. Moreover, in Matthew 12, after depicting Jesus's merciful deeds, Matthew concludes by stating that Isaiah's prophecy is fulfilled (12.17–21). The prophecy is taken from Isaiah 42.1–4, in which Matthew cites Isaiah 42.1 as:

ἰδοὺ ὁ παῖς μου ὃν ἠρέτισα, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου (Matt 12.18)

Behold, my servant whom I have chosen, my beloved, with whom my soul is well pleased.

⁵⁵ Cf. Roland Deines, 'Not the Law but the Messiah: Law and Righteousness in the Gospel of Matthew — An Ongoing Debate', in *Built upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew*, ed. by Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), pp. 53–84 (pp. 74–77).

It is noteworthy that Matthew's citation of Isaiah 42.1–4 differs from the LXX (and the MT).⁵⁶ The terms *ὁ ἀγαπητός μου* and *εὐδοκέω* are peculiar to Matthew's citation of Isaiah 42.1–4. The appearance of these terms effectively connects Jesus's ministry (12.1–16) to Jesus's baptism, echoing God's words when Jesus is baptised: 'This is my beloved (*μου ὁ ἀγαπητός*) son, with whom I am well pleased (*ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα*)' (Matt 3.17).⁵⁷ The deliberate connection between the fulfilment of the prophecy (Matt 12.17–21) and Jesus's baptism (Matt 3.13–17) suggests that Matthew, through Jesus's caring for the hungry, the sick, the weak and the oppressed (Matt 12.1–16), recognises Jesus as God's beloved one who fulfils all 'righteousness' (*δικαιοσύνη*, 3.7–15), shows 'mercy' (*ἔλεος*, 12.7) and brings 'justice' (*κρίσις*, 12.18, 20). In this way, fulfilling *δικαιοσύνη* entails doing *ἔλεος* and *κρίσις*, which are 'the weightier matters of the Law' (Matt 23.23).

In light of Matthew's portrayal of the ways in which the Pharisees do not do but Jesus does the will of God, the matter can be summarised: the exceeding 'righteousness' (*δικαιοσύνη*, 5.20) equates to doing the will of God in the ways that Jesus does.⁵⁸ This 'exceeding righteousness' includes deeds of 'mercy' and 'justice', the weightier matters of the Law, as Jesus has demonstrated. As Jesus comes, the Law and the Prophets are fulfilled (Matt 5.17). This fulfilment entails not only the realisation of God's promises,⁵⁹ but also the

⁵⁶ Isa 42.1 MT has *הִן עַבְדִּי אֲתִמְךָ כֹּה בַחֲרִי רִצְתָה נַפְשִׁי* ('Behold my servant, whom I uphold, my chosen, in whom my soul delights'). The LXX has *Ἰακωβ ὁ παῖς μου, ἀντιλήμψομαι αὐτοῦ· Ἰσραηλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου, προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἢ ψυχὴ μου* ('Jacob, my servant, I will help him. Israel, my chosen one, my soul has accepted him').

⁵⁷ The terms *μου ὁ ἀγαπητός* and *εὐδόκησα* are taken from Mark's account of Jesus's baptism (Mark 1.11; cf. Luke 3.22).

⁵⁸ Similar to Davies and Allison, who suggest that 'with the possible exception of 5:6, *δικαιοσύνη* seems in Matthew to be uniform in meaning—moral conduct in accord with God's will'; idem, *Matthew*, I, p. 327.

⁵⁹ The fulfilment of the Prophets is a prominent theme in Matthew: *ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου* ('so that what was spoken by the Lord through the prophet is fulfilled'; Matt 1.22; 2.15; cf. 2.17, 23; 4.14; 8.17; 12.17; 13.35; 21.4; 26.56; 27.9).

demonstration of completely doing the will of God as instructed in the commandments. Only those who learn from Jesus are able to know and do the will of God, having the righteousness necessary for entering the kingdom of heaven.

6.2.2 *The 'exceeding righteousness' and perfection*

While Jesus fulfils all righteousness by doing the will of God, demonstrating what the 'exceeding righteousness' entails, he also elaborates this righteousness in his teaching concerning the Law. As commentators suggest, Matthew 5.20 is the heading of Jesus's exposition of the Law in 5.21–48; that is, the so-called 'Antitheses' are an explanation of the ways in which the righteousness of Jesus's disciples exceeds that of the scribes and the Pharisees.⁶⁰ Since the 'exceeding righteousness' includes deeds of the weightier matters of 'the Law', the Antitheses are not likely to be antithetical to the Law itself. Rather, the Antitheses can be regarded as explaining the ways in which the followers of Jesus should observe the commandments so as to do the will of God, and, ultimately, to be perfect like God (5.48).

6.2.2.1 *The 'Antitheses' and the Law*

In Matthew 5.21–48, Jesus's teaching seems antithetical to the Law because the commandments are introduced with 'you have heard that it was said' (*ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη*)⁶¹ and then followed by Jesus's exposition with 'but I say to you' (*ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν*).⁶² It might be understood that, in the Antitheses, what is spoken against is the interpretation of the commandments but not the Law itself.⁶³ This is discernible when the content of what 'you

⁶⁰ Hill, 'On the Use and Meaning', p. 117. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, I, p. 499; France, *Matthew*, p. 228.

⁶¹ Matt 5.21, 27, 33, 38, 43; cf. 5.31 has *ἐρρέθη* only.

⁶² Matt 5.22, 28, 32, 34, 39, 44.

⁶³ Loader, *Jesus' Attitude*, p. 172.

have heard' cited includes words that are not attested in the Pentateuch. For example, in the sentence 'you have heard that it was said, "you shall love your neighbour and hate your enemy"' (5.43), 'love your neighbour' is in the Law but 'hate your enemy' is not. Thus, this sentence as a whole can be regarded as the interpretation of 'love your neighbour'.

However, in two of the Antitheses, the content of what 'you have heard' includes only the commandments in the Law: 'you shall not commit adultery' (5.27)⁶⁴ and 'an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth' (5.38).⁶⁵ With regard to this, the terms 'hear' (*ἀκούω*) and 'say' (*λέγω*) in the phrase 'you have heard that it was said' might give a clue. Barth points out that these terms correspond to שמע ('hear') and אמר ('say'), which are often employed in the rabbinic literature in relation to teaching and receiving of 'tradition': 'The Torah was thus received as a part of the tradition and in its traditional meaning'.⁶⁶ That is, what is spoken of in the Antitheses is the meaning of the commandments understood in the tradition.

By contrast, Banks argues that not only the interpretation of the Law is being referred to, but the Law itself is in view, even if the words quoted do not appear in the Law. For example, he argues that the words quoted in 5.21 'whoever kills will be liable to judgement' is 'an expression of the Old Testament position'.⁶⁷ Above all, Banks regards Jesus's teaching as surpassing the Law.⁶⁸

Indeed, the Antitheses show that Jesus's teaching demands 'to do more' (*περισσὸν ποιεῖτε*, 5.47) than what is stated in the Law. With regard to Jesus's radicalisation of the Law, Thielman argues that Jesus's address to the 'fundamental cause of the action' obviates the

⁶⁴ Exod 20.14; Deut 5.18.

⁶⁵ Exod 21.24; Lev 24.20; Deut 19.21.

⁶⁶ Barth, 'Matthew's Understanding', p. 93.

⁶⁷ Banks, *Jesus and the Law*, pp. 186–87.

⁶⁸ Banks, *Jesus and the Law*, p. 203.

prohibitions stated in the Decalogue; that is, if one follows Jesus's teaching of no evil thoughts, the prohibitions of adultery and murder in the Decalogue would then become unnecessary.⁶⁹

However, Jesus's radical demand does not necessarily mean that his teaching obviates or surpasses the Law. The implications of Jesus's teaching of the Law, which seems radical and extreme, can be understood from the heading of the Antitheses (5.20) and from its conclusion (5.48).

6.2.2.2 *The righteousness which exceeds that of the Pharisees*

Firstly, the heading (5.20) indicates that the Antitheses are the illustration of the meaning of the 'exceeding righteousness'. This sets the Antitheses against the background of the contrast between Jesus and the scribes and the Pharisees, concerning their teaching and the observance of the Law (5.17–18). The end of the narration of the Sermon of the Mount, which states that Jesus's teaching (*διδασκῆ, διδάσκω*) is different from 'their scribes' (*οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν*, Matt 7.28–29; cf. Mark 1.22), also suggests that this contrast is the matter of concern. It should be noted that the contrast is not on the concern that the scribes teach the commandments given through Moses (*Μωϋσῆς*, 23.2) while Jesus teaches his own commandments which surpass the Pentateuch.⁷⁰ The concern is, rather, about the ways in which the Pharisees' teaching and observance of the Law annul the commandment of God and neglect the will of God.

As the controversies between Jesus and the Pharisees show, the Pharisees 'make void' (*ἀκυρόω*) the commandment of God (honour your parents) for the sake of their 'tradition' (*παράδοσις*, 15.6). What they teach is not the commandments of God but precepts of their

⁶⁹ Frank Thielman, *The Law and the New Testament: The Question of Continuity* (New York: Crossroad, 1999), pp. 52–53.

⁷⁰ See further below, §8.5, for the issue concerning Matthew, Judaism, and the Law.

own, thus their worship of God is also ‘in vain’ (μάτην, 15.9). Their Sabbath observance also reflects their ignorance of God’s will with regard to the Sabbath commandment. It can be said that the Sabbath controversies (12.1–14) contrast Jesus and the Pharisees by telling the audience something like what the Antitheses tell: you have heard what is not lawful to do on the Sabbath, ‘but I say to you’ (12.6),⁷¹ it is lawful to perform merciful deeds on the Sabbath. This ‘antithesis’ does not give a new commandment which abrogates the Sabbath commandment in the Decalogue, but demonstrates the ways in which one should observe the Sabbath by taking heed to ‘the weightier matters of the Law’ (in this case, ἔλεος). Similarly, in the Antitheses, by illustrating what ‘more’ should be done, Jesus shows the ways in which the commandments should be observed by taking heed of ‘the weightier matters of the Law’. Only in this way does Law observance accord with doing the will of God and with pursuing the righteousness which belongs to the kingdom of God (5.20; cf. 5.6, 6.33). Since the Antitheses are directed toward the Pharisees’ failure in their interpretation and observance of the Law, the intensification of the demand that appeared in the Antitheses can be understood as demonstrating the correct attitude toward Law observance: one must pursue righteousness in perceiving the will of God in the Law and not ignoring ‘the weightier matters’.⁷²

6.2.2.3 Perfection as the aim of Law observance

Secondly, the Antitheses conclude by exhorting the disciples to be ‘perfect’ like God:

ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι ὡς ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειός ἐστιν (Matt 5.48)

Therefore you are to be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.

This exhortation to imitate God connects immediately to the interpretation of ‘love your neighbour’ as including also one’s enemy, which is illustrated by God’s unconditional love

⁷¹ This phrase, λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, which recalls that in the Antitheses (ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, Matt 5.22, 28, 32, 34, 39, 44), appears precisely in the Sabbath story where Hos 6.6 is cited (12.6–7).

⁷² Cf. Bornkamm, ‘End-Expectation’, p. 31.

towards both the righteous and the unrighteous (5.45). Jesus's teaching of 'doing more' in this last antithesis (5.43–47) is based on imitating God's love for humanity.

The mention of τέλειος in Matthew 5.48, which concludes not only the last antithesis but the whole section of the Antitheses (5.21–47),⁷³ suggests further implications of Jesus's teaching of Law observance. First, in the Septuagint, τέλειος is usually a translation of תָּמִים ('complete', 'blameless', 'without blemish', 'perfect')⁷⁴ or שְׁלֵם ('complete', 'perfect', 'whole', 'undivided').⁷⁵ The exhortation 'you are to be perfect' (ἔσεσθε τέλειοι, Matt 5.48) echoes Deuteronomy 18.13 'you shall be perfect (τέλειος ἔσγ/יהיה תָּמִים) before the Lord your God', which entails complete loyalty to God (Deut 18.9–13).⁷⁶ Moreover, 'be perfect' (εἶναι τέλειος) appears in descriptions of a person's wholeheartedness towards God in terms of keeping God's commandments: 'Let our hearts be perfect towards the Lord our God, to walk also holily in his ordinances, and to keep his commandments' (ἔστωσαν αἱ καρδίαί ἡμῶν τέλειαι πρὸς κύριον θεὸν ἡμῶν καὶ ὁσίως πορεύεσθαι ἐν τοῖς προσταγμασιν αὐτοῦ καὶ φυλάσσειν ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ, 3 Kdgs 8.61; cf. 11.4; 15.3, 14).⁷⁷ Since τέλειος has been used in the Septuagint as referring to complete loyalty to God and wholeheartedness towards God in Law observance, Matthew might also use τέλειος to describe the correct attitude of Law observance: it is about wholeheartedness towards God. For Matthew, it is necessary to

⁷³ As scholars suggest, Matt 5.48 concludes not only the last antithesis (love your neighbour vs love your enemy, 5.43–47), but also concludes all antitheses in Matt 5.21–47; Carson, 'Matthew', p. 160; France, *Matthew*, p. 228; Nolland, *Matthew*, p. 270.

⁷⁴ HALOT, s.v. 'תָּמִים'. It is noteworthy that the LXX also translates תָּמִים as ἄμωμος in descriptions of God's Law or God's way as 'perfect' (Ps 19.7 [18.7 LXX]; 2 Sam [2 Kdgs LXX] 22.31), and in descriptions of a righteous person as 'blameless' (2 Sam [2 Kdgs] 22.24; Prov 11.5).

⁷⁵ HALOT, s.v. 'שְׁלֵם'.

⁷⁶ The echo of Deut 18.13 is well recognised. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament*, p. 73; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, I, p. 560; Nolland, *Matthew*, p. 271.

⁷⁷ The MT (1 Kings 8.61) has 'your heart' (לִבְבַכֶּם) instead of 'our hearts' (αἱ καρδίαί ἡμῶν); τέλειαι is translated from שְׁלֵם ('whole'). The LXX also added an extra adverb ὁσίως ('holily').

dedicate oneself to doing the will of God to the greatest extent, as if it is radical and extreme.

Jesus himself does the will of God to the extent that he has to suffer and die on the cross:

‘your will be done’ (γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου, 26.42).

It is noteworthy that תמיים also appears in the Qumran literature concerning the community’s wholeheartedness towards God and concerning their complete observance of God’s commandments. There are men and priests ‘perfect in everything that has been revealed from all the law’ (תמימים בכול הנגלה מכול התורה; 1QS 8.1–2), and ‘men of holiness who walk in perfection’ (אנשי הקודש ההולכים בתמים) so that they do not deviate from any counsel of ‘the Law’ (התורה), ‘in order to walk in complete willfulness of their heart’ (ללכת בכול שרירות לבם; 1QS 9.8–10).⁷⁸ Commentators point out that Matthew’s understanding of the Law and ‘perfection’ shows points of similarity to these concepts around ‘perfection’ in the Qumran literature: ‘perfection’ is understood as the goal of complete observance of God’s commandments (Matt 5.48; 1QS 1.8, 12–13), which depends on a correct interpretation of the Law through the revelation from God (Matt 11.25–27; 1QS 9.18–19), and marks the difference of the disciples/members of the community from others.⁷⁹ For the Qumran community, they are ‘a blameless and true house in Israel’.⁸⁰ For Matthew, only those who follow Jesus have the ‘exceeding righteousness’ for entering the kingdom of heaven (Matt 5.20).

⁷⁸ The Hebrew texts and the English translations are taken from *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*, ed. by Florentino G. Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, 2 vols (Leiden: Brill, 2000). The translation is slightly modified.

⁷⁹ Barth, ‘Matthew’s Understanding’, pp. 98–99; Davies, *Setting*, pp. 210–15.

⁸⁰ ובית תמים ואמת בישראל 1QS 8.9; Michael Wise’s translation, taken from Wise, Abegg Jr., and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 129.

However, Matthew is peculiar as he uses τέλειος as a predicate referring to God: ‘as your heavenly Father is perfect’. Both τέλειος in the LXX and תמיִם in the MT or the Qumran literature do not appear as the predicate of God.⁸¹ Davies also notes that the description concerning ‘perfection’ in the Qumran literature is not mentioned directly with regard to the imitation of God.⁸² A possible background of the exhortation of the imitation of God in Matthew 5.48 is Leviticus 19.2: ‘You shall be holy; for I the Lord your God am holy’,⁸³ because there are further allusions to Leviticus 19 in the Antitheses (Matt 5.33//Lev 19.12; Matt 5.43//Lev 19.18).⁸⁴ In Leviticus 19, the exhortation ‘be holy’ is followed by a list of commandments (Lev 19.3–37), indicating that the observance of ‘all’ God’s commandments (כֹּל-חֻקֵּי / πάντα τὸν νόμον μου, Lev 19.37) leads to holiness, which can mean ‘a godly life’.⁸⁵ In other words, the attribute ‘holy’ in Leviticus 19, as the aim of Law observance, refers to a manifestation of virtues in everyday life.⁸⁶ Isaiah also describes God’s holiness as shown by his moral excellence:⁸⁷ ‘the Lord of hosts is exalted by justice (משפט/κρίμα), and the holy God shows himself holy by righteousness (צדקה/δικαιοσύνη)’.⁸⁸ Matthew also

⁸¹ Léopold Sabourin, ‘Why Is God Called “Perfect” in Mt 5:48’, *Biblische Zeitschrift*, 24.2 (1980), 266–68; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, I, p. 563. On the other hand, a phrase expressing God as ‘perfect’ using the verb τελειόω appears in 2 Kgdms 22.26 LXX: ‘with the perfect man you will be perfect’ (μετὰ ἀνδρὸς τελείου τελειωθήσῃ).

⁸² W. D. Davies, ‘“Knowledge” in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11:25–30’, *Harvard Theological Review*, 46.3 (1953), 113–40 (p. 115).

⁸³ יהוה אלהיכם / ἄγιοι ἔσεσθε ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιος κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν (Lev 19.2).

⁸⁴ Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament*, p. 73; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, I, p. 560.

⁸⁵ Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB, 3A (New York: Doubleday, 2000), pp. 1605–6.

⁸⁶ The ethical meaning of ‘holy’ is clear when 1 Pet 1.15–16 cites Lev 19.2 in an exhortation for pursuing holiness ‘in all conduct’ (ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ).

⁸⁷ Cf. Susan J. Wendel, ‘Doing Torah, Imitating Yahweh: A Reconsideration of the Good Samaritan Story’, *The Expository Times*, 133.3 (2021), 105–16 (p. 109 note 25).

⁸⁸ Isa 5.16; translated from the MT: יהוה צבאות במשפט והאל הקדוש נקדש בצדקה. The LXX has δοξασθήσεται (‘shall be glorified’) for נקדש (‘shows himself holy’).

describes being like God in terms of love (5.44–45) and mercy (18.33). It is then likely that the exhortation of imitating God in Matthew 5.48 entails a pursuit of moral excellence, just as God manifests his moral excellence with his deeds.

In fact, *τέλειος* has been employed by Philo in expressions with regard to God, human beings and their virtues respectively.⁸⁹ On one occasion, *τέλειος* appears almost as the predicate of God: ‘I am the perfect, the imperishable, the truly good existence’ (ἐγὼ τὸ τέλειον καὶ ἄφθαρτον καὶ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἀγαθόν, *Gig.* 45).⁹⁰ Philo also describes God as ‘the most perfect’ (τὸ τελειότατον) with regard to God as the origin of all virtues (*Spec.* 1.277).⁹¹ With reference to virtues, Philo speaks of Noah, who is ‘perfect’ (*τέλειος*) because he possesses and exhibits all virtues (*Abr.* 34–36).⁹² Furthermore, for Philo, the Law guides people towards a virtuous life,⁹³ and is for humans to ‘imitate God’ (μιμεῖσθαι θεόν, *Virt.* 168; *Spec.* 4.186–88).⁹⁴ This reflects an understanding of keeping the commandments as aiming at being perfect in the sense of complete possession of the virtues like God.⁹⁵

The understanding of being *τέλειος* as complete possession of the virtues is clear for Origen, who states ‘he who has all the virtues is perfect’ (τέλειός ἐστιν ὁ πάσας ἔχων τὰς

⁸⁹ Gerhard Dellling, ‘τέλειος’, *TDNT*, VIII, pp. 70–71.

⁹⁰ Colson’s translation.

⁹¹ Cited above, p. 93 note 123.

⁹² See also below, p. 242.

⁹³ See above, Chapter 3, §3.2.3.

⁹⁴ See below, Chapter 7, §7.1.2.

⁹⁵ For Philo, this perfection does not mean that a person is ‘absolutely’ (καθάπαξ) good, as he uses ‘in his generation’ to explain to what extent Noah is perfect: ‘that he was “perfect in his generation”, thus indicating that he was not absolutely good, but only in comparison with the people of that time’ (ὅτι τέλειος ἦν ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ αὐτοῦ, δηλών ὅτι οὐ καθάπαξ ἀλλὰ κατὰ σύγκρισιν τῶν καθ’ ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον γεγονότων ἀγαθὸς ἦν, *Abr.* 36). The English translation is taken from Birnbaum and Dillon, *Abraham*, p. 95.

ἀρετάς).⁹⁶ When Origen discusses the imitation of God with reference to virtues, he cites both Luke 6.36 and Matthew 5.48 as the scriptural proof:

[The Scripture] says that the human being was made *in the image* of God; and in him the marks of the divine image are manifestly discerned not through the form of his body, [...] but through the prudence of his mind, justice, moderation, virtue, wisdom, discipline, in sum through the whole band of virtues (*per omnem denique uirtutum chorum*), which exist in God essentially and which may exist in the human being through diligence and the imitation of God (*per industriam et per imitationem dei*), just as the Lord points out in the Gospel, saying, *Be merciful as your Father is merciful* and, *Be perfect, as your Father is perfect*.⁹⁷

In light of the above, the exhortation to imitate God, which features τέλειος and appears in the conclusion of the Antitheses, might suggest that Matthew understands the goal of Law observance as complete possession of every virtue like God.

The above possible senses of τέλειος might give clues to the reason why Jesus's teaching demands 'more' but not in the sense that his teaching surpasses the Law. First, τέλειος entails one's wholeheartedness in fulfilling the will of God, only with which Law observance can lead to the 'exceeding righteousness' that the Pharisees lack. Jesus's teaching of Law observance concerns the heart, not only the deeds. The emphasis on this wholeheartedness can be further observed from the fact that the Antitheses is followed immediately by the description of the failure of the 'hypocrites' (ὕποκριταί, 6.2, 5, 16),⁹⁸ who practise 'righteousness' (δικαιοσύνη, 6.1) by pursuing praises from fellow humans rather than

⁹⁶ Origen, *Comm. Matt.* 15.16. The Greek text is taken from Origen, *Matthäuserklärung I*, ed. by Erich Klostermann, GCS, 40 (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1935), p. 395. The English translation is taken from *The Commentary of Origen on the Gospel of St Matthew*, trans. by Ronald E. Heine, OECT, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), II, p. 456.

⁹⁷ Origen, *Princ.* 4.4.10. Only the Latin translation is preserved. The Latin text and the English translation are taken from *Origen: On First Principles*, ed. & trans. by John Behr, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 582–83; the italics in the English translation are original.

⁹⁸ In Matthew, 'hypocrites' (ὕποκριταί) is frequently employed to address the Pharisees (Matt 15.7; 22.18; 23.13, 15, 23, 25, 27, 29). Mark is the source for Matthew in describing the scribes and the Pharisees as ὑποκριταί (Mark 7.6 // Matt 15.7).

pleasing God (6.1–18).⁹⁹ These hypocrites have outward piety (almsgiving, praying and fasting) but lack wholeheartedness towards God, falling short of both righteousness and perfection.¹⁰⁰ They observe the Law, have deeds of ‘righteousness’, yet their deeds are neither out of piety towards God nor out of love towards fellow humans, but for the sake of themselves so that they can boast in themselves as ‘righteous’.¹⁰¹ The disciples are told not to practise righteousness in the ways like the hypocrites do (6.1). In fact, the terms ἡ δικαιοσύνη ὑμῶν (‘your righteousness’) link 6.1 back to 5.20,¹⁰² suggesting that 6.2–18 illustrates the ways in which the ‘righteousness’ of the disciples should be more than that of the Pharisees (5.20): the ‘exceeding righteousness’ entails wholeheartedness toward God, only with which can Law observance fulfil the will of God.

Second, τέλειος entails complete possession and exhibition of moral excellence, and Matthew relates this to the imitation of God. It is noteworthy that Matthew on the one hand, names ‘mercy’ (ἔλεος) as among ‘the weightier matters of the Law’, and, on the other hand, portrays the ways in which a person should imitate God as God ‘shows mercy’ (ἐλεέω, Matt 18.33). Indeed, God himself does those things that are named as ‘the weightier matters of the Law’: ‘I am the Lord who does mercy, justice and righteousness (ποιῶν ἔλεος καὶ κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην/קַדְקֵד וְצִדְקָה מִשְׁפָּט וְחַסֵּד עֲשֵׂה) on the earth, because in these things is my will (ἐν

⁹⁹ Some manuscripts have ελεημοσύνην or δοσιν instead of δικαιοσύνην in Matt 6.1, and δικαιοσύνην is most probably the original reading; Benno Przybylski, *Righteousness in Matthew and His World of Thought*, SNTSMS, 41 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), p. 78.

¹⁰⁰ Δικαιοσύνη in Matt 6.1 can be understood as ‘piety’, referring to the acts described in 6.2–18; David Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew* (London: Oliphants, 1972), p. 132. A ‘pious’ (εὐσεβής) person is characterised by acts of almsgiving and praying (Acts 10.2).

¹⁰¹ Cf. Luke 16.15 and 18.9–14 describe the self-righteousness of the Pharisees.

¹⁰² Przybylski, *Righteousness*, p. 87.

τούτοις τὸ θέλημα μου)' (Jer 9.23).¹⁰³ Therefore, 'to be perfect just as God is perfect' is a goal directing a person to observe all commandments as following the ways in which God does 'the weightier matters of the Law'. Jesus's teaching does not surpass the Law, but affirms the Law and illustrates what are the matters of concern in Law observance: a wholeheartedness towards God and a life which follows the way of God.

In sum, Matthew 5.17–48 shows the ways in which Law observance leads to the righteousness required for entering the kingdom of heaven. Law observance must involve a pursuit of perfection: a wholeheartedness towards God and a commitment to imitate God. The radicalisation of the demand indicates that perfection 'remains a goal' which serves as an orientation for a pursuit to be like God,¹⁰⁴ to live in accordance with the will of God. It is noteworthy that Matthew links this perfection to the story of the rich young man, in which deeds of mercy and following Jesus are regarded as essential for perfection.

6.2.3 Deeds of mercy, following Jesus, and imitating God

The story of the rich (young)¹⁰⁵ man is included in all three Synoptic Gospels, all of which feature the rich man's failure in entering the kingdom of God because of not being able to fulfil the requirements that he lacks: selling his possessions and giving to the poor, and following Jesus (Matt 19.16–22 // Mark 10.17–22 // Luke 18.18–23).

This story concerns the question of what a person must 'do' (ποιέω) to have 'eternal life' (ζωὴ αἰώνιος),¹⁰⁶ which equates to 'entering the kingdom of heaven' (εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν

¹⁰³ Translated from the LXX. For ἐν τούτοις τὸ θέλημα μου, the MT has באלה הפצתי ('In these things I delight').

¹⁰⁴ As France suggests, perfection 'remains a goal, not an achievement'; France, *Matthew*, p. 228 note 166.

¹⁰⁵ Matthew 19.20 describes the man as 'young' (νεανίσκος), while Mark 10.20 and Luke 18.21 narrate the man as keeping the commandments 'from youth' (ἐκ νεότητός).

¹⁰⁶ Matt 19.16; Mark 10.17; Luke 18.18.

βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν).¹⁰⁷ Jesus's answer to this question refers to 'the commandments' (τὰς ἐντολάς).¹⁰⁸ Thus a connection between the Law and entering the kingdom of heaven is in view. All three Synoptic Gospels give a description of the rich man regarding himself as having kept the commandments,¹⁰⁹ and depict him as still lacking.¹¹⁰ The distinctive elements in Matthew's narration suggest that Matthew intends to link this story back to Jesus's teaching about Law observance and the 'exceeding righteousness' (Matt 5.17–48).¹¹¹

In Matthew's narration, Jesus tells the rich man that Law observance is necessary for having eternal life: 'if you want to enter life, keep the commandments' (εἰ δὲ θέλεις εἰς τὴν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν, τήρησον τὰς ἐντολάς, Matt 19.17).¹¹² This again shows Jesus's upholding of the Law.¹¹³ In the list of the commandments mentioned, Matthew uniquely includes 'love your neighbour as yourself' (ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν, Matt 19.19; cf. Mark 10.19; Luke 18.20). This commandment, together with 'you shall not murder' (οὐ φονεύσεις) and 'you shall not commit adultery' (οὐ μοιχεύσεις), echo the commandments mentioned in the Antitheses (Matt 5.21, 27, 43; 19.18–19). The rich young man, though he regards himself as having observed these commandments, still lacks something. The echoes of the Antitheses already imply that what the rich man needs is what the Pharisees lack: the 'exceeding

¹⁰⁷ Matt 19.23, which is parallel to 'the kingdom of God' (εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ) in Mark 10.23 and Luke 23.24.

¹⁰⁸ Matt 19.17; Mark 10.19; Luke 18.20.

¹⁰⁹ Matt 19.20; Mark 10.20; Luke 18.21.

¹¹⁰ 'What do I still lack?' (τί ἔτι ὑστερῶ; Matt 19.20); 'you lack one thing' (ἓν σε ὑστερεῖ, Mark 10.21); 'one thing still remains for you' (ἓτι ἓν σοι λείπει, Luke 18.22).

¹¹¹ For a list of the parallels between Matt 5.17–48 and 19.16–22, see Olmstead, 'Jesus', pp. 51–52. Davies and Allison see further points of contact in the two passages and their wider context, i.e., Matt 5–7 and 19.16–30; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III, pp. 62–63.

¹¹² This saying is unique in Matthew's account; Matt 19.17 // Mark 10.18–19 // Luke 18.19–20.

¹¹³ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III, p. 43.

righteousness’ (Matt 5.20) and perfection (Matt 5.48). Matthew then makes it clear that the rich man still needs ‘perfection’ (τέλειος):

ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· εἰ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι, ὑπάγε πώλησόν σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ δός [τοῖς] πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανοῖς, καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολούθει μοι. (Matt 19.21)¹¹⁴

Jesus said to him, ‘If you wish to be perfect, go, sell your possessions, and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven, and come, follow me.’

The phrase ‘to be perfect’ (εἶναι τέλειος) is unique to Matthew among the parallel accounts. It further strengthens the link between this story and the Antitheses. Like its appearance in the Antitheses (Matt 5.48), ‘to be perfect’ in Matthew 19.21 relates to Law observance and to entering the kingdom of heaven, suggesting that ‘to be perfect’ in both passages probably carries the same meaning.¹¹⁵ Given the close affinity of the two passages, it can be helpful to see the two passages as supplementary to each other concerning the concepts around Law observance, deeds of kindness and following Jesus.

6.2.3.1 *Perfection, keeping the commandments, and deeds of kindness*

As shown in Matthew 5.17–48, perfection entails wholeheartedness towards God and a life of doing the will of God according to God’s commandments (5.48). Jesus’s saying to the rich man, ‘if you want to be perfect’, therefore, means that the rich man falls short in keeping the commandments. This is then reflected by his failure to sell his possessions and to give the proceeds to the poor. Taking care of the poor is an aspect of ‘love your neighbour as yourself’,¹¹⁶ the commandment which Matthew peculiarly includes in this story.¹¹⁷ The rich

¹¹⁴ The square brackets are from NA²⁸.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Olmstead, who suggests that the use of τέλειος in Matt 19.21 ‘seems designed to point readers back to its only other occurrence in the Gospel (5:48)’; Olmstead, ‘Jesus’, pp. 43–44.

¹¹⁶ James rebukes those who dishonour the poor, describing them as not ‘fulfilling’ (τελέω, or: ‘performing’) the commandment ‘love your neighbour as yourself’ (Jas 2.6–8).

¹¹⁷ Mark and Luke do not have this commandment in their accounts of the story of the rich young man; Matt 19.19 // Mark 10.19 // Luke 18.20.

man's failure to give to the poor can be regarded as a failure to fulfil this commandment.¹¹⁸ In other words, Matthew regards the story of the rich young man as another illustration showing that deeds of kindness are integral to keeping all the commandments of God and to become 'perfect'.

Moreover, in Matthew, there is a connection between the rich man and those who are accursed in the Son of Man's judgement (25.31–46): both of them fall outside 'eternal life' (ζωή αἰώνιος, 19.16; 25.46) and the 'kingdom' (ἡ βασιλεία, 19.23–24; 25.34), being highlighted by their failure in performing deeds of kindness. In the judgement scene, deeds of kindness are highlighted as what the 'righteous' (δίκαιος) have done: giving food to the hungry, drink to the thirsty and clothes to the naked, taking care of the sick, welcoming the stranger, and visiting the prisoner (25.37–40). These deeds are summarised in a word, 'serve' (διακονέω, 25.44).¹¹⁹ The verb διακονέω has connotations of giving out one's possessions to support others;¹²⁰ its cognate noun διακονία can be employed to describe giving to the poor and the needy.¹²¹ Reading the stories of the rich young man and the judgement scene together, it can be said that, the rich young man's failure in selling his possessions and giving to the

¹¹⁸ In the Early Church, there are interpretations regarding the rich young man as not fulfilling the commandments. For example, Clement of Alexandria comments that the rich young man 'had not fulfilled (οὐ πεπληρώκει) "You shall love your neighbour as yourself"' (*Strom.* 3.6.55). Similarly, *The Gospel of the Nazaraeans* (dependent on Matthew) describes the Lord saying to a rich man: 'How can you say, "I have fulfilled the law and the prophets", since it is written in the law: You shall love your neighbour as yourself, and lo! many of your brethren, sons of Abraham, are clothed in filth, dying of hunger, and your house is full of many goods, and nothing at all goes out of it to them.' The English translations are taken from John Ferguson, *Clement of Alexandria, Stromateis: Books 1–3*, The Fathers of the Church, 85 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1991), p. 290; *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation*, ed. by J. K. Elliott (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), p. 11. Cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III, p. 46 note 52.

¹¹⁹ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III, p. 431.

¹²⁰ E.g., Luke 8.3.

¹²¹ E.g., Acts 11.29; 2 Cor 9.12–13. In *The Testament of Job*, Job is described as using his 'possessions' (τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, *T. Job* 8.2) to provide clothes, alms, and meals for the poor and the needy (*T. Job* 9–10), which is described as a 'service' (διακονία) for them (*T. Job* 11.1–3).

poor reflects that he is not among the ‘righteous’ who has served the needy, showing that the rich young man falls short of the righteousness which is required for entering the kingdom of heaven. This is then another illustration of what ‘exceeding righteousness’ (5.20) would entail: those who have ‘exceeding righteousness’ are characterised by their deeds of kindness. For Matthew, this is about doing the will of God as performing ‘the weightier matters of the Law’ (23.23); this is also about imitating God and following Jesus.

6.2.3.2 *Perfection, deeds of kindness, and following Jesus*

As Matthew mentions ‘to be perfect’ in the Antitheses and the story of the rich man, he highlights love and mercy in these two passages which concern imitating God and following Jesus. In Matthew 5.48, the exhortation ‘to be perfect like God’ concludes Jesus’s teaching of the Law, expressing the goal as imitating God just as God possesses all virtues. In this context, God’s benevolence towards both the righteous and the unrighteous is highlighted such that the disciples are exhorted to imitate God and learn to love their enemies (5.43–47). Matthew also highlights God’s mercy in another passage concerning imitating God in the same way that God also forgives. The parable of the unmerciful slave, which is an illustration of God’s demand for mercy in forgiveness,¹²² expresses this exhortation: ‘should not you have had mercy (ἐλέεω) on your fellow servant, ‘as’ (ὡς) I had mercy (ἐλέεω) on you?’ (18.33).¹²³

To be perfect like God must include being merciful like God; in this respect, following Jesus is indispensable because he is the one who fulfils and teaches about God’s will for ‘mercy’. He brings forth God’s healing and forgiveness and demonstrates how to reach out towards sinners so that the lost can be found and healed (Matt 9.9–13). He also demonstrates

¹²² Its conclusion ‘so also my heavenly Father will do to you, if each of you does not forgive your brother from your heart’ (Matt 18.35) on the one hand shows the necessity of forgiveness, on the other hand is another expression (negatively) of the beatitude ‘blessed are the merciful, for they will be shown mercy’ (μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθήσονται, Matt 5.7).

¹²³ Cf. Matt 5.48: ‘as (ὡς) your heavenly father is perfect’.

how to observe the Sabbath according to God's will for kindness towards the hungry and the sick and for giving relief to the afflicted on the Sabbath (Matt 12.1–14). This indicates the ways in which Matthew understands the significance of the notion of deeds of kindness and following Jesus as indispensable for 'being perfect' (Matt 19.21): it is about imitating God just as God is merciful. For the rich man, to be perfect must include showing mercy to the poor just as God cares for the poor. For all others, their perfection and righteousness must be characterised by deeds of kindness just as God is benevolent towards all humans. Given that God is benevolent towards even the wicked and the unrighteous (Matt 5.45), and given that God cares not only for humans but also for animals such that animals are given rest and relief on the Sabbath (Matt 12.11–12), those who are exhorted to imitate God should learn to show kindness towards everyone in need. This is what perfection and righteousness entail: to 'serve' the king by performing deeds of kindness to every person in need, any 'one of the least of these brothers of mine' (ἐνὶ τούτων τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν ἐλαχίστων, Matt 25.40).¹²⁴

To conclude, 'to be perfect' clarifies the relationship between Law observance and following Jesus. Jesus fulfils all righteousness and the will of God as he comes to fulfil the Law and the Prophets. He teaches and demonstrates total obedience to God. Only by following Jesus can a person become perfect (Matt 19.21) because only by learning from Jesus can a person do the will of God according to the commandments of God and be perfect like God (Matt 5.48). It is noteworthy that 'be perfect' is linked to 'the full yoke of Christ' by early Christians: 'For if you are able to bear the whole yoke of the Lord, you will be perfect'

¹²⁴ It is a matter of debate regarding the identity of 'one of the least of these brothers of mine' mentioned in the judgement scene. Our findings support reading it as 'everyone in need'. Davies and Allison have offered a summary of different points of view, showing that the more popular suggestion is 'everyone in need' or 'all Christians/disciples', and that a few other argue for a reading as 'Christian missionaries/leaders'. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III, pp. 428–29.

(εἰ μὲν γὰρ δύνασαι βαστάσαι ὄλον τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου, τέλειος ἔσῃ, *Did.* 6.2).¹²⁵ To bear Jesus's yoke is to learn from him (Matt 11.28–30). Therefore, Jesus's words to the rich man 'come, follow me' (δεῦρο ἀκολούθει μοι, Matt 19.21) is a call to learn from him,¹²⁶ that is, to follow his example in fulfilling God's will, of which acts of kindness are an integral part. Following Jesus equates to following God because both entail observance of God's commandments (cf. 1 Sam 15.11).¹²⁷ The observance of the Law cannot be fulfilled without following Jesus, and following Jesus must include keeping all the commandments of God. Both entail to be perfect like God, and both are necessary for entering the kingdom of heaven.

6.3 Conclusion

Matthew's emphasis on 'mercy' (ἔλεος) as among the weightier matters of the Law affirms that all the commandments of God are relevant to doing the will of God and thus they should be kept. Matthew highlights 'mercy' as the character and the will of God and depicts Jesus as fulfilling the will of God. 'Justice' and 'mercy', named 'the weightier matters of the Law', are part of the 'exceeding righteousness' which is taught and demonstrated by Jesus: he is the shepherd-king who shows mercy and is the servant of God who brings forth justice. He is the Son of God, doing the will of God, fulfilling all righteousness, in whom God is well pleased.

¹²⁵ The Greek text is taken from *The Apostolic Fathers*, ed. by Bart D. Ehrman, LCL, 24 & 25, 2 vols (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2003). The English translation is my own.

¹²⁶ These terms are similar to those in the exhortation 'come to me' (δεῦτε πρὸς με) that Jesus speaks and invites people to bear his yoke (Matt 11.28).

¹²⁷ With regard to following God, Philo mentions that the 'goal' (τέλος) of human life is to 'follow God' (τὸ ἔπεσθαι θεῷ) and obey God's commandments, that is, 'go after the Lord your God' (ὀπίσω κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ σου πορεύσῃ) like Abraham did all the 'law' (νόμος) of God (*Migr.* 129–131). Some scholars relate this concept to the imitation of God mentioned in Matt 5.48; e.g., Israel Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels: Second Series* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1924), pp. 156–57; Reinhard Feldmeier, "'As Your Heavenly Father Is Perfect": The God of the Bible and Commandments in the Gospel', *Interpretation*, 70.4 (2016), 431–44 (p. 433).

Jesus's teaching of the Law points towards perfection: to be perfect like God. This perfection entails wholehearted obedience to God in keeping his commandments and manifesting his will, his character, and his deeds. Above all, the pursuit of being 'perfect like God' reflects the importance of 'mercy': the goal of Law observance is to be like God; to follow Jesus is to learn from him and do the will of God. Among these things, deeds of kindness are indispensable because God is kind and merciful.

Chapter 7

Philo and Matthew on kindness, Law observance and the imitation of God

On exploring Matthew's understanding of love for God and love for one's neighbour as the summary of all God's commandments (Chapter 2), we have discussed Philo's Exposition of the Law to see how the highlighting of love for God and love for humans as the summary of the Law can mean that they are regarded as the all-encompassing elements of every commandment of God (Chapter 3). Our subsequent discussion of Matthew's emphasis on *ἔλεος* (Chapters 4–6) has demonstrated the ways in which *ἔλεος*, entailing kindness towards humans, refers to the deeds which God and Jesus do such that the disciples are exhorted to imitate them and practise deeds of kindness. Two areas of similarity between Matthew and Philo appear to be worthy of further discussion: both Matthew and Philo highlight kindness towards humans as the summary of the Law, and both of them regard Law observance as essential for imitating God. Therefore, putting Matthew and Philo in comparison might yield further fruits for our understanding of *ἔλεος* and the Law in Matthew. The present chapter will begin with a discussion of Philo's emphasis on philanthropy (*φιλανθρωπία*) and the ways in which this virtue relates to the imitation of God (§7.1), followed by a comparison of Matthew and Philo concerning their points of similarity and distinctiveness in their understanding of kindness and the Law (§7.2).

7.1 Philo's emphasis on philanthropy and its relationship to the imitation of God

In his Exposition of the Law, Philo pays special attention to 'philanthropy' (*φιλανθρωπία*, 'love for humans'). As discussed above, he juxtaposes philanthropy with justice by stating that one of the 'two highest heads' of the laws is 'duty to humans through philanthropy and

justice' (τὸ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους διὰ φιλανθρωπίας καὶ δικαιοσύνης, *Spec.* 2.63), and regards philanthropy as the twin of 'piety' (εὐσέβεια, *Virt.* 51), which is 'the queen of virtues'.¹ Furthermore, Philo expounds philanthropy at the greatest length (*Virt.* 51–174) in this discussion of virtues.² It is thus fitting to investigate the reasons for, and the implications of, Philo's emphasis on philanthropy.

Neither φιλανθρωπία nor *humanitas* appear among the Platonic or Stoic principal virtues.³ Φιλανθρωπία is also not included in the variations of the canon of virtues in Greek philosophical literature.⁴ According to Luck, the earliest attestations of the word-group φιλανθρωπία or φιλόανθρωπος appear to describe the gods, to denote their benevolence and aid to humans. This attribute is subsequently applied to rulers or kings to describe their goodness towards their subjects, and later became a spectacular virtue pursued by ordinary people.⁵ For example, Demosthenes (384–322 BCE) juxtaposes φιλανθρωπία with δικαιοσύνη (2 *Philip.* 1)⁶

¹ See above, Chapter 3.

² Philo's discussion on philanthropy is named as Περὶ φιλανθρωπίας ('On Philanthropy') in some manuscripts (S C G²); see the apparatus in Cohn's edition (CW), v, p. 279. Περὶ φιλανθρωπίας is translated in Latin as *De humanitate*. For a list of the length of the treatises in Philo's Exposition of the Law, see Sterling, 'The Queen', pp. 110–11.

³ For the Platonic or Stoic principal virtues, see the discussion in Chapter 3, §3.2.3.1.

⁴ Walter T. Wilson, 'The Constitution of Compassion: Political Reflections on Philo's *De humanitate*', in *Scripture and Traditions: Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Carl R. Holladay*, ed. by Patrick Gray and Gail R. O'Day, NovTSup, 129 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 37–46 (p. 34); David Konstan, 'Philo's *De virtutibus* in the Perspective of Classical Greek Philosophy', *Studia Philonica Annual*, 2006, 59–72 (p. 66).

⁵ Ulrich Luck, 'φιλανθρωπία', *TDNT*, ix, pp. 107–12 (pp. 108–9).

⁶ τοὺς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν λόγους καὶ δικαίους καὶ φιλανθρώπους ὁρῶ φαινομένου ('I observe that all the speeches on our side are manifestly inspired by justice and generosity'). The Greek text and the English translation are taken from: Demosthenes, *Philippics*, trans. by J. H. Vince, LCL, 238 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1930).

and εὐσέβεια (*Mid.* 12)⁷ respectively;⁸ Seneca (c. 4 BCE–65 CE) discusses *humanitas* (‘humanity’ or ‘philanthropy’) alongside *fortitudo*, *fides*, and *temperantia* (‘courage’, ‘loyalty’, and ‘moderation’), and regards these virtues as important for the perfection of the soul (*consummatur animus*, *Epistles* 88.28–30).⁹

Similarly, Philo has high regard for philanthropy, treating it as one of the prominent virtues (alongside εὐσέβεια/ὀσιότης, φρόνησις, σωφροσύνη, δικαιοσύνη, ἀνδρεία, *Spec.* 4.135; *Virt.* 1.1) which are exemplified in the Mosaic legislation.¹⁰ Philo expresses the prominence of philanthropy in the Law in two ways. First, he regards philanthropy and justice as the summary of the duties to humans in the Mosaic legislation, and these are both closely related to piety, the queen of virtues. He describes Abraham, one of the living laws, as a person of piety and justice, who is characterised by philanthropy. Second, Philo regards the Mosaic legislation, being the divine Law, as suffused with philanthropy. The Law is philanthropic, just as God is philanthropic.¹¹ By observing the laws and following the precepts, people imitate God and attain virtuous lives which are well-pleasing to God.

⁷ πάντες εἰς τοσοῦτον ἀφῆχθε φιλανθρωπίας καὶ εὐσεβείας (‘you have all risen to such a height of benevolence and piety’). The Greek text and the English translation are taken from Demosthenes, *Orations XXI–XXVI*, trans. by J. H. Vince, LCL, 299 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935).

⁸ Konstan, ‘De virtutibus’, p. 66.

⁹ Carl Joachim Classen, ‘Plato’s Virtues in Rome’, in *Aretai und Virtutes: Untersuchungen zu den Wertvorstellungen der Griechen und Römer*, BzA, 283 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), pp. 320–31 (p. 322). Seneca discusses *fortitudo*, *fides*, *temperantia* and *humanitas* in *Epistles* 88.29–30. The Latin text is taken from Seneca, *Epistles* 66–92, LCL, 76 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920), p. 366.

¹⁰ See above, Chapter 3, §3.2.3.

¹¹ It should be noted that φιλανθρωπεῖν, φιλανθρωπία, φιλόθρωπος, and φιλανθρώπως do not appear in the Greek translations of the scriptures which have extant Hebrew manuscripts; therefore, it is hard to recognise the Hebrew counterparts of these words (e.g., there are no Hebrew words in Hatch and Redpath, s.v. ‘φιλανθρωπεῖν’, ‘φιλανθρωπία’, ‘φιλόθρωπος’, ‘φιλανθρώπως’). In the LXX, φιλανθρωπία occurs in Est 8.12l, 2 Macc 6.22; 14.9; 3 Macc 3.15, 18; 1 Esd 8.10, and φιλόθρωπος in 2 Macc 4.11; 4 Macc 5.12; Wis 1.6; 7.23; 12.19. They are mainly used to refer to the virtue of kings and rulers (Est 8.12l; 1 Esd 8.10; 2 Macc 4.11; 6.22; 14.9; 3 Macc 3.15, 18), sometimes to the attribute of the divine wisdom (Wis 1.6; 7.23), sometimes to the virtue of a righteous man (Wis. 12.19). Luck, ‘Φιλανθρωπία’, pp. 109–10.

7.1.1 *Philanthropy relates closely to piety and justice*

In the opening statement of ‘On Philanthropy’ (*Virt.* 51–174), Philo states the close relationship between philanthropy and piety:

Τὴν δ’ εὐσεβείας συγγενεστάτην καὶ ἀδελφὴν καὶ δίδυμον ὄντως ἐξῆς ἐπισκεπτέον
φιλανθρωπίαν. (*Virt.* 51)

The next subject to be examined is philanthropy, the virtue closest akin to piety, its sister and its twin.¹²

This statement designates philanthropy as the closest akin to piety, showing the prominence of philanthropy among the virtues because Philo regards piety as the beginning of all virtues (*Decal.* 52; cf. *Spec.* 4.97), the summary of the laws.¹³ Philo regards both piety and philanthropy as ‘the queens of virtues’: εὐσεβεία καὶ φιλανθρωπία αἱ ἀρετῶν ἡγεμονίδες (*Virt.* 95). This juxtaposition is comparable to Philo’s statement that regards all the laws as summarised as ‘two highest heads’: one is the duty to God through ‘piety and holiness’ (εὐσεβεία καὶ ὁσιότης), the other is the duty to humans through ‘justice and philanthropy’ (δικαιοσύνη καὶ φιλανθρωπία, *Spec.* 2.63). Two points are noteworthy and will be explained below. First, Philo’s discussion of Abraham’s life (*Abr.* 60–276), which is a demonstration of piety and justice, is characterised by Abraham’s philanthropy. Second, Philo’s discussion of philanthropy (*Virt.* 51–174) includes notions of piety and the laws which also pertain to justice. For Philo, philanthropy is interwoven with piety and justice across the whole body of the Mosaic legislation.

7.1.1.1 *The pious Abraham as characterised by justice and philanthropy*

In the discussion of Abraham’s life, Philo states that a pious person must also be philanthropic, and that being philanthropic equates to exhibiting justice towards humans: ‘for

¹² Colson’s translation; slightly modified.

¹³ Cited and discussed above, Chapter 3, pp. 84–86.

it is characteristic of the same nature to be both pious and philanthropic, and one may observe in the same person each virtue, holiness in relation to God, justice in relation to humans' (*Abr.* 208).¹⁴ This statement is situated at the point where Philo transitions from the discussion of Abraham's piety (*Abr.* 60–207) to Abraham's justice (*Abr.* 208–276).

One of the examples given in the discussion of Abraham's piety is his hospitality to the three travellers (*Abr.* 107–118; cf. Gen 18.1–8). Philo describes Abraham's hospitality as his philanthropy (φιλανθρωπία, *Abr.* 107, 109), and Abraham's 'hospitality' (φιλόξενον, literally 'love for strangers') towards 'strangers' (ξένοι ἄνδρες) as 'an incidental aspect of a greater virtue; that virtue is piety' (πάρεργον ὃν ἀρετῆς μείζονος· ἡ δ' ἀρετὴ θεοσέβεια, *Abr.* 114).¹⁵ Abraham's justice is also characterised by his philanthropy. One example is his distress at his nephew's captivity: being concerned about his nephew's life, he decided to fight the five kings (*Abr.* 225–235). Regarding this moment, Philo describes Abraham as one who 'is set on deeds of justice and philanthropy' (δικαίων καὶ φιλανθρώπων ἔργων ἐφιῆται τις, *Abr.* 232).

The life of Abraham outlined above offers a perspective on the ways in which a pious and just person expresses philanthropy. For Philo, this person is no other but the living law which is the 'original' (ἀρχέτυπος) of the written laws (*Abr.* 3–5).¹⁶ Philo in his subsequent discussion of the written laws also shows that certain laws pertain to philanthropy and at the same time relate closely to justice and piety.

¹⁴ Cited above, p. 72.

¹⁵ The English translation is taken from Birnbaum and Dillon, *Abraham*, p. 111. For the implications of regarding 'piety' as the greater virtue (which seems to be a ranking among the virtues), see the discussion in Chapter 3, pp. 84–86.

¹⁶ For the implications of the living law being as the 'original' of the particular laws, see above, §3.1.2.

7.1.1.2 *The laws pertaining to philanthropy have notions of piety and justice*

‘On Philanthropy’ (*Virt.* 51–174) is divided into two parts. In the first part (*Virt.* 51–80), Philo gives proofs to show the ‘philanthropy and fellowship’ (φιλανθρωπία καὶ κοινωνία, *Virt.* 80) of Moses. Moses’ philanthropy is expressed in his decision to choose neither his son nor his nephew as his successor. He besought God, giving the election of his successor to God instead of giving it to himself (*Virt.* 53–65). Philo considers this as a proof of the ‘philanthropy and faithfulness’ (φιλανθρωπία καὶ πίστις) that Moses showed to his compatriots (*Virt.* 66). Another proof is Moses’ joy after Joshua was chosen because the nation would have the best guardian. Moses encouraged his successor, blessed his subjects and sang hymns of thanksgiving to God (*Virt.* 66–75). Philo says that these hymns are woven with ‘holiness and philanthropy’ (ὁσιότης καὶ φιλανθρωπία, *Virt.* 76). These descriptions show the ways in which Moses’ philanthropy relates to his piety: his philanthropy is expressed by his obedience to God’s commands (*Virt.* 63),¹⁷ by his prayer for the nation, and by his thanksgiving to God.¹⁸

After showing the philanthropy of Moses, Philo discusses the relevant laws (*Virt.* 80–174), the purpose and the outline of which is stated in a transitional statement (*Virt.* 80–81). Philo states that he has given proofs of the legislator’s ‘philanthropy and fellowship’ (φιλανθρωπία καὶ κοινωνία), which should be followed by saying the things that the legislator ‘prescribed’ (διετέταξε), in which the legislator establishes ‘kindness and gentleness’ (τὸ ἐπιεικὲς καὶ ἡμερον) not only in the ‘fellowship’ (κοινωνία) among humans, but also in relation to animals and plants. Philo then discusses the laws which exhort people to show kindness and gentleness to humans (*Virt.* 82–124), animals (*Virt.* 125–147) and plants (*Virt.* 148–160)

¹⁷ As the discussion of Abraham’s life shows, Philo considers piety as following God, obeying God’s commands and practising a law-abiding life (*Abr.* 60–61).

¹⁸ Cf. Wilson, *On Virtues*, p. 158.

in sequence. The discussion of these laws shows that, for Philo, philanthropy relates closely to justice and piety, expressed frequently in terms of being kind and merciful.

First, some of the laws discussed in this part (*Virt.* 82–160) are also discussed in the section pertaining to justice (*Spec.* 4.135–238): no delay of wages (*Virt.* 88; cf. *Spec.* 4.195–196), the seventh and the fiftieth year (*Virt.* 97–101; cf. *Spec.* 4.214–218), the conduct of war (*Virt.* 109; cf. *Spec.* 4.219–225), and the prohibition of destroying plants (*Virt.* 148–154; cf. *Spec.* 4.226–229). These show the ways in which certain laws are characterised particularly in terms of justice and philanthropy. For example, concerning the laws of wages to be paid on the same day (cf. Lev 19.13; Deut 24.14–15), Philo discusses it in the context of justice where wealth cannot be unjustly gained, that the rich should not deprive the poor of their remuneration (*Spec.* 4.195). When he mentions this law again in the discussion concerning philanthropy, he states that this law is ‘just’ (*δίκαιον*) and also urges ‘philanthropy’ (*φιλανθρωπία*) because the daily need and the morale of the employee is considered (*Virt.* 88).

Philo’s explanation of the laws about the seventh and the fiftieth year in his discussion of both justice and philanthropy shows that caring for the poor is a matter of both justice and philanthropy. Philo comments that the laws about the seventh year (*Virt.* 97–98; cf. Exod. 23.10 LXX), which give opportunities for the poor and the needy to gather food as a gift of nature, are ‘kind and philanthropic’ (*χρηστὰ καὶ φιλόφθωπα*, *Virt.* 97). The law pertaining to the fiftieth year restores the ownership of property (*Virt.* 99–100), so that the original owner is not punished by poverty but ‘receives mercy’ (*ἐλεεῖσθαι*, *Virt.* 99–100). This law ‘extends philanthropy beyond all measure’ (*πᾶσαν ὑπερβάλλει φιλανθρωπίαν*, *Virt.* 99). Through these regulations, the poverty of the poor is relieved; at the same time, these laws prohibit wealth to be unjustly accumulated (*Spec.* 4.214–218). Philo comments that this restoration of the original inheritance is ‘a deed full of philanthropy and justice’ (*πρᾶγμα φιλανθρωπίας καὶ δικαιοσύνης μεστόν*, *Decal.* 164).

However, the philanthropy exemplified in these laws does not only mean caring for the poor (nor ‘almsgiving’).¹⁹ For Philo, ‘mercy and kindness’ (τὸ ἰλεων καὶ χρηστόν) should be diffused not merely to the poor but to all, even if they are foreigners or enemies, and even to animals and plants (*Virt.* 160). By showing kindness to animals and plants, people also learn to show kindness to humans (*Virt.* 141). Ultimately, everyone cares for each other and attains utmost ‘good fortune’ (εὐδαιμονία, or ‘well-being’):

τοῦτο δὲ μάλιστα βούλεται διὰ πάσης τῆς νομοθεσίας ὁ ἱερώτατος προφήτης κατασκευάζειν, ὁμόνοιαν, κοινωνίαν, ὁμοφροσύνην, κρᾶσιν ἡθῶν, ἐξ ὧν οἰκίαι καὶ πόλεις ἔθνη τε καὶ χῶραι καὶ τὸ σύμπαν ἀνθρώπων γένος εἰς τὴν ἀνωτάτω προέλθοιεν εὐδαιμονίαν. (*Virt.* 119)

This above all is what the most holy prophet throughout the whole of his legislation intends to provide, concord, fellowship, unanimity, and a unity of dispositions, from which households and cities, nations and lands, and the entire human race might advance to the utmost good fortune.²⁰

This statement describes that these laws of active benevolence are to promote *κοινωνία* (‘fellowship’) and the unity of the human race. This description echoes Philo’s introduction of ‘On Philanthropy’:

ὁδὸν γὰρ οἷα λεωφόρον ἄγουσαν ἐφ’ ὁσιότητα ταύτην ἠπίστατο — τοὺς ὑπ’ αὐτὸν ἅπαντας ἤλειφε καὶ συνεκρότει πρὸς κοινωνίαν. (*Virt.* 51)

He [Moses] understood that she [φιλανθρωπία] leads like a highway to holiness. He used to prepare and train all his subjects for fellowship.²¹

This connection of philanthropy and fellowship shows similarities to Cicero’s discussion concerning ‘justice’ (*iustitia*). For Cicero, the ‘fellowship’ (*communitas*) of one another in a community is maintained by a ‘principle’ (*ratio*) which consists of two parts: one is ‘justice’

¹⁹ Scholars are concerned that the Graeco-Roman concept of philanthropy is mistaken as merely showing kindness to the poor. For example, Pieter W. van der Horst, ‘Organized Charity in the Ancient World: Pagan, Jewish, Christian’, in *Jewish and Christian Communal Identities in the Roman World*, ed. by Ya’ir Furstenberg, *AJEC*, 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), pp. 116–33 (p. 120).

²⁰ Wilson’s translation.

²¹ Wilson’s translation.

(*iustitia*), another is *beneficentia* ('beneficence') which may be called *benignitas* ('kindness') or *liberalitas* ('generosity') (*Off.* 1.20).²² Cicero considers that *iustitia* is about maintaining the unity of 'the whole of the human race' (*totius complexu gentis humanae*) 'with generosity and equity' (*munifice et aequae*, *Fin.* 5.65).²³ Similarly, Philo's concept of philanthropy has a concern for the fellowship of 'the whole human race' (τὸ σύμπαν ἀνθρώπων γένος, *Virt.* 119).²⁴ In light of Cicero's similar concept of justice in terms of benevolence to the whole human race, Philo's connection of philanthropy to 'fellowship' might also suggest that, through the contemporary concepts of 'fellowship', Philo further points out how philanthropy is interwoven with justice such that both virtues are indispensable for the good of the whole human race.

Second, the laws discussed in 'On Philanthropy' also have connections to piety. Philo states that philanthropy is akin to 'piety' (εὐσέβεια) and is a high road leading to 'holiness' (δσιότης, *Virt.* 51). On the discussion of the laws which forbid the gathering of the fallen fruits, the gleaning of vineyards and the picking of the remaining olives (*Virt.* 91–94; cf. Lev 19.10; Deut 24.20–21 LXX), Philo points out that through these laws God 'shows mercy and compassion' (ἐλεῶν καὶ οἰκτείρων) to those who fell into poverty (*Virt.* 91); for those who refuse to follow these laws, Philo regards them as 'being impious' (ἀσεβοῦντες, *Virt.* 92) and their practice as both 'misanthropy and impiety' (μισανθρωπία καὶ ἀσέβεια, *Virt.* 94). The issue at stake is that although these impious people recognise the fruits as being bestowed by nature, they act as if these fruits are a result of their work alone, and they refuse to obey the

²² Cf. Wilson, *Mysteries*, p. 84.

²³ The Latin text and the English translation are taken from Cicero, *De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum*, trans. by H. Rackham, LCL, 40, 2nd edn (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931). This text is also cited in Winston, 'Philo's Ethical', p. 393.

²⁴ Winston suggests that Cicero's connection of benevolence, solidarity and justice is comparable to Philo's understanding with regard to philanthropy; Winston, 'Philo's Ethical', pp. 392–94.

holy laws to share these fruits (*Virt.* 94). Closely related to this law is the law of giving the first fruits to the priests (*Virt.* 95). This offering is both a sacrifice to God and a giving to the priests (*Spec.* 4.98), and thus exemplifies both ‘piety and philanthropy’ (εὐσέβεια καὶ φιλανθρωπία, *Virt.* 95; cf. *Spec.* 4.97–98).²⁵ On the one hand, piety is expressed in terms of honouring God (*Virt.* 95) and giving thanks to God (*Spec.* 4.97–98); on the other hand, philanthropy is expressed in terms of recognising the ministry of the priests (*Spec.* 4.98; cf. *Spec.* 2.183). For Philo, the laws about philanthropy are for reminding people that their strength is a gift from God and they should give thanks to God (*Virt.* 165).

Philo’s discussion of these laws shows the ways in which philanthropy relates closely to justice and piety, demonstrating that the laws exhort people to be pious, just and philanthropic, which are exactly the ‘nature’ (φύσις, or ‘character’) of the living law, Abraham (*Abr.* 208). Moreover, for Philo, to be just and philanthropic is to imitate God, this imitation is likewise emphasised when Philo discusses the particular laws with reference to justice and philanthropy.

7.1.2 The Law, philanthropy, and the imitation of God

In *Exposition of the Law*, Philo shows the ways in which the particular laws relate to virtues. After discussing the former under the ten headings according to the Decalogue, Philo discusses the laws with reference to virtues (*Spec.* 4.133–134).²⁶ He begins the discussion with ‘justice’ (δικαιοσύνη, *Spec.* 4.135–238), subsequently ‘courage’ (ἀνδρεία, *Virt.* 1–50) and ‘philanthropy’ (φιλανθρωπία, *Virt.* 51–174), after which he discusses ‘repentance’ (*Virt.* 175–186) and ‘nobility’ (*Virt.* 187–227).²⁷ In the discussion of virtues, Philo highlights the

²⁵ Cf. Wilson, *On Virtues*, p. 240.

²⁶ See the discussion above, Chapter 3, §3.2.3.

²⁷ Philo sometimes states the transition from one topic (virtue) to another: *Spec.* 4.135; *Virt.* 1, 51.

significance of imitating God (μιμεῖσθαι θεόν), which, in turn, links the observance of the Law to becoming ‘perfect’ (τέλειος/τέλεος) and to the ‘goal’ (τέλος) of human existence. The present section will explore the ways in which Philo understands philanthropy and its relation to the virtues of God and to the goal of human life as imitating God.

7.1.2.1 Imitating God to benefit others and to give

Philo mentions imitating God twice amid his discussion of virtues. The first passage is in the section pertaining to δικαιοσύνη, focussing on rulers, who should imitate God just as God has power and is willing to benefit humans (*Spec.* 4.186–188). The second passage is in the section pertaining to φιλανθρωπία, discussing the fact that humans should imitate God just as God gives (*Virt.* 168–169).

The context of the first passage is a discussion of the laws concerning rulers and justice. Philo describes ‘a law-abiding ruler’ (νόμιμος ἄρχων) as ‘who honours equality, who is unbribed and gives judgements justly’ (ισότητα τιμῶντος, ἀδεκάστου, τὰ δίκαια κρίνοντος δικαίως, *Spec.* 4.169). The related commandments are ‘do not accept a bribe’ and ‘pursue justice justly’ (οὐδὲ λήμψονται δῶρον [...] δικαίως τὸ δίκαιον διώξῃ),²⁸ which Philo has discussed earlier (*Spec.* 4.62, 66).²⁹ Philo then, citing the Pentateuch again, shows that these are the ways in which God gives judgement:

ὕμνησας γὰρ τὰς τοῦ ὄντος ἀρετὰς ὁ ἱεροφάντης τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον· ὁ θεὸς ὁ μέγας καὶ κραταίος, ὅστις οὐ θαυμάζει πρόσωπον οὐδὲ μὴ λάβῃ δῶρον ποιῶν κρίσιν, ἐπιλέγει — τίσιν ἢ κρίσις; οὐ σατράπαις καὶ τυράννοις καὶ γῆς καὶ θαλάττης ἀναψαμένοις τὸ κράτος, ἀλλ’ ἐπηλύτῳ καὶ ὀρφανῷ καὶ χήρᾳ. (*Spec.* 4.177)

For when the revealer [Moses] has hymned the virtues of the Self-existent in this manner ‘God the great and powerful, who has no respect to persons, accepts no bribe

²⁸ Deut 16.19–20 LXX; cf. Exod 23.8. Δῶρον (‘gift’) in this context means negatively ‘bribe’.

²⁹ ‘The second instruction to the judge is not to receive gifts’ (δεύτερον παράγγελμα κριτῆ δῶρα μὴ λαμβάνειν, *Spec.* 4.62); ‘Moses commands [us] to pursue justice justly’ (Μωσῆς δικαίως τὸ δίκαιον προστάττει μεταδιώκειν, *Spec.* 4.66). Colson’s translation, slightly modified. The cross references to *Spec.* 4.62 and 4.66 at 4.169 are mentioned by Colson (VIII, p. 113 note a).

and gives judgement,' he proceeds to say for whom the judgement [is given]—neither for satraps nor despots nor men invested with power by land and sea, but 'for the incomer, orphan and widow'.³⁰

Based on Deuteronomy 10.17–18,³¹ Philo points out that receiving no bribes and performing justice for incomers, orphans and widows are the virtues (*ἀρεταί*) of God, implying that rulers should do likewise when they give judgement. Then, in the subsequent discussion of another 'very just prohibition' (*δικαιοσύνη ἀπαγόρευσις*), which forbids rulers 'to walk deceitfully among the people' (*πορεύεσθαι δόλω ἐν τῷ ἔθνει*, *Spec.* 4.183),³² Philo points out those who are able to make things either better or worse should will 'to benefit' (*ὠφελεῖν*) instead of injuring (4.186), and states the reason: 'for this is to follow God, since He too can do both but wills the good only' (*τὸ γὰρ ἔπεσθαι θεῷ τοῦτ' ἐστίν, ἐπεὶ κακείνω δύναμις μὲν ἐστὶ δρᾶν ἐκάτερα, βούλεται δὲ μόνον ἀγαθὰ*, 4.187).³³ Philo then concludes by stating that 'these things good rulers must imitate if they have any aspiration to be assimilated to God (*ταῦτα μιμεῖσθαι προσήκει τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἄρχοντας, εἴ γέ τις αὐτοῖς φροντίς ἐστὶν ἕξομοιώσεως τῆς πρὸς θεόν*, 4.188).³⁴ 'These things' (*ταῦτα*), in the nearer context, refers to the ways in which God and his 'beneficent powers' (*εὐεργέτιδες δυνάμεις*) change things for the better (4.187). On the other hand, 'these things' might further include the aforesaid deeds of justice which God has set as an example for the rulers to follow (e.g., 4.169, 177). In this way, Philo shows the relationship between Law observance and imitating God: to follow the commandments pertaining to *δικαιοσύνη* is to follow the ways in which God performs *δικαιοσύνη*.

³⁰ Colson's translation, slightly modified.

³¹ Deut 10.17–18 LXX: ὁ θεὸς ὁ μέγας καὶ ἰσχυρὸς καὶ ὁ φοβερός, ὅστις οὐ θαυμάζει πρόσωπον οὐδ' οὐ μὴ λάβη δῶρον, ποιῶν κρίσιν προσηλύτων καὶ ὀρφανῶν καὶ χήρα ('God, who is great, mighty and fearful, has no respect to persons, does not accept a bribe, doing justice for the sojourner, orphan and widow').

³² Cf. Lev 19.16 LXX: οὐ πορεύσῃ δόλω ἐν τῷ ἔθνει σου.

³³ Colson's translation.

³⁴ Colson's translation.

The second passage where Philo mentions imitating God is in his discussion of the laws pertaining to *φιλανθρωπία*. The context of this passage is about those who are abundant in ‘riches, honours and magistracies’ (*πλοῦτοι καὶ δόξαι καὶ ἡγεμονίαι*, *Virt.* 161–162).³⁵ Philo suggests that these people should remember God and reject arrogant thoughts because the Law reminds them that their strength is a gift from God: ‘for he gives you strength to produce power’ (*οὗτος γὰρ σοι δίδωσιν ἰσχὺν ποιῆσαι δύναμιν*, *Virt.* 165).³⁶ The ‘strength to produce power’ in this context means the ability to help others to acquire virtues (*Virt.* 166–167),³⁷ which are also gifts from God (*Virt.* 169).³⁸ God gives virtues to these people for them to use properly and edify others. Those who receive these gifts from God should give just as God gives:

ἄλλως τε καὶ μάθημα ἀναδιδάσκει τῇ λογικῇ φύσει πρεπωδέστατον, μιμεῖσθαι θεὸν καθ’ ὅσον οἶόν τε, μηδὲν παραλιπόντα τῶν εἰς τὴν ἐνδεχομένην ἐξομοίωσιν. ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν, φησὶν, ἔλαβες ἰσχὺν παρὰ τοῦ δυνατωτάτου, μετάδος ἄλλοις ἰσχύος διαθείς ὃ ἔπαθες, ἵνα μιμήσῃ θεὸν τῷ παραπλήσια χαρίζεσθαι. κοινωφελεῖς γὰρ αἱ τοῦ πρώτου ἡγεμόνος δωρεαί, ἃς δίδωσιν ἐνίοις, οὐχ ἵν’ ἐκεῖνοι λαβόντες ἀποκρύψωσιν ἢ καταχρήσωνται πρὸς ζημίαν ἐτέρων, ἀλλ’ ἵν’ εἰς μέσον προενεγκόντες ὥσπερ ἐν δημοθιμίᾳ πάντα ὅσους οἶόν τε καλέσωσιν ἐπὶ τὴν χρῆσιν καὶ ἀπόλαυσιν αὐτῶν. (*Virt.* 168–169)

And elsewhere he teaches the rational nature a most appropriate lesson, to imitate God as much as possible, neglecting none of the things contributing to such assimilation. ‘Therefore,’ he says, ‘when you receive strength from the all-mighty, grant a share of your strength to others, giving that which you received, so that you might imitate God by giving gifts of the same kind. For the gifts of the supreme ruler are of common utility, given to some, not so that they, upon receiving them, might hide them or misuse them to harm others, but so that they might present them in public, just as in a civic feast they summon all they can to make use and have enjoyment of them.’³⁹

³⁵ Translation is taken from Wilson, *On Virtues*, p. 75. The section ‘On Philanthropy’ can be outlined as falling into three parts: philanthropy and Moses (*Virt.* 51–79), philanthropy and the Law (*Virt.* 80–160), and philanthropy and the ruling classes (*Virt.* 161–174). Wilson, *On Virtues*, p. 17.

³⁶ This is a citation from Deuteronomy; cf. Deut 8.18 LXX: αὐτός σοι δίδωσιν ἰσχὺν τοῦ ποιῆσαι δύναμιν.

³⁷ As Wilson suggests, *ποιῆσαι δύναμιν* in this context entails ‘imparting virtues to others’. Wilson, *On Virtues*, p. 349.

³⁸ Philo understands ‘virtues’ (*ἀρεταί*) and ‘the performing powers [for virtues]’ (*ἐνέργειαι*) as ‘gifts’ (*δωρεαί*) from God to humans (*Ebr.* 119).

³⁹ Translation is taken from Wilson, *On Virtues*, p. 76.

As this passage shows, while stating the duty of those who have gifts, Philo emphasises the use of gifts to benefit instead of to harm others as an act of imitating God, which he mentions twice (μιμεῖσθαι θεόν, ἵνα μιμήσῃ θεόν, *Virt.* 168). Philo regards the act of ‘sharing with others’ (μεταδιδόναι ἄλλοις) as imitating God by ‘giving’ (χαρίζεσθαι). It is important that Philo understands God’s χαρίζεσθαι as closely associated with God’s philanthropy and his merciful nature, both of which are also discussed in relation to the imitation of God.

For Philo, God as a giver of gifts is a prominent feature of God’s philanthropy: God is ‘philanthropic’ (φιλόανθρωπος) ‘to provide’ (παρασχεῖν) all good things to the human race (*Opif.* 81).⁴⁰ Since God’s philanthropy includes being a giver of gifts to humankind, one way for humans to imitate God is ‘to give’:

ὁ γὰρ ἔφη τις οὐκ ἀπὸ σκοποῦ τῶν πρότερον, ἀληθές ἐστιν, ὅτι παραπλήσιον οὐδὲν ἄνθρωποι θεῷ δρῶσιν ἢ χαρίζομενοι. τί δ’ ἂν εἴη κρεῖττον ἀγαθὸν ἢ μιμεῖσθαι θεὸν γενητοῖς τὸν αἰδίον; (*Spec.* 4.73)

For what one of the men of old aptly said is true, that in no other action does man so much resemble God as in giving, and what greater good can there be than that they should imitate God, they the created Him the eternal?⁴¹

The above mention of imitating God as in ‘giving’ (χαρίζομενοι) appears in the context where Philo states that ‘[Moses] has filled almost the whole legislation with precepts towards mercy and philanthropy’ (ὁ πᾶσαν σχεδόν τι τὴν νομοθεσίαν πεπληρωκῶς τῶν εἰς ἔλεον καὶ φιλανθρωπίαν διαταγμάτων, *Spec.* 4.72). This statement emphasises the philanthropic character of the legislation by hyperbolically describing almost every precept in the Law as leading to mercy and philanthropy (εἰς ἔλεον καὶ φιλανθρωπίαν). Philo then describes the ways in which the legislation is filled with mercy and philanthropy. For example, the Law exhorts people to care for the needy, urging those who are rich ‘to consider abundant wealth not as

⁴⁰ See further below for Philo’s understanding of God’s φιλανθρωπία, §7.1.2.1 and §7.1.2.2.

⁴¹ Colson’s translation; slightly modified. Regarding this text, Colson translates χαρίζομενοι as ‘showing kindness’.

their own possessions but as common possessions of those in need' (τὰς περιουσίας οὐκ ἴδια κτήματα νομίζουσιν ἀλλὰ κοινὰ τῶν ἐν ἐνδείαις, *Spec.* 4.72). The things to 'share' (μεταδίδωμι) include not only gold and silver but also strength and wisdom. Those who possess these things should share to help the poor, to strengthen the weak, and to benefit others with knowledge. By doing so, they honour equality (ἰσότητα τιμήσας μεταδιδότω, 'honouring equality you should share'; *Spec.* 4.74), which is also the attitude of a law-abiding ruler (νόμιμος ἄρχων ἰσότητα τιμῶν, *Spec.* 4.169) that Philo mentions when he discusses δικαιοσύνη.

The concept expressed in this passage (*Spec.* 4.72–74) is consistent with that in *On Virtues* 168–169, and several key terms are shared by both passages. In both passages, Philo mentions that the legislation urges philanthropy in order to destroy arrogance (*Spec.* 4.74; *Virt.* 161–174). Possessions (in terms of wealth, strength, wisdom, etc.) are gifts from God (*Spec.* 4.74–75; *Virt.* 165), not given to all but to some people. These recipients of gifts are to 'bring forth [these gifts] to the public' (προφέρειν εἰς μέσον, *Spec.* 4.74; *Virt.* 169) for common benefit.⁴² By 'giving' (χαρίζεσθαι), they act in a manner which is 'nearly resembling' (παραπλήσιος)⁴³ God (*Spec.* 4.73; *Virt.* 168). These descriptions show the ways in which philanthropy associates with equality (and thus justice)⁴⁴ in terms of imitating God in 'giving' (χαρίζεσθαι) to benefit others.

Furthermore, regarding philanthropy and the imitation of God, Philo speaks of imitating 'the merciful power' (ἡ ἴλεω δύναμις) of God:

οἱ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ἴλεω δύναμιν ἀπομιμούμενοι μετριώτερον καὶ φιλανθρωπότερον χρῆσονται ταῖς τιμωρίαις· θεοῦ δὲ τὸ εὐεργετεῖν ἴδιον. (*Mut.* 129)

⁴² Cf. *Spec.* 2.141 and *Virt.* 140, where Philo also describes φιλανθρωπίας in terms of 'bringing forth [gifts] to the public' (προφέρειν εἰς μέσον).

⁴³ LSJ, s.v. 'παραπλήσιος'.

⁴⁴ The phrase ἰσότητα τιμήσας 'honouring equality' appears in both *Spec.* 4.169 (pertaining to δικαιοσύνη) and *Spec.* 4.74 (pertaining to φιλανθρωπία).

Those who imitate the merciful power of the Father will dispense punishment in a more moderate and more philanthropic manner. Beneficence is the peculiar prerogative of a god.⁴⁵

This passage relates philanthropy to God's 'merciful power',⁴⁶ which Philo also mentions elsewhere: 'the merciful [power], by which the creator shows compassion and mercy to his own work' (ἡ ἰλεως, δι' ἧς ὁ τεχνίτης οἰκτεῖρει καὶ ἐλεεῖ τὸ ἴδιον ἔργον, *Fug.* 95).⁴⁷ Philo's alternative way to express ἰλεως as an attribute of God is stating that God has a 'merciful nature' (ἰλεως φύσις),⁴⁸ or God is 'merciful' (ἰλεως).⁴⁹ He explains God's merciful character with the verbs οἰκτίρω and ἐλεέω (*Fug.* 95; cf. *Mos.* 1.72).⁵⁰ Since Philo relates God's merciful character to philanthropy and the imitation of God (*Mut.* 129), it is necessary to further investigate Philo's concept of ἔλεος and the ways in which ἔλεος is associated with philanthropy.

7.1.2.2 Ἔλεος and φιλανθρωπία as virtues of humans and of God

As mentioned above, in *On the Special Laws* 4.72, Philo juxtaposes ἔλεος and φιλανθρωπία, highlighting these as the attributes of the legislation.⁵¹ This juxtaposition shows that Philo's concept of ἔλεος includes regarding ἔλεος to an extent as a virtue, parallel to φιλανθρωπία.

⁴⁵ Colson's translation; slightly modified.

⁴⁶ Other instances where Philo mentions God's 'merciful power' (ἰλεως δύναμις) include: *Mos.* 1.185; 2.96, 132; *Spec.* 1.229, 265, 294; 2.15; *Somn.* 2.265, 292.

⁴⁷ My translation. Ἡ ἰλεως is one of the 'powers' (δυνάμεις) discussed in the context.

⁴⁸ *Fug.* 141; *Mos.* 1.72, 101; 2.61; *Spec.* 1.310; 2.23, 253.

⁴⁹ *Somn.* 1.90; *Ios.* 198; *Spec.* 1.187; *Virt.* 41.

⁵⁰ This description of ἡ ἰλεως in terms of οἰκτίρω and ἐλεέω shows that, for Philo, οἰκτίρω and ἐλεέω are almost synonyms that can be used interchangeably to mean 'pities', 'shows compassion' or 'shows mercy' for describing the action of a 'merciful' (ἰλεως) person. For example, regarding this text (*Fug.* 95), Yonge translates οἰκτεῖρει καὶ ἐλεεῖ as 'pities and shows mercy', while Colson translates this phrase as 'takes pity and compassion'. Similarly, οἶκτος and ἔλεος often appear together in the phrase λαβεῖν οἶκτον καὶ ἔλεον (or λαβεῖν ἔλεον καὶ οἶκτον, *Mut.* 33; *Mos.* 1.86; *Spec.* 1.308; 2.138; 3.4, 116; 4.180, *Flacc.* 121).

⁵¹ *Spec.* 4.72; cited above, p. 227.

This is intriguing because the principal meaning of ἔλεος refers to the emotion ‘pity’ as discussed by Aristotle, whose definition of ἔλεος is regarded as the starting point of a study of this word:⁵²

ἔστω δὴ ἔλεος λύπη τις ἐπὶ φαινομένῳ κακῷ φθαρτικῷ ἢ λυπηρῷ τοῦ ἀναξίου τυγχάνειν, ὃ κὰν αὐτὸς προσδοκῆσειεν ἂν παθεῖν ἢ τῶν αὐτοῦ τινα, καὶ τοῦτο ὅταν πλησίον φαίνεται· (*Rhet.* 1385b)⁵³

Let pity, then, be a kind of pain in the case of an apparent destructive or painful harm in one not deserving to encounter it, which one might expect oneself, or one of one’s own, to suffer, and this when it seems near.⁵⁴

Aristotle regards ἔλεος (‘pity’) as an ‘emotion’ (πάθος, *Rhet.* 1378a).⁵⁵ Pity, for Aristotle, is a kind of ‘pain’ that arises when one perceives another suffering from undeserved misfortune.⁵⁶ Konstan argues that in a judicial context, an undeserved misfortune would happen if an innocent person is punished unjustly,⁵⁷ an appeal to pity is thus deemed legitimate for urging the judge not to condemn an innocent person.⁵⁸ However, Konstan also notes that ‘pity’ (*miser cordia*) is attacked especially by the Stoics because of its incompatibility with impartial judgement.⁵⁹ Despite this, Graeco-Roman philosophers commend a gracious attitude or action towards humans, expressed in terms of ‘philanthropy’ (φιλανθρωπία). This is in view

⁵² Rudolf Bultmann, ‘ἔλεος’, *TDNT*, II, pp. 477–87 (p. 477); David Konstan, *Pity Transformed* (London: Duckworth, 2001), p. 49; Mirguet, *Compassion*, p. 28.

⁵³ The Greek text is taken from Aristotle, *Art of Rhetoric*, LCL, 193 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926).

⁵⁴ Konstan’s translation; idem, *Pity*, p. 34.

⁵⁵ This definition of ἔλεος is mentioned in Aristotle’s discussion of ‘emotions’ (πάθη, *Rhet.* 1378a–1388b). The emotions discussed are ‘anger’ (ὀργή, 1378a), ‘love’ (τὸ φιλεῖν, 1380b), ‘hatred’ (ἔχθρα, 1382a), ‘fear’ (φόβος, 1382a), ‘shame’ (αἰσχύνη, 1383b), ‘favour felt’ (χάρις, 1385a), ‘pity’ (ἔλεος, 1385b), ‘indignation’ (τὸ νεμεσᾶν, 1386b), ‘envy’ (φθόνος, 1387b) and ‘emulation’ (ζῆλος, 1388a).

⁵⁶ As Konstan and Mirguet point out, ἔλεος is specified by ‘undeserved’ (ἀνάξιος) in Aristotle’s definition. Konstan, *Pity*, p. 34; Mirguet, *Compassion*, pp. 28–29, 39.

⁵⁷ Konstan, *Pity*, pp. 38–40.

⁵⁸ Konstan, *Pity*, p. 43.

⁵⁹ E.g., Cicero, *De or.* 1.52.225–54.223; Seneca, *Clem.* 2.5.1. Konstan, *Pity*, pp. 47–48. Cf. Bultmann, ‘ἔλεος’, p. 478.

of the fact that gods are considerate with regard to the vulnerability of humankind and offer aid to humans: they are ‘philanthropic’ (φιλόανθρωπος).⁶⁰ This attribute is also employed to describe rulers or conquerors.⁶¹ Later, around the first century BC, especially in the *Library of History* by Diodorus of Sicily (c. 80–20 BCE),⁶² ἔλεος and φιλανθρωπία are nearly synonyms (Diodorus 13.19–24).⁶³ For example, the gracious action of Alexander the Great towards the wife of the defeated Darius is described as ἔλεος and φιλανθρωπία (Diodorus 17.38.3) and regarded as a ‘good deed’ (καλὸν ἔργον, 17.38.4).⁶⁴ Konstan thus comments: ‘The profusion of terms for humaneness blurs the distinction between the sentiment of pity and a disposition to gentleness’.⁶⁵ Therefore, a tension between seeing ἔλεος as an emotion (a feeling of pain on persons suffering undeservedly) and seeing ἔλεος as a virtue (close to φιλανθρωπία) has become apparent.

This tension is clear in Philo,⁶⁶ especially in his explanation of ‘not to pity a poor man in judgement’ (πένητα ἐν κρίσει μὴ ἐλεεῖν, *Spec.* 4.72):⁶⁷

⁶⁰ Luck, ‘φιλανθρωπία’, p. 107–9. Among the earliest attestations of the use of φιλόανθρωπος, there is one where φιλόανθρωπος is employed to describe the aid of a god to humans: in Aristophanes (c. 446–385 BCE), *Pax* 392, Hermes is addressed as ‘the most philanthropic and munificent’ (φιλανθρωπότατε καὶ μεγαλοδωρότατε) among the gods. The Greek text is taken from Aristophanes, *Clouds. Wasps. Peace.*, LCL, 488 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998). p. 478.

⁶¹ E.g., Xenophon (c. 430–354 BCE) portrays Cyrus as a ruler who is ‘most philanthropic’ (φιλανθρωπότατος, *Cyr.* 1.2.1). Luck, ‘φιλανθρωπία’, p. 108. The Greek text is taken from Xenophon, *Cyropaedia: Books I–IV*, LCL, 51 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914), p. 10.

⁶² Konstan, *Pity*, p. 91.

⁶³ David Konstan, *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006), pp. 215–16. Konstan also notes that, earlier in the writings of Demosthenes (4th century BC), φιλανθρωπία is associated to ἔλεος to express a sentiment similar to humane concern. Konstan, *The Emotions*, p. 216; Konstan, *Pity*, p. 94.

⁶⁴ Konstan, *Pity*, p. 149 note 36. The Greek texts are taken from Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History*, LCL, 12 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1933–1967).

⁶⁵ Konstan, *Pity*, p. 91.

⁶⁶ Cf. Mirguet, *Compassion*, pp. 57–60.

⁶⁷ A citation from Exodus 23.3, differs slightly from the LXX, which has: πένητα οὐκ ἐλεήσεις ἐν κρίσει.

τοιαῦτα τοῖς νόμοις ἀγάλματα συνύφανται καὶ πεποίκιλται πρὸς εὐπορίαν ἀπόρων, οὓς ἐπὶ μόνῃ κρίσεως ἔλεεῖν οὐ θεμιτόν· ἔλεος γὰρ ἐπ' ἀτυχήμασιν, ὁ δ' ἐκουσίῳ γνώμῃ πονηρευόμενος οὐκ ἀτυχής, ἀλλ' ἄδικος. τιμωρίαι δ' ἐπ' ἀδίκους ὡς ἐπὶ δικαίους τιμαὶ βεβαιούσθωσαν· ὥστε μηδεὶς μοχθηρὸς ἄπορος ὑπείλλων καὶ ὑποστέλλων ἀχρηματίας οἴκτω τὸ δίκην δοῦναι παρακρουέσθω, δεδρακῶς οὐκ ἔλεου — πόθεν; — ἀλλ' ὀργῆς ἄξια. (*Spec.* 4.76–77)

Such ornaments being interwoven in the laws work together to the assistance of the needy; only before judgement we are not allowed to pity them. For pity is for misfortunes, and he who acts wickedly of his own free will is not unfortunate but unjust. Let punishment be meted to the unjust as surely as honours to the just. And therefore let no cowering, cringing rogue of a poor man evade his punishment by exciting pity for his penniless condition. His actions do not deserve pity, far from it, but anger.⁶⁸

In this passage, the laws for the ‘assistance of the needy’ (πρὸς εὐπορίαν ἀπόρων) refer to ‘the precepts towards mercy and philanthropy’ (τὰ εἰς ἔλεον καὶ φιλανθρωπίαν διατάγματα, *Spec.* 4.72), which exhort people to give and share (*Spec.* 4.73–75). The use of the word ἔλεος in this context shows that it can refer to a virtue of showing kindness. However, Philo also mentions that, in a judicial context, ‘pity’ refers to an emotion due to the undeserved misfortune of the innocent: ‘pity is for misfortunes’ (ἔλεος ἐπ' ἀτυχήμασιν), and the deeds of the unjust person ‘do not deserve pity but anger’ (οὐκ ἔλεου ἀλλ' ὀργῆς ἄξια).⁶⁹ This refers to the emotions which are elicited in an ancient Greek judicial context. According to Konstan, the emotions of ‘pity’ (ἔλεος) and ‘anger’ (ὀργή) are both legitimate in the situation that ‘pity’ is elicited for the innocent and ‘anger’ is elicited for the wicked.⁷⁰ In Philo’s terms, ‘pity’ is legitimate for preventing the innocent from undeserved punishment, and ‘anger’ is legitimate for meting out deserved punishment on the wicked.

Philo also uses ἔλεος to denote the ‘emotion’ (πάθος) which leads to ‘kind deeds’ (χρηστὰ ἔργα) towards unattended infants (*Spec.* 3.116; cf. *Mos.* 1.15). The fact that Philo

⁶⁸ Colson’s translation; slightly modified.

⁶⁹ Cf. *Decal.* 69: ‘pity’ (ἔλεος) is for a ‘misfortunate’ (ἀτυχῶν) person, ‘punishment’ (κόλασις) is for a ‘depraved’ (μοχθηρός) person.

⁷⁰ Konstan, *Pity*, pp. 43, 81–83.

juxtaposes ἔλεος with φιλανθρωπία in his discussion of the laws which pertain to the duty to fellow humans (*Spec.* 4.72) shows that ἔλεος can at times refer not only to an emotion, but also to the actual deeds resulting from this emotion. The description of ‘showing mercy’ is often expressed in terms of ἔλεος or its cognate verb ἐλεέω with concrete actions mentioned. For example, ‘showing mercy’ (λαβεῖν ἔλεον) to abandoned infants and give them food (*Spec.* 3.116), and ‘showing mercy’ (ἐλεεῖν) to an exposed body to bury it (*Ios.* 25), etc.⁷¹ For Philo, ἔλεος is similar to φιλανθρωπία in that both can be regarded as duties towards fellow humans. For example, Philo uses the phrase τὸ ἔλεος καὶ τὰ δίκαια (‘mercy and justice’) to describe the duty to consider the right of certain unfortunate people to offer the Passover sacrifice on a day other than the fourteenth day of the first month (*Mos.* 2.228). This use of the word ἔλεος shows that it is almost understood as a virtue like φιλανθρωπία.⁷²

Similarly, Philo’s description of God’s φιλανθρωπία is often associated with God’s ἔλεος, and it can be said that Philo understands both φιλανθρωπία and ἔλεος as virtues of God,⁷³ just as he understands both as human virtues. On God’s benevolence towards humans, sometimes Philo discusses this in terms of φιλανθρωπία, and sometimes he discusses the same in terms of ἔλεος. For example, God is considerate to the frailty of human nature and bestows gifts upon humankind:

ἐλπίς ἂν ἦν τὸν θεὸν ἅτε φιλάρετον καὶ φιλόκαλον καὶ προσέτι φιλόανθρωπον τάγαθὰ αὐτόματα παρασχεῖν ἐξ ἐτοίμου τῷ γένει· (*Orif.* 81)

⁷¹ As discussed in Chapter 5, giving food and burying the dead are typical deeds of kindness, often named as ἐλεημοσύνη. It is intriguing that the word ἐλεημοσύνη does not appear in Philo’s extant treatises. In the Pentateuch LXX, ἐλεημοσύνη appears three times: twice as the translation of פָּרָדָּבָּ (Deut 6.25; 24.13); once as the translation of טֹבָה (Gen 47.29).

⁷² Philo also juxtaposes ἔλεος with προμήθεια (‘forethought [of a wise man]’; *Sacr.* 121), and with πίστις (‘trustworthiness [of a king]’; *Mos.* 1.34). In both texts, these terms are likely employed to refer to virtues.

⁷³ Cf. *Spec.* 4.177, in which Philo describes God’s justice towards orphans and widows in terms of God’s virtues (ἀρεταί); cited above, pp. 224–25.

There would be hope that God, being the lover of virtue and the lover of what is good and beautiful and also the lover of humankind, would provide for our race good things all coming forth spontaneously and all in readiness.⁷⁴

God, being a ‘lover of humankind’ (φιλόανθρωπος, ‘philanthropic’), provides good things to the human race. It is noteworthy that the same idea is mentioned several times in terms of God’s ‘mercy’ on the human race: ‘Showing mercy to our race’ (ἐλέησας ἡμῶν τὸ γένος), God gives virtues to aid the illness of the soul (*Leg.* 1.45). Similarly, ‘in mercy for our race’ (δι’ ἔλεον τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν, *Her.* 112; *Somn.* 1.112), God sends down the copy of divine virtue (*Her.* 112), and sends illumination to human minds (*Somn.* 1.112; cf. *Somn.* 1.147; *Praem* 163).

God’s providence to humankind is also described in different passages in terms of philanthropy and mercy respectively. For example, ‘showing mercy, inasmuch as he is saviour and lover of humankind’ (λαβὼν οἶκτον ἅτε σωτὴρ καὶ φιλόανθρωπος), God increases the fertility of humankind (*Abr.* 137). God is ‘philanthropic’ (φιλόανθρωπος, *Spec.* 3.36) or ‘merciful’ (ἰλεως, *Mos.* 2.61) so that he preserves the species of humans and animals; the preservation of the human race is also described as God’s ‘mercy’ (ἔλεος, *Deus.* 76).

In terms of ‘mercy’, Philo also discusses God’s aid to those who suffer from deficiency or vulnerability. For example, God ‘shows mercy’ (ἔλεον λαμβάνει) to Jacob and provides guidance to help him overcome his fear and uncertainty (*Ios.* 255); he ‘shows mercy’ (ἐλεέω) on Jacob and bestows blessings on him (*Sacr.* 42; cf. *Her.* 38). God ‘shows mercy’ (ἔλεον λαβὼν) to Israel and saves them from their slavery in Egypt (*Mos.* 1.86; cf. *Mos.* 1.72). God ‘shows mercy’ (ἔλεον λαμβάνει) on those who are vulnerable, helpless or being oppressed (*Spec.* 1.307–308; 4.180; *Flacc.* 121). The ‘merciful’ (ἰλεως) God cares for orphans

⁷⁴ Colson’s translation; slightly modified.

and widows (*Spec.* 1.310). In one passage, God's help for the vulnerable is described in terms of both philanthropy and mercy (*Mos.* 1.184–200): God is 'merciful' (ἰλεως, 1.185), and because of his 'philanthropy' (φιλανθρωπία, 1.198), he 'shows mercy' (ἐλέεω, 1.198) to relieve the people of Israel from the suffering of thirst and hunger in the wilderness.

Therefore, in Philo's discussion of God's benevolence towards humans, the concept of 'philanthropy' (φιλανθρωπία) overlaps to a considerable degree with the concept of 'mercy' (ἐλεος). God's philanthropy is often described as God's mercy shown to humans in different ways. This includes giving gifts on the consideration of the frailty of human nature, and the providence given generally to the human race without regard to their specific situation. Closely related to this is God's response to the need of specific people, 'showing mercy' in terms of providing aid to relieve sufferers from distress, or to provide care to the vulnerable. God's deeds of philanthropy and mercy are also often described with reference to God's character: God is 'merciful' (ἰλεως, *Mut.* 129; *Fug.* 95).⁷⁵ The close relation of philanthropy to the character of God suggests that the legislation, which is filled with precepts of philanthropy, directs the ways in which humans can imitate God: to acquire virtues just as God has virtues. While the laws have the highest heads 'philanthropy' (φιλανθρωπία) and 'justice' (δικαιοσύνη) as the summary of duties to fellow humans (*Spec.* 2.63), the focus is not only on the pursuit of virtues: it points towards God's character, and precisely Philo mentions imitating God in his discussion of justice (*Spec.* 4.186–188) and philanthropy (*Virt.* 168–169). It is also clear that Philo understands imitating God as not only for rulers but also for 'human beings' (ἄνθρωποι) in general (*Spec.* 4.73). For Philo, imitating God is the goal of human existence, and from this concept the relation of the imitation of God to Law observance can be further understood.

⁷⁵ See above, pp. 228–29.

7.1.2.3 Philo's understanding of imitating God as the goal of human life

The preceding discussion shows the ways in which Philo emphasises the virtue 'philanthropy' (φιλανθρωπία) in his Exposition of the Law. He discusses philanthropy with reference to God's merciful nature, and mentions the importance of imitating God as God is benevolent to human beings. Philo regards deeds of mercy and philanthropy as the most effective actions for human beings to perform to resemble God, and he understands imitation of God as the best thing with regard to human existence (*Spec.* 4.73).⁷⁶ This might suggest that Philo's emphasis on philanthropy is based on his understanding of imitating God as the 'goal' (τέλος) of human life, which is worthy of further exploration.

As discussed above, Philo mentions imitating God in his discussion of the laws pertaining to the virtues δικαιοσύνη and φιλανθρωπία respectively (*Spec.* 4.187–188; *Virt.* 168–169). Both passages show that Philo understands 'imitating' (μιμεῖσθαι) God's deeds of benevolence as contributing to 'assimilation' (ἐξομοίωσις) to God:

ταῦτα μιμεῖσθαι προσήκει τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἄρχοντας, εἴ γέ τις αὐτοῖς φροντίς ἐστὶν ἐξομοιώσεως τῆς πρὸς θεόν. (*Spec.* 4.188)

These things [i.e., God's deeds of benevolence] good rulers must imitate if they have any aspiration to be assimilated to God.⁷⁷

ἄλλως τε καὶ μάθημα ἀναδιδάσκει τῇ λογικῇ φύσει πρεπωδέστατον, μιμεῖσθαι θεὸν καθ' ὅσον οἶόν τε, μηδὲν παραλιπόντα τῶν εἰς τὴν ἐνδεχομένην ἐξομοίωσιν. (*Virt.* 168)

And elsewhere he teaches the rational nature a most appropriate lesson, to imitate God as much as possible, neglecting none of the things contributing to such assimilation.⁷⁸

Philo's mention of assimilation to God in the discussion of virtues can be further understood from his discussion of the creation of human beings, in which he relates the 'goal' (τέλος) of human existence to both 'virtues' and 'assimilation to God':

⁷⁶ Cited above, p. 227.

⁷⁷ Colson's translation.

⁷⁸ Wilson's translation.

συγγενής τε καὶ ἀγχίσπορος ὢν τοῦ ἡγεμόνος, ἅτε δὴ πολλοῦ ῥυέντος εἰς αὐτὸν τοῦ θείου πνεύματος, πάντα καὶ λέγειν καὶ πράττειν ἐσπούδαζεν εἰς ἀρέσκειαν τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ βασιλέως, ἐπόμενος κατ' ἴχνος αὐτῶ ταῖς ὁδοῖς, ἅς λεωφόρους | ἀνατέμνουσιν ἀρεταί, διότι μόναις ψυχαῖς θέμις προσέρχεσθαι τέλος ἡγουμέναις τὴν πρὸς τὸν γεννήσαντα θεὸν ἕξομοίωσιν. (*Opif.* 144)

He was closely related and akin to the Director, because the divine spirit had flowed into him in ample measure, and so all his words and actions were undertaken in order to please the Father and King, in whose footsteps he followed along the highways that the virtues mark out, because only those souls are permitted to approach him who consider the goal of their existence to be assimilation to the God who brought them forth.⁷⁹

Philo's understanding of the goal of human existence as 'assimilation to God' (ἕξομοίωσις πρὸς θεόν) is based on the fact that human beings came into existence 'after God's image and after his likeness' (τὸν ἀνθρωπὸν γεγενῆσθαι κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν, *Opif.* 69).⁸⁰ In this text (*Opif.* 144), Philo relates assimilation to God to following the footsteps of God. This shows that he is aware of the formulations of τέλος (the 'goal' of human existence)⁸¹ by the Platonists and the Stoics respectively, and he further formulates τέλος as 'to please the Father' (εἰς ἀρέσκειαν τοῦ πατρὸς). More importantly, Philo's concept of τέλος shows the ways in which he understands the imitation of God as pertaining to the observance of the Law and becoming 'perfect' (τέλειος).

⁷⁹ Translation is taken from Runia, *On the Creation*, p. 85.

⁸⁰ Cf. *Opif.* 72, where Philo cites and discusses Gen 1.26 LXX: ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν ('let us make a human being according to our image and likeness'). See also Wendy E. Helleman, 'Philo of Alexandria on Deification and Assimilation to God', *Studia Philonica Annual*, 2 (1990), 51–71 (pp. 56–57).

⁸¹ See Runia's translation of τέλος as 'the goal of their existence' in *Opif.* 144. Similarly, τέλος in such context can be understood as referring to 'the purpose of life' (Dillon) or 'the aim of life, the final goal of every human action' (Torri). John M. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists: 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*, rev. edn (New York: Cornell University Press, 1996), p. 145; Paolo Torri, 'The Telos of Assimilation to God and the Conflict between Theoria and Praxis in Plato and the Middle Platonists', in *Thinking, Knowing, Acting: Epistemology and Ethics in Plato and Ancient Platonism*, ed. by Mauro Bonazzi, Filippo Forcignanò, and Angela Ulacco, Brill's Plato Studies Series, 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2019), p. 229.

The formulations of τέλος concern the quest for ‘well-being’ (εὐδαιμονία) in human life.⁸² Philo also has εὐδαιμονία in mind when he mentions τέλος (*Opif.* 144).⁸³ According to Runia, schools of thought in Hellenistic and Imperial philosophy varied in their interpretation of εὐδαιμονία in terms of their particular formulation of τέλος.⁸⁴ In *Opif.* 144, Philo regards τέλος as ‘assimilation to God’ (ἐξομοίωσις πρὸς θεόν), a concept which he also knows from Socrates: ‘likeness to God’ (ὁμοίωσις θεῶ) is ‘to become just and holy with prudence’ (δίκαιον καὶ ὅσιον μετὰ φρονήσεως γενέσθαι, *Fug.* 63, citing Plato’s *Theaetetus* 176b).⁸⁶ *Theaetetus* 176 concerns the pursuit of virtues, stating that human beings ‘ought to avoid wickedness and pursue virtue’ (δεῖν πονηρίαν μὲν φεύγειν, ἀρετὴν δὲ διώκειν).⁸⁷ Philo agrees with Socrates,⁸⁸ and regards attaining virtues as a way to become like God, just as God possesses those virtues and shows them through his deeds.⁸⁹ Philo explains this concept further by continuing his citation of *Theaetetus* 176 in *Fug.* 83, stating that God is ‘the most

⁸² Runia, *On the Creation*, p. 342.

⁸³ Cf. *Decal.* 73, *Spec.* 1.345; 2.236; *Mos.* 2.151; *Plant.* 1.37, 49; *Mut.* 216.

⁸⁴ Runia, *On the Creation*, p. 342, who also mentions that there is a list of these formulations in Clement of Alexandria’s *Strom.* 2.127–131.

⁸⁵ As Runia notes, Philo prefers the word ἐξομοίωσις to ὁμοίωσις. The latter appears only in Philo’s citation of the LXX and Plato. Runia, *On the Creation*, p. 344.

⁸⁶ Philo cites *Theaetetus* accurately such that he is regarded as having ‘a text of Plato at hand’. Helleman, ‘Deification’, p. 54.

⁸⁷ The Greek text is taken from Plato, *Theaetetus*, *Sophist*, LCL, 123 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921); the English translation is taken from *Plato: Theaetetus*, ed. by Lesley Brown (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 55.

⁸⁸ Philo regards this saying from *Theaetetus* as ‘noble utterance’ (μεγαλειότερον) from ‘a man highly esteemed, one of those admired for their wisdom’ (τις τῶν ἐπὶ σοφία θαυμασθέντων ἀνὴρ δόκιμος, *Fug.* 63). Colson’s translation.

⁸⁹ As discussed above, Philo mentions ‘assimilation to God’ (ἐξομοίωσις πρὸς θεόν) in his discussion of virtues (*Spec.* 4.188; *Virt.* 168), focussing on imitating God’s benevolence towards humans. Helleman investigates the relevant texts in Philo (*Fug.* 63, 82; *Spec.* 4.186–188; *Virt.* 163–169; *Opif.* 144; *Migr.* 127–131; *QG* 2.62) and concludes: ‘Such assimilation involves a choice based on knowledge and reason, a choice to pursue goodness, and to cultivate the virtues which are in turn imitations of divine virtues or powers’. Helleman, ‘Deification’, p. 70.

just' (δικαιοτάτος) and humans would be more like God when they become just to the greatest possible extent: 'there is nothing that is more like him than the man who is as just as possible' (οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῷ ὁμοιότερον οὐδὲν ἢ ὃς ἂν ἡμῶν αὖ γένηται ὅτι δικαιοτάτος, *Fug.* 82).⁹⁰ In *Theaetetus* 176, neither the term τέλος appears, nor is 'assimilation to God' explicitly designated as the purpose of life.⁹¹ Later, however, Socrates and Plato are regarded as understanding the τέλος as 'assimilation to God':

Socrates and Plato agree with Pythagoras that the human goal is assimilation to God (τέλος ὁμοίωσιν θεῷ). Plato articulated it more clearly by adding 'in respect of what is possible' (κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν), and it is only possible by wisdom, that is to say, by living in accordance with virtue. In God resides the capacity to create the cosmos and to administer it, in the wise person establishment and regulation of a way of life are present. Homer hints at this when he says: 'proceed in the footsteps of God' (κατ' ἴχνια βαῖνε θεοῖο), while Pythagoras after him says: 'follow God' (ἔπου θεῷ).⁹²

This text, preserved in a selection of texts by Stobaeus (5th century CE), is regarded as originating from Eudorus of Alexandria,⁹³ and is regarded as the earliest explicit attestation of the formulation of τέλος in terms of assimilation to God.⁹⁴

On the other hand, 'follow God' (ἔπου θεῷ), a maxim attributed to Pythagoras,⁹⁵ appears as a formulation of τέλος by the Stoics: Epictetus mentions 'the goal is to follow

⁹⁰ Yonge's translation; slightly modified.

⁹¹ Torri, 'The Telos', p. 236.

⁹² Stobaeus, *Eclogae* 2.7.3f. The English translation is taken from Mauro Bonazzi, 'Towards Transcendence: Philo and the Renewal of Platonism in the Early Imperial Age', in *Philo of Alexandria and Post-Aristotelian Philosophy*, ed. by Francesca Alesse, SPhA, 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 233–51 (p. 246). The Greek text is taken from *Ioannis Stobaei Anthologium*, ed. by Curt Wachsmuth, 5 vols (Berlin: Weidmann, 1884), II, pp. 49.

⁹³ Dillon, *Middle Platonists*, pp. 122–23; Torri, 'The Telos', p. 232 note 12. According to Dillon, Eudorus was earlier than Strabo (64 BCE–19 CE) and was active approximately fifty years before Philo; Dillon, *Middle Platonists*, pp. 115, 182.

⁹⁴ Torri, 'The Telos', p. 245.

⁹⁵ As stated in Stobaeus, *Eclogae* 2.7.3f. See also Iamblichus, *On the Pythagorean Way of Life* 137, in which Iamblichus (3rd century CE) describes the way of life of Pythagoras and his followers as arranged 'for following the deity' (πρὸς τὸ ἀκολουθεῖν τῷ θεῷ). The Greek text and the English translation are taken from Iamblichus, *On the Pythagorean Way of Life*, trans. by John M. Dillon and Jackson P. Hershbell (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1991), p. 156–57.

gods' (τέλος ἐστὶ τὸ ἔπεσθαι θεοῖς), and attributes this teaching to Zeno (Epictetus, *Discourses* 1.20.15).⁹⁶ Zeno's concept of τέλος entails a life in accordance with virtues and in conformity with nature. Philo speaks of Zeno (Ζηνώνειος) when mentioning the formulation of τέλος as τὸ ἀκολουθῶς τῆ φύσει ζῆν ('to live in conformity with nature', *Prob.* 160).⁹⁷ Clement of Alexandria (c. 150–215) reports Zeno's formulation of τέλος as 'a life in accordance with virtue' (τέλος τὸ κατ' ἀρετὴν ζῆν).⁹⁸ Diogenes Laertius (3rd century CE) reports Zeno's formulation of τέλος as 'a life in agreement with nature' (τέλος τὸ ὁμολογουμένως τῆ φύσει ζῆν), and explains it as 'the same as a life in accordance with virtue' (ὅπερ ἐστὶ κατ' ἀρετὴν ζῆν).⁹⁹ Philo recognises the concept of τέλος as following God and its relation to a virtuous life in agreement with nature. He not only mentions 'in whose [God's] footsteps he followed along the highways that the virtues mark out' in the context where he regards the τέλος as assimilation to God (*Opif.* 144; cited above), but also clearly states 'the goal is to follow God' (τέλος ἐστὶ τὸ ἔπεσθαι θεῷ, *Migr.* 131) in a passage where he also mentions τέλος as 'a life of following nature' (τὸ ἀκολουθῶς τῆ φύσει ζῆν, *Migr.* 128).

⁹⁶ See also *Discourses* 1.30.4: "What is the goal?" "To follow you [God]." (τέλος δὲ τί; τὸ σοὶ ἀκολουθεῖν). The Greek text is taken from Epictetus, *Discourses: Books 1–2*, LCL, 131 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925). These texts are mentioned by Gerhard Kittel, 'ἀκολουθέω,' *TDNT*, I, p. 210.

⁹⁷ Cf. The notes on *Migr.* 128 in *Abrahams Aufbruch: Philon von Alexandria, De migratione Abrahami*, ed. by Maren Niehoff and Reinhard Feldmeier, *SAPERE*, 30 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), p. 123 note 152. See also *Plant.* 49 and its commentary by Albert C. Geljon and David T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria, On Planting: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, PACS, 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2019), pp. 164–65.

⁹⁸ *Strom.* 2.129; Clement continues to report the formulation of τέλος in terms of 'in accordance with nature' (κατὰ φύσιν) by the Stoics. The Greek text is taken from Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata Buch I–VI*, ed. by Ludwig Früchtel and Ursula Treu, GCS, 52 (Berlin: Akademie, 1985); the English translation is my own.

⁹⁹ Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 7.1 Zeno 87.

Philo's statements concerning τέλος show that he understands imitating God, which he identifies as both 'assimilation to God' and 'following God',¹⁰⁰ as the purpose of human existence, the goal of human life. His understanding of τέλος includes concepts which are attested in Platonic and Stoic literature; however, he expands the concept and discusses it based on the teachings from the Pentateuch. As Runia comments on *Opif.* 144: 'Philo alludes to two well-known formulations of the *telos* and adds a biblical formulation of his own'.¹⁰¹ Philo's concept of τέλος includes being well-pleasing to God.

When discussing the creation of human beings, Philo regards the goal of human life as assimilation to God and relates it to 'to be pleasing' (εἰς ἀρέσκειαν) to God (*Opif.* 144). He also gives a clear formulation 'the goal is to be well-pleasing to God' (τέλος εὐαρεστεῖν θεῷ) in another treatise (*Abr.* 235; cf. *Praem.* 24). 'To be well-pleasing to God' (εὐαρεστεῖν τῷ θεῷ), a phrase which Philo most likely takes from the Pentateuch, is a description of Enoch and Noah (Gen 5.22, 24; 6.9 LXX),¹⁰² whose lives are discussed in Philo's Exposition of the Law (*Abr.* 17–47).¹⁰³ This description applies to Abraham, too: God told Abraham 'be well-pleasing before me' (εὐαρέσκει ἐναντίον ἐμοῦ, Gen 17.1 LXX),¹⁰⁴ a text which Philo also cites and discusses (*Mut.* 39, 47; *Gig.* 63). Philo's formulation of τέλος as 'to be well-pleasing to

¹⁰⁰ It is noteworthy that Philo employs all the terms ἐπεσθαι θεῷ ('following God'), μιμεῖσθαι ('to imitate') and ἐξομοίωσις πρὸς θεόν ('assimilation to God') in his discussion of δικαιοσύνη to explain the reason why rulers should benefit people (*Spec.* 4.187–188; cited above). Helleman, 'Deification', pp. 55–56.

¹⁰¹ Runia, *On the Creation*, p. 342. Cf. Dillon, who comments on *Opif.* 142–44 and thinks that Philo combined the Stoic, Platonic and Pythagorean terminology of τέλος, 'duly reclaimed for the true father of philosophy, Moses'; John Dillon, 'Philo and the Telos: Some Reflections', *The Studia Philonica Annual*, 28 (2016), 111–19 (pp. 117–18).

¹⁰² The LXX translates all occurrences of אֵת־הַלֵּךְ אֵת־הָאֱלֹהִים ('he walked with God') in Genesis (5.22, 24; 6.9) as 'he was well-pleasing to God' (εὐηρέστησεν τῷ θεῷ). See also Sir 44.16.

¹⁰³ Philo cites Gen 5.24 in *Abr.* 17, and Gen 6.9 in *Abr.* 31. His citations accord with the LXX. See also *Mut.* 34; *Deus.* 109, 117–18.

¹⁰⁴ Εὐαρέσκει ἐναντίον ἐμοῦ is a translation of לֵּךְ אֵת־פְּנֵי (‘walk before me’); cf. Gen 5.22, 24; 6.9.

God' is probably inspired by the description of Noah as 'perfect' (τέλειος) and 'well-pleasing to God' (εὐαρεστεῖν τῷ θεῷ) in Genesis 6.9 LXX. He explains a perfect person as one who 'acquired, not just one virtue, but all of them, and having acquired them continued to practise each of them as occasion arose' (οὐ μίαν ἀρετὴν ἀλλὰ πάσας ἐκτήσατο καὶ κτησάμενος ἐκάστη κατὰ τὸ ἐπιβάλλον χρώμενος διετέλεσεν, *Abr.* 34).¹⁰⁵ A virtuous life is a life that imitates God. Through the understanding of being 'perfect' (τέλειος) as acquiring and practising virtues as much as possible, Philo readily connects 'to be well-pleasing to God' to the goal of human life: to imitate God as God possesses and practises all virtues.

In this way, the Law and its observance are indispensable for human beings to reach the goal — to be perfect and well-pleasing to God. Philo clearly understands the Mosaic legislation as helping people reach the goal. He regards the teachings in the 'legislation' (νομοθεσία) as persuading people 'deeming the life lived in accord with virtue to be the sole end [or: goal]' (ἐν μὲν τέλος ἡγουμένους τὸ κατ' ἀρετὴν βιοῦν, *Virt.* 15).¹⁰⁶ Furthermore, Philo's reading of Abraham's life reflects the ways in which Law observance relates to perfection and the goal.

For Philo, Abraham is a prominent exemplar of following God and obeying God's commandments (*Abr.* 60–61), and a living law who lives a virtuous life (*Abr.* 4–6).¹⁰⁷ He describes Abraham as a person who pressed forward to the 'goal' (τέλος), which is 'to be well-pleasing' (εὐαρεστῆσαι) to God (*Praem.* 24). To be well-pleasing to God entails being 'perfect' (τέλειος, Gen 6.9 LXX) and 'blameless' (ἄμεμπτος, Gen 17.1 LXX).¹⁰⁸ Specifically,

¹⁰⁵ The translation is taken from Birnbaum and Dillon, *Abraham*, p. 95.

¹⁰⁶ Wilson's translation.

¹⁰⁷ For Philo's understanding of Abraham as a living law, see the discussion above, Chapter 3, pp. 69–71.

¹⁰⁸ It is noteworthy that τέλειος in Gen 6.9 LXX and ἄμεμπτος in Gen 17.1 LXX are the translations of the same תָּמִיִם (Gen 6.9; 17.1 MT).

Philo describes how Abraham is obedient to God's words, and discusses these in terms of τέλος as 'following God' (ἔπεσθαι θεῷ, *Migr.* 127–131). Describing Abraham's journeying in accordance with what God spoke to him (*Migr.* 127–131),¹⁰⁹ Philo states that 'the actions of the wise man are nothing else than the words of God' (τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σοφοῦ λόγων ἀδιαφορεῖν θείων, *Migr.* 129).¹¹⁰ Philo shows that the concept of following God as doing God's Law is based on the Pentateuch. He cites the Pentateuch and identifies the 'words' (λόγοι) of God as 'a law' (νόμος),¹¹¹ and regards Abraham's doing God's words as 'Abraham did all my [God's] law' (ἐποίησεν Ἀβραὰμ πάντα τὸν νόμον μου).¹¹² Philo also explains the meaning of following God by citing 'you shall walk after the Lord your God' (ὀπίσω κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ σου πορεύση),¹¹³ regarding this verse as 'to bring out how the soul should comply with those Divine ordinances' (τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς πρὸς τὰ θεῖα δόγματα παριστάς ἀκολουθίαν, *Migr.* 131).¹¹⁴ By citing and explaining the Pentateuch, Philo states that 'the goal is, according to the most holy man Moses, to follow God' (τέλος ἐστὶ κατὰ τὸν ἱερώτατον Μωυσῆν τὸ ἔπεσθαι θεῷ, *Migr.* 131).¹¹⁵

Philo's reading of Abraham's life thus shows the ways in which he understands τέλος in terms of the Law, the virtues and the imitation of God. The goal of human beings is to follow God and be well-pleasing to God, which is done by obeying the words of God, that is, the observance of God's Law. For the 'living laws' (such as Abraham), these people manage

¹⁰⁹ Philo cites and explains Gen 12.4.

¹¹⁰ Colson's translation.

¹¹¹ *Migr.* 130, citing Deut 33.3–4 LXX.

¹¹² *Migr.* 130, paraphrasing Gen 26.5.

¹¹³ *Migr.* 131, citing Deut 13.4 LXX.

¹¹⁴ Colson's translation.

¹¹⁵ Colson's translation; slightly modified.

to follow God and live a virtuous life without being taught by the written laws; for the others, the Mosaic legislation is indispensable for guiding them to imitate God just as God possesses and performs all virtues, notably justice and philanthropy.¹¹⁶ Therefore, for Philo, the ‘goal’ (τέλος) is to do all God’s commandments and to be ‘perfect’ (τέλειος) in performing all virtues, like God.

7.1.3 Summary and concluding remarks

The above discussion has clarified the ways in which Philo highlights the importance of philanthropy. He regards philanthropy as a virtue which is akin to the most prominent virtues, piety and justice, and regards these two virtues with philanthropy as the ‘highest heads’ of the Law. The life of a pious and just person, Abraham, is characterised by philanthropy. Philo often understands philanthropy in terms pertaining to ‘mercy’ (ἔλεος) in the sense that both can be regarded as God’s virtues and related to God’s merciful character.

The reason why Philo highlights philanthropy in his discussion of the Law can be discerned from Philo’s understanding of the goal of human life.¹¹⁷ For Philo, the goal is to

¹¹⁶ As Martens points out, Philo acknowledges that ‘except those few heroes of the past and present-day sages who could follow the law of nature [...], people needed the written law and had to follow its commandments’. John W. Martens, ‘The Meaning and Function of the Law in Philo and Josephus’, in *Torah Ethics and Early Christian Identity*, ed. by Susan J. Wendel (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), pp. 27–40 (p. 239).

¹¹⁷ Regarding the prominence of philanthropy in Philo’s Exposition of the Law, some scholars argue that Philo intends to respond to the accusation against Jewish people about their ‘misanthropy’ (μισανθρωπία); for example, Katell Berthelot, *Philanthrôpia Judaica: le débat autour de la ‘misanthropie’ des lois juives dans l’Antiquité*, SupJSJ, 76 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 188–321; Peder Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time*, NovTSup, 86 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp. 251–53. Berthelot’s extensive discussion on this issue is responded to by Wilson; Wilson, *On Virtues*, pp. 23–37.

Berthelot argues that Philo’s discussion of philanthropy is to show that the Mosaic legislation emphasises a human relationship which is not limited to the Jewish community, it is thus a response to the accusation of misanthropy. Berthelot, *Philanthrôpia*, pp. 266–68; cf. Wilson, *On Virtues*, p. 25. However, as Wilson points out, Philo’s discussion of philanthropy does not express a major concern for social relationships to non-Jews. Wilson, *On Virtues*, pp. 25–27. Moreover, the apologetic tone is only slight in Philo’s discussion concerning philanthropy. Therefore, more evidence is still needed for seeing Philo’s emphasis on philanthropy as specifically responding to the accusation of misanthropy.

imitate God just as God possesses and performs all virtues, among which philanthropy is the very virtue that reflects God's merciful character and his benevolence to human beings. The fact that the life of a perfect person who follows God is characterised by philanthropy, and the fact that the Mosaic legislation is full of precepts guiding people towards philanthropy and mercy, point to the fact that human beings should imitate God by showing kindness to fellow humans. Above all, the purpose of human existence cannot be realised without performing mercy and philanthropy in accordance with God's Law because human beings are created after the image of God, who is merciful.

Philo is one of those who highlight God as philanthropic or merciful with regard to the imitation of God. For example, Musonius Rufus, a Stoic from the first century, highlights God as 'philanthropic' (φιλόανθρωπος) in a discussion concerning a human being as 'an imitation of God' (μίμημα θεοῦ).¹¹⁸ Similar emphases on God's merciful character also appear in Hellenistic Jewish literature. In the *Letter of Aristeas*, in a context which mentions how a king should 'follow' (κατακολουθέω) God and 'imitate' (μιμέομαι) God (*Let. Aris.* 205, 210), the suggestion for the king who wants to be 'philanthropic' (φιλόανθρωπος) is: to show 'mercy' (ἔλεος) towards humans like the 'merciful' (ἐλεήμων) God does (*Let. Aris.* 208).¹¹⁹ Likewise, the Gospel of Matthew highlights 'merciful' (ἐλεήμων) as the attribute of the blessed (Matt 5.7), and includes a parable to illustrate why humans must show mercy: just as God 'shows

¹¹⁸ The Greek text is taken from Cora E. Lutz, 'Musonius Rufus: "The Roman Socrates"', *Yale Classical Studies*, 10 (1947), 3–147 (p. 108), in which Lutz also provides an English translation (section 17). Cf. Gretchen Reydam-Schils, "'Becoming like God" in Platonism and Stoicism', in *From Stoicism to Platonism: The Development of Philosophy, 100 BCE–100 CE*, ed. by Troels Engberg-Pedersen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), pp. 142–58 (p. 156).

¹¹⁹ *Let. Aris.* 203–220 is a self-contained unit narrating the second symposium of the king with the translators; Wright III, *Aristeas*, p. 55.

mercy' (ἐλεέω) to them, so also they must 'show mercy' (ἐλεέω) to fellow humans (Matt 18.33). For Matthew, to be perfect like God must include to be merciful like God.¹²⁰

In this way, Philo's emphasis on philanthropy as the summary of the laws and as the virtue of God for humans to imitate suggests similarity to Matthew. A comparison between Matthew and Philo regarding their understanding of kindness and the Law might further shed light on our exploration of the meaning and significance of Hosea 6.6 in Matthew.

7.2 Matthew and Philo: points of similarity and distinctiveness concerning their emphasis on love for humans and its relation to the whole Law

Philo and Matthew can be put in comparison concerning their emphasis on love for humans and its relation to the Law. Both of them regard love for God and love for humans as the all-encompassing element threaded throughout all the commandments, and the commandments concerning love for God and the commandments concerning love for humans as equally important.¹²¹ Both of them highlight love and kindness for humans as the character of God, who must be imitated.¹²² As will be shown below, this comparison facilitates our exploration of the implications of Matthew's double citation of Hosea 6.6.

7.2.1 Kindness as the all-encompassing element suffusing the whole Law

With regard to the Law, both Matthew and Philo highlight love and kindness towards humans. Matthew mentions this in terms of 'love' (ἀγαπάω) and 'mercy' (ἐλεος): 'love' for fellow humans, alongside love for God, are the most important commandments (Matt 22.40); and 'mercy', alongside justice and faithfulness, are 'the weightier matters of the Law' (Matt

¹²⁰ See also the NT notions of imitating God or Christ in mercy, love, or kindness: Luke 6.36 (οἰκτίρων, 'merciful'); John 13.34 (ἀγαπάω, 'love'); Eph 4.32–5.2 (χρηστός 'kind'; εὐσπλαγχνος, 'tender-hearted'; χαριζόμενος, 'forgiving'; ἀγάπη, 'love').

¹²¹ As discussed in Chapters 2 and 3.

¹²² As discussed in Chapter 6 and earlier in the present Chapter.

23.23). Philo mentions this in terms of ‘philanthropy’ (φιλανθρωπία): ‘philanthropy’ and justice towards humans, alongside piety and holiness towards God, are the ‘highest heads’ of all the commandments (*Spec.* 2.63). Comparative language is employed in these descriptions, and both Matthew and Philo show that these descriptions are for the purpose of indicating what are the all-encompassing elements being threaded throughout the whole Law. Matthew describes this by the hanging image: the double love commandments as the overarching principle on which the whole Law hangs (Matt 22.40).¹²³ Similarly, Philo describes this by a cutting image (whole and part relationship) and the genera-species relationship, pointing out that the highest head of the laws is like the origin of a fountain and the root of a tree, to which all the particular laws can be referred.¹²⁴

Therefore, in Matthew’s gospel and Philo’s treatises, the use of comparative language such as the ‘highest heads’ and ‘the weightier matters of the Law’ means neither that there are less important commandments in the Law, nor that the cultic commandments are replaced by these ‘highest heads’ and ‘weightier matters’. These descriptions are only for highlighting what elements encompass all the commandments, indicating what fruits must be yielded from the observance of the Law. This suggests that Matthew’s citation of Hosea 6.6 is intended to identify ‘mercy’ (ἔλεος) as what God demands from the observance of the Law. For Matthew, those who observe the Law must not neglect to perform the ‘weightier matters’ because they are the essential elements of the ‘exceeding righteousness’ which God desires from his people. Without these, a person is not regarded as having done the will of God (Matt 5.20, 7.21).¹²⁵

¹²³ See Chapter 2 (§2.2) for the discussion.

¹²⁴ See Chapter 3 (§3.2) for the discussion.

¹²⁵ See Chapter 7 for the detailed discussion concerning Matthew 5.20 and 23.23.

7.2.2 *The imitation of God as the goal of Law observance*

Both Matthew and Philo highlight kindness towards humans as the deeds of God, whose merciful character and deeds must be imitated. Both of them regard God's commandments as directing people to imitate God: to be perfect just as God is perfect in possessing and performing all virtues.¹²⁶ Philo discusses these in relation to the 'goal' (τέλος) of human existence as imitating God, which he understands as doing God's Law, being perfect and being well-pleasing to God. Being merciful and doing philanthropy are indispensable in reaching the goal because philanthropy is the virtue of God and the character of the Law. The lives of the living laws (e.g., Abraham and Moses) are characterised by philanthropy, so also the written legislation is full of precepts of mercy and philanthropy.

Philo's notion of τέλειος ('perfect') in relation to imitating God and being well-pleasing to God might shed further light on our understanding of Matthew's notion of τέλειος. Like Philo, Matthew understands the aim of Law observance as imitating God. Matthew does not express this in terms of τέλος but shows this by the ways in which he structures the Antitheses: he concludes the Antitheses with a statement of 'to be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect', which shows that is thus the goal of Law observance (Matt 5.48).¹²⁷ However, Matthew further indicates that following Jesus is indispensable for being perfect. On the one hand, Jesus teaches and does God's Law by explaining the intended meaning of the commandments and by demonstrating them through his deeds. On the other hand, only Jesus is God's son with whom God is well-pleased, a fact which Matthew emphasises by linking Jesus's transfiguration to his baptism and his deeds of mercy with the description God

¹²⁶ For Matthew's description of God's mercy and kindness towards humans, see Chapters 4 and 5. For Matthew's understanding of kindness and its relation to perfection, see Chapter 6. For Philo's understanding of philanthropy and its relation to perfection, see the discussion earlier in the present Chapter. Regarding the imitation of God, the relevance of Matt 5.48 and Philo's *On the Migration of Abraham* 127–131 is mentioned by Feldmeier, 'As Your Heavenly Father', p. 433; Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism*: 2, pp. 156–57.

¹²⁷ See Chapter 6 for the detailed discussion.

‘is well-pleased with’ (εὐδοκέω).¹²⁸ This description, which Matthew picks up from Mark, can be understood as similar to the expression ‘be well-pleasing to God’ (εὐαρεστησαι τῷ θεῷ, Gen 6.9 LXX and Philo). In light of Philo’s view of imitation of God and being well-pleasing to God as the goal, and in light of Matthew’s emphasis on Jesus as the son in whom God is well-pleased who fulfils all righteousness (Matt 3.17) and performs deeds of mercy and justice (Matt 12.18–21), the point which Matthew makes by relating perfection to following Jesus is strengthened: only those who follow Jesus can be on the right path towards perfection, that is, to follow Jesus’s way of completely doing the will of God, keeping the commandments, practising virtues and being well-pleasing to God. On the one hand, Law observance without learning from Jesus cannot reach the goal of being perfect like God. On the other hand, following Jesus does not mean the observance of the Law is no longer necessary.

7.2.3 Matthew’s use of ἔλεος and Philo’s use of φιlanθρωπία

Both Matthew and Philo understand ἔλεος as more than an emotion. For them, ἔλεος can mean ‘kindness’, a virtue which humans perform by following God and keeping his commandments. Philo relates both ἔλεος and φιlanθρωπία to God’s merciful character (ἰλεως) and describes the Law as full of precepts which guide people practising ἔλεος and φιlanθρωπία (*Spec.* 4.72). These notions show the close affinity of ἔλεος and φιlanθρωπία in Philo’s understanding of God, his character, his deeds and his commandments.¹²⁹ In

¹²⁸ This description appears thrice in Matthew (3.17; 12.18; 17.5), whereas Mark and Luke only include this description in Jesus’s baptism (Mark 1.11; Luke 3.22).

¹²⁹ The relation of φιlanθρωπία to the Law and God’s merciful character is also found in *The Letter of Aristeas*, which, in a narrative concerning the translation of the Pentateuch and in the context concerning the imitation of God, describes the ways in which the king can aim to be ‘philanthropic’ (φιlanθρωπος): to observe the suffering of humans and ‘turn to mercy’ (πρὸς τὸν ἔλεον τραπήσῃ), considering that ‘God is merciful’ (ὁ θεὸς ἐλεήμων ἐστίν, *Let. Aris.* 208); see also above, p. 245 note 119. As Wright III mentions, in the latter part of the

discussing the Law in terms of ‘virtue’ (ἀρετή), it is natural for Philo to use the term φιλανθρωπία to discuss the commandments concerning God’s merciful character and his will for kindness because φιλανθρωπία is regarded as a spectacular virtue in the Graeco-Roman world at the turn of the Common Era.¹³⁰

By contrast, Matthew does not use the term φιλανθρωπία,¹³¹ although he also understands ἔλεος as kindness and relates it to God’s merciful character, and describes ἔλεος as among ‘the weightier matters of the Law’, a description that is similar to Philo’s description of φιλανθρωπία as among the ‘highest heads’ of the Law. Φιλανθρωπία does not appear in the Greek translations of the Law and the Prophets;¹³² this could be a possible reason why Matthew does not use the term φιλανθρωπία and uses ἔλεος. For Matthew, the term ἔλεος is helpful for identifying God’s will for mercy and kindness described in the Law and the Prophets. Matthew has received the term ἐλεέω from Mark’s description of Jesus’s mercy (ἐλεέω)¹³³ on the sick and his compassion (σπλαγγνίζομαι)¹³⁴ on the crowd who are like sheep without a shepherd, and strengthens the link between these descriptions and the promises concerning the eschatological shepherd-king foretold in the Prophets. Moreover, Matthew might have recognised the allusion to Hosea 6.6 in Mark 12.33; by turning this allusion into a double citation, he further develops the theme of ἔλεος in his narration of Jesus’s story. For Matthew, God’s will for ἔλεος stated in Hosea 6.6 and the manifestation of

narrative, ‘philanthropy’ (φιλανθρωπία) is regarded as the most necessary possession of a good king (*Let. Aris.* 265, 290); Wright III, *Aristeas*, p. 360.

¹³⁰ E.g., Seneca, *Epistles* 88.28–30; see above, p. 216.

¹³¹ In the NT, φιλανθρωπία only appears two times. One appearance relates to kindness towards strangers (Acts 28.2), another one relates to God’s benevolence towards humans in salvation (Titus 3.4).

¹³² See above, p. 216 note 11.

¹³³ Matt 20.30 // Mark 10.47; cf. Matt 9.27; 15.22.

¹³⁴ Matt 9.36; cf. Matt 14.14; Mark 8.2.

κρίσις ('justice') foretold in Isaiah 42.1–4 have been fulfilled in Jesus's life ministry. The designation of κρίσις and ἔλεος as 'the weightier matters of the Law' in 23.23 recalls not only God's oracles in the Prophets but also the ways in which Jesus has performed these virtues. The term ἔλεος effectively connects the Law, the Prophets and the deeds of Jesus together, fitting Matthew's portrayal of Jesus as God's beloved son to whom the disciples should listen.

Therefore, with regard to kindness and the Law, despite the fact that both Philo and Matthew are similar in understanding kindness as an all-encompassing element in the Law which guides people to imitate the merciful God, there is also a difference between them. Their difference includes not only their use of terms such that Matthew does not use φιλανθρωπία but Philo does. More importantly, for Matthew, there are further implications with regard to the merciful God and his kindness towards humans: ἔλεος is also about the fulfilment of God's will and promises upon the coming of the Son of David, Jesus Christ, whom Philo does not know but Matthew recognises and follows.

7.2.4 Understanding Matthew's use of Hosea 6.6 in Philo's terms

With regard to 'mercy' and 'sacrifice', it can be concluded that both Matthew and Philo highlight 'mercy' and at the same time affirm the importance of 'sacrifice'. Philo most likely did not cite Hosea 6.6,¹³⁵ but Philo's discussion of mercy and philanthropy in his Exposition of the Law shows that some laws that pertain to sacrifice are also for teaching people to imitate the merciful God. He explicitly identifies the laws concerning Sabbath observance (cultic laws) and the laws concerning the first fruits (sacrifices) as reflecting God's philanthropy and as teaching people to perform philanthropy.¹³⁶ Philo regards philanthropy as

¹³⁵ Citations from Hos 14.9–10 appear in Philo's extant treatises, and Philo states that it is an oracle from one of the prophets (*Plant.* 138; *Mut.* 139), but citations from Hos 6.6 are not found. See the index of texts from the Old Testament in Colson's edition, I, p. xxxiv.

¹³⁶ See above, pp. 222–23.

one of the virtues which are given by God, who expects those who possess virtues to share these gifts for the benefits of fellow humans. The virtues and the actions in accordance with virtues, in turn, are ‘perfect and blameless sacrifices’ (τέλεια γὰρ καὶ ἄμωμα ἱερεῖα, *Fug.* 18) in which God ‘rejoices’ (χαίρω, *Spec. Leg.* 1.271–72).¹³⁷

In this way, these notions in Philo might shed further light on the understanding of Matthew’s double citation of Hosea 6.6. In the first pericope, concerning God’s mercy towards sinners (9.9–13), the citation emphasises the obligation of those who have received God’s mercy: they should show mercy towards fellow humans in forgiveness. Perhaps this can be rephrased in Philo’s terms: just as they have received God’s gift of merciful forgiveness, so also they are expected to share this gift by forgiving fellow humans. In the second pericope, concerning Sabbath observance (12.1–14), the citation does not regard ‘mercy’ and ‘sacrifice’ as antithetical. If Sabbath observance is a sacrifice, what God demands from this sacrifice is ‘mercy’: deeds of kindness. Perhaps this can also be rephrased in Philo’s terms: with regard to Sabbath observance, the perfect sacrifice in which God rejoices is the virtue philanthropy.

7.3 Conclusion

The above exploration of Philo with regard to philanthropy and the Law shows that Philo’s understanding of philanthropy and the imitation of God can shed further light on the relevant concepts in Matthew. It affirms that the meaning of ἔλεος in Matthew is comparable to the meaning of φιλανθρωπία in Philo: both are understood as kindness towards humans, which is the virtue of the merciful God who should be imitated. It also suggests that Matthew’s

¹³⁷ *Spec.* 1.271–72 speaks of virtues as sacrifices in which God delights in view of certain people who offer sacrifices to God, but whose lives are full of covetousness and unjust (*Spec.* 1.270). See also *Spec.* 1.215; *Plant.* 108.

concern for Law observance is, above all, following Jesus and imitating God. "Ἐλεος, on the one hand, pertains to the kind and merciful character of God, Jesus and the Law. On the other hand, it is a word focussing on God's mercy shown to sinners. These point to Matthew's concern for Christology: Jesus comes to save his people from their sins (Matt 1.21, 20.28, 26.28), and to show his people the ways in which they should do God's Law and be well-pleasing to God, like Jesus himself.

Chapter 8

Conclusions

The present study has explored the significance of a distinctive and intriguing point in the Gospel of Matthew: the double citation of Hosea 6.6 ‘I desire mercy but not sacrifice’ (ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν). By comparing Matthew with Mark, we have paid attention to a fundamental issue which was overlooked in the previous studies regarding Matthew’s use of Hosea 6.6: there is a high possibility that Matthew has omitted the allusion to Hosea 6.6 which he probably detected in Mark’s account of the double love commandments.¹ Moreover, by comparing Matthew with Philo of Alexandria, we have demonstrated the ways in which both Matthew and Philo regard love for God and love for humans as the summary of the Law and how they understand this summary and its relationship to all other commandments in the Law. These comparisons, featuring both similarities and differences, have enabled a clearer appreciation of what Matthew might (and might not) have intended by his citation of Hosea 6.6. Our findings suggest that Matthew’s use of the citation is not likely to be intended to negate or downgrade sacrifice. Furthermore, the comparison between Matthew and Philo has demonstrated how they regard love and kindness as the overarching principle of the Law. This comparison also leads to an exploration of the ways in which they understand the relationship between Law observance and following God. These outcomes thus relate to and can be helpful for further reflections on the larger debates concerning Matthew and Judaism.

¹ As mentioned in §1.2.2.

8.1 Love for God and love for humans as a summary of the Law

‘I desire mercy but not sacrifice’ suggests a comparison and contrast between ‘mercy’ and ‘sacrifice’. This comparison appears in Mark 12.28–32, the pericope concerning the commandments of love for God and love for one’s neighbour, with which the present study begins. Mark narrates a dialogue between Jesus and a scribe regarding ‘which commandment is the first of all’. The dialogue concludes with the scribe agreeing with Jesus’s answer: no other commandment is greater than the commandments of love for God and love for one’s neighbour. The scribe then states that these two commandments are much more than all burnt offerings and sacrifices. The comparative language ‘greater’ (μείζων) and ‘much more’ (περισσότερον) in this pericope reflects a tendency to prioritise the double love commandments over all other commandments, in which the cultic commandments are specified. The description of something more than sacrifices might allude to 1 Samuel 15.22 and Hosea 6.6, and the allusion to Hosea 6.6 can be stronger because the whole verse of Hosea 6.6 can be understood as: God desires kindness to humans and the knowledge of God more than all sacrifices.² Therefore, in Mark’s narration, the allusion to Hosea 6.6 is connected to a priority of the double love commandments over the cultic commandments.

Prioritising commandments can imply non-observance of some commandments. On the one hand, the commandments with a higher priority might override those with a lower priority. Concepts which understand some commandments as overriding other commandments are attested in rabbinic literature, which offers an idea of the possible ways in which ancient Jews might have assigned a priority when they discussed the observance of the commandments. On the other hand, regarding certain commandments as less important might gradually set them aside. Mark’s tendency to set aside the cultic commandments is further suggested by his understanding of Jesus’s dispute with the Pharisees concerning purity: he

² As discussed in §2.1.1.2.

regards Jesus as ‘declaring all foods clean’ (Mark 7.19), a comment that implies that the food laws are abrogated.

By contrast, Matthew’s narration of the same stories shows that he is concerned about the tendency to set aside any commandments. Matthew omits the comment of ‘all foods are clean’ in his narration of Jesus’s dispute with the Pharisees concerning purity (Matt 15.17 // Mark 7.19). Moreover, he modifies Mark’s account of the double love commandments story so that the story no longer appears to assign priority among the commandments. When narrating the same story (Matt 22.34–40), Matthew adjusts Jesus’s reply by modifying *πρώτη* (‘the first’) with *μεγάλη* (‘the most important’) and *δευτέρα* (the second) with *ὁμοία αὐτῇ* (‘similar to it’). This clarifies that the adjectives ‘first’ and ‘second’ in Jesus’s reply refer to a list without ranking the two commandments; it also shows that Matthew understands the dialogue as a discussion of the most important commandments, in which love for one’s neighbour is similar to love for God in the sense that both of them have the same great importance.

Moreover, Matthew replaces the scribe’s statement of love as better than sacrifice with Jesus’s statement which describes the whole Law and the Prophets as hanging on the double love commandments (Matt 22.40). This indicates that Matthew understands the double love commandments as the most important in the sense that they are the summary of all the commandments: love for God and love for one’s neighbour form an overarching principle which encompasses the whole Law. The double love commandments neither replace nor downgrade other commandments but are the fundamental principle on which every commandment depends. Every commandment is based on and points towards love for God and love for fellow humans. In this way, Matthew regards the discussion between Jesus and the scribe as summarising rather than prioritising the commandments.

Love for God and love for fellow humans also appear together as a summary of the commandments in parabiblical literature. In *Jubilees* and *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, love for God and love for brothers are juxtaposed as a summary of the instructions given by the patriarchs at their deathbeds to their children. Similarly, *The Letter of Aristeas* describes the Law in terms of ‘piety’ (εὐσέβεια) and ‘justice’ (δικαιοσύνη), while Philo states that the ‘highest heads’ of all the commandments are piety and holiness towards God and justice and philanthropy towards fellow humans. Philo has written several treatises to discuss the Law; therefore, in the present study, comparable concepts found from Philo’s treatises are explored so that the ways in which a first-century Jew understands and summarises the Law can be further discerned.

Philo’s exposition of the Pentateuch shows that, in a discussion of the Law and the commandments, although terms of comparison and contrast are employed, the importance of all of the laws is at the same time emphasised. Philo understands the Pentateuch as containing two parts: the ‘unwritten laws’ (νόμοι ἄγραφοι) and the ‘written laws’ (νόμοι ἀναγραφέντες, *Decal.* 1). The part ‘unwritten laws’ refers to the lives of the Patriarchs (the historical part of the Pentateuch), contrasted with the part ‘written laws’, which refers to the Mosaic legislation. As discussed in Chapter 3, in the first-century Graeco-Roman world, one feature of the concepts around ‘unwritten law’ places the ‘unwritten’ over the ‘written’ in terms of the superiority of God over human, universal over particular, and eternal over temporary. Philo also uses the terms ‘originals’ and ‘copies’ to contrast the unwritten laws and the written laws, but he carefully explains the relationship between the two to show that he does not regard the written laws as inferior.

Philo understands the unwritten laws in two ways. First, the Patriarchs are the living laws, who lived in accordance with the divine law and did all the divine commands. Second, the unwritten laws are the originals, and the written laws are the copies of the originals. The

copies are not inferior because they carry the same function as the originals. The originals display examples of virtuous lives which do all the divine commands, and the copies are the written form of these divine commands for people to follow by observing the written laws. The written laws are neither redundant nor superfluous because both the unwritten laws and the written laws are of the one divine law. For example, Abraham did the divine law and all the divine commands; he himself is a law, being the ‘original’ of the written laws, which are the ‘copies’. Philo summarises the life of Abraham as a life of piety and justice, just as he regards the written laws as pointing to the ‘highest heads’ of piety and justice. For Philo, both the unwritten laws and the written laws share the same essential character.

Concerning the written laws, Philo regards the Decalogue commandments as the heads summarising the particular laws. He further summarises the Decalogue commandments as duties towards God and duties towards humans, and emphasises that both duties are equally important such that none of them can be ignored. Philo’s differentiation of the Decalogue commandments from the particular laws does not undermine the particular laws. He carefully illustrates their relationship by using a genera-species relationship. The Decalogue commandments are ten ‘generic heads’ (γενικὰ κεφάλαια), which Philo describes as ‘roots’, ‘sources’ and ‘fountains’ to explain the role of the Decalogue as the origin of the particular laws: all the particular laws come forth from the Decalogue.

In addition, Philo regards the laws as intended for building up virtues. He discusses the particular laws by relating them to prominent virtues such as justice and philanthropy. Philo’s emphasis on virtues, however, does not imply that the laws are to be reduced to virtues or ethical principles. He points out the importance of the literal practice of the particular laws: both the literal practice and the symbolic meaning of the laws are essential. The pursuit of virtues and the emphasis on ethical principles go hand in hand with the literal practice of the laws.

Therefore, Philo's discussion of the Law shows how a summary of the laws as piety towards God and justice towards fellow humans emphasises both love for God and love for humans but does not downgrade the particular commandments. The pursuit of virtues does not replace the literal practice of the laws. Rather, the practice of the particular laws can yield virtues. In light of Philo's summary of the Law, it can be suggested that Matthew understands the double love commandments in a similar way: the highlighting of love for God and love for one's neighbour as the most important commandments does not make other commandments inferior. Matthew's illustration of all the laws as hanging on the double love commandments is comparable to Philo's illustration of all the particular laws as originating from the Decalogue commandments inscribed on the two tablets, which Philo describes in terms of φιλόθεος ('having love for God') and φιλόανθρωπος ('having love for humankind', *Decal.* 110). Matthew and Philo are similar in their understanding of love for God and love for humans as the overarching principle encompassing the whole Law.

8.2 Matthew's double citation of Hosea 6.6: mercy but not sacrifice?

Matthew omits the allusion to Hosea 6.6 in his narration of Jesus's discussion of the double love commandments. Instead, he adds the citation of Hosea 6.6 to another two pericopae which he has also received from Mark. The first pericope is about Jesus's table fellowship with sinners, and the second pericope is about Jesus's dispute with the Pharisees on the Sabbath (Matt 9.9–13; 12.1–14 // Mark 2.13–17, 23–28).

Following Mark's overall structure, Matthew places the story of the table fellowship amongst several healing stories. Both Mark and Matthew narrate the table fellowship immediately after Jesus's healing of the paralysed man – the two stories which reflect a connection between healing and forgiveness of sins. This suggests that Matthew's citation of Hosea 6.6 pertains to his portrayal of Jesus as the one who brings healing and forgiveness of

sins. Further distinctiveness of Matthew's narration of Jesus's healing ministry (Matthew 8–9) indicates the possible purpose of citing Hosea 6.6 in the table fellowship story. First, Matthew cites Isaiah 53.4 to show that Jesus's healing fulfils the promise of God (Matt 8.16–17). Second, Matthew describes Jesus as the Son of David who shows mercy (*ἐλεέω*) to the sick, a description which he picks up from Mark and places into the group of healing stories in Matthew 8–9. This suggests that Matthew intentionally uses both *ἐλεέω* (9.27) and *ἔλεος* (9.13) in this self-contained block of the healing stories. These two points of distinctiveness have two points of significance.

First, Matthew regards Jesus's healing and forgiveness of sins as a fulfilment of God's promise. He relates this to Jesus's identity as the Son of David, suggesting that he understands Jesus as the Davidic shepherd-king promised in Ezekiel 34 who heals the people of God. Matthew's emphasis on Jesus as the Son of David also connects to the description of Jesus as the king who saves his people from their sins by the blood of covenant, bringing forgiveness of sins. These, in turn, suggest that Hosea 6.6 is cited in relation to God's promise of healing and forgiveness as fulfilled through Jesus, who shows mercy to the sick and sinners.

Second, Matthew's use of both *ἐλεέω* (9.27) and *ἔλεος* (9.13) in the same context which depicts Jesus's merciful actions towards the sick and sinners suggests that the cognates are employed to the same end: mercy is shown on the sick and sinners. This reading is further supported by the ways in which Matthew understands Jesus's ministry: in summarising Jesus's ministry, Matthew uses *σπλαγχνίζομαι* ('have compassion') to describe Jesus's compassion on the crowd (9.36). Therefore, in this context, Hosea 6.6 is cited to indicate God's will for showing mercy on the sick and sinners to fulfil his promises spoken through the prophets. Moreover, the use of Hosea 6.6 also indicates that God demands his people to be kind and merciful: just as they have been shown mercy and their sins are forgiven, so also they are expected to show mercy to fellow humans with forgiveness and to show kindness to

accept those who are forgiven by God. This is supported by the fact that Matthew also uses both *ἐλέεω* and *σπλαγχνίζομαι* to depict God's forgiveness and God's demand on his people to forgive their fellow humans (18.27, 33).

Regarding the negation 'mercy but not sacrifice' in Matthew 9.13, the lack of mention of 'sacrifice' in the context suggests that it is not likely that Matthew intends to transfer the prophetic critique of sacrifice into his narration of Jesus's healing and forgiveness of sins. The negation is likely rhetorical in that it is employed to focus on 'mercy'. This is supported by the fact that Matthew inserts Hosea 6.6 right before a rhetorical negation 'not ... but' (*οὐ ... ἀλλά*, 9.13): not the righteous but sinners Jesus has come to call. This negation is rhetorical, which is meant to emphasise Jesus's mission for sinners and is not meant to deny or downgrade the righteous. In light of this, 'I desire mercy but not sacrifice' should be understood similarly as a rhetorical negation that merely emphasises God's will for mercy.

Just as the contextual features in Matthew 8–9 are decisive for understanding Matthew's use of Hosea 6.6 in the table fellowship story, so also the contextual features around the Sabbath stories (12.1–14) contribute to the meaning and the significance of Matthew's second citation of Hosea 6.6. Both Mark and Matthew narrate the two Sabbath stories as a self-contained section, but Matthew adds further descriptions of Jesus around this section. Right before the first Sabbath story, Matthew narrates Jesus's promise of rest to the burdened (11.28–30). After the second Sabbath story, Matthew describes Jesus as God's beloved servant who helps the afflicted (12.15–20). These descriptions, again, identify Jesus as the Davidic shepherd who gives rest to his people (Ezekiel 34) and God's servant (Isa 42.1–4; 53.4) who gives relief to the weak and the afflicted. They, together with the citation of Hosea 6.6, link the depiction of Jesus in the Sabbath stories to that in the healing ministry, indicating that the citation of Hosea 6.6 in Matthew 12.7 should be understood in light of these descriptions.

Matthew's narration of Jesus's promise of rest, which mentions Jesus's yoke as 'kind' (*χρηστός*), suggests that the subsequent Sabbath stories show the ways in which Jesus demonstrates God's will for Sabbath observance with reference to the fact that both God and his Law are 'kind'. This is also suggested by Matthew's distinctiveness in his account of the Sabbath stories. First, Matthew adds one more *ἐξεστί* ('lawful') to the stories by modifying the beginning of the second story with a question of what is 'lawful' (*ἐξεστί*, 12.10), indicating that attention should be paid to the deeds which are allowed on the Sabbath. The mention of the work of priests on the Sabbath shows that there are 'lawful' activities on the Sabbath and suggests that keeping God's commandments is part of Sabbath observance. Second, Matthew highlights the hunger of Jesus's disciples, showing that both Sabbath stories concern deeds of kindness: feeding the hungry and caring for the sick. As discussed in Chapter 5, deeds of kindness are in accordance with the descriptions of Sabbath observance in the Law: Sabbath observance pertains to giving relief to the afflicted because the Sabbath laws give people rest from toil and release from debts and slavery. Third, Matthew includes an illustration of 'one sheep' in the second story, linking Jesus's healing on the Sabbath to the shepherd who goes and searches for his 'one sheep' (Matt 18.12), whose action echoes that of the Davidic shepherd depicted in Ezekiel 34. In this way, Jesus's care for the hungry and the sick on the Sabbath shows how the promise of giving rest is fulfilled and demonstrates how one should observe the Sabbath in accordance with God's will for relief to be given to the afflicted on the Sabbath.

The appearance of the hungry and the sick further links the Sabbath stories to the Son of Man's judgement (Matt 25.31–46). This link sheds light on the meaning of *ἔλεος* in the Sabbath stories: *ἔλεος* most likely has a similar sense to *ἐλεημοσύνη* that refers to deeds of kindness, which are frequently mentioned as feeding the hungry and clothing the naked. They

are ‘lawful’ on the Sabbath not only because they are allowed; more importantly, the Sabbath is honoured precisely by showing kindness towards the needy and the afflicted.

In the Sabbath stories, Matthew cites Hosea 6.6 for the second time, in a context where both ‘mercy’ and ‘sacrifice’ are mentioned and the importance of both are recognised: deeds of ‘mercy’ accord with God’s will for Sabbath observance, and ‘sacrifices’ are offered by the priests on the Sabbath according to God’s commandments. This suggests that the negation ‘I desire mercy but not sacrifice’ in this pericope is best understood as a rhetorical negation that merely emphasises God’s will for ‘mercy’, which is similar to what it functions in its first appearance in the gospel. The citation is not meant to regard deeds of kindness as competing with or replacing the Sabbath commandment but to emphasise God’s will for deeds of kindness, which are not allowed to cease even on the Sabbath.

8.3 Kindness, Law observance and the imitation of God

The third and last occurrence of ἔλεος in Matthew also appears in a language of comparison, where ἔλεος is juxtaposed with κρίσις and πίστις, and the trio are designated as ‘the weightier matters of the Law’ (Matt 23.23). The comparative ‘weightier’ (βαρύτερα) might imply a priority, and in this context, the contrasted counterpart is the tithes. However, this saying does not marginalise the tithes or the cultic matters. It is part of Jesus’s polemical speech against the Pharisees and is employed to point out the ‘blindness’ of the Pharisees. Κρίσις, ἔλεος and πίστις are described as ‘weightier’ in the sense that these matters are all-encompassing, embedded in every law. Everyone should be able to see and not neglect them if they are not as ‘blind’ as the Pharisees.

The meaning of κρίσις, ἔλεος and πίστις can be discerned in light of the details in Matthew 23.23: the trio appear as the objects of the verb ποιέω (‘practise’), and they are related to Law observance. Examples from the Septuagint (e.g., Ezekiel 18; Sir 15.15, etc.)

show that, in a context with reference to Law observance, the terms *ποιέω κρίσιν*, *ἔλεος*, and *πίστιν* have been employed to express the practice of justice, kindness, and faithfulness. This is likely the meaning expressed in Matthew 23.23.

The significance of naming *ἔλεος* as among ‘the weightier matters of the Law’ in Jesus’s polemic against the Pharisees can be explored in light of the points of similarity between Matthew 23.23 and 5.17–20: both texts mention Law observance in a depiction of the contrast between Jesus and the Pharisees. The Pharisees are regarded as lacking in ‘righteousness’ (*δικαιοσύνη*, 5.20) and in their practice of ‘the weightier matters of the Law’ (23.23). This, in turn, suggests that Matthew understands the practice of justice, kindness and faithfulness as entailing the righteousness of Jesus’s disciples which exceeds that of the Pharisees.

For Matthew, *δικαιοσύνη* can be a term summing up ‘the weightier matters of the Law’. It entails doing God’s will and keeping all God’s commandments wholeheartedly. First, *δικαιοσύνη* entails doing God’s will. Matthew depicts Jesus as doing the will of God and fulfilling all righteousness. He highlights Jesus’s ministry as fulfilling God’s will for bringing forth justice and mercy (*κρίσις*: 12.18, 20; *ἔλεος*: 9.13; 12.7), the ‘weightier matters of the Law’. Second, *δικαιοσύνη* entails keeping all God’s commandments wholeheartedly. The meaning of the ‘exceeding righteousness’ is expounded in the Antitheses (5.21–48), which conclude with an exhortation to be perfect like God. The word ‘perfect’ (*τέλειος*) reflects completeness and wholeheartedness with regard to Law observance. In this way, ‘perfect’ is likely another term Matthew uses to describe those who possess the righteousness which is required for entering the kingdom of heaven.

Just as *ἔλεος* is highlighted as among ‘the weightier matters of the Law’ so that Law observance must not lack the practice of kindness, so also kindness towards humans is

highlighted in the exhortation ‘to be perfect’. Matthew connects the teaching regarding the ‘exceeding righteousness’ (5.17–48) to the story of the rich young man (19.16–22) through the theme of ‘to be perfect’. In both texts, kindness towards humans is highlighted. For Matthew, ‘to be perfect’ is to imitate God. One way of imitating God is to show kindness, just as God is benevolent to humans, both the good and the wicked (5.44–48). ‘To be perfect’ also pertains to following Jesus and showing kindness to humans, such as caring for the poor (19.21–22). The connection of the two texts strengthens the point which indicates that deeds of kindness are indispensable with regard to doing the will of God and perfection. Showing kindness towards humans is the will and the deeds of God and Jesus, both of whom the disciples should follow and imitate by observing the commandments of God.

Matthew understands *ἔλεος* (‘kindness towards humans’) as among ‘the weightier matters of the Law’. Similarly, Philo understands *φιλανθρωπία* (‘philanthropy: love for humans’) as among the ‘highest heads’ of all the particular laws. As demonstrated in Chapter 7, an exploration of Philo’s emphasis on philanthropy sheds further light on the concepts around kindness, Law observance and the imitation of God.

For Philo, philanthropy relates closely to piety and justice, that is, the summary of the Law. He summarises the life of the living law Abraham as a life of piety and justice, showing that a pious person must also be philanthropic and exhibit justice towards fellow humans (*Abr.* 208). Moreover, when Philo discusses the laws in terms of philanthropy (*Virt.* 51–174), he firstly highlights the legislator’s (Moses’) philanthropy, mentioning his obedience to God’s commands (*Virt.* 63), and subsequently shows the ways in which the laws pertaining to philanthropy also have connotations of piety and justice. Philanthropy is interwoven with piety and justice across the whole body of the legislation, just as the life of Abraham, who did all God’s commandments, is also characterised by these virtues.

The emphasis on philanthropy and its close affinity to piety and justice in Philo's discussion of the Law can be understood in light of Philo's concept of Law observance and the imitation of God. Philo mentions imitating God in his discussion of the laws pertaining to the virtues of justice and philanthropy respectively (*Spec.* 4.187–188; *Virt.* 168–169), focussing on imitating God's deeds of benevolence, which he regards as contributing to 'assimilation' (ἐξομοίωσις) to God. The specific deeds mentioned are 'benefitting' people and 'giving graciously' (ὠφελεῖν, *Spec.* 4.186; χαρίζεσθαι, *Virt.* 168). Philo understands God's benevolence towards humans as closely associated with God's philanthropic and merciful attributes. He often describes God's 'mercy' (ἔλεος) towards humans in terms of these attributes. This shows that, for Philo, the term ἔλεος can be employed to refer to God's (and humans') virtue in the sense that ἔλεος is similar to φιλανθρωπία. He does not hesitate to use both ἔλεος and φιλανθρωπία together to describe the legislation as suffused with precepts which are for the purpose of showing mercy and philanthropy towards humans (*Spec.* 4.72). Living according to the precepts in the Law builds one up with virtues such as justice and philanthropy.

For Philo, to live a virtuous life is important because it is a life imitating God and pleasing to God, which is the 'goal' (τέλος) of human existence (*Opif.* 144). Through the description of the life of Abraham, Philo describes a life in pursuit of the goal as a life following God and doing the words of God, which Philo understands as God's Law (*Migr.* 127–131). Moreover, Philo understands to be pleasing to God as to be 'perfect' (τέλειος), which he explains as possessing and performing all virtues, like God. In this way, Philo links up the observance of God's Law to the concepts around the 'goal', namely: imitating God, following God, possessing virtues and being well-pleasing to God. Law observance is indispensable for pursuing the goal.

The ways in which Philo regards ‘mercy’ and ‘philanthropy’ as suffusing the Law and connects them to the merciful character of God is similar to the ways in which Matthew emphasises ‘mercy’. Both of them regard the observance of the Law as indispensable because the commandments direct people to imitate God: to possess and perform virtues like God does, a prominent example of which is to be merciful. In light of Philo’s view of imitation of God and being well-pleasing to God as the ‘goal’, a possible point of significance which Matthew makes by connecting ‘perfection’ to following Jesus (19.21) can be discerned: Matthew, by depicting Jesus as pleasing to God by doing the will of God, indicates that, on the one hand, Law observance without learning from Jesus cannot reach the goal. On the other hand, following Jesus does not mean that Law observance is no longer necessary.

In light of the observation that both Matthew and Philo regard all the laws as based on and pointing towards love for God and love for humans, it can be concluded that both of them highlight ‘mercy’ and at the same time affirm the importance of ‘sacrifice’. It is also possible to further understand Matthew’s citation of Hosea 6.6 by rephrasing this in Philo’s terms. Concerning God’s mercy towards sinners (9.9–13), the citation indicates that those who have received God’s mercy should show mercy towards fellow humans in forgiveness. Perhaps this can be rephrased in Philo’s terms: just as they have received God’s gift of merciful forgiveness, so also they are expected to share this gift by forgiving fellow humans. Concerning Sabbath observance (12.1–14), the citation shows that, if Sabbath observance is a sacrifice, what God demands from this sacrifice is kindness. Perhaps this can also be rephrased in Philo’s terms: with regard to Sabbath observance, the perfect sacrifice in which God rejoices is the virtue philanthropy.

The close affinity between *φιλανθρωπία* and *ἔλεος* in Philo’s discussion concerning the Law and the imitation of God might shed light on discerning the sense of the word *ἔλεος* in Matthew. Similar to Philo’s connection of *ἔλεος* to *φιλανθρωπία*, Matthew also connects *ἔλεος*

to kindness towards humans, showing that ἔλεος can mean not only ‘mercy’ but more broadly ‘kindness’. In Matthew 9.13, ἔλεος not only relates to God’s mercy towards the sick and sinners but also relates to God’s demand for kindness to be shown to accept repented sinners. In Matthew 12.7, ἔλεος is connected to χρηστός, and they are employed together to show that deeds of kindness accord with God’s will for the Sabbath. However, in terms of giving a translation of ἔλεος in Matthew, if translating it as ‘mercy’ can effectively link it to the verb ἐλεέω (‘showing mercy’) and thus the merciful actions of God and Jesus depicted in Matthew, then ‘mercy’ perhaps is the most fitting choice. For Matthew, ἔλεος is important in doing the will of God because God and Jesus are merciful.

8.4 The findings in relation to current scholarship

As our survey of recent research shows,³ the views on Matthew’s use of Hosea 6.6 vary with fundamental disagreement concerning the meaning of ἔλεος and the purpose of the citation in Matthew. The suggestion which regards ἔλεος in the citation as meaning ‘covenant faithfulness’ has appeared from time to time.⁴ Whether the citation negates cultic commandments or places them in a lower priority is also still debated.⁵ Our findings show that a better understanding of Matthew’s citation of Hosea 6.6 can be achieved by comparing Matthew with Mark and with Philo. The following sections will summarise how these findings contribute to the research of the subject matter itself and indicate the ways in which

³ See above, §1.2.

⁴ Earlier by Glynn (1971) and Hill (1977), and most recently by Ribbens (2018) and Ahn (2020); as mentioned in §1.2.1.

⁵ For example, Keith and Ribbens regard the citation as indicating that ἔλεος has replaced θυσία (although they understand the meaning of ἔλεος differently), and Kubiś suggests that the citation does not negate or downgrade sacrifice; as mentioned in §1.2.1.

the present study might have wider relevance to scholarship in Philo and Matthew, as well as Matthew and Judaism.

8.4.1 The fundamental issues concerning the study of Matthew's use of Hosea 6.6

The present study has addressed two fundamental issues reflected in the previous studies of the subject matter. First, the citation of Hosea 6.6 should not be read in isolation from the larger context of Matthew, and second, the implications of Matthew's omission of the allusion to Hosea 6.6 in the pericope about the double love commandments should be duly recognised.

As mentioned above,⁶ the reading of ἔλεος as 'covenant loyalty' has divorced ἔλεος from its cognate verb ἐλέεω in the same context and thus fallen short of recognising the significance of Matthew's deliberate use of the cognates in the same block of the healing stories. The present study confirms that the cognates work together in Matthew's depiction of Jesus as the merciful Davidic shepherd-king. Our reading accords with the view which regards the purpose of the citation as indicating that God's mercy, through Jesus's life ministry, has been brought towards his people.⁷ Furthermore, the portrait of Jesus as the Davidic shepherd-king appears in both contexts where Matthew cites Hosea 6.6, affirming the suggestion which considers the citation's second appearance (Matt 12.7) as recalling what it has meant in its first appearance (9.13).⁸ With regard to this view, our findings may support a further point: the third appearance of ἔλεος (23.23) also recalls the preceding stories in which Matthew uses ἔλεος (9.13; 12.7) and portrays Jesus as fulfilling God's will by performing deeds of kindness.

⁶ See above, §1.2.2.

⁷ As Keith and Seeanner suggest; mentioned in §1.2.1.

⁸ Keith's suggestion; mentioned in §1.2.1.

Some of those who regard ἔλεος in Matthew as meaning ‘covenant loyalty’ suggest that ἔλεος is integral to the righteousness which exceeds that of the Pharisees.⁹ Although the present study refutes the reading of ἔλεος as ‘covenant loyalty’, the relationship between ἔλεος and this ‘exceeding righteousness’ is further expounded. Our findings recognise that those who have this ‘exceeding righteousness’ are those who do the will of God, which must include performing ἔλεος towards humans, just as Jesus himself does. Since Matthew designates ἔλεος as among ‘the weightier matters of the Law’, perhaps those commentators’ understanding of ἔλεος as ‘covenant loyalty’ can be clarified and articulated in this way: Matthew’s use of Hosea 6.6 does not regard ἔλεος as ‘covenant faithfulness’ towards God; rather, the disciples’ faithfulness towards God is reflected by whether they do the will of God and take heed of God’s commandments. Regarding this, ἔλεος, kindness towards humans, is highlighted as one of the elements that encompasses the whole Law.

With regard to the relationship between Matthew’s citation of Hosea 6.6, his designation of ἔλεος as among ‘the weightier matters of the Law’, and his narration of the double love commandments, the present study has made a distinct contribution to scholarship by comparing Matthew with Mark and comparing Matthew with Philo. Our examination of the difference between Matthew and Mark in their narration of the double love commandments offers a significant basis for investigating Matthew’s use of Hosea 6.6 and his use of the comparative language ‘weightier matters of the Law’. Matthew’s omission of the allusion to Hosea 6.6 in Mark’s account of the double love commandments indicates that Matthew is concerned about prioritising the commandments. This provides an important clue for understanding Matthew’s double citation of Hosea 6.6: it is not likely to be intended to mean a downgrade of cultic laws. Bearing this observation in mind in examining the passages

⁹ As Glynn and Hill suggest; mentioned in §1.2.1.

where Matthew cites Hosea 6.6, the present study further confirms that the citation does not mean a downgrade or a denial of sacrifice: the negation rhetorically emphasises God's will for ἔλεος. Our reading is contrary to the often-recognised view which relates Hosea 6.6 to the double love commandments and regards Matthew as prioritising 'mercy' over the cultic laws (such as Sabbath observance),¹⁰ but it finds further support by comparing Matthew with Philo.

As discussed above,¹¹ both Matthew and Philo summarise the Law as love for God and love for humans. While Matthew describes this in a short statement (22.40), Philo explains the relationship between the 'heads' and the particular laws in several treatises, an exploration of which has facilitated our understanding of Matthew. The findings support reading Matthew's notion of 'the weightier matters of the Law' as identifying the all-encompassing elements of the Law, one of which is ἔλεος. This, in turn, clarifies the debated relationship between ἔλεος and Sabbath observance in Matthew 12.1–14: ἔλεος, kindness, does not override Sabbath observance. Instead, Sabbath observance is about performing kindness (towards humans, even towards animals) because ἔλεος is the essential element of the Sabbath laws. Philo's discussion of the Sabbath laws also sheds light on this: he explains how these laws point towards philanthropy. The above is an example of the ways in which a comparison between Matthew and Philo can be helpful. The following section will give further reflections regarding the use of Philo in Matthew studies.

8.4.2 Philo and Matthew

Philo's writings have been recognised as an important window for seeing the world of Hellenistic Judaism at the turn of the first century and useful for understanding the New Testament in the context of the Jewish tradition and the cultural environment during that

¹⁰ Mentioned above, §1.2.2 and §5.2.3.1.

¹¹ See §7.2.1 for the summary and the comparison.

time.¹² Philo has long and often been used in studies of Paul, John and Hebrews; much attention has been paid to the ‘parallels’ in language and concepts between Philo and them.¹³ By contrast, studying Matthew by using Philo as a comparison counterpart remains a much-neglected task.¹⁴ This is probably because the similarity in language and concepts between Philo and Matthew is relatively smaller. Even if there is similarity, it is not necessarily peculiar to Philo and Matthew. For example, the phenomenon of regarding love for God and love for humans as a summary of the commandments also appears in other ancient Jewish literature.¹⁵

However, as the present study has demonstrated, the task of comparing Matthew with Philo does not merely identify ‘parallels’. It also investigates the texts in their own right and recognises both similarity and difference between the texts. Philo’s *Spec.* 2.63 has been recognised as one of key points of comparison with Matthew 22.40. This ‘similarity’ serves as a starting point, and our task of comparison recognises the ‘difference’ by investigating the two short texts further in their own context in order to explore Matthew’s and Philo’s concerns, respectively. Two outcomes significant to the subject matter are then obtained. First, as mentioned, the findings are helpful for articulating the relationship between the summary and all other commandments in the Law, as our exploration of Philo’s Exposition of the Law has shown. Second, by discussing Matthew’s emphasis on ἔλεος and Philo’s

¹² Gregory E. Sterling, ‘Philo Has Not Been Used Half Enough’: The Significance of Philo of Alexandria for the Study of the New Testament’, *Perspectives in Religious Studies*, 30 (2003), 251–69 (p. 252); Larry W. Hurtado, ‘Does Philo Help Explain Early Christianity?’, in *Philo und das Neue Testament: wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen: I. Internationales Symposium zum Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum, 1.-4. Mai 2003, Eisenach/Jena*, ed. by Roland Deines and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, 172 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), pp. 73–92 (p. 74).

¹³ Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, pp. 66–83; Hurtado, ‘Does Philo Help Explain Early Christianity?’, pp. 74–79.

¹⁴ Mentioned above, p. 15 note 87.

¹⁵ As discussed in §2.2.2.

emphasis on *φιλανθρωπία* in their own context, further points of similarity can be discerned: both Matthew and Philo express their deeper concerns regarding Law observance, that is, imitating God and being well-pleasing to God.¹⁶ Other than these outcomes, the present study also shows that it is possible to rephrase Matthew's use of Hosea 6.6 in Philo's terms.¹⁷

With the growing amount of research resources, perhaps the task of comparing Matthew with Philo will be performed more frequently in the future. Scholars have been compiling more lists of 'cross references' between Matthew and Philo. For example, Sterling has offered a list of Philo's texts which are relevant to the Gospels (such as the Passion narrative and the sayings of Jesus).¹⁸ Moreover, some scholars have recently published a handbook for comparing Matthew with other texts, in which Philo's texts are also listed.¹⁹ Furthermore, the recent publication of a series of commentaries on Philo's treatises is instrumental for studying Philo in his own right,²⁰ adding resources which facilitate the task of comparison.

By observing the similarity and distinctiveness between Matthew and Philo, the present study confirms the view which regards Matthew as affirming Law observance for Christians. Our findings thus have a wider relevance to the debates concerning Matthew and Judaism, as will be explained in the following section.

¹⁶ See above, §7.2.2.

¹⁷ See above, §7.2.4.

¹⁸ Gregory E. Sterling, 'Philo of Alexandria', in *The Historical Jesus in Context*, ed. by Amy-Jill Levine, Dale C. Allison, and John Dominic Crossan (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), pp. 296–308.

¹⁹ Bruce Chilton and others, *A Comparative Handbook to the Gospels of Matthew and Luke: Comparisons with Pseudepigrapha, the Qumran Scrolls, and Rabbinic Literature*, *The New Testament Gospels in Their Judaic Contexts*, 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2021).

²⁰ That is, the Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series published by Brill.

8.4.3 Matthew and Judaism

By demonstrating the ways in which Matthew's emphasis on love and mercy does not regard the love commandments as competing with other commandments, the present study has offered a solution to a puzzle: a tension which might have resulted from Matthew's double citation of 'I desire mercy but not sacrifice' (9.13; 12.7) and his insistence that none of the commandments (including the cultic laws) should be neglected (5.17–19; 23.23). This shows that a discussion of Matthew's use of Hosea 6.6 is part of a larger debate concerning Matthew and Law observance, which can be extended further to the debate concerning Matthew and Judaism. In fact, the three places where Matthew cites Hosea 6.6 and mentions ἔλεος all depict the Pharisees and the scribes negatively, playing a prominent role in the gospel's overall polemic towards them.

The debates concerning Matthew and Judaism over recent decades relate to the quest of the situation of Matthew's community. Kilpatrick's description of 'within Judaism'²¹ and his notion of Matthew's depiction of 'the synagogues' as 'their synagogues'²² have appeared in later discussions;²³ Bornkamm's notion of '[t]he struggle with Israel is still a struggle within its own walls'²⁴ is taken up by later scholars such that the terms *intra muros* ('within the walls') and *extra muros* ('outside the walls') since then have been employed to describe

²¹ G. D. Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1946), p. 122.

²² The places where Matthew adds αὐτῶν after συναγωγαί from Mark's parallel accounts include: Matt 10.17 // Mark 13.9; Matt 12.9 // Mark 3.1; Matt 13.54 // Mark 6.2. Kilpatrick, *The Origins*, p. 110.

²³ Cf. Graham Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992), pp. 119–20.

²⁴ Bornkamm, 'End-Expectation', p. 39. The phrase *intra muros* appears in Bornkamm's original words: 'Der Kampf gegen Israel ist noch ein Kampf intra muros'; Günther Bornkamm, 'Enderwartung und Kirche im Matthäusevangelium', in *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium*, by Günther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz Joachim Held, WMANT, 1 (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1960), pp. 13–47 (p. 36).

Matthew's relationship with Judaism.²⁵ The definition of the 'walls' varies,²⁶ and the views of the scholars are nuanced such that the dichotomy of *intra muros/extra muros* is often unhelpful in articulating the complex issue and different points of view.²⁷ Despite these, the *intra muros/extra muros* debate is ongoing,²⁸ as is also the related issue of Matthew's understanding of the Law. For example, Foster, challenging the *intra muros* viewpoint, regards Matthew's community as 'having already taken its first steps away from Judaism'.²⁹ He regards the Antitheses as indicating that Jesus interprets the Law either by 'redefining' or 'replacing' its commands, and the authority of Jesus 'overrides that of Torah'.³⁰ Similarly, Deines opposes the *intra muros* viewpoint,³¹ disagreeing with the view that regards Matthew

²⁵ For example, Davies, *Setting*, p. 290.

²⁶ For example, the relationship between Matthew and Judaism has been discussed in terms of 'Matthean Judaism and formative Judaism' (Overman), 'the church and the synagogue' (e.g., Stanton), 'the church and Israel' (e.g., Konradt), etc. J. Andrew Overman, *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), pp. 2–5; Stanton, *A Gospel*, pp. 126–31; Konradt, *Israel*, pp. 7–13.

²⁷ In a recent article, Konradt suggests that a move beyond 'the within or outside alternative' (i.e., either *intra* or *extra muros*) is necessary to articulate the 'multi-faceted relations'. Matthias Konradt, 'Matthew within or outside of Judaism? From the "Parting of the Ways" Model to a Multifaceted Approach', in *Jews and Christians – Parting Ways in the First Two Centuries CE?*, ed. by Jens Schröter, Benjamin A. Edsall, and Joseph Verheyden, BZNW, 253 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021), pp. 144–45.

²⁸ Konradt considers that the *intra muros* viewpoint has emerged as a 'new perspective' in current research of Matthew; Konradt, 'Matthew Within or Outside', pp. 121–22; Matthias Konradt, 'The Role of the Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew', in *Matthew within Judaism: Israel and the Nations in the First Gospel*, ed. by Anders Runesson and Daniel M. Gurtner, ECL, 27 (Atlanta: SBL, 2020), pp. 213–31 (p. 214). See also the introduction of a collection of recent studies related to the 'Matthew-within-Judaism' perspective by Anders Runesson and Daniel M. Gurtner, 'Introduction: The Location of the Matthew-within-Judaism Perspective in Past and Present Research', in *Matthew within Judaism: Israel and the Nations in the First Gospel*, ed. by Anders Runesson and Daniel M. Gurtner, ECL, 27 (Atlanta: SBL, 2020), pp. 1–25.

²⁹ Paul Foster, *Community, Law, and Mission in Matthew's Gospel*, WUNT, 2/177 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), p. 260.

³⁰ Foster, *Community*, p. 139.

³¹ Roland Deines, 'Jesus and the Torah according to the Gospel of Matthew', in *The Gospel of Matthew in Its Historical and Theological Context: Papers from the International Conference in Moscow, September 24 to 28, 2018*, ed. by Michail Seleznev, William R. G. Loader, and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, WUNT, 459 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021), p. 299; Deines, 'Not the Law', p. 57.

as expecting his community ‘to keep all the commandments of the Torah’,³² insisting that ‘Matthew should not be read as advocating a law abiding Christian life-style’.³³ By contrast, the *intra muros* viewpoint is often accompanied by a description of Matthew as affirming the validity of the Law and the obligation of its observance for Jesus’s disciples.³⁴

In these debates, Matthew’s understanding of the double love commandments is sometimes mentioned. For example, Deines suggests that, for Matthew, the kingdom of God is based on ‘the double commandment of love’, and only Jesus’s commandments are relevant for the disciples: ‘The Torah no longer has a separate function in addition to the commandment of Jesus’.³⁵ Stanton, regarding Matthew’s community as having ‘recently parted company painfully with Judaism’,³⁶ mentions that, for Matthew, the law and prophets are still authoritative for Christians with the condition that they are interpreted according to Jesus’s love commandment,³⁷ which expresses the ‘very essence’ of the laws and the prophets but does not contradict them.³⁸ Similarly, Luz suggests that Matthew’s community had ‘lived through the painful break with the synagogue’, and they in practice ‘probably subordinated the Torah’s many individual commandments to the love commandment as their center’.³⁹

In light of the relevance of Matthew’s understanding of the Law to the above debate, the findings of the present study might offer some points for further consideration. First, Matthew regards the double love commandments as the essential element which is embedded

³² Deines, ‘Jesus’, p. 299; cf. Deines, ‘Not the Law’, pp. 82–83.

³³ Deines, ‘Jesus’, p. 326.

³⁴ See, for example, Konradt, ‘Matthew Within or Outside’, pp. 138–40, 142.

³⁵ Deines, ‘Not the Law’, p. 79.

³⁶ Stanton, *A Gospel*, p. 169.

³⁷ Stanton, *A Gospel*, p. 49.

³⁸ Stanton, *A Gospel*, p. 383.

³⁹ Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, p. 223.

in all the commandments of *God*.⁴⁰ Matthew does not see them as a love commandment of *Jesus* which competes with God's other commandments. To the contrary, in Matthew's narration, Jesus condemns those who transgress 'the commandment of God' (τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ) and make void 'the word of God' (τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ).⁴¹ Therefore, for Matthew, Jesus's authority does not compete with that of the Law which is from God. Instead, Jesus's authority overrides that of the leaders of the Jews, who are in fact the blind guides (concerning their understanding and teaching of the Law)⁴² and bad shepherds (concerning their deeds, contrasting the deeds of the merciful shepherd Jesus).⁴³ In this way, all the commandments (the whole Law and the Prophets) are valid and authoritative for Jesus's disciples, who learn to observe them through learning from Jesus.

Second, Matthew is concerned about Law observance because he is ultimately concerned about doing the will of the heavenly Father and being pleasing to him. For Matthew, the only way to pursue being perfect like God is to follow the ways in which Jesus obeys God and does the will of God, completely and wholeheartedly.⁴⁴ The use of Hosea 6.6 and the depiction of God and Jesus as merciful are meant to give concrete illustrations for the disciples to understand the will of God and to imitate God. The commandments of God are of utmost relevance to this because the will of God is conveyed through his commandments, and every single one of them indicates how to be pleasing to God. It is in this sense that Matthew understands that completely and wholeheartedly observing the Law and following Jesus go hand in hand.

⁴⁰ As discussed in Chapter 2.

⁴¹ Matt 15.3, 6.

⁴² As discussed in Chapter 6.

⁴³ As discussed in Chapters 4 and 5.

⁴⁴ As discussed in Chapter 6.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

This section lists publications which contain an edition of the text in the original language.

1. The Tanakh, the Septuagint, the New Testament

- Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece: Based on the work of Eberhard and Erwin Nestle*, 28th edn (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012)
- Aland, Kurt, Barbara Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren, eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece: post Eberhard Nestle et Erwin Nestle*, 26th & 27th edn (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979)
- Aland, Kurt, ed., *Synopsis quattuor evangeliorum: locis parallelis evangeliorum apocryphorum et patrum adhibitis*, 13th edn (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1985)
- Elliger, K., W. Rudolph, and A. Schenker, eds., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, 5th edn (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997)
- Gelston, Anthony, ed., *The Twelve Minor Prophets*, *Biblia Hebraica Quinta*, 13 (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2010)
- Rahlfs, Alfred, ed., *Septuaginta: id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, 2 vols (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935)
- Rahlfs, Alfred, and Robert Hanhart, eds., *Septuaginta: id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, revised edn (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006)
- Swete, Henry Barclay, ed., *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint*, 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1887–1894)
- Wright, Robert B., *The Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*, *Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies*, 1 (London: T&T Clark, 2007)
- Ziegler, Joseph, ed., *Duodecim prophetae*, *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*, 13 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943)
- , *Isaias*, *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*, 14 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939)

2. Greek and Latin Texts

- Andokides, *On the Mysteries*, ed. by Douglas M. MacDowell (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962)
- Aristophanes, *Clouds. Wasps. Peace*, ed. & trans. by Jeffrey Henderson, Loeb Classical Library, 488 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998)
- Aristotle, *Art of Rhetoric*, trans. by J. H. Freese, Loeb Classical Library, 193 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926)
- , *The Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. by H. Rackham, Loeb Classical Library, 73, rev. edn (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1934)
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius, *De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum*, trans. by H. Rackham, Loeb Classical Library, 40, 2nd edn (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931)
- , *De Officiis*, trans. by Walter Miller, Loeb Classical Library, 30 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1913)
- , *De Re Publica, De Legibus*, trans. by Clinton W. Keyes, Loeb Classical Library, 213 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928)
- Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata Buch I–VI*, ed. by Ludwig Früchtel and Ursula Treu, Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, 52 (Berlin: Akademie, 1985)
- Demosthenes, *Orations, Volume I: Olynthiacs; Philippics; Minor public speeches; Speech against Leptines I–XVII, XX*, trans. by J. H. Vince, Loeb Classical Library, 238 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1930)
- , *Orations, Volume III: Orations XXI–XXVI*, trans. by J. H. Vince, Loeb Classical Library, 299 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935)
- Dio Chrysostom, *Discourses 1–11*, trans. by J. W. Cohoon, Loeb Classical Library, 257 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932)
- , *Discourses 61–80, Fragments, Letters*, trans. by H. Lamar Crosby, Loeb Classical Library, 385 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1951)
- Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History*, trans. by C. H. Oldfather, Loeb Classical Library, 12 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1933–1967)
- Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, trans. by R. D. Hicks, Loeb Classical Library, 184 & 185, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925)
- Epictetus, *Discourses: Books 1–2*, trans. by W. A. Oldfather, The Loeb Classical Library, 131 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925)
- Iamblichus, *On the Pythagorean Way of Life*, trans. by John M. Dillon and Jackson P. Hershbell (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1991)

- Josephus, Flavius, *Jewish Antiquities*, trans. by H. St. J. Thackeray, The Loeb Classical Library, 9 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965)
- , *The Life. Against Apion*, trans. by H. St. J. Thackeray, The Loeb Classical Library, 186 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926)
- Origen, *Matthäuserklärung I*, ed. by Erich Klostermann, Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, 40 (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1935)
- Philo of Alexandria, *De specialibus legibus III et IV*, trans. by André Mosès, Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie, 25 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1970)
- , *Philo*, trans. by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, The Loeb Classical Library, 10 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929–1962)
- , *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, ed. by Leopold Cohn and Paul Wendland, 7 vols (Berlin: Reimer, 1896–1906 [vol. 1–6]; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1928–1930 [vol. 7]; repr. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1962–1963)
- , *Philo: Supplement*, trans. by Ralph Marcus, The Loeb Classical Library, 380 & 401, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953)
- Plato, *Laws*, trans. by R. G. Bury, Loeb Classical Library, 187 & 192, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926)
- , *Republic 1–5*, ed. & trans. by Chris Emlyn-Jones and William Preddy, Loeb Classical Library, 237 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013)
- , *Theaetetus. Sophist.*, trans. by Harold North Fowler, The Loeb Classical Library, 123 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921)
- Plutarch, *Moralia: Volume II*, trans. by Frank Cole Babbitt, The Loeb Classical Library, 222 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928)
- , *Moralia: Volume III*, trans. by Frank Cole Babbitt, The Loeb Classical Library, 245 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931)
- Seneca, Lucius Annaeus, *Epistles 66–92*, trans. by Richard M. Gummere, The Loeb Classical Library, 76 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920)
- Sophocles, *Antigone, The Women of Trachis, Philoctetes, Oedipus at Colonus*, ed. & trans. by Hugh Lloyd-Jones, Loeb Classical Library, 21 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994)
- Stobaeus, Joannes, *Ioannis Stobaei Anthologium*, ed. by Curt Wachsmuth, 5 vols (Berlin: Weidmann, 1884)
- Xenophon, *Cyropaedia: Books I–IV*, trans. by Walter Miller, Loeb Classical Library, 51 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914)
- , *Memorabilia, Oeconomicus, Symposium, Apology*, trans. by E. C. Marchant and O. J. Todd, Loeb Classical Library, 168 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1923)

3. Other Primary Texts

- Beentjes, Pancratius C., *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, 68 (Leiden: Brill, 1997)
- Brock, Sebastian P., ed., *Testamentum Iobi*, Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece, 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1967)
- Charles, R. H., *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1908)
- Dochhorn, Jan, *Die Apokalypse des Mose: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar, Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum*, 106 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005)
- Ehrman, Bart D., ed., *The Apostolic Fathers*, trans. by Bart D. Ehrman, Loeb Classical Library, 24 & 25, 2 vols (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2003)
- Gathercole, Simon J., *The Gospel of Thomas: Introduction and Commentary*, Texts and Editions for New Testament Study, 11 (Leiden: Brill, 2014)
- Goldschmidt, Lazarus, *Der Babylonische Talmud*, 9 vols (Haag: Martinus Nijhoff, 1933–1935)
- Hadas, Moses, ed., *Aristeas to Philocrates*, trans. by Moses Hadas (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1951)
- de Jonge, Marinus, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*, Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece, 1.2 (Leiden: Brill, 1978)
- Lightfoot, J. L., *The Sibylline Oracles: With Introduction, Translation, and Commentary on the First and Second Books* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)
- Martínez, Florentino G., and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*, 2 vols (Leiden: Brill, 2000)
- Schechter, Solomon, *Aboth de Rabbi Nathan* (New York: Feldhaim, 1945)
- Sperber, Alexander, ed., *The Latter Prophets According to Targum Jonathan*, The Bible in Aramaic, 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1962)
- Ulrich, Eugene, ed., *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, 134 (Leiden: Brill, 2010)
- Weiss, J. H., ed., *Sifra* (Wien: Jacob Schlossberg, 1862)
- Zuckermann, M. S., ed., *Tosephta: Based on the Erfurt and Vienna Codices*, 2nd edn (Jerusalem: Bamberger & Wahrmann, 1937)

Secondary Sources

- Abrahams, Israel, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels: First Series* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1917)
- , *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels: Second Series* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1924)
- Ahn, Daniel, ‘The Significance of Jesus’s Use of Hosea 6:6 in the Gospel of Matthew’ (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2020)
- Alexander, P. S., ‘Jesus and the Golden Rule’, in *Hillel and Jesus: Comparative Studies of Two Major Religious Leaders*, ed. by James H. Charlesworth and Loren L. Johns (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997), pp. 363–88
- Allison, Dale C., ‘Mark 12.28–31 and the Decalogue’, in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. by Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series*, 104 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994), pp. 270–78
- , *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993)
- , ‘Two Notes on a Key Text: Matthew 11:25–30’, *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 39.2 (1988), 477–85
- Amir, Yehoshua, ‘The Decalogue According to Philo’, in *The Ten Commandments in History and Tradition*, ed. by Ben-Tsiyon Segal and Gershon Levi, trans. by Yvonne Glikson (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1990), pp. 121–60
- Andersen, Francis I., and David Noel Freedman, *Hosea: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible, 24 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980)
- Anderson, Gary A., *Charity: The Place of the Poor in the Biblical Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013)
- Andrews, Herbert T., ‘The Letter of Aristeas’, in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, ed. by R. H. Charles, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913), II, 83–122
- Annas, Julia, *Virtue and Law in Plato and Beyond* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017)
- Banks, Robert J., *Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition*, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, 28 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975)
- Barclay, John M. G., *Against Apion*, Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary, 10 (Leiden: Brill, 2007)
- , *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996)
- , ‘Paul and Philo on Circumcision: Romans 2:25–9 in Social and Cultural Context’, *New Testament Studies*, 44 (1998), 536–56

- Barclay, John M. G., and B. G. White, 'Introduction: Posing the Questions', in *New Testament in Comparison: Validity, Method, and Purpose in Comparing Traditions*, ed. by John M. G. Barclay and B. G. White, Library of New Testament Studies, 600 (London: T&T Clark, 2020), pp. 1–7
- Bartelt, Andrew H., 'Dialectical Negation: An Exegetical Both/And', in *Hear the Word of Yahweh: Essays on Scripture and Archaeology in Honor of Horace D. Hummel*, ed. by Dean O. Wenthe, Paul L. Schrieber, and Lee A. Maxwell (St. Louis, MO: Concordia, 2002), pp. 57–66
- Barth, Gerhard, 'Matthew's Understanding of the Law', in *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, by Gunther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz Joachim Held, trans. by Percy Scott, 2nd edn (London: SCM, 1982), pp. 58–164
- Bauer, Johannes Baptist, 'Das milde Joch und die Ruhe, Matth. 11,28–30', *Theologische Zeitschrift*, 17.2 (1961), 99–106
- Baxter, Wayne S., 'Healing and the "Son of David": Matthew's Warrant', *Novum Testamentum*, 48 (2006), 36–50
- Beaton, Richard, *Isaiah's Christ in Matthew's Gospel*, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, 123 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)
- Becker, Jürgen, *Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen*, Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, 3.1 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher, 1974)
- Behr, John, ed., *Origen: On First Principles*, trans. by John Behr, Oxford Early Christian Texts, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017)
- Berger, Klaus, *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu: ihr historischer Hintergrund im Judentum und im Alten Testament, Teil I: Markus und Parallelen*, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 40 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1972)
- Berthelot, Katell, *Philanthrôpia Judaica: le débat autour de la 'misanthropie' des lois juives dans l'Antiquité*, Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 76 (Leiden: Brill, 2003)
- Betz, Hans Dieter, 'Logion of the Easy Yoke and of Rest (Matt 11:28–30)', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 86.1 (1967), 10–24
- Bird, Michael F., *The Gospel of the Lord: How the Early Church Wrote the Story of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014)
- Birnbaum, Ellen, and John M. Dillon, *Philo of Alexandria, On the Life of Abraham: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series, 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2021)
- Blass, F., and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. by Robert W. Funk (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961)

- Blomberg, Craig L., 'Matthew', in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. by Gregory K. Beale and Donald A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), pp. 1–109
- Boda, Mark J., *The Book of Zechariah*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016)
- Bonazzi, Mauro, 'Towards Transcendence: Philo and the Renewal of Platonism in the Early Imperial Age', in *Philo of Alexandria and Post-Aristotelian Philosophy*, ed. by Francesca Alesse, Studies in Philo of Alexandria, 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 233–51
- Bons, Eberhard, 'Osée 6:6 dans le Texte Massorétique', in '*Car c'est l'amour qui me plaît, non le sacrifice...*': recherches sur Osée 6:6 et son interprétation juive et chrétienne, ed. by Eberhard Bons, Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 88 (Leiden: Brill, 2004)
- Borgen, Peder, 'Philo of Alexandria – a Systematic Philosopher or an Eclectic Editor?', *Symbolae Osloenses*, 71 (1996), 115–34
- , *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 86 (Leiden: Brill, 1997)
- Bornkamm, Günther, 'Enderwartung und Kirche im Matthäusevangelium', in *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium*, by Günther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz Joachim Held, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 1 (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1960), pp. 13–47
- , 'End-Expectation and Church in Matthew', in *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, by Günther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz Joachim Held, trans. by Percy Scott, 2nd edn (London: SCM, 1982), pp. 15–57
- Botner, Max, 'Has Jesus Read What David Did? Probing Problems in Mark 2:25–26', *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 69.2 (2018), 484–99
- Brooks, Roger, 'Mishnah-Tosefa Peah', in *The Law of Agriculture in the Mishnah and the Tosefta: Translation, Commentary, Theology*, ed. by Jacob Neusner, Handbook of Oriental Studies, 79/1 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 583–786
- Brown, Lesley, ed., *Plato: Theaetetus*, Oxford World's Classics (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014)
- Burer, Michael H., *Divine Sabbath Work*, Bulletin for Biblical Research Supplements, 5 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012)
- Calabi, Francesca, 'Les sacrifices et leur signification symbolique chez Philon d'Alexandrie', in '*Car c'est l'amour qui me plaît, non le sacrifice...*': recherches sur Osée 6:6 et son interprétation juive et chrétienne, Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 88 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. 97–117
- Carson, D. A., 'Matthew', in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Volume 8*, ed. by Frank E. Gæbelein (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), pp. 1–599

- Cathcart, K. J., and R. P. Gordon, *The Targum of the Minor Prophets: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes*, The Aramaic Bible, 14 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989)
- 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, 2/216 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006)
- Charles, R. H., ‘The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Introduction’, in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, ed. by R. H. Charles, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913), II, 282–95
- Chilton, Bruce, Alan J. Avery-Peck, Darrell L. Bock, Craig A. Evans, Daniel M. Gurtner, Jacob Neusner, and others, *A Comparative Handbook to the Gospels of Matthew and Luke: Comparisons with Pseudepigrapha, the Qumran Scrolls, and Rabbinic Literature*, The New Testament Gospels in Their Judaic Contexts, 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2021)
- Classen, Carl Joachim, ‘Plato’s Virtues in Rome’, in *Aretai und Virtutes: Untersuchungen zu den Wertvorstellungen der Griechen und Römer*, Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 283 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), pp. 320–31
- Cohen, Naomi G., *Philo Judaeus: His Universe of Discourse*, Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentums, 24 (Frankfurt a.M.: P. Lang, 1995)
- , ‘The Greek Virtues and the Mosaic Laws in Philo: An Elucidation of De Specialibus Legibus IV 133–135’, *Studia Philonica Annual*, 5 (1993), 9–23
- Cohn, Leopold, Isaak Heinemann, Maximilian Adler, and Willy Theiler, eds., *Philo von Alexandria: Die Werke in deutscher Übersetzung*, 7 vols (Breslau: Marcus, 1909–1938 [vol. 1–6]; repr. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1962 [vol. 1–6]; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1964 [vol. 7])
- Collins, Adela Yarbro, *Mark: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007)
- Danby, Herbert, *The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933)
- Davies, W. D., ‘“Knowledge” in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11:25–30’, *Harvard Theological Review*, 46.3 (1953), 113–40
- , *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964)
- Davies, W. D., and Dale C. Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, International Critical Commentary, 3 vols (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–97)
- Dearman, J. Andrew, *The Book of Hosea*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010)
- Deines, Roland, ‘Jesus and the Torah according to the Gospel of Matthew’, in *The Gospel of Matthew in Its Historical and Theological Context: Papers from the International*

- Conference in Moscow, September 24 to 28, 2018*, ed. by Michail Seleznev, William R. G. Loader, and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*, 459 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021)
- , ‘Not the Law but the Messiah: Law and Righteousness in the Gospel of Matthew — An Ongoing Debate’, in *Built upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew*, ed. by Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), pp. 53–84
- deSilva, David A., *The Letter to the Galatians*, *The New International Commentary on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2018)
- Deutsch, Celia, *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke: Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11.25–30*, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement*, 18 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987)
- Dillon, John, ‘Philo and the Telos: Some Reflections’, *The Studia Philonica Annual*, 28 (2016), 111–19
- Dillon, John M., *The Middle Platonists: 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*, rev. edn (New York: Cornell University Press, 1996)
- Docherty, Susan E., ‘New Testament Scriptural Interpretation in Its Early Jewish Context’, *Novum Testamentum*, 57.1 (2015), 1–19
- Doering, Lutz, ‘Sabbath Laws in the New Testament Gospels’, in *New Testament and Rabbinic Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 207–53
- , *Schabbat: Sabbathalacha und-praxis im antiken Judentum und Urchristentum*, *Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum*, 78 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999)
- Donaldson, Terence L., ‘The Law That Hangs (Matthew 22:40): Rabbinic Formulation and Matthean Social World’, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 57 (1995), 689–709
- Dschulnigg, Peter, *Das Markusevangelium*, *Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, 2 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2007)
- Duling, Dennis C., ‘Solomon, Exorcism, and the Son of David’, *The Harvard Theological Review*, 68.3 (1975), 235–52
- Elliott, J. K., ed., *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993)
- Epstein, I., ed., *The Babylonian Talmud*, 35 vols (London: Sonico, 1935)
- Evans, Craig A., *Mark 8:27–16:20*, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 34B (Nashville: Nelson, 2008)
- Feldmeier, Reinhard, ‘“As Your Heavenly Father Is Perfect”: The God of the Bible and Commandments in the Gospel’, *Interpretation*, 70.4 (2016), 431–44
- Ferguson, John, *Clement of Alexandria, Stromateis: Books 1–3*, *The Fathers of the Church*, 85 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1991)

- Foster, Paul, *Community, Law, and Mission in Matthew's Gospel*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament, 2/177 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004)
- , 'The Rise of the Markan Priority Hypothesis and Early Responses and Challenges to It', in *Theological and Theoretical Issues in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. by John S. Kloppenborg and Joseph Verheyden, The Library of New Testament Studies, 618 (London: T&T Clark, 2020)
- France, R. T., *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, The New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002)
- , *The Gospel of Matthew*, The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007)
- Freund, Richard A., 'The Decalogue in Early Judaism and Christianity', in *The Function of Scripture in Early Jewish and Christian Tradition*, ed. by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 154 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998)
- García, Jeffrey P., 'Matthew 19:20: "What Do I Still Lack?" Jesus, Charity, and the Early Rabbis', in *The Gospels in First-Century Judaea: Proceedings of the Inaugural Conference of Nyack College's Graduate Program in Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins, August 29th, 2013*, ed. by R. Steven Notley and Jeffrey P. García, Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series, 29 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), pp. 20–43
- Geljon, Albert C., and David T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria, On Planting: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series, 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2019)
- Gerhardsson, Birger, 'The Hermeneutic Program in Matthew 22:37', in *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity; Essays in Honour of William David Davies*, ed. by Robert Hamerton-Kelley, Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, 21 (Leiden: Brill, 1976)
- Gesenius, Friedrich Wilhelm, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, ed. by E. Kautzsch, trans. by A. E. Cowley, 2nd edn (Oxford: Clarendon, 1910)
- Gisin, Walter, *Das Buch Hosea*, Edition C Bibelkommentar Altes Testament, 37 (Witten: SCM R. Brockhaus, 2014)
- Glynn, Leo Edward, 'The Use and Meaning of ἔλεος in Matthew' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, 1971)
- Gnilka, Joachim, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, Herders Theologischer Kommentar Zum Neuen Testament, 1, 2 vols (Freiburg: Herder, 1986)
- Goldin, Judah, *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan*, Yale Judaica Series, 10 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955)
- Goodenough, Erwin R., 'Philo's Exposition of the Law and His De vita Mosis', *Harvard Theological Review*, 26 (1933), 109–25

- Gould, Ezra P., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark*, International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1896)
- Gregory, Bradley C., *Like An Everlasting Signet Ring: Generosity in the Book of Sirach*, Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies, 2 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010)
- Gruber, Mayer I., *Hosea: A Textual Commentary*, Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies, 653 (New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017)
- Guillaume, Alfred, *Prophecy and Divination among the Hebrews and Other Semites*, Bampton Lectures, 1938 (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938)
- Gundry, Robert H., *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993)
- , *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution*, 2nd edn (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994)
- , *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel: With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1967)
- Hagner, Donald A., *Matthew 1–13*, Word Biblical Commentary, 33A (Dallas: Word, 1993)
- , *Matthew 14–28*, Word Biblical Commentary, 33B (Dallas: Word, 1995)
- Ham, Clay Alan, *The Coming King and the Rejected Shepherd: Matthew's Reading of Zechariah's Messianic Hope*, New Testament Monographs, 4 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2005)
- Harper, William Rainey, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea*, The International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1905)
- Hayes, Christine E., *What's Divine about Divine Law? Early Perspectives* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015)
- Hays, Richard B., *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2016)
- Hecht, Richard D., 'Preliminary Issues in the Analysis of Philo's De Specialibus Legibus', *Studia Philonica*, 5 (1978), 1–55
- Heil, John Paul, 'Ezekiel 34 and the Narrative Strategy of the Shepherd and Sheep Metaphor in Matthew', *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 55.4 (1993), 698–708
- Held, Heinz Joachim, 'Matthew as Interpreter of the Miracle Stories', in *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, by Gunther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz Joachim Held, trans. by Percy Scott (London: SCM, 1963), pp. 165–299
- Helleman, Wendy E., 'Philo of Alexandria on Deification and Assimilation to God', *Studia Philonica Annual*, 2 (1990), 51–71
- Hill, David, 'On the Use and Meaning of Hosea 6:6 in Matthew's Gospel', *New Testament Studies*, 24.1 (1977), 107–19

- , *The Gospel of Matthew*, New Century Bible (London: Oliphants, 1972)
- Hinkle, Mary E., ‘Learning What Righteousness Means: Hosea 6:6 and the Ethic of Mercy in Matthew’s Gospel’, *Word & World*, 18.4 (1998), 355–63
- Hoppe, Rudolf, ‘Gerechtigkeit bei Matthäus und Philo’, in *‘Dies ist das Buch ...’: das Matthäusevangelium; Interpretation - Rezeption - Rezeptionsgeschichte; für Hubert Frankemölle*, ed. by Rainer Kampling (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004), pp. 141–55
- van der Horst, Pieter W., ‘Organized Charity in the Ancient World: Pagan, Jewish, Christian’, in *Jewish and Christian Communal Identities in the Roman World*, ed. by Ya’ir Furstenberg, *Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), pp. 116–33
- Hurtado, Larry W., ‘Does Philo Help Explain Early Christianity?’, in *Philo und das Neue Testament: wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen: I. Internationales Symposium zum Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum, 1.-4. Mai 2003, Eisenach/Jena*, ed. by Roland Deines and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*, 172 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), pp. 73–92
- Hwang, Jerry, *Hosea: A Discourse Analysis of the Hebrew Bible*, Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2021)
- Jobes, Karen H., and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000)
- de Jonge, Marinus, ‘The Two Great Commandments in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs’, *Novum Testamentum*, 44.4 (2002), 371–92
- Joosten, Jan, ‘The Text of Old Testament Quotations in Matthew’, in *The Gospel of Matthew in Its Historical and Theological Context: Papers from the International Conference in Moscow, September 24 to 28, 2018*, ed. by Michail Seleznev, William R. G. Loader, and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*, 459 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021), pp. 201–15
- , ‘ $\tau\omicron\eta$, “Benevolence”, and ἔλεος, “Pity”: Reflections on Their Lexical Equivalence in the Septuagint’, in *Collected Studies on the Septuagint: From Language to Interpretation and Beyond*, *Forschungen zum Alten Testament*, 83 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), pp. 97–111
- Keener, Craig S., *The Gospel of Matthew: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009)
- Keith, Pierre, ‘Les citations d’Osée 6:6 dans deux péripécopes de l’Évangile de Matthieu (Mt 9:9–13 et 12:1–8)’, in *‘Car c’est l’amour qui me plaît, non le sacrifice...’: recherches sur Osée 6:6 et son interprétation juive et chrétienne*, ed. by Eberhard Bons, *Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism*, 88 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. 57–80
- Kilpatrick, G. D., *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1946)

- Konradt, Matthias, 'Israel's Scriptures in Matthew', in *Israel's Scriptures in Early Christian Writings: The Use of the Old Testament in the New*, ed. by Matthias Henze and David Lincicum (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2023), pp. 209–35
- , *Israel, Church, and the Gentiles in the Gospel of Matthew*, trans. by Kathleen Ess, Baylor-Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014)
- , 'Law, Salvation and Christian Identity in Paul and Matthew', in *Concepts of Law in the Sciences, Legal Studies, and Theology*, ed. by Michael Welker and Gregor Etzelmüller, *Religion in Philosophy and Theology*, 72 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), pp. 181–204
- , 'Matthew within or outside of Judaism? From the "Parting of the Ways" Model to a Multifaceted Approach', in *Jews and Christians – Parting Ways in the First Two Centuries CE?*, ed. by Jens Schröter, Benjamin A. Edsall, and Joseph Verheyden, *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 253 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021)
- , '"Nehmt auf euch mein Joch und lernt von mir!" (Mt 11,29). Mt 11,28-30 und die christologische Dimension der matthäischen Ethik', *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*, 109.1 (2018), 1–31
- , *Studien zum Matthäusevangelium*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 358 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016)
- , *The Gospel According to Matthew: A Commentary*, trans. by M. Eugene Boring (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2020)
- , 'The Role of the Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew', in *Matthew within Judaism: Israel and the Nations in the First Gospel*, ed. by Anders Runesson and Daniel M. Gurtner, *Early Christianity and Its Literature*, 27 (Atlanta: SBL, 2020), pp. 213–31
- Konstan, David, 'Philo's De virtutibus in the Perspective of Classical Greek Philosophy', *Studia Philonica Annual*, 18, 2006, 59–72
- , *Pity Transformed*, Classical Inter/Faces (London: Duckworth, 2001)
- , *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006)
- Kruse, Heinz, 'Die "dialektische Negation" als semitisches Idiom', *Vetus Testamentum*, 4.4 (1954), 385–400
- Kubiś, Adam, '"I Delight in Love, Not in Sacrifice": Hosea 6:6 and Its Rereading in the Gospel of Matthew', *Collectanea Theologica*, 90.5 (2020), 295–320
- Kugel, James L., 'Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', in *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture*, ed. by Louis H. Feldman, James L. Kugel, and Lawrence H. Schiffman, 3 vols (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 2013), II, 1697–1855

- Kuschke, Arnulf, 'Das Idiom der »relativen Negation« im NT', *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche*, 43 (1951), 263
- Laansma, Jon C., *'I Will Give You Rest': The 'Rest' Motif in the New Testament with Special Reference to Mt 11 and Heb 3–4*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament, 2/98 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997)
- Lane, William L., *The Gospel According to Mark*, New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974)
- Leonhardt, Jutta, *Jewish Worship in Philo of Alexandria*, Texte Und Studien Zum Antiken Judentum, 84 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001)
- Loader, William R. G., *Jesus' Attitude Towards the Law: A study of the Gospels*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2/97 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997)
- Lutz, Cora E., 'Musonius Rufus: "The Roman Socrates"', *Yale Classical Studies*, 10 (1947), 3–147
- Luz, Ulrich, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8–17)*, Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, I/2 (Zürich: Benziger, 1990)
- , *Matthew 1–7: A Commentary*, trans. by James E. Crouch, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2007)
- , *Matthew 8–20: A Commentary*, trans. by James E. Crouch, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001)
- , *Matthew 21–28: A Commentary*, trans. by James E. Crouch, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005)
- Lybæk, Lena, 'Matthew's Use of Hosea 6,6 in the Context of the Sabbath Controversies', in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*, ed. by C. M. Tuckett, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 131 (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1997), pp. 491–99
- Macatangay, Francis M., *When I Die, Bury Me Well: Death, Burial, Almsgiving, and Restoration in the Book of Tobit* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2016)
- Macintosh, Andrew A., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Hosea*, International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997)
- Maier, Gerhard, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus, Kapitel 1–14*, Historisch-Theologische Auslegung (Witten: SCM R. Brockhaus, 2015)
- Mann, C. S., *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible, 27 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1986)
- Marcus, Joel, *Mark 1–8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible, 27 (New York: Doubleday, 2000)

- , *Mark 8–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible, 27A (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009)
- Martens, John W., *One God, One Law: Philo of Alexandria on the Mosaic and Greco-Roman Law*, Studies in Philo of Alexandria, 2 (Boston: Brill Academic, 2003)
- , ‘The Meaning and Function of the Law in Philo and Josephus’, in *Torah Ethics and Early Christian Identity*, ed. by Susan J. Wendel (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), pp. 27–40
- , ‘Unwritten Law in Philo: A Response to Naomi G. Cohen’, *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 43 (1992), 38–45
- Maschmeier, Jens-Christian, *Reziproke Barmherzigkeit: Theologie und Ethik im Matthäusevangelium*, Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, 227 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2020)
- Mays, James Luther, *Hosea: A Commentary*, Old Testament Library (London: SCM, 1969)
- Meier, John P., *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus Volume 4: Law and Love*, Anchor Bible Reference Library (New York: Doubleday, 2009)
- Menken, Maarten J. J., *Matthew’s Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 173 (Leuven: Peeters, 2004)
- , ‘The Source of the Quotation From Isaiah 53:4 in Matthew 8:17’, *Novum Testamentum*, 39.4 (1997), 313–27
- Metzger, Bruce M., *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd edn (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994)
- Milgrom, Jacob, *Leviticus 17–22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible, 3A (New York: Doubleday, 2000)
- Millard, Matthias, ‘Osée 6,6 dans l’histoire de l’interprétation juive’, in *‘Car c’est l’amour qui me plaît, non le sacrifice...’: recherches sur Osée 6:6 et son interprétation juive et chrétienne* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. 119–46
- Mirguet, Françoise, *An Early History of Compassion: Emotion and Imagination in Hellenistic Judaism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017)
- Mitchell, Matthew W., ‘The Yoke Is Easy, but What of Its Meaning?: A Methodological Reflection Masquerading as a Philological Discussion of Matthew 11:30’, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 135.2 (2016), 321–40
- Moo, Douglas J., *Galatians*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013)
- Morgan, Teresa, *Roman Faith and Christian Faith: Pistis and Fides in the Early Roman Empire and Early Churches* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015)

- Moss, Charlene McAfee, *The Zechariah Tradition and the Gospel of Matthew*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 156 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008)
- Moyise, Steve, *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction*, T & T Clark Approaches to Biblical Studies, 2nd edn (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015)
- Najman, Hindy, 'Decalogue', in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, ed. by John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), pp. 526–28
- , 'The Law of Nature and the Authority of Mosaic Law', *The Studia Philonica Annual*, 11 (1999), 55–73
- Neusner, Jacob, *A Life of Yohanan Ben Zakkai, ca. 1–80 C.E.*, Studia Post-Biblica, 6, 2nd edn (Leiden: Brill, 1970)
- , *The Talmud of Babylonia: An American Translation. Volume 15A: Tractate Nedarim Chapters 1–4*, Brown Judaic Studies, 262 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1992)
- Newport, Kenneth G. C., *The Sources and Sitz im Leben of Matthew 23*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement, 117 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995)
- Niehoff, Maren, and Reinhard Feldmeier, eds., *Abrahams Aufbruch: Philon von Alexandria, De migratione Abrahami*, Scripta Antiquitatis Posterioris ad Ethicam Religionemque pertinentia, 30 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017)
- Niehoff, Maren R., *Philo of Alexandria: An Intellectual Biography* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018)
- , 'Philo's Rationalization of Judaism', in *Rationalization in Religions: Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, ed. by Yohanan Friedmann and Christoph Marksches (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2019), pp. 21–44
- 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', in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels: The Gospel of Matthew*, ed. by Thomas R. Hatina (London: T&T Clark, 2008), pp. 133–46
- North, Helen F., 'Canons and Hierarchies of the Cardinal Virtues in Greek and Latin Literature', in *The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan*, ed. by Luitpold Wallach (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966), pp. 165–83
- Novakovic, Lidija, 'Matthew's Atomistic Use of Scripture: Messianic Interpretation of Isaiah 53.4 in Matthew 8.17', in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels: Volume 2: The Gospel of Matthew*, ed. by Thomas R. Hatina (London: T&T Clark, 2008), pp. 147–62
- , *Messiah, the Healer of the Sick: A Study of Jesus as the Son of David in the Gospel of Matthew*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament, 2/170 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003)

- Olmstead, Wesley G., 'Jesus, the Eschatological Perfection of Torah, and the imitatio Dei in Matthew', in *Torah Ethics and Early Christian Identity*, ed. by Susan J. Wendel and David M. Miller (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), pp. 43–58
- , *Matthew 1–14: A Handbook on the Greek Text*, Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament (Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2019)
- Origen, *The Commentary of Origen on the Gospel of St Matthew*, trans. by Ronald E. Heine, Oxford Early Christian Texts, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018)
- Ottenheijm, Eric, 'The Shared Meal—A Therapeutical Device: The Function and Meaning of Hos 6:6 in Matt 9:10–13', *Novum Testamentum*, 53.1 (2011), 1–21
- Overman, J. Andrew, *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990)
- Pearce, Sarah, 'On the Decalogue', in *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture*, ed. by Louis H. Feldman, James L. Kugel, and Lawrence H. Schiffman, 3 vols (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 2013), I, 989–1032
- Pesch, Rudolf, *Das Markusevangelium*, Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, 2 vols (Freiburg: Herder, 1976)
- Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright, eds., *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)
- Piotrowski, Nicholas G., "'I Will Save My People from Their Sins": The Influence of Ezekiel 36:38b–29a; 37:23b on Matthew 1:21', *Tyndale Bulletin*, 64.1 (2013), 33–54
- Przybylski, Benno, *Righteousness in Matthew and His World of Thought*, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, 41 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980)
- Repschinski, Boris, *The Controversy Stories in the Gospel of Matthew: Their Redaction, Form and Relevance for the Relationship Between the Matthean Community and Formative Judaism*, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 189 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000)
- Reydams-Schils, Gretchen, "'Becoming like God" in Platonism and Stoicism', in *From Stoicism to Platonism: The Development of Philosophy, 100 BCE–100 CE*, ed. by Troels Engberg-Pedersen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), pp. 142–58
- Ribbens, Benjamin J., 'Whose "Mercy"? What "Sacrifice"? : A Proposed Reading of Matthew's Hosea 6:6 Quotations', *Bulletin for Biblical Research*, 28.3 (2018), 381–404
- Royse, James R., and Adam Kamesar, 'The Works of Philo', in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*, ed. by Adam Kamesar (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 32–64

- Runesson, Anders, and Daniel M. Gurtner, 'Introduction: The Location of the Matthew-within-Judaism Perspective in Past and Present Research', in *Matthew within Judaism: Israel and the Nations in the First Gospel*, ed. by Anders Runesson and Daniel M. Gurtner, *Early Christianity and Its Literature*, 27 (Atlanta: SBL, 2020), pp. 1–25
- Runia, David T., *On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses*, Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series, 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2001)
- , *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey*, *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, III/3 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1993)
- Sabourin, Léopold, 'Why Is God Called "Perfect" in Mt 5:48', *Biblische Zeitschrift*, 24.2 (1980), 266–68
- Sakenfeld, Katharine D., *The Meaning of Hesed in the Hebrew Bible: A New Inquiry*, Harvard Semitic Monographs, 17 (Missoula: Scholars, 1978)
- Saldarini, Anthony J., *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan (Abot de Rabbi Nathan) Version B: A Translation and Commentary*, *Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity*, 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1975)
- Sanders, E. P., *Jesus and Judaism* (London: SCM, 1985)
- Sandmel, Samuel, *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979)
- Seeanner, Josef, *Die Barmherzigkeit (ἔλεος) im Matthäusevangelium: rettende Vergebung* (Kleinhain: St. Josef, 2009)
- Shuler, Philip L., 'Philo's Moses and Matthew's Jesus: A Comparative Study in Ancient Literature', *The Studia Philonica Annual*, 2 (1990), 86–103
- Skehan, Patrick W., and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, Anchor Bible, 39 (New York: Doubleday, 1987)
- Stanton, Graham, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992)
- Stendahl, Krister, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament*, *Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis*, 20, 2nd edn (Lund: Gleerup, 1968)
- Sterling, Gregory E., 'Philo Has Not Been Used Half Enough': The Significance of Philo of Alexandria for the Study of the New Testament', *Perspectives in Religious Studies*, 30 (2003), 251–69
- , 'Philo of Alexandria', in *The Historical Jesus in Context*, ed. by Amy-Jill Levine, Dale C. Allison, and John Dominic Crossan, *Princeton Readings in Religions* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), pp. 296–308
- , 'Philo of Alexandria's Life of Moses: An Introduction to the Exposition of the Law', *The Studia Philonica Annual*, 30 (2018), 31–45

- , “‘The Queen of Virtues’: Piety in Philo of Alexandria”, *The Studia Philonica Annual*, 18 (2006), 103–23
- Strack, H. L., and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, 3 vols (München: Beck, 1922–26)
- Strack, H. L., and G. Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, trans. by Markus Bockmuehl, 2nd edn (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996)
- Stuart, Douglas, *Hosea–Jonah*, Word Biblical Commentary, 31 (Dallas: Word, 1987)
- Svebakken, Hans, *Philo of Alexandria’s Exposition of the Tenth Commandment*, Studia Philonica Monographs, 6 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012)
- Sweeney, Marvin A., *The Twelve Prophets*, Berit Olam, 2 vols (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2000)
- Talbot, Elizabeth, ‘Rest, Eschatology and Sabbath in Matthew 11:28–30: An Investigation of Jesus’ Offer of Rest in the Light of the Septuagint’s Use of Anapausis’, in *‘What Does the Scripture Say?’: Studies in the Function of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity*, ed. by Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias, Library of New Testament Studies, 470 (London: T&T Clark, 2012), pp. 57–69
- Termini, Cristina, ‘Taxonomy of Biblical Laws and Φιλοτεχνία in Philo of Alexandria: A Comparison with Josephus and Cicero’, trans. by C. Peri, *Studia Philonica Annual*, 16 (2004), 1–29
- Thielman, Frank, *The Law and the New Testament: The Question of Continuity*, Companions to the New Testament (New York: Crossroad, 1999)
- Torri, Paolo, ‘The Telos of Assimilation to God and the Conflict between Theoria and Praxis in Plato and the Middle Platonists’, in *Thinking, Knowing, Acting: Epistemology and Ethics in Plato and Ancient Platonism*, ed. by Mauro Bonazzi, Filippo Forcignanò, and Angela Ulacco, Brill’s Plato Studies Series, 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2019)
- Urbach, Ephraim E., *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*, trans. by Israel Abrahams (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1975)
- VanderKam, James C., *Jubilees*, Hermeneia, 2 vols (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2018)
- Verseput, Donald, *The Rejection of the Humble Messianic King: A Study of the Composition of Matthew 11–12*, European University Studies Series, XXIII/291 (Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1986)
- Viljoen, Francois P., ‘Hosea 6:6 and Identity Formation in Matthew’, *Acta Theologica*, 34 (2014), 214–37
- Watson, Francis, *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013)
- , *The Fourfold Gospel: A Theological Reading of the New Testament Portraits of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2017)

- Weiss, Herold, *A Day of Gladness: The Sabbath among Jews and Christians in Antiquity* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003)
- Wendel, Susan J., 'Doing Torah, Imitating Yahweh: A Reconsideration of the Good Samaritan Story', *The Expository Times*, 133.3 (2021), 105–16
- Williamson, Ronald, *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Arbeiten Zur Literatur Und Geschichte Des Hellenistischen Judentums, 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1970)
- Willitts, Joel, *Matthew's Messianic Shepherd-King: In Search of 'the Lost Sheep of the House of Israel'*, Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft Und Die Kunde Der Älteren Kirche, 147 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007)
- Wilson, Walter T., 'Matthew, Philo, and Mercy for Animals (Matt 12,9–14)', *Biblica*, 96.2 (2015), 201–21
- , *Philo of Alexandria, On Virtues*, Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series, 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2011)
- , 'The Constitution of Compassion: Political Reflections on Philo's De humanitate', in *Scripture and Traditions: Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Carl R. Holladay*, ed. by Patrick Gray and Gail R. O'Day, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 129 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 37–46
- , *The Mysteries of Righteousness: The Literary Composition and Genre of the Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*, Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum, 40 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994)
- Winston, David, 'Philo's Ethical Theory', in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II.21.1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984), pp. 372–416
- Wise, Michael O., Martin G. Abegg Jr., and Edward M. Cook, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*, rev. edn (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2005)
- Wolff, Hans W., *Hosea: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Hosea*, trans. by Gary Stansell, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974)
- Wolfson, Harry A., *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, Structure and Growth of Philosophic Systems from Plato to Spinoza, rev. edn, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962)
- Wright III, Benjamin G., *The Letter of Aristeas: 'Aristeas to Philocrates' or 'On the Translation of the Law of the Jews'*, Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015)
- Yang, Yong Eui, *Jesus and the Sabbath in Matthew's Gospel*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 139 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997)
- Yonge, C. D., *The Works of Philo Judaeus, the Contemporary of Josephus: Translated from the Greek*, 4 vols (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1854)

Zacharias, H. Daniel, *Matthew's Presentation of the Son of David: Davidic Tradition and Typology in the Gospel of Matthew* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017)

Zetzel, James E. G., ed., *Cicero: On the Commonwealth and On the Laws*, trans. by James E. G. Zetzel, *Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought*, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017)

Ziegert, Carsten, 'What Is קָדָשׁ? A Frame-Semantic Approach', *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, 44.4 (2020), 711–32

Concordances and Dictionaries

Bauer, Walter, Frederick W. Danker, William Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich, eds., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd edn (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000)

Borgen, Peder, Kåre Fuglseth, and Roald Skarsten, *The Philo Index: A Complete Greek Word Index to the Writings of Philo of Alexandria* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000)

Botterweck, G. Johannes, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, eds., *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, 17 vols (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–2021)

Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, eds., *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament: With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic, Based on the Lexicon of William Gesenius as Translated by Edward Robinson* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1907)

Clines, David J. A., ed., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, 8 vols (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993–2011)

Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath, eds., *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon, 1906)

Hornblower, Simon, Antony Spawforth, and Esther Eidinow, eds., *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 4th edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)

Jastrow, Marcus, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*, 2 vols (London: Luzac, 1903)

Kittel, Gerhard, Gerhard Friedrich, and Geoffrey W. Bromiley, eds., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)

Köhler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann Jakob Stamm, eds., *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 5 vols (Leiden: Brill, 2000)

Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones, eds., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th edn (Oxford: Clarendon, 1940)

Montanari, Franco, *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, ed. by Madeleine Goh and Chad Schroeder (Leiden: Brill, 2015)

Simpson, J. A., and E. S. C. Weiner, eds., *The Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd edn, 20 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989; repr. [with corrections] Oxford: Clarendon, 1991)